

## Gaps and stopgaps in Basque finite verb agreement\*

Milan Rezac, CNRS-IKER  
milan.rezac@yahoo.ca

Abstract: This chapter surveys gaps in Basque finite verb agreement, their sources, and their theoretical consequences. First come interpretive gaps due to Condition B. In Basque they are grammaticalised, and reveal a useful distinction between agreement and clitic systems. Next are gaps due to conditions on syntactic dependencies, two taken up in detail. One is the impossibility of dative agreement across an absolutive, which does not rule out any forms but certain pairings of form and meaning. The second is the Person Case Constraint, a gap with repairs through otherwise unavailable syntactic structures and novel agreeing forms. Last and in most detail are taken up morphological gaps in many western dialects, where some or all 1<sup>st</sup> person plural + 2<sup>nd</sup> person combinations are missing. In their place are often found stopgaps, forms that fail to code features of the arguments involved, including forms surface-identical to impersonals. A concern throughout is the potential of gaps and responses to them in helping understand the boundaries and interactions of morphology, syntax and interpretation.

### 1 Introduction to gaps

Gaps are a curious property of natural language: expressions that one would expect on the basis of others, but missing. Gwen's tunic might evoke *I want one too*, but not her trousers *\*I want ones too*; one can get *less fruit* or *fewer vegetables*, but not ask for *??less/\*fewer oats*. These absences are striking in inflectional paradigms. There is *underwent* and *embargoed*, and there was *forwent*, but for many *forgo* no longer has a past; *stridden* too is mostly gone, though *hid* and *ridden* and *glided* are with us still. Other domains of language as well riddle the field of expression with gaps. The typical island constraint gives rise to syntactic gaps: *\*How many mechanics did they ask if \_\_\_ fixed the cars?* "is a fine thought, but it has to be expressed by some circumlocution" (Chomsky 2013).

A fascinating and difficult aspect of gaps is how language responds to them, I-language and E-language. It is characteristic of most gaps that I-language does not see them. There is no form, structure or interpretation

---

\* I am grateful to P. Albizu, B. Fernández, M. Jouitteau, and A. Nevins for discussion, to B. Fernández and an anonymous reviewer for helpful comments, and to the editors for their long labours. This research has been partly supported by Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness grant FFI2014-51878-P9. The research leading to these results has also received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement n° 613465.

licensed only by the absence of *\*forwent* or *\*ones*: there are no repairs. E-language is another matter. To get around gaps, speakers resort to circumlocution, to independently available expressions of similar meaning – say *I went without dinner* or *I need a pair too*. It seems reasonable that in time, circumlocutions would grammaticalise to fill gaps. Yet though there are grammaticalised stopgaps, nonce or repurposed syntactic structures and morphological formations, whenever we will meet one, it will turn out never to have been available as a circumlocution.

These themes of gap and response, their natures and their sources, are the business of this article. The domain is the rich and intricate agreement system of the Basque finite verb. Gaps may be defined by phi-features, and bar agreeing forms, like *\*amn't*, structures or interpretations, *\*Either she or I \_\_\_ lying right now, aren't \_\_\_?* (Pullum 2013, McCawley 1998), or uses, *(\*)John gave the book to me, who speak(s) French* (Morgan 1972, cf. Sobin 1997), *(\*)One of my friends' mother broke a vase* (Green 1971, cf. Fodor and Inoue 1994). I take up first interpretive gaps due to Condition B. In Basque, they have become grammaticalised beyond their interpretive source, and that grammaticalisation is a characteristic of agreement system in one sense of the term. Next come gaps due to conditions on syntactic dependencies. One of them is a rare gap with syntactic repairs: the Person Case Constraint. Finally, and in most detail, are taken up morphological gaps in the agreement paradigms of many western dialects, where some or all 1p+2 combinations do not exist, and instead morphological stopgaps similar to *aren't* for *\*amn't* are found: a phenomenon with much potential to shed light on the boundary between syntax and morphology and the ways to find it.

## 2 The Basque agreement complex

Basque finite verb agreement is part of an agreement complex, a morphological word also reflecting mood and tense (for overviews, see Laka 1993a, Albizu 2002, Hualde 2003, Ariztimuño 2013). In the usual analytic formation, (1), the complex is built on an auxiliary root accompanying a nonfinite form of the verb. The form of the root can depend on just about any information coded in the complex, including the case and phi-features of agreement controllers. In the synthetic formation, the complex is built in a similar manner on a verbal root; it is available with *be* (mostly syncretic intransitive auxiliaries) and *have* (syncretic with transitive auxiliaries), and more sporadically with a handful of other verbs.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Glosses for agreement combine 1/2/3 person, s/p number, E, D, A ergative, dative, absolutive case (also glossing case on nouns), save that 2° is the familiar 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular followed by m/f gender if need be. Other glosses are X default prefix, √ root, TM theme marker, and Leipzig Glossing Rules glosses. Translations distinguish 2s *you*, 2p *ye*, 2° *thou*. Translations of citations and corpus examples are mine.

- (1) a. (Nik zuri haiek) eman d-i-zki-zu-t  
 I.E you.D they.A given X.PRS-√-pA-2sD-1sE  
 I gave them to you 1sE-2sD-3pA
- b. (Nik zuri haiek) eman n-i-zki-zu-n  
 I.E you.D they.A given 1sE-√-pA-2sD-PST  
 I gave them to you 1sE-2sD-3pA-PST

Each suffix agrees for person and number agreement with the ergative (-*t*) or the dative (-*zu*).<sup>2</sup> The prefix agrees in person and number with the absolutive if 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person, or else reflects tense and mood (*d*-). The plurality of the absolutive is indicated by one or more affixes in a variety of positions (-*zki*-). Some phenomena modify these correlations. In (1b), ergative displacement ED in the past tense shifts control of the prefix to a 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person ergative if there is no 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person absolutive, but never affects the absolutive plural morpheme. Agreement is usually obligatory if allowed.

A morphological breakdown of the agreement complex will often not be necessary. In that case the complex is glossed by agreement controllers alone in the order ((E-)D-)A, as in the translations in (1). 3sA systematically uses the morphology that one would expect if there were no A controller, so in glossing examples, 3sA is bracketed unless there is a 3sA argument, as in 3sE(-3sA).

Each of these controller-form relationships is subject to dialectal variation. A description of the Basque dialectal situation and of variation in verbal morphology is found in Hualde (this volume). Table 1 illustrates the variation found in agreement. A quick impression may be had by putting the forms side by side, e.g. *nazkitzun - nitizu - dotzutesen*, not unlike (*you*) *are - art - be*, but pervasive. Standard Basque or *Euskara batua* (EB) has often codified older forms and formations, so it is a useful point of reference for dialectal developments. In what follows, unprovenanced examples are EB.

Table 1: Dialectal variation (from Yrizar)

Variety <sup>†</sup>	Traditional analysis	Divergences from EB <sup>‡</sup>
EB	$n_{1sE}i\checkmark-zki_{pA}-zu_{2sD}-n_{PST}$	
L Urdax 1	$n_{1sE}a_{TM+}\checkmark-zki_{pA}-tzu_{2sD}-n_{PST}$	√; TM; 2sD form
L Urdax 2	$z_{2sD}in_{TM}t_{pD}u\checkmark-zki_{pD}-da_{1sE}-n_{PST}$	D treated like A; no ED
B Lekeitio 1	$n_{1sE}e_{TM}u\checkmark-tzu_{2sD}-se_{pA}-n_{PST}$	√; TM; pA form, pos.
B Lekeitio 2	$d_{X.PRS}o_{TM+}\checkmark-tzu_{2sD}-te_{1sE}-se_{pA}-n_{PST}$	√; no ED
B Bermeo	$-tsu_{2sD}-te_{1sE}-n_{PST}$	√; no ED; no pA; affixal
N Esteribar	$n_{1sE}it_{pA}i\checkmark-zu_{2sD}$	pA form, pos.; no PST

<sup>†</sup> EB Standard Basque, L Lapourdian, B Biscayan, N Navarrese

<sup>2</sup> In allocutive forms an additional suffix agrees in gender with the 2<sup>o</sup> addressee, and in some varieties also in politeness level (Oyharçabal 1993).

‡ √ root allomorphy; TM theme marker allomorphy; pos. positional variation

Essentially for reference, Table 2 gives the basic agreement prefix, suffix, and absolutive pluraliser forms in EB (Hualde 2003).<sup>3</sup>

Table 2: EB agreement morphemes and pronouns

	Prefix	Suffix	Pronoun (A, E, D)
3s	∅-‡	E -∅(-) D -o(-)	<i>hura hark hari</i>
3p†	∅-‡	E -te(-) D -e(-)	<i>haiek haiek haiei</i>
1s	<i>n-</i>	<i>-da-/-t</i>	<i>ni nik niri</i>
2°m	<i>h-</i>	<i>-ka-/-k</i>	<i>hi hik hiri</i>
2°f	<i>h-</i>	<i>-ka-/-n</i>	
1p†	<i>g-</i>	<i>-gu(-)</i>	<i>gu guk guri</i>
2s†	<i>z-</i>	<i>-zu(-)</i>	<i>zu zuk zuri</i>
2p†	<i>z-...-te(-)</i>	<i>-zue(-)</i>	<i>zuek zuek zuei</i>

† Controls a pluraliser if absolutive: *-(i)t-*, *-tza(-)*, *-z(-)*, *-zki(-)*, *-de*

‡ ED or default prefix: present *d-*, past *z-*, hypothetical *l-*, imperative *b-/∅-*

### 3 Interpretive phi-gaps: Condition B

By and large, interpretation imposes gaps on pairings of form and meaning for the agreement complex, not on the availability of forms. For *He<sub>i</sub> described her<sub>k</sub> to them<sub>\*i+k</sub>*, there is a candidate agreeing form, *deskribatu die 3sE-3pD-3sA*, but Condition B bars its use with this meaning. There is nothing here specific to Basque.

In one case, however, interpretation appears to rule out the forms themselves. Condition B bars full covaluation in local domains, *\*I chose me*, and reflexives step in, *I chose myself*. It also bars partial covaluation, *I asked us (??each) a question*, and then there is only a gap, because reflexives need exhaustive antecedence, *\*I asked ourselves a question*. The partial covaluation ban is of some importance, since it cannot be derived from preference for reflexives over pronouns (Lasnik 1981, Reinhart and Reuland 1993: sec. 4, Kayne 2002: 143-6, Safir 2004: 3.3.1, 2013: 15.4.2). It does not matter here whether the partial covaluation ban should be attributed to the same principles as the full covaluation ban, only that it creates gaps.

In English, there has been debate about the existence of the partial covaluation ban (Büring 2005: 9.2-4, Safir 2004: 3.3.1). It is known to be far stronger in certain clitic systems, such as French (2) (clitics in italics).

<sup>3</sup> The complexity of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person is mostly historically straightforward: the 2<sup>nd</sup> person familiar, 2° or *thou*, is the old 2s; 2s, *you*, is the old 2p so it combines with pluralisers; 2p, *ye*, is a repluralised 2s. The unique presence of gender distinction in 2° remains mysterious.

- (2) a. Vous deux *t'avez* %(\*chacun) choisi pour répondre à cette question.  
 Ye two have %(\*each) chosen *thee* to answer that question.
- b. \*Mai, Mael et Yann *l<sub>Mai</sub>'ont* %(\*chacun) choisi pour répondre à cette question.  
 Mai, Mael and Yann have %(\*each) chosen *her<sub>Mai</sub>* to answer that question.

(Rezac and Jouitteau 2015)

The literature gives such cases as ungrammatical (Blanche-Benveniste 1975: 213, Morin 1978: 347, Kayne 2002: 143-6, Schlenker 2005, Rooryck 2006). Some speakers tolerate similar examples with a collective reading of the plural argument, but not when there is an entailment of reflexivity, as here with *chacun* 'each' (cf. Reinhart and Reuland 1993: 677). The clitic system of French is a useful point of comparison for Basque, as it stands between strong pronouns and agreement systems, descriptively speaking: it looks morphologised in idiosyncratic constraints imposed by one clitic form on another, but it allows clitic combinations that only arise in multiclausal structures and unlikely to be lexicalised (Rezac 2010a).

In Basque, both the full and partial covaluation cases of Condition B are irredeemably bad for agreeing arguments. For 3+3 combinations, the forms exist, as *du, ditu* 3pE-3s,pA, but they cannot get the wholly or partially covalued meaning. For 1+1, 2+2 combinations, there are no forms: between *h<sub>2°A</sub>-au-t<sub>1sE</sub>* 1sE-2°A and *n<sub>1sA</sub>-au-k<sub>2°E</sub>* 2°E-1sA, one would expect \**n<sub>1sA</sub>-au-t<sub>1sA</sub>* 1sE-1sA, and so for \**naugu* 1pE-1sA, \**gaitut* 1sE-1pA, \**didagu* 1pE-1sD-3sA. The morphology is transparent and speakers amuse themselves in constructing the forms; but they are sharply ungrammatical, unlike other nonce formations discussed later.<sup>4</sup> Instead, partial covaluation is ineffable. Full covaluation is coded by the 3<sup>rd</sup> person reflexive *X's buru-* 'X's head' and reciprocals like *elkar* 'each.other' (Artiagoitia 2003, Etxepare 2003b, Albizu 2001, Hualde, Elordieta and Elordieta 1994, Ortiz de Urbina 1989).

It is natural to look to Condition B for the absence of these forms, since Condition B degrades similar combinations of full pronouns and clitics. Oyarçabal (1993: 102) proposes this reduction for full covaluation in Basque, and Rhodes (1993) even for partial covaluation in Ojibwa.

<sup>4</sup> A. Irurtzun and M. Duguine had first made me aware of the recreational use of these ungrammatical forms. B. Fernández points out the Ondarroa poet Leire Bilbao's use of them in *Ezkatak* (2006: 22, Zarautz: Susa), nicely encapsulated in the critique "In this *Ezkatak* we also find poems that play at breaking the laws of the language: *Ez daukat ezer, ez naukat* ["I have nothing, I do not have me" have-1sE-1sA]; *Ez daukazu ezer, Ez zauzkazu* ["You have nothing, You do not have you" have-2sE-2sA]" (Aritz Galarraga, "Buia itsaso erdian", *Gara*, 25.3.2006). Cysouw and Fernández (2012: 775) give as playful but ungrammatical 1sE-1pA *Eta zain, Etxarrin oroitzen gaitut, eta berdin zait Euskaltzaindiak nire oroitzapenak ez onartzea, nik, zu eta ni, Etxarrin oroitzen gaitut* "And wait, I remember us in Etxarri, and the Basque Language Academy not accepting my memories does not matter to me, I, you and me, I remember us in Etxarri" (Xabier Silvera, "Egin topa, haiengatik!").

However, more seems needed for the agreement system of Basque. Arregi and Nevins (2011: 1.4.5.4) show that Condition B applies in nonagreeing clauses, but less strongly than in agreeing forms (citing X. Artiagoitia p.c.). Adapting their Ondarroa example to EB, their starred nonfinite (3)a is more acceptable than the strictly impossible finite (3)b (mere overlap like *guk neu* 'we.E I.A' is even better).

- (3) a. \*[Nik neu maite izatea] nahi du.  
 I.E I.A love being want 3sE(-3sA)  
 \*He wants me to love me.<sup>5</sup>
- a'. [Nik neure burua maite izatea] nahi du.  
 I.E my head.A love being want 3sE(-3sA)  
 He wants me to love myself.
- b. \*\*Nik neu maite nahi naut.  
 I.E I.A love want 1sE-1sA  
 \*\*I want to love me.
- b'. Nik neure burua maite nahi dut.  
 I.E my head.A love want 1sE(-3sA)  
 I want to love myself.

Analysing agreement as clitics, Arregi and Nevins propose that the agreeing forms violate "a restriction that is specific to clitic combinations, perhaps related to a similar restriction found in Spanish clitic combinations (Perlmutter 1971: 41-45)." However, the ungrammaticality of the partial covaluation forms exceeds that of Romance clitics. Cysouw and Fernández (2012: 774-7) contrasts the judgments of a native Basque-Spanish bilingual in the two languages for overlapping reference combinations: Spanish *a mí me excluimos de la expedición* "We excluded me from the excursion" and similar examples "feel a bit strange", but the Basque counterpart *\*txangotik baztertzen naugu* is "completely wrong", and so for *\*izozkiak erosi nigun* beside *nos compré unos helados* "I bought us some icecreams" and likewise for 2<sup>nd</sup> person. They conclude that there is a contrast between the absence of overlapping reference forms in agreement systems (citing also Belhare, to which Rhodes's 1993 study of Ojibwa may be added), and their relative acceptability in clitic or weak pronoun systems in (Spanish, French, Dutch, and Serbo-Croatian).<sup>6</sup>

Thus while Condition B contributes to the absence of *\*naugu* 1sE-1sA, there is more. With Cysouw and Fernández (2012), we seem to have a difference between systems traditionally described as agreement and clitics. It encompasses even those Basque morphemes most frequently viewed as

<sup>5</sup> Original Ondarroa [Nik \*neu/neure buru matxe ixati] nai dau. I have had similar contrasts reported for EB.

<sup>6</sup> Cysouw and Fernández do not check for reflexive entailment, so their larger conclusion that there is no grammatical ban on overlapping reference at all does not follow.

clitics, the dative and ergative suffixes, as in *\*di-da*<sub>1sD</sub>-*gu*<sub>1pE</sub> 1pE-1sD-3sA. This is of great theoretical interest. Much work has viewed some or all Basque agreement morphemes as clitics (Laka 1993a, Rezac 2006, Preminger 2009, Arregi and Nevins 2011: chapter 2, Etxepare 2012); other work has viewed Romance clitics, especially in clitic doubling, as Basque-like agreement (Suñer 1988, Franco 1993, Ormazabal and Romero 2013 on Spanish, Heger 1966, Lambrecht 1981, Miller and Sag 1997 on French). There are interesting arguments one way or the other, like the presence or absence of tense-conditioned allomorphy, but their theoretical grounding is unclear. A sharp difference in the status of overlapping reference forms has potential in this debate – as a touchstone in telling one type of system from another, and as a window on what makes the two types different, that is on one theoretical notion of *clitic* and *agreement* among others (cf. Rezac 2010c).

This contrast for Condition B between Basque agreement and Spanish clitics could be construed as syntactic or morphological. Basque morphology might simply not have *\*naugu* the way that English does not have *\*amn't*, *\*stridden*, *\*forwent*. In a syntactic approach, Basque agreement might involve structures smaller than Romance clitics, and that might bar collective readings of plurals needed to obviate the partial covaluation ban. Here is one way to work this out, using a common theory of plurality (Barker 1992):

- (i) Plural pronouns have [plural] whereby they denote pluralities.
- (ii) Higher up there is a lexical item *G* that turns pluralities into group atoms, so that semantically *we chose me* can be *our group chose me*.
- (ii) Condition B bars reflexive entailments and so access to the *me* in *we*, which pluralities but not groups give, as in *we/\*our group knew each other*.
- (iv) Basque agreement affixes spell out structures too small to include *G*, Romance clitics can spell out larger structures and so avoid Condition B.

This story needs for agreement affixes to constrain the interpretation of controllers, since partial covaluation is out even when there is a full pronoun controller that can evade the constraint in nonagreeing clauses, as in (3). This would be so if agreement affixes are interpreted as arguments covalued with their controllers.<sup>7</sup>

One way to tease apart the syntactic and morphological accounts is to examine cases of Condition B for which neither morphology nor

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Rooryck (2006) for French, and Den Dikken, Lipták and Zvolenszky (2001) for Hungarian, analysing of a subset of overlapping reference combinations that contrast with others in escaping the ban on partial covaluation, discussed below, by positing a complex structure for plurals in question. This is one out of a gamut of options. Suppose alternatively that multiple identical features within a terminal cannot be linearised, e.g. {...[1]...[1]...} (Béjar and Rezac 2009: 58); then Basque *\*naugu* 1sA-1sE would run into this problem if it reflects the Agree-valued features pooled on a single head, while French *nous me* 'we me' would not if displaced pronouns, correlating with other differences (Rezac 2010c).

interpretation can be responsible. Arregi and Nevins find that Condition B in Basque operates even when English escapes it in (4), under pragmatic coreference rather than semantic covaluation (Reinhart 2006, Heim 1998, 2008; for marginality in English, Roelofsen 2008: 46).

- (4) Nobody loves me/Jon: Mikel doesn't love me/Jon, Miren doesn't love me/him, and
- a. Neuk be es dot nire buru matxe.  
 I.E even not 1sE-3sA my head.A love  
 Even I don't love myself.
- a' \*Neuk be es nat (ni) matxe.  
 1sE-1sA (I.A)  
 Even I don't love me.
- b. Jonek be es dau bera buru matxe.  
 Jon.E even not 3sE-3sA his head.A love  
 Even Jon doesn't love himself.
- b' Jonek<sub>i</sub> be es dau (bera\*<sub>i</sub>) matxe.  
 3sE-3sA (he.A)  
 Even Jon doesn't love him.

(Ondarroa, Arregi and Nevins 2011)

Here there seems to be a problem that is not due to interpretation, given English, or morphology, given the availability of *dau* 3sE-3sA. That leaves something about the syntax of Basque agreement to explain the problem. Continuing in the same vein as above, perhaps pragmatic coreference needs extra content in a pronoun, and this content is unavailable to agreement affixes. In Romance clitics, the coreference exception is more difficult to obtain than in English (Baauw and Delifitto 2005 for Spanish as mostly out, Hamann 2011 as good, Schlenker 2005: 73-5 is more nuanced and relates the ban on partial covaluation). This suggests the cline English strong pronouns > Romance clitics > Basque agreement. The cline lends itself to reification through increasing syntactic structure and correlated interpretive options, along the lines of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999). There might be correlated clines elsewhere; the syntactic Person Case Constraint discussed later seems to have the strength cline Basque agreement > Romance verb-attached clitics > Czech second position clitics or Germanic weak pronouns (Rezac 2010b).

Condition B in English and French creates gaps that have no repairs: in the absence of *I helped us ?(\*each) realise this*, one cannot press into service the *X-self* reflexive, *\*I helped ourselves*. Remarkably, Artiagoitia (2003: 623-4) (5) and Arregi and Nevins (2011: op.cit.) observe that the *X's buru*- 'X's head' anaphor does appear in partial covaluation environments. On the other hand, Cysouw and Fernández (2012: 775-6) claim the contrary with an example virtually identical to Arregi and Nevins's, so there is variation.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The examples are: Arregi and Nevins, Ondarroa Basque, *Nik geure buru ikusi dot (>rot) ispillun* "I saw us in the mirror", beside Cysouw and Fernández, EB, *\*Nik ispilluan geure*

- (5) Geure burua aipatu dut,  
 our head.A mentioned 1sE-3sA  
 [The problems of the people out there resemble those we have or  
 might have ...] I have mentioned ourselves, [and I don't know if I  
 said it right, ...]

(Mitxelena, cited in Artiagoitia 2003: 623)

The availability of *X's burua* in partial covaluation looks like the emergence of an otherwise impossible syntax or interpretation, a *repair* of the sort we will see for the Person Case Constraint. There are two hints that it is not: one in Basque itself, another in French.

First, *X's burua* is less grammaticalised as reflexive than *X-self*. Artiagoitia (op.cit.) and Oyharçabal (2003) find contexts where *X's burua* need not have a clausemate antecedent but *X-self* does. Artiagoitia (2003: 621-3) also observes that the coding of *X* and the plural marking on *buru* 'self' vary in ways similar to inalienable possession, cf. *They each saw their self/selves*, whereas for *X-self* they are fixed, *They each saw themselves*. So perhaps in partial covaluation, *X's burua* is not an anaphor; Oyharçabal (2003) proposes this for other uses of it. Den Dikken, Lipták and Zvolenszky (2001) reach a similar conclusion for Hungarian. It too allows reflexives in SG→PL though not \*PL→SG combinations like *I represented ourselves*. Observing that the reflexive is morphologically *core-1p* 'our core', the authors suggest that "If ... syntactic structure of Hungarian reflexives is that of a possessed noun phrase, then [the inclusive use] is syntactically parallel to something like 'I represent/vote for our friend'" (p. 148).<sup>9</sup> The same idea works for Hausa, where "a singular subject can take a plural reflexive if the subject is included in the referential group" in counterparts of *Ladi criticised "themselves"*, *Today I embarrassed "ourselves"*, where the reflexives are as in Basque *X's head* (Newman 2000: 524, Dixon 2003: 147, 164). Yet Cysouw and Fernández (2012: 772) report an *I-ourselves* case in Even with a direct object reflexive that seems morphologically simplex.

The second hint for what might be going on in (5) comes from French. The perfect auxiliary is ordinarily *avoir* 'have', but *être* 'be' if there is an object clitic reflexive to the subject. Rooryck (2006) finds a class of partial covaluation combinations that are fine when others are not. The most robust is 1s→1p, *Je nous ai chacun inscrit* "I registered us each", much better than 1p+1s or 2s+2p.<sup>10</sup> Just for 1s→1p, *être* is sometimes found for *avoir*, (6). However, this has not been studied for speaker judgments (they are shifty), nor extension beyond 1s→1p (it does not seem to).

---

*burua ikusten dut* "I see us in the mirror".

<sup>9</sup> The generalisation is stated for overlapping context but only illustrated with 1s→1p.

<sup>10</sup> Even *je nous* is rejected by Morin (1978: 347) and treated as a jest by Blanche-Benveniste (1975: 45n1); but research leading to Rezac and Jouitteau (2015) revealed speakers confirming Rooryck's *je nous* even if *nous* is distributed by *chacun*.

- (6) a. une promesse que je nous suis faite  
 a promise that I us<sub>clitic</sub> am [= have] made  
 (Balzac, cited in Haas 1909: 191)
- b. Je nous suis réservé un taxi  
 I us<sub>clitic</sub> am [= have] reserved us a taxi  
 (Queneau, cited in Blanche-Benveniste 1975: 223n1)

So there is something more "reflexive" about the 1s→1p combination than about other partial covaluations, and that might bear on (5). The snag is understanding the relevant notion of reflexivity.<sup>11</sup>

#### 4 Syntactic phi-gaps: Locality

Syntax is the best-studied domain of gaps, and it often affects agreement systems. Even the poor agreement system of English has gaps of the sort in (7), and sometimes syntax has been seen as their source (Pullum 2013: 512, McCawley 1998: 506, Sobin 1997: 320-1).

- (7) Either she or I \_\_ lying right now, aren't \_\_?

This section takes up a gap created by island constraints in the agreement system of Basque. All island violations can be thought of as gaps, ruling out certain form-meaning pairs in paradigms of good pairings. The constraint of interest bars agreement with a dative past an intervening absolutive in ECM configurations, making unavailable certain interpretations for the dative, and lexical items that need those interpretations.

The effects of our constraint have been studied in French. Consider first raising configurations. (8)a embeds the small clause  $\alpha$  built on the predicate adjectives *antipathique* 'antipathic' with an optional dative experiencer; the dative must cliticise if it is 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person. (8)b has an unaccusative VP  $\beta$  with a dative possessor; it too must cliticise. The subjects raise to agreeing nominatives, and the dative clitics attach to the finite verbs.

- (8) a. Tout le monde<sub>i</sub> (me<sub>k</sub>) sera/paraîtra [ $\alpha$  t<sub>i</sub> antipathique t<sub>k</sub>].  
 Everyone me will.be/seem antipathic [= to me]
- b. Tout le monde<sub>i</sub> m<sub>k</sub>' est [ $\beta$  t<sub>i</sub> tombé dans les bras t<sub>k</sub>].

<sup>11</sup> In examples of the type (i) *No one chose me; only I chose me* or (ii) *I<sub>i</sub> dreamt that I<sub>i</sub> was Gwen<sub>k</sub>, and that I<sub>k</sub> kissed me<sub>i</sub>*, the auxiliary in French must be the reflexive auxiliary *être*, though in English the pronoun prefers to be disjoint (Roelofsen 2008: 4.7, Heim 1998: n15, Anand 2007: 29n19, Arregui 2007, Safir 2004: 4.3). That makes it seem that reflexivity for auxiliary choice and *self*-anaphora does not coincide. However, in French (i) at least strongly prefers reflexive to disjoint object pronouns in 3<sup>rd</sup> person, the sole to make this distinction overtly (Schlenker 2005: 73). The matter is complicated by varieties that seem to make the *me/myself* distinction in (i) through auxiliary choice (Morin 1978: 361n8).

Everyone me has fallen into the arms. [= my arms]

When  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  are embedded in an ECM construction, their lower subject, now accusative, cliticises upstairs or remains low as a nonclitic, and the dative cannot cliticise:

- (9) a. Tout le monde (\*me) croit Gwen antipathique.  
 Everyone me believes Gwen antipathic  
 b. Tout le monde (\*me) la croit antipathique.  
 everyone me her believes antipathic
- (10) a. \*Tout le monde m' a vu tomber Gwen dans les bras.  
 everyone me has seen fall Gwen into the arms  
 b. \*Tout le monde me l' ai vu/cru tomber dans les bras.  
 everyone me her has seen/believed fall into the arms

There is agreement that uncliticisability of the dative in ECM reflects constraints on syntactic dependencies. In generative grammar it has been chiefly attributed to the Specified Subject Condition: in raising the subject does not intervene in dative cliticization because it raises, in ECM it does because it stays low (Kayne 1975: 4.5-6, Emonds 1999; cf. den Dikken 2006, 2007, Gallego 2010 for subjecthood barriers in current frameworks).<sup>12</sup>

The same pattern seems to characterise the interaction of absolutive and dative agreement in Basque. Basque datives come in "high" and "low" configurations (Albizu 1997a, 2011, Etxepare and Oyharçabal 2013, Fernández, Ortiz de Urbina and Landa 2009, Fernández and Ortiz de Urbina 2010, Fernández 2011, Rezac 2008b, 2011: chap. 5, Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare 2014). High datives are above an absolutive coargument for purposes like anaphor binding, and must control agreement in finite/agreeing clauses. Low datives are below the absolutive. In eastern dialects, they do not agree. In western dialects, they agree when they can, but often permit nonagreement otherwise (cf. for causatives Ortiz de Urbina 2003a, variation in Trask 1981, and for differential object marking Fernández and Rezac this volume). Basque allows only one instance of dative agreement, so low but not high datives are possible when another dative controls agreement. Certain interpretations like experiencers need high datives.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> I give a simplified description of the French data and its analysis, which have both been a battlefield: see Rezac (2011: chapter 4) and literature there, esp. Postal (1983, 1984, 1990).

<sup>13</sup> Distinct from nonagreeing low datives is optionality of dative agreement in multipredicate structures. It affects both high and low datives and reflects restructuring versus richer nonfinite structures (Ortiz de Urbina 2003c). This may be the explanation of alternations like *begira egon zaio/da* "She has been looking her.D" 3sD(-3sA) (Fernández 2013), where agreement of the dative is free even in western Basque. Some instances of nonagreeing low datives might fall to a similar analysis: for instance, causatives with a dative causee might introduce more structure above the causativised predicate than ones without.

Fernández (2011) shows that the two types of datives are found with adjectives. Adjectives like *leial* 'loyal' allow their argument to use the low dative structure, and so do not require dative agreement. Others like *atsegin* 'pleasant' require the high dative structure and agreement. The contrast comes out in contexts where another dative already controls agreement, (11)-(12): the low dative of *leial* is fine, the high one of *atsegin* is out, with no "repair" such as otherwise unavailable nonagreement.<sup>14</sup>

- (11) a. Niri Jon [hizkuntzari leiala] iruditzen zait.  
me.D Jon.A language.the.D loyal seeming 1sD-3sA  
Jon seems to me to be loyal to the language.  
b. \*Niri entretamendua [Joni atsegina] iruditzen zait.  
me.D exercise.A Jon.D pleasant seeming 1sD-3sA  
Exercise seems to me to be pleasant to Jon.  
(Fernández 2011)
- (12) a. Niri ikasleak [bere irakasleari leialak] iruditzen zaizkit.  
me.D students.A their teacher.the.D loyal seeming 1sD-3pA  
b. Niri ikasketak [(\*)Joni atseginak] iruditzen zaizkit.  
me.D lessons.A (\*Jon.D) pleasant seeming 1sD-3pA  
(R. Etxepare, p.c.)

Armed with high-dative *atsegin* and high/low-dative *leial*, consider dative agreement past an absolutive in ECM. The ECM subject controls matrix absolutive agreement, but bars agreement with the dative argument of the adjective. This is fine with *leial* but barred for *atsegin*. There is no repair: *atsegin* simply cannot have an experiencer in ECM.<sup>15</sup>

- (13)  $V_{ECM-\phi_{ABS}}-(*)\phi_{DAT}$  [... DP<sub>ABS</sub> ... DAT<sub>DAT</sub> ...]

Basque has a couple of ECM structures. One is nonfinite perception complements (Arteatx 2007, 2012, Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare 2014). Embedding *be* + adjective contrasts *leial* and *atsegin* as described.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Supporting contrasts between the *atsegin* and *leial* adjective types are reflexive binding, *Mikeli bere burua atsegin/\*leial zaio*, "Mikel.D himself.A has been pleasant/\*loyal" versus *Mikel bere buruari leial zaio* "Mikel.A himself.D has been loyal" (data thanks to B. Fernández p.c.), and control into nominalizations (Fernández 2011). Etxepare (2003a: 168) contrasts the PCC found with *gustatu* 'please' but not *atsegin izan* 'be agreeable', which makes sense if the theme *gustatu* is generated below the high dative but that of *atsegin izan* above it, that is predicated of an AP extended to include the high applicative (Rezac 2008b: 73n7; cf. Diesing 1992). Of relevance may be that while in French dative pronouns need to cliticise, this is weaker with *fidèle* 'faithful' than with *antipathique* (Rezac 2011).

<sup>15</sup> I am grateful to P. Albizu and R. Etxepare for discussion of this matter for drafts of Rezac (2013) and Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare (2014).

<sup>16</sup> I give this as the simplest illustration of datives under ECM, but unlike the following, even the good example is quite unnatural, perhaps owing to the difficulty of individual-level predicates as perception complements (Felser 1999: 45, Arteatx 2012: 413).

- (14) a. *Ikasleak zuri leialak izaten antzeman ?ditut /*  
 students.the.A you.D loyal being perceive 1sE-3pA /  
 \**dizkizut.*  
 \*1sE-2sD-3pA  
 I perceive the students to be loyal to you.
- b. *Ikasleak zuri atseginak izaten antzeman \*ditut /*  
 students.the.A you.D pleasant being perceive 1sE-3pA /  
 \**dizkizut.*  
 \*1sE-2sD-3pA  
 I perceive the students to be pleasant to you.

A second ECM structure is so-called transitive predication, where Basque *have* predicates take a small clause complement in ECM and relate it to their ergative subject in a vague relation like an experiencer (Etxepare 2003b, de Rijk 2008, Etxepare and Uribe-Etxeberria 2012, Fernández and Rezac this volume). One type, with *eduki* 'have' in EB, seems similar to the English type *She has all four grandparents alive/\*clever*. This type takes stage-level predicates like *begira* 'looking', *adi* 'attentive'. Both allow low datives and so are legitimate in ECM, but only without agreement:

- (15) a. *Jon zuri begira egon zaizu / da.*  
 Jon.A you.D looking be 2sD-3sA / 3sA  
 Jon is looking at you.
- b. *Jon zuri begira eduki {duzu / du Martxelek /*  
 Jon.A you.D looking had 2sE-3sA / 3sE-3sA Martxel.E /  
 \**dizu}*.  
 3sE-2sD-3sA  
 You have Jon looking at you.

(A. Elordieta p.c. to B. Fernández)

The other type of transitive predication, with *\*edun* 'have' in EB, is immune to the English restrictions. Here we may test the individual-level *leial* and *atsegin*. Agreement is out, leaving acceptable a low nonagreeing dative with *leial*, but not *atsegin*:

- (16) a. *Mikeli leiala duzu/nauzu (\*dizu/\*naiozu).*  
 Mikel.D loyal have-2sE-3sA/1sA (\*have-2sE-3sD-3sA/1sA)  
 She is / I am loyal to Mikel (lit. You have me/her loyal to Mikel).
- b. \**Mikeli atsegina duzu/nauzu (dizu/naiozu).*  
 Mikel.D kind have-2sE-3sA/1sA (have-2sE-3sD-3sA/1sA)  
 I am / She is kind to Mikel (lit. You have her/me kind to Mikel).

(B. Fernández, p.c.)

Finally, in (17) a perception verb ECM embeds a nonfinite clause based on an unaccusative with a high dative of possession. The dative can agree in a simple clause, because it is a high dative, but not in ECM:

- (17) a. Mireni giltzak eskuetatik erori zaizkio / \*dira /  
 Miren.D keys.the.A hands.the.from fallen 3sD-3pA / \*3sA /  
 \*zaio.  
 \*3sD-3sA  
 The keys fell from Miren's hands.
- b. Giltzak Mireni eskuetatik erortzen entzun ditut /  
 keys.the.A Miren.D hands.the.from falling heard 1sE-3pA /  
 \*dizkiot.  
 1sE-(*\*3sD*-)3pA  
 I heard the keys fall from Miren's hands. (*does not entail* #Giltzak  
 entzun ditut 'I heard the keys')

(from drafts of Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare 2014)

In all these Basque ECM constructions, a Specified Subject Condition story would suppose that the absolutive is at some point above the dative and a subject in the relevant sense. For apparently bare adjectives in ECM, (14)-(16), this is so if the ECM complement is a small clause predicating the absolutive of the adjective's AP containing its dative argument, a usual analysis. For the nonfinite clause in (17), evidence for absolutive > dative comes from word order. In a finite clause, the absolutive satisfies the EPP of T by rich agreement, but the dative is higher as an XP, and dative > absolutive is a (or the) neutral word order (Rezac 2008b). In ECM, absolutive > dative is the sole neutral word order. Possibly, the absolutive must satisfy the EPP of nonfinite T in ECM complements phrasally because there is no analogue of rich agreement (cf. Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare 2014). Then the absolutive intervenes for agreement with the dative.<sup>17</sup>

The ban on dative agreement past an intervening absolutive is an example of syntactic constraints that create gaps in available pairings of agreeing forms and interpretations. Other examples include the limit of a single agreeing dative per clause, and constraints on remote agreement studied in Etxepare (2003a, 2006, 2012), Preminger (2009).<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> It is not clear whether the dative remains legitimate in the infinitive without agreement because infinitives have a richer structure than the predicate adjectives seen so far, or because we have to hand a possessor dative whose point of origin is lower than the experiencer dative seen with *atsegin* (cf. Albizu 2011). We cannot compare the two dative types directly, as there are no adjectives with possessor datives, and perception verbs do not embed psych-verb infinitives due to constraints on event structure (Felsner 1999).

<sup>18</sup> The nature of the restriction to one agreeing dative is unclear, but it looks syntactic. Perhaps there is not enough structural space in a single functional architecture for multiple high datives. Morphology allow for multiple dative agreement suffixes if they are controlled by one dative in agreement doubling and tripling like (*Niri erraiten dei-TA(-DA)-zü-T* 2sE-1sD(-3sA) "You say it to me" (Iruri, Zuberoa, Fernández and Albizu 2006). In French and Spanish, multiple dative clitics also typically fail to combine: French *Gawain me (\*lui) semble reconnaissant (à Gryngolet)* "Gawain seems to me.D to be grateful to \*them.D / to Gryngolet", *Merlin te le (\*lui) mettera dans les bras* "Merlin will put him in your.D arms for him.D" (Rezac 2010a), Spanish *Se la/\*le permitió escribir* "I permitted him.D to write it.A/\*her.D" (Rivas 1977). Exceptions like French *\*Elle<sub>i</sub> me les lui<sub>i/k</sub> fera envoyer* "She<sub>i</sub> will make me send them (the packages) to her<sub>i/k</sub>", binding suggests a more complex structure

## 5 The Person Case Constraint

The Person Case Constraint PCC of Bonet (1991, 1994) excludes in Basque combinations of 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person absolutive and dative agreement in certain structures: \**eraman zaizkiot* "I brought you to her 1sE-3sD-2sA", \**gustatzen zatzaizkit* "You please me 1sD-2sA". I set out here briefly the syntactic character of the constraint and its repairs, from Rezac (2008b, 2009, 2011); key literature on the constraint in Basque includes Albizu (1997ab), Laka (1993a), Oyharçabal and Etxepare (2012), Arregi and Nevins (2011).

Three aspects of PCC are extraordinary. First, while with transitives the result is the absence of E-D-1/2A agreeing forms, with unaccusatives D-1/2A forms exist but cannot be paired with certain syntactic structures, bespeaking the syntactic rather than morphological character of the constraint. Second, some of the structures incurring the constraint are repaired by otherwise impossible ones. That makes for an apparent case of reference-set computation: one syntactic structure depends for its legitimacy on the badness of another, existing only as last resort. One type of repairs moreover results in a morphological formation that does not otherwise exist. Last, the constraint is not categorical across the history and varieties of the language, so it must be parameterizable.

The canonical context of the PCC in Basque are transitives. No living variety is known to have any E-D-1/2A forms, but they did exist (a convenient gathering is Yrizar 1981: 36f.). A rich set of exceptions is found in Leizarraga's sixteenth century translation of the Bible into his literary Lapurdian, like *redimitu garauzac Iaincoari* "thou redeemedst us to God" 2<sup>o</sup>mE-3sD-1pA (Oyharçabal and Etxepare 2008). There are a handful of such forms in nineteenth century eastern writers, like Duhalde's *Eman giotza* "He gave us to him" 3sE-3sD-1pA, and another couple in Zavala's grammar of western Basque, like *eskiniten gautsazac* "Thou offerest us to him" 2<sup>o</sup>m-3sD-1pA. Most explicitly, there is the grammarian Azkue's report that "An old woman of Dima and another of Zeanuri gave me as common" forms like *Zuk ni berari eroan nautsazu* "You brought me to him" 2sE-3sD-1sA. Basque is not alone in a categorical PCC with exceptions in literature (Mohawk, Baker 1996: 238n3) or dialects (Georgian, Haspelmath 2004). They may reflect a different syntax, say an agreement systems like Abaza's immune to the constraint (Rezac 2008a).

---

with multiple Condition A/B domains (see Postal 1984: 125-6, Rezac 2011: chap. 4). Basque also suggests that syntax rather than morphology is at issue, insofar as multiple high datives remain out when the foregoing examples are transposed to nonfinite, nonagreeing clauses, \**Niri ikasketak Joni atseginak iruditzea...* "For exercises to seem to me.D pleasant Jon.D..." (B. Fernández p.c.; for the status of otherwise agreeing arguments in nonagreeing clauses, see Laka 1993a, Rezac 2011: 190n9).

The PCC ban on \*E-D-1/2A makes one set of structures ineffable: those with 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person absolutive arguments and high datives like possessors, datives of interest, and causees, since both must control agreement, (18).

- (18) a. Mireni haurrak besoetara bota dizkiote / \*dituzte.  
Miren.D children.the.A arms.the.to thrown 3pE-\*(3sD)-3pA  
b. Mireni zu besoetara bota \*zaituzte / \*zaizkiote.  
Miren.D you.A arms.the.to thrown 3pE-\*(3sD)-2sA  
They threw the children/\*you into Miren's arms.  
(possessor dative; Rezac 2009)

It is different for low datives. These do not or need not agree in eastern Basque, while in the west they agree if they can, but not if dative agreement is unavailable, as in the previous section when taken up by another dative. 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person absolutives are fine with nonagreeing low datives (perhaps with variation in the west, Artiagoitia 2000: 405, Albizu 1997a, Odria in prep.). The result in western Basque is an alternation for datives between (19)a obligatory agreement with a 3<sup>rd</sup> person absolutive and (19)b no agreement in a 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person absolutive.<sup>19</sup>

- (19) a. Mireni haurrak eramango dizkiote / \*dituzte.  
Miren.D children.the.A bring.FUT 3pE-\*(3sD-)3pA  
They will bring Miren the children.  
b. Mireni zu eramango zaituzte / \*zaizkiote.  
Miren.D you.A bring.FUT 3pE-\*(3sD-)2sA  
They will bring you to Miren. (*nonagreeing dative*)  
(goal dative; Rezac 2011: 184)

Cross-linguistic parallels suggest that the availability of nonagreeing low datives in western Basque is a repair strategy dedicated to the PCC, one that licenses a syntactic structure distinct from the one that allows agreement, say a structure with extra structure in the dative PP (Rezac 2011: chap. 4). However, within western Basque, the suspension of agreement in PCC contexts is not distinguishable from its suspension in the other cases.

In unaccusatives, the PCC does not bar any agreeing forms as such, but rather certain pairings of forms and structures. Datives with unaccusatives again occur in high and low configurations, high ones needing agreement (required for say experiencers), low ones not agreeing in eastern Basque and up to possibility in western Basque (available for say goals of motion). The PCC bars D-1/2A combinations for high but not low datives (Albizu 1997b). Apparent exceptions have existed and may exist still, more robustly than for

---

<sup>19</sup> Related to the availability of nonagreeing with low datives if another dative usurps agreement may be Albizu's (1997a) unique report of a PCC repair whereby the 1/2 object agrees as dative while absolutive in case: *Azpisapoek ni etsaiari saldu \*naute / didate*, Traitors.the.E I.A enemy.the.D sold \*3pE-1sA / 3pE-1sD.

the transitive PCC (see Albizu 2011 for a careful study).<sup>20</sup> Neither the absolutive nor the high dative can suspend agreement to escape the PCC.<sup>21</sup>

- (20) a. Mireni hurbiltzen / gustatzen zaizkio.  
Miren.D approaching / liking 3sD-3pA  
They are approaching Miren / Miren likes them.  
b. Mireni hurbiltzen / ?\*gustatzen natzaio.  
Miren.D approaching / ?\*liking 3sD-1sA  
I am approaching Miren / ?\*Miren likes me.

Two repair strategies are reported in the literature. Both avail themselves of the absence and thus the availability of ergative agreement in unaccusative constructions.

One strategy, *absolutive displacement* or *absolutive promotion*, deploys ergative agreement to code the absolutive, with speaker variation on whether the pronoun is ergative or absolutive in case (Arregi 2004, Arregi and Nevins 2011, Rezac 2008b, 2011: 5.6).<sup>22</sup> This is impossible outside PCC contexts, in D-3A combinations:

- (21) a. Itxasori liburuak/\*liburuek gustatzen zaizkio / \*diote.  
Itxaso.D books.the.A/\*E liking 3sD-3pA / \*3pE-3sD(-3sA)  
Itxaso likes the books.  
b. Itxasori (%zuk/%zu) gustatzen \*zataizkio / diozu.  
Itxaso.D you.%E/%A liking 3sD-2sA / 2sE-3sD(-3sA)  
Itxaso likes you.  
c. (Zu/\*zuk) Itxasori etortzen (\*)zataizkio / \*diozu.  
you.A/\*E Itxaso.D coming (\*)3sD-2sA / \*2sE-3sD(-3sA)  
You are coming to Itxaso.  
(Tolosa, Rezac 2008b; *zataizkio* learned form)
- (22) a. Niri su/suk ondo jauste stasu.

<sup>20</sup> Contemporary descriptive grammars giving D-1/2A combinations almost always illustrate with motion and never psych-verbs (e.g. Zeberio *laguntan yoan ñatzu* "I have gone to help you" 2sD-1sA, Etxeberria 1988: 214). Older grammars are another matter. Azkue (1923-5: §885) has the types *geu agertu gekiozan* "nosotros nos le aparecimos" 3sD-1pA, *il nakio* "me le he muerto" 3sD-1sA, Lafitte (1979: §538) *lakhet hintzaitan* "tu m'étais agréable" 1sD-2°A (drawn to my attention by B. Fernández p.c.). Yet we do not know a priori if a given dative requires the high structure – cf. low-PP experiencer in *She seemed (friendly) to me*, possessor *Je suis à toi*, or variable evidence for the height of causee datives (for Basque in Fernández, Ortiz de Urbina, and Landa 2009, for French in Rezac 2011: 4.5.4) and possessor datives (for Basque in Albizu 2011).

<sup>21</sup> One source reports omission of absolutive person agreement, reducing 3sD-1pA to 3sD-3pA: Arretxe's (1994: 250n26) description of Basauri discussed in Rezac (2008b: 100-1). Speakers generally strongly resist such suspension, even when there is no other repair of the PCC; but morphological gaps discussed later have lots of such nonagreement.

<sup>22</sup> In Tolosa, the variation does not seem to reduce to optionality of ergative marking on 1/2 pronouns, as Arregi and Nevins (2011: 3.2) propose for Ondarroa.

- me.D you.A/E well liking 2sE-1sD(-3sA)  
I like you.
- b. Jonei gu/guk es dotzau gustaten.  
Jon.D we.A/E not 1pE-3sD(-3sA) liking  
Jon does not like us.
- c. Niri Jon ondo jausten gasta  
me.D Jon.A well falling 3sD-3sA  
\*Niri Jon/Jonek ondo jauste sta.  
\*me.D Jon.A/E well falling 3sE-3sD(-3sA)  
I like Jon.

(Ondarroa, Arregi and Nevins 2011: 3.2)

This strategy appears to be a new phenomenon. I know of no mention prior to Arregi (2004), and it seems to characterise speakers born after 1970; many, old and young, sharply reject it. Yet it may be ever more widespread in western Basque, where it has been found in independent inquiries (Rezac 2008b, Arregi and Nevins 2011; K. Arregi p.c. of a class questionnaire; B. Fernández p.c. of a class questionnaire).<sup>23</sup>

The specificity of this repair strategy to the PCC is highlighted by its unavailability to fix other agreement gaps in unaccusatives. Many dialects, especially in western Basque, are subject to a partial or total loss of D-1/2A forms, whether the dative is high or low. This is a morphological loss. Often it gives rise to a spotty D-1/2A paradigm. These morphological gaps are not repairable by ergative agreement of the absolutive, unlike the PCC. Even if a speaker lacks (\*)*etortzen zataikzio* in (21)c, and allows *gustatzen diozu* for \**gustatzen zataikzio* in (21)b, she cannot use the latter to fix the former as \**etortzen diozu*, (21)c.<sup>24</sup> Both the limitation of the PCC to high datives, and the limitation of PCC repairs to high datives even where low dative D-1/2A forms are missing, indicate the dependency of the PCC and its repairs on syntactic structure rather than surface morphology.

<sup>23</sup> This strategy combines with other developments, such as dative displacement in *nekatuta iruditzen didazu* → *nazu* "you seem tired to me" 2sE-1sD → 2sE-1sA and the loss of ergative displacement *nekatuta iruditzen zenian* → *ziazun* "you seemed tired to me" 2sE-1sD. Often the phenomena belong to the same register and reinforce each other's naturalness.

<sup>24</sup> I do not know whether Western Basque morphological D-1/2.A gaps can avail themselves of nonagreeing low datives, as they can when agreement problems arise in transitives; speakers seem to use circumlocutions such as the allative for goals (Egaña 1984: 11; so also B. Fernández p.c.). This transitive-unaccusative difference may relate to why low datives do not create the PCC with intransitives, (\*)*etortzen natzaizu* "I am coming to you" 2sD-1sA (only a morphological gap in some varieties), but do with transitives, \**ekarri naiozu* "You brought me to him" 2sE-3sD-1sA (universally out, with repair by a nonagreeing dative). Distinct but possibly related is the tendency in some western varieties to replace *all* datives in unaccusatives by alternatives like the allative, effectively eliminating the D-A paradigm, which again does not affect transitives or the E-D-A paradigm (see e.g. Extabe and Garmendia 2003: 166 for younger speakers in Zaldibia).

Absolute displacement is distinct from another repair strategy, call it *absolute shift*. It takes the root of D(-3sA) forms, and tacks onto it a 1/2 suffix, as if the absolute were agreeing in the manner of an ergative. Thus for 2sA-1pD-PST in (23), the EB form is  $z_{2s}in_{TM}tzai\checkmark-zki_{pA}gu_{1pD}n_{PST}$ , with the absolute controlling the prefix and absolute pluraliser. Instead, we get  $z_{X.PST}i_{TM}tzai\checkmark-gu_{1pD}z_{1sA}n_{PST}$ , that is 1pD(-3sA)-PST *zitzaigun* plus 2sE/D suffix *-zu-* attached in its usual place before past tense *-n*, but controlled by the absolute. In the few examples I have, expected absolute argument is *pro*-dropped or in absolute case, not ergative.<sup>25</sup>

- (23) Anai-odolez gorri zan gure mendia, / etxe ta baso sutan, negarrez  
 erria, / ta arantza-gaiñean  
*Zu*, Goi-pakezko izarra, / agertu *zitzaiguzun*, uxatzen negarra.  
 you.A ... appeared 2sA-1pD-PST  
 Our mountain was red with blood of brothers, / house and wood on  
 fire, the country in tears / and above the sloe, you, star of high peace,  
 appeared to us, chasing the tears.

(Jaurtakol, "Beti zure erri", *Olerti* 1961 I)

Aramaio (2001) is the sole report known to me of what might be absolute shift, in the Basque of Berriatua and Ondarroa. Beside the D-A forms expected for this Bizkaian area, Aramaio reports new forms for D-1/2A combinations. They are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Berriatua D-A present indicative paradigm<sup>†</sup>

	3sD	3pD	1sD	1pD	2sD	2pD
3sA	(j)ako <sup>α</sup>	(j)akue <sup>α</sup>	(j)ate <sup>α</sup>	(j)aku <sup>α</sup>	(j)atzu <sup>α</sup>	(j)atzue <sup>α</sup>
3pA	(j)akos <sup>α</sup>	(j)akues <sup>α</sup>	(j)ates <sup>α</sup>	(j)akus <sup>α</sup>	(j)atzus <sup>α</sup>	(j)atzues <sup>α</sup>
1sA	nako <sup>α</sup>	nakue <sup>α</sup>	–	–	*	*
1pA	atzau <sup>β</sup>	*	–	–	(g)atzaue <sup>β</sup>	*
2sA	atzasu <sup>β</sup>	*	(g)astesu <sup>β</sup>	askusu <sup>β</sup>	–	–
2pA	atzasue <sup>β</sup>	*	(g)astesue <sup>β</sup>	askusue <sup>β</sup>	–	–

<sup>†</sup> <sup>α</sup> old D-A formation, <sup>β</sup> new D-A formation, – reflexive, \* gap

All the forms are distinct from E-D-A forms, including from E-3sD-3sA *otza-t*<sub>1sE</sub>/*u*<sub>1pE</sub>/*su*<sub>2sE</sub>/*sue*<sub>2pE</sub>/*Ø*<sub>3sE</sub>, 3pE-3sD-3sA (*o*)*tze*. Aramaio views them as Berriatua adaptations and extensions of parallel Ondarroa formations. In Ondarroa, they are restricted to 1sD-2sA (*g*)*astasu*, 1sD-2pA (*g*)*astasue*,

<sup>25</sup> For *pro*-drop, cf. (i), where *zitzaidazun* is like *zitzaiguzun* but with 1sD *-da-*.

- (i) Ezagutu ginenean, ikusi zintudan eta mutilik ederrena iruditu *zitzaidazun* (orain ere).  
 When we knew each other, I saw you and you seemed to me the most beautiful of boys  
 (now too).

([hitzarentxokoa.blogspot.com/2013/02/ez-dakit-zergatik.html](http://hitzarentxokoa.blogspot.com/2013/02/ez-dakit-zergatik.html))

transparently formed in the manner of *zaidazu*: 2s *su*, 2p *sue* suffix on 1sD-3sA *gasta*. Berriatua 2sD-1pA is built up in this manner too. So are Berriatua 3sD-1/2A, 1pD-2A forms, save that they use stem *atza*, *asku*, which look like a cross between D-A and E-D-A stems.

There are two ways of looking at absolutive shift forms. One is as described, with 1/2 suffixes otherwise controlled by D/E tacked onto a D-3A stem. Absolutives almost never control suffixes across Basque dialects, but they do so in absolutive displacement. Alternatively, the forms look like absolutive pronouns tacked onto the stem of D-3A forms, like *zaida-*, though not onto the D-3A form itself, in this case *zait*. Absolutive pronouns are identical to suffixes for 1p and 2s/p. Just these are the forms attested in absolutive shift; I know of no 2sD-1sA *zaizut* – as yet. Either way, absolutive shift gives rise to forms not used for anything else, while absolutive displacement always yields extant E-D-A forms.<sup>26</sup>

Almost all remains to be learned about absolutive shift. Aramaio does not give any examples of the forms in use, so it is not even clear whether her forms are used as PCC repairs as in (23), or whether they are found outside PCC contexts with low-dative unaccusatives. In both Ondarroa and Berriatua, the forms are a new phenomenon:

We need to keep in mind that these new forms, both in Ondarroa and in Berriatua, are only heard from some young people, and so neither old people nor most speakers use them in daily life. It seems that the lack of certain verbal forms lead them to the invention of new verb forms unconsciously, and perhaps by confusion or analogy, these strange forms were created.

(Aramaio 2001:15n16)

Absolutive shift in any form is sharply rejected by many speakers, including those with absolutive displacement.<sup>27</sup>

Most speakers have no repairs for the PCC. They resort to circumlocutions, to expressions available independently of gaps. A typical circumlocution for *Gustatzen zait*/\**zatzaizkit*, lit. liking 1sD-3sA/\*2sA, is the transitive predication of a derived adjective, *Gustuko(a) dut/zaitut*, lit. pleasant have-1sE-3sA/2sA ("I have you pleasant"). The relationship of gap to circumlocution is the same as between any two expressions of similar meaning, say *I am on her side* and *She has me on her side*. In this example at

---

<sup>26</sup> That includes any vagaries an E-D-A form may have in a given idiolect, say loss of ergative displacement in 2s/pE-D-A but not 1pE-D-A.

<sup>27</sup> I am grateful to B. Fernández for providing me with Aramaio's work, and pointing out that Aramaio does not describe the phenomenon as identical to the use of E-D-A, unlike what is reported in Arregi and Nevins (2011: 3.2). I am also grateful to those who have swiftly and firmly rejected *gustatzen zaidazu* as wholly unknown, whether they have *gustatzen didazu*, *nazu* or nothing: K. Erdozia, U. Etxebarria, A. Irurtzun, and J. Manterola.

least, existence of the gap is keenly felt and the circumlocution frequent. Stories about gaps that look to function have work to do.<sup>28</sup>

## 6 Morphological gaps

The last set of gaps seems to belong to morphology, the best-explored domain of agreement gaps (for overviews, see Rezac 2011: chap. 2 and the papers in Baerman, Corbett and Brown 2010). In drawing out the theoretical consequences, I will view morphology as the realization of syntactic structures by pieces, as in Distributed Morphology DM (Embick and Noyer 2007; on morphological theories, see Stump 2001). Morphological gaps are best known from derivational morphology, for instance *-ity* nominalizations, but inflection is rife with them, and their sources and behaviours are diverse.

One type of gap is illustrated by the absence of the past of *forgo*, beside *underwent* and *embargoed*, or of the past participle of *stride*, beside *hid(den)*, *ridden*, *glided*. Such gaps may be due precisely to the multiplicity of available formations and arise when there is not enough evidence to acquire one (Yang et al. 2012, Albright 2006). The result is ineffability: one simply cannot express the past of *She forgoes dinner* save by circumlocution. I will refer to this as the *stridden* type of gap.

A second type of gap, the *amn't* type, differs on two scores. There is no *\*amn't* in English beside *aren't*, *isn't*, *wasn't*, *weren't*, *couldn't*, though the formation should be transparent and unambiguous. The origin of the gap may have to do with phonology, and for long it has been positively reinforced, helped perhaps by markedness, since *am* is the sole form coding person agreement in English. The gap also has something that the *stridden* gap does not: a form unexpectedly used in its place. This form is *aren't*, and is unexpected insofar as *are* is not otherwise a 1s form of *be*. Indeed in some varieties *aren't* is not available to plug the gap, while in others it is available only in contexts like inversion. I will refer to such unexpected forms for expected ones as *stopgaps* (see Hudson 2000, Broadbent 2009, Nevins 2012 on the origins and distribution of *amn't* and its *aren't* stopgap).

---

<sup>28</sup> Ideal speakers in secure relationships readily confess awareness of gaps and volunteer circumlocutions to be studied. Otherwise one has Orr's experience, only imagine the grocer being pressed by one who wants to hear him say *I like you*.

This is further supported by the data reported by Orr concerning *nine eggs*. Orr first found it impossible to surreptitiously elicit *neuf* 'nine' directly followed by *oeufs* 'eggs'; the grocer would consistently say *neuf beaux oeufs* [nœfbozø] 'nine beautiful eggs'. When Orr finally asked the grocer directly why he would not say *neuf* immediately followed by *oeufs*, the grocer's answer was extremely revealing: 'My god sir, with *neuf*, I always say: [nœfbozø]. [nœfæf], you see, that clashes. [nœfzø], ultimately, that would maybe be more correct.'

Tranel (1981: 214)

The nature of the relationship between gaps and stopgaps is of great interest. If stopgaps respond to gaps in order to repair them, then they rely on reference-set computation whereby one structure refers to the goodness of another. Alternatively, *aren't* might be quite independent of *amn't*. It might be that *are* is a default, pre-empted by *am* ordinarily, but not when *am* is unavailable due to the gap, which lets *are* emerge. It might also be that *are* has simply become grammaticalised as a 1s form in the context of negation and whatever else it is restricted to like inversion (Embick and Marantz 2008, Hudson 2000, Bresnan 2001, Broadbent 2009, Nevins 2011).<sup>29</sup>

Before turning to gaps, something needs to be said about the productivity of Basque verbal agreement morphology. There is evidence that speakers can construct and use as grammatical novel forms built with pieces found in familiar ones. The most striking are K. Mitxelena's "morphological monsters". In the canonical paradigms of the language – agreement forms for all combinations of ergative, absolutive and dative coarguments – only one absolutive controller is found. However, there are cases where a singular absolutive argument of a verb controls absolutive person morphology, and a remote plural absolutive controls absolutive number morphology, giving otherwise impossible combinations like 1sA + pA agreement (Ortiz de Urbina 2003c: 293-4, Oyharçabal 2003: 784, 2005). Mitxelena's example (24)a involves a relative operator as the remote absolutive. The standard form of the finite verb would be *n<sub>1sA</sub>-en<sub>TM</sub>-bil<sub>∅</sub>-en<sub>PST.REL</sub>* walk-1sA-PST.REL, but instead *n<sub>1sA</sub>-en<sub>TM</sub>-bil<sub>∅</sub>-tza<sub>pA</sub>-n<sub>PST.REL</sub>* walk-1sA-pA-PST.REL may be preferred, with the pA morpheme *tza* seen in canonical forms like *g<sub>1pA</sub>-en<sub>TM</sub>-bil<sub>∅</sub>-tza<sub>pA</sub>-n<sub>PST.REL</sub>* walk-1pA-PST.REL. The pA agreement is controlled by the relativised object of *bila* 'in search of'. Similar monsters were identified by P. Lafitte where the remote absolutive is the object of a restructuring infinitival complements, (24)b. The standard form would be *nindoakon* 3sD-1sA, but the pluraliser *z* is added to agree with *harmak* 'the arms.sA' in the complement *hartzera* 'to take'.<sup>30</sup>

- (24) a. Nik ez ditut aurkitu ... [[\_\_ bila] nenbiltzan]-ak  
           in\_search\_of walk.1sA.pA.PST.REL-the.Ap  
           I have not found ... what I was looking for.  
           (Mitxelena, cited in Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 293-4)

<sup>29</sup> I should say that there are gaps that look like a problem with form but whose statement goes beyond what one expects of a morphological condition. The problem has been well studied for the English Double-ing Filter, *\*It's starting raining* (Ross 1972; Pullum and Zwicky 1999; Richards 2010: 23, Nevins 2011). Here is a case from Gipuzkoan Basque, as described in de Rijk (2008: 24.6.1): the potential formed by the particle EB *ahal*, Gipuzkoan *al*, is blocked precisely when it can be interpreted as the question particle *al*, namely the simple present and past of matrix clauses, and independently available but otherwise less common alternatives like the potential mood must be used.

<sup>30</sup> Ortiz de Urbina (2003c: 294) observes that pA *tza* in Lafitte's forms is not the *tzi* given for canonical forms like *doatzi* 'go-3p', *bagoatzi* 'go-1p' (but Lafitte does give canonical forms like *doatza*, §512, *goatzak*, §584, so the matter needs more study).

- b. etxaiari harmak hartzera nindoazkon  
 enemy.D arms.pA take.to go.3sD.1sA.pA.PST  
 I was going to take the arms from the enemy

(Lafitte 1979: §531)

Construction of such forms in both relativization and remote agreement needs study, but it may be relatively common. Examples can be found in well-edited publications and are acceptable to speakers on reflection.<sup>31</sup>

- (25) a. Nik ez dakit ematen ari *natzaizkizuen* arrazoiak gutxi ala asko diren, baina beste bat emango dizuet.  
 I do not know whether the reasons<sub>i</sub> that I am giving ye *2pD-1sA-3pA<sub>i</sub>-REL* are few or many, but I will give ye another.  
 (Eusko legebiltzarra IX N°. 45 zk., 25/03/2010, p. 101)
- b. Hala ere, dezibelak neurtzen ari *natzaizkizu*, eta duela 48 urte Caracasera joan zinenean baino ozenago hitz egiten duzu.  
 However, I am measuring decibels<sub>i</sub> on you *2sD-1sA-3pA<sub>i</sub>*, and you are louder than 48 years ago when you went to Caracas.  
 (*Berria*, "Fidel zutik eta onik" by Amagoia Mujika)

These forms suggest that Basque verbal morphology is not to be entirely analysed as a set of monolithic memorised forms whose pieces are not part of I-language though accessible to analogical generalization in language change, as argued by Hualde (2002). There is a certain productivity. The existence of a productive formations does not preclude gaps: past, perfect, and contracted negation all have productive formations in English.

Yet Basque morphology can also seem like a lexicalised mess, as in the gradual loss of ergative displacement motivating Hualde's proposal. Here is one example: the placement of ergative and dative agreement morphemes *ka/na* 2°m/f with respect to other suffixes in the dialect of Guernica (Yrizar 1992a: 245ff.). Usually, pA *s* precedes 2°m/fE *ka/na*, as in the variety of Ajánguiz 2°m/fE-1sD-3pA *deu-sta*<sub>1sD</sub>-*sa*<sub>pA</sub>-*k/na*<sub>2°m/fE</sub>. In the neighbouring variety of Navárniz, however, the order depends on the gender of 2°E, *deu-sta*<sub>1sD</sub>-*sa*<sub>pA</sub>-*k*<sub>2°mE</sub> but *deu-sta*<sub>1sD</sub>-*na*<sub>2°fE</sub>-*s*<sub>pA</sub>. Even in Ajánguiz, this is the pattern if the 1sD dative is changed to 1pD, 2°m/fE-1pD-3pA: *deu-sku*<sub>1pD</sub>-*sa*<sub>pA</sub>-*k*<sub>2°mE</sub> but *deu-sku*<sub>1pD</sub>-*na*<sub>2°fE</sub>-*s*<sub>pA</sub>. In 2°m/fE-3pD-3pA, the order in Ajánguiz has evolved from this latter pattern, *deu-tze*<sub>3pD</sub>-*sa*<sub>pA</sub>-*k*<sub>2°mE</sub>, *deu-tze*<sub>3pD</sub>-*na*<sub>2°fE</sub>-*s*<sub>pA</sub>, at the beginning of the twentieth century, to *dxau-tza*<sub>1D</sub>-*sa*<sub>pA</sub>-*k/na*<sub>2°m/fE</sub> at the end. Turning to dative 2°m/fD *ka/na*, usually it precedes ergative 1s/pE *da/gu* in Ajánguiz as in Basque generally, 1s/pE-2°m/fD-3sA *deu-a/na*<sub>2°m/fE</sub>-*t/gu*<sub>1s/pD</sub>. But changing from 3pA to 3sA, there is both variation on this usual order, 1sE-2°m/fD-3pA *deu-na*<sub>2°fE</sub>-*da*<sub>1sD</sub>-*s*<sub>pA</sub> beside

<sup>31</sup> Both examples are acceptable to R. Etxepare (p.c.). Other reactions exist: P. Iribertegi's review in *Berria* 2003-08-16 ([kritikak.armiarma.com/?p=854](http://kritikak.armiarma.com/?p=854)) heaps little but praise on K. Navarro's translation of I. B. Singer's *Zortzi kontakizun* (Elkar: Alberdania, 2002), but asks "Is there a verbal form *natzaizkizu*?" See also the discussion in Oyharçabal (op.cit.).

*deua-da*<sub>1sD</sub>-*sa*<sub>pA</sub>-*na*<sub>2°E</sub>, and exceptions to it, 1pE-2°m/fD-3pA *deua-gu*<sub>1pD</sub>-*na*<sub>2°E</sub>-*s*<sub>pA</sub> from *deu-na*<sub>2°E</sub>-*gu*<sub>1pD</sub>-*s*<sub>pA</sub> a century earlier. There is a quaint term comes to mind: higgledy-piggledy.

Variety after variety in Yrizar's fifteen volumes of the morphology of the most commonly used paradigms of the auxiliary has something like this, often a great deal of it. Variations in agreement morphology can be very neat and serve as isoglosses, but there always seem to be varieties they become a higgledy paradigm (including all the dialectal markers in Zuazo 1998). From form to form for a single speaker, from farm to farm, from generation to generation, unpredictability is common, though the rule only when a paradigm stands on the threshold of loss.<sup>32</sup>

One can see how this complexity might give rise to gaps: if forms are memorised, one cannot predict a missing one; if they are composed, there are many modes of formation. Yet gaps are not usually associated with such complexity. There are no gaps in the E-D-A paradigms of Ajánguiz: no absolute gaps, that is ineffable E-D-A combinations, nor any combinations realised by a form impoverished for agreement phi-features. Rather, there are different ways to map phi-features to form, like pA + gender and gender + pA, but together they supply one or more forms for every feature combination. English past is like that: the weak pasts have tended to replace the strong ones on an item-by-item basis, *crow* : *crew* → *crowed*, and this is the productive mode for *wugged*, but there is the odd reversal, *sneak* : *sneaked* → *snuck*, and no synchronic predictability, *know* : *knew*, *streak* : *streaked*. Yet gaps like \**forwent* are almost absent. A nice counterpart in a clitic system is Iberian variation in the ordering of *se* and *me/te* (Heap 2008).

Gaps of the *stridden* type, with no stopgap, and *amn't*, with the *aren't* stopgap normally realising a different structure, do occur in Basque agreement. They are most frequent where an entire agreement paradigm is being lost. In the Basque auxiliary, this is common and largely restricted for D-1/2A forms (Rezac 2013). The full set of D-1/2A forms is present in EB, and – so it seems – in every variety of which there are records at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century or earlier, including varieties where they are now mostly gone (Azkue 1923-5), though even then there are hints of incipient loss, as in Markina (Rollo 1925). Today, a relatively full set of

<sup>32</sup> I had long wondered whether such microvariation was an artefact of Yrizar's massive study; but exhaustive studies of the grammars of and by individual native speakers explicitly highlight it (e.g. Zeberio, Etxebarria 1988: 210; the source for late 20<sup>th</sup> century Ajánguiz forms seems to be among them, Yrizar 1992a: 245). My qualms have been allayed by sharp judgments I have met myself: for EB *zenion* and *genion* 2sE/1pE-3sD-3sA-PST (2sE/1pE coded by prefixes *z-*, *g-* under "ergative displacement"), a central Gipuzkoan speaker with *ziozun* but *giñion* (ergative displacement lost in favour of a suffix for 2E but not 1pE, the most common pattern) smiles at the *ziñiozun* for *zenion* of a friend a short afternoon walk's away (ergative displacement doubled by a suffix, still for 2E only) or the *gendiogun* for *genion* of another over the hill (same but extended to 1pE) and knows nothing of 1pE-3sE *nugun* for EB *genuen* at the end of a frequent trainride (with prefix otherwise used for 1sE and suffix for 1pE). For another example, see Rezac (2006: 3.2.1).

forms is found in eastern varieties, like Ahetze (Cabodevilla 1991) or Maya (N'Diaye 1970). In many western and central varieties, D-1/2A forms are disappearing, leaving only D-3A. D-1/2A forms are gone in Basauri (Arretxe 1994), Pasaia (Agirretxe et al. 1998), and Ondarroa (Rotaetxe 1978). Only vestiges, particularly for present indicative D-1sA and chiefly among older speakers, remain in Ultzama (Ibarra 1995) and Bermeo (Gaminde, Romero and Legarra 2012). More robust is Larresoro (Epelde 2003), with 3sD-1sA/2°A present and past, but 1pA and 2s/pA lost. Still more so Zeberio (Etxebarria 1998), with intact and used present indicative save for D-2pA, but otherwise only D-1sA. In Zaldibia young speakers even seem to be giving up the whole the D-A paradigm (Etxabe and Garmendia 2003). The loss of these forms is absolute: nothing takes their place, and independently available circumlocutions are used instead: thus *Nekaneri joan natzaio* "I went to Nekane", lit. Nekane.D gone 3sD-1sA, with an agreeing dative, vanishes, but is expressed well enough by *Nekanerengana joan naiz* 1sA, lit. Nekane.to gone 1sA, with an animate allative.<sup>33</sup>

The deterioration of the D-A auxiliary does not typically affect other paradigms of the auxiliary, at least not in the indicative, not until a dialect is on the threshold of death (as the variety Olazagutia-Ciordia of Burunda, Yrizar 1991). It is, however, echoed in the paradigms of strong or synthetic

---

<sup>33</sup> Contemporary descriptive grammars of western and central dialects where D-1/2A forms are partly or almost wholly lost mention relics among older speakers, typically for D-1sA and the imperative (presumably due to their frequency, see Hualde 2002 for 1s); when examples are given, they involve low datives like the goal for *etorri* 'come' and not high datives like the experiencer of *iruditu* 'seem': Arrasate, Bergara (imperative only), Bermeo, Ermua, Leioa, Mallabi (imperative only), Oñati, Otxandio (imperative only), Sopela, Ultzama, Zaldibia, Zamudio, Zeberio, Zegama. Only D-3A forms are mentioned for Antzuola, Basauri, Eibar, Foru, Lekeitio, Oiartzun, Ondarroa, Ordizia, Orío, Pasaia. Azkue (1923-5) quoted below is clear on the existence of D-1/2A in dialects where they are now lost. He is corroborated by careful descriptions like Rollo (1925) for Markina, who goes to such nuances like the availability of *etorri nakisula* "that I come to you" 2sD-1sA beside the incipient loss of D-1/2A forms in the allocutive conjugation, and rarity and hesitation in less common tense-mood combinations. Among localities where D-1/2A forms are now mostly gone, the morphophonology of relics seem to presuppose an internal history (e.g. Zeberio (*laguntan yoan*) *ñatzu*, *natxatzu*, *nayatzu* 2sD-1sA, given as living forms, Etxebarria 1988: 214). This all suggest the classical story of loss I go with in the text. B. Fernández (p.c.) informs me of a widespread current view that D-1/2A forms never existed where they are now absent. It needs very Galfridian a reading of Azkue:

The inflections ... *nakio* [3sD-1sA] and *nakizu* [2sD-1sA], which in imperative and subjunctive are said without deformation and are still heard as such in Bakio, Urduliz, Bañika and Maruri (at least in the past\*), the rest of us Bizkaians pronounce in one of the following ways: *nađako* (Añatia), *nadxako* (Lekeitio), *natxako* (Markina and Mondragón), *najako* (Soraluze). [Note \*] Even aged persons of these villages, consulted by me in May of 1924, no longer use *nakio* in indicative, but rather, following the general trend, say *nađako* (Urduliz and Bañika), *nadxako* (Bakio), *naixako* (Maruri). The inflections of the past are said in their pristine purity: *neu agertu nekion* I appeared to him [3sD-1sA], *geu agertu gekiozan* [3sD-1pA] we appeared to him.

(Azkue 1923-5: §885; all un glossed auxiliary forms are 3sD-1sA)

verbs: those that may themselves carry agreement inflections. Their number and range of forms has been decreasing throughout Basque history, and survivors in current spoken varieties mostly present the moth-eaten aspect of typical western D-1/2A paradigms.

## 7 1p+2 gaps and stopgaps

In this and the remaining sections, I turn to particular set of gaps identified by Arregi and Nevins (2006, 2011).<sup>34</sup> They are of particular interest because of the nature of their stopgaps. I will agree with Arregi and Nevins's analysis: the gaps and stopgaps result from morphological operations that eliminate phi-features in the agreement complex on the way to its realization.

Basque agreement morphology combines one of absolutive A agreement, dative D and ergative E agreement in A, D-A, E-A, and E-D-A- paradigms. Each paradigm has characteristic allomorphy, such as the choice of auxiliary root: in EB root *u* for E-A, *tzai* for D-A, and *i* for E-D-A.<sup>35</sup> In the +E paradigms, namely those agreeing with E, western dialects sometimes have gaps in 1p+2 combinations. They differ on which combinations are gapped and in how they are expressed. In this section these gaps and their stopgaps are introduced in general; the next looks at one particular variety up close.<sup>36</sup>

Consider first Zeberio Basque (Etxebarria 1998: 147ff., 211-2). In otherwise intact E-A and E-D-A indicative paradigms of the auxiliary, the combinations 1pE-2s/p/fA and 1pE-2s/p/fD-3A are missing, vestiges aside. Two strategies are reported to make do without them. One is *circumlocution*, here described for 1pE-2pA:

[W]hen a form is almost lost, things are expressed by a sentence of some other sort: For example, instead of saying *atzo bakarrik ikusi zinduguzan* ["We saw you alone yesterday", 1pE-2pA-PST], the following are said: *atzo bakarrik ibili sintzen* ["Yesterday you were walking alone", 2sA-PST] ... *se iten saindun ba bakarrik atzo* ["What were you doing alone yesterday", 2sE-3sA-PST] or *e(s)aunken lagunik atzo ala* ["You did not have friend yesterday then?", 2sE-3sA-COND]?

(Etxebarria 1998: 212, 215)

<sup>34</sup> The gaps have long been noted in descriptions such as that of Egaña (1984), and briefly in generative literature by Fernández (2001: 156).

<sup>35</sup> 3sA has zero exponents and does not condition allomorphy, as if it were absent, as discussed later.

<sup>36</sup> The phenomenon has only been discussed for western dialects, but occurs elsewhere. In the southern High Navarrese subvariety of southern Erro, at the locality of Aincioa, the transitive indicative present paradigm uses differential object marking forms for 2-1, e.g. *ikusi dirazu neri ... karriken* "you saw me 2sE-1sD ... in the street", but for 1sE-2sA there is the impersonal-type stopgap *elizan ikusi zaizu* (!) "te he visto", lit. church.in seen 2sD(-3sA), instead of 1sE-2sD as in neighbouring Loizu *nik zuri ikusi dizut oiania* "I saw you in the forest" (Yrizar 1992b: 303; (!) is his).

The other strategy is *stopgaps*, forms that exist independently but not with the syntax and meaning of the gap, like *aren't* for *\*amn't*. In Zeberio, the foregoing gaps recruit forms identical to those used as impersonals of transitives. Impersonals of transitives eliminate any overt expression of the ergative argument, including its agreement. Likewise for stopgaps: +E forms are replaced by -E ones, 2A for 1pE-2A and 2D-3A for 1pE-2D-3A. I return to this below; here impersonals are translated as passives:

Despite some forms not being used, the flow of communication is not lost, because it is completed by a filler verb-form. I will mention an example that I have often heard:

[A:] *belu deta, banoa etzera* ["It's late, I am going home."]

[B:] *nasai ba, eroango sara ra* ["Don't worry, you'll be brought", 2sA]

That is, instead of *eroango zaitugu* ["We'll bring you", 1pE-2sA], an impersonal case is used as filler.

[A:] *ser ingu ba aurten buskentzakas* ["What will we do then this year with the blood sausages?"]

[B:] *es ikeratu ba, eroango yakos da* ["Fear not, they'll be brought to him", 3sD-3pA"]

Here also, instead of using *eroango deutsaguz* ["We'll bring them to him", 1pE-3sD-3pA], the impersonal is used.

(Etxebarria 1998: 211-2)

Bermeo presents similar gaps but a different sort of stopgap (Egaña 1984, Laka, Olondo and Gaminde 2012, Gaminde, Romero and Legarra 2012). 1p+2 combinations are wholly missing in the E(-D)-A paradigms, and there are two sorts of stopgaps, both affecting the 1p argument. 1pE-2A and 1pE-2D-3A behave as in Zeberio: 1pE is obliterated, resulting in 2A and 2D-3A forms respectively, identical to those used in impersonals. In 2E-1pA, on the other hand, the stopgap is 2E(-3sA), which can be viewed as obliteration of 1pA agreement or its impoverishment by deletion of both person and number. I return to this dichotomy later.

What do we do when we need to use these missing forms? Well, the ABS, DAT, or ERG is put before or after the verb, as needed. Let us see with one example:

\**Eroango gaitusu* ["You will bring us", 2sE-1pA]

→ *Erungosu gu* ["You will bring it", -2sE.3sA we.A]

...

In some other cases, to overcome gaps, the impersonal form is used:

\**Esan geuntsun ez erosteko ezer* ["We said to you not to buy anything", 1pE-2sD(-3sA)-PST]

→ *Esan dxatsun es erosteko eser* ["It was said to you not to buy anything", 2sD(-3sA)-PST]

(Egaña 1984)

Circumlocution is also used:

It can happen that using neither, then seizing the sense, what we want to say appears in another way. That is: Instead of saying *Erungosu gu* [see above], to say this: *Bakosu guretsako lekorik ela?* ["Have you room for us?"]

(Egaña 1984)

The circumlocutions look like circumlocutions do: independent expressions with a close enough meaning to the gapped expressions to be usable in their stead. Far less clear, and potentially far more interesting, is the nature of the stopgaps. Consider first those syncretic with the impersonals of transitives. Their description as impersonals suggests that they might be circumlocutions. On this view, instead of saying *We'll bring you home*, one says *You'll be brought home*, as one could independently of the gap, with all the syntax and the semantics of an impersonal. At most the gap would influence pragmatics, in the way the use of *We'll meet twelve/#one day from today* is affected by the availability of *tomorrow* (for such effects in impersonals, cf. Zribi-Hertz 1982, 2008). Alternatively, the impersonal-like stopgaps might be unusual realisation of regular transitive syntax. This is the analysis of Arregi and Nevins (2011) as morphological deletion of ergative agreement. On their proposal, the stopgaps share no aspect of the syntax of impersonals to the exclusion of transitives.

The Basque impersonal is understood well enough that these alternatives can be probed (Albizu 1998, 2001, Ortiz de Urbina 2003b, 2006; for the closely similar Spanish *se*-impersonals, Mendikoetxea 1999, 2008). The impersonal is illustrated in (26) and described below.

- (26) a. Transitive  
 (Haiek) atepak irekitzen dituzte.  
 they.E doors.the.A opened 3pA-3sE  
 They open (the) doors.
- b. Impersonal and Anticausative  
 (\*Haiek) atepak irekitzen dira.  
 they.E doors.the.A opening 3pA  
 The doors are opened *and* The doors open.

(I) The impersonal of a (di)transitive has the realization of an absolutive-subject intransitive, identical to the anticausative when there is one: there is no overt ergative and agreement is (D-)A rather than E-(D-)A.

(II) The syntax of the impersonal differs from that of both the anticausative and transitive. The external argument, interpreted as 'people' or 'someone', cannot be realised as agreeing or nonagreeing or pro-dropped ergative, and is partly syntactically active (for reciprocals and control but not reflexives).

(III) If the absolutive of a transitive is 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person, E-1/2A, it resists this impersonal treatment to 1/2A, but may appear for many speakers as dative in case and agreement, 1/2D(-3sA).<sup>37</sup>

Using these properties to probe impersonal-looking stopgaps, it is clear that while they have the same realization (I), they differ in syntax (II-III). On (II), stopgaps unlike impersonals have an overt albeit nonagreeing ergative, (27)-(28). On (III), impersonal-looking stopgaps regularly fix 1pE-(D-)2A gaps with (D-)2A forms, (28), flouting impersonals' restriction to 3<sup>rd</sup> person absolutives.<sup>38</sup>

- (27) orain *geuk* kantako *dxatxu* suri  
 now we.E sing.FUT 2sD(-3sA) you.D  
 cf. EB orain *geuk* kantatuko *dizugu* zuri  
 now we.E sing.FUT 1pE-2sD(-3sA) you.D  
 Now we will sing to you.

(Bermeo; Gaminde, Romero and Legarra 2012: 144)

- (28) [I]nstead of using *zaitugu* [1pE.2sA.AUX<sub>EA</sub>] and *zaituztegu* [1pE.2pA.AUX<sub>EA</sub>], the intransitive ABS-subject paradigm is used, for instance: - *guk ikusi sara* [we.E seen 2sA] ([for] *guk zu ikusi* *saitugu* ["We saw you" we.E you.A seen 1pE-2sA]).

(Foru; Gaminde 1992: 92)

As far as (II-III) go then, impersonal-like stopgaps look syntactically like transitives, not impersonals. Only their realisation is anomalous. To be sure, the evidence is not conclusive. Taking (II), for instance, one could suppose that the stopgaps have the syntax of impersonals plus additional structure to license the external argument. However, this syntax would have to be parametrised by idiosyncratic phi-combinations of two arguments, subsets of 1p+2; and that may be beyond the bounds of syntax, while morphology does manipulate individual phi-features according to other phi-features in local contexts (Arregi and Nevins 2006, 2011, Rezac 2011: 2.2; I return to this in the next section). So (II) and (III) support a realizational analysis.

There is something that stopgaps share with impersonals beyond form. Impersonal argument often acquire "pseudospecific" and "specific" uses, notably a use similar to and sometimes replacing *we* (Cinque 1988). Among stopgaps for 1p+2, those that look like impersonals are only found when the

<sup>37</sup> This seems independent of whether a speaker allows differential object marking of a transitive high-animacy object as dative (Fernández and Rezac this volume), but the matter has not been studied. Spanish seems to show the same behavior.

<sup>38</sup> The situation in Bermeo at first sight suggests a more nuanced picture: whereas older speakers plug \*1pE-2A gaps with 2A stopgaps, younger speakers use 2D(-3sA), as if making the stopgaps conform to impersonals. However, younger speakers have also introduced differential object marking of plain transitive 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person direct objects by the dative, and this is expected to extend to stopgaps if they are just plain transitives with morphological suppression of 1pE (cf. Laka, Olondo and Gaminde 2012: 30).

obliterated E is 1p: there is for instance *zaitugu* 1pE-2sA → *zara* 2sA, but no *gaituzu* 2sE-1pA \*→ *gara* 1pA, only → *dozu* 2sE(-3sA). It is tempting to think of impersonal-looking stopgaps as grammaticalisations of impersonals in (pseudo)specific use. Yet it is opaque how to get a 2A stopgap for 1pE-2A when impersonals are unavailable for E-1/2A combinations. So this might be a dead end. Indeed, 1p is the preferred target of agreement obliteration or reduction not only when the result ends up like the impersonal, but also otherwise: for instance, in Bermeo and Ondarroa, not only in 1pE-2A/D→2A/D, but also in 2E-1pA/D→2E(-3sA).

This brings us to the nature of the second type of stopgap, which is not syncretic with the impersonal, but also reduces the phi-features coded in the agreement complex. A well-studied example is for 2E+1p gaps in Ondarroa (Arregi and Nevins 2011: 172-4). In (29)-(30) with 2E-1pD(-3A), 1pD is wholly obliterated to give 2E(-3A), distinct from 2pE-3s/pD-3A. Yet despite lack of agreement, a 1pD pronoun remains available. This is in partial tension with the situation outside the gapped forms: in Ondarroa as in western Basque generally, a low dative must agree if possible.<sup>39</sup>

- (29) a. Suk *guri* liburu emon  $\text{\textcircled{d}}\text{su}/*\text{\textcircled{d}}\text{skusu}$   
 you.E we.D book given 2sE-(\*1pD-)-3sA  
 cf. b. Berak *guri* liburu emon  $\text{\textcircled{d}}\text{sku}/*\text{\textcircled{d}}\text{au}$   
 s/he.E we.D book given 3sE-\*(1pD-)-3sA  
 (Ondarroa; Arregi and Nevins 2011: 172-175)
- (30) Suek *guri* lagundu \* $\text{\textcircled{d}}\text{skusuen}$  →  $\text{\textcircled{d}}\text{senduen}$   
 ye.E we.D helped \*2pE-1pD(-3sA) → 2pE(-3sA)  
 (Zamudio; Gaminde 2000: 376, in Arregi and Nevins 2011: 177)

The tension is more striking with absolutes. The gap at 2E-1pA surfaces as the 2E(-3sA) stopgap in (31), with 1pA removed by obliteration or reduction to 3sA. Again the nonagreeing 1pA argument can appear as an overt pronoun. The same goes for the impersonal in Bermeo above (*erungosu gu*). Yet 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person absolutes must agree otherwise, even when it leads to ineffability as in the PCC. Arguably, they need to Agree for licensing (Béjar and Rezac 2009). This suggests that in (31) syntactic Agree licenses the overt pronoun. Agree may also license pro-drop when the absolute is not overt (cf. Arregi and Nevins 2011: 172).

- (31) Suk *geu* ikusi  $\text{\textcircled{d}}\text{su}/*\text{\textcircled{d}}\text{atxusu}$   
 you.E we.A seen 2sE(-3sA)/\*1pA  
 (Ondarroa; Arregi and Nevins 2011: 172-175)

Both sorts of stopgaps seen here then, those that end up looking like impersonals and those that do not, seem to reflect plain transitive syntax with an anomalous realization, reducing or obliterating agreement phi-features. In

---

<sup>39</sup> Note that 2sE-3sA *dosu* ≠ 2sE-3s/pD-3sA *dotzasu* (Arregi and Nevins 2011: 309), in both (29) and (31).

neither case do they seem to have arisen from circumlocutions, since the putative circumlocutions are ungrammatical: 1/2A impersonals or nonagreeing datives and absolutes. The last section returns to this puzzle. But first, the next section takes up the system of Bermeo, where the mechanics of 1p+2 gaps and stopgaps can be studied in detail.

## 8 Morphological 1p+2 gaps in Bermeo

This section describes one system of 1p+2 gaps and stopgaps, that of Bermeo, and in its light the suitability of morphological analyses like that of Arregi and Nevins (2011).

The agreement morphology of Bermeo is set out in Laka, Olondo and Gaminde (2012), Gaminde, Romero and Legarra (2012), to which may be compared earlier stages and adjacent varieties in Yrizar (1992a). Bermeo has drastically simplified its agreement complex, and the rise of gaps may be related to it. Moods have been pruned to the indicative and the past mostly refashioned as present + *-n*.<sup>40</sup> Gaps cover the 1p+2 combinations of the E-A paradigm, Table 4, and E-D-3A paradigm, taken up later in Table 5.<sup>41</sup>

Table 4: Bermeo E-A paradigm<sup>†</sup>

	3sE	3pE	1sE	1pE	2sE	2pE
3sA	dau sauen	dauie sauien	dot nauen, doten	du +n	su +n	suye +n
3pA	daus, txus sausen	dauie(s) sauien	dotas, dotes nauen, tasen	dus +en	sus +en	suye(s) suyen
1sA	nau +en	nauie +n	–	–	nosu +n	nosuye +n
1pA	gaitxus gaitxu(se)n	gaitxusie gaitxuyen	–	–	→E-3sA	→E-3sA
2sA	saitxus +en	saitxusie +n	saitxut +en	→A	–	–
2pA	saitxusie +n	saitxusie +n	saitxutie +n	→A	–	–

<sup>40</sup> Of the indicative, imperative, subjunctive, hypothetical, and conditional, differing in mood affix, root, and ergative displacement, only the indicative survives, and the imperative limited to 3A objects. The subjunctive has been replaced by nominalizations, the hypothetical and the conditional are formed on the indicative by the invariant particle *leki*. The past has been remodelled on the present + *-n*, losing ergative displacement and the default past prefix *s-*, save in a handful of optional outliers: thus old past 3s *san*, 2s *siñen*, 2sD-3pA *dxatxus*, new *da-n* beside *san*, *sara-n*, *dxatxus-en*. Also lost are 2<sup>nd</sup> person familiar and allocutive forms and D-1/2A forms, as commonly elsewhere.

<sup>41</sup> Data from Laka, Olondo and Gaminde (2012); Gaminde, Romero and Legarra (2012) differ only in the interaction of the *s* and *(y)e* pluralisers.

† Present and past on separate lines, with *+(e)n* attached to present form.

In the E-A paradigm 1p+2 gaps, namely 1pE-2A and 2E-1p, stopgaps eliminate 1p. Arregi and Nevins (2006, 2011) distinguish two ways of eliminating 1p: obliteration, which wholly removes its agreement, and impoverishment, which reduces it to 3s.

*Obliteration* occurs in 1pE-2A combinations and obliterates E agreement. It does not just replace the 1pE suffix *-(g)u-* by the 3sE zero suffix, but also eliminates allomorphy that depends on the presence of E agreement. So for instance 2sA present (past) *sara(n)* replace 1pE-2sA *saitsugu(n)* (recorded for Bermeo). Young speakers use 2D(-3A) forms, e.g. 2sD(-3A) *dxatzu*, because of differential object marking of 2<sup>nd</sup> person objects as dative rather than absolutive, independently of the stopgap.<sup>42</sup>

For 2E-1pA combinations, Arregi and Nevins propose *impoverishment*: deletion of both person and number of 1pA to give 3sA. So for instance 2sE(-3sA) present *su* is used for such forms as 2E-1pA *\*gaitxusu* or *\*gosus* (not recorded for Bermeo) – and not for instance 2sE-3pA *sus*, preserving number. We will see below that obliteration and impoverishment can be distinguished, but not in these forms. Impoverishment rather than obliteration would be required if forms like *su* (EB *dosu*) were necessarily 2sE-3sA and not 2sE alone. However, 3sA agreement forms are also found where the presence of even an expletive 3sA argument has been doubted.<sup>43</sup> Thus forms glossed E-3sA might reflect E alone, and stopgaps apparently impoverishing 1pA to 3sA can be analysed as obliterating 1pA.<sup>44</sup>

Shorter shrift can now be given to the E-D-3A paradigm in Table 5.

---

<sup>42</sup> Younger speakers have also introduced 1pE-2A forms from EB.

<sup>43</sup> For instance: E(-A?) *lanean ematen dute* "they seem at work" 3sE(-3sA?), E-D(-A?) *jarraitu diete* "they follow them" 3pE-3pD(-3sA?), D(-A?) *damutzen zait honetaz* "I.D regret this.INS" 1sD(-3sA?) (Laka 1993b, 2000, Rezac 2011: 5.5, Preminger 2012, cf. Fernández and Ortiz de Urbina 2010: 3.3.2).

<sup>44</sup> Symmetry of E-A and E-D-3A paradigms might support this obliteration treatment: as to 1pE-2A→2A corresponds 1pE-2D-A→2D-A, so to 2E-1pA→2E(-3sA?) corresponds 2E-1pD-3A→2E-3A, and the latter clearly has obliteration as seen next.

Table 5: The E-D-3A paradigm<sup>†</sup>

		3sE	3pE	1sE	1pE	2sE	2pE
3sD	sA	txo(n)	txoye(n)	txat(en)	txagu(n)	txasu(n)	txasuye(n)
	pA	txos(en)	=	txates(en)	=, txagusen	txasus(en)	=
3pD	sA	txoye(n)	txoye(n)	txatie(n)	txaguye(n)	txasuye(n)	txasuye(n)
	pA	txoyes, =	=	txaties, =	=	=	=
1sD	sA	dost(en)	dostie(n)	–	–	stasu(n)	stasuye(n)
	pA	dostes(en)	=, dostiesen	–	–	status(en)	=
1pD	sA	dosku(n)	doskuye(n)	–	–	→E-A	→E-A
	pA	doskus(en)	=	–	–	–	–
2sD	sA	txu(n)	txuye(n)	txut(en)	→D-A	–	–
	pA	txus(en)	=	txutes, =	–	–	–
2pD	sA	txuye(n)	txuye(n)	txutie(n)	→D-A	–	–
	pA	=	=	=	–	–	–

<sup>†</sup> = indicates that a pA form identical to the sA form.

Gaps again cover 1p+2 combinations. Stopgaps are all clearly of the obliteration type. 1pE-2D-A eliminates 1pE to give 2D-A forms, e.g. present 1pE-2sD-3sA → 2sD-3sA *dxatxu* for *-tsugu* (recorded in Bermeo). 2E-1pD-3A eliminate 1pD to give 2E-3A forms, distinct from 2E-3sD-3A: e.g. present 2sE-1pD-3sA → 2sE-3sA *su(n)* for *-skusu* (recorded for Bermeo; general Bizkaian *deuskusu*).

Let us turn in more detail the morphological analysis of stopgaps in Arregi and Nevins (2011: 4.6, 4.8 cf. 2006). It occurs in post-syntactic realizational morphology. Gaps are barred by markedness constraints on two clitics each with [+participant]. Stopgaps are derived by language-specific rules deleting the person and number of one of the clitics (impoverishment to 3s) or the clitic itself (obliteration). At the rules' point of application, morphology is distinct from syntax: the computation has branched off from the mapping to LF so there is no effect on meaning, and it is characterised by distinctive properties such as restriction to the morphological word (cf. Embick and Noyer 2001). However, linearization and exponent insertion has not yet occurred, so linear order and phonological form are irrelevant.

Four issues may be taken with the analysis: restriction to 1p+2 forms, distinction between obliteration and impoverishment, degrees of impoverishment, and implementation before linearization. The first three are raised here, and I suggested that the proposal is on the right track for each, while the last is left for the next section.

The markedness ban on multiple [+participant] elements would be expected to apply to 1s+2 combinations as well as 1p+2, but it does not, in Bermeo or elsewhere in Basque. The major discussion of similar gaps outside Basque is Heath (1991, 1998), who finds that regular expression of 1+2 combinations widely avoided, and attributes it to social conventions. That should include 1sE-2A par excellence, and does in other languages. Frequency might be the culprit in Basque. Basque 1p+2 gaps and stopgaps

seem to have arisen in recent remodellings of agreement paradigms, and these are often resisted by 1s as the most frequent form. Bermeo shows this independently. 1sE is the sole ergative in Bermeo to retain the older mode of past formation, beside the newer one of tacking on *-n* to the present, and Hualde (2002) attributes it to frequency:

The persistence of the etymological form *nozan* 'I V it to him, past' in the face of a complete restructuring of the morphological system must undoubtedly be due to the greater frequency of use of this form. The conservative nature of forms for a first person singular subject due to their great frequency is also pointed out in Bybee & Brewer (1980) ...

(Hualde 2002)

It is in this perspective that Arregi and Nevins's coding of the 1s exception might be seen. They impoverish 1s [+participant, +author, +singular] by deleting [+participant], excluding it from the ban on multiple [+participant] clitics. It is a stipulation, but one suitable to capturing the consequences of the frequency of 1s, by making it less complex than other [+participant] elements through deletion of redundant specification.

Turning to the distinction between obliteration and impoverishment, it has been seen that forms subsumed under impoverishment of 1p to 3s in Bermeo might actually be analysed as obliteration. The Bermeo pattern seems to be the most frequent one, and is found in all the stopgaps seen so far. Yet it is not universal. Two divergences from it are found: clear impoverishment of 1p to 3s rather than its obliteration, and impoverishment or obliteration of 2. Both are found in Albóniga, a subvariety of Bermeo for which Yrizar (1992a: 466ff.) gives two sources, Azkue (henceforth  $\alpha$ ) in the first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and Olazar (henceforth  $\omega$ ) in the last.

In Albóniga 1pE-2A combinations are mostly retained, present 1pE-2sA  $\alpha$  *saittugu*  $\omega$  *saitxugu*. However, for 1pE-2pA, where  $\alpha$  has the regular *saittuegu*,  $\omega$  uses 3E-2pA *saitxusie*, not 2pA *sarie*. The difference is the presence of 3E agreement controller, which conditions root allomorphy, even though it has no overt suffix. So impoverishment of 1pE-2pA yields a 3E-2pA stopgap distinct from the 2pA impersonal look-alike. There is nothing inevitable about stopgaps' surface identity to impersonals, not even when 1pE is the element targeted by reduction.

The same is true of present 2s,pE-1pA combinations, retained by  $\alpha$  as *gosus*, *gosues* but turned to 3s,pE-1pA in  $\omega$  *gaitxus*, *gaitxues*.<sup>45</sup> These are of independent interest for two reasons. First, it is the 2<sup>nd</sup> person argument that is affected, not as hitherto 1p. This, Arregi and Nevins point out, shores up their analysis, which stipulates which phi-features are reduced. Second, the singular/plural distinction of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person argument is retained, as 3s/p: we have *partial impoverishment*, of person only (Antzuola below furnishes more examples). I would advance this as support for the full scope of Arregi and

---

<sup>45</sup> 2°E-1pA forms are regular in  $\alpha$  and not used or recorded in  $\omega$ .

Nevins' impoverishment mechanics: it is in principle capable of deleting person and number separately, and here we see it for person. Number alone can apparently be partially impoverished as well:  $\alpha$  has regular past 1pE-2sA *sendugusan?* [sic], 1pE-2pA *senduegusan*, but  $\omega$  replaces 1pE-2sA by 1sE-2sA *saitxuten*, impoverishing the number of 1pE, and 1pE-2pA by 3sE-2pA *saitxusie* [sic, no -n] (again Antzuola will have another example).<sup>46</sup>

Other variations on this theme are found in the Plentzia varieties of Maruri, Gatika and Butron, differing in minor matters such as whether and when the E-D-A paradigm is included and whether past and present behave the same (Yrizar 1992a: 648ff.). Arregi and Nevins (2011: 4.6.3) observe the relevance of these varieties; I have done no more than add support for the finer nuances their mechanics make available. We may conclude with Arregi and Nevins that any or all 1p+2 combinations may be transformed by "deleting the ergative, deleting the absolutive, deleting the dative, deleting the first plural, deleting the second person", adding that person and number can delete wholesale or piecemeal. This proposal is utterly stipulative about deletions; the data fit. There are, to be sure, things to say about frequency – the preference of affecting 1p in any capacity to 2 for instance – but these seem external to the mechanics of morphology.

This capriciousness in gaps and stopgaps is not unique to Basque. The Chukchi spurious antipassive is a good example (Bobaljik and Branigan 2006: 68, 77n20):

- (32) Chukchi spurious antipassive: deletion of object agreement phi-features and insertion of a voice-like morpheme in subject→object contexts 3SG→1SG, 2→1 in non-participial tenses, and 1→2, 1/2→3, 3SG→3 in participial tenses.

Such arbitrariness fits well theories of morphology like that of Bonet (1991), Noyer (1992), Embick and Noyer (2001), Arregi and Nevins (2011), some explicitly devised to model it. It contrasts with the profile of syntactic mechanisms (Rezac 2011: chapt. 2). Agreed-on syntactic phenomena never seem to depend on arbitrary combinations of phi-features from multiple arguments: there is no system where phrasal object shift or a *by*-phrase agent is available only in structures with 1p nominative and 2s dative. Moreover,

<sup>46</sup> In past 2s,pE-1pA,  $\alpha$  retains *gendususan*, *gendusuesan*,  $\omega$  impoverishes 3s/pE in *gendusen*, the 3s/pE distinction here not being marked either in the stopgap or in regular 3s/pE-1pA past. Corresponding 2° forms are regular for  $\alpha$  when extant, else not used or recorded. In the E-D-A paradigm of Albóniga, 1p+2 are not affected save when 2° is involved. This also support arbitrarily stipulating reductions: 1p+2 combinations behave differently in the E-A and E-D-A paradigms, and in both can be finely microparametrised. The details are 2°m,fE-1pD-3sA;3pA  $\alpha$  *doskuk*, *doskunaa*; *doskusak*, *doskunas?* but  $\omega$  *dok*, *dona*; *dok*, *dosuena*, with 1pD obliteration save in the opaque last form, 1pE-2°m,fD-3s;pA  $\alpha$  *duagu*, *deunagu?*; *deuagus*, *deunagus* but  $\omega$  *dxak*, *dxana* = 2°D-3sA and thus 1pE obliteration, with no 3sA-3pA distinction which does exist for 2°D-3s/pA. The corresponding past forms with 2° are mostly not in use or not recorded.

there is a contrast between 1p+2 gaps/stopgaps, which reduce surface agreement without consequences for syntax, and more clearly syntactic gaps like the PCC that cannot reduce agreement and do affect syntax. To the extent that this is systematic, a line is to be drawn between syntax and morphology, even if its precise course remains in doubt.

## 9 At the sources of gaps in Antzuola

1p+2 gaps in Basque go with idiosyncracies seen elsewhere in 1+2 agreement combinations, which often fail to be the cumulations of exponents expected on the basis of 1/2(+3) forms (Heath 1991, 1998). Deletions and transfers of phi-features, obfuscation of their realization, and resort to impersonal-looking forms, are commonplace. Rhodes (1993: 145) aptly calls such opaque agreement in Algonquian *inflectional idioms*.

Heath (1991, 1998) gives 1+2 gapping a pragmatic explanation:

[T]he correct cross-linguistic generalization is a negative one, namely, that transparent 1 ↔ 2 combinations are avoided (Heath 1991). In other words, maximally transparent 'I saw you', 'you saw me', etc., tend to form negative or taboo targets and are often replaced by more opaque surface forms.

This preference for opacity resembles pragmatic restrictions in many languages on the use of transparent 2sg pronominals (*thou, tu*, etc.), which may become bluntly "familiar," hence inappropriate in polite discourse, where they are replaced by impersonal, third-person, or morphological "2pl" forms. ...

In languages with rich pronominal agreement, pragmatic restrictions ... focus on the verbal agreement system, and particularly (I suggest) on the transitive 1 ↔ 2 combinations. ... [In Mississippi Choctaw] I had difficulties eliciting 1 ↔ 2 forms of transitive verbs (even though they turn out to be formally regular in that language). My first informant ... when it came to 'you hit me' he balked, saying "We Choctaws don't talk like that; it sounds like I'm accusing you."

(Heath 1998: 84-5)

Heath also observes that some of the avoidance strategies reduce the surface transitivity of the morphology in various ways, "disguising or deleting a subject or object marker, or fusing the two into a portmanteau", or resort to impersonals like Basque. The situation in Chinook is worth giving in detail, since as in Basque, different strategies target apparently arbitrary subsets of 1+2 combinations:

Chinook (Boas 1911: 580-84, cf. Silverstein 1976:132) has a basically well-behaved transitive agreement system with ergative and absolutive prefix slots. The irregularities occur in 1 → 2 combinations. In 1sg → 2

forms, instead of the regular 1sg prefix *n-* we get a suppletive *ya-* ... In combinations of 1st nonsingular subject on 2d object, the usual 1st nonsingular ergative markers (e.g., 1pl exclusive ergative *ntc-k-*, including ergative case marker *-k-*) are replaced by *qa-*, which seems to be an *indefinite subject (ergative) marker q-* plus a linking vowel. Boas further indicates (1911: 584) that a 1st-person agent is omitted in ditransitive verbs when a 2d-person dative object is present: *Ø-t-am-l-ō't-a* 'I will give them to you' (Ø-3pl-2sg-to-give-Future).

(Heath 1998: 91; my italics)

Heath's proposal speaks to the origin of gaps. But it does not help understand how synchronically certain combinations but not others are gapped, say Ondarroa 2→1p but not 1p→2, Albóniga ω 2s/p-1pA, 1pE-2pA not 1pE-2sA. And it is hard to apply it to stopgaps, for insofar as these look like other forms, they look like forms that would be ungrammatical in their context, say impersonals with 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person absolutes.

Differently, Arregi and Nevins (2011: 6.4) see in a Zamudio gap and its stopgap the grammaticalization through acquisition of a near-homophony created by regular sound-change. Their example is 1pE-2sD *dotzugu* > *dotzuu* > *dotzu*, acquired as a variant of 2sD(-3sA) *datzu*. True or not for this particular form, it does not generalise to other 1p+2 gaps.

One might seek causes of gaps in complexity. One type of complexity is featural, and it is inherent in Arregi and Nevins's (2011) characterisation of gaps as involving two [+participant] elements.<sup>47</sup> Other sorts of complexity might be looked at as well. In Bermeo, gaps occur in a system that has recently drastically simplified the agreement complex, but it's not clear how that would exclude 1p+2 and not say 1p+3p. Other dialects have 1p+2 gaps without remodelling the agreement complex, and some could even be said to have added complexity. So it is in Antzuola (Larrañaga 1998). I set it out in some detail, for gaps in it often emerge where the system gets particularly warped, bringing the discussion back to the *stridden* and *amn't* gap types.<sup>48</sup>

Antzuola Basque keeps all the intricacies typical of the Basque agreement complex. Particularly relevant here are: (i) *ergative displacement* ED in hypothetical and past (+ED) but not present (-ED) paradigms, whereby 1/2E is coded as prefix rather than suffix if 1/2A does not control the prefix; (ii) the use of different roots for the auxiliaries, one for indicative-conditional paradigms, *\*edun*, and one for the subjunctive-potential

---

<sup>47</sup> It would be tempting to differentiate 1s-2 and 1p-2 by complexity of number, since morphologically 2s is plural in Basque from older 2p, while 2p is doubly plural; thus 1p-2s/p would be singled out against 1s-2p by having two [+plural] features. However, in varieties where the older morphologically singular 2s, now used as 2°, is in living use, it too falls prey to the 1p-2 gap, as in Zeberio and Zamudio and Albóniga, and 1p-2° is not more complex in number 1s-2s/p.

<sup>48</sup> The complexity of Antzuola is forbidding, and my prose does not help. The section ends on the larger conclusions that are accessible without the details.

paradigms, *egin* in western and central dialects like Antzuola for EB *\*ezan*. These two parameters design the system in Table 6.<sup>49</sup>

Table 6: The Basque tense-mood system<sup>†</sup>

		*edun (-eu/-o-) [ <i>*edun</i> (-u-)]		egin (-ai-, -ei-) [ <i>*ezan</i> (-eza-)]	
		Indicative	Conditional	Subjunctive	Potential
-ED	Pres.	doT [duT]	– [(du-ke-T)	daiDA-n [dezaDA-n]	→ Nei-ke [deza-ke-T]
+ED	Hyp.	ba-Neu [ba-Nu]	Neu-ke [Nu-ke]	– [ba-Neza]	Nei-ke [Neza-ke]
	Past	Neb-an [Nu-en]	– [Nu-ke-en]	Neix-en [Neza-n]	Nei-ki-en [Neza-ke-en]

<sup>†</sup> 1sE agreement morpheme in caps, EB forms in brackets.

Antzuola has undergone several developments that render this system more complex and that are relevant to gaps. All are related to ED.<sup>50</sup> EB and the antecedents of all current Basque varieties are characterised by the following generalization about the position of agreement affixes coding person: 1/2A control prefixes, 1/2E suffixes, save in +ED paradigms, where if there is no 1/2A to control the prefix, 1/2E does so. So ED disrupts the A:prefix-E:suffix pattern by 1/2E:prefix. This disruption is extended in Antzuola through three developments in the +ED paradigms. They are more common in the less frequent potential *egin*-based paradigms than in the indicative and conditional *\*edun*-based paradigms.<sup>51</sup> The developments may be introduced by a monster they create when they join forces. Potential nonpast 1pE-2sA should be *s-einke-gu-s* (EB *z-intzake-gu*), with 2sA prefix *s* and 1pE suffix *gu*. The form conforms to the even in Antzuola predominant coding of 1/2A by prefix and 1/2E by suffix outside ED. Instead, we find the reverse, *g-einke-su*, with 1pE prefix and 2sA suffix. Arguably not

<sup>49</sup> Antzuola along with many western and central varieties lacks several combinations: the potential present *daike* [deza<sup>ke</sup>] has been replaced by originally hypothetical *neike* [neza<sup>ke</sup>], and the counterparts of [duke] and [baneza] are not used.

<sup>50</sup> There are other complexities with respect to EB, notably the differentiation, rare in the west, of the E-D-A paradigm by different roots according to as D is 3<sup>rd</sup> or 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person; simplifications, notably the common western loss (vestiges aside) of 3s/pA distinction if there is a D argument; and other developments, such as redeployment of pA *s* for the 2s/p distinction in some cases. I omit a handful of odd gaps, like 1pA missing in *egin* past potential 2°E-1pA *ekian/eikienan* (EB *gintzakek/gintzaken*).

<sup>51</sup> The subjunctive and imperative are based on *egin* but are not affected by these developments. The subjunctive is riddled with gaps, but some survivors are surprising given where the rest of the gaps are, e.g. 2sE-1pE *gaitusun* and 2sE-1pD-3sA *daigusun*; so also imperative 2pE-1pA *gaitzue*, 2sE-1pD-3sA *igusu*. Their irregularity suggests they are not felt as part of the system; presumably the subjunctive is rare as elsewhere in the west. I set them aside henceforth when speaking of *egin* paradigms.

coincidentally, this very feature combination turns out to be frequently gapped, and a 1pE-3sA stopgap is used instead.

Here is what seems to be involved, and how it may have come about.<sup>52</sup>

*Development 1:* ED is partly lost for 2s/pE but not 1s/pE.<sup>53</sup> It is a common dialectal development to double the 1/2E prefix of ED by suffix, or to lose ED so that 1/2E is coded by suffix alone, as if ED did not take place, and the prefix is filled by a default morpheme. This dialectal development can be sensitive to the presence, phi-features, and exponents of E, D, A agreement, tense/mood, and root choice; usually it starts with 2s/pE, perhaps because its prefix *z/s-* is identical with the past tense default prefix *z/s-*.<sup>54</sup> In Antzuola precisely this has taken place. For *\*edun*, the E-A indicative past shows ED, but the E-D-A indicative past contrasts ED in 1pE-2sD-3A *gontsun* and ED loss in 2pE-1pD-3A *soskusun*. For *egin*, compare potential nonpast 1pE-3sA ED *geinke* but also ED+suffix *geinkiu*; 2sE-3pA ED *sei(n)ske* or *seinke*, but also ED+suffix *seinkesu* and *sei(n)ketzu*, as well as nonED *leikesuke*, where only the suffix expresses 2pA and *l-* is the default prefix of the hypothetical (in EB forms, as if *zenitzake* > *zenitzakezu* > *litzakezu*). The outcome is the pattern 2E:suffix-3A versus 1E:prefix-3A, robust in the +ED paradigms both of *egin* (for E-A, E-D-A) and of *\*edun* (for E-D-A but not E-A).

*Development 2:* The +ED paradigms, especially those of *egin*, show a tendency to code 2A by suffix rather than prefix. For 2°A, this occurs frequently outside Antzuola only as the doubling of the 2°A prefix *h-* >  $\emptyset$ - by the gender suffixes (*k*)a M, *na* F. The 2°A prefix can be detected in such cases even if  $\emptyset$ -, because it does not allow ED of 1/2E into the prefix slot. In Antzuola, we also get 2°A controlling gender suffixes in the +ED paradigms of both *\*edun* and *egin*, e.g. *egin* potential nonpast 3sE-2°A *eikek/n*. Remarkably, some such forms allow ED of 1/2E into the prefix slot, as will be seen in Development 3. Except for 2°A, coding of A by suffix is extremely rare elsewhere, but in Antzuola it does occur for 2s/pA in the +ED *egin* paradigm, as in potential nonpast 3pE-2sA *seikisue* (EB *zintzakete*), alongside regular forms like 1sE-2sA *seinket* (EB *zintzaket*). This extraordinary development is perhaps due to Development 1: the latter yields the opposition 2E:suffix-3A – 1E:prefix-3A, on which might have been restructured older E-1A:prefix – E-2A:prefix as E-1A:prefix – E-2A:suffix.

<sup>52</sup> The morphemes involved are in bold: prefixes 1s *n*, 1p *g*, 2s/p *s*, 2°  $\emptyset$ , default prefixes past *s* (EB *z*) and hypothetical *l*; suffixes 1s *t(a)*, 1p *gu*, 2s/p *su*, 2°m/f (*k*)a/*na*.

<sup>53</sup> For 2°E, one cannot tell, since the prefix is  $\emptyset$ - from older *h-*, and use of suffixes to express gender of 2°E, type (*h*)*unan* (EB *huen*), is a widespread and independent of ED loss (Rezac 2006: appendices and 3.2.1).

<sup>54</sup> Thus Pasaia Donibane 2sE-3sD-3sA ED *seniyon*, ED+suffix *seniyosun*, ED loss *siyosun*, but with 1pE only the former two options, *geniyon* and *geniyogun* (Agirretxe, Lersundi and Olaetxea 1998: 117).

*Development 3*: ED codes 1/2E by prefix rather than suffix in 1/2E-3A of +ED paradigms. In Antzuola, there is a tendency in +ED paradigms to code 1pE by prefix always and by suffix never. The tendency avails itself of Development 2, whereby 2A is coded by suffix. This is clearest in the potential paradigm based on *egin*, where this tendency characterises 1pE-2A: for instance nonpast 1pE-2°A *geinkek/geinken* (EB *hintzakegu*), 1pE-2sA *geinkesu~geinkisu* (EB *zintzakegu*). It extends even to 1sE-2°A, as in nonpast *neikek/neiken* (EB *hintzaket*). In the +ED paradigm of \**edun*, namely the indicative past, only 1pE-2°A combinations are affected, *giñdduan/giñddunan*. There a further twist appears: when 1pE is not coded by a prefix for 1pE-2°A, it still resists being coded by a suffix, and 3sE-2°A is used, *iñdduan/iñddunan* – a gap and its stopgap. Likewise in the remaining +ED paradigms of \**edun*. Sometimes 1pE is properly suffixal, so 1pE-2sA in conditional protases has the expected form *basiiñusteu* with the 1pE suffix *u*. But alongside it, there is also found as stopgap 3sE-2°A *basiiñus*, and remarkably, 1sE-2°A *basiiñusket*, which impoverishes 1pE for number alone (these two stopgaps are replicated in the indicative past, so they are not freak accidents). The restriction of this development to +ED paradigms shows that the coding of 1p(s)E by prefix through ED plays an important role in it. It is restricted to 1E and does not affect not 2E because it is bled by Development 1 which codes 2E by suffix.<sup>55</sup>

The combination of Developments 2 and 3 leads to such spectacular reversals of the usual E:suffix-A:prefix coding as potential nonpast 1pE-2°A *geinkek/geinken* (EB *hintzakegu*), 1pE-2sA *geinkesu~geinkisu* (EB *zintzakegu*). The usual Basque pattern of A:prefix-E:suffix remains typical even of Antzuola +ED paradigms, e.g. \**edun* indicative past 1sE-2sA *siñustan~siñustan* or \**egin* potential nonpast 1sE-2sA *seinket* (EB *zintzaket*).<sup>56</sup> The developments increase the complexity of form-based

<sup>55</sup> Though 1pE here undergoes ED to the prefix left vacant by zero expression of 2°A, it cannot be said of Antzuola that 2°A never controls the Ø- prefix, though this seems to be true of Zeberio. In Antzuola, ED of E with 2°A occurs only sometimes, and 2°A never permits the insertion of default tense-mood prefixes that appear with 3A if there is no ED, past *s-* as in 3sE-3sA *seban* (contrast 3sE-2°A *iñdduan*) or hypothetical *l-* as in 3sE-3sA *leike* (contrast 3sE-2°A *eike*). 2s/pA coded by suffix does end up using the past *s-*, but that is because of the diachronic pathway identifying 2s/pA and past prefixes *s-*. In Zeberio, on the other hand, 2°A Ø- has been more generally interpreted as absence, so we regularly get default prefixes, 1sE-2°A present indicative *doat/donat* (EB *haut*), and ED, 1sE-2°A past indicative *noan* (EB *hindudan*) (cf. 3sE-2°A *oan* (EB *hinduen*)), conditional protasis *banoa* (EB *bahindudan*) (cf. 3sE-2°A *baloa* (EB *bahindu*)) (unless 2°A forms are gapped, as in *ke-*forms). The existence of this pattern and its absence elsewhere is relevant to theories of ED (Laka 1993a, Fernández 2001, Hualde 2002, Rezac 2003, 2006, Arregi and Nevins 2011; see also Rebuschi 1983 for ED of allocutives). The prefix wants to be filled, comes to dislike what was originally only a phonological zero due to *h-* > Ø-, and so copies E-3A forms where ED plugs an originally true zero.

<sup>56</sup> The result of the reversal is accidentally identical to E-D-A 1pE-2D; but it does not reflect differential object marking where 2A would be dative in case, which the dialect does not

generalizations: rather than keeping prefix-coding of E to 1/2E-3A combinations, it differentiates 1E from 2E and so on.

Let us turn now to gaps in Antzuola, and their possible relationship to these developments. As in other varieties, the gaps are concentrated in 1p+2 combinations, and are replaced by stopgaps obliterating or impoverishing one argument.

In the E-A paradigm, for *egin* both 2s/pE-1pA and 1pE-2s/pA are gapped in the way we have seen for other dialects, with partial or full impoverishment. For *egin* potential present/hypothetical and past 2s/pE-1pA, there is 2s/pE-3sA, and its analogues were seen in the last section.<sup>57</sup> For *egin* potential present/hypothetical 1pE-2s/pA, the paradigm presents the above-discussed warped forms like *geinkisu~geinkesu/geinkesue*, with inversion of the usual prefix-suffix coding. However, they are in fact usually gapped and stopgapped by 1pE-3sA:

1pE-2sA *geinkisu/geinkesu*, very few say. *Guk su ekarri geinke* [we.E you.A brought 1pE-3sA] is said. Thus, the verbal form does not have *zu* [2sA] or ABS morpheme. ... The verbal form corresponding to 3<sup>rd</sup> person ABS is used, and, to obtain comprehensibility, instead of the verbal form having the ABS morpheme, the pronoun corresponding to this ABS is mentioned in the sentence ... The same for the 1pE-2pA form.

(Larrañaga 1998: 99f.; 119)

This description does not reveal whether for 1pE-2pA we get 1pE-3sA *geinke* or 1pE-3pA *geinske*, that is whether number is retained. Here however the potential past paradigm provides crucial evidence: number *is* retained: 1pE-2sA uses 1pE-3sA *geinkien*, but 1pE-2pA uses 1pE-3pA *geinskien*. This is confirmed by a comment to the paradigm: "In the verbal forms for 1pE-2sA and 1pE-2pA pronouns, no trace appears of the ABS phrase, thus, they have the form of 1pE-3sA *and* 1pE-3pA." (Larrañaga 1998: 120, my italics) This retention of number has already been seen in Albóniga and constitutes partial impoverishment, of number only.

I have so far eschewed 1pE-2°A forms, which might be expected to be gapped like 1pE-2s/pA are (so in Zeberio, for instance). However, 1pE-2°A is not gapped with *egin*, and instead the *geinkesu*-type inversion is actually used: potential present *geinkek/geinken*, past *geinkien/geinkienan*. This is not surprising. To get *geinkesu*, we need the extraordinary coding of 2s/pA by suffix (Development 2) to make the prefix available for 1pE (Development 3). In *geinkek*, the 2° *ka*, *na* suffixes were originally gender

---

have (Etxebarria 1988: 99).

<sup>57</sup> Thus for present/hypothetical 2sE-1pA "*Zuk-gu ekarri seinke...* [you.E us.A brought 2sE-3sA] is used; in this verb form there is no morpheme corresponding to *us*. *Zuk hura* [s/he.A] *ekarri seinke* = *zuk gu ekarri seinke*." (Larrañaga 1998: 99-100) For potential past presumably the same happens; the description gives a lacuna. In fact, the relevant 2s/pE-3sA forms are also each found for 2s/pE-3pA, though for the latter there are also distinct forms.

markers that in many Basque varieties combine with the 2°A prefix *h-* >  $\emptyset$ - regardless of how well ED is retained. Thus Development 2 was not needed here, only the extension of ED of 1pE to the  $\emptyset$ - of 2°A (as happens more generally in Zeberio). This yields *geinkek* – which then makes for a plausible starting point for Development 2 in the coding of 2s/p, specific to Antzuola.

So much for 1p+2 E-A combinations with *egin*. Matters are different for 2A with *\*edun*. The details have been described under Development 3. In 1s/pE-2A, 1pE is sometimes retained as suffix, sometimes undergoes ED which replaces the  $\emptyset$ - of 2°A, sometimes is fully impoverished to 3sE, sometimes partly to 1sE. 2s/p/fE-1pA is fine for *\*edun* throughout, unlike for *egin*.

In E-D-A, 1p+2 gaps fit the pattern seen elsewhere and are independent of Antzuola developments. In the *egin* (potential) paradigms, we have gaps for 2s/pE-1pD-3A but not 1pE-2s/pD-3A. The regular form is found for 2pE-1pD-3A *seinkigusue* (EB *zeniezagukete* but with ED+suffix, as if *\*zeniezagukezue*). Optionally in this combination, and obligatorily for 2sE-, 1pD is obliterated, so that 2s/pE-3A forms are used like 2sE-1pD → 2sE-3sA *seikesu*, and overt pronouns disambiguate. For E-D-A of *\*edun*, gaps likewise target 2s/pE-1pD-3A and not 1pE-2s/pD-3A. This starts with the +ED paradigms, but among younger speakers extends to the -ED indicative present and for some to the conditional. Stopgaps obliterate 1pD: *suk guri karamelua emon dosu* (younger speakers), you.E we.D karamel.A given 2sE-3sA, *suk guri karamelua emon doskusu* (older speakers), 2sE-1pD-3sA, but both *suek guri erregalua ekarri siñuen*, ye.E we.D gift.A brought 2sE-3sA. Again, overt pronouns disambiguate.

Interestingly enough, gapping by obliteration of D seen in E-D-A is also used for a feature combination that is not 1p+2: 3pE-1sD-3A-2°ALLOC (the allocutive conjugation adds gender suffixes controlled by the addressee to forms where the addressee is not an argument).

It is well past time to take stock of this remarkable system. Antzuola strengthens earlier conclusions but raises the relevance of the complexity of form to the origin of gaps. Overall, the character of gaps and stopgaps in and outside Antzuola fits Arregi and Nevins' (2011) language-specific morphological rules, capable of targeting any phi-feature in any context in the morphological word, and similar approaches, as seminally developed by Bonet (1991) for Catalan clitics. There is a synchronically arbitrary selection of 1p+2 combinations for gapping, but also sporadic gaps elsewhere. There are stopgaps that differ arbitrarily from each other in obliterating person, number, both, or agreement entirely, without repercussions on syntax. For both Bonet (1991) and Arregi and Nevins (2011), morphology manipulates phi-features prior to linearization and insertion of morphophonological material – that is independently of form, of the mapping of morphosyntactic features to morphological positions. That too seems to fit Basque.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Gaps and stopgaps differ between auxiliary roots, like *egin* and *\*edun*, but it might suffice

Form does seem key to the emergence of gaps in Antzuola. There are regions of the paradigm where ergative and absolutive coding has been bent out of its earlier and still predominant shape, E:suffix - A:prefix, through a new pattern, 2:prefix - 1p:suffix. Where the two tendencies cross, gaps can arise and are plugged by stopgaps that resolve the conflict by giving up some of the features involved. Antzuola lets us see this because it has undergone Developments 1-3. Yet these realise tendencies inherent in a range of Basque agreement systems, and it may be that they play a role in the origin of 1p+2 gaps elsewhere. How form gives rise to gaps remains dark: through parsing garden paths, through too many formations to acquire (cf. *\*stridden*), through stigmatisation of certain forms or formations (cf. *\*amn't*).

I will end on a gap in Antzuola that has nothing to do with the foregoing ones, but where such role of form shines through:

1pE-3A *gein(s)kien* they say easily and frequently, 3sE-1pA *geinkien* on the other hand with difficulty. It is not a form used a lot.

(Larrañaga 1998: 120)

Table 7: 1pE-3A and 3E-1pA potential past in Antzuola<sup>†</sup>

	Antzuola	EB
1pE-3sA	<i>geinkien</i>	<i>g en ezake en</i>
1pE-3pA	<i>geinskien</i>	<i>g en it za ke en</i>
3sE-1pA	<i>gei(n)skien</i>	<i>g in t za ke en</i>
3pE-1pA	<i>geinskien</i>	<i>g in t za ke te n</i>
		1pTMpA <sup>√</sup> KE3pPST

<sup>†</sup> *ke* is a mood marker

The relevant part of the paradigm is in Table 7. The EB forms are distinguished by material between the 1p prefix *g-* and the root *-za-*: the so-called theme marker TM *-en-* versus *-in-* and the absolutive pluraliser *-it-* versus *-t-*. Their form is sensitive to matters like ergative displacement, and varies greatly across Basque dialects (a survey for *\*edun* is given in Rezac 2006). Their allomorphs differentiate feature combinations that would collapse otherwise, as EB 3sE-1pA *gintzakeen* and 1pE-3pA *genitzakeen*. In some dialects, they sometimes do collapse. The western *egin* root is particularly susceptible to the collapse of 3E-1/2A (-ED) with 1/2E-3A (+ED) forms. In Antzuola this occurs with *geinskien*. The ambiguous form is fine for expressing one combination of features, 3E-1pA, and gapped for its inverse, 1pE-3A.

---

to refer to syntactic conditions on root allomorphy, if it is never sensitive to the particular form of agreement morphemes, or roots might have their morphophonological identity even in syntax (Harley and Noyer 1999, Embick 2000, Chomsky 2001).

## 10 References

- Agirretxe, Joxe Luix, Mikel Lersundi and Ortzuri Olaetxea. 1998. *Pasaiako hizkera*. Pasaia: Pasaiko Udala.
- Albizu, Pablo. 1997a. The syntax of person agreement. Doctoral dissertation draft, University of Southern California.
- Albizu, Pablo. 1997b. "Generalized Person-Case Constraint: A case for a syntax-driven inflectional morphology." In *Theoretical issues on the morphology-syntax interface*, Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria and Amaya Mendikoetxea (eds.), 1-33. Donostia: UPV/EHU.
- Albizu, Pablo. 1998. "Impersonal constructions of Basque revisited." Handout from Mayfest '98, July 6-8 1998, University of Maryland.
- Albizu, Pablo. 2001. "Sobre la distribución sintáctica de las formas finitas del verbo vasco." *ASJU* 35: 65-106.
- Albizu, Pablo. 2002. "Basque verbal morphology: Redefining cases." In *Erramu Boneta*, Xabier Artiagoitia, Patxi Goenaga, and Joseba A. Lakarra (eds.), 1-19. Bilbao: UPV/EHU.
- Albizu, Pablo. 2011. "Micro-variación en las construcciones inacusativas de dativo posesivo del euskera." Handout from Wedisyn 2, University of Barcelona, February 17-18, 2011.
- Albright, Adam. 2006. "Lexical and morphological conditioning of paradigm gaps." Ms., MIT. On-line: <http://web.mit.edu/albright/www/papers>.
- Anand, Pranav. 2007. *De de se*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Aramaio, Itziar. 2001. *Berriatuako aditz laguntzailea*. BA Thesis, Deustuko Unibertsitatea, Bilbo.
- Arregi, Karlos. 2004. "The *have/be* alternation in Basque." Ms., University of Illinois. On-line: [home.uchicago.edu/~karlos](http://home.uchicago.edu/~karlos).
- Arregi, Karlos, and Andrew Nevins. 2006. "Obliteration vs. impoverishment in the Basque g-/z- constraint." In *Penn Linguistics Colloquium* 30: 1-14.
- Arregi, Karlos, and Andrew Nevins. 2011. *Morphotactics: Basque auxiliaries and the structure of spellout*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Arregui, Anna. 2007. "Being me, being you: pronoun puzzles in modal contexts." *Sinn und Bedeutung* 11: 31-45.
- Arretxe, Jon. 1994. *Basauriko euskara*. Basauri: Basauriko Udala.
- Arteatx, Iñigo. 2007. "Euskarazko oharmen-aditzen osagarrietako perpaus jokatuabeak." *Uztaro* 63: 31-63.
- Arteatx, Iñigo. 2012. "Perception verb complements in Basque." In *Noun phrases and nominalizations in Basque* Urtzi Etxebarria, Ricardo Etxepare and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria (eds.), 397-436. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Artiagoitia, Xabier. 2000. *Hatsereak eta parametroak lantzen*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: EHU.

- Artiagoitia, Xabier. 2003. "Reciprocal and reflexive constructions." In *A grammar of Basque*, José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 607-631. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ariztimuño, Borja. 2013. "Finite verbal morphology." In *Basque and Proto-Basque*, Mikel Martínez-Areta, 359-428 (ed.). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Azkue, Resurrección María de. 1923-1925. *Morfología vasca*. Bilbo: Editorial Vasca.
- Baauw, Sergio, and Denis Delfitto. 2005. "New views on reflexivity: Delay effects in Romance." *Probus* 17: 145-184.
- Baerman, Matthew, Greville G. Corbett and Dunstan Brown (eds.). 2010. *Defective paradigms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, Mark. 1996. *The polysynthesis parameter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barker, Chris. 1992. "Group terms in English: Representing groups as atoms." *Journal of Semantics* 9: 69-93.
- Béjar, Susana and Milan Rezac. 2009. "Cyclic Agree." *Linguistic Inquiry* 40: 35-73.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire. 1975. *Recherches en vue d'une théorie de la grammaire française: Essai d'application à la syntaxe des pronoms*. Paris: Champion.
- Boas, Franz. 1911. "Chinook." In *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 40: 559-677.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Phillip Branigan. 2006. "Eccentric agreement and multiple Case checking." In *Ergativity: Emerging issues*, Alana Johns, Diane Massam, and Juvenal Ndayiragije (eds.), 47-77. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Bonet, Eulàlia. 1991. Morphology after syntax. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Bonet, Eulàlia. 1994. "The Person-Case constraint: A morphological approach." *MITWPL* 22: 33-52.
- Broadbent, Judith M. 2009. "The \*amn't gap: The view from West Yorkshire." *Journal of Linguistics* 45: 251-284.
- Bresnan, Joan. 2001. "Explaining morphosyntactic competition." In *Handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, Mark Baltin and Chris Collins (eds.), 1-44. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Büring, Danel. 2005. *Binding Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, Joan, and Mary A. Brewer. 1980. "Explanation in morphophonemics: changes in Provençal and Spanish preterite forms." *Lingua* 52: 201-242.
- Cabodevilla, Josu. 1991. *Aetzen Uskara*. Iruñea: Nafarroako Gobernua.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michael Starke. 1999. "The typology of structural deficiency." In *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), 145-233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. "Derivation by phase." In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Chomsky, Noam. 2013. "Problems of projection." *Lingua* 130: 33-49.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1988. "On *si* constructions and the theory of *Arb*." *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 521-581.
- Cysouw, Michael, and Javier Fernández Landaluce. 2012. "On the (im)possibility of partial argument coreference." *Linguistics* 50: 765-782.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 2006. *Relators and linkers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 2007. "Phase extension: A reply." *Theoretical Linguistics* 33: 133-63.
- den Dikken, Marcel, Anikó Lipták, and Zsófia Zvolenszky. 2001. "On inclusive reference anaphora: New perspectives from Hungarian." *WCCFL* 20: 137-149.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 2003. *Basic linguistic theory 3*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Egaña, Aitzane. 1984. "Bermeoko aditzaren azterketa lorratzak." *Bermeo* 4: 13-43.
- Embick, David. 2000. "Features, syntax, and categories in the Latin perfect." *Linguistic Inquiry* 31: 185-230.
- Embick, David and Rolf Noyer. 2001. "Movement operations after syntax." *Linguistic Inquiry*. 32-4. 555-595.
- Embick, David, and Rolf Noyer. 2007. "Distributed Morphology and the syntax-morphology interface." In *The Oxford handbook of linguistic interfaces*, Gillian Ramchand and Charles Reiss (eds.), 289-324. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Embick, David, and Alec Marantz. 2008. "Architecture and blocking." *Linguistic Inquiry* 39: 1-53.
- Emonds, Joseph E. 1999. "How clitics license null phrases." In *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), 291-367. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Epelde, Irantzu. 2003. Larresoroko Euskara. Doctoral dissertation, UPV-EHU.
- Etxabe, Karmele and Larraitz Garmendia. 2003. *Zaldibiako euskara: Bertako bizimodua, ohiturak, eta pasadizoak*. Zaldibia: Zaldibiako Udala.
- Etxebarria, Juan Manuel. 1988. *Zeberio haraneko euskararen azterketa etno-linguistikoa*. Bilbo: Deustuko Unibertsitatea.
- Etxepare, Ricardo. 2003a. "Urruneko komunztadura eta menpeko infinitiboak euskaraz." *Lapurdum* 8: 167-206.
- Etxepare, Ricardo. 2003b. "Valency and argument structure in the Basque verb." In *A grammar of Basque*, Jon Ortiz de Urbina and José Ignacio Hualde (eds.), 363-384. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Etxepare, Ricardo. 2006. "Number long distance agreement in (substandard) Basque." In *ASJU Supplements* 40: 303-350.

- Etxepare, Ricardo. 2012. Agreement configurations: Lessons from distance. Habilitation thesis, IKER, CNRS.
- Etxepare, Ricardo and Bernard Oyharçabal. 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.
- Etxepare, Ricardo, and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria. 2012. "Denominal necessity modals in Basque." In *Noun phrases and nominalization in Basque*, Urtzi Etxebarria, Ricardo Etxepare and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria (eds.), 282-330. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Felser, Claudia. 1999. *Verbal complement clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fernández, Beatriz. 2001. "Absolutibo komunztaduradun ergatiboak, absolutibo komunztaduradun datiboak: Ergatiboaren Lekualdatzetik Datiboaren Lekualdatzera." In *On Case and agreement*, Beatriz Fernández and Pablo Albizu (eds.), 147-165. Bilbo: EHUko Argitalpen Zerbitzua.
- Fernández, Beatriz. 2011. "Goi- eta behe-datiboak eta datibokomunztaduraren murriztapena." In *ASJU Supplement* 69: 37-64.
- Fernandez, Beatriz, and Pablo Albizu. 2006. "Agreement doubling in Basque dialects." Slides from Workshop on Syntactic Doubling, March 2006, Amsterdam.
- Fernández, Beatriz, Jon Ortiz de Urbina, and Josu Landa. 2009. "Datibo komunztaduraren gakoez." In *ASJU Supplements* 43: 352-380.
- Fernández, Beatriz, and Jon Ortiz de Urbina. 2010. *Datiboa hiztegian*. Bilbao: UPV/EHU.
- Fodor, Janet Dean, and Atsu Inoue. 1994. The diagnosis and cure of garden paths. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 23: 407-434.
- Franco, Jon. 1993. *On object agreement in Spanish*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California at Los Angeles.
- Gallego, Anjel. 2010. *Phase theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gaminde, Iñaki, Asier Romero, and Hiart Legarra. 2012. *Gramatika eta hizkuntz bariazioa Bermeon*. Bermeo: Bermeoko Udala eta Campos Hegaluzea.
- Gaminde, Iñaki. 1992. *Foruko euskararen morfosintaxiaz*. Forua: Foruko Udala.
- Green, Georgia. 1971. "Unspeakable sentences: Book 2". *Linguistic Inquiry* 2: 601-2.
- Haas, Josef. 1909. *Neufranzösische Syntax*. Halle an der Saale.
- Hamann, Cornelia. 2011. "Binding and coreference: Views from child language." In *Handbook of generative approaches to language acquisition*, Jill de Villiers and Tom Roeper (eds.), 247-290. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Harley, Heidi, and Rolf Noyer. 1999. "Distributed Morphology." *Glott International* 4.4: 3-9.

- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. "Explaining the ditransitive Person Case Constraint: A usage-based approach." *Constructions* 2. <http://www.constructions-online.de/articles/35>.
- Heap, David. 2008. "Morphosyntactic theory needs Iberian linguistic geography (and vice versa)." *Dialectologia* 1: 45-64.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1991. "Pragmatic disguise in pronominal-affix paradigms." In *Paradigms: The economy of inflection*, Frans Plank (ed.), 75-89. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1998. "Pragmatic skewing in 1↔2 pronominal combinations in Native American languages." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 64: 83-104.
- Heim, Irene. 1998. "Anaphora and semantic interpretation: A reinterpretation of Reinhart's approach." *MITWPL* 25: 205-246.
- Heim, Irene. 2008. "Forks in the road to Rule I." *NELS* 38: 339-358.
- Heger, M. Klaus. 1966. "La conjugaison objective en français et en espagnol." *Persée* 1: 19-38.
- Hualde, José Ignacio. 2002. "On the loss of ergative displacement in Basque and the role of analogy in the development of morphological paradigms." In *The linguist's linguist: A Collection of papers in honour of Alexis Manaster Ramer*, Fabrice Cavoto (ed.), 219-230. München: Lincom Europa.
- Hualde, José Ignacio. 2003. "Finite forms." In *A grammar of Basque*, Jon Ortiz de Urbina and José Ignacio Hualde (eds.), 205-245. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hualde, Jose Ignacio, Gorka Elordieta and Arantzazu Elordieta. 1994. *The Basque dialect of Lequeitio*. Bilbao: UPV-EHU.
- Hudson, Richard. 2000. "I amn't." *Language* 76: 297-323.
- Ibarra, Orreaga. 1995. *Ultzamako hizkera. Inguruko euskalkiekiko harremanak*. Iruñea: Nafarroako Gobernua.
- Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard. 2002. "Pronouns and their antecedents." In *Derivation and explanation in the Minimalist Program*, Samuel David Epstein and T. Daniel Seely (eds.), 133-166. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lafitte, Pierre. 1979 [1995]. *Grammaire Basque (Navarro-Labourdin littéraire)*. Donostia: Elkar.
- Laka, Itziar. 1993a. "The structure of inflection." In *Generative studies in Basque linguistics*, José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 21-70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Laka, Itziar. 1993b. Unergatives that assign ergative, unaccusatives that assign accusative. *MITWPL* 18: 149-172.
- Laka, Itziar. 2000. "The tabling Case: Burzio's Generalisation and its image in the mirror." In *Arguments and Case*, Eric Reuland (ed.), 103-129. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Laka, Enara, Leire Olondo, and Iñaki Gaminde. 2012. "Bermeoko gazteen euskararen aditz morfologiaz." *Euskalingua* 13: 27-36.

- Lambrecht, Knud. 1981. *Topic, antitopic, and verb agreement in non-standard French*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Larrañaga, Jone. 1998. *Antzuolako hizkera*. Antzuola: Antzuolako Udala.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1981. "On two recent treatments of disjoint reference." *Journal of Linguistic Research* 1: 48–58.
- McCawley, James D. 1998. *The syntactic phenomena of English*. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago University Press.
- Mendikoetxea, Amaya. 1999. "Construcciones con *se*: medias, pasivas e impersonales." In *Gramática de la lengua española*, vol. 2, Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte (eds.), 1631-1722. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Mendikoetxea, Amaya. 2008. "Clitic impersonal constructions in Romance." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 106: 290-336.
- Miller, Philip H., and Ivan A. Sag. 1997. "French clitic movement without clitics or movement." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15: 573-639.
- Morgan, Jerry L. 1972. "Verb agreement as a rule of English." *CLS* 8: 278-86.
- Morin, Yves-Charles. 1978. "Interprétation des pronoms et des réfléchis en français." In *Cahier de linguistique* 8: 337-76.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2011. "Marked targets versus marked triggers and impoverishment of the dual." *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 413-444.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2012. "Haplological dissimilation at distinct stages of exponence." In *The morphology and phonology of exponence*, Jochen Trommer (ed.), 84-116. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Newman, Paul. 2000. *The Hausa language*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- N'Diaye, Genevieve. 1970. *Structure du dialecte basque de Maya*. Mouton: The Hague.
- Noyer, Rolf. 1992. Features, positions, and affixes in autonomous morphological structure. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Odria, Ane. in prep. *Differential object marking in Basque syntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, UPV-EHU.
- Ormazabal, Javier, and Juan Romero. 2013. "Object clitics, agreement and dialectal variation." *Probus* 25: 301-344.
- Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 1989. *Parameters in the grammar of Basque*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 2003a. "Causatives." In *A grammar of Basque*, Jon Ortiz de Urbina and José Ignacio Hualde (eds.), 592-607. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 2003b. "Impersonal clauses." In *A grammar of Basque*, Jon Ortiz de Urbina and José Ignacio Hualde (eds.), 572-591. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 2003c. "Periphrastic constructions." In *A grammar of Basque*, Jon Ortiz de Urbina and José Ignacio Hualde (eds.), 284-299. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 2006. "Old Basque (medio)passives." *ASJU* 40: 763-786.
- Oyharçabal, Beñat. 1993. "Verb agreement with non arguments: On allocutive agreement." In *Generative studies in Basque linguistics*, José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 89-114. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Oyharçabal, Beñat. 2003. "Lexical causatives and causative alternation in Basque." In *ASJU Supplement* 46: 223-253.
- Oyharçabal, Beñat. 2005. "Tokiz kanpoko numero komuntadura." *Iker* 17: 395-408.
- Oyharçabal, Beñat, and Ricardo Etxepare. 2012. "The absence of Person-Case Constraints in early Lapurdian." In *Second Conference of the Luis Michelena Chair*, Joseba Lakarra, Joaquín Gorrochategui and Blanca Urgell (eds.), 149-170. Vitoria-Gasteiz: UPV-EHU.
- Perlmutter, David. 1971. *Deep and surface constraints in syntax*. New York: Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Postal, Paul M. 1983. "On characterizing French grammatical structure." *Linguistic Analysis* 11: 361-417.
- Postal, Paul M. 1984. "French indirect object cliticisation and SSC/BT." *Linguistic Analysis* 14: 111-172.
- Postal, Paul M. 1990. "French indirect object demotion." In *Studies in Relational Grammar 3*, Paul M. Postal and Brian D. Joseph (eds.), 104-200. University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Preminger, Omer. 2009. "Breaking agreements." *Linguistic Inquiry* 40: 619-666.
- Preminger, Omer. 2012. "The absence of an implicit object from unergatives: New and old evidence from Basque." *Lingua* 122: 278-288.
- Pullum, Geoffrey. 2013. "The central question in comparative syntactic metatheory." *Mind and Language* 28: 492-521.
- Pullum, Geoffrey, and Arnold Zwicky. 1999. "Gerund participles and head-complement inflection conditions." In *The clause in English*, Peter Collins and David Lee (eds.), 251-272. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rebuschi, George. 1983. *Structure de l'énoncé en basque*. Paris: SELAF.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 2006. *Interface strategies*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya, and Eric Reuland. 1993. "Reflexivity." *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 657-720.
- Rezac, Milan. 2003. "The fine structure of cyclic Agree." *Syntax* 6: 156-182.
- Rezac, Milan. 2006. "Agreement displacement in Basque." Ms., University of the Basque Country. On-line: [www.iker.cnrs.fr/rezac-milan.html](http://www.iker.cnrs.fr/rezac-milan.html).
- Rezac, Milan. 2008a. "Phi-Agree and theta-related Case." In *Phi theory: Phi-features across interfaces and modules*, Daniel Harbour, David Adger, and Susana Béjar (eds.), 83-129. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rezac, Milan. 2008b. "The syntax of eccentric agreement: The Person Case Constraint and Absolute Displacement in Basque." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 61-106.

- Rezac, Milan. 2009. "On the unifiability of repairs of the Person Case Constraint: French, Basque, Georgian, and Chinook." In *ASJU Supplements* 43: 769-790.
- Rezac, Milan. 2010a. "Ineffability through modularity: Gaps in French clitic clusters." In *Defective paradigms: Missing forms and what they tell us*, Matthew Baerman, Greville G. Corbett, and Dunstan Brown (eds.), 151-180. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rezac, Milan. 2010b. "Review of *Agreement restrictions*." *Language* 86: 348-353.
- Rezac, Milan. 2010c. "Phi-Agree vs. movement: Evidence from floating quantifiers." *Linguistic Inquiry* 41: 496-508.
- Rezac, Milan. 2011. *Phi-features and the modular architecture of language*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rezac, Milan. 2013. "Person restrictions in Basque intransitives." *Lapurdum* 13: 305-322.
- Rezac, Milan, and Beatriz Fernández. 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.
- Rezac, Milan, and Mélanie Jouitteau. 2015. "The ways of referential deficiency: French impersonal *on* and its kin." Ms., CNRS.
- Rezac, Milan, Pablo Albizu, and Ricardo Etxepare. 2014. "The structural ergative of Basque and the theory of Case." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32: 1273-1330.
- Rhodes, Richard. 1993. "Syntax vs. morphology: A chicken and egg problem." *BLS* 19: 139-147.
- Richards, Norvin. 2010. *Uttering trees*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rijk, Rudolf P. G. de. 2008. *Standard Basque*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rivas, Albert Mario. 1977. A theory of clitics. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Roelofsen, Floris. 2008. Anaphora resolved. Doctoral dissertation, ILLC.
- Rollo, William. 1925. *The Basque dialect of Marquina*. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris.
- Rooryck, Johan. 2006. "Binding into pronouns." *Lingua* 116: 1561-1579.
- Ross, John Robert. 1972. "Doubl-ing." *Linguistic Inquiry* 3: 61-86.
- Rotaetxe, Karnele. 1978. *Estudio estructural del euskera de Ondarroa*. Durango: Leopoldo Zugaza.
- Safir, Ken. 2004. *The syntax of anaphora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Safir, Ken. 2013. "Syntax, binding, and patterns of anaphora." In *The Cambridge handbook of generative syntax*, Marcel den Dikken (ed.), 515-576. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2005. "Nonredundancy: Towards a semantic reinterpretation of the Binding Theory." *Natural Language Semantics* 13: 1-92.

- 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.
- Sobin, Nicholas. 1997. Agreement, default rules, and grammatical viruses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2: 318-343.
- Stump, Gregory. 2001. *Inflectional morphology: A theory of paradigm structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suñer, Margarita. 1988. "The role of agreement in clitic-doubled constructions." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 391-434.
- Tranel, Bernard. 1981. *Concreteness in generative phonology: Evidence from French*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Trask, Robert L. 1981. "Basque verbal morphology." *Iker* 1: 285-304.
- Yang, Charles, Kyle Gorman, Jennifer Preys, and Margaret Browczyk. 2012. "Productivity and paradigmatic gaps." Handout from NELS 43, CUNY, October 19-21, 2012. On-line: <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~ycharles>.
- Yrizar, Pedro de. 1981. *Contribución a la dialectología de la lengua vasca*. Donostia: Gipuzkoako Kutxa.
- Yrizar, Pedro de. 1991. *Morfología del verbo auxiliar gipuzcoano*, vol. 2. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia.
- Yrizar, Pedro de. 1992a. *Morfología del verbo auxiliar vizcaino*, vol. 1. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia.
- Yrizar, Pedro de. 1992b. *Morfología del verbo auxiliar alto navarro septentrional*. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia.
- Zribi-Hertz, Anne. 1982. "La construction *se-moyen* du français et son statut dans le triangle : moyen-passif-réfléchi." *Linguisticae Investigationes* 6: 345-401.
- Zribi-Hertz, Anne. 2008. "Le médiopassif à SN préverbal en français : pour une approche multifactorielle." *Congrès mondial de linguistique française 2008*: 2645-62.
- Zuazo, Koldo. 1998. "Nafarroako euskal hizkerak." In *Nafarroako hizkerak*, Iñaki Camino (ed.), 1-22. Bilbo: UEU.