

Semantic Parameters of Basque Split Intransitivity in Role and Reference Grammar

Author(s): Lincoln Ward Cutting

Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session Dedicated to the Contributions of Charles J. Fillmore (1994), pp. 145-157

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

The Semantic Parameters of Basque Split Intransitivity in Role and Reference Grammar

Lincoln Ward Cutting
SUNY at Buffalo

Introduction

Following the advance of the Unaccusative Hypothesis [UH] by Perlmutter (1978) most research has attempted to explain split intransitivity in syntactic terms, while at the same time allowing for certain pretheoretical generalizations regarding the observable semantic character of the phenomena. Recently, Van Valin (1990) has argued, within the framework of Role and Reference Grammar [RRG], that an explanatory account of split intransitivity can be rendered in terms of semantics. This paper is an examination of the intransitive split in Basque within the framework of RRG. Focusing on that theory's system of verb classification and predicate semantics, the semantic parameters of Basque (Vizcayan dialect) intransitive predicates will be identified and a predictive account of the morphosyntactic behavior related to split intransitivity in the language will be rendered.

1.0 Syntax and Morphology

1.1 Basic Properties of Basque Sentences

Basque is an elaborately inflected ergative language, possessing at least sixteen nominal cases. A typical tensed sentence in the language is composed of a verb in a participial form together with an inflected auxiliary bearing tense, person, number and case marking, along with NPs bearing argument relations to the verb. Basque has traditionally been described as a relatively free word order language. This description, however, pertains primarily to basic constructions in which any permutation is possible. In the main, a default SOV word order is observed together with a fixed preverbal focus slot.

Basque verbs have traditionally been divided into two major classes according to canonical case array assignment and auxiliary selection. The first of these classes typically takes a single argument marked with the NOR case (i.e. the case commonly identified as the absolutive case) and occurs with the auxiliary IZAN 'to be'. This class is referred to as the 'NOR' class. The second class of verbs typically takes two arguments, one marked with the NOR case and the other marked with the NORK case (i.e. the case commonly identified as the ergative case) and occurs with the auxiliary UKAN 'to have'. These are referred to as the 'NOR-NORK' verbs. Traditional descriptions link these classes with the intransitive and transitive verb classes respectively. This paper, in part, intends to highlight specific faults with this characterization. I will, however, make use of the terminology just described for the purposes of coherence with traditional literature.

1.2 Ergativity

Examples (1) and (2) show that Basque displays an ergative pattern of case marking:

- (1) Ni-k gizona- \emptyset ikusi d-u-t
 1s-NORK man-NOR seePrf 3sNOR-UKAN-1sNORK
 I have seen the man
- (2) Gizona- \emptyset etorri d-a- \emptyset
 man-NOR comePrf. 3sNOR-prs-IZAN
 The man has come

Notice that the subject in example (2) and the object in example (1) (*gizona* in both cases) are both marked with the NOR case (i.e. the morphologically unmarked case in Basque). The pronominal subject *ni* in the transitive construction in example (1) receives a distinct and overt case marking; the NORK case. In contrast with an accusative system of case morphology, wherein the distinct case is associated with the object of a transitive predicate, Basque clearly conforms to an ergative pattern.

1.3 Intransitive Split

Beth Levin (Dissertation 1988) observed that those single argument predicates in Basque which motivate a NOR case configuration, in fact represent only a subclass of the intransitive verbs in the language. Consider example (3) below:

- (3) Ni-k dantzatu d-u- \emptyset
 1s-NORK dancePerf. 3sNOR-UKAN-1sNORK
 I have danced

This intransitive construction contains a subject which is marked with the NORK case. This represents evidence of a distinct class of intransitive predicates which mark for case in a way which distinguishes them from those single argument predicates which have traditionally been thought to comprise the whole of the class of intransitives in Basque (i.e. the NOR marked intransitives). Levin (Ibid.) has correctly identified this pattern as indicative of an intransitive split; describing the NOR class of intransitives as an 'unaccusative' class and the intransitive NORK predicates as an 'unergative class'. Explaining the phenomena along traditional GB lines, she suggests that Basque is unique in that it has a system of morphological case that reflects d-structure grammatical relations directly rather than allowing distinct notions of s-subject and s-object (Ibid. 334). Unaccusatives are described as having d-structure objects and unergatives as having d-structure subjects. In the following sections, I will present an alternative analysis of intransitive split, based on the framework of Role and Reference Grammar.

2.0 Role and Reference Grammar

Merging traditional structural grammatical concepts with a functionalist perspective which views language as a system of communicative social action, Role and Reference Grammar [RRG] has been described as a 'structural-functionalist theory of grammar' (Van Valin 1993). Crucially, syntax in RRG is not viewed as autonomous but as relatively motivated by semantic and pragmatic factors. Consequently, RRG's system of lexical representation and semantic roles represents the most central feature of the theory.

The system of lexical representation in RRG builds on approaches to the lexical decomposition of predicates engineered by Dowty (1979). His work in turn makes integral use of Vendler's (1967) schema for the analysis of verbs into four distinct classes (i.e. states, activities, achievements and accomplishments). For each class Dowty assigned a unique formal lexical representation or 'logical structure' [LS] (see table (6.1)). Class membership for a verb is determined by a set of semantic and syntactic tests designed to reveal the inherent aspectual quality or 'aktionsart' of a predicate (see table (6.2)). The applicability of a specific test in a given language depends, in large measure, on the identification of morphological elements in that language which are commensurate with those identified in the tests. Importantly, the predicate and test phrase must cooccur with the correct interpretation as identified by the prototypes. Test selection, then, is motivated by specific language internal criteria in concert with the general guidelines provided by the theory.

RRG posits two 'tiers' of semantic roles. The first of these tiers makes use of thematic concepts which parallel traditional theoretical notions. The second tier, on the other hand, makes use of less recognizable role concepts. This tier consists of two generalized semantic roles called 'macroroles', referred to as 'actor' and 'undergoer.' Each macrorole subsumes a number of more specific thematic relations which are in turn systematically identified by argument positions in LSs. Macroroles are then determined by relative position on a markedness hierarchy involving two clines which bias between agent and patient at the extremes. In a given default transitive construction the most agent-like argument will be actor and the most patient-like argument will be undergoer.

All of the intransitive verbs examined in this analysis are listed in table (6.3). It should be noted that many of these verbs also have transitive counterparts. It is the intransitive uses of these verbs, however, which are to be examined. Transitive constructions will be scrutinized only in so far as they serve to further distinguish the class identity of the predicates in question. An analysis of these verbs in terms of Dowty's approach to classification allows for various distinct class groupings. The format of the database in table (6.3) is organized according to the identified classes, various semantic subsets within classes having been distinguished by lettered groups.

3.0 Analysis

3.1 Activity Predicates

In all simple declarative intransitive constructions containing the intransitive predicates in (a - d) in table (6.3), the auxiliary verb selected is UKAN, and the single argument receives the NORK case accordingly (see (4a)). As described above, this group of verbs represents an unergative class of predicates in Basque (i.e. the single argument predicates which are marked with the ergative case). Unergative predicates share the common general semantic character of describing an activity. Within this group of predicates various semantic subsets can be distinguished. These subsets can be characterized as follows: general activities (a), involuntary and voluntary bodily activities (b), manner of speaking verbs (c), and verbs describing sounds made by animals (d). These predicates, together as a class, can be shown to respond positively to the primary aktionsart tests for the identification of activities (see table (6.2)). The following tests represent the critical

indicators of activity status for a verb in Basque: *Progressive* (with the verb *ari* 'to be engaged in'), 'X is Ving' entails 'X has Ved, 'spend an hour Ving'(with the verb *igaroz*) entails 'V at all times in that hour.' The relevant constructions involving the verbs in groups (a-d) are shown in the following examples.

- (4) a. Jon-ek dantzatu d-u- \emptyset
 Jon-NORK dancePrf 3sNOR-UKAN-3sNORK
 Jon has danced
- b. Jon ari haiz lanegi-te-n
 Jon continuePrf 3sNOR-prs-IZAN work-nom-loc
 Jon is working
- c. Jon-ek ordu bat- \emptyset igaroz z-u-en
 Jon-NORK hour one-NOR spend time 3sNORK-UKAN-pst
 dantzatzen
 danceHab.
 Jon spent one hour dancing

There are two ways to express a progressive aspect in conjunction with activity verbs in Basque (Saltarelli 1988). One approach involves the stative verb *egon* ('to be/exist') together with the descriptive predicate in an adverbial form. This construction, however, appears to only marginally allow activity verbs. In addition, it does not yield a true progressive aspect, but rather motivates something more like a stative expression (this will be discussed shortly). Example (4b) shows the construction in which activities most naturally occur with the progressive. Here the progressive aspect is expressed by using the verb *ari* 'to continue' together with a nominalized verbal complement marked with a locative case which serves to describe the action in progress. Notice, in this example an unaccusative case array and auxiliary have been selected, rather than the unergative case array and auxiliary typically associated with these verbs in simple constructions. This is consistent with the fact that the main verb *ari* is a NOR intransitive (i.e. it marks as such when it occurs independently of verbal complements). The identity of *ari* as an unaccusative is further evidenced by the fact that it cannot occur as a nominalized complement in a progressive construction in which it is itself the main verb. The focus of the test 'X is Ving' (progressive with *ari*) entails 'X has Ved,' is to identify the aspectual quality which suggests an inherently unspecified extent of the activity being described. As such, the progressive aktionsart test serves to distinguish activities and accomplishments from states and punctual achievements. Constructions of the type in (4b) crucially entail parallel constructions of the type in (4a). Thus all activity predicates realized in the progressive aspect with the verb *ari* are shown to describe an *atelic* action (i.e. an action with a temporally unbounded extent, possessing the inherent potential of an unbounded duration for the action described).

Expressions of the 'spend time' type are crosslinguistically equivalent to constructions of the 'X for an hour' type, as indicated in test (3) (see table (6.2)). This test is the canonical indicator of atelic quality for a predicate. In these constructions a temporal portion of a potentially unbounded event is focused on. Constructions using the verb *igaroz* 'spend time', together with the activity verbs in (a-d) in an adverbial form, yield a 'spend time Ving' interpretation. The verb

igaroz is a transitive predicate which motivates structures that subcategorize for a temporal object, making this verb specific to constructions like the one in (4c). As with other transitive activity predicates in Basque, constructions with *igaroz* are marked ergatively (i.e. arguments receive the NOR and the NORK cases). Unlike the progressive construction containing *ari*, only intransitive unergative verbs can occur with *igaroz*. That is, only intransitives which mark ergatively can occur in constructions with *igaroz*. This fact helps to further distinguish the independent atelic aktionsart identity of unergatives in Basque.

3.2 States, Achievements and Accomplishments

The intransitive predicates which mark their argument with the NOR case (i.e. the absolutive case) and select the auxiliary IZAN belong to the remaining three aktionsart classes of predicates; states, achievements and accomplishments. These intransitives behave unaccusatively together as a group.

3.2.1 States

The state class includes predicates describing states or conditions of being (e). This class also includes predicates such as *jakin* 'to know' and *ikusi* 'to see'. These, however, represent two argument stative predicates and, as such, are not considered in this discussion. All intransitive state predicates occur with the auxiliary IZAN together with arguments which receive the NOR case. Examples (5a) - (5c) exemplify:

- (5) a. Jon- \emptyset egon d-a- \emptyset
 Jon-NOR be/existPrf. 3sNOR-prs-IZAN
 Jon has existed

- b Jon- \emptyset bizirik-egon d-a- \emptyset
 Jon-NOR be alivePrf. 3sNOR-prs-IZAN
 Jon has been alive

- c Jon- \emptyset ordu bete egon d-a- \emptyset egon-ga
 Jon-NOR hour full be/existprf 3sNOR-prs-IZAN be-Adv
 Jon has been in the state of existing for a full hour

A fundamental aktionsart opposition exists between state predicates and all other classes. Activities, accomplishments and achievements can be characterized equivalently as dynamic actions, in so far as they each describe a 'happening' of some sort. Stative predicates, conversely, do not describe a 'happening' but instead describe a condition of existence irrespective of change. This basic distinction among predicates motivates the characterization of states as [-dynamic] and all other classes as [+dynamic]. In most cases, a given predicate can be readily identified as a state by determining whether it can be used as the answer to the question 'what happened?' By this criteria alone, the verbs in (e) in the database represent states. Furthermore, these verbs respond positively to the main test listed in table (6.2) for states: 'X for an hour' entails 'X at all times in that hour' (see example 4c). This test reveals that the conditions described by the predicate are atelic inherently, a quality states share with activity predicates. Unlike activity predicates, state predicates can not occur in *ari* type progressive constructions, or

in “spend time” type constructions with *igaroz*. This serves to distinguishing them from activities.

3.2.1.1. Other Stative Constructions

As mentioned above, a progressive aspect may also be expressed by using the verb *egon* ‘to be’ together with an adverbial complement. All classes of verbs (with the exception of states) can be shown to occur in this construction (activities occurring with a strictly limited acceptability). The resulting constructions, although appearing to reflect a progressive aspect in translation, in point of fact motivate something more like a stative expression. When used in conjunction with the stative verb ‘egon’ (be/stay), predicates are interpreted as stative manifestations of the activity, achievement or accomplishment which they describe. Examples of the *egon* ‘progressive’ construction containing members of the various classes appear below.

- (6) a. (*) Jon- \emptyset *egon* z- \emptyset -en ja-ten
 Jon-NOR bePrf 3sNOR-IZAN-pst eat-Adv
 Jon has been in the act of eating
- b. Jon- \emptyset *egon* z- \emptyset -en ito-ten
 Jon-NOR bePrf 3sNOR-IZAN-pst drown-Adv
 Jon has been in the act of drowning
- c. Jon- \emptyset parke-ra *egon* z- \emptyset -en corritz-an
 Jon-NOR park-to bePrf 3sNOR-IZAN-pst run-Adv
 Jon has been in the act of running to the park

Constructions using the intransitive verb *egon*, like constructions with *ari*, select the unaccusative auxiliary and case array. Unlike the progressive with *ari*, however, the verbal adjunct in these constructions appears in an adverbial form and the action described is not truly progressive. In (6a) the action is conceived of not as a canonical atelic activity (i.e. an activity having the inherent potential of extending beyond the moment described) but rather as a completed state of action with a definite bounded duration. In examples (6b) the inchoative *ito* ‘to drown’ receives a like interpretation, the state change associated with an achievement predicate having been extracted from focus. Importantly, the resulting condition of ‘having drown’ is conceived of (by virtue of a default implicature) as having followed necessarily from the event described. A similar state interpretation is realized for accomplishments in construction with *egon* (see example (6c)). The implicature associated with achievements, however, does not obtain for accomplishments. In (6c) ‘Jon’s having arrived at the park’ is assumed as a tentative implicature such that his ‘having arrived’ is contingent on a more direct proposition. Additionally, it can be observed that the constructions in (6a)-(6c) make operator-like use of the stative predicate *egon* in motivating what are clearly stative concepts. These constructions, as such, reveal a parallel between the structures employed in Basque to express stative notions and the canonical stative structure as constrained in the LSSs utilized by RRG.

3.2.2. Achievements and Accomplishments

Many of the intransitive predicates which select the NOR case belong to the class of achievements and accomplishments. These include inchoatives as in (f), aspectuals as in (g), verbs of happening listed in (h), and verbs of motion in (i). The critical tests for determining achievement status for a predicate in Basque include the following: *Progressive* (with the verb *ari* 'to be engaged in,' and *egon* 'to be/exist'), 'X is Ving' entails 'X has Ved.' Regarding achievements in progressive constructions, test (1) (see table (6.2)) indicates that punctual achievements cannot occur, whereas durative achievements can. The achievement predicates in Basque behave accordingly (see examples (7a) - (7b)). Durative and punctual achievements both can appear in 'progressive' constructions with *egon*. In these constructions, however, they are interpreted similarly as states, as has been outlined in conjunction with example (6b). Achievement verbs can not occur in 'spend an hour' type constructions, thus distinguishing them from activity predicates (see example 7c).

- (7) a. *Jon- \emptyset ari d-a- \emptyset heltzen
 Jon-NOR continuePrf 3sNOR-prs-IZAN arriveNomLoc
 Jon is arriving
- b. Jon- \emptyset ari d-a- \emptyset hiltzen
 Jon-NOR continueprf 3sNOR-prs-IZAN dieNomLoc
 Jon is dying
- c.* Jon-ek ordu bat igaroz z-u-en ateratzen
 Jon-NORK hour one spend time 3sNORK-UKAN departHab
 Jon has spent an hour leaving

Achievements cannot occur in a 'for x time' phrase but are grammatical in an 'in x time' phrase (as indicated by test 4 table (6.2)). The Basque equivalent of an 'x in y time' phrase utilizes the transitive verb *eroan* meaning 'to take.' Like 'igaroz,' this verb is transitive and it also subcategorizes for a temporal object. In constructions with *eroan* the verb describing the action appears in a nominalized form. Achievement verbs are the only verbs which can occur in these constructions, distinguishing them from activities and accomplishments (see e.g. (8a)). Constructions with *eroan* appear to be constrained by volitionality such that achievement verbs which do not allow volitional control (like *hil* 'to die' in (8b)) are not acceptable. Consequently, *eroan* constructions have a limited diagnostic power regarding aktionsart analysis.

- (8) a *Jon-ek ordu bat- \emptyset eroan z-u-en
 Jon-NORK hour one-NOR take 3sNORK-UKAN
 etorrtea
 comeNom
 Jon took an hour to get here
- b. *Jon-ek ordu bat- \emptyset eroan z-u-en hil-tzea
 Jon-NORK hour one-NOR take 3sNORK-UKAN die-Nom
 Jon took an hour to die

- c. Jon- \emptyset joan d-a- \emptyset
 Jon-NOR goPrf 3sNOR-prs-IZAN
 Jon has gone there/out

Since accomplishments in Basque cannot occur in 'spend time' type constructions with *igaroz*, it is difficult to distinguish them from achievements. The verb *joan* in example (9b), for instance, appears in an intransitive accomplishment structure. This same verb may also belong to the class of achievement predicates when it appears on its own. Example (8c) demonstrates that *joan* operates not as an activity but as a general motion achievement predicate indicating origin or destination state change (i.e. a departure from a location and/or an arrival at a location). In addition, *joan* does not occur in *ari* progressive constructions or in *igaroz* constructions, further distinguishing it from activities. The tests used to determine accomplishment status for a predicate in Basque are: 'x is V-ing' does *not* entail 'x has V-ed', 'x Ved in and hour' entails x was V-ing during that hour'. Additionally, the stative constructions described in (6a) - (6c) may represent a secondary diagnostic for achievements and accomplishments. In (6c) the utterance does not suggest, necessarily, that the resultant state of affairs associated with accomplishment predications has occurred (i.e. 'Jon's having arrived at the park'). When appearing in constructions with *egon*, in contrast, achievement verbs more strongly entail the suggestion that the change of state associated with achievements has occurred.

3.2.2.1. Accomplishments From Activities

The use of activity type verbs in accomplishment predicate structures is a crosslinguistically well supported operation. In English, for example, this is done with the addition of a prepositional phrase which serves to specify a change of state, condition or location which results from the stated activity. Consider the sentence 'Bill ran to the park'. In this sentence the prepositional phrase 'to the park' motivates an accomplishment interpretation for this structure because it serves to specify a result change of location, namely 'Bill's being at/in the park'. Certain activity verbs in Basque are inherently activities and they cannot appear in accomplishment structures even with the addition of some specification of a resultant change of state, condition or location. Consider examples (9a) and (9b):

- (9) a. *Jon-ek parke-ra corridu z-u-en
 Jon-NORK park -to runPrf 3sNORK-UKAN-pst
 Jon ran to the park
- b. Jon- \emptyset parke-ra joan z- \emptyset -en arrin-arrin-ga
 Jon-NOR park-to goPrf 3sNOR-IZAN-pst fast-fast-Adv
 Jon ran to the store

(9a) shows that an activity predicate with a NORK marked argument cannot occur with a locative marked NP indicating result destination. Instead, a construction like the one in (9b) is needed to express this meaning. The predicate *joan* is used in combination with a NOR marked NP and an adverbial which serves to describe the manner peculiar to the action being described. In example (9b) the action being described is that of running. The resulting intransitive accomplishment structure incorporates the canonical quality of motion associated with running (i.e. fastness),

with *joan*. In phrases of this type the precise nature of the activity associated with the accomplishment is derived by an implicature. With the addition of case marked nominals describing manner, such as *oin-ez* ‘by foot’, the action may be made more explicit.

3.2.3. *Ibili*

The Basque verb *ibili*, translated traditionally as ‘walk’, suggests itself as a canonical activity verb based on its crosslinguistic identity as a predicate describing pedal locomotion. As such, this verb would be expected to pattern like other members of the activity class of predicates in Basque in motivating an unergative case array. Some researchers have suggested (Saltarelli 1988), however, that *ibili* selects an unaccusative auxiliary and case rather than an unergative one. This research suggests that *ibili* is, in fact, ungrammatical on its own in an intransitive construction (see example (10a)):

- (10) a. *Ni- \emptyset *ibili* n-a-iz
 1s-Nor (walk)Prf 1sNOR-prs-IZAN
 I have done it
- b. Zu- \emptyset *ibili* h-a-iz lan-ean
 2s-NOR (walk)Prf 2sNOR-prs-IZAN work-at(Adv)
 Have you engaged in the act of working?
- c. Jon- \emptyset *oin-ez* *ibili* z- \emptyset -en
 Jon-NOR foot-by (walk)Prf 3sNOR-IZAN-pst
 Jon has (been in the act of) walked
- d. Jon- \emptyset *atzera* *eta aurrera* *ibili* z- \emptyset -en
 Jon-NOR backwards and forwards (walk)Prf 3sNOR-IZAN-pst
 Jon has (been in the act of) walked up and down

The sentence in (10a) is acceptable only as an answer to a question like the one in (10b) in which the quality of the action is identified by an adverbial expression having the form NP + locative. Most importantly, the verb *ibili* can not take *igaroz* or occur in a progressive construction. This distinguishes *ibili* from typical activity verbs in Basque. Additionally, *ibili* appears to possess some of the generalized achievement properties associated with the motion achievement verb *joan*. It fails the progressive test, however, thus distinguishing it from achievements. In (10b)-(10d) the activity is focused on not as an atelic action but rather as a state or condition of existence with a bounded temporal extent which is characterized by the associated activity. The fact that *ibili* passes the tests for states suggests a stative interpretation for the verb. The meaning of this verb may be roughly described as ‘to be in the midst of’ or ‘to be located in an action’.

4.0 Basque Unergatives as Transitive Predicates

Some research has suggested that Basque unergative predicates assign the NORK (i.e. ergative) case to their argument because they are, in fact, transitive

overtly in the syntax (Laka 1993; Hale & Keyser 1991; Uribe-Etxebarria 1989). Basque unergative predicates, it is argued, appear in constructions in which object deletion has occurred. Additionally, it is further argued that verbs of this type do not involve a true nominal incorporation but instead represent the interaction of a 'light verb' (i.e. *egin* 'to do') and an action noun. Citing the free movement of the NP element of unergative compounds as evidence, unergatives are described as being unincorporated lexical compounds whose constituents display independent behavior in the syntax, thus showing that they diverge from unaccusatives in terms of the syntax. These analyses are based on a view which claims primary unergative identity for verbs of the NP + EGIN ('to do') form. This necessarily discounts the behavior of unergative borrowings and unergatives not of the NP + EGIN. Example (4a) shows that the non-compound verb *dantzatu* 'to dance' behaves unergatively. This verb is an obvious Spanish borrowing, but it is nevertheless fully incorporated into the syntax and semantics of Basque and as such must be accounted for. Verbs such as *jan* ('to eat') and *egin* ('to do') itself (clearly non-compounds and non-borrowings) also display unergative behavior which must be accounted for. Additionally, in consideration of the free word order properties of Basque, the general argument could be made that this behavior may be indicative of more general conditions obtaining in the syntax. In terms of RRG it is of crucial importance to determine whether movement of the nominal element in EGIN compounds alters the aktionsart character of the specific construction in question. This research suggests that it is the aktionsart characteristics of predicates, not syntactic factors, which correlate with the morphological behavior in question. Crosslinguistic evidence strongly suggests that the existence of split intransitive phenomena in Basque should not necessarily be denied on the basis of structural clues alone. The default morphosyntactic behavior for Basque activity verbs in intransitive constructions (i.e. *sans* 'object') clearly indicates an unergative morphology. The semantic parameters identified in this paper lend further support to the general claims regarding the existence of an unaccusative class in Basque.

5.0 Conclusion

As has been shown, Basque displays two distinct patterns of marking for intransitive predicates. This analysis has revealed that the following generalization holds true regarding these predicates: Intransitive NORK verbs which select UKAN as their auxiliary (i.e. the unergatives) are activity verbs; the class of verbs identified by Van Valin as being consistently marked unergatively crosslinguistically. The intransitive NOR verbs which select IZAN as their auxiliary (i.e. the unaccusatives) belong to the other three classes of predicates. An analysis of the logical structures of the verbs in question will serve to delimit the differences that exist between NOR and NOR-NORK marked intransitive predicates. The sentences in (11) contain examples from all four verb classes, along with their corresponding LSs.

(11)	Activity Jonék dantzatu du Jon has danced do' (Jon [dance' (Jon)])	State Jon egon da Jon has been/existed be' (Jon)
------	---	---

Achievement Jon joan da Jon has gone BECOME NOT be at' (Jon, \emptyset)	Accomplishment Jon parkera joan zen arrin arringa Jon ran to the park [do' (Jon [go' (Jon)])] CAUSE [BECOME be at' (Jon, park)]
---	--

The LSs above represent intransitive manifestations of the four classes (the accomplishment LS serving to represent both transitive and intransitive). These LSs reveal that all predicates which select arguments that receive NOR as their case contain a stative predicate in their LS. Activity predicates, in contrast, contain no stative element in their LS. We can generalize further, therefore, and say that the NOR predicates represent an independent class: an unaccusative class. It is important to note that the LSs of the predicates under examination, in and of themselves, do not serve to explain class behavior. The LS associated with each verb class represents a schematic description which serves to make explicit the common behavior of predicates with respect to aktionsart. The semantic and syntactic tests described in this paper represent independent and principled criteria for the identification of the thematic character of a predicate vis-a-vis logical structure. Compared to Levin's (1983) account of split intransitivity in Basque, an RRG account, by deferring to the aktionsart properties of predicates, is able to demonstrate consistencies of behavior for each and every intransitive verb in the language relative to the morphosyntactic phenomena in question. This investigation lends further evidence to the general assertions made by Van Valin regarding the semantic nature of split intransitivity and the value of a semantically based account for explaining the variation of the phenomenon of unaccusativity across languages. On a final note, because this phenomenon can be explained by RRG, it cannot be claimed as evidence against monostratal theories of syntax (like RRG) which make integral use of lexical semantics and semantic roles.

6.0 Tables

6.1	a.	Activity	DO(x[predicate' (x)])
	b.	State	predicate' (x)
	c.	Achievement	BECOME predicate' (x)
	d.	Accomplishment	[DO (x [predicate' (x)])]CAUSE[BECOME predicate' (x)]

6.2	Criterion	States	Achievements	Accomplishments	Activities
1.	Occurs with progressive	NO	D: Yes/P: NO	YES	YES
2.	Occurs with adverbs like <i>vigorously, carefully, etc.</i>	NO	D: YES/P: NO	YES	YES
3.	Occurs with <i>X for an hour spend an hour Xing</i>	NO	D: YES/P: NO	YES	YES
4.	Occurs with <i>X in an hour take an hour to X</i>	NO	D: YES/P: NO	YES	NO
5.	<i>X for an hour</i> entails <i>X at all times in the hour</i>	YES	D: NO/P: d.n.a.	NO	YES
6.	<i>Y is Xing</i> entails <i>Y has Xed</i>	d.n.a	D: NO/P: d.n.a.	NO	YES
7.	Has inherent causative semantics	NO	NO	YES	NO

6.3

(a)	lan egin jan dantza egin idatzen corridu	'work' 'eat' 'dance' 'do' 'write' 'run'	(b)	izerditu negar egin lo egin irri egin eztul egin keinu egin usin egin	'sweat' 'cry' 'sleep' 'laugh' 'cough' 'wink' 'sneeze'	(c)	galde erantzun aipatu erauisi hitz egin didar egin zin egin	'ask' 'answer' 'mention' 'murmur' 'talk' 'shout' 'swear'
(d)	zaunka egin marmar egin	'bark' 'growl'	(e)	egon bizirik hilda	'be/stay' 'be alive' 'be dead'	(f)	hil ito hasi hobetu jaio esnatu	'die' 'drown' 'grow' 'improve' 'be born' 'wake up'
(g)	amaitu hasi	'end' 'begin'	(h)	agertu bihertu	'happen' 'become'	(i)	heldu atera joan etorri itzuli	'arrive' 'depart' 'go' 'come' 'return'

References

- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. Italian syntax: a government-binding approach. Dordrecht Holland: D. Reidel.
- Brettschneider, G. 1979. Typological characteristics of Basque ergativity. Towards a theory of grammatical relations. Academic Press.
- Centineo, Guilia. 1986. A lexical theory of auxiliary selection in Italian. Davis working papers in linguistics 1, 1- 35.
- Dowty, David. 1979. Word meaning and montage grammar. Dordrecht Holland: D. Reidel.
- Gereno, Xabier. 1976. Euskara ikasteko metodoa (Metodo de Euskara). CINSA
- Hale, K. & Keyser, S.J. 1991. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. ms. MIT.

- Laka, Itziar. 1993. Unergatives that assign ergative, unaccusatives that assign accusative. Unpublished ms. University of Rochester.
- Levin, Beth. 1983. On the nature of ergativity. Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge: MIT.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1978. Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. BLS 4: 157- 89
- Rebuschi, Georges. 1984. Structure De L'enonce En Basque. Publie' Ministere De L'Education Nationale
- Saltarelli, Mario. 1988. Basque (Croom-Helm Descriptive Grammar Series). London/New York/Sydney: Croom-Helm.
- Uribe-Etxebarria, M. 1989. Some notes on the structure of IP in Basque. ms. U of Conn, Storrs
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. 1977. Ergativity and the universality of subjects. Papers from the thirteenth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago: Chicago UP.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. 1987. The unaccusative hypothesis vs. lexical semantics: syntax vs semantic approaches to verb classification. NELS 17: 641-61.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. 1990. Semantic parameters of split intransitivity. Language 66:2, pp. 221-260.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. 1993. Advances in role and reference grammar . Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. Linguistics in philosophy. Ithica: Cornell UP.