

Governed Anaphors in Basque

Author(s): D. Azkarate, J. Ortiz de Urbina, and M. Saltarelli

Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1982), pp. 261-270

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.

Governed Anaphors in Basque

M. Azkarate, D. Farwell, J. Ortiz de Urbina and M. Saltarelli
University of Illinois

1. The pro-drop parameter in Basque

This paper deals with Basque syntax in relation to the concept of government (Chomsky 1981). It is shown that its typological characteristics observed in Inversion, Pro-drop, and Clitic Doubling suggest a core grammar in which argument bearing categories are ungoverned (in 'free' positions) and coindexed with a verb agreement system of argument-bound anaphors governed by V. This parametric option, it is claimed, defines Basque as non-configurational, i.e., as an Absolutive/Ergative language in which the Subject/Object asymmetry of Nominative/Accusative languages is not recognized.

In a recent paper we (Authors 1981) argued that the definition of pro-drop language is not generally characterized by a rule of syntax assigning the INFlectional constituent to the VP (Chomsky 1981, Chapt. 4). Such a rule is available as an option only in the grammar of languages like Italian. When the rule applies, it leaves the subject position free from its governing category. Thus, in such languages an empty category is an option in subject position, which defines the phenomena of subject Inversion and Pro-drop. In Basque the two phenomena obtain irrespective of the relational asymmetry between Subject and Object observed in accusative languages, as can be gleaned from the data in (1), illustrating Inversion, and (2) illustrating Pro-drop. If the question of focus or galdegaia is disregarded

- (1) zu-k Mikel-i e^gkutitza idatzi d-io-zu
you-E Michael-D the letter-A write 3sA-3sD-2sE
(you have written the letter to Michael)
- (2)(a) Mikel-i e^kkutitza idatzi d-io-zu
(b) eskutitza idatzi d-io-zu
(c) idatzi d-io-zu

for ease of exposition (but cf. Authors 1981, sect. 1,2), all permutations of the verb idatzi d-io-zu and the arguments zuk, Mikeli and eskutitza result in grammatical sentences. Likewise, in (2) it is shown that any or all of the arguments may be Pro-dropped. The extended pro-drop parameter just exemplified for Basque exceeds the characterization of pro-drop vs. non-pro-drop language proposed in view of languages like Italian vs. English, as the incorporation of an optional rule of syntax assigning INFL to VP. Any adequate government and binding theory of Basque must be rich enough to provide at S-structure a scenario where all major categories in maximal S (a) appear in

all possible permutations and (b) are ungoverned. Any hypothesis characterizing such a theory must insure that INFL is in \bar{V} and, at the same time, that no one of the major categories is in \bar{V} . One such viable theory for Basque would incorporate a (partially) unordered base roughly of the form (3).

- (3) (a) $\bar{S} : X^{n*} \bar{V}$
 (b) $\bar{V} \rightarrow e \bar{V}$ $e : \underline{\text{galdegaia}}$
 (c) $\bar{V} \rightarrow V$ INFL

2. Case marking and inflectional anaphors

Further insights into the government structure of Basque come from the binding relation between the morphological case marking system of nouns and pronouns (as well as adjectives and demonstratives) and the inflectional system of the verb. In addition to tense and aspect the verb in Basque agrees with its arguments via a case bound system of pronoun-like morphemes in portmanteau with the auxiliary verb, or with the main verb in synthetic constructions, as one can see at a glance in (4). In this example, for each argument in the sentence there is a

- (4) zu-k Mikel-i e \dot{s} kutitza idatzi d-io-zu
 you-E Michael-D letter-A write 3sA-3sD-2sE
 (you have written the letter to Michael)

corresponding marker which is part of the inflectional make up of the auxiliary. One can observe the antecedent-anaphor pair zu-k/zu for the ergative case marked argument 'you.' For the dative case marked argument 'to Michael' the pair is Mikel-i/io, and e \dot{s} kutitza/d is the antecedent-anaphor pair for the absolutive (zero case) argument 'the letter.'

The correlation between case markers, pronouns and inflectional anaphors can be more inclusively seen by comparing the synopses presented in (5). Basque, like many other languages, inflects nouns by suffixation. Of some fifteen different

- | | <u>A</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>E</u> | | | |
|----------------|-------------|----------|----------|-----------|----|-----------------|
| | \emptyset | -i | -k | | | |
| (5) (a) Nouns: | | | | Anaphors: | n- | -it- -t |
| (b) Pronouns: | 1s | ni | niri | nik | h- | -ik/in -k/n |
| | 2s | hi | zuri | hik | d- | -io \emptyset |
| | 3s | hura | hari | hark | g- | -igu -gu |
| | 1p | gu | guri | guk | z- | -izu -zu |
| | 2s | zu | zuei | zuek | z- | -izue -zue |
| | 2p | zuek | | zuek | d- | -ie -te |
| | 3p | haiek | haiei | haiek | | |

morphological cases, Basque nouns (5)(a), and pronouns (5)(b), may be inflected for the Absolutive, the unmarked or \emptyset case, for the Ergative -k and for the Dative -i, which signal roughly the semantic roles of experiencer/patient, actor/agent, and goal

respectively: the classic arguments of main verbs. In strict agreement with the case inflectional system of its arguments the verb is inflected for person, case (and number for the Absolutive). It is evident on inspection that the case inflectional system of verbs is cloned from pronouns(5)(b), with some expected accidents. This pronoun-derived system of inflectional morphemes is obligatory in Basque. Every argument in a main clause is doubled onto its inflection bearing auxiliary (or main verb for synthetic constructions) by a corresponding morpheme, which will be defined as its anaphor. It is not the case, however, that the converse is true: i.e., that each inflectional morpheme implies an argument. The system appears to have become grammaticized in that it is used for the strict subcategorization of its syntactic/morphological verb system. The linear order in which the three sets of inflectional anaphors (5)(b) may appear is strictly determined by the case they mark, namely A-D-E. There is one curious variation from this order in which the Ergative morpheme appears in first position (6)(a). This occurs in only one form: in the preterite with a third person absolutive marker exhibiting the pluralizing morpheme only (6)(a).

(6)(a) ni-k txoriak hil n-it-u-en
I-E birds-A kill 1sE-3pA-Root-pst
(I killed the birds)

(b) txori-e-k ni hil n-in-du-te-n
birds-E I-A kill 1sA-pst-Root-3pE-pst
(the birds killed me)

For expository purposes we shall be referring to the inflectional anaphors as part of the inflectional constituent in terms of the case-argument system of major categories to which they are bound and in the prevalent linear order in which they appear: A-D-E (7).

(7) VERB-A-D-E

From a cross-linguistic perspective the argument-anaphor doubling of Basque reminds us of Clitic Doubling in Portefiño Spanish (Jaeggli 1980) and Romanian (Steriade 1980). Basque and Romance are similar in that in both the anaphor is obligatory while the bounding argument may appear as an empty category. Doubling is however quite distinct in other significant respects. Morphologically the anaphors are clitics in Romance but inflectional suffixes in Basque. Syntactically, whereas in Romance doubling is restricted to object arguments, in Basque the phenomenon obtains regardless of the subject/object asymmetry. Inflectional anaphors offer then further evidence, along with Inversion and Pro-drop (Authors 1981), that in Basque the

relational categories of nominative/accusative languages are not recognized.

3. Cooccurrence restrictions on inflectional anaphors

We have shown, in the preceding section, that Basque nominal inflection exhibits a system of suffixes distinguishing an Absolutive case, which is phonologically unmarked, a Dative case (suffix -i), an Ergative case (suffix -k), and a dozen more (5). For the first three cases mentioned, the suffixation system is doubled onto the verb via a set of pronominal anaphors (cf. (5)(b) which appear in the inflectional constituent of the verb in the prevalent linear order A-D-E (cf. (7)). In this section we define the possible cooccurrences of the inflectional anaphors with respect to the verb. The possible cooccurrences of Verb+ A-D-E are displayed in (8). Examples of V+A-D+E are given in (9). A morphologically-based implicational statement of the anaphors is presented in (10).

- (8) (a) *V+ \emptyset
 (b) *V+E
 (c) *V+D
 (d) V+A
 (e) V+A-D
 (f) V+A-E
 (g) V+A-D-E
 (h) *V+D-E

- (9) (d) V+A hil d-a
 die 3sA-R (Root: izan 'be')
 (he has died)
- (e) V+A-D gustatzen n-a-tza-io
 like 1sA-prs-R-3sD (Root: izan 'be')
 (he likes me)
- (f) V+A-E hil d-u-gu
 kill 3sA-R-1pE (Root: ukan 'have')
 (we have killed him)
- (g) V+A-E-E idatzi d-io-zu
 write 3sA-3sD-2sE (Root: ukan 'have')
 (you have written it to him)

(10) [A < E, D]

One can see at a glance in (8) that of the eight possible combinations of anaphors which may be suffixed to the verb, given the linear order determined in (7), only four occur as actual sentences. It can be read in (8) that anaphors appear

obligatorily on the main/inflected verb. There is no main verb, in the morphologically understood sense, that may appear without at least one inflectional anaphor (cf. (8)(a)). Of the three types of anaphors considered only the one which marks the Absolutive case is a well-formed construction (cf. (8)(d) and its corresponding example (9)(d)). This class includes, apparently, verbs like hil 'die' which take an experiencer as an argument. The class of verbs defined by Perlmutter (1978) as the 'unaccusative' fall under this morphological subcategorization in Basque. It is also this class that selects izan 'be' rather than ukan 'have' as the inflectional auxiliary verb. The Absolutive marking anaphor may cooccur with the Dative marking anaphor, as illustrated in (9)(e). This construction, reminiscent of the Spanish construction me gusta 'I like it (it is pleasing to me)' often called the 'dative subject' construction in recent analyses of the Romance languages, falls under the Absolutive verb subcategorization as (9)(d) in that morphologically both take an Absolutive inflectional anaphor, syntactically both select the auxiliary izan, and semantically both accept an experiencer argument.

The remaining two inflectional patterns (9)(f,g), illustrated in (9), involve the cooccurrence of the Ergative case marking anaphor with the Absolutive anaphor (9)(f), as well as with the Dative (9)(g). The Ergative verb class involves morphologically the inflectional anaphor marking Ergative case, syntactically it selects the auxiliary verb ukan, and semantically accepts an agent/actor argument. One should note, in particular, that in this language 'transitivity' is signaled by the cooccurrence of the Absolutive and Ergative inflectional anaphors (cf. (9)(d) and (f)). The verb hil is intransitive ('die') or transitive ('kill') in conjunction with the cooccurrence of the Absolutive and Ergative inflectional anaphors. The sentence (9)(f) is equivalent to direct causative constructions such as E. John caused Bill to die or It. mi fai morire di paura 'you scare me to death' in which the causer and the causee are coreferential. The causative verb erazi in Basque is found in indirect causative constructions in which the causer and the causee are not coreferential: hil erazi d-io-gu 'we have had him killed.' In such sentences, the increased valency of the verb is reflected in the presence of the inflectional anaphors d- (3sA), -io- (3sE), -gu (1pE). The inflectional cooccurrence of anaphors in indirect causative constructions is, thus, the same as that of di-transitive constructions (9)(g), which represents the maximum valency that can be marked on a main/inflected verb. It follows from this that causative constructions with di-transitive lower verbs such as E. John caused Mary to write the letter to Peter which in Italian can only appear in Clause Union type constructions, i.e., It. (11)(b) Gianni fece scrivere la lettera a Piero da Maria, must be handled differently in Basque. In fact, in this language we find the equivalent di-transitive

Clause Union type causative construction in the form (11)(c), where the goal Peter is in a dependent clause with the verb eman. There is an interesting dialect variation with respect to (11)(a). For some speakers this sentence is not interpreted with the meaning "we have had him killed." For these speakers Clause Union types with erazi 'to cause' are limited to those cases in which the lexical valency of the main verb is not altered. In this strategy, in other words you cannot make an intransitive verb transitive nor a transitive di-transitive. Thus for this variety of Basque you can have a Clause Union type for the English equivalent of "John made Bill write a letter," but not for "John made Bill kill a bird," owing to the fact that 'write' is a three-place predicate and 'kill' is a two-place predicate.

(11)(a) hil erazi d-io-gu
 cause 3sA-3sD-lpE
 (we had him killed)

(b) abbiamo fatto scrivere la lettera a Piero da Maria
 have-lp cause write letter to by
 (we caused Mary to write the letter to Peter)

(c) Miren-i eskutitza idatzi arazi d-io-gu Pedror-i ema-teko
 Mary-D letter-A write cause 3sA-3sD-lpE Pedro-D give
 (we caused Mary to write the letter to Peter)

There is one final point which should be made regarding the cooccurrence restrictions on inflectional anaphors. They are statable by an implicational hierarchy based on the morphological case system which the inflectional anaphors reflect, as given in (10). It should be noted that the implicational cooccurrence properties of Absolutive, Ergative and Dative are independent of the linear order (cf.(7)) in which they appear in the inflectional constituent.

4. Bound and 'free' inflectional anaphors

In the preceding section 3. a statement of the cooccurrence properties of the anaphors displayed in (8)(b) with respect to the verb was presented in the form of the implicational case hierarchy (10). It was shown that they define a morphological system of verb subcategorization by virtue of their obligatory presence in surface structures. The case subcategorization, signaled by the inflectional anaphors, defines auxiliary selection and appears to indicate at first glance some properties of the thematic structure of the sentence.

In this section we consider the boundness properties of inflectional anaphors, i.e., the nature of the correlation between the occurrence of an inflectional anaphor and its

bounding argument. If we look at inflectional anaphors in a way parallel, but not identical, to Jaeggli's appraisal of clitic doubling in Porteño Spanish (Jaeggli 1980) it follows that for every argument noun phrase in a main clause (be it phonological or as PRO, morphologically marked Absolutive, Dative or Ergative) we should find a corresponding inflectional anaphor. This is indeed the case, as one can observe in (12)(d-g). The

- (12)(d) (Jon) hil d-a
 John-A 3sA
 (John has died)
- (e) (har-i)(ni) gustatzen n-a-tza-io
 him-D I-A 1sA 3sD
 (he likes me)
- (f) (gu-k)(hura) hil d-u-gu
 we-E he-A 3sA lpE
 (we have killed him)
- (g) (zu-k)(Miren-i)(e)skutitza idatzi d-io-zu
 you-E Mary-D letter-A 3sA-3sD-2sE
 (you have written the letter to Mary)

antecedent-anaphor cooccurrence between an argument and its bound inflectional anaphor is also defined by the case hierarchy (10). There are however constructions in which we find an inflectional anaphor with apparently a missing antecedent (13)(a) as well as constructions in which an argument does not appear, on inspection, to be doubled by an anaphor (13)(b,c).

- (13)(a) euria egin d-u-∅
 rain-A make 3sA-R-3sE Root: ukan 'have'
 (it has rained)
- (b) txoria Peru-k hil-a izan d-a
 bird-A Peter-E kill-A be 3sA-R Root: izan 'be'
 (the bird has been killed by Peter)
- (c) Jon e)skutitza idazten ari d-a
 John-A letter-A write 'be' 3sA-R Root: izan 'be'
 (John is writing the letter)

The first example concerns meteorological verbs such as euria egin du 'it has rained' (13)(a), as well as elurra egin du 'it has snowed' and the like. In these constructions we find an Absolutive-Ergative cooccurrence of inflectional anaphors (cf. (8)(f) but only one antecedent bounding the Absolutive anaphor. The question is the following: is the Ergative anaphor argument 'free' or is it bound by PRO? If the latter is the

hypothesis, PRO in meteorological verbs must be assigned properties distinct from those of PRO alternating with phonological lexical matrices. The other hypothesis available is that the Ergative inflectional anaphor is 'free,' that is not bound by an antecedent. The latter analysis requires that anaphors be base-generated. Note further, in relation to the meteorological construction illustrated in (13)(a), that euria, the noun phrase which we assumed to be the antecedent of Absolutive anaphor d-, behaves syntactically differently from other noun phrases with argument bound inflectional anaphors. Whereas all three major arguments of inflected/main verbs can generally be prodropped and/or inverted in Basque (as shown in section 1. and in Authors 1981), euria cannot be subjected to either of the characteristics of the pro-drop parameter. Neither egin du euria nor egin du are well formed constructions which correspond to (13)(a). One analysis that comes to mind as the usual dictionary entry for this verb is that euria is in fact part of the verb and not the Absolutive antecedent of the inflectional anaphor -d. Under this intuitively plausible hypothesis neither one of the inflectional anaphors in (13)(a) would have a bounding argument of the more observable pro-drop variety, thus lending more credibility that the anaphors in meteorological verbs are argument 'free.' It should be noted that lexically complex verbs like euria egin 'to rain' are not limited to meteorological verbs. A long list of the class defined by Perlmutter (1978) as 'unergative' verbs are lexically complex in Basque. Such list includes verbs like 'to work' lan egin, 'to run' korri egin, and many others. Under the complex verb analysis the Absolutive anaphor would be 'free' in this instance as well.

A syntactically more prominent violation of the antecedent-anaphor relation embodied in the case hierarchy (13) is apparent in (13)(b) and (13)(c). The first example, txoria Peruk hila izan da 'the bird has been killed by Peter' shows two arguments, an Absolutive txoria and an Ergative Peruk, but only one anaphor, the Absolutive inflectional suffix d-. The question is the following: why is the Ergative argument Peruk not doubled as an inflectional anaphor? An appealing solution is available if one considers constructions such as (13)(a) as passives, in the sense established for accusative languages like English. The Basque construction exhibits in fact izan 'be' as main verb. More interestingly, from a relational grammar point of view (Postal, P. 1976), Peruk would represent a demoted non-term, a chomeur. Consequently, one can argue, it would not play a role in the surface syntax of these constructions. Another analysis is however available which is internal to the structure of Basque. There is evidence that in this type of sentences Peruk hila functions as a sort of adjectival phrase with respect to txoria, hence the Absolutive nominal case marker -a suffixed on hil-a. Consequently Peruk is an argument of hil, which not being a main verb is not inflected

and therefore does not carry a suffixed anaphor. txoria on the other hand is the one, and only one, argument of the main verb izan. Hence, only one Absolutive inflectional anaphor is doubled on the auxiliary d-a. The latter adjective phrase hypothesis likens sentences of the type (13)(b) to copulative constructions already existing in the language. Positing a passive analysis for Basque requires independent proof.

The last aberrant example with respect to the uniqueness relation between an inflectional anaphor and its antecedent is given in (13)(c), the so-called 'continuous' or ari construction. In contrast with (13)(b), we find in (13)(c) two Absolutive arguments Jon and eskutitza but only one inflectional anaphor d-. Following the accusative-language type of reasoning entertained in relation to the previous construction, it has been suggested (Postal 1976) that the continuous construction is itself a detransitive structure where ari functions like izan in so-called passive constructions like (13)(b), above. Thus, a relationally-based hypothesis would posit that eskutitza is a demoted non-term or chômeur via a more properly termed anti-passive process. Consequently, eskutitza is not doubled as an anaphor on the main verb inflection. A language internal analysis for this aberrant type of antecedent-anaphor is not readily available.

Following the reasoning invoked in the putative passive case (13)(b) it can be established that all permutations of the arguments with the verb are possible. Evidence from negative formation also shows that either ari or idazten may function as a main verb. idazten is in these constructions analyzed as a nominal in the inessive case. Comparative evidence shows that eskutitza is eskutitza-ren in such constructions in the northern dialects. -ren, the genitive case, does not double onto the inflection of the verb. If the same structure can be assumed for the southern dialects the apparent argument-anaphor aberration in continuous constructions would have a language internal explanation.

5. Summary and conclusions

In summary, we have shown that the phenomenon of inflectional anaphor doubling, along with Inversion (free word order) and Pro-drop (the possibility of null categories) in Basque fall under an organizational principle subsumed under the concept of governed/ungoverned category. In this ergative language all arguments are ungoverned but in a binding relation with their anaphors which are all governed by the verb. In this syntactic scenario configurations can play no role. Hence, the asymmetry between subject (i.e., governed by inflection) and object (i.e., governed by the verb) restricting syntactic phenomena in configurational languages like English and Italian is not recognized in Basque.

References

- Azkarate, M., D. Farwell, J. Ortiz de Urbina, and M. Saltarelli (1981) "Word Order and WH-movement in Basque," in Proceedings of the 12th Annual Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistics Society (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Chomsky, N. (1981) Lectures on Government and Binding. Foris Publications: Amsterdam.
- Jaeggli, O. (1980) On Some Phonologically-Null Elements in Syntax. Unpublished MIT PhD Dissertation.
- Perlmutter, D. (1978) "Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis," in the Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (Berkeley, California).
- Postal, P. (1976) "The Antipassive in French." Unpublished manuscript.
- Steriade, D. (1980) "Clitic Doubling in the Roumanian WH Constructions and the Analysis of Topicalization," Unpublished manuscript.