Valency and Argument Structure in the Basque Verb

Ricardo Rikardo, R. Etxepare

HAL Id: artxibo-00000087
https://artxiker.ccsd.cnrs.fr/artxibo-00000087

Submitted on 15 Mar 2006

Valency and Argument Structure in the Basque Verb

CONTENTS

1. Valency and the Auxiliary System. An Outline.

Leaving aside a small set of verbs (see 3.6.3.), Basque finite verbs are composed of an morphologically independent lexical verb carrying aspectual information, and a clitic auxiliary bearing Tense, Agreement and Modal affixes. The choice of auxiliaries in Basque seems to be largely dependent on the valency of the predicate. Intransitive, transitive, and ditransitive auxiliaries typically correspond to monovalent, bivalent and trivalent predicates. The arguments of the verb (participants in the event, such as agents, themes or patients, and beneficiaries) are mapped systematically by person and number morphology corresponding to grammatical functions such as subject, object and indirect object. Changes in the argument structure of the verb (as in the causative/inchoative alternation) are also signaled in the choice of the auxiliary . However, in some cases the correlation between valency and choice of auxiliary does not, or does not seem to obtain. The mismatch between valency and morphology is due in these cases to the contribution of an aspectual dimension (Grimshaw,90) (see section 1.3).

In order to maintain the two domains clear (lexical structure and morphology), I will refer to the valency of the verb with categories such as <u>monovalent</u>, <u>bivalent</u> or <u>trivalent</u> (see Hualde, section 3.6.3 in this book), and to its morphological expression with categories such as <u>intransitive</u> and <u>transitive</u>. The latter are familiar from the structural analysis of basic verbal paradigms (Hualde, in section 3.6.3.) and are based on the presence/absence of ergative morphology. When ergative morphology is present in the paradigm corresponding to a finite form, I will refer to that form as transitive. Otherwise, I will refer to that form as intransitive.

1.1. Case and Agreement patterns

Basque is an ergative language in both its case marking system and in its verbal morphology (with splits depending on Tense, see Hualde, section 3.6.3). That is, a language where subjects of intransitive verbs and objects of transitive ones are Case-marked and cross-referenced in the agreement elements of the verb identically and differently from subjects of transitive verbs. The Case marking of transitive subjects is called ergative, that of intransitive subjects and objects of transitives, absolutive. Table 1 shows the absolutive and ergative case endings in the three numbers (singular, plural and indefinite)[1]:

---

[1] This table differs from Ortiz de Urbina's (1989,p.6), that I give below:

	Singular	Plural	Indefinite
Ergative	-ak	-ek	-(e)k
Absolutive	-a	-ak	-∅

I take the common element –a- of both singular ergative and plural absolutive to be the determiner –a that one finds in all singular and plural noun phrases in Basque. Hence not part of the Case marking itself. As for the plural form of absolutives, it is probably nothing other than a combination of the

Table 1

	Singular	Plural	Indefinite
Ergative	-k	-ek	-(e)k
Absolutive	∅	-∅	∅

The ergative pattern is is displayed in the following examples:

(i)   a. Peruk   ardoa   edan   du
     Peru-erg wine-D-abs drink Aux-T
     'Peru drank wine'
   b. Ardoa/Peru   iritsi   da
      wine-D-abs/Peru-abs arrived Aux-I
      'The wine/Peru arrived'

As for verbal agreement, Basque incorporates three[2] types of person agreement markers: ergative, absolutive (zero in the case of third person singular), and dative.

Verbs fall into two main subclasses, according to whether they include an ergative marker (transitives) or not (intransitives). Each class will incorporate a dative marker if there is a dative argument in the clause. Auxiliaries containing an ergative marker are built up on the (auxiliary) verb *edun (to have), whereas the auxiliaries that bear no ergative marker are built up on the verb *izan* (to be). We have then four classes out of all logical combinations of Ergative, Absolutive and Dative:

(2)   a. Absolutive b. Absolutive-Dative   (IZAN)
        c. Ergative-absolutive   d. Ergative-Absolutive-Dative (*EDUN)

All those combinations correspond to actual different auxiliary forms. We give below a few examples of each type:

---

determiner –a- and an affix indicating plurality. One finds that same combination in cases of plural agreement with absolutive subjects an objects in predicative expressions:

(i)   a. Jonek   liburu-a-k irakurr-i-a-k   ditu
            Jon-erg book-D-pl read-partc-D-pl   Aux-T
            'Jon has those books read'
        b. Adiskide-a-k etorr-i-a-k   dira
            friend-d-pl come-partc-D-pl Aux-I
            'My friends have arrived'

Indefinite ergative subjects take a vowel –e- before the Case marker if the noun to which it attaches ends in a consonant. The fact that the Case marking of indefinites does not require –e- suggests that that affix is really a plural marker in plural ergatives, perhaps fused to the Case marker -k. Then the –a- that precedes the singular ergative case marker is a singular marker, identical to the singular determiner –a .

[2]   There is also an optional agreement marker that encodes the addressee (see Hualde, section 3.6.2). As it is not part of the argument structure of the verb, I will leave it aside.

(3)   a. Joan n-a-iz   "I went/I have left"
           go   1sing(abs)-Present-root(be)
        b. Joan n-a-tza-i-o   "I went to him"
           go   1sing(abs)-Present-root-(pre)dative-3sing(dat)
        c. Erosi d-u-t   "I bought it"
           buy-partc ∅(3sing.abs)-Present-root-1sing(erg)
        d. Erosi d-i-o-t   "I bought it for him/her"
           buy-partc ∅(3sing.abs)-Present-(pre)dative-3sing(dat)-1sing(erg)

In non-past Tenses, the agreement pattern is also ergative: the subject-affix of intransitive auxiliaries and the object affix of transitive ones are identical, and different from the transitive subject marker. Consider as an example the first person agreement marker in the two verbal forms below:

(4)   a. Etorr-i   n-a-iz   "I came"
           come-partc 1sing(abs)-Present-root
        b. Ekarri   n-a-u-zu   "You brought me"
           bring-partc 1sing(abs)-Present-root-2sing(erg)
        c. Ekarri   d-u-t   "I brought it"
           bring-partc Present-root-1sing(erg)

1.2. Syntactic versus Morphological Ergativity
        Although a morphologically ergative language, Basque is syntactically a nominative-accusative language. That is, grammatical constrains that affect subjects generally in nominative-accusative languages also affect subjects of transitives and subjects of intransitives in Basque. Ortiz de Urbina (1989, ch.1) presents a number of relevant grammatical phenomena in Basque illustrating this point:

(i)   Control Structures
        Control phenomena are clearly accusative in Basque. The gapped argument of a control structure is always the subject of either a transitive or an intransitive verb:

(i)   a. Ez dakit   [nori e e eman]
           neg know-I who-Dat give
           'I don't know whom to give this'
        b. Joni   esan dio   [zer e egin]
           Jon-dat say Aux-DT what do
           'He/she told Jon what to do'

(5a) involves two gaps in a control structures. One gap corresponds to the transitive subject, and another one to the object. Only the subject can (and must) be interpreted as coreferent with the matrix subject[3]. The fact that control operates on the agentive subject

---

[3]   Levin (1983) provides other control structures with complements of jussive verbs such as *agindu* "to order" and *eskatu*   "to ask". Ortiz de Urbina objects to the relevance of those facts on two bases:

in (5b) and not on the patient discards an interpretation a-la Marantz (1984) of the facts.

(ii)   Coordinate structures:
A common phenomenon occurring in coordinated clauses is the deletion of material in the second conjunct under referential identity with elements of the first conjunct. This sort of deletion process is available in Basque too, but is limited to subject arguments, transitive or intransitive:

(ii)   [Jonek semea eskolan   utzi zuen] eta [e klasera joan zen]
          Jon-erg son-abs school-in leave Aux-T and   class-to go Aux-I
          'Jon left his son at school, and then he (Jon/*his son) went to class'

To the extent that those phenomena separate intransitive and transitive subjects from transitive objects (unlike in syntactically ergative languages), we can conclude that Basque behaves as a syntactically accusative language[4].

---

first, those complements are not obligatory control structures, since they can have overt subjects, disjoint in reference from the purported controller:

(i)   [Ni-k ikusteko] agindu/eskatu   du
          I-erg see-N-for order/ask-partc Aux-T
          '*He asked/ordered for me to see it'

Then, even syntactically ergative languages, such as Dyirbal (Dixon,1979) seem to behave "accusatively" in this sort of complement. Neither is the case in indirect wh-questions such as those in (5).

[4]   Ortiz de Urbina (1989, p.18-20) following Heath (1972), presents also the following facts as supporting the idea that Basque is syntactically accusative: Some eastern dialects of Basque assign or require a genitive case for complements of nominalized verbs. Only transitive objects can acquire such a Case. Subjects of intransitives cannot. Genitive Case therefore singles out objects from subjects, be it transitive or intransitive (see Heath, 1972):

(i)   a. Horren egiteko   abiatu   gara
             that-g   do-N-for set out Aux-I
             'We set out to do that (lit. …to do of that)'
          b. *Ene etortzeko…
               me-g come-N-for

Although the contrast is clear in contexts such as (i), it is also the case that those purposive adverbial clauses in Basque are control structures, as evidenced by the fact that an overt subject is impossible:

          (i)   *[Guk/gure horren egiteko]   abiatu   gara
          we-erg/we-g that-g di-N-for set out-partc Aux-I

But if so, the impossibility of (ib) follows from the theory of control, and is irrelevant to the point. As for the purported evidence brought up by the distribution of reciprocal reflexive forms (p.20-21), it reduces to the fact that they cannot appear in subject position of either transitive or intransitive verbs:

(i)   a. Adiskideek elkar   ikusi   dute
             friends-erg   each-other see-partc Aux-T
             'The friends saw each other'

1.3. Basque as an "extended" ergative language

Ergative languages divide into two different Case patterns. One, exemplified by Dyirbal or Samoan, marks all subjects of intransitive verbs identically, irrespective of the aspectual or agentive properties of the verb or the agentive properties of the single argument. Another one, exemplified by Basque and Georgian, among other ergative languages, marks some subjects of intransitives as objects of transitives (that is, absolutive), and some others as subjects of transitive verbs (with the ergative Case). A pattern that Dixon (1979,1994) calls "extended ergative". This split case marking pattern depends apparently on the aspectual properties of the verb, particularly on whether it is telic or not (see section 4.1. for a discussion on Basque; and Lyell, 1995, p.120-123 for Georgian). In this, Basque seems to express morphologically a distinction that has been noted syntactically in other languages between unaccusative and unergative predicates (Perlmutter, 1978; Burzio, 1981). Subjects of unergative predicates take the ergative Case, subjects of unaccusative predicates take the absolutive Case. In accord with Case marking, unergative predicates take the transitive auxiliary, and unaccusative predicates the intransitive one:

(iii) a. Jonek ardoa ekarri du
    Jon-erg wine-abs bring-partc Aux-T
    'Jon brought the wine'
  b. Jonek saltatu du
    Jon-erg jump-partc Aux-T
    'Jon jumped'
  c. Jon etorri da
    'Jon came'

This is the basic outline of the relation between valency, Case and auxiliary selection. Auxiliary selection and Case marking in Basque are also conditioned by the aspectual configuration of the verb phrase. This is particularly clear in the presence of measuring or affected complements (in the sense of Tenny,1994), that enforce the presence of a transitive auxiliary (section 2 and 4.4). The expression of possessive structures also affects auxiliary selection and (concomitant) Case marking. What follows is a thorough (never exhaustive) examination of the relation between argument structure, aspectual configuration and auxiliary selection.

---

  b. *Elkar   joan ziren
   each other go Aux-T
   '*Each other went'
  c. *Elkarrek   ikusi dituzte lagunak
   each other-erg see-partc Aux-T friends
   'Each other saw the friends'
But (b,c) also lack appropriate antecedents for the reciprocal, so their ungrammaticality could be only indirectly linked to subjecthood (via binding theory).

2. Intransitive Monovalent Structures
2.1. Existence

The most simple intransitive monovalent structure in Basque is constituted by the verb *izan* "to be" as a lexical verb, in statements of existence:

(8)   *Izan ala ez izan, horra auzia*
        to be or not to be, that's the question

(9)   *Ni naiz nirez,   nire borondatez* (Ar. K:42)
        I am by myself,   by my own will

Existence can also be stated through the borrowing *esistitu* "to exist":

(10)   *Esistitzen al da   horrelako izakirik?*
         Exists-Asp Q Aux such   beings
        'Could there exist any such being?'

2.2. Copular constructions
2.2.1. Stage and individual level predications

Basque makes a distinction between stage level predications (those which attribute some transitory property to the subject of predication) and individual level predications (those which attribute some standing property to the subject of predication) in the auxiliaries selected to express them. Transient properties are assigned by the verb *egon* "to be in a location", whereas standing properties are assigned through the verb *izan* "to be". The distinction is akin to the one found in Spanish between *ser* and *estar* [5]. *Izan* is also used in equative sentences.

(11)   *Haien mende gaude   gu, haien mende dago   Euskara* (Ib. 68)
         their will-in are-in a location we their will-in is-in a loc Basque

---

[5]   With some important differences, discussed in Zabala (1993). It seems that, at least in some varieties, *izan* can occur in all contexts in which *egon* can occur, but *egon* cannot in some cases where *izan* is possible. Those cases are the ones presented above as typical contexts of insertion for *egon.* However, there is a difference in the availability of *izan* vis-à-vis *egon* : when *izan* is used in contexts where *egon* can be used a locative complement is absolutely necessary. This is not the case for *egon* :

    (i)   a. Xabier   al da?   b. Xabier   etxean   al da?
                Xabier-Abs Q is   Xabier-Abs home-loc Q is
                'Is that Xabier?'   'Is Xabier home?'
            '*Is Xabier there?'

    (ii)   a. Xabier   al dago? b. Xabier etxean al dago?
                Xabier-Abs Q is   Xabier-Abs home-loc Q is
            'Is Xabier there?'   'Is Xabier home?'

Not all speakers seem to agree on those judgements. For Zabala (1993), both *izan* (when it is used in the contexts where *egon* can be used) and *egon* must be accompanied by a locative complement. See Zabala (this volume) for a detailed discussion of these facts.

'We are under their will, Basque is under their will'

(12)   *Nekatuta / etxean   dago*
        tired   home-at he-is (in a location)
        'He is tired/home'

(13)   *Gu ez gara nor,   gu ez   gara ezer,   gu ez gara aberri-lorrean*
        we not are anybody, we not are anything, we not are country carrying
        ari geran txindurri txatxar batzuk besterik (Ib.288)
        Asp are-Rel ant   miserable some but
        'We are nobody, we are nothing, we are but miserable ants carrying the
        country'

(14)   *Xabier   argia   da*
        Xabier-abs intellingent is
        'Xabier is intelligent'

(15)   *Jekill doktorea Mr. Hide zen*
        Jekill doctor   Mr. Hide was
        'Dr.Jekill was Mr.Hide'

Nouns expressing jobs can be followed by either izan or egon, with two different interpretations:

(16)   a. Xabier   zerbitzari dago   kafetegi horretan
           Xabier-abs waiter   is-in a location cafe   that-in
           'Xabier is working as a waiter in that cafe'
        b. Xabier   zerbitzari(a) da
           Xabier-Abs waiter   is
           'Xabier is a waiter'

Whereas in (a) it is implied that Xabier is just in a temporary position (a job preceded by and probably followed by, some others), (b) implies that Xabier has this characterizing job.

2.2.2. Physical and Mental States

As expected, given the above characterization of the diference between *izan* and *egon*, predications involving mental and physical states occur with *egon* (see also section 2.7. and 4.6). The verb follows a bare stage level adjective or a participle, never a locative phrase:

(17)   a. *Bero/hotz nago*   b. *Egarri/ gose   nago*
           hot/ cold   be-in a location   thirsty/ hungry be-in a location
           'I am hot/cold'   'I am thirsty/hungry'
        b. *Haserre nago*   b. *Gaiso dago   gaur*
           angry   be-in a location   fear   be-in a location today
           'He is angry'   'He is sick today'

Adjectives which follow that same pattern are *ados (egon)* "to be in accord, to agree",

8

alde (egon) "to be in favor", *kontra egon* "to be against", *lasai egon* "to be calm", *uzkur egon* "to be reticent", *harro egon* "to be proud", *kexu egon* "to complain (to be in complain)", *ikara egon* "to be scared (to be in tremble)", *beltzuri egon* "to be frowning/sad", *jelos egon* "to be jealous", *urduri egon* "to be nervous", *larri egon* "to be in a critical condition", *oker egon* "to be wrong", *triste egon* "to be sad", *ziur egon* "to be sure", *haurdun egon* "to be pregnant", *oinuts egon* "to be barefoot".

Although the great majority of stage level adjectives are followed by egon, there is a subset of them that is followed by izan. They are the following: *ahalke* (E), *lotsa izan* "to be ashamed", *aiher izan* (E) "to be desirous", *bekaitz* , *inbiri izan* "to be envious", *fio izan* "to trust (to be in trust)", *antsi izan* (E) "to be anxious", *herabe izan* (E) 'to be fearful, shy", *damu izan* "to be regretful", *haizu izan* (E) "to be allowed".

(18)   a. *Lotsa naiz/*nago*   c. *Damu   naiz/*nago*
           shame am/am-in a loc.   Regretful am/am-in a loc.
         'I am ashamed'   'I am regretful'

Of those predicates, *inbiri* "envy", *damu* "regretful", *lotsa* "shame" and *herabe* "fearful" can also be constructed with the transitive auxiliary, giving rise to a possessive construction where the mental state is the possessed term and the experiencer the subject:

(19)   a. *Inbiri(a) dut*   b. *Lots   haundia dut*
           envy-D   Aux-T   shame big-D   Aux-T
           'I have envy"   'I have shame'

Other (individual level) adjectives that are constructed with *izan* are only possible in the third person. They usually take a clausal complement, or a demonstrative referring to a proposition (see Artiagoitia, this volume):

(20)   a. *Neke/errez da*   c. *Zilegi   da*
           hard/easy   is   permitted is
           'It is hard/easy'   'It is permitted'

2.3. Existential sentences

Existential sentences are constructed with the verb *egon* in Basque[6] :

(21)   a. *Badago   gizon bat atean*
            Aff-is-location man   a   at the door
            'There is a man at the door'
         b. *Gizon bat atean dago*
             man   a   door-at is-loc

---

[6] The claim is subject to the same observation as before: in some varieties, *izan* can be used in existential sentences.

'There is a man at the door'
'A man is at the door'

2.4. Verbs of location and directional motion
2.4.1. Purely ntransitive predicates
The following verbs of location and directional motion are necessarily followed by the intransitive auxiliary *izan* (22-23):

(22)   a. *Etorri da*   b. *Joan da*   c. *Ailegatu   da*   d. *erori da*
        come Aux   go Aux   arrive Aux   fall Aux
        'He came'   'He went/left'   'He arrived'   'He fell'
        e. *Partitu da   (E)*   f. *Jaiki da*
        depart Aux-I   get up Aux-I
        'He left'   'He got up'
(23)   a. *Etxean   egon   da*   b. *Etxean   gelditu da*
        at home been   Aux   home-at stayed Aux-I
        'He has been home'   'He stayed home'
        c. *Ez da hor kabitzen*
        neg Aux-I there fit
        'It does not fit there'

2.4.2. Aspectual Structure and Transitivity Alternations with Motion and Location verbs
It has long been noted that notions such as the internal configuration of an event (its having a specified endpoint, a process subpart, or a given length of complition) defines different aspectual classes that affect the syntactic mapping of the event participants. Motion and location verbs in Basque give rise to a transitivity alternation that involves clear aspectual notions such as the affected status of an object or the measuring out of the event denoted by the verb, in the sense of Tenny (1994). The transitive structures are produced by changing the choice of auxiliary from *izan* "to be" to **edun* "to have".

This transitivity alternation involves motion verbs such as *igo* "to go up", *igaro* "to pass by" and *jaitsi* "go down, descend" and *ibili* "to walk", whose lexical structure specifies a path along which the movement proceeds. In these cases the transitive alternate produces an "affected" reading, where the whole surface of the movement gets "used up":

(24)   a. *Mendi horretara igo naiz*   b. *Mendi hori igo dut*
        mountain that-to rise aux-I   mountain that climb aux-T
        'I climbed to that mountain'   'I climbed that mountain'
(25)   a. *Ibai hartatik igaro dira*   b. *Ibai hura igaro dute*
        river that-through pass aux-I   river that cross aux-T
        'They went through that river'   'They crossed that river'
(26)   a. *Jaitsi   da*   b. *200 metro jaitsi   ditu   oinutsik*

go-down Aux-I 200 mts descend Aux-T barefoot

'He went down, descended' 'He descended 200 meters barefoot'

(27)   a. *Bertatik/hiru egunes   ibili naiz*
        there-through/for three days walk Aux-I
        'I walked over there/for three days'

       c. *Harainoko bidea/hiru kilometro ibili   dut/ditut*
        there-to-g way-D/three kilometers walk Aux-T(sing/plural)
        'I walked three kilometers/the way to there'

(24a) for instance can be used in contexts such as (28), but (24b) cannot:

(28)   a. *Mendi   horretara igo   naiz, baina ez   naiz tontorreraino iritsi*
        mountain that-to   climb Aux-I but   neg Aux-I top-to   get
        'I climbed to that mountain, but i didn´t get to the top'

       b. *Mendi   hura igo   dut, #baina ez naiz   tontorreraino iritsi*
        mountain that climb Aux-T but   neg Aux-I top-to   get
        'I climbed that mountain, #but I didn't get to the top'

Some of these verbs, for instance *igo* and *jaitsi* , can be bivalent, in which case the nominal complement is understood as the patient or theme of the event. The auxiliary following the verb is transitive in that case too, and the transitivity alternation involved is of the causative/inchoative type (see section 4.2. in this chapter):

(29)   a. *Kaxa guziak igo   ditut*   b. *Kaxak jeitsi   ditut*
        Box   all   take up aux-T   box-pl take down aux-T
        'I took up all the boxes'   'I took down the boxes'

The specified distance and the object can occur together in these cases. Agreement is with the theme argument:

(30)   a. *Kaxak   200 metro igo   ditut*
        boxes-D 200 mts   take up Aux-T
        'I took up the boxes 200 meters'

       b. *Kaxak   200 metro jeitsi ditut*
        boxes-D 200 mts   take down Aux-T
        'I took down the boxes 200 meters'

An interesting subcase of this sort of transitivity alternation is provided by two verbs of movement: *iritsi* and *heldu* , both meaning "arrive, get somewhere"[7]. Their transitive counterpart means "reach" in the case of *iritsi* , and "grab" in the case of *heldu* . The latter requires a ditransitive auxiliary:

---

[7] *Heldu* also means "to ripen, to mature". See next section.

(31)   a. *Iritsi da*   b. *Iritsi du*
           arrive Aux-I   reach Aux-T
           'He/she arrived'   'He/she reached it'
(32)   a. *Heldu da*   b. *Heldu dio*
           arrive Aux-I   grab   Aux-DT
           'He/she arrived'   'He/she grabbed him'

Both *iritsi* and *heldu*, meaning "arrive" contrast sharply with ailegatu, also meaning "to arrive", that cannot be converted into a transitive verb. Why should *iritsi* and *heldu*, but not *ailegatu* have a transitive counterpart? Consider the contrast between the two verbs when they occur inside a complement to *hasi*, "to begin" or *bukatu* "to finish", two verbs that can have an aspectual function as semiauxiliaries:

(33)   a. *Kamioia Iruna   iristen hasi   da*
             runner   Irun-to arrive begin Aux-I
           'The truck began to arrive to Irun (a village)'
        b. ??*Kamioia Iruna   ailegatzen hasi   da*
             runner   stadium-to arrive   begin Aux-I
           'The truck began to arrive to Irun'
(34)   a. *Paketeak   bukatu du   iristen*
             package-Erg finish Aux-T arrive-N-Loc
           'The package finished arriving'
        b. *??Paketeak   bukatu du   ailegatzen*
             package-Erg finish   Aux-T arrive-N-Loc
           'The package finished arriving'

Whereas *iritsi* admits being the main predication of the complement of *hasi* and *bukatu*, *ailegatu* doesn´t. The contrast can be accounted for under the assumption that *iritsi*, but not *ailegatu*, involves in its argument structure a path structure (that can be focused on for different subparts) for the event it denotes (Jackendoff,1983, p.161-170). Observe that the rest of the pure intransitive motion verbs are also impossible under *hasi* with the meaning in which subparts of a purported path are selected:

(35)   a. *Londresera joaten hasi da*   b. *Bilbora   etortzen   hasi   da*
           London-to go-Ger begin Aux-I   Bilbao-to come-Ger begin Aux-I
           'He began to go to London'   'He began to come to Bilbao'

In none of the above cases does the beginning refer to the internal configuration of the coming or going event, but rather to the beginning of an habitual fact: that John comes or goes somewhere frequently.

In the case of *bukatu* "to finish", the complement with *iritsi* is interpreted in terms of a path structure. An appropriate scenario for the interpretation of (28a) could be the following: the package, which was coming from Pakistan to my homevillage in the Basque Country, was lost in the village post office but finally managed to reach my

house The complement with *ailegatu* cannot be interpreted that way.

Heldu , which also enters into a transitivity alternation, goes with *iritsi* , and not *ailegatu* [8]:

(36) *Kamioia Iruna heltzen   hasi da*
       Truck-abs Irun-to arrive-N-ger begin Aux-I
       'The truck began to arrive to Irun'

The lexical structure of *iritsi* and *heldu* , specifying a motion through a path, allows the transitive use of those verbs.

A similar distinction affects *partitu* (E) and *joan* "depart", which can only be used intransitively, and *abiatu* "set off", which can be used transitively. *Abiatu* shows an alternation similar to the *jaitsi* and *igaro* cases (ex.25-26). Observe the contrast below:

(37)   a. *Abiatu   da*
          set off   Aux-I
       b. *Konpainiak proiektu berri bat abiatu du*
          company-Erg new project-Abs set off Aux-T
       c. **Konpainiak hiru langile abiatu ditu*
           company-Erg three worker set off Aux-T

Whereas the transitive *abiatu* allows an object such as *proiektu berri bat* "a new project", it does not admit an animate object such as *hiru langile* "three workers". The reason is that *proiektu berri bat* is an affected object, one that is constructed as the event goes on. *Hiru langile* "three workers" however cannot be affected that way: the only interpretation the complement can give rise to is one in which it is a theme, an object set in motion by an agent. This latter alternation would be of the inchoative/causative type. But in this case, to get a causative interpretation, we need a causative affix:

(38)   *Konpainiak hiru langile   abiarazi   ditu*
       company-Erg three workers set off-cause Aux-T

---

[8] If verbs such as *heldu* or *iritsi* have a path structure, with a process subpart and an endpoint, we may have a partial explanation of why in some varieties of Basque the participial intransitive form of *heldu* , as in (i):

(ii)   Heldu   da
             Arrive-partc Aux-I
             'It arrived'
             'It is arriving now (it comes)'

Is ambiguous between a process reading and a result reading. In those varieties where (i) is possible, the verb heldu lexicalizes either the process or the result state of a path structure.

'The company set off three workers"

Verbs of location can also be classified according to their ability to transitivize. Consider for instance the verb *gelditu* which means either "remain" or "stop" in its intransitive use. When it is used transitively, only the "stop" meaning remains. The transitive alternate means "to cause x to stop". The alternation is thus of the causative/inchoative type. *Egon* "stay, be in a location" only takes the intransitive auxiliary:

(39)   a. *Zakurra bidean gelditu   da*
          dog-the way-in stop/remain aux
          'The dog stopped/remained in the way'
       b. *Jonek   zakurra   gelditu du*
          Jon-Erg dog-the   stop   aux
          'Jon stopped the dog'
(40)   *Zakurra denbora luzez egon   da   etzanda*
        dog-D   long   time be/stay Aux-I lying
       'The dog stayed lying/laid for a long time'

2.5. Verbs of occurrence and appearance

The availability of a transitive alternate distinguishes between two subsets among the verbs of occurrence: *Gertatu* "to happen, to result in" and *Pasatu* "to happen, to come by, to go through" on the one hand, *Jazo* (B) "to happen, to occur" on the other.

The two meanings of *gertatu* are illustrated below:

(41)   a. *Ezbehar bat gertatu da*
          accident one happen Aux-I
          'An accident occurred'
(42)   a. *Euskal arimaren mintzabide gerta   dadin* (MEIG III, 118)
          Basque spirit-of expression result Aux-I-Subj.
          'So that it results in the expression of the basque spirit'
       b. *Irrigarri   gertatu   gara*
          ridiculous result-partc Aux-I
          'We found ourselves in ridicule'
       c. *Horrelako beharrean gertatu   naiz*
          such   need   result-partc Aux-I
          'I found myself in such a need'

In (41), *gertatu* is just a verb denoting occurrence. In (42), it is clearly a resultative verb, allowing secondary predication of a result state. The different meanings of *pasatu* are illustrated in (43)-(44).

(43)   a. *Hala pasatu da*   b. *Jende anitz   pasa   da*
          so   happen Aux-I   people many pass-by Aux

14

'So it happened'   'A lot of people came by'

(44)   a. *Ibaiean zehar /ibaitik   pasatu naiz*
           river-in through   pass   Aux-I
       'I went through the river'

In other words, there is no transitive equivalent of *gertatu* "to happen" or *pasatu* "to happen, to come by".

Only the resultative *gertatu* can be transitivized (45), with the meaning of "to prepare, to arrange", and only the path structure *pasatu* takes a transitive auxiliary (46):

(45)   a. *Afaria gertatu dugu*   b. *Gertatu zuten urkamendia*
           dinner prepared Aux-T   arrange Aux-T scaffold-D
           'We prepared the dinner'   'The arranged the scaffold'
(46)   a. *Ibaia pasatu dut*   b. *Gorriak pasatu ditu*
           river cross   Aux-T   hardship pass Aux-T
           'I crossed the river'   'He went through/endured hardship'

This transitivity alternation thus recalls the one found in motion verbs such as *igo* "to climb" or *jaitsi* "to descend".*Pasatu* can also have a bivalent transitive form, in the same way that verbs such as *jaitsi* or *igo* can, taking a theme argument complement:

(47)   *Kontrabandoa pasatu   dute*
        contraband-D pass-partc Aux-T
        'They passed the contraband'

Jazo "to happen" cannot be transitivized, as it does not have a resultative or a bounded space reading:

(48)   a. *Hori jazo   da*   b. **Parregarri jazo gara*
           that happen Aux-I   ridicule happen Aux-I
           'That happened'   '(Intended) we found ourselves in ridicule'
        c. **Hori jazo du*
           that   happen Aux-T

Verbs that express occurrence as a matter of chance, such as *suertatu* , *tokatu* , *fortunatu* , are followed invariably by an intransitive auxiliary:

(49)   *Halaxe/hori suertatu/fortunatu/tokatu da   oraingoan*
        so/that   happen-partc by chance   Aux-I this time
        'So it happened this time/that happened this time (by chance)"

Other verbs of appearance such as *agertu* "to show up, to appear (somewhere)", and *azaldu* "to show up, to pop up, to surface" give rise to an inchoative8causative alternation. When they are transitivized they become "to show" and "to explain, to

expose" respectively:

(50) a. *Untzi bat agertu da   ostertzean*
      ship one appear Aux-I horizon-in
      'A ship appeared in the horizon'
    b. *Azkenaldian problemak azaldu dira*
      lately   problems pop up Aux
      'Problems popped up lately'
(51) a. *Nere borondatea agertu nion*
      my will   show Aux-DT
      'I show him my willingness'
    b. *Teorema azaldu   nion*
      theorem explain Aux-DT
      'I explained the theorem to him'

Not all verbs of appearance can enter into such an alternation. For instance *desagertu* "disappear" cannot. To convert *desagertu*   into a transitive verb we need to invoke the causative affix *-erazi* :

(52) *Gorpua desagertarazi   dute*
    corps   disappear-Cause   Aux
    'they made the corps disappear'

2.6. Verbs of change of state

Verbs of change of state can also be divided into those that admit and those that don´t admit transitivization. Consider for instance the difference between *jaio* "be born" and *sortu* "come into existence". Whereas the first only involves a result state, the second one is a complex event. Only sortu allows transitivization:

(53) a. *Irunen jaio da*   b. *Irunen sortu*   *da*
      Irun-in born Aux-I   Irun-in come-into-existence Aux
      'He is born in Irun'   'He came into existence in Irun'
(54) a. *Jaio du   b.*Sortu du*
      born Aux-T   create Aux-T
                    'He created it/gave it birth'

A similar distinction affects *garatu* "to sprout, to develop", *ugaldu* "to multiply, to increase in number", *ondu* "to ripen", on the one hand, and *loratu* "to bloom", lilitu "to blossom", *heldu* "to mature" on the other. The latter do not transitivize, the former do, with the following meanings: *garatu* "to develop (tr), *ugaldu* "to multiply (tr.), *ondu* "to ripen(tr.)".

Verbs which denote the transition between two successive states, such as *bihurtu* "to become" and or more, such as *bilakatu* "to develop into", can be conjugated either with the intransitive or the transitive auxiliary. With the transitive auxiliary, they mean

"to convert x into y" and "to develop x into y":

(55) a. *Aberats bihurtu da*   b. *Famatua bilakatu da*
     rich   become   Aux-I   famous   develop-into Aux-I
     'He became rich'   'He developed into a famous person'

(56) a. *Eraikin   hura zahar-etxe   bihurtu dute*
     building that   old folk's home convert Aux-T
     'they converted that building into an old folk's home'
    b. *Aberatsentzako elkartokia   bilakatu   dute*
     rich-for   meeting-club develop-into Aux-T
     'They developed it into a meeting-club for the rich'

The verb *jarri* "to put", when used intransitively, with an animate subject and following a stage level adjective or an adverb denoting a mental state, also has the meaning of "to become":

(57)   *Triste/pozik jarri da*
     sad/glad   put   Aux-I
     'He became sad/glad'

2.7. Weather Verbs
     The event configuration of weather verbs also allows transitivity alternations. Non-eventive predications are formed with a nominal expression and the verb *egon* "to be in a location":

(58) a. *Bero dago*   b. *Hotz dago*   c. *Ilun dago*   d. *Ateri dago*
     hot   is   cold   is   dark is   clear is
     'It is hot'   'It is cold'   'It is dark'   'It is clear'

As soon as we focus on the resultative state of a weather change, we are forced to use the transitive auxiliary[9,10] :

---

[9] For some reason it does not extend to *goibel* " cloudy". Its perfective form requires the intransitive auxiliary:

     (i)   a. Goibel dago   b. Goibeldu   da/*du
              cloudy   is   cloudy-partc Aux-I/T
              'It is cloudy'   'It became cloudy'

[10] Whereas (59a-c) can specify the object of change (the day or evening becomes hot, cold or dark), (59d) cannot. In those cases, the perfective forms become intransitive (i), unless the agent or cause of change becomes itself explicit too:

     (i)   a. Eguna berotu   da/*du   b. Eguna hoztu da/*du
              day-D   warm-partc Aux-I/T   day-D   cold   Aux-I/T
              'The day became hot'   'The day became cold'

          c. Eguna   ilundu   da/*du   d. *Zerua atertu da

17

(59) a. *Berotu   du*   b. *Hoztu   du*   c. *Ilundu   du*
     warm-partc Aux-T   cold-partc Aux-T   dark-partc Aux-T
     'It has become hot'   'It has become cold'   'It has become dark'
   d. *Atertu   du*
     clear-partc Aux-T
     'It has become clear'

When the weather condition involves events, such as "rain", or "snow", the transitive auxiliary is the only option. The gerundive aspectual particle *ari* is obligatory in this case:

(60) a. *Euria ari du*   b. *Elurra ari du*   c. *Izotza ari du*
     rain   Ger Aux-T   snow Ger Aux-T   freeze Ger Aux-T
     'It is raining'   'It is snowing'   'It is freezing'

Generic statements involving atmospheric conditions also involve the transitive auxiliary, rather than *egon* :

(61)   a. *Herri horietan   bero haundia egiten   du/?dago*

---

                day-D dark-partc Aux-I/T   sky   clear   Aux-I
                'The day darkened'

   (ii)   a. Hego haizeak   eguna berotu   du
            south wind-Erg day-D warm-partc Aux-T
            'The south wind warmed the day'

         b. Hodeiek   eguna ilundu   dute
            clouds-Erg day-D dark-partc Aux-T
            'The clouds darkened the day'

Although Basque is a pro-drop language on the three basic arguments of the verb (subject,object and indirect object) on no account should the examples in (30) be interpreted as derived from regular transitive bivalent structures such as (2) above by pro-drop on the subject. Consider the following contrast, where the empty brackets represent a purported pro-dropped argument:

   (iii)   a. *[ ]$_i$ berotu   du,   baina [ ]$_i$ ez zen berez   hain haize beroa
                 warm-partc Aux-T, but   not was by itself such warm wind-D
            '*It$_i$ warmed, but it$_i$ wasn't such a hot air'

        b. [ ]$_i$ eguna berotu   du,   baina [ ]$_i$ ez zen hain haize beroa
               day-D warm-partc Aux-T, but   not was such warm wind-D
           'It warmed the day, but it wasn't such a hot air'

Whereas the subject of a transitive bivalent weather predicate is referential, whether pro-dropped or not, the subject of a transitive monovalent weather predicate cannot be referred to. Pro-droped elements in Basque are referential.

country those-in hot   big   do-Hab Aux-T/be-in a location
'In those countries it is very hot (as a property of those countries)'
b. *Ifar   poloan hotz haundia egiten   du/?dago*
north pole-in cold big   do-Hab Aux-T/be-in a location
'In the north pole, it is very cold (as a property of the pole)'

Although the transitive forms can also be used, together with the noun+*egon* forms, to express punctual situations:

(62)   a. *Jamaikan   bero haundia dago   (oraintxe)*
jamaica-in hot   big   be-in a location (right now)
'In Jamaica it is very hot right now'
b. *Jamaikan   bero haundia egiten   du   (oraintxe)*
Jamaica-in hot   big   do-Hab Aux-T   right now
'In Jamaica it is very hot right now'

2.8. Aspectual and Control Verbs
2.8.1. Aspectual Verbs
Basque has a seemingly purely intransitive aspectual verb *ari izan*, which is used to form the gerundive. This aspectual verb follows a locative nominal expressing an event, or a nominalized clause[11] (see Oihartzabal, this volume):

(63)   a. *Lanean ari da*   b. *Lanean   aritu   da*
work-in ari Aux-I   work-in ari-Partc Aux-I
'He is writing'   'He has been working'

With the same function western Basque also has *egon* "be in a location":

(64)   a. *Lanean dago*   b. *Lanean   egon da*
work-in is   work-in be   Aux-I
'He is working'   'He has been working'

The verb *hasi* has also an aspectual, monovalent use ("to begin to"), when followed by a locative phrase containing a bare nominal or a nominalized clause. In this case it is followed by the intransitive auxiliary *izan* (see Artiagoitia, chapter XXX):

(65)   a. *Lanean hasi   naiz*   b. *Idazten hasi   naiz*
work-in begin Aux-I   writing begin Aux-I

---

[11] This aspectual verb is followed by a transitive auxiliary only when it follows a nominal expressing an eventive weather condition:

(i)   Euria ari du
rain ari Aux-T
'It is raining'

'I began to work'   'I began to write/writing'

Hasi "to begin" can also be a bivalent verb, in which case it is followed by a transitive auxiliary:

(66)   *Nobela berri bat   hasi   du*
        novel   new one begin Aux-T
        'He began a new novel'

Also intransitive is the verb *ibili* "to walk" when it is used as a frequentative aspectual auxiliary:

(67)   *Bere burutazioak idazten   ibiltzen   da*
        my   memories   writing   walking Aux-I
        'He is/keeps writing his thoughts'

The verb *joan* "to go" can be used as an aspectual verb denoting gradual change. In that case, it is preceded by a nominalized clause followed by the locative postposition:

(68)   *Ohitzen   joan da*
        Custom-N-Loc go   Aux-I
        'He has got used to it gradually'

2.8.2. Control verbs: the *try* -class

Control verbs of the *try* -class, are only conjugated with the intransitive auxiliary *izan* (qua control verbs). The nominalized complements of these verbs are followed by a locative suffix (see Artiagoitia, Subordination, 1.2.2.2.6) Consider for instance *saiatu* and *ahalegindu* "to try, to attempt" and *ausartu* "dare":

(69)   *Xabier irrifarre egiten   saiatu/ahalegindu da*
        Xabier smile   do-N-loc try   Aux-I
        'Xabier tried to smile'

Saiatu can be used also as a transitive verb only with a nominal, non-clausal complement as "to try (something)":

(70)   *Mirenek   soineko berria saiatu du*
        Miren-Erg dress   new   try   Aux-T
        'Miren tried a new dress'

Neither *ahalegindu* nor *ausartu* have transitive counterparts.

2.9. Reflexives

In Basque, reflexivization operates either with the addition of reflexive arguments (*elkar* "each other" and X-*ren burua* "X-self" (literally "X's head")) or by

detransitivizing the auxiliary, which becomes the intransitive *izan* "to be":

(71)   a. *Jonek   bere burua ispiluan   ikusi du*
         Jone-Erg his head   in the mirror   see Aux-T
         'Jon saw himself in the mirror'
       b. *Jon ispiluan   ikusi da*
         jon mirror-in see   Aux-I
         'Jon saw himself in the mirror'

The alternation is not entirely free, however. Many arguments can only take the reflexive argument, and cannot reflexivize via detransitivization, whereas other predicates can only form their reflexive by ditransitivizing. Still, a third class of predicates can be reflexivized in either of the two ways.

A sample of verbs that do not reflexivize with the intransitive auxiliary would consist of: *maite izan* "to love", *atsegin izan* "to like", *erakutsi* "to exhibit", *errepresentatu* "to represent", *irudikatu* "to represent, to picture", *ito* "to drawn, to asfixiate", *erre* "to burn", *jantzi* "to educate" (Abs) , *adoretu* "to encourage", *akatu* "to kill", *miretsi*, *ederretsi* "to admire", *ezagutu* "to know", *hobetsi* "to favor", *iraunarazi* "to perpetuate, to preserve", *nabarmendu* "to show off", *nahastu* "to mess up", *puztu* "to boast", *zuritu* "to justify". These verbs divide into three classes: those verbs whose intransitive forms are inchoatives, such as *erre* , *ito* , *puztu* , *zuritu* , *puztu* , *nabarmendu* , *nahastu* ; verbs which are stative, such as *maite izan* , *atsegin izan* , *ezagutu* , *miretsi* , *ederretsi* and *hobetsi* , and then a handful of eventive verbs involving (active) representation, such as *errepresentatu* , *irudikatu*, and *erakutsi* .

Those predicates whose reflexive argument is mapped into a grammatical function which is not marked Absolutive, obligatorily take a reflexive noun phrase (case or postposition of the non-absolutive argument in parentheses): *burlatu* "to make fun of" (Instr.), *leporatu* "to impute" (Dat), *egotzi* "to attribute" (Dat), *galdetu* "to ask" (Dat), *fidatu* "to trust" (Instr.), *solastatu* "to talk with" (Com.), *ahaztu* "to forget" (Instr), *arduratu* "to take responsibility for" (Instr), *axolagabetu* "to become unconcerned" (Instr), *etsaitu* "to become enemies" (Com), *etsitu* "to desperate" (Instr), *jaramon egin* "to pay attention" (Dat), *kexu izan* "to be uneasy with" (Instr), *kasu egin* "to pay attention" (Dat) *sinetsi* "to believe in"(loc):

(72)   a. *Bere buruarengan sinesten du*   b. **Sinisten da*
         his head-in   believe Aux-T   believe Aux-I
         'He believes in himself'   'He believes in himself'
       b. *Bere buruari galdetu dio*   d. **Galdetu da*
         his head-Dat ask   Aux-DT   ask   Aux-T
         'He asked himself/wondered'   'He asked himself/wondered'

Predicates that reflexivize by either a reflexive argument or by an intransitive auxiliary constitute the richest group. Among them: *aurkeztu* "to introduce", *bota* "to

throw (e.g. oneself under the bridge)", *estimatu* "to appreciate", *laudatu* , *goraipatu* "to praise", *gobernatu* "to look after oneself", *libratu* "to set free", *armatu* "to arm", *babestu* "to protect", *behartu* "to force", *defendatu* "to defend", *desondratu* "to dishonor", *engainatu* "to deceive", *gaitu* "to able", *gertatu, prestatu* "to prepare, to arrange", *ikusi* "to see", *juzkatu* "to judge", *konparatu* "to compare", *saldu* "to sell (e.g. to the enemy)" *zaindu* "to take care of":

(73) a. *Xabier   etengabe   goraipatu da*
        Xabier-Abs continuously praise   Aux-I
        'Xabier has praised himself continuously'
      b. *Xabierrek etengabe   bere burua goraipatu du*
        Xabier-Erg continuously his head   praise Aux-T
        'Xabier has praised himself continuously'

The two alternative forms are not always equivalent. This is particularly clear with constructions that specify a path structure. Take for instance a verb like babestu "to protect", that can be reflexivized through detransitivization or by a reflexive noun phrase:

(74) a. *Babestu   gara*   b. *Gure buruak babestu   ditugu*
        protect-partc Aux-I   our heads-abs protect-partc Aux-T
        'We protected ourselves'   'We protected ourselves'

If we introduce an adlative modifier and create a path structure, detransitivization becomes the only available strategy:

(75) a. *Gerrilariak basora babestu   dira*
        partisans-abs wood-to protect-partc Aux-I
        'The partisans protected themselves into the woods'
      b. **Gerrilariak beren buruak basora   babestu   dituzte*
        partisans   their heads-abs woods-to protect-partc Aux-T
        'The partisans protected themselves inmto the woods'

The reflexive noun phrase is again possible if the modifier is locative, and expresses the place where the partisans protect themselves:

(76) a.*Gerrilariek   basoan babestu   dituzte beren buruak*
        partisans-erg wood-in protect-partc Aux-T their   heads-abs
        'The partisans protected themselves in the wood'

    Consider now the verb *bota* "to throw", a verb that inherently specifies direction of motion. The alternate with the reflexive phrase gives rise to ambiguous interpretation of modifiers in a way that the intransitive altyernates don't:

(77) a. *Xabier   zubiazpian   bota da*

22

Xabier-abs under the bridge-loc throw Aux-I
'Xabier threw himself under the bridge'
   b. *Xabierrek bere burua zubiazpian bota   du*
Xabier-erg his head-abs under the bridge-loc Aux-T
'Xabier threw himself under the bridge'

In (77b) the locative modifier "under the bridge" is ambiguous between two readings: one that modifies the beginning of the event (that is the place from which the jumping takes place) or the endpoint of the event (the place where the jump ends). Xabier may have thrown himself from under the bridge or to under the bridge. In (77a) no such ambiguity arises: *zubiazpian* "under the bridge" only localizes the place from which the jumping tales place. The ambiguity in (77b) disappears if the postposition is directional. In this case the modifier marks the place from where the jumping occurred:

(78)   *Xabierrek bere burua zubiazpira   bota du*
        Xabier-erg his head-abs under the bridge-to throw Aux-T
        'Xabier threw himself (to) under the bridge'

The ambiguity in the scope of the locative suggests that reflexive forms constructed with a noun-phrase reflexive have a more complex structure than the intransitive reflexive forms.

     Predicates that only admit the intransitive reflexive form are the so-called inherent reflexives: *gorde* "to hide" *jantzi* "to dress", *apaindu* "to make up", *garbitu* "to wash", *zikindu* "to soil", *idortu*, *lehortu* "to dry". Intransitive forms here not allways have a reflexive meaning, they can also have an inchoative meaning:

(79)   a. *Jantziak lehortu dira*   b. *Lehioak zikindu dira*
        clothes dry   Aux-I   windows soil   Aux-I
        'The clothes dried'   'The windows soiled'
   b. *Eguzkia gorde da*   c. *Zelaia lorez   jantzi da*
        sun   hide Aux-I   field   flower-instr dress Aux-I
        'The sun hid'   'The field became dressed with flowers'

All of them have also transitive forms in which the arguments are not coindexed. and which are associated to the inchoatives:

(80)   a. *Xabierrek zakurra garbitu du*
        Xabier-erg dog-Abs wash   Aux-T
        'Xabier washed the dog'
   b. *Xabier   garbitu da*
        Xabier-abs wash   Aux-I
        'Xabier washed'

However, none of them can take a reflexive NP:

(81)   a. *Mirenek   panpina jantzi du*
          Miren-erg doll   dress Aux-T
          'Miren dressed her doll'
       b. **Mirenek   bere burua jantzi du*
          Miren-erg his head   dress Aux-T
          'Miren dressed up'
(82)   ??*Mirenek   bere burua garbitu du*
          Miren-erg his head   wash   Aux-T
          'Miren washed'
(83)   a. *Mirenek   ilea idortu du*
          Miren-erg hair dry   Aux-T
          'Miren dried up her hair'
       b. **Mirenek   bere burua idortu du*
          Miren-erg his head   dry   Aux-T
          'Miren dried herself up'

3. Intransitive Bivalent Structures (dative-absolutive constructions)

Dative-absolutive auxiliaries can be found following four different verb classes: (i) motion verbs; (ii) psych verbs of the *piacere* class; (iii) "dative of interest" constructions; and finally, a small set of verbs that alternate between dative-absolutive auxiliaries and ditransitive auxiliaries. Psych verbs are extensively discussed in section 4.6. "Dative of interest" constructions are treated in section 6, as possessive constructions. Here I will deal briefly with the first and last subclasses.

3.1. Motion verbs

Purely intransitive motion verbs may incorporate a dative agreement marker, as the verb *joan* "to go" below:

(84)   a. *Joan da*   b. *Joan zaio*
          go Aux-I(abs)   go   Aux-I(abs-dat)
          'He went'   'He went to him'

In verbs of motion, the dative argument has the role of endpoint of the motion. Consider for instance the aspectual difference between (a) and (b) above:

(85)   a. *Xabier   ordubietan   Jonengana joan da.*   *Lauretarako*
           Xabier-abs two o'clock-at Jon-to   go   Aux-I(abs-dat) four-by
           iritsi   gabea   zen (oraindik)
           arrived without-Det was yet
           'Xabier went to Miren at two o'clock. By four o'clock he wasn't yet there'
        b. *Xabier   Mireni   ordubietan joan zaio.*   # *Lauretarako   iritsi*
           Xabier-abs Miren-dat two o'clock go   Aux-I(abs-dat)   four o'clock-by arrive
           gabea   zen
           without-Det was
           'Xabier went to Miren at two o'clock. By four o'clock he wasn't yet there'

Alternatively, the dative can just express a relation of possession or interest between the absolutive subject and the argument marked by dative Case (section 6). In those cases, the dative constructions can be paraphrased by a phrase internal possessive. No aspectual effect arises in these cases:

(86) a. *Jonen adiskide bat   joan   da*
        Jon-g friend   one-abs leave Aux-I
        'A friend of Jon left'
      b. *Joni   adiskide bat joan   zaio*
        Jon-dat friend   one leave Aux(dat-abs)
        'A friend of Jon left'

3.2. Alternating verbs

A few verbs show two auxiliary choices: *baliatu* "to be profitable for someone" and *atxeki* "to attach to, to stick", for instance, take either an ergative-absolutive auxiliary or a dative-absolutive one:

(87) a. *Hori   baliatu   zaio*
        that-abs profit-partc Aux(dat-abs)
        'That was profitable to him'
      b. *Hori   baliatu   du*
        that-abs profit-partc Aux-T
        'He made that profitable'
(88) a. *Atxiki   zaio*   b. *Atxiki   du*
        stick-partc Aux(dat-abs)   stick-partc Aux-T
        'It sticked to him'   'He retained it'

When in the ergative/absolutive pattern those verbs mean, respectively, "to make something profitable" and "to retain". Only the former gives rise to a causative meaning in its transitive variant. One noun+auxiliary construction that is not a mental state also shows the same kind of alternation as (88): *eskas ,falta* +auxiliary "to lack" (89).

(89) a. *Zopak   gatza   falta du*   b. *Zopari   gatza   falta zaio*
        soup-erg salt-abs lack Aux-T   Soup-dat salt-abs lack Aux(dat-abs)
        'The soup needs salt'   'The soup lacks salt'

A handful of verbs such as *jarraitu* "to follow" and *jazarri* "to rebel" use both the dative-absolutive and the ditransitive auxiliaries interchangeably. The historical record shows that those verbs were originally employed only with the dative-absolutive auxiliary. The ditransitive auxiliary has imposed in the last couple of centuries. *Jariatu* "to spill" admits indistinctly both the dative-absolutive and the transitive (ergative-absolutive) auxiliaries. In its synthetic form, the dative-absolutive is the most common, although some varieties admit transitive bipersonal forms:

(90)   a. *Zauriari   odola dario*
           wound-dat blood spill(dat-abs)
           'The wound bleeds'
        b. *Etxeetako tximiniak   kea   dariote*   (Lz,BB,156)
           houses-g chimney-erg smoke spill(erg-abs)
           'The chimneys of the houses send up smoke'

Some noun+auxiliary constructions take the dative-absolutive auxiliary among a wider range of choices. For instance *balio* +auxiliary "to be worth" and *axola* +auxiliary "to matter":

(91)   a. *Balio du*   b. *Balio zaio*   c. *Balio dio*
           value Aux-T   value Aux(dat-abs)   value Aux-DT
           'It is worth'   'It is worth/useful for him'   'It is worth/useful for him'

3.3. An aspectual verb: lotu
The verb *lotu* , which has a transitive use as "to tie" has an aspectual use in its dative-absolutive form as "to engage in":

(92)   a. *Lokarriak lotu   ditu*   b. *Lanari   lotu   zaio*
           ties-abs   tie-partc Aux-T   work-dat tie-partc Aux(dat-abs)
           'He tied his laces'   'He tied himself to work (he engaged in working)'

4. Transitive Structures
4.1. Unergatives
A class of predicates in Basque takes the transitive auxiliary but typically prohibits, or severely constrains, the availability of an overt object. This class corresponds roughly to the class of unergative predicates of other languages (Perlmutter, 78;Burzio,1981, Levin,1983). Unergative predicates have an ergative subject, typical of transitive structures. Compare in this regard a standard transitive verb such as *erosi* "to buy", and an unergative verb such *distiratu* "to shine":

(93)   a. *Jonek etxe berria   erosi   du*
           Jon-erg house new-D-abs buy-partc Aux-T
           'Jon bought a new house'
        b. *Lehioko   kristalak distiratu   du*
           window-of glass-erg shine-partc Aux-T
           'The glass in the window shone'
        c. *Kristalak lurra distiratu   du*
           glass-erg floor shine-partc Aux-T
           '*The glass shone the floor (made the floor shine)'

Verbs of this sort are also *dirdiratu* "to glimmer", *botatu* (W) "to bounce", *bozkatu* "to vote", *eskiatu* "to sky", *nabigatu* "to navigate", *txitatu* (W) "to set on eggs", *gogoetatu* "to meditate", *eutsi* "to withstand", *irakin* "to boil", *iraun* "to persist", *bazkaldu* "to

26

lunch", *afaldu* "to have dinner", *usaitu* "to smell".

When unergative verbs admit objects, they are either cognate objects (94), or in the case of motion verbs, complements indicating length (95):

(94)   a. *Gene Kelly-k   dantza famatu bat   dantzatzen du   film horretan*
        Gene Kelly-erg dance famous one dance-ger   Aux-T film that-loc
        'Gene Kelly dances a famous dance in that film'
    b. *Jolas polit bat jolastu   zuten*
      play nice one play-partc Aux-T
      'They played a nice play'
    c. *Abraracourcix-ek   borroka luze bat borrokatzen du   istorio horretan*
        Abraracourcix-erg fight   long one fight-ger   Aux-T story   that-loc
        'Abraracourcix fights a long fight in that story'
(95)   a. *Jauzilari kubarrak bi   metro saltatu   ditu*
        jumper   cuban-erg two meters jump-partc   aux-T(pl)
        'The cuban athlete jumped two meters'
    b. *Bi kilometro   korritu   ditut oinutsik*
      two kilometers run-partc Aux-T barefoot

Alternatively (and most commonly), unergative verbs in Basque are complex predicates, composed by a (typically) bare noun that specifies the kind of event involved, and a verb indicating action: *egin* "to do" (see section 4.6). Many unergative verbs can occur in either of those two forms (96). The possibility of having a cognate object disappears in the complex predicate alternate (Uribe-Etxebarria, 1989)(97):

(96)   a. *Jonek korritu   du*   b. *Jonek   korri egin du*
        Jon-erg run-partc Aux-T   Jon-erg run do   Aux-T
        'Jon ran'   'Jon ran'
(97)   a. *Jonek dantza bat dantzatu   du*
        Jon-erg dance one dance-partc Aux-T
        'Jon danced a dance'
    b. **Jonek   dantza bat dantza egin du*
        Jon-erg dance one dance do   Aux-T
        'Jon danced a dance'

The existence of complex predicates of the sort above has been adduced as evidence that unergative verbs are syntactically transitive, having a thematic object in their underlying representation (Hale&Keyser,91,93). The existence of such a correlation between syntactically transitive compound predicates and morphologically transitive simplex verbs, together with the case marking of the subject in simplex unergative predicates supports that idea. However, that correlation does not always hold: to some complex predicates formed with a bare noun or locative phrase (see section 4.6) and the verb *egin* "to do" correspond simplex verbs with intransitive auxiliaries and absolutive surface subjects. Among those are: *hegatu* "to fly" (<*hegan/z*

egin　"wing-loc/instr do"), *dardaratu* "to tremble" (<*dardar egin* "trembling do"), *irristatu* "to slip" (<*irrist egin*　"slip do"), *behaztopatu*　"to stumble" (<*behaztopa egin* "stumble do"), *solastu* "to chat" (<*solas(ean) egin*　"chat-(loc) do") and *zintzatu* "to sneeze" (< *zintz egin* "to do sneeze"). Consider as an illustration (98):

(98)　　a. *Jonek　solas(ean) egin du　　gurekin*
　　　　　 Jon-erg chat-loc　 do　 Aux-T us-with
　　　　　 'Jon chatted with us'
　　　　b. *Jon gurekin solastu da*　　　　　c. **Jonek　gurekin solastu　　du*
　　　　　 Jon-abs us-with chat-partc Aux-I　　　 Jon-erg us-with chat-partc Aux-T
　　　　　 'Jon chatted with us'　　　　　　　　 'Jon chatted with us'

Other unergative verbs optionally admit an intransitive variant. These are: *jolastu* "to play", *borrokatu* "to fight", *gudukatu* "to war", *saltatu* "to jump", *dantzatu* "to dance", *barautu* "to fasten". An example is given in (99):

(99)　　a. *Jonek　Urtainen kontra borrokatu　du*
　　　　　 Jon-erg Urtain-g against fight-partc Aux-T
　　　　　 'Jon fought against Urtain'
　　　　b. *Jon　　Urtainen kontra borrokatu　da*
　　　　　 Jon-abs Urtain-g　against fight-partc Aux-T
　　　　　 'Jon fought against Urtain'

All those verbs have also transitive structures with an overt object, where the object measures the length of the event (with *jolastu* , *saltatu* , *dantzatu* , *barautu*), as in (100), or the target of the event (with *borrokatu*　and *gudukatu*), as in (101):

(100)　a. *Jonek　bi　dantza　　dantzatu　　ditu*
　　　　　 Jon-erg two dance-abs dance-partc Aux-T
　　　　　 'Jon danced two dances'
　　　　b. *Berrogei egun eta berrogei gau　barautu　　zituen*
　　　　　 forty　 day　 and forty　　 night fasten-partc Aux-T
　　　　　 'He fastened for forty days and forty nights'
(101)　a. *Urtain　　borrokatu du　　Jonek*
　　　　　 Urtain-abs fight-partc Aux-T Jon-erg
　　　　　 'Jon fought Urtain'
　　　　b. *Gu baino sendoagorik ez dugu　 ba　 gudukatuko*
　　　　　 us　than stronger-part neg aux-T then war-partc-fut
　　　　　 'We want war those who are stronger that us, then'

　　　　For some authors (Grimshaw,90; Pustejovsky, 92,95), the class of unergative predicates must be associated to a given aspectual configuration. Unergative predicates would be aspectual processes (Vendler,1967; Dowty 1979, Verkuyl,93 and references therein): verbs denoting an activity of indefinite length. For Grimshaw, the partial analogy between process denoting unergatives and prototypical transitive

accomplishments is derived from the fact that they share a process subpart. Accomplishments are complex events involving both a process subpart, that counts as the event bringing about a state, and a state subpart, denoting the result of the causation process. Agents and causes are typically related to the process subpart of a complex event, and they are mapped as the most prominent grammatical function: as (non-derived) subjects. If unergatives are processes, their single argument will be mapped as a non-derived, ergative subject too. Although such a proposal would explain the fact that all unergative verbs which are morphologically transitive are actually aspectual processes (see the list above), it fails to account for the fact that some of them either are, or can optionally be, intransitive. At least under the assumption that ergative Case should be invariably linked to non-derived subjects. It is also worth noting that the set of complex predicates, according to this characterization of unergative predicates, is actually larger than the set of aspectual processes. Complex predicates such as *behaztopa egin* "to stumble", *irrist/laban egin* "to slip" or *zintz egin* "to sneeze" are not aspectual processes. Interestingly, all those have intransitive simple couterparts.

Levin&Rappaport (1995) propose to derive the class of unergative verbs from the notion of "internally caused event". In internally caused eventualities, some property inherent to the argument of the verb is "responsible" for bringing about the eventuality. This is inmediately clear in the case of verbs such as *korritu* "to run" or *bozkatu* "to vote", that depend on the volition or will of the agent who performs that activity. Levin &Rappaport extend it also to verbs such as *distiratu* "to shine"or *irakin* "to boil" which are not agentive. Those verbs can be taken to describe internally caused eventualities because those eventualities arise from internal properties (material structure) of the arguments. In Basque, the correlation between internally caused event and transitive auxiliary is not clear-cut. Events which are externally or internally caused (in the sense of Levin and Rappaport) require the intransitive auxiliary (*dardaratu* "to tremble", *hegatu*, *hegaldatu* "to fly", *solastu* "to chat", *zintzatu* "to sneeze") whereas others optionally take it: *jolastu* "to play", *borrokatu* "to fight", *gudukatu* "to war", *dantzatu* "to dance". Although those verbs either do not take or do not necessarily take the transitive auxiliary, a diagnostic for unergativity in Basque, they do not allow (lexical) causative variants either[12], as other standard intransitive verbs do. This is a standard test for unergativity (Hale&Keyser, 1993, and references therein):

(102) a. **Berriak Mikel dardaratu du*
           news-erg Mikel-abs tremble-partc   Aux-T
           '*The news trembled Mikel (made Mikel tremble)'
       b. **Ehiztariak aztorea hegatu du*

---

[12] To derive their causatives we need an extra causative affix: -erazi. As an illustration:

(ii)   Berriak   Mikel   dardara-erazi   du
             News-erg Mikel-abs tremble-cause Aux-T
             'The news made Mikel tremble'

hunter-erg hawk-abs fly-partc Aux-T
'*The hunter flew the hawk (made the hawk fly)'
c. *Pailazoak haurrak   jolastu   ditu
   clown-erg children-abs play-partc Aux-T
   'The clown played the children (made the children play)'

4.2. Causative/Inchoative Alternation

This transitivity alternation affects typically those change of state verbs that are constructed out of adjectives such as *garbi* "clean", *ilun* "obscure", *argi* "clear", *zikin* "dirty" or *arin* "light". The alternation can be transparently described by adding a causative layer to the intransitive counterpart. For instance *garbitu* "to clean":

(103) a. *Garbitu   da*   b. *Garbitu   du*
         clean-partc Aux-I   clear-partc Aux-T
         'It became clean'   'Someone cleaned it (made it become clean)'

Other verbs not derived from adjectives can also produce this alternation. For instance, verbs of directed motion:

(104) a. *Xabier sartu da*   b. *Xabierrek   kotxea   sartu du*
         Xabier enter Aux-I   Xabier-Erg car-Abs enter aux-T
(105) a. *Xabier atera   da*   b. *Xabierrek kotxea   atera   du*
         Xabier get out Aux-I   Xabier-Erg car-Abs take out Aux-T

Also all those verbs constructed from a noun specifying the endpoint of a motion and an adlative suffix that encodes direction:

(106) a. *Etxe-ra-tu   da*   b. *Norbait   etxe-ra-tu   du*
         home-to-partc Aux-I   someone home-to-partc   Aux-T
         'He went home'   'He took someone home'
(107) a. *Oheratu   da*   b. *Norbait oheratu   du*
         bed-to-partc Aux-I   someone   bed-to-partc Aux-T
         'He went to bed'   'He put someone to bed'

4.3. Monovalent transitive structures with measuring objects

A few transitive verbs admit monovalent structures in which the object measures out the event. Some of them require a locative or a comitative phrase that denotes an activity. The verbs in question are *eman* "to give", *egin* "to do", and *bete* "to fill".

(108) a. *Dirua eman du*   b. *Urteak eman ditu horretan*
         money give Aux-T   years-abs give Aux-T that-in
         'He/she gave money'   'He/she spent years on that'
(109) a. *Zerbait   egin du*   b. *Egunak egin ditu   horrekin*
         something do Aux-T   days-abs do   Aux-T that-with
         'He/she did something'   'He spent days with that'
(110) a. *Botila   bete du*   b. *Zigorra   bete   du*

30

bottle-abs fill Aux-T   (prison) term-abs accomplish Aux-T
'He filled the bottle'   'He accomplished his prison term'

4.4. Locative alternation

A few transitive verbs give rise to a locative alternation of the spray-load type (from Rebuschi, 82, p.347):

(111) a. *Patxik   soroan garia   erein du*
          Patxi-erg field-in wheat-abs sow   Aux-T
          'Patxi sowed wheat in the field'
       b. *Patxik   soroa   gariz   erein du*
          Patxi-erg field-abs wheat-instr sow Aux-T
          'Patxi sowed the field with wheat'
(112) a. *Patxik   sagarrak   kamioian kargatu ditu*
          Patxi-erg apples-abs truck-in   load   Aux-T(pl.abs)
          'Patxi loaded the apples in the truck
       b. *Patxik   kamioia sagarrez   kargatu zuen*
          Patxi-erg truck-abs apple-instr load   Aux-T(sing.abs)
          'Patxi loaded the truck with apples'

4.5. *Pit* -verbs

A small class of verbs of change of state, all of them related to growing, gives rise to a puzzling alternation. In this alternation, the transitive counterpart is interpreted as expressing a removal of the thing growed. Consider for instance the following unaccusative verbs:

(113) a. *Artaburuak   aletu   dira*
          corn-ears-abs pit-partc Aux-I
          'The corn (ears of) grew pits'
       b. *Adarrak   kimatu dira*
          Branches-abs bud-partc Aux-I
          'The branches budded'
       c. *Txitak   lumatu   dira*
          chicks-abs grew-feathers-partc Aux-I
          'The chicks grew feathers'
(114) a. *Artaburuak aletu   dituzte*   b. *Adarrak   kimatu   dituzte*
          corn-abs   pit-partc Aux-T   branches-abs trim-partc Aux-T
          'They pitted the corn'   'They trimmed the branches'
       c. *Txitak   lumatu   dituzte*
          chicks-abs pluck-partc Aux-T
          'They plucked the chicks'

Not all verbs of growing give rise to this alternation: *lilitu* "to flower" , *loratu* "to bloom", *abartu* "to grow branches", *hostatu* , *orritu* "to sprout leaves" do not admit it, although all of them have zero-related nominals (*abar* "branch", *hosto* , *orri* "leave"). A

relation of inalienable possession or part-whole underlies this alternation (see Levin, 1993, p.130, for the same alternation in English). But that condition alone doesn't seem to exclude inexistent potential cases such as *abartu* "to remove branches", or *hostatu* "to remove leaves".

4.6. Complex predicates
4.6.1. Complex predicates with egin
4.6.1.1. Basic pattern

Basque has a very productive way of creating new predicates out of the combination of the verb egin "to do" and a bare nominal indicating the kind of action entertained. These complex predicates are typically equivalent to unergative predicates of other languages (Levin,1983; Ortiz de Urbina,1989; Uribe-Etxebarria,1989; Laka,1993). The result is a syntactically transitive construction, whose subject is marked Ergative:

(115)　a. *Jonek   lan   egiten   du*
　　　　 Jon-Erg work do-Gen Aux-T
　　　　 'Jon works'
　　　b. *Mikelek   salto egin du*
　　　　 Mikel-Erg jump do　Aux-T
　　　　 'Mikel jumped'

Here is sample of predicates formed in this way:

A. Verbs of emission:
a.1. Verbs of sound emission:
　　Auhen egin "to lament (to do lament)" ,*deiadar egin*　"to scream (to do scream) ,*intziri egin*　"to moan (to do moan)", *uhuri/ulu egin*　"to howl (to do howl)" ,　*hasperen egin*　"to sigh (to do sigh)" , *oihu egin*　 "to yell (to do yell)", *negar egin*　"to cry (to do cry)", *orro egin*　"to roar (to do roar)" , *marrixka egin*　"to meow (to do meow)" , *irri egin* "to laugh (to do laugh)", kirrinka egin "to creak (to do creak)".

a.2. Light emission:
　　Dir-dir egin "to shine" , *diz-diz egin*　"to glow, to sparkle", *nir-nir egin*　"to twinker, flicker".

a.3. Verbal emission:
　　Birao egin　"to blaspheme (to do blaspheme)", *burla egin*　"to make fun" , *errieta egin* , *agiraka egin*　"to reprehend" , *oles egin*　"to summon" , *marmar egin* "to grunt" , *dei egin, hots egin*　"to call" , *zin egin*　"to swear".

B. Internal body motion:
　　Dar-dar egin　"to tremble (to do tremble)", *bor-bor egin*　"to boil noisily (to do boiling noise)".

C. Physical activities

c.1. Actions against an object or an individual:

Ausiki egin "to bite (to do bite)", *tiro egin* "to shoot (to do shoot)", *bultza egin* "to push (to do push)", *saka egin* "to press, to push, to shove (to do press, etc)", *indar egin* "to make an effort", *gogor egin* "to struggle (to do force)" , *buru egin* "to face, to hold (to do head)", *zizt egin* "to puncture (to do puncture)", *laztan egin* "to caresse (to do caress)" , *putz egin* "to blow (to do blow)" , *iskin egin* "to elude (to do corner)".

c.2. Motion verbs:

Laster/korri egin "to run (to do run)", *ihes egin* "to flee (to do flee)", *salto egin* "to jump (to do jump)" , *igeri egin* "to swim (to do swim)", *hanka egin* "to escape rapidly (to do leg)" , *alde egin* "to leave (to do distance)" , *zirkin egin* "to move (to do move)".

c.3. Bodily functions:

Aharrausi egin "to yawn (to do yawn)", *kaka egin* "to shit (to do shit)", *txiza egin* "to urinate (to do urine)", *zintz egin* "to blow one's nose", *izerdi egin* "to *sweat* "to do sweat", *usin egin* "to sneeze (to do sneeze)" , *arnas egin* "to breath "to do breath", *hatz egin* "to scratch (to do finger)" , *lo egin* "to sleep (to do sleep)".

D. Mental activities

Duda egin "to doubt (to do doubt)" , *gogoeta egin* "to meditate (to do meditation)", *hausnar egin* "to ruminate (fig.) (to do rumination)", *kasu egin* "to pay attention (to do attention)", *kontu egin* "to take into account (to do count)", *hitz/berba egin* "to talk (to do talk)", *otoitz egin* "to pray (to do pray)", *amets egin* "to dream (to do dream)", *solas egin* "to chat (to do chat)".

E. Behavioral verbs:

Axut/desafio egin "to challenge (to do challenge)", *mehatxu egin* "to threaten (to do threaten)", *planto egin* "to stop by refusing to follow a game (to do stop)", *paso egin* (W) "to be uninterested (to do pass)", *muzin egin* "to be unfriendly, disdainful (to do a disdain gesture)".

Not all complex predicates with egin require a bare nominal. Some of them require a locative or an adverbial (-ka or -z):

(116) a. *Haginka egin dit*   b. *Hegan   egin du* c. *Gainez   egin du*
        tooth-Adv do Aux-DT   wing-loc   do Aux   top-instr do Aux
        'It bite me'   'It flied'   'It overflew'

Finally, some of those complex predicates admit, but do not require, a structure such as the one above with a locative or adverbial complement:

(117) a. *Dantza(n) egin dute*   b. *Laster(ka) egin dute*
        dance-loc do   Aux-T   run-adv do   Aux-T
        'They danced'   'They ran'

33

b. *Borroka(n) egin dute*   c. *Oihu(ka)   egin dute*
   fight-loc do   Aux-T   scream-adv do   Aux-T
   'They fought'   'They screamed,yelled'
d. *Errieta(n) egin dute*   e. *Jauzi(ka)/salto(ka) egin dute*
   dispute-loc do Aux-T   jump-adv do Aux-T
   'They disputed'   'They jumped'

In these cases, the event denoted by the complex predicate takes on an iterative meaning: it is implied that those events happened once and again in a given time.

4.6.1.2. Syntax

These complex predicates are not instances of incorporation of the polisynthetic sort. As shown by Uribe-Etxebarria (1989), Ortiz de Urbina (1989), and (Laka,93), the bare nominal and the verb *egin* can be separated by a number of syntactic operations (118), and the bare nominal can take partitive Case (119)[13]. To this we should also add the facts above: patterns which involve postpositional complements, arguably phrasal objects[14].

---

[13] Not all complex predicates admit partitive marked bare nominals. Only those complex predicates denoting delimited events can. For instance, eztul egin "cough" and zirkin egin "move" can, as can also huts egin "to miss", tiro egin "to shoot", behaztopa egin "to stumble", birao egin "to blaspheme", salto egin "to jump", auhen egin "to lament", txalo egin "to applaud, to clap", kalte egin "to damage". Activities with no clear delimiting point do not take the partitive: light emission verbs, such as dir-dir egin "to shine", nir-nir egin "to glimmer", aspectual activities such as bultza egin "to push" , laster egin "to run", tiro egin "to shoot", hatz egin "to scratch", gogoeta egin "to think, to meditate", solas egin "to chat", buru egin "to face", gogor egin "to retaliate". Achievements do not admit partitives either: leher egin "to explode", tupust egin "to collide with", topo egin "to meet casually", bat egin "to unite", eztanda egin "to explode". The behavior of other verbs is harder to ellucidate: amets egin "to dream", lo egin "to sleep" admit the partitive, as do other mental activity verbs, such as kasu egin "to pay attention", kontu egin "to take into account" and duda egin "to doubt". Finally, what I called behavioral verbs, such as paso egin "to show indifference", planto egin "to stop (in a card game)", muzin egin "to reject", mehatxu egin "to threaten", desafio egin "to defy" do not admit a partitive nominal. Activity verbs of speaking such as hitz egin "to talk" do admit partitive objects.

[14]   Ortiz de Urbina (1989, p.47) provides another important argument in favor of viewing those bare nominals as true arguments: they behave as canonical arguments in causative formation. Subjects of trnaisitve verbs appear as indirect objects of causativized structures:

(i)   a. Nik zorrak   pagatu   ditut
            I-erg debts-abs pay-partc Aux-T
            'I payed debts'
         b. Niri zorrak   pagaerazi dizkidate
            I-dat debts-abs pay-cause Aux-DT
            'They made me pay debts'

Complex predicates of the nominal+egin sort behave as transitive verbs in this regard:

(ii)   a. Jonek dantza egin du
            Jon-erg dance do   Aux-T
            'Jon danced'

(118) a. *Jonek   dantza egin du*
    Jon-Erg dance   do   Aux-T
    'Jon danced'
  b. *Nork egin du   dantza* ?   (wh-questions)
    who   do Aux-T dance
    'Who danced?'
  c. *JONEK egin du   dantza*   (focus movement)
    Jon-Erg do   Aux-T dance
    'JON danced'
  d. *DANTZA egin du   Jonek*
    dance   do   Aux-T Jon-Erg
    'Jon DANCED'
  e. *Dantza, Jonek   EGITEN   du*
    dance   Jon-Erg do-freq   Aux-T
    'As for dancing, Jon does dance'
(119) a. *Ez   du   zirkinik   egiten*
    neg Aux move-part do-prog
    'He doesnt move (at all)'
  b. *Ez   du   eztulik   egin*
    neg Aux-T cough-part do
    'He didn't cough (a single time)'

4.6.1.3. Simple counterparts of complex predicates
    Many of the complex predicates with *egin* have simplex verbal counterparts:

(120) a. *Jonek   dantza egin du*   b. *Jonek dantzatu   du*
    Jon-Erg dance   do   Aux-T   Jon-Erg dance-partc Aux-T
    'Jon danced'   'Jon danced'

Simplex verbs can take cognate objects, complex predicates cannot:

---

        b. Joni   dantza eginarazi diote
          Jon-dat dance do-cause   Aux-DT
          'They made Jon dance'

The same is not the case with simple unergatives:

    (iii)   a. Jonek dantzatu   du
          Jon-erg dance-partc Aux-T
        b. Jon   dantzarazi dute
          Jon-abs dance-cause Aux-T
          'They made Jon dance'
        c. ?Joni   dantzarazi diote
          Jon-dat dance-cause Aux-DT
          'They made Jon dance'

(121) a. *Jonek dantza bat dantzatu   du*
        Jon-Erg dance a   dance-partc Aux-T
        'Jon danced a dance'
      b. **Jonek   dantza bat dantza egin du*
         Jon-Erg dance   a   dance   do   Aux-T
         'Jon danced a dance'

There is also an aspectual difference between complex predicates and their corresponding simplex verbs that can be described in the following terms: whereas the complex predicate describes an attempted action without specifying whether the action affected the object, the simplex verb denotes an action that affects the object:

(122) a. *Zoro batek   oinezko   biri   harrika   egin zien*
         fool one-Erg pedestrians two-Dat stone-adv do   Aux-DT
         'A fool threw stones at two pedestrians'
      b. *Zoro batek   oinezko   bi   harrikatu   zituen*
         fool   one-Erg pedestrians two-Dat shoot-partc   Aux-T
         'A fool stoned two pedestrians'
(123) a. *Zakurrak hondakinei usna   egin zien*
         dog-Erg   garbage-dat smell do   Aux-DT
         'The dog smelled at the garbage'
      b. *Zakurrak hondakinak usnatu   zituen*
         dog-Erg   garbage   smell-partc Aux-T
         'The dog smelled (all) the garbage'
(124) a. *Jonek mahaiari (*bazterrera) bultza egin zion*
         Jon-Erg table-Dat corner-to push   do   Aux-DT
         'Jon pushed at the table (*to the corner)'
      b. *Jonek mahaia bazterrera bultzatu   zuen*
         Jon-Erg table   corner-to push-partc Aux
         'Jon pushed the table to the corner'

Whereas in (111b) the simplex cognate verb implies that the stone throwing affected the walkers (by hurting them) in (111a) there is no implication of that sort. In (112b) the simplex verb implies a thorough examination of the garbage, whereas (112a) does not imply that. In (113b) telicity can be imposed on the simplex verb by the presence of an adlative modifier, but not on the complex predicate.

Simple verbs are almost always conjugated with a transitive auxiliary (the only exception being *lehertu* "to explode"), but they differ on whether they admit an overt object or not and on whether the object is a cognate object (a pure extension of the meaning of the predicate) or not. They also differ in the interpretation of ditransitive structures if they have one available. Cognate verbs can thus be divided into four classes. The first class is constituted by those verbs that take a cognate object, such as *dantzatu* "to dance", *jolastu* "to play", and *borrokatu* "to fight". When the verb does not have an overt object, and gives rise to a simple activity reading, it alternates freely

between an intransitive or an intransitive auxiliary[15]:

(125) a. *Jolas bat jolastu   du*   b. *Jolastu du*   c. *Jolastu   da*
         play one play-partc Aux-T   play-partc Aux-T   play-partc Aux-I
         'John played a game'   'Jon played'   'Jon played'

The second class corresponds to the simplex equivalents of physical activity verbs such as *bultza egin* "to push" (*bultzatu*) and *saka egin* "to push" (*sakatu*) or verbs or verbal emission such as *dei egin* (*deitu*) "to call". Those verbs can be conjugated with the transitive and the ditransitive auxiliary. The choice of the ditransitive produces a non-affected reading of the sort we discussed for the complex predicate form:

(126) a. *Mikel bazterrera bultzatu   du*
         Mikel corner-to push-partc Aux-T
         'He pushed Mikel to the corner'
      b. *Mikeli   (*bazterrera) bultzatu   dio*
         Mikel-Dat corner-to   push-partc Aux-DT
         'He pushed at Mikel (*to the corner)'

The third class comprehends a few verbs that have transitive morphology but no overt object. They correspond to aspectual activities such as *dudatu* "to doubt" (dudatu) or *iraun* "persist, to stand":

(127) a. *(*Hori) dudatu dut*   b. *Iraun dut*
         that   doubt Aux-T   stand Aux-T
         'I doubted that'   'I stood'

Finally, we have the class of predicates that can take an object or not. They are aspectual activities, on which an overt object imposes a boundary:

(128) a. *Bi metro   saltatu   ditu*   b. *Saltatu   du*
         two meters jump-partc Aux-T   jump-partc Aux-T
         'he jumped two meters'   'He jumped'
(129) a. *Bi kilometro   korritu   ditu*   b. *Korritu   du*
         two kilometers run-partc Aux-T   run-partc Aux-T
         'He ran two kilometers'   'He ran'

There is also a group that corresponds to those verbs which necessarily take an object: *laztandu* (<*laztan egin*) "XXX", *mindu* (<*min egin*) "to hurt", *birrindu* (*birrin-birrin egin*) "to powder", *txikitu* (<*txiki-txiki egin*) "to break into little pieces", *ausiki* (*ausiki egin*) "to bite". Those can be considered as transitive verbs. It is further evidence for

---

[15]   Perhaps we could place in this context a dialectal distinction in the auxiliary choice of *jardun* "to be busy with, to spend time in", which takes an intransitive auxiliary in some western varieties and a transitive one in others

the idea that complex predicate formation is in itself a process larger than unergative predicate formation.

4.6.2. Other complex predicates
4.6.2.1. Noun + hartu (take)

Other complex predicates are formed by a bare noun and the verb *hartu* "to take". Those are: *min hartu* "to get hurt (lit. to take pain)", *atseden hartu* "to rest (lit. to take rest", gain hartu "to dominate, to surpass", *hats hartu* "to breath (lit. to take breath)", *hitz hartu* "to compromise (lit. to take word) and *kargu hartu* "to reproach (to take charge)". Syntactically, they behave exactly as the complex predicates with *egin*:: the parts of the predicate can be separated by a number of syntactic rearrangements, such as wh-movement:

(130)   Nork   hartu du   min?
          Who-erg pain Aux-T pain
          'He/she hurt him/her in two minutes

4.6.2.2. Noun + eman (give)

A last class of complex predicates is formed by a bare noun and the verb *eman* "to give": *aurpegi eman* "to face (to give face)", *buru eman* "to counter(to give head)", *begi eman* "to look at (to give eye)", *amore eman* "to surrender (to give surrender)", *antz eman* "to notice (to give look)", *min eman* "to hurt(to give pain)", *bide eman* "to cede passage (to give way)", *bihotz eman* "to encoureage (to give heart)", *hitz eman* "to promise (to give word)", *musu eman* "to kiss (to give face/kiss". Those complex predicates show different degrees of coalescence: while *hitzeman* cannot be separated, *min eman* for instance can be separated by all sorts of syntactic operation, as most *egin* -predicates do. As the complex predicates with *hartu*, these are also incompatible with accomplishment adverbials, but most of them (leaving aside *hitzeman*) are compatible with a duration adverbial. Most of these predicates (all except *hitzeman* and *amore eman*) are conjugated with the ditransitive auxiliary, differently from regular instances of *eman* + object, which do not require it:

(131) a. *Jonek   antz eman dio/*du*   b. *Jonek   min eman dio/*du*
           Jon-Erg look give Aux-DT/T   Jon-Erg pain give Aux-DT/T
           'Jon noticed it'   'Jon hurt him'

4.7. Psychological predicates

If we follow auxiliary selection, we have three classes of psychological predicates in Basque. We have those predicates that select an auxiliary with Dative and absolutive agreeing morphemes (typically, Belleti&Rizzi's piacere class), those which are invariable transitive, with absolutive-ergative agreement (corresponding to the temere or fear class of other languages), and finally, those which vary between an intransitive (absolutive agreement) and a transitive (absolutive and ergative agreement)

auxiliary, and which we could take as equivalent to the preoccupare frighten class of other languages. The latter class is special in typological terms, since it gives rise to causative-inchoative alternations that are not possible with prototypical verbs of the preoccupare class elsewhere (Zubizarreta, 1987).

4.7.1. Dative-Absolutive constructions

Absolutive-Dative auxiliaries go together with verbs that typically form the piacere class in other languages. In these cases, the experiencer receives Dative Case, and surfaces as the subject of the sentence. Verbs in this class comprehend: *gustatu* , *laketu* (E) "to like", *interesatu* "to interest", *dolutu* "to repent" , *damutu* "to repent", *bururatu* , *otu* "to occur to, to come to mind", and *gaitzitu* (E) "to be offensive to". All of them except *gustatu* , *bururatu* and *otu* , can also select an absolutive agreeing auxiliary. In that case, the experiencer takes absolutive Case and the stimulus becomes a postpositional phrase (instrumental or locative):

(132) a. *Hori   damutu/dolutu zaio*   b. *Horretaz damutu/dolutu da*
        that-abs regret-partc   Aux-dat-abs   that-instr regret-partc   Aux-I
(133) a. *Interesatu   zaio*   b. *Horretan interesatu   da*
        interest-partc Aux-dat-abs   that-in   interest-partc Aux-I
        'It interested him'   'He gor interested in it'
(134) a. *Laketu   zaio*   b. *Laketu   da*
        like-partc Aux-dat-abs   like-partc Aux-I
        'He liked it'   'He became fond of it'
(135) a. *Gustatu/bururatu/otu zaio*   b. **Gustatu /bururatu/otu   da*
        like/occur   Aux-dat-abs   like-partc/occur-partc   Aux-I
        'He liked it/it occurred to him'

4.7.2. Purely transitive constructions (Ergative-Absolutive)

In these constructions, the experiencer always occurs as the ergative subject, and the stimulus as the absolutive object. This class is equivalent to the temere/fear class of other languages. Verbs in this class comprehend: *etsi* "to desperate, to resignate",*miretsi* "admire", *ederretsi* , *gurtu* "to worship, to revere", *gutxietsi* "to despise", *gaitzetsi* "to condemn", *onetsi* "to accept", *estimatu* "to esteem, to appreciate", *errespetatu* "to respect", *desiratu* "to desire", *irrikatu* "to yearn for", *ametitu/ onartu* "to admit, to accept", *eraman* "to bear":

(136) a. *Jonek   estimatzen zaitu* b. *Jonek   eskeintza onartu du*
        Jon-Erg appreciates Aux-T   Jon-Erg offer-Abs accept   Aux-T
        'Jon appreciates you'   'Jon accepted the offer'

Verbs in this class differ in their aspectual configuration: whereas verbs such as *errespetatu* , *desiratu* , *irrikatu* , and *eraman* , are purely stative verbs, others such as *gutxietsi* , *gaitzetsi* , *onetsi* , *onartu* and even *ederretsi* , involve a judgement process and an endstate, the result or veredict of the judgement process. All of them are morphologically complex, having an adjective that marks the result of the judging

process and a judgement verb such as *etsi* "consider" or *hartu* "take (for)":

(137)   *Onetsi < on* "good" + etsi "consider"
        Ederretsi < eder "beatiful"+ etsi
        Gaitzetsi < gaitz "bad" + etsi
        Gutxietsi < gutxi "little" + etsi
        Onartu <on "good"+*hartu* "to take"

The two sets of predicates differ in their interpretation when they take a participial form. The set in (137) can receive a punctual interpretation, the others cannot:

(138)   a. *Proposamena goizeko   bilkuran   onetsi/onartu   dute*
           proposal-abs   morning-of meeting-loc accept-partc   Aux-T
           'They accepted the offer in this morning's meeting'
        b. *Abertzale gehienek atentatua   gaitzetsi   dute*
           nationalist most-erg terrorist act-abs condemn-partc Aux-T
           'Most nationalists condemned the terrorist action'
        c. ?*Ehun   urte eta gero, pintura zahar horiek ederretsi   dituzte*
             hundred year and then painting old those-abs consider beautiful Aux-T
        'One hundred years later, they have considered those old pictures as beatiful'
(139)   a. **Jonek   hori   atzo   irrikatu/desiratu zuen*
             Jon-erg that-abs yesterday desire-partc   Aux-T
             '*Jon desired that yesterday'
        b. *Jonek ez   du   hori   eraman*
           Jon-erg neg Aux-T that-abs bring
           'Jon didn´t bring that/*Jon didn´t bear that (yesterday)
        c. *Jonek ezin   du   hori eraman*
           Jon-erg cannot Aux-T that bear
           'Jon cannot bear/stand that'

Some non-complex verbs such as *errespetatu* and *adoratu* , can have complex events readings, with a process part and a resultant state. With those verbs there is a clear difference in interpretation between the perfective and imperfective forms. The state readings are only possible with imperfective forms, whereas the perfective forms denote either activities or accomplishments:

(140)   a. *Jon   adoratzen   dute   han* b. *Haurtxoa   adoratu   dute*
           Jon-abs adore-imperf Aux-T there   little child-abs worship-partc Aux-T
           'They adore Jon there'   'They have worshipped the child Jesus'
           'They worship Jon, there'

The complex event reading implies that the subject engages in some action that counts as the stative attitude towards the object. Consider for instance *errespetatu* "to respect". Again the state reading is only possible with imperfective forms, whereas the perfective form is interpreted as "showing respect":

(141)   a. *Nere adiskideek errespetatzen naute*
      my friends-erg   respect-impf   Aux-T
      'My friends respect me/have me respect'
   b. *Nere adiskideek errespetatu naute*
      my friends-erg respect-partc Aux-T
      'My friends showed me respect'

(141b) can only be interpreted as my friends having behaved in such a way that it implied respect towards me.

4.7.3. Transitive-Intransitive Psych-verbs (Ergative-Absolutive and Absolutive)

This class comprehends those verbs that have a causative reading when conjugated with the transitive auxiliary, and where the stimulus is mapped as the ergative subject of the sentence. This class corresponds to the preoccupare-frighten class of other languages. They are verbs of mental change of state. Verbs in the preoccupare-frighten class can be divided into two subclasses: on the one hand, those verbs that can be conjugated with both the intransitive and the transitive auxiliary; on the other, those verbs that only admit intransitive auxiliaries. Verbs that enter into the alternating subclass are: *asaldatu* "to scare, to be scared, perturbed" *nerbiostu/urduritu* "to excite, to get (someone) nervous", *harritu* "to surprise, to get surprised", *txunditu* "to astound, to get astounded", *aspertu* "to bore, to get bored", *kontsolatu* "to comfort, console (oneself)", *piztu* "to hearten", *alaitu* "to make/become merry", *poztu* "to make/become joyful", *zapuztu* "to frustrate, get frustrated", *kezkatu* "to worry, to become worried", *gogoratu* "to remember", *zoratu* "to madden", *haserratu* "to angry, to become angry", *liluratu* "to dazzle", *aztoratu* "to confuse, get confused", *nahastu* "to confuse, to get messed up", *ikaratu*, *beldurtu* "to frighten, to become frightened", *engainatu* "to deceive (oneself)", *unatu* "to tire (mentally)" . All these verbs have transitive and intransitive alternates. They are verbs derived in the most part from either adjectives (*urduri* , *nerbios* "nervous", *alai* "merry", *zoro* "mad", *nahas* "confusion, mess") or nouns (*kezka* "worry", *beldur*, *ikara* "fear", *lilura* "dazzle", *poz* "joy", *harri* "stone"):

(142)   a. *Zoratuko naute*   b. *Zoratu naiz*
      madden Aux-T   madden Aux-I
      'They will madden me'   'I will become mad'
(143)   a. *Beldurtu naute*   b. *Beldurtu naiz*
      frighten Aux-T   frighten Aux-I
      'They frightened me'   'I became frightened'

The class that only admits intransitive auxiliaries also involves a change of mental state, although they lack any causative meaning. They represent events whose only possible origin is in the mind of the experiencer: *akordatu* "to remember (casually), *tematu* , *setatu* "to become stubborn" (from the nouns *tema* "stubbornness", and *seta* "obstinacy") *obsesionatu* "to be obsessed", *lehiatu* "to hurry". All of them take a postpositional complement, indicating the target or the matter of the mental event:

(144) a. *Horrekin tematu/setatu/   obsesionatu da*
         that-with become stubborn/obsess-partc Aux-I
         'He became stubborn at that/obsessed with that'
      b. *Horretaz oroitu/akordatu da*
         that-instr remember   Aux-I
         'He remembered that'

Oroitu "to recall" can take either an intransitive or a transitive auxiliary in some western varieties.

4.7.4. Noun + Auxiliary constructions

Besides the verb+participle form, mental states can also be expressed through constructions that combine a noun and an auxiliary form. Depending on the mental state denoted by the noun, the auxiliary is of the ergative-absolutive form only, or alternates between an ergative-absolutive and an absolutive-dative form. Most noun+participle constructions have verb-participle counterparts. The difference between them is aspectual. Noun+auxiliary constructions are purely stative, whereas verb+participle constructions can have (depending on the aspectual mark they incorporate) all the range of aspectual meanings. Consider for an example the following pair:

(145) a. *Hura   desira dut*   b. *Gertatzea   desira-tzen /-tu   dut*
         that-abs desire Aux-T   happen-abs desire-imperf/perf   Aux-T
         'I desire that'   'I desire/have desired that it happened'
(146) a. **Gertatzea desira ari naiz*   b. *Gertatzea   desiratzen ari naiz*
         happen-inf desire Ger Aux-I   happen-inf desire   Ger Aux-I
         'I keep wishing for it to happen'   'I keep wishing for it to happen'

Also, the verbal form can occur without a patient argument, in generic contexts, unlike the noun plus auxiliary construction:

(147) a. *Animaliek desio dute*   b. *Animaliek desiatzen dute*
         animals-Erg desire Aux-T   Animals-erg desire-gen Aux-T
         'Animals desire it'   'Animals desire it'
                                         'Animals (have the capacity to) desire'

Whereas reflexivization through auxiliary selection is possible with the verbal form (at least for some speakers), the noun+auxiliary form obligatorily requires an overt reflexive phrase:

(148) a. *Jonek   bere burua gorroto du*   b. **Jon   gorroto da*
         Jon-erg his head   hate   Aux-T   Jon-abs hate   Aux-I
         'Jon hates himself'   'Jon hates himself'
(149) a. *Jonek   bere burua gorrotatzen du*   b. *Jon   gorrotatzen da*

Jon-erg his head   hate-gen   Aux-T   Jon-abs hate-ger   Aux-I
'Jon hates himself'   'Jon hates himself'

The reflexivization facts suggest that the structure of the noun+Aux construction is that of a small clause, where the absolutively marked argument is an argument of the noun, and not of the auxiliary edun "have":

(150)   *Xabierrek [musika hori gorroto] du*
         Xabier-erg music   that hate   Aux-T
         'Xabier hates that music'

Remember that reflexivization by intransitivizing the verb was only possible when identity of referential indexes was established between coarguments (see section 2.9). The fact that such a process is not possible with the bare nominal construction suggests that the absolutively marked argument is not an argument of *have*. If this is correct, then this is a raising construction, and the agreement and Case properties of the apparent object are acquired via extraction from an embedded sentential structure. Agreement (in number) is obligatory with the object:

(151)   *Xabierrek barazkiak gorroto ditu*
         Xabier-erg vegetables hate   Aux-T-plural
         'Xabier hates vegetables'

Nouns expressing modal notions, such as *nahi* "want", *behar* "need", *asmo* "intention" and *gogo* "wish" select for infinitival and/or participial complements (Lafitte, 1944; Artiagoitia, Ortiz de Urbina, this volume). When those nouns take a participial clause, the arguments of the participial clause agree with the matrix auxiliary (Ormazabal,1991). When the complement is a nominalized clause (the "infinitival"), then there is no agreement between the arguments of the embedded, nominalized verb and the matrix auxiliary. The participial construction provides further evidence for the idea of raising of arguments in modal periphrasis:

(152)   a. *Xabierrek [barazkiak   erosi]   nahi ditu*
           Xabier-erg vegetables-abs   buy-partc want Aux-T-plural
           'Xabier wants to buy vegetables'
        b. *Xabierrek [barazkiak   erostea]   nahi du*
           Xabier-erg   vegetables-abs buy-nom-Det want Aux-T-sing
           'Xabier wants someone else to buy vegetables'

As the translations show, the choice of a participial or a nominalized clause complement has other effects besides agreement: the nominalized clause admits overt subjects, and subject reference is always disjoint. Participial clauses do not admit overt subjects, and the reference of the implicit subject is always the same as the matrix subject (Ormazabal, 1991; Artiagoitia, this volume)

Nouns expressing mental states that are followed by an ergative-absolutive auxiliary only comprehend: *maite* "love", *plazer* "pleasure", *susmo* "suspicion", *amets* "dream", *asmo* "plan, purpose", *desira* "desire", *erruki* "pity", *gupida* "mercy", *irriki* "vehement desire", *hastio, gorroto* "hate". Also in this group are nouns expressing modality: *nahi* "want", *behar* "necessity, need" and (somewhat literary) *gogo* "wish", which are constructed following the noun + auxiliary pattern. The object in those cases can be either a participial or a noun phrase (the latter only *nahi* and *behar*):

(153) a. *Hori   nahi/behar dut*   b. *Hori   bisitatu   nahi/behar dut*
           that-abs want/need Aux-T   that-abs visit-partc want/need Aux-T
           'I want/need that'   'I want/need to visit that'
       c. *Hori   bisitatu   gogo   du*
           that-abs visit-partc wish Aux-T
           'He wishes to visit that'

Behar actually behaves either as an auxiliary verb, with no effect on the transitivity of the verb, or as a bare noun predicate, forcing a small clause structure:

(154) a.*Egin behar du/*da*   b. *Joan behar du/da*
           do   need Aux-T/I   go   need Aux-T/I
           'He needs to do it'   'He needs to go'

The same alternation affects reflexivization, as one would expect. Take an inherent reflexive such as *garbitu* "to wash". Reflexivization via intransitivization is only possible with *behar* as an auxiliary , but not as a bare nominal forcing a small clause structure:

(155) a. *Xabier bota   behar da* (reflexive)
           Xabier throw must Aux-I
           'Xabier must throw himself'
       b. *Xabierrek bota   behar du* (non-reflexive)
           Xabier-erg throw must aux-T
           'Xabier must throw something'
       c. *Xabierrek bere burua   zubiazpian   bota   behar du/*da*
           Xabier-erg his head-abs under the bridge throw must Aux-T/I
           'Xabier must throw himself under the bridge'

Nouns expressing mental states that are followed by either an ergative-absolutive auxiliary or an absolutive-dative one are: *atsegin* , *laket* "pleasure", *higuin* "loathing":

(156) a. *Nik hori   atsegin   dut*   b. *Hori   atsegin   zait*
           I-erg that-abs pleasure Aux-Erg-Abs   that-abs pleasure Aux-Dat-Abs
           'I like that'   'That pleases me'

In (156a), the experiencer is the ergative subject and the stimulus is the absolute

object. In (156b), the stimulus is the absolute object, and the experiencer is the dative subject. The alternance is reminiscent of the difference between the temere class and the piacere class.

Nouns expressing mental states that are followed by an intransitive auxiliary only are: *lotsa* , *ahalke* "shame" and *fio* "trust". Their complements are respectively, genitive and instrumental (section 2.2. also, and Zabala, this volume):

(157) a. *Horren lotsa naiz* b. *Horretaz fio naiz*
      that-of shame Aux-I   that-about trust Aux-I
      'I am ashamed of that'   'I trust that'

Some oriental dialects have besides mental state nouns followed by either an intransitive or an ergative-absolutive auxiliary are: *aiher* "inclination" and *herabe* "reluctance".

(158) a. *Herabe naiz hori egitera*   b. *Herabe dut hori egitera*
      reluctance Aux-I that do-inf-to   reluctance Aux-T that-abs do-inf-to
      'I am reluctant to do that'   'I am reluctant to do so'

Finally, some mental state nouns are followed by *egon* "to be in a location" (Cf. Section 2.2): those are *beldur* "fear" and *haserre* "anger".

(159) *Haserre/Beldur daude*
      Anger / fear   are-in a location
      'They are angry / fearful'

4.8. Aspectual verbs

Biscayan varieties of Basque have a morphologically transitive aspectual verb eroan "to carry" that contributes a frequentative meaning. It is conjugated synthetically always, and follows a participial form:

(160) a. *Eman daroat*
      Give carry-T(erg-abs)
      'I usually give it'

5. Ditransitive Structures
5.1. Trivalent ditransitive

In this group we insert all those verbs that can increase their valency with the addition of a dative marked argument realising the role of recipient or beneficiary. They all have therefore a more basic transitive bivalent use. I exclude from the group those ditransitives which encode a possession relation between the dative and some other argument of the verb (see section 6), the so-called "datives of interest". Verbs in this group are (among many others) *eman* "to give", *erosi* "to buy", *saldu* "to sell", *esan* "to tell", *eskeini* "to offer", *erakutsi* "to show", *ekarri* "to bring", *kontatu* "to tell",

esan "to say", *erantzun* "to answer". They all involve a notion of transfer from an agent or causer to a recipient or beneficiary. Verbs that cannot be interpreted as involving a transfer can have ditransitive forms, but they are invariably of the possessive sort.

The dative argument is doubly marked by Case on the noun-phrase and dative affixes on the auxiliary[16] (see Hualde, 3.6.2 for important restrictions; also Albizu, 1997):

(161) a. *Jonek   ardoa ekarri   du*
         Jon-erg wine bring-partc Aux-T
       b. *Jonek   Mireni   ardoa   ekarri dio*
         Jon-erg Miren-dat wine-abs bring Aux-DT
         'Jon brought wine for Miren'

5.2. Bivalent ditransitive verbs

A few verbs in Basque require ditransitive auxiliaries while showing only two arguments. They are *eritzi* "to think, have an opinion about" (see section 7), *eutsi* "to retain, to hold on", and the aspectual verbs *eman* "to give", *ekin* "to engage in" and *eragon* "to keep on, hold on to". Among the aspectual verbs the last two take noun phrase or nominalized clausal complements, the first only noun phrases with an eventive meaning:

(162) a. *Lanari ekin dio*
          work-dat engage-in Aux-DT
         'He began to work, he engaged in working'
       b. *Eragon   beti   gauza onen   bati* (S.)
          hold-on always thing good-g one-dat
          'Hold on to some good thing always'
       c. *Emaztea hil eta gero, negarrari eman zion*
          wife-abs die and after, cry-D-dat give Aux-DT
          'After his wife died, he cried very often (gave himself to crying)'

None of this verbs admits any overt absolutive argument.

5.3. Alternating Verbs

A few bivalent verbs alternate between a transitive and a ditransitive auxiliary: *deitu* "to call", *lagundu* "to help", *bultzatu* "to push", *jarraitu* "to follow" , *begiratu* "to look at", *barkatu* "to pardon", *eraso* "to attack", *esetsi* "to attack", *itxaron* "to wait", *abisatu* "to notify", *erreparatu* (W) "to pay attention", *utzi* "to allow". Among them we shall draw two groups: first, those verbs where both the transitive and the ditransitive form accompany an (apparently) bivalent verb. In this group we have *deitu* , *abisatu* ,

---

[16]   In some eastern varieties, the dative agreement is optional (Lafon, 1961):

    (i)   Eman du   haurrari
            Give Aux-T child-dat
            'He gave it to the child'

46

bultzatu , *esetsi* and *lagundu* .

(163) a. *Xabier deitu dute*   b. *Xabierri deitu diote*
       Xabier-abs call-partc Aux-T   Xabier-dat call-partc Aux-DT
       'They called Xabier'   'They called Xabier'

Although the two forms seem to be equivalent at first glance, there are important aspectual differences that show up when we add modifiers. If we add an adlative modifier to (1a) and (b), we get different interpretations (also with *abisatu*):

(164) a. *Xabier   bulegora deitu   dute*
       Xabier-abs office-ad   call-partc Aux-T
       'They called Xabier to the office'
     b. *Xabierri   bulegora deitu   diote*
       Xabier-dat office-adl call-partc Aux-DT
       'They called Xabier to the office'

Whereas (164a) is ambiguous between a reading in which Xabier is in his office and they called him there, and a reading where Xabier is called from an office and ends there, (164b) has only the first reading. The structure of (164a) is rich enough to allow different scope positions for the adlative modifier. (164b) is in this regard identical to its complex predicate alternate *dei egin* "to do call", that behaves as the ditransitive form.
       Similarly with *bultzatu* "to push":

(165) a. *Autobusera bultzatu   gaituzte*
       bus-adl   push-partc Aux-T
       'They pushed us into the bus'
     b. *Autobusean/?Autobusera bultzatu   digute*
       bus-loc/adl   push-partc Aux-DT
       'They pushed us in the bus'
     c. ?*Autobusera bultza egin digute*
       bus-adl   push   do   Aux-DT
       'They pushed us into the bus'

In the case of *lagundu* "to help, to accompany", the transitive form is more accurately translated as "to help", whereas the ditransitive form is ambiguous between accompany and help:

(166) a. *Ezezagun batzuek   lagundu   gaituzte*
       unknown some-erg help-partc Aux-T
       'Unknown people helped us'
     b. *Ezezagun batzuek   lagundu   digute*
       unknown some-erg help/accompany-partc Aux-DT
       'Unknown people helped/accompanied us'

The second group comprehends those alternating verbs such that their ditransitive alternates always follow bivalent predicates, whereas their transitive forms are monovalent: in this group are *itxaron* "to wait", *begiratu* "to look", *eraso* "to attack", *erregutu* "to supplicate", *erreparatu* "to pay attention". In their transitive form, these verbs are unergative:

(167) a. *Jonek itxaron du*   b. *Jonek   itxaron dit*
      Jon-erg wait   Aux-T   Jon-erg wait   Aux-DT
      'Jon waited'   'Jon waited for me'
    b. *Begiratu   dut*   b. *Joni   begiratu   diot*
      look-partc Aux-T   Jon-dat look-partc Aux-DT
      'I looked'   'I looked at Jon'

6. Possessive constructions
6.1. Attributive
6.1.1. Individual level attributions
Many languages have the ability to encode possession relations not only through specific verbs or noun phrase morphology, but also directly in the argument structure of the verb. The finite morphology of the verb or the auxiliary then expresses the addition of a possessor. We can illustrate the alternance between noun phrase internal and noun phrase external possession with the following constrast in Basque:

(168) a. *Bere anaia   da*   b. (??*Bere*) *anaia   du*
      his   brother Aux-I   his   brother Aux-T
      'It is/He is his brother'   'He is his brother (lit. he has him brother)'

The structure of (168b) involves a predication relation between the possessed term and the term expressing the kind of possession relation: they both optionally agree in number. The auxiliary, on the other hand, agrees in person and number with both the subject possessor and the possessed:

(169)   *Nik   alproja horiek   adiskide(ak) ditut*
      I-erg cur   those-abs friend(s)   Aux-T
      'Those curs are my friends'

The two alternates have slightly different interpretations though, as we can see from the glosses. Whereas (168a) admits an interpretation where the subject is not referential, (168b) doesn't:

(170) *Nork deitzen du ?   Beren anaia da / ??Anaia dute*
      who   call-ger Aux-T   their brother Aux-I/ brother Aux-T
      'Who's calling? It is their brother/??He is their brother'

Noun phrase internal possessions typically express a wider range of relations than

noun external ones. In order for the noun phrase external transitive possession to be admissible, it must be either of the inalienable kind or pertaining to something like the "personal sphere". The personal sphere includes, besides affective notions such as friend or family (171), professional relations (172), and familiar objects (173). Part/whole relations are also accessible through this construction (174). Possessive relations that fail to express any of those relations are inadmissible in a external possession structure (175)-(176):

(171) a. *Jonen anaia   da*   b. (*Hango hura*) *Jonek   anaia   du*
        Jon-G brother is   that one-abs Jon-erg brother has
        'He/it is Jon's brother'   'That one is Jon's brother'

(172) a. *Kotxeak Jonen lanbidea   dira*   b. *Jonek   kotxeak lanbide   ditu*
        cars-abs Jon-G occupation Aux-I   Jon-erg cars-abs occupation Aux-T
        'Cars are Jon's occupation'   'Cars are Jon's occupation'

(173) a. *Hori   nere ohea da*   b. *Hori   ohea dut*
        that-abs my bed   Aux-I   that-abs bed-D aux-T
        'That is my bed'   'That is my bed'

(174) a. *Gela hori   etxearen ganbara da*
        room that-abs house-G loft   Aux-I
        'That room is the loft of the house'
      b. *Etxeak   gela hori   ganbara du*
        House-erg room that-abs loft   Aux-T
        'That room is the loft of the house'

(175) a. (*Hango hura*) *Eusko Jaurlaritzaren   bozeramailea   da*
        that one-abs Basque Government-G spokesman/woman-abs is
        'That one is the spokesman/woman of the Basque Government'
      b. *(*Hango hura*) *Eusko Jaurlaritzak   bozeramaile   du*
        that one-abs   Basque Government-erg spokesman/woman has
        'That one is the spokesman/woman of the government'

(176) a. *Hori   nere liburua da*   b. *Hori liburua dut*
        that-abs my   book-D Aux-I   that book-D Aux-T
        'That is my book'   'That is my book'

Not all possessive relations expressed trhough a transitive structure exclude an overt possessive. In this there seems to be a difference between purely inalienable relations (177), on the one hand, and professional relations (178) and familiar objects on the other (179):

(177) a. *Hori   nere anaia da*   b. *Hori (??nere) anaia   dut*
        that-abs my brother Aux-I   that-abs my   brother Aux-T
        'That is my brother'   'That is my brother (lit. I have that (as) brother)

(178) a. *Hori nere lanbidea da*   b. *Hori (nere) lanbidea dut*
        that my job-D   Aux-I   that (my) job-D   Aux-T
        'That is my job'   'That is my job'

49

(179) a. *Hori   nere ohea da*   b. *Hori   (nere) ohea dut*
        that-abs my   bed-D Aux-I   that-abs my   bed Aux-T
        'That is my bed'   'That is my bed'

Inalienable possession and other types of possession that enter into this type of construction also differ in the entailments they give rise to, despite their (apparent) formal identity:

(180) a. *Jonek Aitor   anaia   du*
          Jon-erg Aitor-abs brother Aux-T
          'Aitor is Jon's brother'
      b. *Jonek   kotxeak lanbide ditu*
          Jon-erg cars-abs job   Aux-T
          'Cars are Jon's occupation'

Whereas from (180a) it follows that Jon must have a brother, it does not follow from (180b) that Jon must own any car.

6.1.2. Stage level attributions

Possessive relations involving a temporary or transient condition can also be expressed either through a noun-phrase internal relation or through a noun phrase external relation. The transitive, noun external, structure does not admit an overt possessor when the possession relation is of the inalienable kind (181). Otherwise it is optional (182):

(181) a. *Nere eskuak   ikara/bero   daude*
          my   hands-abs trembling/hot are-in a location
          'My hands are trembling'
      b. *(*Nere) eskuak   ikara/bero   ditut*
          I-erg   my   hands-abs trembling/hot Aux-T(pl)
          'I have my hands trembling'
(182) a. *Nere ohea bero dago*   b. *Nik (nere) ohea   bero   dut*
          my   bed-abs warm is-in a location   I-erg my   bed-abs warm Aux-T
          'My bed is warm'   'I have my bed warm'

5.2. Lexical verbs

The possessive forms can also be extended to intransitive and transitive lexical verbs. Consider for instance the following alternation:

(183) a. *Bere ama   hil da*   b. *Ama   hil zaio*
          his mother-abs die Aux-I   mother-abs   die Aux-dat-abs
          'His mother died'   'His mother died (on him)'

Motion verbs give rise to an interesting ambiguity when they occur in the dative-absolutive form. Consider the following cases:

(184) a. *Eskutitza iritsi   zaio*   b. *Irakaslea   joan zaio*
     letter-abs arrive-partc Aux-dat-abs   teacher-abs go   Aux-dat-abs
     'The letter got to him'   'The teacher went to him'
     'His letter arrived to its destination'   'His teacher left'

The dative argument can represent either a hidden possessor or a patient (a true argument of the verb). In the first case, the verb behaves as its intransitive form, where the absolutive constituent is the only argument of the verb and marks the patient, in the case of *iritsi* , or the theme (object in motion) in the case of *joan* . In the second case, the dative only marks a possessive-like relation with the absolutive[17].

Verbs of inherently specified motion (such as *igo* "to climb", *jaitsi* "to go dawm, to descend" or *igaro* "to cross" give rise to two sorts of transitive structures: on the one hand, transitive structures in which the object is a Theme (185a); on the other, affected transitive structures in which the object is some sort of measure (185b):

(185) a. *Jonek patata zakuak   jaitsi   ditu*
        Jon-erg potato sacks-abs take down Aux-T
        'Jon took down the potato sacks'
      b. *Jonek   50 metro jaitsi   ditu   urpean*
        Jon-erg 50 meters descend-partc Aux-T underwater
        'Jon descended 50 meters'

Possessive ditransitive constructions can only be construed from (186a), but not from (186b):

(186) a. *Jonek patatak   jaitsi   dizkit*
        Jon-erg potatoes-abs take down Aux-DT
        'Jon took down my potatoes/Jon took down the potatoes on my interest'
      b. *Jonek   50 metro jaitsi   dizkit   urpean*
        Jon-erg 50 meters descend-partc Aux-DT underwater

---

[17] Other modifiers may disambiguate between the two meanings. For instance, an ablative or locative postpositional phrase makes (2a) inequivocally non-possessive (but not (2b)):

   (i)   *Eskutitza Madriletik/-n iritsi   zitzaion*
         letter-abs Madrid-abl/loc arrive-partc Aux-I-dat-abs (past)
         'The letter got to him from/in Madrid'

Interestingly, adlative modifiers (and all those that are constructed from it) are compatible with both the possessive and the directional interpretations, in both (2a) and (2b):

   (ii)   *Eskutitza Madrilera iritsi   zaio*
          letter-abs Madrid-adl arrive Aux-I-dat-abs
         'The letter got to him to Madrid (to his address in madrid)'
          'His letter arrived to Madrid'

'Jon descended 50 meters underwater on my interest'

Transitive verbs may also encode possession in the argument structure of the verb. In that case, the auxiliary becomes ditransitive. Consider for instance *hautsi* "to break":

(187) a. *Mikelek   Jonen kotxea hautsi   du*
        mikel-erg Jon-g car-abs break-partc Aux-T
        'Mikel broke Jon's car'
     b. *Mikelek   Joni   (bere) kotxea hautsi   dio*
        Mikel-erg Jon-dat his   car   break-partc Aux-DT
        'Mikel broke his car to Jon'

If the possession relation is of the inalienable sort, the noun phrase internal possessor must disappear:

(188) a. *Mikelek   Jonen sudurra   hautsi du*
        Mikel-erg Jon-g nose-abs break Aux-T
        'Mikel broke Jon's nose'
     b. *Mikelek   Joni   (*bere) sudurra   hautsi   dio*
        Mikel-erg Jon-dat his   nose-abs break-partc Aux-DT
        'Mikel broke Jon his nose'

The ban on the overt presence of the possessive in inalienable constructions dissappears if the possessed element is one in a set of identical elements:

(189) a. *Mikelek   Jonen beso bat   hautsi du*
        Mikel-erg Jon-g arm one-abs break Aux-T
        'Mikel broke one of Jon's arms'
     b. *Mikelek   Joni   bere beso(etako) bat hautsi dio*
        Mikel-erg Jon-dat his   arm(loc-g) one break Aux-DT
        'Mikel broke Jon one of his arms'

There is a difference in meaning between the noun phrase internal possessive construction and the noun phrase external one in the case of inalienable possession. The noun phrase external construction implies that the dative-marked element and the absolutive-marked element enjoy material integrity (form a unit). Consider the contrast below:

(190) a. *San Vicenteren besoa   hautsi dute*
        Saint Vincent-g arm-abs break Aux-T
        'They broke Saint Vincent's arm'
     b. *San Vicenteri   besoa   hautsi diote*
        Saint Vincent-dat arm-abs break   Aux-DT
        'They broke Saint Vincent's arm'

Whereas in (b) it is necessary that Saint Vincent has an arm as part of his material integrity which results broken as a result of pagan or heretic violence, in (a) this is not necessary: it could be for instance the relic in the cathedral of Valencia, involuntarily broken by some unattentive tourist. Family relations also give rise to an equivalent contrast:

(191) a. *Jonen ama   hil da*   b. *Joni   ama   hil zaio*
          Jon-g mother-abs die Aux-I   Jon-dat mother die Aux-dat-abs
          'Jon's mother died'   'Jon's mother died'

Whereas to utter (191b), Jon must be directly affected (and therefore alive) when his mother dies, this is not necessary to utter (191a). (191a) can be uttered in a situation in which Jon is dead a longtime ago, and now his mother dies.

In very colloquial (and stigmatized) registers of western Basque, inalienable reflexive relations can be expressed either by noun-phrase internal possession or by reflexivizing (ditransitivizing) the auxiliary:

(192) a. *Mikelek besoa   hautsi du*
          Mikel-erg arm-abs break Aux-T
          'Mikel broke his arm'
       b. *Mikel   besoa   hautsi   da*
          Mikel-abs arm-abs break-partc Aux-I
          'Mikel broke his arm'

There is a difference between the two: only the former, transitive, form admits agentive modifiers (181).

(193) a. *Mikelek besoa   nahita   hautsi   du*
          Mikel-erg arm-abs voluntarily break-partc Aux-T
          'Mikel broke his arm voluntarily'
       b. ??*Mikel   besoa   nahita   hautsi da*
          Mikel-abs arm-abs voluntarily break Aux-I
          'Mikel broke his arm voluntarily'

Surprisingly enough, these intransitive forms admit plurals in a very restricted way and when so, with marginal results:

(194) a. **Adiskideak besoak   hautsi dira*
          friends-abs arms-abs break Aux-I
          'My friends broke their arms'
       b. ?*Adiskideak besoa   hautsi dira*
          friends-abs arm-abs break Aux-I(plural)
          'My friends broke (each) an arm'
       c. **Adiskidea besoak   hautsi da/dira*

53

friend-abs arms-abs break Aux-I(sing/plural)
'My friend broke his arms'

7. Verbs of saying, thinking and judging
7.1. Intransitive

Some factive verbs (verbs of thinking whose finite complement is understood factively) are conjugated with the intransitive auxiliary in Basque: *akordatu* "to remember", *jabetu* "to come to realize", *ohartu* "to realize". Two others admit both a transitive and an intransitive auxiliary: *gogoratu* , *gomutatu* "to recall". The finite complement of intransitive auxiliaries is probably not a canonical object. Two pieces of evidence can be brought up in favor of this view: (i) DP objects of those verbs are never absolutive, but postpositional (ii) Basque has a general ban on relativizing certain postpositional non argumental elements (Artiagoitia,1992), and relativizing the finite complement or a de dicto demonstrative is impossible with intransitive verbs of saying, thinking and judging. Verbs such as *gogoratu* "to recall", that have both transitive and intransitive alternates are significant in this regard. In the transitive case the complement is absolutive and admits relativization, but not in the intransitive one:

(195) a. *Horretaz gogoratu naiz*   b. *Hori gogoratu dut*
      that-instr recall-partc Aux-I   that-abs recall-partc Aux-T
      'I recalled that'   'I recalled that'

(196) a. **Gogoratu naizena hori/horretaz da*
      recall-partc Aux-I-rel-D that-abs/instr Aux-I
      'What I recall is that'

    b. *Gogoratu dudana hori da*
      recall-partc Aux-T-rel-D that-abs Aux-I
      'What I recall is that'

A verb of speech, *mintzatu* "to talk", is intransitive, and conjugated with the auxiliary *izan* "to be":

(197) *Horretaz mintzatu naiz*
      That-about talk-partc Aux-I
      'I talked about that'

Finally, the verb *egon* "to be in a location" can be used as a verb of judgement, with the meaning of "to be in the opinion that":

(198) *Nago ez direla garaiz etorriko*
      Am-in a location neg Aux-I-Comp in time come-fut
      'I think (am in the opinion) that they will not be on time'

This verb cannot be negated:

(199) **Ez nago etorriko dir-ela/-enik*

neg am-in a location come-fut Aux-I-Comp
'I don´t think that they will come'

7.2. Transitive verbs

Most of the verbs of saying, thinking and judging are transitive. Among them *aditu* "to hear, to understand, to perceive", *adierazi* "to express, to let someone know", *adostu* "to agree on something", *agertu* , *azaldu* "to explain", *agindu* "to promise, to order", *aholkatu* "to advise", *aipatu* "to mention", *salatu* "to denounce", *sortu* , *zabaldu* "to invent, spread the false idea that", *amestu* "to dream", *asmatu* "to invent", *aurreratu* "to anticipate that", *iragarri* "to announce", *hitzeman* "to promise", *dudatu*/*duda egin* "to doubt", *deklaratu* "to declare", *aldarrikatu* "to proclaim", *entzun* "to hear", *erabaki* "to decide", *esan* "to say", *erakutsi* "to show", *erantzun* "to answer", *eskatu* "to ask for", *galdetu* "to ask", *berretsi* "to confirm", *hotsegin* "to call (saying that)", *idatzi* "to write", *leitu, irakurri* "to read", *ihardetsi* "to reply", *ikasi* "to learn", *jakin* "to know", *kontatu* "to tell", *xuxurlatu* "to whisper", *oihu egin* "to shout (that)", *igarri* "to guess, to divine", *pentsatu* "to think", *sinetsi* "to believe", uste edun "to believe (have an oppinion)" and *ukatu* "to deny". Among the transitive verbs of saying, thinking and judging, there are some that have been adapted to such functions from apparently more basic meanings: *egin* "to do", *eman* "to give", *jo* "to hit". The first (*egin*) is used for conjectures (200), the second (*eman*) to denote hypothetical events (201):

(200)   a. *Egingo nuke Xabier   taberna horretan dagoela*
              Do-fut hyp-T Xabier-abs pub   that-in   is-in a location-Comp
           'I would say that Xabier is in that pub'
         b. *Egin nuen nere arterako lan   hura   ez   zela   komeni*
             do Aux-T   my own-for work that-abs neg was-Comp convenient
             'I said to myself that that work wasn't convenient'
(201)   a. *Emango nuke uzta ederra izango dugula*
            give-fut Aux-T-hyp good be-fut Aux-T-Comp
            'I would say that we will have a good harvest'
          b. ??*Eman nuen ez   zela   etorriko*
              give   Aux-T neg Aux-I-Comp come-fut
              'I conjectured that he would not come'

Jo "to hit" is used as an equivalent of "take for" when the complement is prolative:

(202)   *Tontotzat   jo dute*
          Dumb-pro hit Aux-T
          'They considered him as dumb'

Raising verbs of saying, thinking and judging are morphologically transitive: *iduri* "to seem" and *eman* "to seem":

(203) a. *Iduri du   Jon   haserre   dagoela*
           seem Aux-T Jon-abs angry be-in a location-Comp

55

'It seems that Jon is angry'
b. *Jonek iduri du   haserre dagoela*
   Jon-erg seem Aux-T angry   be in a location-Comp
   'Jon seems to be angry (lit. Jon seems that is angry)'

The embedded subject of (a) is raised in (b), and takes ergative Case. Evidence for raising is provided by the fact that no overt element can occur as the subject of the embedded clause when there is an overt subject in the matrix (but see Artiagoitia, section, this volume):

(204) **Jonek iduri du   bere taldeak galdu   duela*
         Jon-erg seem Aux-T his team-erg lose-partc Aux-T-Comp
        '*Jon seems that his team lost'

Similarly for *eman* . When *iduri/irudi* takes an aspectual mark, it is automatically conjugated with the dative-absolutive auxiliary. The result is a non-raising verb that can have two different overt subjects in the matrix and the embedded clause, respectively:

(205) *Joni   iruditu/tzen   zaio Xabier ez dela   etorriko*
      Jon-dat seem-partc/ger Aux-I (dat-abs) neg Aux-I-Comp come-fut
      'It seems to Jon that Xabier will not come ((lit.) To Jon seems that…)'

Raising of the absolutive embedded subject is not possible (with flat, non-focus intonation):

(206) **Nonbait, Xabier   Joni   iruditu zaio   ez dela   joango*
      Apparently, Xabier-abs Jon-dat seem   Aux-I(dat.abs) neg Aux-I-Comp go-fut
      '*Apparently, Xabier seems to Jon that (Xabier) will not come'

7.3. Ditransitive verbs

There are two morphologically ditransitive verbs of saying and judging in Basque. One is *eritzi* "to judge", that has both synthetic and periphrastic forms and the other one, which can only be conjugated synthetically is **io* "to say". Part of the latter's defective paradigm is formally identical to some forms of the ditransitive auxiliary. Consider for instance (207), where the bivalent forms of **io* are compared to the ditransitive auxiliary:

(207) a. Ekarri diot   =I something to him   b. diot =I say
          'bring' diozu =you something to him   diozu=you say
                  dio   =He something to him   dio=he says
                  diogu =We something to him   diogu=we say
                  diozue=You something to him   diozue=You say
                  diote   =They something to him   diote=they say

56

To the ditransitive auxiliary following a verb like bring, corresponds a formally identical synthetic verb with a transitive meaning of "someone saying something". There are no such forms involving anything other than third person absolutives and datives. The verb *io has also ditransitive forms, but those include a further dative marker –ts- and a person affix referring to the dative argument:

(208) a. *Jonek   Xabier   etorriko dela   dio*
          Jon-erg Xabier-abs come-fut Aux-I-Comp he-says
          'Jon says that Xabier will come'
      b. *Jonek etorriko   dela   diosku (<dio+ts+gu)*
          Jon-erg come-fut Aux-I-Comp he tells us (say+ditransitive+1st.pl)
          'Jon tells us that Xabier will come'

The verb *eritzi* "to judge" is also conjugated as a ditransitive verb, although it takes no overt absolutive argument:

(209) *Nik horri   interesgarri deritzot*
          I-erg that-dat interesting judge(dat-abs-erg)
          'I judge that as interesting'

References

Sources of examples:

Aresti, G. (1983) [1968] *Harri eta Herri* , Harria liburuak-1, Haranburu editor, Donostia.

Ibiñagabeitia, Andima (1999) [1950-1967] *Idazlan Hautatuak* , edited by Pako Sudupe, Elkarlanean, Donostia.

Michelena, Luis (1987-1998) *Orotariko Euskal Hiztegia-Diccionario General Vasco* , Euskaltzaindia, Desclee de Brouwer-Ediciones Mensajero, Bilbao.

Sarasola, I (1996) *Euskal Hiztegia* , Kutxa Fundazioa, Donostia.

Bibliography:

Artiagoitia, X. (1992) "Why Basque doesn't relativize everything". In *Syntactic Theory and. Basque Syntax* , edited by J. Lakarra and J. Ortiz de Urbina. Supplement 27 of the Anuario de Filologia Vasca Julio de Urquijo. Diputación Foral de Gipuzkoa, Donostia. 11-37.

Albizu, P (1997) "Generalized Person-Case Constraint: A Case for a Syntax-Driven Inflectional Morphology" . In *Theoretical Issues at the Morphology-Syntax Interface*, edited by A. Mendikoetxea and M. Uribe-Etxebarria. Supplement 40 of the Anuario del Seminario Julio de Urquijo. Diputacion Foral de Gipuzkoa , Donostia. 1-35.

Burzio, L. (1981) *Intransitive Verbs and Italian Auxiliaries* . Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

De Rijk (197X)

Dowty, D.R. (1979) *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar* . Reidel, Dordrecht.

Dixon, R.M.W. (1994) *Ergativity* . Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 69, Cambridge University Press.

Fernandez, B. (1997) *Egiturazko kasuaren erkaketa euskaraz* . EHUko argitalpen zerbitzua-Publication Services of the University of the Basque Country.

Grimshaw, J. (1990) *Argument Structure* . Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 18, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Hale, K. and S.J Keyser (1993) "On Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Relations" . In *The View from Building 20: Essays in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger* , ed. By K. Hale and S.J. Keyser, Current Studies in Linguistics 24, MIT Press.

Heath, J. (1972) "Genitivization in complement clauses." In *Anuario del Seminario de Filologia Vasca Julio de Urquijo* , 6, 46-66. Donostia.

Jackendoff, R (1983) *Semantics and Cognition* . Current Studies in Linguistics Series 8. MIT Press.

Laka, I. (1993) "Unergatives that assign ergative, unaccusatives that assign accusative2 in *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 18: Papers on Case and Agreement 1* , 149-72. Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Levin, B. (1983) *On the Nature of Ergativity* . Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Levin, B. (1993) *English Verb Classes and Alternations* . The University of Chicago Press.

Levin, B. and M. Rapaport (1995) *Unaccusativity* . Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 26, MIT Press,

Lyell, J. (1997) *Aspects of Ergativity* . Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.

Ormazabal, J. (1991) "Modal Verbs in Basque and Head-Movement." In *Memoriae L. Mitxelena Magistri Sacrum. Pars Altera* . Edited by J. Lakarra and I. Ruiz Arzalluz. Separata 14 of the Seminario de Filologia Vasca "Julio de Urquijo". Donostia. 835-845.

Ortiz de Urbina, J. (1989) *Parameters in the Grammar of Basque* . Foris, Dordrecht.

Perlmutter, D.M. (1978) "Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis". In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* , 157-89. Berkeley Linguistics Society, University of California, Berkeley.

Pustejovsky, J (1995) *The Generative Lexicon* . MIT Press.

Oihartzabal, B. (1994) "Contribution de la comparaison typologique à une analyse des rapports ergativité-(in)transitivité en Basque." In Jean Baptiste Orpustan (ed.) *La langue basque parmi les autres-Actes du colloque de l'URA 1055 du CNRS* . Editions Izpegi.

Rebuschi, G. (1982) *Structure de l'énoncé en Basque* . L'Europe de la tradition orale 3, Société d' études linguistiques et anthropologiques de France, Paris.

Tenny, C. (1994) *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface* , Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 52, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Uribe-Etxebarria, M. (1989)

Van Valin, R (1990) "Semantic parameters of split intransitivity." In *Language* 22, 221-260.

Zabala, I. (1993) *Predikazioaren teoriak gramatika sortzailean (Euskararen kasua)* . Doctoral disseratation, University of the Basque Country, Vitoria-Gasteiz.

Zubizarreta, M.L. (1987) *Levels of Representation in the Lexicon and in the Syntax* . Foris, Dordrecht.