Bizkaiera Basque relativization: the Promotion analysis
Ager Gondra, SUNY-Purchase College

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 Artiagoitia (1992) assume the Head External analysis for Basque relative clauses ([$_{DP}$ [$_{NP}$ [$_{N'}$ N_i ...] [$_{CP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{TP}$ ... t_i ...]]]]). However, I show that Bizkaiera Basque follows the Promotion analysis to build RCs ([$_{DP}$ [$_{CP}$ DP$_i$ [$_{C'}$ [$_{TP}$ ...t_i ...]]]$_D$]). 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-verb 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   eskolara.
         today pepper.ABS do   aux.3s3s school.ELAT
         'Today you cut school' (Lit:'Today you did pepper to school')
      b. [[Eskolara   [e_i ein] dozun]   piperrak$_i$]   ez dotzu   notarako konteko
          school.ELAT ∅.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 e_i trate dauzen]   hiru pazientiek]   etorri ziren.
         doctor   each.ERG ∅.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 $_D$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 $_D$Case (ERG) and φ-features of the internal D. Since the $_D$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]$_{C'}$ mutileri$_i$]] dirue   emon dotsat.
                3s.**ERG** flowers.ABS buy   aux.A3plEs-C boy**DAT**   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 $_D$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 T_{ERG}. 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) $[_{CP}$ Nor$_i$ $[_{C'}$ esan deu$_k$ $[_{TP}$ Ainhoak t$_k$ $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ $[_{CP}$ t$_i$ $[_{C'}$ eingo dauela$_j$ $[_{TP}$ t$_i$ $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ jatekoa t$_j$] t$_j$]]]]]]]?
       who.s.**ABS**. say   aux.A3sE3s Ainhoa.ERG   do   aux.A3sE3s-C   ø.ERG food.ABS
       '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) a. $[_{CP}$ Nortzuk$_i$ $[_{C'}$ esan deuz$_k$ $[_{TP}$ Ainhoak t$_k$ $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ $[_{CP}$ t$_i$ $[_{C'}$ eingo dabiela$_j$ $[_{TP}$ t$_i$ $[_{vP}$ t$_i$
        who.ABS.**pl**   say   aux.A**3pl**E3s Ainhoa.ERG   do.FUT aux.A3sE3pl-C ø.ERG

     jatekoa t$_j$] t$_j$]]]]]]]?
     food.D.ABS
     'Who did Ainhoa say is going to cook?'

     b. $[_{CP}$ t$_i$ $[_{vP}$ t$_i$ $[_{CP}$ t$_i$ $[[_{TP}$ Mutilek   *e*$_i$ ekarri dauz]-ela]   aitsitsek
                        boy.s.ERG ø.pl.ABS   bring   aux.A3plE3s-C grandfather.ERG

     esan]   dauz]-en]   txakurrek$_i$]   hainke   ein dostie.
     say   aux.A**3pl**E3s-C dog.**pl**.ERG   bite.D   do aux.A3sD1sEpl
     'The dogs that the grandfather said the boy brought bit me'

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 $_D$Case valued u-feature is still visible for further targeting by a c-commanding Probe.

REFERENCES:

ARTIAGOITIA, X. 1992. Why Basque Doesn't Relativise Everything. *Syntax Theory and Basque Syntax,* ed. by Lakarra & Ortiz de Urbina, 11-35. Diputación Foral deGipuzkoa, San Sebastián. BORSLEY, R. 1997. Relative Clauses and the Theory of Phrase Structure. *Linguistics Inquiry* 28:159-187. CHOMSKY, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, 89-159. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ETXEBARRIA, U. 2012. Quantification in Basque. Handbook of Quantifiers in Natural Languages, ed. by Edward Keenan and Denis Paperno. Springer. GONDRA, A. 2013. Basque Relative Clauses: Head Raising, Case and Micro-variation within   Bizkaiera.   Purdue-University Dissertation. OYHARÇABAL, B. 1988. Operatzaile isila euskarazko perpaus erlatiboetan. *Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca 'Julio Urquijo'* 22, 93-97. REZAC, M. 2008. Phi-Agree and Theta-Related Case. Phi Theory: Phi-Features across Modules and Interfaces, ed. by Harbour, Adger & Béjar, 83-129. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics, Oxford University Press. REZAC, M., P. ALBIZU, and R. ETXEPARE. 2011. The structural ergative of Basque and the theory of case. *Case at the interfaces, Brussels Conference on Generative Linguistics (BCGL)*. RIJK, R. DE. 1988. Basque Syntax and Universal Grammar. *II Euskal Mundu-Biltzarra*, ed. by Eusko Jaurlaritza, 69-88. Eusko Jaurlaritza, Gasteiz.