This presentation establishes the syntactic representation and derivation of relative clause (RC) constructions in Bizkaiera Basque from a Minimalist approach (Chomsky 2000). In addition, it shows that certain features stay accessible for revaluation until they are shipped off to Spell-Out.

De Rijk (1988), Oyharçabal (1988) and Artiagotia (1992) assume the Head External analysis for Basque relative clauses (\( \{ [DP [sp \ N, N, \ldots] [CP Op, [TP \ i_t \ \ldots]]] \} \)). However, I show that Bizkaiera Basque follows the Promotion analysis to build RCs (\( \{ [CP [DP, [C \ [TP \ i_t \ \ldots]]] \} \)). Evidence for the Promotion analysis comes from idioms, scope interaction, and pronoun binding. These three tests focus on the existence of a local relationship, internal to the RC, between the Head and the elements in the RC. If such local relation is detected, we can conclude that the Head of the RC was inside the RC. First, an idiomatic interpretation arises only via a local relationship between the verb and the object. Given that (1b), out of (1a), retains the idiomatic interpretation, we can conclude that there is a local relation between the RC-head and the Head, thus there is raising of the Head to its surface position. Second, in scope interactions, the universal quantifier bakoitz ‘each’ always has a distributive interpretation, and as such, it must get scope over a variable (Etxebarria 2012). The grammaticality, and therefore, the distributive interpretation of (2) indicate that the variable left by the Head occupied a position c-commanded by bakoitz (i.e., internal to the RC), thus the Head originated within the RC. Finally, same results are obtained for pronoun binding.

(1) a. Geur [piper ein] dozu escolar.a
   today pepper.ABS do aux.3s3s school.ELAT
   ‘Today you cut school’ (Lit: ‘Today you did pepper to school’)

b. [[Eskolara [ei ein] dozun] piperraki] ez dotzu notarako konteko
   school.ELAT Ø.ABS do aux.3s2s-C pepper.ERG no aux.3s3s2s grade.BEN count
   ‘The fact that you have cut school will not count for your grade’
   (Lit: ‘The pepper that you have done will not count for your grade’)

(2) [Mediku bakoitzak ei trate dauzen] hiru pazientiek etorri ziren.
   doctor each.ERG Ø.ABS treat aux.A3sE3pl-C three patient.pl.ABS come aux.A3pl
   ‘The three patients that each doctor treated came over’

A problem for the Promotion analysis is that morphologically rich languages show that the Head shares the Case of the external D and not that of the internal D (Borsley 1997). Bizkaiera RCs also show that the Head shares the Case of the external D (3). I propose the Precariousness Condition, which establishes that a \( _{p} \)Case (the one assigned by T or \( v \)) valued \( u \)-feature is precarious until it is sent to Spell-Out and therefore, the value is visible for further targeting by a c-commanding Probe. In a RC with a DP Head (3), the external D copies the \( _{p} \)Case (ERG) and \( \varphi \)-features of the internal D. Since the \( _{p} \)Case valued \( u \)-feature of the external D is precarious because it has not been spelled-out yet, it is targetable by a c-commanding Probe (T, \( v \), P in the main clause). When a Probe Agrees with the external D, the Goal obtains a new Case value (DAT), which is the Case value that is spelled-out for being the last one that the external D has received.

(3) \( \{ DP [CP [TP \ e_i \ lorak erosi dauz]-en], C \} \) dirue emon dotsat.
   3s.ERG flowers.ABS buy aux.A3plEsC boyDAT money.ABS give aux. A3sD3sE1s
   ‘I gave money to the boy that bought flowers'

The Precariousness Condition is supported by the observation that a DP extracted out of a [-Q] embedded clause gets its \( _{p} \)Case valued \( u \)-feature re-valued by a higher \( v \). I assume that ergative Case assignment takes place by Agree+Move to the Specifier position of T\(_{ERG}\) (Rezac, Albizu and Etxepare 2010), while absolutive Case assignment takes place by Agree+Move to the Specifier position of \( v \)
(Gondra 2013). In (4), Nor ‘who’ was originated within the embedded clause and raised to the embedded Spec-TP position where it got its u-Case feature valued by the Probe _TP_. As a result of this Agree operation, the DP obtained an ergative Case value. Notice, however, that Nor in Spec-CP did not spell-out in the form of ergative, which would be expected based on mainstream assumptions about Case Theory, but in absolutive.

\[
(4) \quad [\text{CP Nor} \quad [\text{C- esan deu}_{k} \quad [\text{TP Ainhoak} \quad t_{k} \quad [\text{vP} \quad t_{i} \quad [\text{TP} \quad t_{i} \quad [\text{C- eingo dauela}_{i} \quad [\text{TP} \quad t_{i} \quad [\text{vP} \quad t_{j} \quad \text{jatekoa} \quad t_{j}]]]]]]]?
\]

‘Who did Ainhoa say is going to cook?’

Furthermore, assuming that a relationship exists between Case and agreement (Chomsky 2000), we expect not only for a DP extracted out of an [-Q] embedded clause to get its Case re-valued, but also for the higher _v_ to get its _ϕ_-features valued. In fact, this is true as it can be observed in the Wh- question (5a) and the RC (5b). In (5a) the auxiliary _deuz(-en)_ agrees with _Nortzuk ‘who.pl’_ and in (5b) the auxiliary _dauz(-ela)_ agrees with _txakurrek ‘the dogs’_ as their plural number shows.

\[
(5) \quad \text{a. [CP Nortzuk,} \quad [\text{C- esan deuz}_{k} \quad [\text{TP Ainhoak} \quad t_{k} \quad [\text{vP} \quad t_{i} \quad [\text{TP} \quad t_{i} \quad [\text{C- eingo dauela}_{i} \quad [\text{TP} \quad t_{i} \quad [\text{vP} \quad t_{j} \quad \text{jatekoa} \quad t_{j}]]]]]]?\]
\]

‘Who did Ainhoa say is going to cook?’

\[
(5) \quad \text{b. [CP } t_{i} \quad [\text{vP Mutilek e}_{i} \quad \text{ekarri dauz]-ela} \quad \text{aitsitsek boy.s.ABS 3pl \_C grandfather.ERG bring aux.A3plE3s-C grandfather.ERG}\]
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{esan] daz]-en] txakurrek}_{j}] \text{ hainke ein dostie. say aux.A3plE3s-C dog.pl.ERG bite.D do aux.A3sD1sEp1}\text{ The dogs that the grandfather said the boy brought bit me'}
\end{align*}
\]

This number agreement (5a-b) and the absolutive Case of Nor ‘who’ (4) indicate that the DP extracted out the [-Q] embedded clause Agreed with _v_ during its cyclic-movement, and therefore, that it was active for further targeting. Thus, we can conclude that the Promotion analysis does not present a problem, as the Head of the RC with a _u_-Case valued u-feature is still visible for further targeting by a _c_-commanding Probe.
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