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Distinguishing Agreement and Clitic-Doubling by Their Failures

Basque morphology once more

(1) Guraso-e-k parent(s)-ARTpl-ERG niri me.DAT belarritako ederr-ak beautiful-ARTpl(ABS) erosi bought earring(s)

[(Basque)]

‘(My) parents have bought me beautiful earrings.’

[Laka 2005]

- the Basque auxiliary carries agreement-morphemes corresponding to each Case-marked noun-phrase in the clause
  o absolutive (ABS)
  o ergative (ERG)
  o dative (DAT)

Basque morphology once more

- if the clause has noun-phrases with some, but not all, of these Case-markings, the auxiliary might bear fewer agreement-morphemes:

(2) Gu we(ABS) amama-ri grandmother-DAT joi gone

‘We have gone to (our) grandmother.’

Basque morphology once more

Recall:
- Bobaljik (2008): you shouldn’t be able to target only ERGATIVE noun-phrases, or only DATIVE ones
  o now, strictly speaking, this is not the state of affairs in Basque
    - ABSOLUTIVE noun-phrases are also targeted
  ➤ BUT NOTICE: the ERGATIVE and/or DATIVE agreement morphemes are separate agreement-morphemes from the ABSOLUTIVE ones
    - i.e., it’s not that there is a single agreement-morpheme that can target either ABSOLUTIVE, ERGATIVE, or DATIVE noun-phrases
  o rather, there are separate agreement-morphemes, each of which targets only one kind of noun-phrase
Basque morphology once more

⇒ focusing on each agreement-morpheme on its own:
  ◦ the ERGATIVE and DATIVE ones constitute violations of Bobaljik’s typological
generalizations . . .
  ◦ . . . unless they are not the result of $\phi$-agreement at all

Apparent Long-Distance Agreement in “substandard” Basque

Etxepare (2006):

(3) a. Uko
egin
i-
$\phi$-
3pl.DAT
$\phi$
refusal(ABS) done 3.ABS- have- sg.ABS-
[[ agindu horiek ]]
[DP$_T$ bete-tze-a-ri ]$_{DP_C}$.
order(s) those$_{ABS}$ obey-NMZ-ART-DAT

‘He or she has refused to obey those orders.’
(subject is [pro-3sg.ERG])

b. Muzin
egin
i-
$\phi$-
3pl.DAT
frown(ABS) done 3.ABS- have- sg.ABS-
[[ horrelako liburu-ak ]]
[DP$_T$ argitara-tze-a-ri ]$_{DP_C}$.
such book(s)-ART$_{ABS}$ publish-NMZ-ART-DAT

‘He or she has frowned on publishing such books.’
(subject is [pro-3sg.ERG])

(4) STRUCTURAL DESCRIPTION

[[[[DP$_T$ V$_0$]-tze-a ]$_{DP_C}$ V$_0$]$_{VP}$ . . . aux]$_{auxP}$

- I will refer to this construction as the Case-marked construction

Apparent Long-Distance Agreement in “substandard” Basque

Labels:

- DP$_T$ the noun-phrase whose plurality determines the plural morphology
  on the auxiliary
- DP$_C$ the entire nominalized embedded clause—incl. the article (/-a/), plus
  appropriate Case-marking

- In (3a–b): the agreement-morpheme whose plurality is determined by DP$_T$ is the DAT
  one
  - corresponding to the Case-marking on DP$_C$ (which is DAT), not DP$_T$ (which is ABS)

- These two Case-markings can be the same, of course:

(5) [[ Nobela _erromantiko-ak] [DP$_T$ irakur-tze-a ]$_{DP_C}$ gustaizen
novel(s) romantic-ART$_{ABS}$ read-NMZ-ART(ABS) like(HAB)

$\phi$
- zai-
- 2pl
- 3.ABS- be-
- [DP$_C$ 3sg.DAT

‘He or she likes to read romantic novels.’
(subject is [pro-3sg.DAT])
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Apparent Long-Distance Agreement in “substandard” Basque

- ϕ-feature asymmetry (in the Case-marked construction): number ✔ person ✗


‘They have refused to invite you.’

(subject is [pro-3pl.ERG])

[Etxepare 2006:(117b)]

➢ in case you were wondering — the ungrammaticality of (6) is not a Person-Case Constraint (PCC) effect
  ○ za-it-u-zte is a possible auxiliary form in Basque
    – it simply cannot be used in (6)
  ○ PCC effects in Basque are restricted to combinations involving DAT agreement-morphemes
    (Béjar and Rezac 2003, Laka 2005, Rezac 2004, 2008a, a.o.)

Apparent Long-Distance Agreement in “substandard” Basque


stone(s) those₃pl(ABS) lift-NMZ-LOC attempt

d- (it) u- zte
3.ABS- pl.ABS- have- 3pl.ERG

‘They have attempted to lift those stones.’

(subject is [pro-3pl.ERG])

[Etxepare 2006:(85a)]


song(s) those₃pl(ABS) sing-NMZ-LOC heard

d- i- (zk) o- t.
3.ABS- have- pl.ABS- 3sg.DAT- 1sg.ERG

‘I have heard/listened to Jon singing those songs.’

(subject is [pro-1sg.ERG])

[Etxepare 2006:(88a)]

(8) STRUCTURAL DESCRIPTION

[[[[DPₜ V₀]-tze-n ]PP V₀ [V₀]VP ... aux]auxP

I will refer to this construction as the adpositional construction

Apparent Long-Distance Agreement in “substandard” Basque

- asymmetry in possible Case of target DPs: ABS ✔ DAT ✗
  (in the adpositional construction)


order(s)-ART₃pl-DAT attention pay-NMZ-LOC try

nin- tzaí φ- e- n.
1.ABS- be- sg.ABS- 3pl.DAT- PAST

‘I tried to pay attention to the orders.’

(subject is [pro-1sg.ABS])
Analyzing the Two Constructions

Distinctive property of the Case-marked construction:

- the appearance of the article on the nominalized embedded clause

(10) MORPHOLOGY OF THE BASQUE ARTICLE

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{sg.} & -a \\
\text{pl.} & -ak \\
\end{array}
\]

⇒ Trask (2003): two independent morphemes

I. invariant /-a/

II. number-dependent morphology: 

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{sg.} & \phi \\
\text{pl.} & -k/ \\
\end{array}
\]

Analyzing the Two Constructions

⇒ general structure of the Basque noun-phrase (Etxeberria 2005):

(11) 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{NumP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{Num}^0 \\
\end{array}
\]

- D^0 enters the derivation with an unvalued number feature ([NUM=–])
- it probes for a valued number feature, to establish \( \phi \)-agreement and value itself
  - it finds one on \( \text{Num}^0 \)
  - the two heads are in an immediate c-command relation
  ⇒ \( \text{Num}^0 \)-to-D^0 head-movement is triggered
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Analyzing the Two Constructions

- the Num° morpheme fuses to the D° morpheme, creating “the article”: /-a(k)/
  - In the Case-marked construction: there is never /-ak/ on those nominalized clauses that exhibit LDA-like effects (i.e., on DP_C)
    - only /-a/, plus whatever Case-morphology is appropriate
  \[ \Rightarrow \] suggesting: D_C° selects nP (the phrase headed by /-tze/) directly
    - rather than selecting a NumP

(12) EMBEDDED STRUCTURE IN THE CASE-MARKED CONSTRUCTION

```
  DP_C
  \         \n  nP  D_C°      
  \         
  n°  -a        
    \   \n    tze
```

By hypothesis, D_C° carries an unvalued number feature, [NUM=\_] (as any other D° would)
- as usual, [NUM=\_] looks for a valued counterpart with which to establish an \( \varphi \)-agreement relation
  - no valued number feature on the complement of D_C°
  - closest valued number feature: on DP_T (the argument of the embedded verb)
Analyzing the Two Constructions

(14) $D_C^0$ PROBES (IN THE CASE-MARKED CONSTRUCTION)

- in (14): there are intervening heads between $D_C^0$ and $D_T^0$
  ⇒ head-movement of the kind in (11) cannot arise here (it would violate the
  Head-Movement Constraint; Travis 1984)
- apparent LDA in the Case-marked construction is comprised of 2 separate relations,
  “stacked” on top of one another:
  I. $\phi$-agreement between $D_C^0$ and $D_T^0$
  II. the relation between the auxiliary and $D_C^0$
- $D_C$ occupies a canonical argument position
  ⇒ the agreement-morpheme corresponding to $D_C^0$’s Case-marking will reflect the
  number feature that has been transmitted from $D_T$ to $D_C^0$
- no evidence of person-features on the Basque $D^0$ ⇒ no analogous mechanism for person
  ⇒ the lack of comparable LDA-like effects in person-features follows
Analyzing the Two Constructions

- In the adpositional construction, the nominalized clause (i.e., the nP headed by the nominalizer, [-tze]₀) is not selected by the article
  - rather, it is selected by the adposition [-n]₀ directly (Laka 2006a,b)
- Recall (7a), repeated here:

\[
\text{(7) a. } [\text{Harri stone(s)}]_{\text{DP}} \text{ lift-NMZ-LOC attempt} \quad \text{[Etxepare 2006:(85a)]}
\]

"They have attempted to lift those stones.'

(7) a. [[ Harri horiek ]\text{DP}_{\text{t}} altxa-tze-n ] probatu d- u- zte.
3.ABS- [pl.ABS] have- 3pl.ERG

⇒ the adpositional construction can be handled in terms of a direct relation between the upstairs auxiliary and an argument of the embedded verb:

\[
\text{(15) EMBEDDED STRUCTURE IN THE ADPOSITIONAL CONSTRUCTION}
\]

- in (15), there is no locality boundary (DP, CP, or vP) between the auxiliary and DPₜ
  ⇒ the relation between the two is on a par with agreement in the English expletive-associate construction, in terms of locality:

\[
\text{(16) there were likely } [ \text{to appear} ] [ \text{to be arrested } [ \text{DP three men} ] ]
\]

A further prediction:
- Recall; in the Case-marked construction, apparent LDA is comprised of 2 separate relations, “stacked” on top of one another:
  I. \( \varphi \)-agreement between \( D^0_C \) and DPₜ
  II. the relation between the auxiliary and \( D^0_C \)
    - [NUM=\_] on \( D^0_C \) facilitates transmission of number features from DPₜ to the auxiliary
Analyzing the Two Constructions

➢ In the account of the *adpositional construction*, there is no comparable “intermediary”
   o the upstairs auxiliary agrees with DP$_T$ directly
   ⇒ the auxiliary should be able to reflect the *person*-features of DP$_T$, as well as its *number* features
   o this is borne out:

     me(ABS) lift-NMZ-LOC attempt 1.ABS- sg.ABS- have- 3pl.ERG
     ‘They attempted to lift me.’
     (subject is [pro-3pl.ERG])

$q\phi$-agreement vs. Clitic-Doubling in the Adpositional Construction

**PROPOSED DIAGNOSTIC**

(18) Given a scenario where the relation $R$ between an agreement-morpheme $M$ and target noun-phrase $F$ is broken, but the result is still a grammatical utterance:
   a. $M$ shows up with default $q\phi$-features (rather than the features of $F$) $\implies R$ is $q\phi$-agreement
   b. $M$ disappears entirely $\implies R$ is clitic-doubling

$q\phi$-agreement vs. Clitic-Doubling in the Adpositional Construction

- We have already seen: the *adpositional construction* can target an ABS DP$_T$, but not a DAT one

(7) a. [[ Harri horiek ]$_{DP_T}$ altxa-tze-n ] probatu
     stone(s) those$_{pl}(ABS)$ lift-NMZ-LOC attempt
d- [it] u- zte.
     3.ABS- [pl.ABS] have- 3pl.ERG
     ‘They have attempted to lift those stones.’
     (subject is [pro-3pl.ERG])

(9) * [[ Agindu-e-i ]$_{DP_T}$ kasu egi-te-n ] saiatu
    order(s)-ART$_{pl}$-DAT attention pay-NMZ-LOC try
    nin- tza- φ- e- n.
    1.ABS- be- sg.ABS- 3pl.DAT- PAST
    ‘I tried to pay attention to the orders.’
    (subject is [pro-1sg.ABS])
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• Using an auxiliary whose DAT agreement-morpheme reflects default features (i.e., 3rd-person singular)—rather than the features of the DAT DP_T—does not salvage (9):

\[(19) \* \begin{array}{c}
\text{Agindu-e-i} \\
\text{order(s)-ART_T-DAT} \\
\text{attention pay-NMZ-LOC try}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{nin-} \\
\text{tzaï-} \\
\text{1.sg.ABS- be-} \\
\text{3sg.DAT- PAST}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{kasu} \\
\text{egi-te-n} \\
\text{saiatu}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{past} \\
\text{'I tried to pay attention to the orders.'}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(subject is } [\text{pro-1sg.ABS}])
\end{array}
\]

Crucially, however, using an auxiliary that lacks a DAT agreement-morpheme altogether (i.e., an auxiliary that carries only ABS agreement-morphemes) renders the sentence grammatical:

\[(20) \begin{array}{c}
\text{Agindu-e-i} \\
\text{order(s)-ART_T-DAT} \\
\text{attention pay-NMZ-LOC try}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{nin-} \\
\text{tzaï-} \\
\text{1.sg.ABS- be-} \\
\text{PAST}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{kasu} \\
\text{egi-te-n} \\
\text{saiatu}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{past} \\
\text{'I tried to pay attention to the orders.'}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(subject is } [\text{pro-1sg.ABS}])
\end{array}
\]

• In other words, according to the proposed diagnostic:

the relation between the DAT agreement-morpheme and the DAT noun-phrase behaves as a clitic-doubling relation

Recall that clitic-doubling is expected to adhere to the clause-mate restriction:

looking again at the ungrammaticality of (9), it appears that something like the clause-mate restriction is indeed operative:

\[(9) \* \begin{array}{c}
\text{Agindu-e-i} \\
\text{order(s)-ART_T-DAT} \\
\text{attention pay-NMZ-LOC try}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{nin-} \\
\text{tzaï-} \\
\text{1.sg.ABS- be-} \\
\text{3pl.DAT- PAST}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{kasu} \\
\text{egi-te-n} \\
\text{saiatu}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{past} \\
\text{'I tried to pay attention to the orders.'}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(subject is } [\text{pro-1sg.ABS}])
\end{array}
\]
By the same logic: unlike their DAT counterparts, ABS agreement-morphemes cannot be the result of clitic-doubling because ABS agreement-morphemes in the adpositional construction are able to reflect the ϕ-features of an ABS DP_T located in the embedded clause—as in (7a), repeated here:

(7) a. \([\text{Harri horiek}]_\text{DP}_T\) \text{altxa-tze-n} probatu\[stone(s) those_{pl}(ABS)\] lift-NMZ-LOC attempt \(d\)  \(it\) \(u\)zte.\[3.ABS-\text{pl.ABS} \ have-3pl.ERG\]

‘They have attempted to lift those stones.’

Consider ditransitive constructions in Basque—for example, (1), repeated here:

(1) \([\text{Guraso-e-k}]_\text{niri}\) \text{berritaroko ederr-ak}\[parent(s)-ART_{pl}-ERG me.DAT\] \text{bought}\(\text{[belarritako ederr-ak]}\) earring(s) \text{beautiful-ART}_{pl}(ABS)\(d\)  \(i\) \(zki\) \(da\)\[3.ABS-\text{have}-\text{pl.ABS} - 1sg.DAT- 3pl.ERG\]

‘(My) parents have bought me beautiful earrings.’

Elordieta (2001), a.o.; the DAT argument of Basque ditransitives is higher than the ABS one

⇒ one might expect the DAT argument to intervene (contrary to fact):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{auxP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{DAT-DP} \\
\text{ABS-DP} \\
\text{V}^0
\end{array}
\]

\(\text{(ϕ-agreement blocked by intervention)}\)
Ditransitive Verb-Phrases and Defective Intervention

- As (1) clearly shows, such intervention does not arise, ...
- ... but recall:
  - clitic-doubling of a DP has been cross-linguistically found to obviate subsequent intervention effects by that DP (Anagnostopoulou 2003)
  - and, the DAT agreement-morpheme—which the auxiliary in (1) does carry—comes about via clitic-doubling

⇒ in an example like (1), one would in fact predict that no intervention effects would arise
- because clitic-doubling has rendered the full DAT noun-phrase incapable of intervening

Ditransitive Verb-Phrases and Defective Intervention

(22)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{auxP} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{[DAT-DP}_{\text{DP}}^{\text{v}}] \\
\text{ABS-DP} \\
\text{V}_{0}^{\text{abs}} \\
\end{array}
\]

\text{clitic-doubling (no longer blocked)}

Ditransitive Verb-Phrases and Defective Intervention

- However: we have already seen a situation that would be analyzed—given the current proposal—as an instance of failed clitic-doubling of the DAT noun-phrase
  - namely, when the DAT noun-phrase is contained within the embedded clause in the adpositional construction
- and one can, in fact, select a ditransitive predicate as the embedded verb in the adpositional construction:

(23) 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[Lankide-e-i]}_{\text{DP}}^{\text{DP}}_{1} \\
\text{[liburu horieik]}_{\text{DP}}^{\text{DP}}_{2} \\
\text{irakur-tze-n} \\
\text{read-3pl} \\
\text{probatu} \\
\text{attempt} \\
\text{subject is [pro-3pl.ERG]} \\
\end{array}
\]

They have attempted to read those books to the colleagues.

- in (23), there is no DAT agreement-morpheme on the matrix auxiliary
  - on the current proposal, this is expected — since the DAT DP$_1$ and the matrix auxiliary are not clause-mates
Ditransitive Verb-Phrases and Defective Intervention

Crucially, as (23) demonstrates, this blocks the relation between the auxiliary and the ABS DP$_T$

(23) [[ Lankide-e-i ]$_{DP_T}$ [ liburu horiek ]$_{DP_T}$ irakur-tze-n ] probatu
colleague(s)-ART$_{pl}$-DAT book(s) those$_{pl}$ABS read-NMZ-LOC attempt
d- [φ/*it]- u- (z)te.
3.ABS- sg.ABS/*p.ABS- have- 3pl.ERG
‘They have attempted to read those books to the colleagues.’
(subject is [pro-3pl.ERG])

- the ABS agreement-morphemes on the matrix auxiliary in (23) can only reflect default features (i.e., 3rd-person singular), not the $\phi$-features of DP$_T$
Ditransitive Verb-Phrases and Defective Intervention

- While the ABS agreement-morphemes in (23) must reflect default ϕ-features (i.e., 3rd-person singular), they cannot be omitted
  - In other words, according to the **proposed diagnostic**:
    
    the relation between the ABS agreement-morpheme and the ABS noun-phrase behaves as a ϕ-agreement relation

- Further support for viewing the effect in (23) as syntactic intervention per se:
  - not just any left-peripheral constituent disrupts the relation between the ABS agreement-morphemes and the ABS noun-phrase (Etxepare 2006)

(26)  

| Miren-entzat  | harri horiekb | altxa-tze-n | probatu |
| Miren-BEN    | stone(s) those₃ABS | lift-NMZ-LOC attempt |
| d- (i)       | u- zte.       |
| 3.ABS- [pl.ABS- have- 3pl.ERG |

‘They have attempted to lift those stones for Miren.’
(subject is [pro-3pl.ERG])

⇒ the support that (23) (repeated above) provides for the proposal is twofold:
  
  I. the operation that generates ABS agreement-morphology is subject to intervention
  II. DAT agreement-morphology behaves in a way typical of clitic-doubling
    - when it is absent (e.g., in (23)): the DAT-DP intervenes
    - when it is present (e.g., in the “simple” ditransitive in (1)): the DAT-DP doesn’t intervene
Ditransitive Verb-Phrases and Defective Intervention

 NOTES:

I. intervention by the DAT DP also rules out an account of DAT agreement-morphology in terms of the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis (Jelinek 1984)

II. the DAT DP behaves as a true defective intervener
   - I have been referring to the probe as the “ABS agreement-morpheme(s)”
     - this presupposes that it can only target ABS DPs
   - in (23), the DAT intervener is a plural DP (lankide-e-i ‘colleague(s)-ARTpl-DAT’)

(23) [[ Lankide-e-i ]DP1 [ liburu horiek ]VP irakur-tze-n ] probatu
    colleague(s)-ARTpl-DAT book(s) thosepl(ABS) read-NMZ-LOC attempt
d- [p/it] u- (z)te.
3.ABS- sg.ABS/*pl.ABS- have- 3pl.ERG
'They have attempted to read those books to the colleagues.'
(subject is [pro-3pl.ERG])
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(27) SCHEMATIZATION: TRANSMISSION OF FEATURES FROM INTERVENER, INSTEAD OF FROM DP_I
(unattested)
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Ditransitive Verb-Phrases and Defective Intervention

• ... but the features on the DAT DP cannot value their counterparts on the probe
  o as (23), repeated here, demonstrates:

(23) \[ \text{Lankide-e-i } \text{DP}_1 \quad \text{liburu horiek } \text{DP}_2 \quad \text{probatu}\]
  colleague(s)-ARTpl-DAT book(s) those pl ABS read-NMZ-LOC attempt
  d- \( \phi/*it \) u- \( z \)te.
  3.ABS- \( \phi/sg.ABS/*pLABS \)- have- 3pl.ERG

‘They have attempted to read those books to the colleagues.’
(subject is \([pro-3pl.ERG]\))

⇒ the term “ABS agreement-morpheme(s)” is therefore justified:
  o the \( \phi \)-agreement operation that gives rise to these morphemes can only value the
    features on the probe using ABS noun-phrases, not DAT ones
  • as will be shown shortly, this restriction is not specific to the \( \phi \)-agreement operation
    that gives rise to ABS agreement-morphemes
  o rather, it’s a general property of \( \phi \)-agreement in Basque

Interim summary:
• We’ve seen converging evidence that...
  o the relation that generates the DAT agreement-morpheme \( \equiv \) clitic-doubling
  o the relation that generates the ABS agreement-morphemes \( \equiv \) \( \phi \)-agreement

• sources of evidence:
  I. the different locality restrictions that apply to the two relations
  II. the susceptibility of the ABS-relation to intervention
  III. the defective nature of these intervention effects
     o i.e., the failure of DAT interveners to transmit their own features to the probing head
  IV. the expected distinction between intervening DP arguments and intervening PP adjuncts
  V. the fact that the presence of DAT agreement-morphemes obviates intervention by
    the DAT DP (as one would expect of clitic-doubling)

⇒ This, in turn, supports the reliability of the proposed diagnostic:

**PROPOSED DIAGNOSTIC**

(18) Given a scenario where the relation \( R \) between an agreement-morpheme \( M \) and target
    noun-phrase \( F \) is broken, but the result is still a grammatical utterance:
    a. \( M \) shows up with default \( \phi \)-features (rather than the features of \( F \)) \( \implies R \) is
       \( \phi \)-agreement
    b. \( M \) disappears entirely \( \implies R \) is clitic-doubling

  o since its verdicts regarding ABS agreement-morphology and DAT
    agreement-morphology, respectively, line up with these results
\( \varphi \) -agreement in the Case-Marked Construction

- Recall (3a), repeated here:

\[
(3) \quad \text{a. Uko ŭagindu horiek bête-tze-\text{a-ri } \text{DP}_C \text{ order(s) those}_\text{pl}(\text{ABS}) \text{ obey-\text{NMZ-ART-DAT}}}
\]

\’He or she has refused to obey those orders.’

(subject is \([\text{pro-3sg.\text{ERG}}]\))

- the plurality of the DAT agreement-morpheme in (3a) is determined by the plurality of the ABS DP\(_T\), within the DAT DP\(_C\).

- RECALL: this comes about by virtue of two separate relations, "stacked" on top of one another

  I. the relation between the auxiliary and DP\(_C\)
      - the precise nature of this relation depends, of course, on the Case of DP\(_C\)
  
  II. the relation between D\(_0\)\(_C\) (the article heading the nominalized clause) and DP\(_T\)

\( \varphi \) -agreement in the Case-Marked Construction

- the latter involves valuation of the number features on D\(_0\)\(_C\)

\[ \Rightarrow \text{it is necessarily an } \varphi \text{-agreement relation:} \]

(28) SCHEMATIZATION: \( \varphi \)-AGREEMENT RELATION BETWEEN D\(_0\)\(_C\) AND DP\(_T\)

\[ \Rightarrow \text{the relation in (28) should be susceptible to intervention effects} \]
\( \varphi \)-agreement in the Case-Marked Construction

- As mentioned earlier, the DAT argument in Basque ditransitives occupies a structurally higher position than the ABS argument (Elordieta 2001, a.o.)
  \[ \rightarrow \text{given a ditransitive embedded within the Case-marked construction, one would expect the relation between D}_C^0 \text{ and } D_P^T \text{ to be disrupted:} \]

\[ \text{(29) SCHEMATIZATION: INTERVENING DATIVE DP DISRUPTING } \varphi \text{-AGREEMENT BETWEEN } D_C^0 \text{ AND } D_P^T \]

\[ \varphi \text{-agreement blocked by intervention} \]

\[ \text{DP}_C \]

\[ \text{VP} \]

\[ \text{DAT-DP}_T \]

\[ \text{ABS-DP}_T \]

\[ V^0 \]

\[ n^0 \]

\[ nP \]

\[ D_0^C \]

\[ \text{DP}_C \text{ disrupts } \varphi \text{-agreement between } D_0^C \text{ and } D_P^T \]
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\( \varphi \)-agreement in the Case-Marked Construction

- This prediction is borne out:

\[ \text{(30) Uko } \text{egin } d- i- \phi \text{-3sg.ABS-have-3sg.DAT/*3pl.DAT-3sg.ERG} \]

\[ || \text{lankide-a-ri } \text{DP}_T \text{ have-3sg.DAT/*3pl.DAT-3sg.ERG} \]

\[ || \text{lankide-a-ri } \text{liburu horiek } \text{DP}_T \text{ book(s) thosepl.ABS} \]

\[ \text{irakur-tze-a-ri } \text{DP}_C \text{ read-NMZ-ART-DAT} \]

\[ \text{‘He or she has refused to read those books to the colleague.’} \]

\[ \text{(subject is [pro-3sg.ERG])} \]

- In (30), the DAT agreement-morpheme is present but singular
  - as opposed to being entirely absent, as in the examples discussed earlier

- This is entirely expected:
  - it is not the relation between the DAT agreement-morpheme and the DAT DP\(_C\) which breaks down in (30):
    - the auxiliary and DP\(_C\) are in a clause-mate relation
\(\phi\)-agreement in the Case-Marked Construction

- The relation that breaks down in (30)—owing to intervention by the DAT DP1—is the relation between \(D^0_C\) and DP_T
  - as argued above, this relation is \(\phi\)-agreement
  \[\Rightarrow\ D^0_C\ will\ retain\ its\ default\ number\-features\]
- the subsequent clitic-doubling of \(DP_C\) goes through unhindered
  \[\Rightarrow\ resulting\ in\ the\ creation\ of\ a\ clitic\ reflecting\ those\ (default)\ \(\phi\)-features\ found\ on\ \(D(P)_C\)
- thus, according to the proposed diagnostic:

\begin{center}
instances of intervention of the kind exemplified in (30) will give rise to a DAT agreement-morpheme bearing default features—rather than the wholesale absence of a DAT agreement-morpheme
\end{center}

(and this is exactly what one observes in examples like (30))

\(\phi\)-agreement in the Case-Marked Construction

- Just as before, with the adpositional construction, further support for viewing the effect in (30) as syntactic intervention per se:
  - not just any left-peripheral constituent disrupts the relation between \(D^0_C\) the ABS noun-phrase (Etxepare 2006)

  Jon-ERG Miren-BEN [thing(s) old-ART_pl(ABS) discard-NMZ-ART(ABS)]
  pentatu d- [i]- u- \(\phi\).
  plan 3.ABS- [PL.ABS] have- 3sg.ERG

'Jon has planned to discard the old things for Miren.'

\(\phi\)-agreement in the Case-Marked Construction

- as with the adpositional construction, the DAT DP behaves as a true defective intervener
  - in (32), below, the DAT intervener is a plural DP (lankide-e-i ‘colleague(s)-ART_pl-DAT’)
  - … but its \([\text{NUM}=\text{pl}]\) cannot be transmitted to the probe:

  [colleague(s)-ART_pl-DAT] book(s) those_pl(ABS) read-NMZ-ART(ABS)
  gustatzen \(\phi\)- zai- (\(\phi*/\text{zki}\))- o.
  like(HAB) 3.ABS- be- 3sg.ABS*/[PL.ABS] 3sg.DAT

'He or she likes to read those books to the colleagues.'

(subject is [pro-3sg.DAT])
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\( \text{\( \varphi \)-agreement in the Case-Marked Construction} \)

- We therefore have converging evidence that \( \varphi \)-agreement in Basque can only value the features on the probe using ABS noun-phrases, not DAT ones
  - I. from \( \varphi \)-agreement between the so-called “ABS agreement-morpheme(s)” on the auxiliary and the ABS noun-phrase, in the \( \text{adpositional construction} \)
    - where DAT noun-phrases can intervene, but not value the features on the probe
  - II. from \( \varphi \)-agreement between \( \text{D}^0_C \) and \( \text{DP}_T \), in the \( \text{Case-marked construction} \)
    - idem

Interim summary:
- the relation between \( \text{D}^0_C \) and \( \text{DP}_T \) is an \( \varphi \)-agreement relation
- sources of evidence:
  - I. the susceptibility of this relation to intervention (as one would expect of \( \varphi \)-agreement)
  - II. the defective nature of these intervention effects
    - i.e., the failure of DAT interveners to transmit their own features to the probing head
  - III. the expected distinction between intervening DP arguments and intervening PP adjuncts

\( \Rightarrow \) This, in turn, supports the reliability of the proposed diagnostic
- since the diagnostic correctly predicts the default \( \varphi \)-feature values on \( \text{D}^0_C \), in instances where intervention has occurred
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