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A New look at Northern Basque Wh-Free Relative Clauses

Georges Rebuschi

Sorbonne Nouvelle & UMR 7107 (CNRS)

Abstract
Ordinary Wh-Free Relative clauses are typically correlative protases, resumed by a pronoun in the apodosis to their right. They sit in the spec of a Topic head in the left periphery or CP domain of the complex sentence. Their internal structure is shown not be always the same: when they contain a single wh- word, that item occupies another Spec,TopP position, but when there are two of them, they sit in the Spec of two contiguous QuantifierPs. A lesser known structure is next described, in which a non-topical Wh-FR occurs within an "exotic" phrase which consists of that clause, the conjunction etc and a demonstrative pronoun: those structures are shown not to be the "source" DP of complex correlative sentences, but rather to be CPs with a predicate gap. Thus, Northern Basque standard correlative FRs are always base-generated, whereas the second type suggests a situation which is the mirror image of Bhatt's (2003) derivation of Hindi correlatives.

0. Introduction

1.1. The problem
Bhatt (2003) recently argued that Hindi correlative clauses do not have the same derivation, according to whether they contain one, or more than one wh- item. More specifically, if the latter must be externally merged in the left periphery of the main clause, the former are first adjoined to their pronominal correlate in argumental or adjunct (adverbial) position within the matrix clause, and raise later towards the left periphery of that clause. The same type of question will be addressed here: (i) Do the Wh-Free Relatives of Northern Basque have the same structure, independently of the number of wh- items they contain? (ii) Given that the same dialects offer constructions in which a wh-FR can form a constituent with a demonstrative pronoun to their right, can a Raising analysis be applied here too — and if not, what is the structure and derivation of those constructions?

*Thanks to Batiltu Coyos, Ricardo Etxepare, Anikó Lipták, and the audiences at the two workshops organized by the group “Structure de la phrase” of the Fédération “Typologie et universaux linguistiques” (CNRS, Paris, December 2004, November 2005) for their remarks and questions, and to Joana Casenave, and Marie Pourquie, for their judgments on the data.
0.2. Basic data

All Basque dialects have Free Relative Clauses (FRCs) which look like ordinary restrictive RCs as in (1a), except that no modified NP “head” is present or visible, as shown in (1b).

(1) a. erori den gizona / liburu.a
    fallen is-Co man-SG book-SG1
    ‘the man / book that has fallen (down)’

b. erori de.n.a
    fallen is-Co-SG
    ‘he who / that which has fallen (down)’2

Ordinary FRCs like (1b) normally do not exhibit wh- elements: their standard GB analysis supposes they possess an phonetically empty relative operator, which either raises from an argumental or adjunct position to “Spec,CP”, or is base-generated in the left periphery (see Oyharçabal 1989 and Rebuschi 2000).3 We will leave them aside here.

The Eastern dialects (those spoken in Navarre/Nafarroa and in the Northern or French Basque Country) also display another type of FRC, always interpreted generically, never elliptically, in which there is an explicit wh-operator, and where the Co is, normally the prefix bait- in the Northern varieties, whereas the South-Eastern varieties typically rather use the suffix -(e)n as their Co).4 This second type of FRC also displays certain distributional

---

1 The abbreviations will be as follows. ABL, ablative; DAT, dative; DEM, demonstrative; E, (would-be) ergative ending of transitive subjects; FR(C), free relative (clause); GEN, genitive INSTR, instrumental case; IMP, imperative; INT, interrogative; KJV, King James’ Version (for the translations from the Bible); LOC, locative case; OP, empty relative operator; PL, plural; PRRT, partitive case; PROS, prospective (aspectual) suffix; QFR, quasi-free relative; SG, singular. Dots will be used to separate morphemes in the Basque words, and hyphens in the corresponding glosses, and the Co prefix bait- will always be separated from the inflected verb it attaches to by a hyphen, without regard to the original spelling, which has systematically been modernized everywhere.

2 Example (1b) has another possible translation, ‘the (one that has fallen down)’, which is clearly elliptical, and may well have another syntactic structure, with a empty (modified) NP, as in (ii) below — if the representation in (i) is correct for the “generic” interpretation of real FRCs.

   (i) [CP [CP Op [C-TPC]]]
   (ii) [CP [CP Op [C-TPC]] [CP 0]]

3 A few examples are however attested in which both a wh- item and a final Number/def suffix -a follows the [+WH] C0 -en. (i) illustrates the case, and (ii) and (iii) show that the same holds good of appositive clauses:

   (i) Oi! zer baka et zer desmantua goza lezakoen [nork ere, burutik keska alfer guzak kendurik, salbatamenduko eta Jainkoaren gauza baziik gogoan erabiliko ez lituzke.en.ak, eta Jainkoaren banfian bere esperantzeta guzia luke.en.ak]!
   "O, what peace and tranquillity should he enjoy, (he who, casting off all vain care, would think only of salvation and of divine things, and would put all his hope in God):"
   [Harisloy 1896: 1,20]

   (ii) Hau diteke guzta bur [zeinetan niki ezagutzarako harti nahi izatu ezekalean.na]... [Etxeberri #1715]
   Lit. ‘This must be something [in/about which I have not wanted to take knowledge]’
   (1907: 33)

   (iii) Nirk duit gudika azkarrago bur, [zoina bere buturaren goitza iseiatzen de.nak]? [Inchauspé 1883: 1,3]

4 But not always, cf. e.g. Lizarraga (1800):

   (i) Nork ere bait-ditu ene manumenduak... oria da onesten nauera ni [Jn 14,21]
   who-E ere C0-AUX my commandments that-one is love AUX-en-SG me
   ‘He that hath my commandments... he it is that loveth me.’
   [KJV]
properties which set them apart from the common type (1b), so that any Wh-FR can be
replaced by an ordinary FRC, whereas the opposite does not hold. Thus, it is possible to find
paraphrases like the following translations of the same text by the same author. Here are, for
instance, two versions of John 8,12 by L. Léon:

(2) Jarraikitzen zaita n.a ez dabilt ilunbetan. [Léon 1929: I,1]
follow AUX-C°-SG not walks darkness-LOC
‘He who follows me[DAT] does not walk in darkness’ [lit. ‘the that follows...’]
(3) Nor ere jarraikitzen bait-zait, eta hura ez dabila ilunbetan. [Léon 1946]
who ere follow C°-AUX and DEM not walks darkness-LOC 
(ditto)6

There exist two more types of Wh-Free Relatives, the first one of which, which has up to
now received much less attention than the preceding ones, is illustrated in (4) — I will dub
this type Quasi-Free Relatives (QFRs). Note that the coordination, along with the duplication
of the exceptional morpheme baizen (baizik today), guarantees that the sequence [[nori ere ..., 
eta hark] baizen] is indeed one constituent.7

(4) Nihork ez daki nor den Aita [[Semeak baizen] eta [nori ere
nobody-E not knows who is-C° father-SG [son-SG-E except] and who-D ere
Semeak agertu nahiko bait-dio, eta hark baizen]].
son-SG-E reveal will-want C°-AUX, and he/that-one-E except
‘... and no man knoweth ... who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the
Son will reveal him.’

[Haraneder 1740 & KJV: Lk 10,22]

Finally, Wh-FRs of the third type do contain a syntactic antecedent, although it
(apparently) makes no semantic contribution to the sentence, see (5); as (6) shows, an
ordinary FRC is of course also possible as a paraphrase.8

---

5 I must emphasize that, unless explicitly stated, all the examples given here, even the earliest ones, have been judged
grammatical by (at least) one of my two informants.

6 The reason why I do not translate such occurrences or ere by ‘ever’ is that indefinites of the whoever type are too
good with adverbial quantification (‘Whoever steals is often arrested’) whilst ere is compatible with such quantification, a
fact that shows that there is no maximization effect produced, cf. (14a) in the text.

7 Other translations are of course possible, in which an ordinary FRC is used (Léon 1946, ibid.) — but here, the simple
article -a is replaced by a demonstrative:

(i) Nihork ez daki Altaren berri, [[Semeak baizik], eta [Semeak argitu nahi duen hurek baizik]]
Nobody-E not knows Father's news son-E except and Son-E reveals AUX-EN DEM-E except
(ii) below is another translation of the excerpt cited in (4), which again illustrates this last type:

(i) Nihork ez daki... nor den aita, baizik ere [[Semeak] eta
basinak zeinari Semeak nahi izan bait-dio ezagutarazi] [Duvoisin, 1865, ibid.]
(5) Bihotzeko bakea handia du [hainak, zeinak] ez bait-du 
heart's peace big-sg has haina-E who which-E not C°-has 
antsiarik ez munduko laudoriez ez afrontuez].
care-prt not worldly praise-instr not blame-instr [Chourio 1720, 2.6.2] 
'He who cares neither for praise nor for blame possesses great peace of heart'

(6) [Ez laudorioez ez eausiez 
ant siarik ez dauka n. ak], 
not praise-instr not confrontation-instr care-prt not has--en-sg-E 
harek gozatzen du barneko deskantsu handia. 
that-one enjoy aux interior quietness big-sg [Haristoy 1896, ibid]

0.3. Organization of the paper

The distributional differences between the first two types of FRCs (those in (2) and (3)) 
wrt. the main clause they are attached to will be dealt with in section 1. Section 2 will 
concentrate on the inner structure of the left periphery, or “CP domain”, of the Wh-FRs 
exemplified in (3) themselves, when they appear in their typical, topical, position in the left 
periphery of a “main clause”, and have come to be known as correlative clauses (i.e. the 
protases of correlative sentences). Section 3 will provide an intermediary summary, and 
sections 4 and 5 will be devoted to the types illustrated in (4) and (5) above and their 
hypothetical transformational relationship with the standard correlatives like the one in (3).

1. Left-peripheral (or correlative) Wh-FRs are Topics

As the comma in (3), as against its absence in (2), indicates, when Wh-FRs occupy their 
preferred position, in the left periphery of the complex sentence in which they appear, they are 
normally separated from the rest by a pause —possibly followed by what is otherwise 
the normal coordinating conjunction eta ‘and’. 9 As discussed in detail in Rebuschi & Lipták (to 
app.), they may be preceded or followed by XPs that function as Topics in the complex 
clauses that contain them. Thus, in (7), another topical XP (holakoetan) precedes the FRC, 
whereas in (8), it is the topicalised pronominal correlaten haina, that follows it.

(7) Holakoetan [bakotxak zer ere bait-du bere baitan], eta hartarik ari da. 
in-such-PL each-sg-E what ere bait aux him in 
and that-ABL acting is

9 But eta can also criticize to the word that precedes it, in this context (Oyarzabal 2003), just as in other contexts 
(Rotacso 2004).
'In such cases, whatever [strength] anyone has in himself, (and) that is what he uses.'

[Hiariart-Urruty 1892-1912 (1972:49)]

(8) Nik derratzuet ...[[nork ere anaiai erranen bait-dio, [Duvoisin 1865:
1 1-tell-you who ere brother-SG-DAT say-PROS bait-AUX Mt 5, 22]
    ‘Raka’, haina biltzarraren mene ko izanen de]-la],
Raka the-such court-SG-GEN power-ko be-PROS AUX-C°
    ‘I tell you that whoever says ‘Raca’ to his brother shall be liable to the Council.’

What clearly shows that the (today obsolete) pronoun haina in (8) is itself a topic is the fact that it is followed by a focused phrase, biltzarraren meneko — it is commonly assumed today that there may only be one focused XP per clause.

Moreover, in contradistinction to FRCs of type (1b) or (2), Wh-FRs just cannot be focalized. Thus, even when they bring the new information contained in the answer to a wh-question, they have to precede the correlative pronoun, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (9b), a tentative paraphrase of the second half of (9a).

(9) a. Zer da ezen horrelako Esku-liburu girichtino Eskualdunarentzat?
    what is then such E.-l. Christian Basque-SG-for
    ‘What is then such an E.-l. for a Christian Basque?’ [Arbelbide 1892]
    Zer ere bait-da Aphezarentzat Brebiarioa, eta gauza berbera [da].
    what ere bait-is priest-SG-for breviary-SG and thing same-same-SG is
    ‘It’s exactly what a breviary is for a [Roman Catholic] priest.’


Needless to say, semantically or pragmatically stronger foci (either of the even type, or corrective ones) are just as bad as (9b).\(^{10}\) This resistance to sitting in Focus position, which markedly distinguishes Wh-FRs from ordinary ones, can be related to the (optional) presence of eta, as in (4), (6) or (8) above, which, as argued in Rebuschi & Lipták (to app.), should be interpreted as the possible lexicalisation of a specific Top° head in a decomposed CP domain à la Rizzi (1997). According to the latter, then, a variety of functional heads (and their projections) replace the now traditional C°, with Force° at the top, a possibly iterated Top[ic]°, and a Focus°.

Example (8) also shows that the whole complex (correlative) sentence can be subordinate (cf. the C° affix -la at the very end of the sentence). If comparative (proportional) correlatives

\(^{10}\) (11) below in the text illustrates the ‘even’ type of focalization: it is the correlative pronoun in the main clause, haina, that carries the clitic ere ‘also, even’, the Wh-FR being to their left.
can be likened to ordinary complex correlative sentences. (10) is a good instance of a complex
Wh-FR+main clause sentence embedded in a relative— an example that corroborates the
identification of the left-peripheral Wh-FRs as specifiers of TopicPs (given that relative wh-
items sit in the Spec,Force position).

(10) Ene egunak iragan dire itzalen gisa [zeinak [zenbatenaz
my days passed are shadows-gen like which-pl by-how-much
beheratzen ago bait-da iguzkia] hanbatenaz bait-dire handiagoak].
declining-more bait is the-sun by-that-much bait they are bigger
‘My days have passed like shadows which, the more the sun declines,
the longer they grow.’

[Gastelučar (1686)]

Furthermore, the possibility for Topics to iterate, well-established by Rizzi for Italian, and
checked in Basque with (7) and (8) above, makes the prediction that correlative protases
should be iterable — and they are, as (11) and (12) show.12

who ere saying C-aux him in that-(he-)stays,
behar du, nola hura ebili bait-da, hala hainak ere ebili.
must how he walked C-aux thus the-such also walk
‘He that sayeth he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he
walked.’

[KJV]

(12) [Nork ere bere herritarretarik edozeini gaizki egin bait-dioke],
who ere his neighbours-abl anyone-to evil done bait-aux, [Duvoisin 1865:
[[nola berak egin du.en], hala egina izanen zaio]]. Lev 24,19
how he-himself done aux-en thus done-sg be-pros aux
‘And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbour: as he has done, so shall it be done
to him.’

[KJV]

The status and position of left-peripheral Wh-FRs as Topic are therefore well established.

---

11 The first occurrence of the prefix bait- is the one typical of Wh-FCRs, whereas the second is due to the fact that the
“main clause” is itself a relative clause.

12 In (11), we have two wh- elements, nor(k) and nola, and two correlative pronouns, hala and hainak). In (12), the
pronominal correlate is silent (a “little” pro can be identified by the dative marker -o in the final auxiliary), but the adverbial
one is explicit (hala again). Note also that the second C* is the more typically “South-Eastern” suffix -en, rather than the
expected prefix bait- as in (11).
2. On the internal structure of Wh-FRs

2.1. FRCs which contain only one wh- word

The wh- items Wh-FRs contain, in spite of their name, are not relative pronouns: whenever a difference can be made, they belong under the interrogative paradigm, as the following examples show, where the interrogative nor ‘who’ is out in normal relative clauses.13

(13) a Nor ikusi duzu? (unmarked, [+hn] interrogative)
   ‘Who(m) have you seen?’
   b *gizona, [nor ikusi bait-dut] (interrogative pro. used as a relative one)
      man-SG wh- [+HN,+INT] seen C°-AUX
   c gizona, [zeina ikusi bait-dut] (relative pronoun, with SG suffix -a)
      man-SG wh-SG [+REL] seen bait-AUX
      ‘the man(,) whom I have seen’

Moreover, the wh-expressions used in correlative FRCs do not occupy the initial (Spec, ForceP) position relative words and phrases do, as is shown by the fact that they can be preceded by topics:

(14) [Bertutean nor ere bait-da barnago sartzen] [Léon 1929, II,12]
   in-virtue who ere bait-is deeper enter
   hak berak maiz kuturte dorpeagoak ditu kausitzan
   he-ERG himself-ERG often cross heavier-PL AUX find
   ‘The more spiritual progress a person makes in virtue, so much heavier
   will he himself frequently find [his] crosses.’

(15) [Lainkoaren hitza nork ere entzuten bait-du eta obratzen],
   God’s word who ere hear bait-AUX and work

---

13 There are only very few texts in which nor is attested as a relative pronoun, but the corresponding sentences are unanimously rejected today. Here are two examples, from two distinct subvarieties of South-Eastern Basque (respectively Iparraldeko Goi-Nafarroera (more specifically, Baztanese), and Hegoaldeko Goi-Nafarroera).

(i) delfin tipi bat, nori egun guzielen erematzen bait-zioten yatera
dolphin small one, nori day all-LOC bringing bait-AUX to-eat
   ‘a small dolphin they brought food to every day’ [Familia... , 18th c.,(1995, p. 775)]

(ii) izan zaizen zure Akita zerukoikume imatzaileak, nork aier aranzten du en bere idukia onen eta gaiztoen gaierat
    ‘So that you may be the children of your Father in heaven, who makes his sun rise upon the good and the bad.’
hura da ene ama eta ene aneia  
that-one is my mother and my brethren.

'Mater mea et fratres mei hi sunt, qui verbum Dei audiant et faciunt. [Latin original] / 'My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God, and do it.' [KJV]

In fact, when there is only one Wh-P, the internal structure of FRCs reflects their position in the left periphery of the complex sentence they belong to, because they must also precede any focused phrase, as shown in (16) — but can also be followed by other topics, as in (17).14

(16) Erraiten cautzu nork ere ENE IZENAREN GATIK utzi bait-du edo etxe, edo telling AUX who ere my name’s becaus left bait-AUX or house or haurrride, harek batentzat ehun bilduko dituela...[Léon 1946, Mt 19,29] brother that-one one-for hundred gather-PROS AUX+ C° 'And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren [...] for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold' [KJV, id]


'Nor is he very wise, (he) who, in times of adversity, loses all hope.'

It thus appears that there is an interesting correspondence between the inner left-peripheral structure of simple correlative Wh-FRs and the left periphery of their host clause, highlighted by the frequent association of ere in the former, and of eta in the latter — see Rebuschi & Lipták (to app.) for details on that subject.

2.2. Wh-FRs which contain two wh- words

As the following paraphrases indicate, when two Wh-Ps follow each other, the first one is, as could be expected, interpreted as a universal quantifier (the second version is a revision, in typically Central-Western "unified Basque" of the first one, which was probably found too marked dialectally)15

---

14 In (17), the Wh-FR is not in the left periphery of the main clause, but this does not make any difference to my informants, who have judged it as grammatical by my informants as the variant in (1):

(i) [Nork ere [TOP inkontru gaitzik heldu zaionean] [FAC esperantza guzia] galtzen bait-du] ez du halaber bertuterik aski. (same meaning as (17))

15 The fact that the first clause is elliptical (it contains no inflected verb and no C°) is irrelevant.
(18) a. Nork zer erein, hura du bilduko. [EAB-I: Gal 6,7]  
who-E what sow that AUX gather-PROS  
‘Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.’ [KJV]  
b. Bakoitzak zer erein, huraxe bilduko du. [EAB-II, id]  
each-E what sow that-itself gather-PROS AUX

The situation has been stable over centuries, as the different versions of the same passage from Thomas à Kempis’s *Limitation* illustrate with interrogative *wh-* words:

(19) Badakit nor nola dabila n [Pouvreau 1669: III.24]  
I-know who how walks-C\(^\circ\)16  
‘I know how people are.’, lit. ‘[…] who is how.’

(20) Badakit bat-bedera zer de n [Chourio 1720, id]  
I-know each-one what is-C\(^\circ\)  
(21) Badakit bakotxa zertan d.en [Haristoy 1896, id]  
I-know each-one what LOC is-C\(^\circ\)

The first *wh-*word being interpreted as a distributive quantifier, the second one must represent the “share” domain (Beghelli & Stowell 1997), whence a duplication of the Quantifier position, which must in any case be distinguished from that of focused phrases (*contra* Rizzi (1997)), as illustrated by the acceptability of (22) below.

(22) Nork nori ere HORRELAKORIK eginnen bait-dio, eta...  
Who-E who-D ere such-PART do-PROS bait-AUX, and  
‘Whoever will say SUCH (THING)S to anybody, s/he/they... ’

Three more facts must be noted. First, in such cases, topics may neither intervene between the two *wh-*words, nor between the second one and the inflected verb (I have found no such examples in the corpus, and my informants have rejected such sentences) — compare (17) above, which contains only one *wh-* word. Second, in the Northern dialects at least, if three interrogative *wh-*words can be used in questions, FRCs are limited to two, a curious fact that definitely requires some further research.\(^\circ\)17 Third, the linear position of *ere* seems to have evolved in the last century. In earlier texts this word could be found in a fairly “high” position

---

\(^{16}\) In all dialects, the \(^\circ\) affix is -\(\text{en}\) for embedded questions.

\(^{17}\) Ricardo Etxebarre (p. c.) informs me that there is no such restriction in the Southern varieties of Eastern Basque.
in the left periphery, since an adnominal wh-word could be separated from the N(P) it modified, as in the 18th c. translation of Mat 7.2 in (23); note that the second translation, from the mid-19th c., in (24), displays both options, first with ere after the XP zer moldez, and second with ere tucked in, as in (23).

(23) [Zer ere juiamenduz] juiatuko bait-ditutzueke bertzeak, what ere judgment-inst judge-pros bait-aux the-others juiamendu beraz izanen zarete zuek ere juiatuak judgment same-inst be-pros aux you-pl too judged eta [zer ere neurri] egin bait-diokezue bertzei, and what ere measure make bait-aux other-pl-d eta neurri bera eginen zaitzue zuei ere. [Haraneder 1740: Mt 7,2] and measure same make-pros aux to-you-pl too ‘For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.’ [KJV]

(24) Ezen [zer moldez ere] bertzez uste izanen baituzue, thus what means-inst ere others-inst opinion have-pros bait-aux molde beraz zuetaz ere uste izanen dute; [Harriet 1855, ibid.] means same-inst you-pl-inst ere opinion have-pros aux eta [zer ere neurri] neurtuko baitiokezuete bertzei, and what ere means-inst measure-pros bait-aux others-dat neurri beraz neurtuko zaitzue zuei ere. measure same-inst measure-pros aux you-pl-dat too (ditto)

The second case is illustrated in the next examples: (25a) is ungrammatical (today), because ere follows the first wh- word, but (25b) is good, where it follows the second one.

(25) a *Nork ere zertan huts egiten bait-du, who-E ere what-in mistake make bait aux eta hark harton ordaindù beharko du. and that-one-e that-in pay-back must-pros aux

b Nork zertan ere huts egiten bait-du … who what-in ere mistake making bait aux ‘In what anyone makes a mistake, in that (domain) he will have to pay.’
3. Taking stock

The facts described above lead us to the following conclusions.

(i) All left-peripheral Wh-FRs occupy a Topic position in the CP domain of the main clause an argument of which they bind (i.e. in the CP domain of the apodosis which contains a pronominal correlate), and the Top head may be phonetically spelled out as *eta* – whereas ordinary FRCs like the one in (2), which can also be topicalised and echoed by a resumptive pronoun, can *never* be followed by that morpheme.

(ii) As far as their internal structure is concerned, the occurrence of *ere* today is strictly limited to the right edge of the last or only phrase which either consists in, or contains, a *wh*-word.

(iii) However, the internal structures of these two types of Wh-FRs differ slightly: if there is only one *wh*- element, the Wh-P is also a Topic, but if there are two of them, they occupy a distinct, lower position — a duplicated Quantifier position, with the first Wh-P interpreted as a universal quantifier, and the second one as the item that denotes the domain the former distributes over.

These results are also directly relevant from two viewpoints.

(iv) Semantically, the two types should not behave the same way. I have argued elsewhere that correlative FRCs with a single Wh-P ought to be interpreted as properties which bind a property variable in the translation of the pronominal correlate, such an approach, which goes against the standard “maximization” analysis proposed e.g. in Grosu & Landman (1998) is corroborated in particular by the fact that the obsolete pronoun *haina* (see (8) or (11)) has been analyzed as a universal quantifier (Rebuschi 1998 2001), the correlative protasis thus providing the restriction of the quantifier, and the apodosis its scope. Now it is a fact that *haina* was, as far as I know, never used when there were two *wh*- items in a correlative FRC. This falls out as a prediction from the fact that whenever there are two *Wh*-items, the first one is interpreted as a universal quantifier; now if both that Wh-P and *haina* have this translation, Full Interpretation will be violated, both items vying to bind the same variable(s).

Besides, the notion of a correlative-protasis-as-a-property does not make much sense when it contains two *wh*-words. But once both the syntax and the semantics are dealt with in a distinct manner, this problem no longer arises: only those Wh-FRs which contain one *wh*-element are to be so interpreted: when there are two, the first one will bind the pronoun in the main clause as a variable, and skolemization will allow to interpret the second one as a function of the former.

(v) Syntactically, this distinction corroborates the theoretical stance Bhatt (2003) adopts concerning the derivation of correlative sentences. Logically, he acknowledges that no raising analysis is possible when a correlative clause contains two *wh*- elements (and two pronominal
correlates). This is so because if the correlative clause raises from one position, associated with one specific pronoun, then it will not be able to raise from the other — and, of course, ATB considerations are clearly irrelevant here. But that, of course, does not preclude that in the other case, the correlative clause might first attach to the pronominal correlate, and be extracted later on. Bhatt therefore suggests a principle according to which Merge should take place as early as possible: at the pronoun/DP level if there is only one wh-word in the correlative clause, at the sentential level if there are more than one.

In the next sections, the other types of Wh-FRs mentioned in the Introduction will be analyzed, and their possible derivational relationship with the correlative ones will be discussed.

4. Haina+Wh- FRCs

Let us start with the type that was illustrated in (5), repeated here, where a wh-relative clause is right adjoined to a pronoun.

(5) Bihotzeko bakea handia du [hainak, zeinak ez bait] du 
heart's peace big-SG has haina-E who which-E not C°-has 
antsiarik ez munduko laudoriez ez afrontuez].
care-PRTT not worldly praise-INSTR not blame-INSTR
‘He who cares neither for praise nor for blame possesses great peace of heart.’

These FRCs are interesting because they have unexpected properties: they may neither be topicalized, nor focalized. Thus, if their “content” must be focused, it is the pronoun that will raise to the left of the inflected copula, as in (26a,b), where a finer notation would insert a trace left-adjacent to the relative pronouns zeinen, zeinek.

(26) a. Bide bazterrekoak,  hainak dire zeinen baitan eraiten bait-da hitza 
path those-at-the-side-of h. are which in sown C°-is word-SG
‘The ones that fell along the path are those in which the word
has been sown.’ [Duvoisin 1865: Mk 4,15]

b. Elhorrietan ereiten zaroen ak, hainak dira zeinek entzuten bait-dute hitza 
thorns-in sow AUX-en-pl h.-PL are which-PL hear C°-AUX word-SG
‘The ones sown among thorns are those which hear the word.’
[Harriet 1855: Mk 4,18]
These FRCs are not much used any longer, because of the stylistic reluctance to building relative clauses with an explicit *wh-* word. But if the question is asked whether they (or their underlying structure) could somehow be taken as a possible source for the correlative *Wh*-FRs proper, the answer is obviously negative. First, all the authors who used *haina* in other circumstances only used that pronoun, rather than the unmarked demonstrative *hura*, in these constructions: more specifically, with a correlative *Wh*-FR, both *haina* and *hura* were possible pronominal correlates to the right of the correlative clause. Second, the relative clause that specifies or restricts the content of *haina* cannot have the interrogative *nor* a its *wh-* item (recall (13b)). Finally, these *Haina+Wh*-FRCs are very often found in the plural, as in the examples above, whereas the usual way of building correlative FRCs consists in having both the verb inside it, and the pronominal correlate, in the singular.  

Whatever the exact internal structure of a sequence like [*hainak, zeinak ez baitu antsi-arik...*] in (5a) is, we must therefore conclude that they have no direct syntactic relationship with correlative clauses.

5. Quasi-Free Relatives (or *Wh*-FR ((eta) Demonstrative)) constructions

5.1. More facts

Let us now return to example (4), the interesting part of which is repeated here as (27):


*eta hark* baizen]]

and he' that-one-E except

`... but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.'

Lit. `and [[who(ever) the Son will want to reveal to him and he] except].'

As was mentioned, since the coordination of two constituents is marked by the iteration of the exceptional morphemes *baizik/baizen*, and given the presence of the conjunction *eta* ‘and’, such an example shows that the whole bracketed sequence is indeed one constituent.

---

18 This was not altogether true in the 16th and 17th centuries. Here is one example:

(i) Ezan nor erekoko obretan bait-dirade, maledikziona azpian dirade  

Indeed who are law's works-ABL C" they-are curse-SG under they-are

`As many as are of the works of the law are under the curse'  

[KJV, *ibid.*]
A version of this structure also existed without _eta_, at least until the 17th c. in the coastal, Labourdin dialect, cf. (39) _infra_, and until the middle of the 18th c. in the Souletin dialect, cf. (28), which is also from the 17th c.:

(28) [Orazioniak] eritarzunak sendotzen ditu, ez solamente _nork_ _ere_ othoitzia  
interrogative-SG-E illness-pl. cure  only who-E _ere_ prayer-SG  
_egoilen_ _bait-di_, _harenac_, baina oraino _norgati_ othoitzien /_bait_ _di_, _harenac_.  
make C^o-AUX theirs but also for-whom pray C^o-AUX theirs  
'A prayer does not only cure the diseases of those who make them, but also of  
those for whom they pray.' Lit.: '...not only who(ever) prays, _his_, but also who he  
prays for, _his_.'  
[Tartas, 1672]

If we really want to check whether a transformational process regulates the relations  
between correlative _Wh_-FRs proper and other types of FRCs, it seems reasonable to also  
consider their shortest version, in which neither _eta_ nor the demonstrative pronoun that  
follows it in (27) turns up. In other words, I shall henceforth consider all the bracketed  
sequences charted in (29), when they appear to the right of the finite verb, to belong to the  
same basic type of _Wh_-FRs, independently of (i) whether they occupy an argumental position,  
or are adjoined like any adverbial phrases.

(29) a. [_Wh- ere_ _bait-V+I..._, _eta_ _hura..._] (where V+I represnets the inflected verb)  
b. [ _Wh- ere_ _bait-V+I..._, _Ø_ _hura..._]  
c. [ _Wh- ere_ _bait-V+I... _Ø _Ø_]

The intermediate structure (29b) was illustrated in (28). Examples of type (29c) were  
attested even earlier, as in (30), another translation of Lk10.22 (see (4)/(27):

(30) [Semeak baizen] _eta_ [nori _ere_ Semeak manifestatu nahi ukanen _bait-drauka_.]
son-SG-E except and who-_D _ere_ son-SG-E reveal want AUX-PROSP C^o-AUX  
'Save the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal it.'  
[Liçarrague 1571, _ibid_]

Such "short" _Wh_-FRs remain acceptable to one of my informants in non-coordinating  
contexts, providing there is no case-clash between the case required by the lower, embedded  
predicate, and the matrix verb — but the "long" variant (29a) is preferred.
5.2. Against Bhatt's (2003) analysis

At first sight, one might think that the Wh-FRs of (29) are simply base-generated in argumental position, and next raised towards a Spec,TopP position in the periphery of the matrix clause. But there are two main objections to this approach:

(i) We have no idea of the internal structure of (29a-c). If (29b) is basic, as could be assumed following Bhatt's analysis of Hindi correlatives, there is a clear violation of the generally accepted ban on adjacency to arguments. Moreover, why eta can show up at all, as in (29a), is not accounted for. As for (29c), it is even more difficult to accept the idea that a full phrase(a CP here) could be adjoined to a phonetically empty argument (a little pro).

(ii) A pause, and/or a high continuative tone at the end of a topicalized phrase, is a natural, if not quasi-universal, phenomenon, but a Raising à la Bhatt would, in the case of (29a,b), predict the pause or the other prosodic mark to follow the demonstrative hura (the last word of the raised constituent), rather than precede it — contrary to fact.

(iii) An alternative might consist in raising several parts of the sequences in (29) independently of each other. Thus, if (29b) is the input to the transformation, only the Wh-clause proper might raise, and the optional (although preferred) movement of the demonstrative towards the left periphery of the matrix clause would be independent. That is not in itself a bad consequence, but, here again, what can we do about eta in the case of (29a)? Must it raise alongside of the Wh-clause? But wouldn't that mean that, contrary to the prosodic data, eta is encliticized to that Wh-clause? And what non ad hoc feature would force it to raise to the head of a Rizzian Top° position?

(iv) At the time of is use in the Labourdin dialect, there is, as far as I know, no example of the pronoun haina in sequences like (29a) or (b) when they appear to the right of a finite verb. This may of course be just a gap in the corpus, but if it is not, there would be no simple, non ad hoc, way of accounting for that fact.

(v) Last but not least, there are occurrences of a demonstrative correlate within a strong syntactic island, as in the following example, from Rebuschi & Lipták (to app. (55)).

\[
\begin{align*}
&[\text{[Nork } \text{ ere huts egiten bait-du]}, \text{ ez dut ezagutzen} \\
&\text{who-E ere mistake do } \text{bait AUX NEG AUX know} \\
&[\text{[hura, zigortuko du]en gizona].} \\
&\text{that-one punish-PROS AUX-en man-SG} \\
&'[\text{Whoever makes a mistake}], \text{ I do not know the man who will punish him/they}.'
\end{align*}
\]

---

19 I that paper (§4.3), we also analyze antireconstruction effects based on the Binding Theory to argue against a Raising analysis of Basque correlative clauses.
It follows that even if a subset of the correlative Wh-FRs could be derived by movement, some of them must be considered to have been base-generated or “externally merged”.

5.3. Towards an unified account of Wh-FR correlative clauses and Quasi-Free Relatives constructions

Given the foregoing arguments, I assume that Wh-FR correlative clauses are “externally merged” in some Rizzian Spec,Top position in the left periphery of the “main clause” rather than raised from some lower position within it. I also take for granted what was said in section 2 above, namely, that both eta and the pronominal correlate (hura, haina...) are basic, in the sense that, even if not phonetically realized, they are syntactically present – i.e. that a Top head is present, even if not materialized by eta, and that if no pronominal correlate is visible, then it is instanciated by a little pro. The tree below illustrates the left periphery of standard correlative sentences (recall that QuantifierPs duplicate in case of Distributive/Share pairing, and that the TopP projection is generally iterable).

(32) ForceP
    \   TopP*
    \   QuantP
    \   FocP
    \   FinP

Turning to QFRs, the first problem to solve is the internal structure of a sequence like [nori ere Semeak agertu nahi ko bai-dio], eta hark] of (27), and of its shortened version in (30). Part of the problem lies in the identification of the “head” of the whole sequence, i.e., with the identification of the nodes X and Y in (33) (where CP represents the inner Wh-FR, and D(em) is for Det/demonstrative):

(33)  Y
      \  CP
       X  eta
       \  D(em)P

Since the final pronoun, hark, bears the morphological case (active/ergative) associated with its role or function wrt. the main clause predicate, an approach à la Bhatt would suppose that X=Y=D(em)P, i.e. that both the CP and eta are adjoined to the demonstrative hura/hark. But we have seen that there is no reason at all why eta should be there. We must now also add
that, given that \textit{eta} is a simple word/morpheme, (33) looks like a classical X-bar projection. But this implies that \textit{eta} is its head, D(em)P its structural complement, and CP its specifier; in other words, X and Y would be the projections of the head \textit{eta}.

Although a priori astonishing, this point of view is not altogether absurd, at least if we take the compositionality approach to semantics seriously. Thus, D(em)P would correspond to an object of type \textit{e}, and \textit{eta} would be take the D(em)P as its argument to yield a generalized quantifier $\langle e, t \rangle$, the role of the contents of the CP remaining, just as in normal \textit{Wh}-FRs, to bind a property variable in the translation of the (possibly silent) D(em) itself.

However, the morphological case of both conjuncts \textit{Semea-k} and the following sequence \textit{[nori \ldots eta hark]} in (27) is not accounted for. Simplifying the structure, a full sentence like (34) can be analyzed with two parallel gaps, bound by the predicate \textit{hori dakite} ‘know that’ in initial position:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(34)] \textit{hori dakite} \hspace{1em} [[\textit{semeak--}] \hspace{1em} \textit{eta} \hspace{1em} \textit{[nori \hspace{0.5em} ere agertuko \hspace{0.5em} bait-dio, \hspace{0.5em} eta \hspace{0.5em} hark--]}] \\
\hspace{1em} \text{that they-know son-SG-E and who-D ere show-PROS C-AUX eta he-E} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{Lit. 'Know that, the son and he to whom he'll reveal it do.'}
\end{enumerate}

It should thus be clear that once this predicate gap is taken into account, it is not two nominal expressions that are coordinated, but \textit{clauses}: the bracketed part of (34) would thus consist of the coordination of two Rizzian TopPs, preceded by the predicate \textit{hori dakite} that occupies the specifier position of a higher TopP. The binding of the gaps would then just be an ordinary ATB case, and the structure of the sequence \textit{[nori ere agertuko bait-dio, eta hark--]} would simply be that of an standard correlative sentence, with \textit{eta} as a Top head whose specifier is the \textit{Wh}-FR, and \textit{hark} sitting in the specifier of the FocP.\footnote{The case of reduced ‘QFRs’ as in (30b,c) would be dealt with alike, since it has been shown in section 2 that both \textit{eta} and the pronominal correlate can be silent.} If ATB phenomena are analyzed as instances of movement, the predicate \textit{hori dakite} would be Rizzi’s Fin[iteness]P, cf (32), raised from the right to the higher Spec.Top position; if a base-generation approach is preferred, we would just have a case of predicate ellipsis or reconstruction, just as in (35), a comparative construction in which where the gap corresponds to \textit{lan egin}, ‘work’.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(35)] \textit{Jonek jaten du [[Mirenek ---] bezala]} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{Jon-E eat AUX Miren-E like/as} \\
\hspace{1em} \text{‘Jon eats like Miren.’}
\end{enumerate}
Semantically, we therefore obtain the same results as above: the conjoined clauses of (34) correspond to generalized quantifiers, since they are objects of type t with a missing <e,t>, and their combination yields a proposition (in fact, two conjoined ones).

6. Conclusion

Although (necessarily) partly borrowing from former studies dealing with Eastern, and more specifically Northern, Basque Wh-FRs, this paper has provided (a) a fuller diachronic array of examples from the Northern literary tradition, (b) a new and distinct analysis of correlatives Wh-FRs, according to whether they contain one, or two, wh-words, (c) the demonstration that even those that contain only one such wh-word are base-generated in a Spec,TopP position (based on a split-CP analysis à la Rizzi (1997)), and (d) the demonstration that what looks at first sight like a very strange complex DP, of the form [Wh-FR - eta - Dem], is not the source of the correlative constructions, but is rather a clause with a predicate gap at its right edge: if anything raises from an underlying structure, that structure is that of an ordinary correlative Wh-FR, and what moves is the FinP that standardly follows or complements the FocusP in (32) above.

Checking whether this analysis carries over to cases when adverbial adjuncts are concerned (as in the following examples), must be left for future research.

(36) Itzül bidi erhautsa beré lurrerat, nontik jalki bait-zen, harat… return AUX[IMP] dust-SG its soil-to where-from exit C°AUX there(-to)
'Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was [− where it has come from]' [Tartas 1666 & KJV: Eccles 12,7]^{21}

(37) … eta eternalak […] egin izan zioen [nola ere mintzatzen baitzen eta halà] and the-Lord-E do AUX AUX how ere speak bait-AUX and thus 'and the LORD did unto [her] as he had spoken.' [d’Urte ±1710 & KVJ: Gen 21,1]

(38) Bada gisa berean eskualdunak ere kausitzen [di]tuenean Eskual-herrian thus way same-in Basque-SG-E too find AUX-en-LOC Basque Country-in eztiren gauzak, [non ere kausituko baitituke, eta halan], not-are things where ere find-PROS bait-AUX and there

---

^{21} This passage is all the more interesting as the author quotes the Latin text: Revertatur pulvis in terram suam unde erat before translating it: the reader will note that the correlative construction is not present in the source text, an interesting fact for all the Bascologists who (dis)regard Basque correlatives constructions as mere Latin calques (see also (15) above).
obligatua dateke hango izenen hartzera

obliged-SG he-will-be there-GEN names-GEN to-take [Etxeberri [±1715], 1907: p. 45]

‘Thus, likewise, when a Basque finds things that are not in the Basque Country, he’ll be forced to borrow the local name, wherever he finds them [lit. and there].’

(39) (Munduko gauza guztiek kondenatzen dute alferra.)

world-SG’s thing all-PL-E condemn AUX lazy-SG

Zeren hartzaz bertze guztiek enplegatzen bait-dute

because that-INSTR other all-PL-E employ bait-AUX

bere denbora, zertako egina bait-dira, hartan. [Axular 1643: § 21] 22

their time, for-which done-PL bait-they-are that-LOC

‘(Everything in the world condemns the lazy person.) For all other beings apart from him spend their time in the very (thing) for which they have been created.’

Lit.: ‘...[they] spend their time, for what they are done, in that.’

(40) Egizu nitaz iduri zaitzuna, [[zer ere bait-zaizu on eta haren] arabera].

do with-me seems aux-n-SG what ere C° AUX good and that-GEN according

‘Do with me as you like, what seems good (best) to you’ Lit. ‘...what is good for you and according to that.’

[León 1929, 3.15.2]
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