

Part I: (Structural) ergative in Basque

Milan Rezac, *Laboratoire de Linguistique de Nantes*
milan_rezac@yahoo.ca

1 Roadmap

- ◆ Domain: ergative-accusative alignment of case or agreement in Basque
 - ergative alignment: always < theta-related Case on external argument?
 - if not, does structural ERG depend on Case competitor, locus, etc.?
 - → what kind of structural Case theory needed?
 - in syntax or morphology?
- ◆ Part A (first half): Ergativity in Basque
- ◆ Some theories of the ergative and dependent Case:
 - inherent - non-inherent; competitor - locus dependent
- ◆ Basque ERG, DAT, ABS in this light:
 - theta-relatedness, split ergativity, argument addition/reduction
 - **raising to ERG and ERG expletives**
- ◆ Part B (second half): The scope of dependent Case
 - ergative on unacc. S in a person restriction context
 - accusative parallels
 - dependent Case as last resort generally
 - syntactic effects of case / agreement?
- ◆ Abbreviations:
- ◆ external argument **EA**, object **O**, intransitive subject **S**, indirect object **IO**
- ◆ **AGR domain** - domain of ERG/ABS/NOM/ACC case and agreement

2 Ergativity

- ◆ **Structural Case (agreement)**: identity depends on functional structure, not thematic relationship to the assignee.

- (1) a. Ég tel vera villu í þessu handriti
I believe to.be error.ACC in this manuscript
I believe there to be an error in this manuscript.
- b. Það er talin vera villa í þessu handriti
there is believed to.be error.NOM in this manuscript
There is believed to be an error in this manuscript. (Icel, Jonas 1996: 74-5)

- ◆ **Inherent (theta-related) case:** established at base-generation and fixed independently of relationship to functional architecture.

- (2) a. Við töldum Ólafi hafa leiðst
 we believed Olaf.DAT to.have bored
 We believed Olaf to have been bored.
- b. Ólafi var talið hafa leiðst
 Olaf.DAT was believed to.have bored
 Olaf was believed to have been bored. (Icel, Sigurðsson 2002: 699)

- ◆ **Potentially distinct: markedness.**

- KP shells vs. bare DPs, contentful vs. empty K...
- Bittner & Hale (1996), Bayer et al. (2001)

- ◆ **Marked class:**

- More robust morphological marking.
- More opacity to binding, control, subextraction, extraction, ...
- More opacity to agreement or dedicated agreement types...

- (3) inherent > DAT > ERG > ACC > NOM, ABS
 (scale by opacity, tentative)
 thematic K^o: *inherent* > bound K^o: *struct. obliq., ERG, ACC* > no K^o: *NOM, ABS*
 (scale of Bittner & Hale 1996)

- ◆ **Ergative as inherent**

- Mahajan (1989, 1990, 1993), Oyharçabal (1992), Nash (1995), Woolford (1997, 2003), Legate (2007), Massam (2005), Anand & Nevins (2005), ...
- Mechanism: Assigned upon base-generation / selection in Spec-*v*.
- Theta-related (\approx *give to DP*, *rely on DP*):
 - **not available to raisees, (pure) expletives**
 - independent of ABS, of argument introduction / reduction
 - unless *v*: select EA \leftrightarrow assign Case (Chomsky 1995: 315-6)
 - independent of functional architecture
 - (Dependent secondarily: subject licensing...)
 - Exception: selection: T_{past} selects *v*_{ERG}, T_{present} selects plain *v*...
 - \approx *v*-assigned inherent Case under gover. by T (Mahajan 1989).
- Co-occurrence: multiple ERG not in principle blocked.

- cf. single vs. multiple applicative option (Baker 1988).
 - \approx multiple (agreeing) datives: Choctaw, Abaza...
- ◆ **Ergative as structural, dependent solely on a (Case/ ϕ) locus (T_{ERG})**
 - (Ortiz de Urbina (1989), Fernández & Albizu (2006)).
 - Loci: $V_{\text{ABS}} \leftrightarrow O$, $T_{\text{ABS}} \leftrightarrow S$, $T_{\text{ERG}} \leftrightarrow EA$
 - Selection: T_{ERG} restricted to EA by selecting v_{trans} .
 - (& those intrans. Vs with ERG S)
 - \rightarrow ERG \approx NOM for EA, ABS \approx NOM for S, ABS \approx ACC for O.
- ◆ **Virtues** of inherent / selection-based accounts: introduce no mechanisms not already needed.
 - In particular, ERG-NOM \approx DAT-NOM (Woolford 1997, Legate 2007)
- ◆ **Rest:** ERG (& ACC) = **marked structural Case dependent on a Case Competitor:** ABS (& NOM).
- ◆ Problem: No uniform c-command relationship in dependency:
 - ◆ ERG > ABS, **but** NOM > ACC
- (4) Path-dependence: Dependencies on syntactic dependencies must lie on the path of the licensing dependency
- Ex: parasitic gaps (Kayne 1983); dative clitics (Anagnostopoulou 2003)
 - Ex: ERG dep. on T-ABS checking as non-final Case in multiple Case checking \rightarrow ACC not dep. (Bobaljik & Branigan 2005)
- \rightarrow If ERG parasitic on ABS checking, ACC not on NOM; vice versa.
- (5) a. $\boxed{H_{\text{ABS}} \dots \underline{\text{ERG}} \dots \text{ABS}}$ b. $\boxed{H_{\text{NOM}} \dots \text{NOM}}$... ACC
- ◆ How does a dependent Case refer to a competitor?
 - directly: outside syntax: free to refer to another DP anywhere (in same AGR domain)
 - directly: Case-binding (Bittner & Hale 1996): rich syntactic tools
 - indirectly: convergence: assignment without competitor crashes (Laka 2000)
- ◆ **Dependent Case via a morphological algorithm** (Marantz 1991)

- Disjunctive hierarchy of case realization from more to less specific: inherent > dependent > default Case.
- (6) Dependent Case: assigned by V+I to a position governed by V+I when a distinct position governed by V+I is
- a. not "marked" (not part of a chain governed by a lexical case determiner)
 - b. distinct from the chain being assigned dependent case.

Dependent case assigned up to subject: ergative.

Dependent case assigned down to object: accusative. (Marantz 1991)

- Note the reference to a phrase-structural locus as well as competitor: subject ERG vs. object ACC with respect to something (INFL, *v*)
- ◆ **Dependent Case via direct sensitivity to Competitor, + locus** (Bittner & Hale 1996)

- Inherent Case: KP: K filled at base-generation by selection.
 - Unmarked structural Case: K-less nominals (DP, NP) gov. by (K or) C.
 - Marked structural Case: KPs with empty K that is Case-bound by
 - **I/D → K=ERG**
 - V/P with an adjoined D → K=ACC.
- (7) a. C (ABS) I [ERG [(ABS)V]] b. C (NOM) I [(NOM) [ACC V+D]]
- No necessary configurational relationship of the competitor to the locus - dependent Case path → permits uniting ERG & ACC.
 - (powerful mechanism)
- (8) a. Case-binding: Let α be a head which delimits a small clause, and let β be an argument. Then α *Case-binds* β , and β 's head, iff
- (i) α locally c-commands β ;
 - (ii) α governs a Case-competitor for β .
- b. Case competitor: γ is a *Case-competitor for* an argument β , if γ is a K-less nominal which is in a chain with a co-argument, or a pseudo co-argument, of β .
(Bittner & Hale 1996)

- ◆ **Dep. Case: indirect sensitivity to Competitor (convergence) + locus**
- (Laka 2000)
 - Loci: T ↔ ERG, NOM, Asp ↔ ACC, ABS
 - Two types of features:
 - active features need to be checked (always strong)
 - non-active features may but need not be checked (strong, weak)

- Oblig. Case Param. (OCP): ACCity ↔ T active; ERGity ↔ Asp active
- Mechanism of dependence of ERG/ACC on ABS/NOM:
 - one DP in need of Case → checked by (OCP) active locus
 - other DPs in need of Case → checked by other locus
 - → non-active locus checking fails to converge unless act. locus checks

- (9)
- | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------------|--|--|------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| a. | T _{ERG} | <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td>v_{ABS}</td></tr></table> | v _{ABS} | S _{ABS} | √ | |
| v _{ABS} | | | | | | |
| b. | T _{ERG} | <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td>v_{ABS}</td></tr></table> | v _{ABS} | S _{ERG} | *(active feature unchecked) | |
| v _{ABS} | | | | | | |
| c. | T _{ERG} | E _{AERG} | <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td>v_{ABS}</td></tr></table> | v _{ABS} | S _{ABS} | √ |
| v _{ABS} | | | | | | |

◆ Status of ABS (structural, default)

- Unique:
 - Low (v) ≈ ACC (Bobaljik 1993, Laka 1993b, 2000)
 - High (C) ≈ NOM: Bittner & Hale (1996)
- Split: T ≈ NOM for S, v ≈ ACC for O (Oyharçabal 1992, Fernández & Albizu 2006, Legate 2007)

◆ In deciding status of ERG:

- **On non-thematic elements: raisees & expletives?** (yes: not inherent)
- Changes with functional architectures (yes: perhaps not inherent)
- Depends on a Competitor (yes: dependent Case account)
- Uniqueness (not forced by inherent account)

◆ Note: case via theta-selection → c/s-selection restrictions, fixed at base-gen

◆ Interpretive restrictions NOT necessarily → theta-selection...

◆ I.e., can being "high" in the clause alone impose restrictions?

- Poss-ing vs. Acc-ing: √raising (including with reconstruction & to experiencers -- genuine raising), ?ref expl, ??idiom chunks, ??pure expl
- Engl GEN prefers animates (Abney) -- in DPs, where raising much worse
- relevance to ERG: ERG ≈ GEN parallelisms (e.g. Johns 1992)

- (11)
- But [a proposition's seeming to a person to be true] is something better than that.
(Conee, Comments in Bill Lycan's..., *Philosophical Studies* 103:1 55-9)
 - reference to [a child's being likely to injure some other person] as a ground for ...
(G-search < Int J Law Policy Family 2005 19: 395-420)
 - I am happy about [it(?'s) being likely that John will finish soon]. (Abney 1987: 208)
 - I was surprised at [it(??'s) seeming that John might not win]. (Abney 1987: 208)
 - I am surprised at [there(*'s) still being books left].
 - I was irked at [advantage(??'s) being taken of John's situation]. (Abney 1987: 208)
 - Serene made reference ... to [the cat's being out of the bag] (G-search)

3 Basque ergative

3.1 General properties

◆ **Case-marking and agreement alignment:**

- ERG: EA, some S; only highest argument of single AGR domain
- ABS: O, some S; never EA (except. impers.)
- DAT: applied objects of transitives and intransitives; c-selected
- One basic argument of V must be ERG, ABS, or (with raising *seem*) CP/small clause
- Single AGR domain: unique ERG; unique agreeing ABS, DAT
 - Exception: ABS person, number < different ABS each in clitic climb.
 - Agreeing + non-agreeing ABS in detrans., DAT more generally.

◆ Available arrays of agreeing cases:

- (12) a. ERG-ABS nik zu ikusi zaitut
 I.ERG you.ABS seen AUX.2rA.1sE
 I saw you.
- b. ERG-DAT-ABS nik zuri haiek eman dizkizut
 I.ERG you.DAT them.ABS given AUX.3pA.2rD.1sE
 I gave you apples.
- c. ERG-DAT nik zuri deitu dizut
 I.ERG you.DAT called AUX.2rD.1sE
 I called you.
- d. ERG iraun / jokatu dut
 last played AUX.1sE
 I lasted / I played (cards).
- e. ABS hurbildu / borrokatu naiz
 approached fought AUX.1sA
 I approached / fought.
- f. DAT-ABS niri haiek gustatu/ hurbildu zaizkit
 ABS-DAT me.DAT they.ABS liked / approached AUX.3pA.1sD
 I liked them / They approached me.
- g. Ø / impersonal halakoetan ihadorkitzen / joaten da
 such.ones.in withstanding going AUX.(3sA)
 In such cases, one withstands / leaves.

(Oyharçabal 1992: 326)

- (13) ABS_{person}-ABS_{number} [etsaiari harmak hartzera] nindoazkon

enemy.DAT arms.ABS to.taking went.1sA.3pA.3sD

I was going to take the arms to/from the enemy.

(Lafitte 1979)

◆ Some excluded patterns:

- Anomalous unaccusatives: no S

(14) a. *Pað logaði á kertinu*
there flamed.3s on a candle "A candle flamed" (Icel, Sigurðsson 1989)

b. *Neartaigh ar a ghlór*
strengthened.3s on his voice "His voice strengthened" (Ir, McCloskey 1996).

c. *Il me la faut*
it needs me.DAT her.ACC "I need them" (French)

- Reflects parametrization of default option for the obligatory probe (Rezac 2004: 333-344)?
- "Quirky" arrays: ABS-ABS, etc.: cf. Choctaw or Icelanic.

(15) Table: Choctaw, Icelandic case-agr frames (Davies 1986, Andrews 2001)

(Bold: not in Basque, with NOM taken \approx ERG for EA, \approx ABS for S)

Case-agr frame	Choctaw	Icelandic
NOM	<i>bali:li</i> 'run'	<i>renna</i> 'run'
ACC	<i>laksha</i> 'sweat'	<i>raka</i> 'reach'
DAT	<i>palammi</i> 'suffer'	<i>hvolva</i> 'capsize'
NOM-ACC	<i>bashli</i> 'cut'	<i>lesa</i> 'read'
NOM-DAT	<i>paya</i> 'call'	<i>hjálpa</i> 'help'
NOM-DAT-ACC		<i>segja</i> 'say'
NOM-ACC-DAT	<i>a:</i> 'give'	<i>leyna</i> 'conceal'
NOM-DAT-DAT	√ with possessor ascension &c.	<i>lofa</i> 'promise'
DAT-NOM	<i>ihaksi</i> 'forget' (& DAT-ACC)	<i>líka</i> 'like'
DAT-ACC	<i>ihaksi</i> 'forget' (& DAT-NOM)	(% \approx DAT-NOM = Faer.)
ACC-NOM		<i>sækja</i> 'seek'
ACC-DAT	<i>noksho:pa</i> 'fear' (& NOM-DAT)	
ACC-ACC	<i>yimmi</i> 'believe' (& NOM-ACC)	<i>vanta</i> 'lack'

- ABS/ACC-ABS/ACC (Choctaw, Lakhota, Mohawk: Baker 1996)
- \approx active (fluid-S) systems, found for both S and EA (Dixon 1994)

(16) a. Chi-banna-li-h
2ACC-want-1NOM-PRED
I want you.

b. Chi-sa-banna-h
2ACC-1ACC-want-PRED
I want you. (Davies 1986: 65)

- multiple ABS/ACC &c. easily treated if inherent Case
- Universal *ERG-ERG
- *ERG ERG fits unique probe of structural Case

◆ **Finiteness:** ERG, DAT, ABS marking alike in finite \approx agreeing and non-finite \approx non-agreeing clauses.

◆ ERG EA, ABS S licensing = specified subject licensing vs. OC PRO

- Correlates with DP-hood / Case-bearing of the infinitive itself
 - Ortiz de Urbina (1989), Artiagoitia (1995), San Martin (2001).
- specified subject licensing \rightarrow Split ABS: ABS O -- ABS S / ERG EA.
- Contrast Legate (2007): EA ERG, ABS S but not ABS O \rightarrow non-finite DAT \rightarrow ABS S and O are not same ABS.

(17) gaizki iruditzen zait [zuk ni harakinari saltzea].
 wrong seeming AUX.1sD you.ERG me.ABS butcher.DAT selling.the.ABS
 Your selling me to the butcher seems wrong to me (Laka 1993a:27)

◆ **Agreement:** (more detail: beginning of handout 2)

- ergative alignment
- ERG, DAT, ABS controllers are determinable by inspection of agreement
- including 3sE vs. 3sA/default controller (important later)
- not easy to read off surface exponence, due to displacements &c.
- AUX glosses:
 - 3sE (3rd singular ergative) &c.; sometimes 3sA/default, in brackets.

◆ **Accusative syntax.**

- (Ortiz de Urbina 1989, Oyharçabal 1992, 1999)
- Obligatory control PRO can only be EA, S.
- Reflexive and reciprocal binding. EA.ERG > (IO.DAT >) O.ABS
- WCO: EA.ERG > O.ABS
- O, not S, EA: genitive or bare ("incorporated") in nominalizations.
- (Causativization, partitive EA vs. O, S, as in French &c.)

(18) Nik_i ez dakit [nor/*nork PRO_{i,*j} ikusi] [obligatory control]
 I.ERG not know.1sE who.ABS/*ERG see
 I do not know who to see / *I do not know who should see me.
 (constructed: Ortiz de Urbina 1989: ch. 1, Oyharçabal 1992: 317f., Artiagoitia 2003)

(19) [(Zuk) handik ur isurtzea]-k harritu ninduen ["incorporation"]
 (you.ERG) there.from water.ABS running-ERG surprised AUX.1sA.3sE [NB: both good with *ura* 'water.the.ABS']
 [For you to run water from there] surprised me.
 *[For water to run from there] surprised me. (Oyharçabal 1992: 317)

◆ Conclusions:

- EA always c-commands O
 - true at base-generation, not changed after
- EA, S grouped by subjecthood (OC PRO)
 - e.g. by EPP movement (Bobaljik 1993)
- → Phrase-structural EA-O asymmetries unrelated to case.

◆ No ergativity-based \bar{A} -extraction asymmetries

- (Artiagoitia 2003, De Rijk 1998)
- EA/S.ERG, S/O.ABS (>) IO.DAT of psych-Vs > DAT > rest.
- Rest \approx subcategoriz., morph. complexity of case marking, case matching.

3.2 Ergative, absolutive, and dative across theta-roles and competitors

◆ Canonical mapping:

- ERG \leftrightarrow transitive subject EA, unergative subject S
- ABS \leftrightarrow transitive object O, unaccusative subject S
- DAT \leftrightarrow applied object IO

◆ No obvious interpretive restrictions associated with the cases themselves...

- E.g. animacy, possessor, agentivity...

- (21) a. Hurrek bakarrik diraute.
 children.ERG alone continue.3pE
The children-ERG are still alone. (Zabala 2003)
- b. [Hurrek euskal liburu asko irakurtzeak] euskarari
 children.ERG Basque book lot.ABS reading.the.ERG Basque.DAT
 onura dakarkio
 benefit bring.3sD
[Children's reading a lot of Basque books]-ERG brings benefit to the Basque
 language. (Artiagoitia 2003)
- c. [Hurrek liburuak irakurtzeari] aberasgarria deritzot.
 children.ERG books.ABS reading.the.DAT enriching consider.3sD.1sE
 I consider [children's reading books]-DAT. (Artiagoitia 2003)

- Idioms with ERG, ABS, DAT idiom chunk
- As for any other selected position....

- (22) a. Deabruiek naramatela!
 devils.ERG carry.1sA.3pE.that
 Let the devil take me, que me lleven los diablos! (*Intza proiektua*)

- b. adarra jo 'play horn.ABS + X.DAT = pull X's leg'
 c. deabruak hartu 'devils.ERG take X.ABS = X becomes angry' jotzeko

◆ **Does ERG depend on a Case Competitor = ABS?**

◆ **Basque is split intransitive.**

◆ Subjects of intransitives generally (Dixon 1994, Bittner & Hale 1996)

- Ergative alignment (Chukchi, Inuit): all S → ABS.
- Split alignment: S according to semantic criteria
 - split-S: unergative S = ERG / unaccusative S = ABS distinction
 - fluid-S: based on agentivity &c.: higher = ERG, lower = ABS

◆ Basque-type split-S (typical treatments):

- (23) a. Unaccusatives with ABS S: *itzuli* 'return', *hil* 'die', *gorritu* 'redden', *harritu* 'be surprised', *agertu* 'appear', *gertatu* 'happen', *hasi* 'begin', *ezkondu* 'get married', ...
- b. Unergatives with ERG S: *jokatu* 'play', *funtzionatu* 'function', *distiratu* 'sparkle' and other Vs of sense stimulus emission, *jazarri* 'attack' (+ DAT), *erauntsi* 'attack' (+ DAT), *ihardoki* 'withstand' (+ DAT), ...

◆ Approaches

- Inherent ERG: ERG S ↔ S in Spec- v_{agent}
 - No necessary relationship to ABS/O.
- Dependent ERG:
 - (Laka 1993b, 2000, Bittner & Hale 1996)
 - Basque: ERG S ↔ null competitor in syntax, e.g. cognate object
 - Inuit type: competitor removed (incorporated) lexically → no ERG S

◆ Null competitor analysis of unergatives confirmed by *N + egin* locutions?

◆ Transparent unergatives: productive *N egin* 'do' + bare noun.

- (Ortiz de Urbina 1989, Uribe-Etxebarria 1989, Laka 1993b, Etxepare 2003):

- (24) Some *N egin* locutions: *negar* 'weeping', *negar egin* 'weep'; *dantza* 'dance', *dantza egin* 'dance'; *hitz* 'word', *hitz egin*, *hitzegin* 'speak'.

◆ How do these square with regular unergatives and with simple transitives?

- D°: independent O must normally bear the article *a*, but *N* here is bare.
- *N* cannot be taken up by a pronoun.
- *N* varies in intervening for focus-verb adjacency.

- Partitive: where O bears partitive, variable behavior for *N* in *N egin*.
- **Causative**: S of *N egin* → DAT; vs. S of unerg. → DAT % ABS.
- **Cognate object**: blocked for *N egin*, √ unergatives (from same base)

- (25) a. *dantza* 'dance' (N), *danzatu* may appear as 'dance a dance', *dantza egin* cannot.
 b. cf. *uko* 'renunciation, refusal', *ukatu* + ABS 'refuse, renounce', *uko egin* + DAT 'renounce'

- ◆ → If null competitor in unergatives, weaker than null competitor in *N egin*.
- ◆ i.e., more deficient, in ϕ -set for example
 - (Dechaine & Wiltschko 2001: DP- ϕ P-NP; Cardinalletti & Starke 1999)
- ◆ Does S split in Basque really correlate with unaccusativity \approx null competitor?

◆ Agentive verbs with ABS subject

- Many transparent transitives with object incorporated by derivation
- Includes really agentive Vs like *borrokatu* 'fight'.
- Esp. Oyharçabal 1992, 1999, Etxepare 2003

- (26) Table: agentive unergatives with absolutive subjects (from Oyharçabal 1999)

Nominal base	<i>N egin</i> 'do' S = ERG	Derived verb S = ABS
<i>hitz</i> 'word'	<i>hitz egin</i>	<i>hizkatu</i> 'speak'
<i>solas</i> 'discussion'	<i>solas egin</i>	<i>solastatu</i> 'converse'
<i>ele</i> 'expression'	<i>ele egin</i>	<i>elekatu</i> 'chat'
<i>borroka</i> 'fight'	<i>borroka egin</i>	<i>borrokatu</i> 'fight'
<i>gudu</i> 'combat'	<i>gudu egin</i>	<i>gudukatu</i> 'combat'
<i>gogoeta</i> 'thought'	<i>gogoeta egin</i>	<i>gogoetatu</i> 'think'
<i>zintz</i> 'snot'	<i>zintz egin</i>	<i>zintzatu</i> 'blow nose'
<i>jauzi</i> 'jump'	<i>jauzi egin</i>	<i>jauzi</i> 'jump'
<i>lo</i> 'sleep'	<i>lo egin</i>	<i>lotü</i> '(fall a)sleep' (souletin)
<i>irrist(ada)</i> 'slip'	<i>irrist egin</i>	<i>irristatu</i> 'slip'
<i>hega</i> 'wing, flight'	<i>hega egin</i>	<i>hegatu</i> 'fly'

- Some Vs vacillate ABS or ERG according to diachrony (ABS → ERG) or dialect.

- (27) Verbs varying in ABS/ERG coding of S: *afaldu* 'dine' and other Vs of meal-time, *behatu* 'observe', *dantzatu* 'dance', *ekin* 'start with', *igo* 'climb', *irten* 'go out', *jarraiki* 'follow' (+ DAT), *atxiki* 'hold, grab' (+ DAT), *jazarri* 'rebel', *kantatu* 'sing', *lagundu* 'help', ... (Oyharçabal 1992, 1999)

◆ Non-agentive verbs with ERG subject (Oyharçabal 1992, 1999)

- (28) a. Duration: e.g. *iraun* 'last' ('endure' and 'dinner lasted two hours'), *berandu* 'be late'

- b. Vs of weather or internal process: ex. *buhatu* 'blow', *iraki* 'boil, ferment'
- c. *seem* Vs: *irudi*, *eman* 'seem' (below)

- Some etymologically (only) transitives / causatives:

- (29)
- a. *iraun* 'last' < **i-ra-(e)gon* 'cause to remain'
 - b. *iraki* 'boil' < **i-ra-jaiki* 'cause to rise'
 - c. *iduri* / *irudi* 'seem': cf. *iduri izan* 'seem' < 'have image'

- Fossilization creates anomalous ergatives elsewhere
- Ex: handful of adjectives as predicates of stage-level predication formally ERG (beside regularly partitive, *goserik* &c.)

- *gose-ak* 'hungry' (*gose* 'hunger'), *beldurr-ak* 'afraid' (*beldur* 'fear'), *pozak* 'glad' (*poz* 'joy')

- (30)
- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| goseak/goserik | nago |
| hunger (hungry).ERG/PART | be.1sA |
| 'I am hungry' (Zabala 2003) | |

- Why? < *goseak hartuta* / *hilda nago* 'I am taken / killed by hunger'. (independently √)
- Cf. Georgian: NOM-ACC in present, ERG-NOM in past, but: *know* uses ERG-NOM in present < aorist (Hewitt 1995: 468-9, Thomas Weir, p.c.).

◆ **Approaches to non-agentive ERG, agentive ABS**

- ◆ **Selection:** ≈ idiomatic ergative & absolutive, not < v_{agentive} .
- ◆ Cf. inherent ACC subject (+ accusative object) with Icel *vantar* 'lack'

- (31)
- a. Dregina vantar mat.
the.boys.ACC lacks food.ACC (Andrews 1982: 462)
- [ACC kept under raising]
- b. Hana virðist vanta peninga.
her.ACC seems to.lack money.ACC (Andrews 1982: 464)

◆ cf. Baker (1996: 212-8) for Mohawk ABS-ABS (O/O-type agr):

- V may lexically associate a feature triggering ABS (O)-type agreement with a position in its theta-grid, incl. EA of (in)transitives.
- → lexicalized but structural O-type agreement & ACC of Icel. *vantar*
- else EA triggers ERG (A)-type agreement

◆ cf. Albizu & Fernández (2006: 89) for ERG S of non-agentive intrans.:

- T_{ERG} selects either transitive v_{trans} or a special V_{lex} to account
- V_{lex} includes *iraun* 'last', *iruditu* 'seem', etc.

- ◆ Suitable to common *borrokatu* type?
- ◆ Not suitable to raising to ergative *seem* type verbs (later...)
- ◆ Should allow ABS-ABS, ERG-ERG, etc. patterns.

- ◆ **Competitor** based approach:
 - *iraun* 'last', *irudi* 'seem': non-agentive, even raisee ERG S
 - posit invisible competitors... distinguished as necessary by content
 - Posit a D° competitor to get ABS, enabling ERG
 - If D° impoverished (no ϕ -features), might allow raising past it, cognate O licensing.
 - cf. incorporated D° in antipassives, Bittner & Hale (1996)

 - *borrokatu* 'fight': agentive ABS S
 - No nominal present in syntax as competitor, because...
 - ...it is a Caseless N° rather than a D°
 - ...it is incorporated in lexicon but not projected in syntax
 - \approx Laka (2000) for intransitives and antipassive in Inuit-type Ls
 - \rightarrow Inuit type non-split ergative pattern exists in Basque.

 - relies on same mechanisms as regular structural ERG, ABS, so correctly blocks ERG-ERG, ABS-ABS if these do.

- ◆ Artificial? Not to the extent these are relics of earlier general formations...

- ◆ **Analogues elsewhere: unaccusatives with accusative subjects:**
 - (Maling & Sigurjónsdóttir 2002, Lavine & Freidin 2002)

 - ACC + NOM expletive *pro* in SpecTP:
 - Ukrainian *no/to* construction, Icelandic new passive

 - ACC in Spec TP ?+ NOM expletive *pro*:
 - Ukrainian *no/to* construction, Russian accusative unaccusative
 - latter: ACC is structural (from case in numeral quantifiers)
 - correctly \rightarrow *ACC ACC, unlike in Icelandic

- (32) Milicierov_i ranilo puljami (prinadležaščimi drug drugu_i)
 militiamen.ACC wounded.3s with.bullets belonging to each other
 Militiamen were wounded by bullets belonging to each other. (Lavine&Freidin 2002)

- ◆ Note: Above for eastern dialects and standard Basque: western Basque far more active in alignment, ERG \leftrightarrow agent: S of *borrokatu* ERG (Aldai 2006).

- ◆ ***Excursus: agreeing dative:**

- Massam 2005, Niuean, ergative alignment:
 - applied IO added to an intransitive (i) gets ABS and (ii) shifts the subject to ERG only S is agent, keeping ABS otherwise

(37) a. Ne fakakofu aki e vaka e tau lauakau
 Pst canoe with AbsC canoe AbsC Pl leaves
 The canoe (ABS) is covered with leaves (ABS).

b. Ne tohitohi aki e/*a Sione e pene
 Pst write with ErgP/*AbsP Sione AbsC pen
 Sione (ERG/*ABS) wrote with a pen. (Massam 2005)

(38) "iff argument x is an agent and the sentence is transitive (contains at least one absolutive argument), then x will be ergative." (Massam 2005, ex. 5, my underlines)

- Basque reflexive detransitivization, below.

◆ Basque

- *ERG ERG in a single agreement domain.
- (√DAT DAT (with restrictions), but only one can be agreeing.)
- *ABS ABS mostly... with nuances to be discussed

3.3.1 *Detransitivization & ABS-ABS*

◆ *ABS ABS, mostly.

◆ Exceptions mostly separate AGR domains > unique agreeing ABS.

- (cf. Laka 2005, Arregi & Molina-Azaola 2003)

(40) Emakumea [ogiak jaten] ari da [not dira]
 the.woman.ABS breads.ABS eating.in PROG AUX.3sA AUX.3pA

◆ Real exception: (rare?), ill-understood clitic climbing: two agreeing ABS

- Lafitte 1979, Etxepare 2003, 2006
- Basque agreement: separate positions for ABS-type person, number
- Examples have unique person, unique number, one < each ABS.

(41) [etsaiari harmak hartzera] nindoazkon [contains 1 ABS.PL and 1 1.ABS]
 enemy.DAT arms.ABS to.taking went.1sA.3pA.3sD
 I was going to take the arms to/from the enemy. (Lafitte 1979: 255f./§531)

◆ Real exception: rare reflexive detransitivization (Albizu 2000).

◆ **Detransitivization**

- (esp. Albizu 2000; Ortiz de Urbina 1989, 2003, Artiagoitia 2003)

- BUT for some speakers, EA = IO, and ABS O is unaffected
- **In such cases, IO is ABS, not DAT.**
 - ≈ reflexivization in Mohawk, where IO behaves normally as the plain transitive O, i.e. primary rather than dative object (Baker 1996: 203)

- (45) a. %Aritz eta Mikel bizarra laga dira aurten.
 Aritz and Mikel.ABS beard.ABS leave AUX.3pA this.year
 Aritz and Mikel have kept their beard this year. (*se han dejado*) [EA = IO]
- b. %Etxe berria erosi naiz.
 house new.ABS bought AUX.1sA
 I bought myself a new house. (*me he comprado*) [EA = IO] (Albizu 2000)

◆ Result: EA/IO = agreeing ABS, O = non-agreeing ABS

◆ How, in terms of Case licensing?

- EA → PRO apparently leads to → IO loses its inherent DAT
- Why? Prerequisite to IO binding EA PRO from SpecTP.

(46) [IO_i T+PRO_i [_{VP} t_{PRO} [_{AppIP} t_{IO} Appl [_{VP} V O.ABS]]]] (using Albizu 2000)

- ?Parallels ERG losing inherent ERG if PRO/*pro*_{arb} ERG inherent above
- How?
- Selection: *v* selecting PRO EA selects Appl w/o DAT (English-type).
- Baroque, but seems a rare option in Basque.

◆ Double ABS: fits dependent Case?

◆ Marantz 1991 algorithm: depends on further conditions on ERG beside just competitor ("assigned to subjects").

◆ Laka 2000: no a-priori reason for single ABS...

◆ Note further a single agreeing ABS does.

◆ But the latter may be < morphological conditions on Basque V.

3.3.2 (*)*Passive and antipassive*

◆ Do not seem to exist in Basque

◆ Inuit (Bittner 1994, Bittner & Hale 1996):

- Plain transitive: A.ERG : O.ABS
- Passive: O.ABS A.oblique
- Antipassive: A.ABS O.oblique
- patterns obtain equally with "O" of ECM type constructions

- (47) a. Juuna-p miiqqa-t paar(i-v)-a-i [EA.ERG - O.ABS]
 J.-ERG child-PL look.after-IND-[+tr]-3SG.3PL
 Juuna is looking after the children. (Bittner & Hale 1996b, ex. 21b)
- b. miiqqa-t Juuna-mit paari-ni-qqar-p-u-t [passive: O.ABS - EA.oblq]
 child-PL J.-ABL look.after-GER-HAVE-IND-[-tr]-3PL
 The children are looked after by Juuna. (Bitter 1994: 21)
- c. Juuna miiqqa-nik paar-si-v-u-q [antipas: EA.ABS - O.oblq]
 J. child-PL.INS look.after-AP-IND-[-tr]-3SG
 Juuna is looking after the children. (Bittner 1994: 23)

◆ ERG depends on Case-competitor → doesn't look inherent.

- Bittner & Hale 1996, Laka 2000

◆ Apparent passive and antipassive in Basque:

- Plain ditransitive:

- (48) Nik zuri eskutitzak idatzi(ak) dizkizut.
 I.ERG you.DAT letters.ABS written(the.PL) AUX.3pA.2rD.1sA
 I wrote you letters. (Uribe-Etxebarria & Ortiz de Urbina 1991: 993)

- Antipassive-like progressive construction:

- (49) Ni zuri eskutitzak idazten ari natzaizu [progressive]
 I.ABS you.DAT letters.ABS writing PROG AUX.1sA.2rD
 I am writing you letters. (constructed)

- Passive-like resultative construction:

- (50) Eskutitzak nik zuri idatzi*(ak) dira [resultative]
 letters.ABS I.ERG you.DAT written.the.PL AUX/be.3pA
 This letter is written by me. (Uribe-Etxebarria & Ortiz de Urbina 1991: 994)

- Antipassive-like resultative construction:

- (51) Ni gutun asko idatzia naiz [resultative]
 I.ABS letter lot.ABS written be.1sA
 I have written a lot of letters. (Zabala 2003)

◆ Progressive

- Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina 1987, Ortiz de Urbina 2003, Laka 2005:

- Predication: SUBJ_i-ABS BE [_{INF} PRO_i^{EA/S} ...]
- not EA ABS: S ABS binding an EA gap
- *I am in/at writing the letters to you.*
- INF: opaque to ABS agr, AUX selection, focus-V adjacency &c.
- When INF becomes transparent (dial.), EA becomes ERG.

◆ Resultative (Uribe-Etxebarria & Ortiz de Urbina 1991 - O&U)

- Predication: SUBJ_i-ABS BE [_{DP/RC} OP_i D+AGR ... *e_i* ... participle]
- *The letters are the (ones) written to you by me.*
- Adjectival passive like stative reading.

(52) [letters.ABS_i [_{RC} OP_i me.ERG you.DAT *e_i* written-the.AGR_i] are]

- Uses an indep avail infinitival relative:

(53) Jonek biharko [paper hau_i [_{RC} (gurasoek) *e_i* sinatu-a_i] ekarriko du
 J.ERG tomorrow paper this parents.ERG signed-the] bring.FUT AUX.3sE
 Jon will bring tomorrow [this paper signed by his parents].

- ERG, DAT, ABS must remain in a cohesive group adjacent to partic.,
- unlike ERG, DAT, ABS in general (freely moveable)
- < ERG-DAT-ABS-partic. group is an extraction island and pied-piping.

(54) a. Gutun hau (nik) (zuri) idatzia da (*nik) (*zuri) [*pass-like*]
 letter this.ABS I.ERG you.DAT written is I.ERG you.DAT
 This letter has been written by you. (based on Zabala 2003)

- Agreeing ABS can be EA (antipass-like), O (pass-like), S gaps in RC.

b. Semea [Ameriketara joana] da. [gap = S of unacc.]
 son.ABS America.ALL gone is
 Their son is gone to America. (Ortiz de Urbina & Uribe-Etxebarria 1991:997)

- Matrix V is not AUX, but the homophonous BE, replaceable by any V compatible with predicative compl.: *egon* 'rest, be', *izan* 'have'.

c. Guk [herria [etsaiek inguratua]] dugu
 we.ERG town.ABS enemies.ERG surrounded have.1pE
 We have the town surrounded by enemies. (Ortiz de Urbina & Uribe-Etxebarria 1991: 1006)

◆ Structure of resultative:

- cf. to Bittner & Hale (1996) on antipassive in Inuit vs. Warlpiri: S ABS in Inuit < *vP* is opaque: antipass. D° on V not competitor for EA in SpecIP.
- but here the opaque domain is an RC = different AGR domain entirely.

◆ No passive or antipassive in Basque.

◆ No evidence from them about removing ABS/ERG bearer.

3.4 Raising, copy-raising, cross-clausal agreement, and expletives

◆ Against inherent ergative in Basque:

- raising from small clauses: to ABS, ERG
 - ERG (and ABS) expletive
 - raising from finite clauses: to ABS, ERG
 - ∅ + remote ERG agreement with ABS without ergative Case assignment
- ◆ Artiagoitia 2001ab, also Etxepare 2003, Albizu & Fernández 2001, 2006, Rezac 2006.

3.4.1 Raising

- ◆ Basque *seem* verbs:

- + small clause SC (oblig raising; subject cannot be licensed within SC)
 - + CP (optional copy-raising CR)
- (56) a. *irudi(tu), iduri(tu)* 'seem', *iduri izan* 'have picture'
- raising to ergative without a dative experiencer (synthetic, analytic)
 - raising to absolutive with a dative experiencer (analytic only)
- b. *eman*
- raising to ergative without a dative experiencer (analytic)
- Sidenote: general ban on raising to ergative past a dative (Albizu & Fernández 2002, 2006, Rezac to appear)

- ◆ *eman* esp. useful for comparison because it has other uses:

- (57) a. ERG *eman* DAT ABS 'give' (basic)
 b. ERG *eman* DAT *beldurra* 'the.fright' = 'frighten'
 c. ERG *eman* ABS AP/DP-*tzat* 'consider ABS as AP/DP'

- ◆ Basic raising out of SC:

- To ergative:

- (58) Futbol zelaiak [sc t hutsik] ematen du
 football field.ERG empty seeming AUX.3sE
 The football field seems empty (Artiagoitia 2001b)

- (59) Arbolen adarrek [sc hilak] iduri zuten
 tress' branches.ERG dead seem AUX.3pE
 The branches of the trees seem dead (Artiagoitia 2001b)

- "Raised-to" ergatives: same vagaries of agr as basic ergatives
- e.g.: ergative displacement
- → so not "different" ergative...

It seems that they gave this child sweets (Artiagoitia 2001b, Salaburu 1987)
 French: *Il/*lui semble qu'ils ont donné ...*

- (65) Ematen du [Jone gaixorik dagoela].
 seeming AUX.3sE Jon.ABS ill is.that
 It seem that Jon is ill. (Artiagoitia 2001b)

- ◆ The expletive is not a quasi-argument: it cannot control / be controlled, unlike referential, weather-type expletives (Artiagoitia 2001ab)

- (66) *pro* ezin du elurra egin [*PRO* hotzik egin gabe].
 unable AUX.3sE snow.ABS do cold done without
It_i cannot snow (=do snow) [without *PRO_i* being (=doing) cold]. (Artiagoitia 2001b)

- (67) **pro_i* [_{CP} Jon nekatuta dagoela] ematen du
 Jon.ABS tired is.that seeming AUX.3sE

[*PRO_i* [lan handirik egin ez duela] eman arren]
 work great done not has.3sE.that seemed despite

It_i seems that John is tired despite it/**PRO_i* seeming that he hasn't done much work.
 (Artiagoitia 2001a)

- ◆ ≈ behavior of "pure" expletives

- (68) a. It rained without *PRO* snowing. [*weather / time... expletive*]
 b. %It was likely, without *PRO* being obvious, that S. [*pro-CP: S was likely*]
 c. %*It seemed, without *PRO* being obvious, that S. [*pure expl: *S seemed*]

- (see Burzio 1981, Chomsky 1981: 234 Rizzi 1986: 528n28, Abney 1987: 209n, Williams 1994: 91, Potsdam & Runner 2002; same contrasts in French)

- ◆ Seems a strong argument: Oyharçabal (1992) argues from apparent absence of such pure expletives that ERG is inherent.

- ◆ Compare: finite CPs cannot bear ergative in Basque or occur in ERG (or DAT) DP positions.

- (69) *[_{CP} Faxistek boz gehiago atera dutela](-k) denok harritu gaitu.
 fascists voice more win have.that(-ERG) everyone surprise AUX.1pA.3sE
 [That fascists have won votes]-ERG has surprised all of us. ~ It-ERG has surprised all of us [that fascists have won votes] (Artiagoitia 2003)

- *CP-ERG/DAT presumably a fact about CPs & case morphology.
 - See Bayer et al. (2001) on German DAT.
- *3SG.ERG + bare CP contrasts with the raising examples.
- The *3SG.ERG + bare CP are CPs that must link to DP position.
- The √3SG.ERG + bare CP are like English *seem*, where CP cannot occur in DP position (*it seems CP -- *CP seems*, Moro 1997)

- = Basque ergative expletives.

- ◆ Other examples: Etxepare (2003: 203n1), Albizu & Fernández (2006)
- ◆ Here ergative expletive here doubles an absolutive non-finite CP
 - (Unlike finite CPs, these are fine in positions corresp to ABS DPs)

(70) Ez du balio goizegi ateratze-a/ak
 not AUX.3sE worth too.early leaving-ABS/ERG
 It is not worth (it) leaving too learly. / Leaving too early is not worth it. (Albizu & Fernández 2006).

- ◆ **Conclusion:** there is an ergative expletive that is as non-thematic as it gets.

3.4.3 Copy raising

- ◆ Copy-raising CR in English
 - (Heycock 1994, Groat 1997, Potsdam and Runner 2002)
 - CR to non-thematic position, %idiom chunks, pure LD Agree: restricted to embedded NOM.
 - Note the % of idiom chunks, and cf. Poss-ing.

(71) a. They seem like they are about to leave.
 b. %The shoe seems like it is on the other foot.
 c. There seem like there are some books on the table.

- thematic use of *seem* for some speakers: non-subject or even no link.

(72) a. They seem like Kate will give them the information.
 b. *The other foot seems like the shoe is on it.
 c. The sky seems like Bilbao is on fire. (< Bsq ex. of Salaburu 1987)

- ◆ Analysis (Potsdam & Runner 2001):
 - Non-thematic CR / LD Agree is bound by the locality of A-movement.
 - → restriction can diagnose non-thematic, raising use of *seem*

- ◆ Copy-raising patterns with *seem* in Basque
 - CR of ERG, ABS subjects to ERG (studied: Artiagoitia 2001ab)
 - CR of ERG, ABS subjects to ABS (not yet sorted from thematic *seem*)

(73) a. Jonek ematen du [pro nekatuta dagoela].
 Jon.ERG seeming AUX.3sE tired is.that
 Jon-ERG seems like he-ABS is tired. [CR: 11-15/21 speakers]

- different set of speakers have thematic use: non-subject to ERG

b. Jonek ematen du [norbaitek min egin diola]

Jon.ERG seeming AUX.3sE someone.ERG pain done AUX.3sD.3sE.that
 Jon-ERG seems like someone hurt him (gave him pain). [thematic: 6/21; = DO link]

- c. Jonek [Ana hardun dagoela] ematen du.
 Jon.ERG Ana.ABS pregnant is.that seeming AUX.3sE
 Jon-ERG seems like Ana is pregnant. [thematic, no link: 1/21]

(Artiagoitia 2001b)

◆ Speaker groups resulting from Artiagoitia's survey (21 speakers):

- (i) no CR allowed
- (ii) no link need (thematic use of *seem*)
- (iii) subject or non-subject link needed (mostly only for 3rd person)
- **(iv) most: subject link only allowed (mostly only for 3rd person)**

◆ Interpretation: ≈ English: non-thematic, raising use = subject-link only

- But if non-subject links → thematic, why limited to 3rd for some?
- Richards 2005, Etxepare 2003: restr. to 3rd < CP intervention on Agree

◆ Other diagnostic for non-thematic ERG in CR (Artiagoitia 2001ab):

◆ **Cannot be causativized**

- Basque/French causativization: EA → DAT, S → ABS, O remains ABS
 - In Basque, monoclausal for all diagnostics. (Ortiz de Urbina 2003)
 - Operates over base-generated positions of EA, S, O, IO, not over movement-derived ones (Rezac forthcoming a)
- **The raisee positions cannot be turned into a causee.**
- Follows if movement-derived position cannot be affected
- ≈ Kayne (1975: 254ff.) for French *causativization of raising.

(74) zuzendariak [Joneri [nekatuta dagoela] esan/*eman-arazi dio.
 the.director.ERG Jon.DAT tired is.that say/*seem-made AUX.3sD.3sE
 The director made John say that / *seem like he is tired. (Artiagoitia 2001b)

- Causativization of *irudi* is possible:
- DAT experiencer → DAT "causee-experiencer" (Ortiz de Urbina 2003)
- ≈ behavior of other DAT-ABS psych-verbs (*gustatu* 'like')
- As expected: DAT experiencer is highest base-gen posn for *irudi*.

(75) Irudierazi zieten haiei haien alde zeudela.
 seem.CAUSE AUX.3pD.3pE them.DAT their side were.3pA.that
 They made it seem to them that they were on their side. (Ortiz de Urbina 2003)

- Makes it more striking that the ERG raisee cannot be turned into a causee
→ not the highest base-generated position, because movement derived.

◆ Scope reconstruction in CR?

- Argiagoitia (2001ab): raised ergative ambiguous $\exists > seem, seem > \exists$.
- Would mean raising through movement, not resumption.
- English CR → no scope reconstruction. (Potsdam & Runner 2001)

(76) Talde honetan [baten batek]_i [t_i nirekin minduta dagoela] ematen du.
group this.in someone.ERG me.with angered is.that seeming AUX.3sE
It appears that someone is angry with me. (Let everyone who is angry get up).
There is a certain person that appears to be angry with me. (Let the one who is angry
get up and explain). (Artiagoitia 2001b)

- (77) a. Two New Yorkers seem to have won the lottery. (2 > seem, seem > 2)
b. Two New Yorkers seem like they won the lottery. (2 > seem, *seem > 2)
c. Someone seems like he is angry with me. (someone > seem, *reverse)
d. Someone seems to be angry with me. (someone >> seem)

◆ Caveat: **idiom chunks cannot CR**

- test seems preliminary so far (?)
- out for many English speakers too (*The shoe seems to be/like it is on the other foot*)
- also out in Poss-ing, but along with pure expletives (*John's seeming to have been exploited / *advantage's seeming to have been taken of John*)

◆ Extending the inventory of CR relationships:

- (73)a : ABS to ERG CR:
- also: ERG to ERG, ABS to ABS, ERG to ABS

(78) (espainolek) iduri dute [ez dakitela borrokatzen ...] [ERG to ERG]
Spaniards.ERG seeming AUX.3pE not know.3pE fighting
The Spaniards seem like they do not know to fight without bleeding each other.
(Artiagoitia 2001b, citing J. Hiriart Urruty 10)

(79) [arreta behar dutela] iruditzen zaizkigun gabeziak eta mugak. [ERG to ABS]
attention need have.3pE seeming are.3pA.1pD lacks and limits.ABS
the lacks and limits that seem like they need attention

(Acta de la reunion constitutiva del Consejo Vasco del Voluntario, Bilbo, 5 Dec. 2001, http://www.gizaetxe.ejgv.euskadi.net/r40-2175/eu/contenidos/informacion/consejo_vasco_volunt_actividad/eu_8418/adjuntos/acta_cvv_5_12_2001_eu.pdf)

◆ Relevance of ERG-to-ABS copy-raising:

- **If *movement*, clearly shows ERG need not be preserved by raising.**

- Scope reconstruction would support movement
- BUT if base-generation of DP in matrix clause + Agree, only shows abs-type agreement can see an ergative (= ergative displacement)
 - Potsdam & Runner 2001, Rezac 2004 -- w no scope reconstruction

3.4.4 Long-distance ergative agreement with absolutive

- ◆ English pattern: copy-raising beside cross-clausal Agree

- (80) a. %The cat seems like (*Kate said that) it is out of the bag.
 b. There seem like (*Kate said that) there are some books on the table.

- ◆ Preamble: in Basque CR, ERG *can* raise out of the embedded clause.
- ◆ Artiagoitia: CRed ERG can control matrix adjunct, in-situ ABS cannot:

- (81) a. *[_{CP} Jon_i nekatuta dagoela] ematen du [_{PRO_i} lanetik irtetea]
 Jon.ABS tired is.that seeming AUX.3sE work.from leaving.on
 It seems that John is tired upon PRO leaving work.
- b. Jonek_i [_{CP} t_i nekatuta dagoela] ematen du [_{PRO_i} lanetik irtetea]
 Jon.ERG tired is.that seeming AUX.3sE work.from
 leaving.on
 John seems like he is tired upon leaving work. (Artiagoitia 2001a)

- ◆ What happens if attempt to keep the "raisee" in-situ?
- ◆ **Very tentative: Remote ERG-type agreement with ABS, no ERG assign.**

- (82) [Hizkuntzalari honi liburu-ak_i/*-ek_i gustatzen zaizkiola] ematen dute.
 linguist this.DAT books.ABS/*ERG liking AUX.3pA.3sD.that seeming AX.3pE
 Lit. There seem-PLERG like [to this linguist (DAT) appeal-PLABS the books (ABS)]
 i.e. The books seem like they appeal to this linguist. (AI)

- ... also in literature (about 5 exx in corpora, comparable to # with ERG):

- (83) Sorginak ere sarritan senarminakin dabil^zatela dirudite
 witches.ABS also often husband.longin-with walk.3pA.that seem.3pE
 Witches.ABS also often seem.3pERG like they.ABS walk with?
 (Jose Luis Arriaga, 1984, *Euskal mitologia*, 126)

- ... and in journals &c. visible to Google:

- (84) Kanpotik begiratuta denak desberdinak direla dirudite
 outside.from seen everyone.ABS unlike are.3pA.that seem.3pE
 Seem from the outside, everyone seems like they are different
 (*Tolosaldeko hitza* [newsp.], "Mundua zeharkatuz, etxetik", Esti Ezeiza, 10/10/2007)
 (http://www.tolosaldekohitza.info/hitza_n.php?herria=TOLOSA&fetxa=2007-10-10&izena=p00004006&eskualdea=TOLOSA&produktua=TOLOSALDEKO)

- (85) Kontuak hobetzen ari direla dirudite

tales.the.ABS getting.better PROG are.3pA seem.3pE

The tales seems like they are getting better.

(http://www.zuredirua.com/historico_resumen_prensa/junio06/29.htm, s.v. Enpresak).

(Web portal offering resumes from journals about economy and finance)

- BUT, the western dialects collapse ERG.PL *ek* with ABS.PL *ak* (Oyharçabal 1999, Hualde et al. 1992), and that may be the explanation.

◆ **Powerful evidence (if borne out)**

(86) Configuration: [... 3PL.ABS_i ... AUX.3pA_i ...] ... seem.3pE_i

- ABS case on 3PL controller can only come from embedded clause.
- Matrix 3PL.ERG agreement cannot be due to a thematic use of *seem*:
- Matrix thematic 3PL.ERG pronoun would trigger a Condition C violation on 3PL.ABS downstairs.

(87) She looks like there is a great view from Kate's apartment.
% (thematic use of *seem*), but **she* = *Kate*

- → 3PL.ERG agr must be due to agreement with the embedded DP...
- → **3PL.ERG agreement has nothing to do with selection.**
- ≈ **3SG.ERG agreement from expletive evidence**

3.4.5 Raising to ergative and dependent Case

◆ Tally:

- ◆ √(Copy-)raising to ergative case, agreement in a non-thematic position.
- ◆ √Ergative "pure" expletive.
- ◆ √Remote ergative-type agreement with an in-situ absolutive.
- ◆ (*Remote ergative assignment to an in-situ absolutive.)

◆ How does this square with various theories of ergative?

◆ Inherent ergative: not for Basque

- ERG-type agr/ case cannot be related to a thematic position

◆ Structural ergative: √.

- Compatible with non-thematic element ≈ NOM.
- Where's the competitor?

◆ Assume a competitor... is there a problem?

(88) a. "Ergative case generalization: Even when ergative case may go on the subject of

an intransitive clause, ergative case will not appear on a derived subject."

- b. "It looks like ACC case can't be assigned when there's a non-thematic subject because in most situations in which there's a non-thematic subject, an NP governed by V+I raises to this non-thematic subject position and thus the subject and object positions are filled by members of the same chain. Similarly, ERG case will not generally be assigned when an NP moves into a non-thematic subject position because again the subject and object positions will belong to the same chain."

(Marantz 1991)

- ◆ But Marantz mainly concerned with derived S of unacc/pass, wo competitor
- ◆ Discusses following, with structural rather than inherent *her*-ACC:

(89) Elmer struck her-ACC as [_{Elmer} being too stubborn for the job.] (Marantz 1991)

- ◆ Similar structure in an ergative language should yield ERG on *Elmer*, provided ABS *her* competitor that does not block raising.
- ◆ Same story goes for syntactic or morphological dependent Case accounts.
- ◆ So... assume a competitor: deficient silent/incorp D/N obj of *seem*
 - cf. etymology (?), 'have appearance' ...
 - cf. Artiagoitia: $\sqrt{\text{SEEM}}$ has [-ABS], and [-ABS] → ERG
- ◆ Why doesn't competitor intervene in raising?
 - Too (ϕ -)deficient to intervene, sufficient to get Case.
 - Cf. unergatives -- *Negin*:
 - null O licenses ERG in both
 - blocks cognate object only in *Negin*
 - (Alternative: SC/CP raising host originates in Spec-*vP*, above null competitor, and not a subject island because in-situ (Stepanov 1999))

(91) a. T_{ERG} ... v_{ABS} D/N_{deficient} [SC/CP ... raisee ...]

b. T_{ERG} ... [SC/CP ... raisee ...] v_{ABS} D/N_{deficient}

- ◆ Independent evidence for deficient interveners (here, & with unergatives in general?)
- ◆ How far does raising to ERG delimit theories of dependent Case?
 - NOT theta-related...
 - But: fully homologous to ABS?
 - Far from necessary: other examples of marking

- (i) compatible with lack of theta-selectin
 - (ii) contrasting with NOM/ABS in depending on a phrase-structural position (no long-distance alternative)
 - (iii) even with interpretive restrictions?
- Poss-ing:
 - (92) a. But [a proposition's seeming to a person to be true] is something better than that.
(Conee, Comments in Bill Lycan's..., *Philosophical Studies* 103:1 55-9)
 - b. reference to [a child's being likely to injure some other person] as a ground for ...
(G-search < Int J Law Policy Family 2005 19: 395-420)
 - c. I am happy about [it(?'s) being likely that John will finish soon]. (Abney 1987: 208)
 - d. I was surprised at [it(??'s) seeming that John might not win]. (Abney 1987: 208)
 - e. I am surprised at [there(*'s) still being books left].
 - f. I was irked at [advantage(??'s) being taken of John's situation]. (Abney 1987: 208)
 - g. Serene made reference ... to [the cat's being out of the bag] (G-search)
 - "Raising to the object of a preposition" (RtPO)
 - Postal (1984, 2003), Runner (2007) for English, McCloskey (1984) for Irish, Joseph (1990) for Greek.
 - (93) a. You can depend on him to do something decent.
 - b. On which person_i does Mary rely e_i to dress himself_i.
 - c. Don't count on there to be that many supporters in the resistance.
 - d. ?They were counting / depending / relying on close tabs to be kept / *placed on her movements.
 - e. ?Close tabs_i were being counted / depended / relied on e_i to be kept / *placed on her movements. (Postal 2003)
 - (94) Tharla dó_i go minic [e_i a bheith ar an anás]
happened to.him often be(-FIN) on poverty
He often happened to be destitute. (McCloskey 1984: 465)
 - RtPO \neq raising to theta-related position (Runner 2006: 79)
 - P, like T, can sub-categorize for a non-thematic OCC/EPP position.
 - ◆ Case that depends on movement / designated position
 - ◆ Case that is P-like / marked (DP - KP - $K_{inh}P$ in Bittner & Hale 1996)
 - ◆ Evidence that Basque ERG is like that?
 - * LD assignment, if this is true
 - Modulation of ergative displacement (Rezac 2006)
 - ◆ How does Case / KP assigned under movement only work?
 - Problems:
 - moving to within a left branch; derived constituent structure
 - (95) a. [depend [_{PP} on [_{INF} there to be ...]] →
 - b. [depend [_? [_{PP/Spec-PP} on there] (θ) [_{INF} t to be ...]]]