



**HAL**  
open science

## Left-peripheral Free Relatives in Northern Basque

Georges Rebuschi, Anikó Lipták

► **To cite this version:**

Georges Rebuschi, Anikó Lipták. Left-peripheral Free Relatives in Northern Basque. 2006. artxibo-00494288

**HAL Id: artxibo-00494288**

**<https://artxiker.ccsd.cnrs.fr/artxibo-00494288v1>**

Submitted on 22 Jun 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Left-periphrastic Free Relatives in Northern Basque\*

## 1. Introduction\*\*

1.1. Left-periphrastic relative clauses (also known as correlative clauses) are widely attested in natural languages — in the Indo-European family, both ancient and modern,<sup>1</sup> and outside of that domain too. Here are a few examples:

- (1) Bambara (Zribi-Hertz & Hanne 1995)  
Musa ye uru **min** san, n ye o ye.  
Moussa PF knife REL buy 1SG PF him saw  
I saw the knife that Moussa bought.'
- (2) Burushaski (Tiffou & Patry 1995)  
amenmoiNga bariN écam (**ka**) mo gusmoiNa γare sail ayét.  
which-COM words I-will-do and the woman-COM with walk don't  
'Don't (have a) walk with the woman with whom I'll speak.'
- (3) Hungarian (Lipták 2005)  
[Akivel Mari moziba jár] az / [az a fiú] illedelmes.  
who-with M. picture-to goes that-one / that the boy polite  
'The boy with whom Mary goes to the pictures is polite.'

In some languages, they are limited to the subtype known as Free Relatives (FRCs); it is the case of the so-called “Left-hanging free relatives” of German (6) and Dutch.

- (4) *Wovon* man nicht sprechen kann, *darüber* muss man schweigen. (Wittgenstein)  
whereof one not speak can, thereon must one keep-silent  
'Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent.'

Such is also the case of Basque, an isolate language spoken in South-Western France and Northern Spain, in which these Left-periphrastic Free Relatives (LPFRs), are restricted to the Eastern dialects, i.e. those spoken in France, and the neighbouring subdialects spoken

\* This paper was to be a contribution to a volume devoted to the left periphery of various languages which, unfortunately, was never published.

\*\* All the examples given here, whether they are made up or borrowed from the literature, have been tested with two Basque native speakers in their early twenties, Marie Pourquié and Joana Casenave, who are to be heartily thanked; in the case of examples borrowed from the modern or less modern literature, if nothing is specified in the text, they have judged them grammatical. The authors also wish to acknowledge the financial help of the *Fédération Typologie et Universaux Linguistiques* (Program: *Structure de la phrase*), CNRS, for help them to meet and enabling A.L. to also actively participate “fieldwork” done in Paris with the aforementioned consultants.

<sup>1</sup> For Hittite, see Justus (1976) and Cooper (1979); the Left-periphrastic relative clauses of the classical Indo-European languages are studied by Haudry (1973) and Bianchi (2000); for the Slavic languages, cf. Boskovic (1997), Izvorski (1996); for Hindi, see the references in § 4.1.

across the boundary, in Spanish Navarre.<sup>2,3</sup> A typical example (all the more so as those constructions are restricted to a noble, even stilted, style) is given in (5):<sup>4</sup>

- (5) [Nork ere bekatu eginen bait-du], (eta) hura zigortua izanen da.<sup>5</sup>  
who-E ere sin make-PROS *bait* AUX and that-one punished-SG be-PROS AUX  
'Whoever will sin[*lit.*: , (and) that one] will be punished.'

As can be seen, there is an explicit *wh*-word in the bracketed clause in (5), and an affixal C° (*bait*- in the Northern varieties,<sup>6</sup> *-en* in the dialects of Navarre) that clearly marks the protasis as non-radical (cf. the word order in (4)). Moreover, since, at first sight at least, the demonstrative *hura* seems to resume the contents of the free relative to its left, I will also use the following vocabulary: the LPFR will be called the *correlative clause* or *protasis*, the root sentence, a *correlative sentence*, and the demonstrative a *pronominal correlate*.

All Basque dialects (including those under study) also have another type of free relative clauses (FRCs), as in (6), where there is no visible *wh*-word, where the C° is now *-en* everywhere, and which are closed off by a Det on their right edge:

- (6) [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> *Op<sub>i</sub>* [<sub>TP</sub> *e<sub>i</sub>* bekatu eginen du]-en]-a]  
sin make-PROS AUX-en-SG  
'the (one) that will sin'

For reasons of space, those “antecedentless” relatives, dubbed “Semi-free Relatives” (SFRs) in Rebuschi (2001) for obvious reasons, will not be dealt with here: see Lipták and Rebuschi (in prep.) for a systematic investigation of the differences between them and

<sup>2</sup> It has not always been the case. Thus, Arejita (1978) cites a fully finite correlative sentence from a Biscayan writer, P. J. de Astarloa in a text written in 1818.

<sup>3</sup> For a sketchy introduction, see Oyharçabal (2003: 818-821).

<sup>4</sup> The impossibility for a left-periphrastic relative clause to restrict a normal N(P) is provided by the contrast between ex. (3) above and its Basque counterpart:

- (i) [Norekin (ere) Mari zinera joaiten bait.da], (\*mutiko) hura untsi ikasia da  
who-with ere M. cinema-to going *bait*-AUX boy that well learned is

If the domain referred to is narrower than the largest lexico-semantic categories such as [±human], etc., it is within the correlative itself that the restriction will be expressed, the *wh*-word then being a modifier, as in (24) or (25) *infra*. For a possible explanation, see the end of § 3.1.

<sup>5</sup> The abbreviations used here are the following: ABL, ablative; ADN, adnominalizing affix; AUX, auxiliary; DAT, dative; DEM, demonstrative; E, ergative; FRC, free relative clause; INS, instrumental; INTER, interrogative item; KJV: King James's Version (for translations of Biblical examples); LOC, locative; PART, partitive; PL, plural; PR, pronominal correlate; PROS, prospective aspect; Qfr, quantifier; QFRC, Quasi-free relative clause; REL, relative; SFR, semi-free relative (clause); SG, singular; SUBJ, subjunctive (mood); VC, verb complex (possibly with a C° prefix or suffix); V+I, verb + inflection.

<sup>6</sup> The current standardised spelling isolates *bait* as an independent word, but it is clearly amalgamated with the following finite verb, as the pronunciation (and traditional spelling) *baitu* shows. I will therefore often use a hyphen between this prefix and the inflected verb forms to which is cliticized to highlight this narrow relationship.

the FRCs proper examined here.<sup>7</sup>

1.2. The issues to be addressed in this chapter are the following:<sup>8</sup>

(i) What is the exact position of the *wh*-word in (5), and, more generally, the internal structure of the CP domain of the FRC which contains it?

(ii) What is the exact position of the left-periphrastic correlative *clause* (i.e. the FRC proper) with respect to the (left periphery of the) correlative *sentence* as a whole? In particular, what role does the (optional) “conjunction” *eta* play in the overall structure, and where does it sit?<sup>9</sup>

(iii) Is a movement / raising (or “internal merge”) analysis of correlative sentences to be preferred to a base-generation (or “external merge”) analysis, as is strongly argued in the case in Hindi by Mahajan (2000) and Bhatt (2003) – as against Srivastav (1991)?

Question (i) will be dealt with in section 2, where the position of the *wh*-word(s) will be examined, leading us to the conclusion that their behaviour and positioning is neither that of relative pronouns, nor that of interrogative pronouns, but rather that of the specifier of a special head and projection situated between a Quantifier<sup>o</sup>/P and a Focus<sup>o</sup>/P.

In section 3, it will be shown that the “conjunction” or “linking element” (*eta* in (5)), which is to be found in many languages that display correlative sentences, must be analysed – in Basque at least – as the lexical realisation of a feature which itself best analyzed as hosted by one of the iterable Topic heads whose existence is argued for in Rizzi (1997).

Finally, section 4 will argue that there is no possible raising analysis for the left-periphrastic position of correlative clauses, in spite of the fact that two potential structures exist which might be thought of as providing an original site for such a movement.

## 2. On the internal structure of free relatives

In this section, the *wh*-words used in correlative free relatives will be compared with those used in (typically appositive) relative clauses and those used in questions; constraints on word order will also be examined, and the resulting picture will be drawn.

2.1. Where a difference can be made between the two paradigms, the *wh*-words that appear within correlative clauses are not *relative wh*-items, but *interrogative* ones, as is made explicit by the following data, where the *wh*-words are in italics:

<sup>7</sup> The structure in (6) is also used for would-be “headed” relatives of the restrictive kind: an N(P) will linearly appear between the AUX+C<sup>o</sup> sequence *du-en* in (6) and the final Det, probably projecting a phrase to which the relative is adjoined, as in:

(i) [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> *Op*<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *e*<sub>j</sub> bekatu eginen du]en] *gizon*]-a]  
sin make-PROS AUX-*en* man-SG

‘the man that will sin’

<sup>8</sup> Compare this list to the one in Adger & de Cat (2004:14).

<sup>9</sup> Curiously enough, Bianchi (2000), although a supporter of Kayne's Antisymmetric theory, does not ask the question whether correlative clauses are in the specifier of some functional head, or represent an exception to its axiomatic ban on (secondary) adjunction.

- (7) a *Nor* ikusi duzu? (unmarked interrogative)  
who-ABS seen you-have?  
‘Who(m) have you seen?’  
b *Zein* ikusi duzu? (marked, D-oriented, interrogative)  
Which seen you-have  
‘Which one have you seen?’  
b' \**Zeina* ikusi duzu? (marked interrogative + SG suffix -a)
- (8) a \**gizona*, [*nor* ikusi bait-dut] (interrogative pronoun used as a relative one)  
man-SG who[INTER] seen *bait*-AUX  
b *gizona*, [*zeina* ikusi bait-dut] (relative pronoun, with SG suffix -a)  
man-SG who-SG[REL] seen *bait*-AUX  
‘the man(.) whom I have seen’  
b' \**gizona*, [*zein* ikusi bait-dut] (relative pronoun, without the SG suffix -a)


Thus, the [+human] interrogative *nor* of (7a), illustrated in the correlative sentence (5), is excluded in all varieties of Basque as a relative pronoun, see (8a); furthermore, although the discourse-oriented interrogative *zein* of (7b) and the relative pronoun of (8b) are obviously related (in the 16th and 17th centuries, *zein* was used in both cases, and still competed with *zeina* in the 18th and early 19th C.s.), the singular (definite) ending *-a* cannot be affixed to the interrogative word, but is (today) compulsory on the relative one. Likewise, the normal, non-discourse related [-hn] interrogative is *zer* ‘what?’, cannot be used in relative clauses (*zeina* also does the job in such cases).

2.2. Another fundamental property of the *wh*-words in Basque correlative clauses is that they can be preceded by a topicalized phrase (9), or a quantified phrase (10) — just as interrogative *wh*-words can:

- (9) [*Bertutean nor* ere bait.da barnago sartzen] (Léon 1929, II.12.7)  
in-virtue who *ere bait*-is deeper entering  
hak berak maiz kurutze dorpeagoak ditu kausitzen.  
he-ERG himself-ERG often cross heavier-PL AUX finding  
‘Often, the deeper someone makes his way into virtue, the heavier he finds his cross(es).’
- (10) [*Nor-bera zonbat* ere bait-da oldartzerat uzkurrago],  
everyone how(-much) *ere bait*-(he-)is to-throw-oneself more-timid  
hanbatez da egunetik egunerat ahulago... (id.: I.13.5)  
by-so-much he-is from day to day weaker  
‘The more shy one is of fighting [evil], the weaker one is/becomes.’

It is therefore tempting to slightly adapt Rizzi's (1997) hierarchy of functional (and pragmatically oriented) heads of the (higher) CP domain by introducing a Quantifier (Qfr) head and projection immediately before the Focus ones, as in (11).<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Note however that the fact that relative *wh*-words and phrases so often end up in Spec,ForceP may well have nothing to do with Force, but could simply be due to a fairly general adjacency requirement between the antecedent and the relative pronoun. This requirement, however, is not universal: in Hindi for example, the nominal “head” of a DP containing a restrictive relative and its *wh*-determiner need not be clause initial, cf. Mahajan (2000). Note also that in Hungarian FRCs (but not in restrictive relatives, admittedly), a *wh*-item may be preceded by some material (Surányi 2004: fn. 6).



Independent empirical evidence for a Quantifier projection in between the Topic ones and the Focus one is provided by the fact that when two *wh*-items are present in the correlative protasis, the first *wh*-word is usually translated into a universal or generic quantifier which distributes over the other *wh*- item interpreted as a restricted variable, thereby yielding a list-of-pairs reading, just as in multiple *wh*- questions – whence it can be safely argued that it probably sits in the Spec,Qfr position, cf.:

- (12) *Nork zer* hazi erein bait-du biltzen dizi komunki.  
 who-ERG what(sort-of) seed sown *bait*-AUX harvesting AUX usually  
 ‘As a rule, one harvests the sort of seed one has sown.’ [Etxepare 1545: 1,14]
- (13) *Nork zertan* baitu bere burua bilhatzen,  
 who-ERG what-LOC *bait*-AUX himself looking-for  
 hartan ere du hark bere amodioa galtzen. [Léon 1929: I.5.6]  
 that-LOC also AUX he-ERG his love losing  
 lit. ‘Who in what seeks himself, in that too he loses his love.’  
 ‘In whatever (thing) anybody seeks himself, he loses his love in that very thing.’

**2.3.** The foregoing examples, starting with (9), thus seem to show that, except in the case of multiple *wh*- correlative clauses, the *wh*-word occupies the typical position associated with its form, i.e., according to Rizzi (*op. cit.*), that of a focused / interrogative phrase. However, there also are arguments that show that the *wh*- words used in free relatives do not behave exactly as those in interrogative clauses.

**2.3.1.** First, whereas multiple questions can use more than two *wh*- words, free relatives may only contain two of them. Thus (14a) is fine (although bookish), but (14b) is not:

- (14) a *Nork zer* nun hartu du?  
 who-E what where taken has?  
 ‘Who has bought what where?’
- b \**[Nork zer* nun hartu bait-du] eta hark hura han bihurtu beharko du  
 who-E what where taken *bait*-has and he-E that there give-back must-PROS AUX

Interestingly, the same constraint that applies to (14b) also applies to the combination of explicit (non-*wh*-) quantifiers and correlative *wh*- items, as shown in (15a) – compare (14b) – whereas (15b) and (c), just as (10) above, are fine:

- (15) a \**Bakotxak* nun zonbat aldiz huts egiten bait-du,  
 each-E where how-many time-INST mistake doing *bait*-AUX  
 eta hark han hanbat aldiz ordaindu beharko du  
 and that-one that so-many times-INST pay must-PROS AUX
- b *Bakotxak/Nork* nun huts egiten bait-du  
 each-E who-E where mistake doing *bait*-AUX

eta hark han ordaindu beharko du  
 and that-one there pay-back must-PROS AUX  
 ‘Whoever makes a mistake anywhere, he’ll have to pay for it there.’

- c *Bakotxak/Nork* zonbat aldiz huts egiten bait-du  
 each-E who-E how-many time-INST mistake doing *bait*-AUX  
 eta hark hanbat aldiz ordaindu beharko du  
 and that-one so-many time-INST pay-back must-PROS AUX  
 lit. ‘Whoever how often makes a mistake, he’ll have to pay for them so many times.’

This strongly suggests that if the first *wh*- word does indeed occupy the Spec,Qfr position, the second one does not occupy the iterable position where non-initial interrogative words normally sit.

**2.3.2.** Another significant difference between the syntax of correlative protases and interrogative sentences containing only one *wh*- word is that whereas, in the latter, the *wh*- word must be left-adjacent to the verbal complex or VC,<sup>11</sup> this linear factor, although statistically unmarked in the left-periphrastic FRCs, is not compulsory at all, as shown by the contrast between the (b) sentences of (16) and (17):

- (16) a *Nork hartu* du dirua?  
 who-E taken has money-SG  
 ‘Who has taken (the) money?’
- b \**Nork dirua* hartu du?  
 who-E money-SG taken has
- (17) a *Nork ere hartuko* bait-du dirua, hark hura bihurtu beharko du  
 who-E *ere* take-PROS *bait*- has money-SG he that give-back must-PROS AUX  
 ‘Whoever will take (the) money will have to give it back’
- b *Nork ere dirua hartuko* bait-du, hark hura bihurtu beharko du  
 who-E *ere* money-SG take-PROS *bait*-has he that give-back must-PROS AUX  
*ditto*

In fact, in this respect at least, FRSs behave like the (appositive) relative clauses introduced by *wh*- words, viz.:<sup>12</sup>

- (18) *Eta etzuen ezagutua* bere seme lehen jaioaz erdi zenean,  
 and NEG+AUX known her son first born-INST give-birth AUX-*en*-LOC  
 zainari eman bait-zioten izena Jesus.  
 who-DAT give *bait*-AUX name Jesus (Harriet 1855: Mt 1,25)  
 ‘And [he] knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and [lit.: whom] he called his name Jesus.’ (KJV, *id.*)
- (19) *Eta etzuen ezagutua* erdi zenean bere seme lehensortuaz  
 and NEG+AUX known give-birth AUX-*en*-LOC her son first-born-INST

<sup>11</sup> The lexical verb if it is inflected, or the sequence lexical participle + inflected auxiliary (in positive assertive sentences). In both cases, the C° proclitic *bait*- (just as well as the suffixes *-en* and *-(e)la*, must be regarded as a part of the VC (see footnote 6).

<sup>12</sup> These examples have been chosen because they are (stylistically) definitely more representative of the religious literature of the past centuries than of today’s; note that both translations come from the main literary dialect of the Northern Basque country (Labourdin/*lapurtera*), and date back to the same narrow period. Finally, it is worth mentioning that, just like the King James’ Version, the Latin *Vulgata* introduces the last clause as a conjoined one: *et vocavit nomen eius Iesum*.

zeinari Josepek eman bait-zioten izentzat Jesus.  
 who-DAT Joseph-E give *bait*-AUX name-for Jesus (Duvoisin 1865, *id.*)  
*ditto*

Thus, in (18) just as in (17a), the VC immediately follows the *wh*- word; but in (19), just as in (17b), they can be separated by an argument (a direct object DP in the first case, the subject in the second one).

**2.3.3.** Finally, there is yet another contrast between free (cor)relative clauses and interrogative sentences. When a contrastive phrase and an interrogative *wh*-word (or phrase) cooccur, the *wh*- word must immediately precede the VC: the contrastive element then either precedes it, and thus functions as a contrastive topic – or else, for “some speakers”, it may also appear to the right of the verbal complex: see Ortiz de Urbina (2003) and Etxepare & Ortiz de Urbina (2003). The sentences (20a,b) are thus good, but (21) is out:

- (20) a DIRUA, nork hartu du?  
 money-SG who-E taken has  
 lit. ‘The MONEY, who has taken it?’  
 b Nork hartu du DIRUA?  
 who-E taken has money-SG  
 lit. ‘Who has taken the MONEY?’  
 (21) \*Nork DIRUA/dirua hartu du?  
 who-E money-SG taken has

Now when the “competition” is between a Free Relative *wh*- item and a focused one, on the other hand, both word orders are fine, i.e. it is either the *wh*- element or the focused element which will be left-adjacent to the VC. Thus if, as was said above, an interrogative word or phrase must always be left-adjacent to the VC, that is just not true in the case of correlative *wh*- items, which need not be adjacent to the VC. Such alternative choices are illustrated in (22-23), where the intervening phrases are in italics.

- (22) a Eta nork ere utziko baititu bere etxea, edo bere anaiak [...] ene izena gatik,  
 and who-E *ere* leave-PROSP *bait*-AUX his house or his brothers my name in  
 hainari ordain emanen zaio ehunetan berte hainbertze...  
 the-such-DAT retribution give-PROSP AUX hundred-in other so-much  
 lit. ‘And whoever will abandon his house or brothers [...] in my name,  
 the such will be given retribution a hundredfold [...]’ (Harriet 1855: Mt 19,29)  
 ‘And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren [...] for my name’s sake,  
 shall receive an hundredfold [...]’ (KJV, *id.*)  
 b Eta nork ere *ene izenaren ariaz* utziko baititu etxea, edo anaiak ...,  
 and who-E *ere* my name’s sake-INST leave-PROSP *bait*-AUX house or brothers  
 hainak ehunetan izanen [...] du.  
 the-such-E hundredfold have-PROSP AUX (Duvoisin 1865, *ditto*)  
 (23) a [Erraiten dautzuet] nork ere *ene izenaren gatik* utzi baitu edo etxe,  
 telling AUX who-E *ere* my name’s because left *bait*-AUX or house  
 edo haurre, hark batentzat ehun bilduko dituela... (Léon 1946, *id.*)  
 or brother that-one-E one-for hundred gather-PROSP AUX+C°  
 b Nork ere utzi baititu etxea, anaiak... edo ontasunak, ene izenaren gatik,  
 who-E *ere* left *bait*-AUX house brothers or riches my name’s because

hark batentzat ehun ukanen du... (Ezkila 1973, *id.*)  
 that-one-E for-*onne* hundred have-PROSP AUX

Both the 19th and 20th century versions offer the two possibilities: in (21a) and (22b), the VC immediately follows the *wh*- word (and its enclitic *ere*), whereas in (21b) and (22a), the focused phrase *ene izenaren ariaz* / *gatik* ‘in my name’s sake’ comes in between them.

**2.4.** To summarize, we can say that the *wh*- words which appear in correlative protases occupy neither the highest Spec,ForceP position typical of relative *wh*- words (and differ from those in form too sometimes), nor the lower Spec,FocP position occupied either by an interrogative *wh*- word (although they share the same paradigm), or by a focused XP if there is no interrogative element in the clause.

Moreover, when there are two *wh*- words, the first one clearly sits in a Spec,QfrP which occupies an intermediate position; it follows that in the unmarked case, when there is only one *wh*- word, this item occupies the specifier position of yet another head, above Foc°, but below Qfr° – whence below any type of Top head as well.

Consider now the distribution of the particle *ere*, which has not been glossed in the examples given so far (although it has been translated into English ‘ever’, it can also be the equivalent of ‘even’ or ‘also, too’ in other contexts),<sup>13</sup> and which generally appears to the right of the *wh*- word or phrase (and is phonologically an enclitic). Whatever its precise semantic import, the following fact is noteworthy: in contradistinction to its distribution in earlier stages of the language, *ere* nowadays may only appear after the (possibly second, see above) correlative *wh*-P – thus, (i) neither after a *wh*-modifier within a single XP, (ii) nor after the first *wh*-P if there are two of them.<sup>14</sup>

The first case is illustrated in (24) and (25): both italicised expressions in the first example, which dates back to the 18th century, are out today; the second expression in (25), which dates back to the middle of the 19th century, has likewise been rejected, but the first one, where *ere* is phrase final, has been judged fine.

- (24) [Zer *ere* jujamenduz] juiatuko baidituzueke bertzeak,  
 what *ere* judgment-INST judge-PROSP *bait*-AUX the-others  
 juiamendu beraz izanen zarete zuek ere juiatuak  
 judgment same-INST be-PROSP AUX you-PL too judged  
 eta [zer *ere* neurri] egin baidiokezue bertzei,  
 and what *ere* measure make *bait*-AUX+SUBJ to-the-others  
 eta neurri bera eginen zaitzue zuei *ere*. (Haraneder 1740: Mt 7,2)  
 and measure same make-PROSP AUX to-you-PL too  
 ‘For with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged;  
 and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.’ (KJV, *id.*)

<sup>13</sup> See e.g. the last word of example (24) below.

<sup>14</sup> It does not seem that the Southern version of correlative clauses, mentioned in Oyharçabal (2003: 820):

- (i) Hark zer esaten duen, nik hura sinesten dut  
 he-E what saying AUX-en I-E that believing AUX  
 ‘I believe what he says’

is an exact counterpart of the construction(s) under study *ere*; note in particular that *ere* is absent, and that the direct object *zer* remains *in situ*, to the right of the subject pronoun.


- (25) Ezen [zer moldez ere] bertzez uste izanen baituzue,  
 thus what means-INST *ere* others-INST opinion have-PROS *bait*-AUX  
 molde beraz zuetaz ere uste izanen dute;  
 means same-INST you-PL-INST *ere* opinion have-PROS AUX  
 eta [zer ere neurri-z] neurtuko baitoikezue bertzei,  
 and what *ere* means-INST -measure-PROS *bait*-AUX others-DAT (Harriet 1855, *id.*)  
 neurri beraz neurtuko zaitzue zuei ere.  
 measure same-INST measure-PROS AUX you-PL-DAT too  
 (*ditto*)

The second case is illustrated in the next examples: (26) is ungrammatical, because *ere* follows the first *wh*- word, but (27) is good, where it follows the second one.

- (26) \**Nork ere zertan huts egiten bait-du,*  
 who-E *ere* what-in mistake making *bait* AUX  
 eta hark hartan ordaindu beharko du.  
 and that-one-E that-in pay-back must-PROS AUX  
 (intended meaning) ‘In what anyone makes a mistake, in that he will have to pay.’
- (27) *Nork zertan ere huts egiten bait-du ...*  
 who-E what-in *ere* mistake making *bait* AUX  
 (same meaning as above)

We can therefore conclude that *ere* is the head of a functional projection in whose specifier the correlative *wh*- items proper (i.e., *not* the ones interpreted as distributive quantifiers) appear, i.e. a head lower than any  $\text{Top}^\circ$ , and  $\text{Qfr}^\circ$ .

As far as the inner structure of the correlative clauses is concerned, the lower part of (11) above (i.e. below ForceP) should therefore be revised as in (28):



What the nature of that  $\text{X}^\circ$  head could be will be examined in 3.4.

Finally, the impossibility for real relative pronouns (as opposed to the “correlative” *wh*- words described with their specific properties here) to occur in Basque FRCs probably explains why, contrary to what happens in many languages that have correlative sentences, left-periphrastic subordinate clauses of this type can *never* be interpreted as restrictive relative clauses modifying a *full* DP in the main clause — i.e. that Basque has no equivalent to the sentences (1)-(3).

### 3. The position of Free Relatives in the left periphery of the main clause

Let’s now turn to the position of the correlative clauses in the complex sentences in which they occur, and of that of the rest of the left periphery of those overall sentences – in particular, of the position of the pronominal correlate. Taking (11) again as a starting point, we shall first show that the correlative clause must be lower than Force P, but

above FocP.

**3.1.** The first thing to note is that a complex correlative sentence, i.e. the couple which consists of a protasis (the correlative clause proper, marked by the  $\text{C}^\circ$  *bait*-), and an apodosis or “main clause” to its right (i.e. what is left of the matrix clause to the right of the protasis), may be embedded:

- (29) Nik *derratzuet* ...[[[nork ere anaiari erranen baitio,  
 I-ERG I-tell-you who-ERG *ere* brother-SG-DAT say-PROSP *bait*-AUX  
 ‘Raka’], haina biltzarraren meneko izanen de]-**la**]. (Duvoisin 1865: Mt 5, 22)  
 Raka the-such court-SG-GEN power-*ko* be-PROSP AUX-*la*  
 ‘But I say unto you that whosoever ... shall say to his brother, ‘Raka,’ shall be in danger of the council.’ [KJV, *id.*]
- (30) *gizona, [zeinak; [[zein ate ere e; hersten bait-du]j,*  
 man-SG who-ERG which door *ere* closing *bait*-AUX  
 nehork ez **bait**-dezake idek *pro]j*  
 nobody NEG *bait* -AUX open  
 ‘a/the man (such) that, whichever door (he) closes, nobody can open (it)’

Finally, correlative sentences as a whole can also be nominalized, as in (31).

- (31) ...gure arimaren ontzeko (bide) lehena, [[gure jite makurra norat ere baitago]  
 our soul-GEN improve-to way first our nature evil-SG whereto *ere bait*-is/tends  
 eta handik gogorki urrun]tze]a] (da);  
 and therefrom tenaciously moving-away-SG is  
 bigarrena, [[bertutetarik zoin ere baitugu eskas  
 the-second, virtues-ABL which *ere bait*-we-have lack  
 eta haren biltzeari gogotik ar]tze]a] (da)  
 and that-GEN picking-up-SG-DAT tenaciously working-SG is (Léon 1929: I.25.4)  
 lit.: ‘The first means to improve our soul is, wherever our evil nature inclines, ‘and’ to move away from there tenaciously; the second one is, whichever virtue we are most lacking in ‘and’ to act tenaciously in order to acquire that [=it].’

Thus the correlative *sentences* are themselves marked as embedded: by the complementizer *-(e)la* in (29), because the global correlative sentence is the complement of a verb of saying (see also (23a) above), by the complementizer *bait*- in (30) because it is a relative one,<sup>15</sup> and by the nominalizer *-tze-* in the singular (*-a...*) in (31). Since these complementizers and nominalizers must be located in  $\text{Force}^\circ$ , the correlative protasis itself must be lower than ForceP in (11).

(Let’s add that the fact that the Hungarian counterpart of (30) would be out is probably due to the fact that relative pronouns must originate in argumental position in that language, whereas there is good evidence that they may be directly inserted or merged in a peripheral position in the CP domain in Basque, as has been argued for by Oyarzábal

<sup>15</sup> The first occurrence of *bait*- in (30) is triggered by the fact that it is the  $\text{C}^\circ$  of the correlative protasis: it is the second one, in the apodosis, which indicates that the correlative *sentence* as a whole constitutes a complex relative clause introduced by *zeina(k)*. Besides, the question of scrambling in Basque is particularly vexing: as the reader can observe here and elsewhere, the  $\text{C}^\circ$  prefix *bait* in appositive relatives, although never clause initial, need not be clause final either – but this problem does not affect the matters under discussion.

(1989) and Etchegoyhen (1997).<sup>16</sup>

**3.2.** If we now look at the CP domain from the other side, i.e. from the lowest functional strata involved, we can see that the pronominal correlate, if phonetically realized, may appear as a (strong or weak) topic, as a focused element, or yet to the right of the VC, in a position that has no special pragmatic properties. Some of the foregoing examples illustrate quite a few of those possibilities.

(i) In (12), a little *pro* must be postulated, since no pronominal correlate is present.

(ii) In (17a,b), the correlate is clearly topicalized, since the element left-adjacent to the VC of the main clause is the pronoun anaphoric to the non-*wh*- direct object of the protasis – whereas in (22) and (23), the focus provides by “new information”. In (9), the correlate *ha(r)k*, made emphatic by the adjunction of *berak* ‘himself’, is again clearly topicalized, since it is separated from the VC by two elements, the adverb *maiz* ‘often’ and the direct object *kurutze dorpeagoak* ‘heavier crosses’ which is itself emphatically focused, as evidenced by the occurrence of the inflected auxiliary to the left of the lexical (participial) verb.

(iii) In (13), the real correlate, *hartan* ‘in that’, which corresponds to the second *wh*- item of the protasis (recall the discussion concerning the status of the first *wh*- element when there are two of them), is itself strongly focused, since here again the aux. precedes the lexical verb. When there is only one *wh*- item in the protasis, the same phenomenon can be observed:

(32) [Zertan ere baitute kausitzen atsegin],  
 in-what ere bait-AUX finding pleasure,  
 hartan ere dute ardura nasaiki biltzen bihozmin. (Léon 1929: III.12.4)  
 in-that also AUX often plenty find grief

<sup>16</sup> Here are two examples from Oyharçabal (1987: p. 66, 68) which illustrate the possibility Basque has to externally merge a relative pronoun or abstract operator in the CP domain (but the base-generation analysis as such only dates back to Oyharçabal 1989):

- (i) [<sub>CP</sub> *Op*<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> *e*<sub>j</sub> ikusten dud.an].e]an eskapatzen naiz]en] gizon.a  
 seeing AUX-en-SG-LOC escaping I-am-e man-SG  
 ‘the man (such) that I run away when I see him’
- (ii) Pasatzen zen lurretan belarrrik gehiago pusatzen ez zen gerlaria zen Atila.  
 passing AUX-en lands-LOC grass-PART more growing NEG AUX warrior-SG was A.  
 ‘Attila was a warrior (such) that the grass no longer grew in the lands he crossed.’

Note in particular that the adverbial adjunct has the structure of a Semi-free Relative clause, since the locative ending can only be suffixed to NPs and DPs.

Consider (iii) now, in the light of Boeckx’s generalization that “in the domain of resumption, [...] an extractee does *not* show any agreement effect on its extraction path” [emphasis mine – GR&AL]:

- (iii) [*Op* [[*e* zozoak direla] erraten duzu]n] / d.*it*.u.zu.n] jendeak  
 idiots they-are-C° saying you-have-(it)-en / you-have-*them*-en people  
 ‘people who you say are idiots’ (Oyharçabal, 1987: 131)

As Oyharçabal comments, this plural agreement on the main verb in case of long-distance relativization, shown by the *a priori* unexpected auxiliary form *d.it.u.zu.n* (where *-it-* normally cross-refers to a plural direct object) is in fact preferred by native speakers to the one in which the 3rd person SG marking (*d-Ø-u.zu.n*) corresponds to the completive clause – rather than to the abstract relative operator.

‘Often, in what(ever) they find (their) pleasure, they also reap grief (“in it”)’ ≈  
 ‘Most of the things in which they find pleasure are those in which they find a lot of grief.’

(iv) Finally, since focusing does not require topicalization, the correlate may appear to the right of the VC, as in (33).

(33) Nork ere aitortuko bainu ni gizonen aintzinean, nik ere aitortuko dut  
 who-E ere confess *bait*-AUX me men-GEN before I-E too confess-PROS AUX  
 hura ene Aita zeruetakoaren aintzinean. (Léon 1946: Mt 10,32)  
 that-one my father celestial-GEN before  
 ‘Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my  
 Father which is in heaven.’ (KJV, *id.*)

Given the fact that the correlate itself can be topicalized – (ii) above – it is clear that the correlative protasis necessarily belongs to the “upper” part of the left periphery of the complex sentence. In any case, it cannot be focalized at all, even if it contains the “new” or “rhematic” part of the discourse, as in the following example (Xarles Videgain, personal fieldwork, cited in Oyharçabal 1987):

(34) A: ‘*Alhapidea* zer da?’  
*alhapide*-SG what is  
 B: ‘No(r)at joaiten ahal, no(r)at haizu b(a)it.da ere, hura alhapidea da.’  
 whither going can whither allowed *bait*-is ere, that *alhapide*-SG is  
 lit.: A: ‘What is an *alhapide*?’  
 B: ‘Where [one/you] can go, where it is possible, THAT is an *alhapide*.’  
 [the noun *alhapide* refers to any free grazing land]

It is the correlative clause that brings the information provided by B’s reply, but it is not in focus position: it is the pronominal correlate *hura* ‘that’ which carries the stress.

**3.3.** Since the Topic projection is iterable in Rizzi’s framework, we have good evidence that the correlative protasis sits itself in the specifier of some TopP. This conclusion is corroborated by the fact that the correlative protases can be iterated, as in (35), from the 16th century, but judged perfectly grammatical by our consultants (at least as far as our syntactic problem is concerned): here two correlative clauses (the second of which is a comparative one) are somehow embedded in one another:

(35) *Nork* erraiten bait-du hura [=Jauna]<sub>i</sub> baitan dagoela, behar du,  
 who-ERG saying *bait*-AUX him Lord-SG in he-stays-C°, must AUX  
*nola* hura<sub>i</sub> ebili bait-da, — *hala hainak* ere ebili —.  
 how that-one walked *bait*-AUX thus PRON also walk (Leizarraga 1571: 1-Jn 2,6)  
 ‘[[He that saith]<sub>i</sub> he<sub>i</sub> abideth in him<sub>i</sub>] ought himself so to walk even as he<sub>i</sub> walked.’ (KJV)

The position of the verb complex of the main clause in (35), *behar du* ‘(he) must’, which governs the ergative case on the archaic pronominal correlate *haina*, can also be as shown by the dashes: in other words, the VC of the main clause must have raised from the lowest or rightmost position (indicated by the second dash) to the one actually occupied, but could have stopped in between.

These facts show that a functional head able to host the VC must occur to the right of

each correlative protasis, and therefore can be *duplicated*.<sup>17</sup> But is there any evidence for such a head, independently of the presence of the VC?

**3.4.** The reader will have noticed the (unsystematic) presence of the word *eta* (normally translated into ‘and’ in other, truly coordinating, contexts), which occurs (more often than not in the literature, and quite systematically for one of our informants)<sup>18</sup> in between the protasis and the apodosis. This “conjunction” seems to be a natural candidate as a (specialized) Topic head taking a correlative protasis as its specifier, and the rest of the main clause as its complement: since the two syntactic objects thus “assembled” in a correlative *sentence* are both *clauses*, i.e. CPs (although distinct ones), it is not unnatural for a conjunction to instantiate the functional head in question.

From a typological point of view, the presence of an (otherwise well-behaved) coordinating conjunction between a left-periphrastic relative clause and the main clause should not surprise anyone: one example of it is given by Burushaski *ka* in (2) above, and further examples are given for Old French and Swahili in Rebuschi (2003) for instance, but they are also attested in Hittite and Gothic – not to mention the element *i* (which, however, *follows* the pronominal correlates) in Slavic languages like Russian, Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian — as can be seen in the examples given by Izvorski 1996, Boskovic 1997, although this point is not discussed in those texts.

What is particularly interesting is the fact that the same item sometimes also appears within the the correlative protasis itself, more specifically, between the *wh*- word and *ere*, as in (36) or (37):

- (36) Noiz *eta* ere ikusten bait-dugu, *eta* orduan egia erraiten diogu  
 when *eta ere* seeing *bait*-AUX and then truth saying AUX  
 lit. ‘When we see him/her (, and then) we tell him/her the truth’
- (37) Zenbat *eta* gehiago edaten bait-du,  
 how-many and more drinking *bait*-AUX,  
 hanbat *eta* zozokeria gehiago erraiten du.<sup>19</sup>  
 so-much and nonsense more saying AUX  
 ‘The more s/he drinks, the more stupid things s/he says.’

This seems to indicate that there is a particular relationship (and even perhaps a sort of agreement relation) between the X<sup>o</sup> of (28) whose specifier hosts the correlative protasis and some specific feature, say, [+corr(ative)], carried by the Topic head which optionally hosts *eta*.<sup>20</sup>

To summarize, then, we can say first that the functional head in the specifier of which the

<sup>17</sup> If the two correlative clauses were two specifiers of the same functional head, the VC *behar du* should have either stayed *in situ* at the end of the construction, or stopped immediately to the left of the two pronominal correlates, *hala* and *hainak*.

<sup>18</sup> In Oyharçabal's (2003) introduction to Basque correlatives, six of the eight LPRCs given as examples display the word *eta* in the position described.

<sup>19</sup> We do not know why the second conjunction is much better *after* the pronominal correlative quantifier *hanbat* rather than to its left. A possible solution might be found in the multiplicity of functional heads proposed by Beghelli & Stowell (1995), but this issue must be left for future research.

<sup>20</sup> *Eta* might thus be described as being optionally introduced under a Top head marked [+corr] – but *only if* the VC has not raised to that position, as in (35).

correlative protasis is to be found is simply a Top head, which as such (i) may be iterated, and consequently (ii) may precede or follow<sup>21</sup> other Topic heads and projections. Second, a special feature, [+corr], must be posited to be available in UG, possibly generally hosted in a Top head, which requires that the TopP's specifier be a (non-independent) clause. Third, in certain natural languages, a lexical item could be associated with that feature: in some of them, like Basque, this item would more specifically require that the specifier be a Free Relative, but that is not necessary: in Old French, for instance, *e(t)* and *si* could appear between just any adverbial or circumstantial clause, including conditional protases, etc., and the (main) clause, cf. Rebuschi (2002).<sup>22</sup> Fourth, the checking of that feature might require that the left-dislocated free relative be recognizable as such — whence, perhaps, the special X<sup>o</sup>/XP of (28) which would host the (now uninterpretable) feature [*u*corr], this feature having to percolate to the Force projection of the FRC: an “Agree” relation would thus obtain between the clausal specifier and the head carrying the [+corr] feature.

**3.5.** Needless to say, the 4th point above needs further research. Concerning the possible semantic interpretability of the syntactic feature [+corr] carried by “eta”, two possibilities come to the mind.

On the one hand, this feature could simply correspond to a  $\lambda$ -operator helping to bind a property variable in the translation of the pronominal correlate (cf. Cooper 1978), the FRC being interpreted as a property – *contra* the maximalization analysis proposed by Srivastav (1991) for the semantics of Hindi correlative sentences, and Grosu & Landman (1998) on more general grounds, between others: see Rebuschi (1998) for some arguments,<sup>23</sup> and an account of the syntactic and semantic differences between the ordinary pronominal correlate *hura* and the archaic *haina* – cf. (21a,b), (29), (35) – based on such an assumption.<sup>24</sup>

On the other hand, if the semantics of Basque correlative sentences can be shown to be, if not identical, at least very similar, to that of conditional sentences with an apparently

<sup>21</sup> In the text, all the examples given so far show that another Topic may follow the correlative protasis. In (i) below, it clearly precedes it:

- (i) *Holakoetan* [bakotxak zer ere bait-du bere baitan...], *eta* hartarik ari da.  
 in-such-PL-LOC each-one what *ere bait* has him in and that-ABL acting is  
 ‘In such cases, whatever [strength] anyone has in himself, (and) that is what he uses’  
 [Hiriart-Urruty 1893 (1972:49)]

<sup>22</sup> Also note that the (modern) French counterpart of (i) below, from Culicover & Jackendoff (1999), optionally allows the presence of the conjunction *et* ‘and’ between the two clauses, see (ii).

- (i) The more you eat, the less you want  
 (ii) Plus tu manges (*et*) moins tu as faim  
 more you eat and less you have hunger

<sup>23</sup> A fairly straightforward one is provided by an example like (32), which exhibits an adverbial element *ardura* ‘often’ which, given the context, may only be interpreted as an unselective binder of the ‘many’ type, semantically incompatible with an interpretation of the FRC as a maximal plural individual.

<sup>24</sup> The usually visible raising of the pronominal correlate would thus be explained in terms of it being the item that must be bound by the property provided by the correlative protasis, independently of any “stylistic” reason.



existential or negative polarity item like *somebody* or *anybody* in the protasis, and a generic tense in the apodosis (which would unselectively bind that term in the course of interpretation), then the feature [+corr] could just be translated by the connective which links the two propositions, as in (38b):

- (38) a If somebody/anybody makes a mistake, s/he shall be punished  
 b GENx [[make a mistake(x): [be-punished(x)]]

#### 4. Movement or base generation?

**4.1.** The fact that a Top head can contain a feature [+corr], hence require that a (correlative) clause appear in its left periphery, probably in that head's specifier (in spite of Chomsky (200?)) is neither an argument in favour of, nor one against, the idea that the FRC should first be generated/merged in a lower position, and next raised to the position it occupies at s-s/Spellout: the requirement may be satisfied either way.

Moreover, even admitting that economy considerations should not be confined to a performance model, and that movement “comes for free”, it is not clear whether or how movement should be preferred to external merge, insofar as raising by definition presupposes a preliminary application of (external) merge in the derivation. Three other vexing issues are: (i) Should optional movement be allowed at all? (ii) Can Scrambling (or any process of direct adjunction to an X<sup>max</sup>) be used as a normal syntactic device (cf. Kayne 1994 and much ensuing work)? (iii) Are we certain today that there is a systematic correlation between movement and reconstruction effects, just as much as specialists are certain there is, conversely, no such correlation between the absence of reconstruction effects and direct merge, i.e. the absence of raising?

The foregoing questions are mentioned because of the various stances taken by the scholars who have worked on correlative sentences in Hindi (Srivastav 1991, Mahajan 2000, Bhatt 2003, between others) with respect to them: depending on their specific answers, alternative solutions emerge or, alternatively, are discarded.

In section 4.2, we shall therefore start from empirical matters, describing two constructions in which a *wh*- FRC appears to the *right* of the verb complex, thereby providing a potential input for a movement analysis (an idea partly inspired by Mahajan's and Bhatt's work cited above), and showing that none of them may in fact constitute such an input (unless many *ad hoc* stipulations are made). In § 4.3, with the proviso above in mind, it will be shown that no reconstruction effects are triggered, thereby corroborating the “external merge” approach.<sup>25</sup>

**4.2.** All the examples of FRCs given so far belong under the left periphery of the

<sup>25</sup> FRCs containing only one *wh*- element will be examined, since whenever there are two, no raising mechanism – not even across-the-board movement, can be devised: see Bhat (2003:fn 11) on this. Note, however, the following Hindi example – where, admittedly, the interpretation is specific, if not definite (Bittner 2001, ex. (10)):

- (i) Jo laRkii jis laRke-se baat kar rahii hai, ve dost haiN.  
 REL girl REL boy-INS talk do PRG is those friends are  
 ‘As for the boy and the girl she's talking to, *those* are friends.’

Needless to say, (i) would be totally out in Basque (as well as in Hungarian). Recall also that, as was seen in §2.3.1, the first *wh*- phrase is best analyzed as a quantifier.

correlative sentence, the reason being that they are much more frequent there than to the right of the verb complex, a position taken to be diagnostic of A-positions. However, Basque does exhibit FRCs — and “quasi-FRCs” (QFRCs, see below) — in argumental position. Let us consider them in turn.

**4.2.1.** The most straightforward construction is just for a FRC to appear towards the end of the main clause, as in (39):

- (39) ... V+I ... [<sub>FRC</sub> *nor ere...* *bait-V+I*]  
 who *ere*

where V+I represents either the tensed lexical verb, or the tensed auxiliary (as indicated in fn. 5, *bait*- is considered to be part of the CV).

Diachronically, (39) is the first construction attested, and the one that best approximates the inner structure of left-periphrastic correlatives.

In the 16th century, if a mismatch arose between the morphological case assigned by the lower predicate and the one assigned by the matrix predicate, the *wh*- word could bear either case ending, but ever since the 17th century, such a structure,<sup>26</sup> has required that the case correspond to the function of the *wh*- item within the FRC, see (40) — where the main clause's verb *eman* assigns the dative case (-i), and the FRC's, the ergative (-k):

- (40) %Mirenek musu bat emanen dio [nork /\*nori ere partida irabaziko bait-du].  
 Miren-E kiss one give-PROS AUX who-E who-DAT *ere* game win-PROS *bait*-AUX  
 ‘Miren will give a kiss to the one who /whoever will win the game.’

On the other hand, if no case mismatch arises, the situation has remained stable across the centuries: just as in the earliest texts, the structure (39) is fine today, cf. (41), where the dative is required both for the addressee role of *mintzatu* ‘speak’ and the indirect object of *eman* ‘give’.

- (41) Mirenek musu bat emanen dio [nori ere (zu) mintzatuko bait-zara].<sup>27</sup>  
 Miren-E kiss one give-PROS AUX *nor-DAT ere* you speak-PROS *bait* AUX  
 ‘Miren will give a kiss to whoever you'll talk to.’

Could then (39) serve as input to the correlative sentences with the FRC in their left periphery? If (40) were rejected by all the speakers, one might suggest that the case conflict is part of the trigger. Given however that such structures are attested in 20th c. literature, and are accepted by one informant, such a tack is difficult to follow, all the more so as the [+corr] feature which we suppose is present under a Topic head should independently attract the FRC. Of course, it is possible to imagine that that feature itself, being interpretable (cf. §3.5 *supra*), need only be checked post Spellout<sup>28</sup> — whereas if it is instantiated by *eta*, the movement would be compulsory. This approach also seems to

<sup>26</sup> If acceptable at all — one of our informants systematically rejects them, but not the other, see below. However, since such examples are attested in mid-20th c. texts, we will regard them as grammatical.

<sup>27</sup> In the northern dialects, the aux. need not (and usually does not) carry any morpheme cross-referencing a dative argument, when *zara/zira*, lit. ‘you are’ instead of (standard) *zatzai/ki* ‘you-(are-)to-him/her’.

<sup>28</sup> But then we would not be discussing correlative clauses and sentences any longer.

have other shortcomings: (a) Raising of the FRC to some Spec,TopP could only affect a correlative sentence whose apodosis contains a *pro* correlate: there is no way to account for the presence of *hura* when the pronominal correlate is explicit. (b) If we are correct in assuming that the FRC contains an uninterpretable Corr Head and projection, since the Raising is optional, this would mean that the uninterpretable  $X^0/XP$  in the FRC, whose specifier hosts the *wh-* element, might remain unchecked (and undeleted) in sentences like (40) and (41) — an impossible move within current theorizing — or else that it is its very presence that, along with that of a correlative pronominal, triggers the movement. Needless to say, this means that the inner structures of the FRC that stays *in situ* and the one which appears as a correlative clause at spellout should be different, but such a stance would require independent arguments in its favour, which we have not been able to find.

**4.2.2.** Let's now turn to an apparently better candidate, (42):

- (42) ... V+I ... [DP *nor ere... bait-V+I*] [#ETA HURA]  
                         who ere                        and that-one

Here, we have what could be called a Quasi-free relative clause (QFRC), since the FRC proper is closely associated with a demonstrative — but *eta* is obligatory here. Sentences of this type have been attested since the early 18th century, and are still acceptable for elderly native speakers (G.R., personal fieldwork). Whatever the exact inner structure of the DP might be,<sup>29</sup> the pause before *eta*, symbolized by #, is compulsory and clearly audible in today's Basque. Also noteworthy is the fact that *hura* must now bear the case assigned by the matrix predicate, whilst the *wh-* word (*nor* in (42)) takes on the case ending which corresponds to its grammatical function in the FRC, as in (43) and (44): (43) illustrates case parallelism (both the *wh-* item and the dem. are in the locative case), whereas in (44), the *wh-* element is in the so-called prolative case, and the dem. in the genitive.<sup>30</sup>

- (43) [...] Eskualdunak ere kausitzen [di]tuenean Eskual-herria ez ziren gauzak,  
       Basque-SG-E too finding AUX-en-LOC Basque country NEG-are things  
       [*non ere kausituko baitituke, eta han*], obligatua dateke hango izenen hartzera  
       where ere find-PROS bait-AUX and there obliged will-be there-ADN names-GEN-to-take  
       ‘[...] when a Basque likewise finds things that are not in the Basque country, he'll be  
       obliged to borrow the local name, wherever he'll find them [lit.: ... *and there*’  
       (Etxeberri Sarakoa [±1710])
- (44) Ene eskuinean edo ezkerrean zuen jar-araztea ez dago niri: toki hoik  
       my right-LOC or left-LOC your seating NEG stays me-DAT place DEM-PL  
       [[*norentzat ere eginak baitira eta heien*]ak] dira. (Léon 1946, Mk 10,40)  
       who-for ere done-PL bait they-are and they-GEN-PL are

<sup>29</sup> *Eta* might play the role of a  $\lambda$ -operator enabling the FRC to its left to bind the property variable alluded to in section X, which would mean that we wouldn't have a DP, but a more complex syntactic object whose functional head would now be obligatorily filled. Note that in Hindi, correlative clauses can be directly adjoined to an argumental DP (Dayal 1997), a fact which is fully exploited by Bhatt's (2003) raising analysis of (real) correlatives in that language.

<sup>30</sup> Curiously enough, for one of our young consultants, such structures are only acceptable if there is a case mismatch, as in (44) – whereas the other rejected them, independently of the case(s) that are assigned. Those (recent) variations will not be dealt with here.

‘But to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared’ [KJV] – lit. ‘...but they are [[for whoever they were made], and their’s].’

At first sight, nothing seems to prevent a raising analysis of correlative clauses due to the optional raising of the DPs or QFRCs: they might either adjoin to TP or some higher projection, or land in the specifier of some Top head. However, a more careful look at the data renders this approach suspicious.

- (i) How could it be that *eta* and even the explicit pronominal correlate *hura*, which are obligatorily present in it in (42)-(44), should optionally disappear during the raising operation? (Of course, if they are phonetically unrealized, this would send us back to the delicate situation discussed in 4.2.1, and based on (39)-(41)).  
 (ii) This approach does not account either for the fact, described in §3, see e.g. (33), that the pronominal correlate, if it is pronounced, need not be right-adjacent to *eta* (if it too is phonetically realized).  
 (iii) A type of indisputable raising of QFRCs independently exists, as in (45).<sup>31</sup>

- (45) %Nork ere huts egiten bait-du eta hura, # Peiok zigortuko du  
       who-E ere mistake doing bait AUX and that-one Peio-E punish-PROS AUX  
       lit. ‘Whoever makes a mistake and him, Peio will punish (him).’

This structure was proposed by the informant who rejected all examples patterned after (43) and (44). From the point of view of a raising analysis, the problem here is that the strong pause, here again indicated by ‘#’, is no longer between the end of the FRC and *eta*, but after *eta hura* ‘and him’. In the absence of any theory able to account for such a phenomenon, it is difficult to see how (45) could be a potentially correlative sentence (at Spellout), or yet undergo a further extraction of the material that precedes *eta hura*, i.e. the FRC contained in the QFR: note in particular that the pause would be displaced here again, since in standard correlative examples like (5), this pause is always just before *eta hura*, i.e., right-adjacent to the end of the FRC proper.<sup>32</sup>

**4.3.** Another argument against a raising analysis of Basque correlative sentences is provided by the total absence of reconstruction effects (as discussed in 4.1, this argument is not very strong, since if such effects are often considered to be evidence in favour of raising, their absence is more neutral).

**4.3.1.** First, names do not reconstruct in normal correlative clauses; thus, in (46), *Jauna(k)* ‘the Lord’ can be coreferential with the pronoun in the main clause to its right:

<sup>31</sup> This type of structure does not seem to have ever been described before.

<sup>32</sup> Oyharçabal (2003:819) provides an instance in which *eta* encliticizes to the correlative protasis, and is separated from the correlative pronoun by a comma (phonetically, a pause):

- (i) Lehenago, nork ere pagatzen baitzuen barrika arno gehienik-eta,  
       earlier who-E ere paying bait-AUX barrel wine most-PART-and  
       hura zukan pasatzen bozetan.  
       that-one AUX passing elections-LOC  
       ‘Before, whoever paid the most barrels of wine (and) that one won the elections.’

Such a sentence does not seem derivable from QFRCs either, for obvious reasons. Besides, the encliticization of *eta* is an independent, widely attested phenomenon, studied in Rotaetxe (2004).

- (46) Nor ere Jaunak maite bait-du,  
 who *ere* the-Lord-E loves *bait*-AUX  
 eta hura hark berekin hartuko du zeruan  
 and that-one that-one-E with-him takePROS AUX sky-SG-LOC  
 '[Whoever the Lord<sub>i</sub> loves]<sub>j</sub>, he<sub>j</sub> will take him<sub>j</sub> with him<sub>j</sub> in heaven.'

If the correlative clause were to reconstruct in a position adjacent to the direct object *him<sub>j</sub>*, the subject pronoun *hark* 'he-ergative' would bind the name *Jauna(k)*, thereby violating Principle C of the Binding Theory. But no such effect can be noticed.

**4.3.2.** Consider now the relations that obtain, or do not obtain, between a quantified expression and a pronoun. In (47), since demonstratives can be bound by a quantified DP in a higher clause, the quantified phrase *mutiko oro* 'every boy' can bind the demonstrative / correlate *hura* in the locative case (*hartan*). Interestingly, if the whole QFRC raises towards the left periphery, the informant who accepted (45) also accepted (48) with the same intended meaning, i.e. with *mutiko oro* and *hartan* coindexed, thereby asseverating the existence of reconstruction effects in some cases.

- (47) *Mutiko oro* fidatzen da [[zein neskatxak ere (*pro*) musu eman bait dio] [eta hartan]]  
 boy every trusting is which girl-E *ere* kiss given *bait* AUX and her-LOC  
 'Every boys trusts the girl who has given him a kiss', lit. 'Every boy<sub>i</sub> confides  
 [whichever girl has given *him<sub>i</sub>* a kiss and in her].'  
 (48) [Zein neskatxak ere (*pro*) musu eman bait dio eta hartan], *mutiko oro* fidatzen da  
 which girl-E *ere* kiss given *bait* AUX and her-LOC boy every trusting is  
*ditto*, lit. '[Whichever girl has given *him<sub>j</sub>* a kiss and in her], every boy<sub>j</sub> confides.'

However, a sentence like (49) is out under the intended interpretation – it can only be interpreted with the little *pro* referring to someone specific, not as a bound variable:

- (49) [Zein neskatxak ere (*pro<sub>i</sub>*) musu eman bait-dio], *mutiko oro<sub>ij</sub>* hartan fidatzen da.  
 which girl-E *ere* kiss given *bait* AUX boy every in-her trusting is  
 lit. 'Which girl has given *him<sub>i</sub>* a kiss, every boy<sub>ij</sub> confides in her.'

More explicitly, (49) cannot mean, '[Every boy]<sub>i</sub> trusts the girl who has kissed him<sub>j</sub>', but only '[Every boy]<sub>j</sub> trusts the girl who has kissed him<sub>j</sub>',  $i \neq j$ . It follows from the contrast between the last two examples that, under null assumptions, the correlative protasis of (49) has certainly not been raised.

**4.4.** A final argument against a raising analysis has to do with resumptive pronouns in relative clauses. They are typically unusual in Basque relatives, and are best analyzed as corresponding to structures in which the *wh*-REL has been base-generated in a non-argumental position (cf. fn. 16 and references therein).

What is worth noting from this point of view is that resumptive pronouns (performing of course the job of a pronominal correlate) are fine within islands such as relative clauses:

- (50) [Nork ere huts egiten bait-du], ez dut ezagutzen  
 who-E *ere* mistake doing *bait* aux NEG AUX know  
 [[*hura<sub>i</sub>* zigortuko du]en gizona].  
 that-one punish-PROS AUX-en man-SG  
 '[Whoever makes a mistake]<sub>i</sub>, I do not know the man who will punish him<sub>j</sub> [or:them].'

- (51) [Nork ere huts egiten bait-du], izanen da  
 who-E *ere* mistake doing *bait*-AUX be-PROS AUX  
 [mementu bat [*hura* zigortua izanen bait-da].  
 moment one [that-one punished be-PROS *bait*-AUX  
 '[Whoever makes a mistake]<sub>i</sub>, there will be a time when he<sub>j</sub>/ll be punished.'

To conclude, then, if there are no absolutely compelling arguments against a raising analysis of correlative FRCs in Northern Basque, far fewer stipulations (in fact, none) are required to account for them as externally-merged, or base-generated, in the left periphery of the complex sentence that contains them.

## 5. Conclusions

Returning to the questions asked in 1.2, we can summarize the results as follows.

- (i) In the absence of standardly assumed distinct underlying structures that might undergo raising, we have been led to conclude that an external merge analysis of Basque correlative clauses, being less stipulative than a movement analysis, is to be preferred (§4).
- (ii) The head of **THAT** TopP contains a [+corr] feature that requires that a non-independent clause sit in its specifier, and can be phonetically realized by the word *eta*, other wise a normal coordinating conjunction, 'and' (§3.1-3.4).
- (iii) We have independently shown that the internal structure of these correlative clauses contains a special position, Corr°, which projects between the lowest TopP and a Quantifier Phrase which immediately dominates the Focus Phrase (§2).
- (iv) It follows that the [ucorr] feature of the Corr head must percolate to the ForceP of the correlative clause, so as to be valued and deleted after checking with the [+corr] feature of the matrix clause (§3.4).
- (i) It also follows that this positive feature must be interpretable, and two hypotheses have been put forward, one of which (which consists in translating that feature into a I-operator enabling the semantic content of the correlative clause, interpreted as a property, to bind a property variable in the translation of the pronominal correlate), is consistent with the data provided by the "Quasi-free relative clauses" to be found in A-position, to the right of the matrix inflected verb (§ 3.5 & 4.2.2).

## References

### Linguistics

- ADGER, David, and Cécile DE CAT. 2004. 'Core Questions about the Edge'. In D. Adger *et al.* (eds.), 1-18.  
 ADGER, C., de CAT & G. TSOULAS (eds.). 2004. *Peripheries: Syntactic Edges and their Effects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.  
 AREJITA, Adolfo. 1978. *Euskal Joskera* [=Basque syntax, in Basque] Durango: Zugaza.  
 BEGHELLI, Filippo, & STOWELL, Tim. 1997. 'Distributivity and Negation'. In A. Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of Scope Taking* (Dordrecht: Kluwer), 71-107.  
 BHATT, Rajesh. 2003. 'Locality in Correlatives'. *NLLT* 21.3, 485-541.  
 BIANCHI, Valentina. 2000. 'Some Issues in the Syntax of Relative Determiners'. In A. Alexiadou *et al.* (eds.), *The Syntax of Relative Clauses* (Amsterdam: Benjamins), 53-81.  
 BITTNER, Maria. 2001. 'Topical Referents for Individuals and Possibilities'. In R. Hastings *et al.* (eds.), *Proceedings from SALT*, XI, 36-55.  
 BOECKX, Cedric. 2003. *Islands and Chains: Resumption as Stranding*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- BOSKOVIC, Zeljko. 1997. 'Superiority Effects with Multiple Wh-Fronting in Serbo-Croatian'. *Lingua* 102, 1-20.
- COOPER, Robin. 1979. 'Variable Bonding and Relative Clauses'. In F. Guenther & S. J. Schmidt (eds.), *Formal Semantics and Pragmatics for Natural Languages* (Dordrecht: Reidel), 131-169.
- CULICOVER, P., and JACKENDOFF, R. (1999). 'the View from the Periphery: The English Comparative Correlative'. *LI* 30.4, 543-571.
- DAYAL, V. 1996. *Locality in WH Quantification. Questions and Relative Clauses in Hindi*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- ETCHEGOYHEN, Thierry. 1997. 'Against Wh-Movement in Relative Clauses'. Colloquium "Langues et grammaire III", Univ. Paris 8, Saint-Denis, June.
- ETXEPARE, Ricardo, & Jon ORTIZ de URBINA. 2003. 'Focalization'. In Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 459-516.
- GROSU, Alexander, & LANDMAN, Fred. 1998. 'Strange Relatives of the Third Kind'. *Natural Language Semantics* 6.2, 125-170.
- HAUDRY, Jean. 1973. 'Parataxe, hypotaxe et corrélation dans la phrase latine'. *BSL* 68.1, 147-186.
- HUALDE, José Ignacio, & Jon ORTIZ DE URBINA (eds.). 2003. *A Grammar of Basque*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- IZVORSKI, R. 1996. 'The Syntax and Semantics of Correlative Proforms'. *NELS* 26, 133-147.
- JUSTUS, Carol. 1976. 'Relativization and Topicalization in Hittite'. In Ch. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic* (New York: Academic Press), 213-245.
- KAYNE, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- LIPTÁK, Anikó. 2005. 'Correlative Topicalization; The adventures of correlatives in the left periphery'. Ms, ULCL, Leiden University
- LIPTÁK, Anikó, & Georges REBUSCHI (in prep.). 'On the Typology of Left-periphrastic free relatives'.
- MAHAJAN, Anoop. 2000. 'Relative Asymmetries and Hindi Correlatives'. In A. Alexiadou *et al.* (eds.), *The Syntax of Relative Clauses* (Amsterdam: Benjamins), 201-229.
- ORTIZ DE URBINA, Jon. 2003. 'Word order'. In J.I. Hualde & J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 448-459.
- OYHARÇABAL, Bernard. 1987. *Etude descriptive de constructions complexes en basque [...]*. Doctoral diss., Univ. Paris VII.
- OYHARÇABAL, Bernard. 1989. 'Pro-drop and the Resumptive Pronoun Strategy in Basque'. In L. Marácz & P. Muysken (eds.), *Configurationality. The Typology of Asymmetries* (Dordrecht: Foris), 63-83.
- OYHARÇABAL, Bernard. 2003. 'Relatives'. J.I. Hualde & J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *A Grammar of Basque* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter), 762-823.
- REBUSCHI, Georges. 1998. 'Nouvelles remarques sur haina'. *Lapurdum* 3, 53-75.
- REBUSCHI, Georges. 2001. 'Semi-Free Relative Clauses and the DP Hypothesis: Basque Evidence and Theoretical Consequences'. *IATL* 8 [Tel Aviv], 55-64.
- REBUSCHI, Georges. 2002. 'Coordination et subordination, II: la co-jonction généralisée'. *Bulletin de la société de linguistique* 97.1, 37-94.
- REBUSCHI, Georges. 2003. 'Towards a theoretical treatment of left-dislocated subordinate clauses'. J. M. MAKAZAGA & B. OYHARÇABAL (eds.), *P. Lafitteren sortzearen mendemugako biltzarra, I: Gramatika gaiak* (Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia), 395-416.
- RIZZI, Luigi. 1997. 'The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery'. L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar; Handbook of Generative Syntax* (Dordrecht: Kluwer), 281-337.
- ROTAETXE, Karmele. 1994. '(E)ta enklitikoak sailkapen eskalarrean' [=A scalar analysis of the enclitic (e)ta, in Basque]. *Fontes Linguae Vasconum* 95, 115-139 [Pamplona].
- SRIVASTAV, Veneta. 1991. 'The Syntax and Semantics of Correlatives'. *NLLT* 9.4, 637-686.
- SURÁNYI, Balázs. 2004. 'The Left Periphery and Cyclic Spellout: The Case of Hungarian'. In D. Adger *et al.* (eds.), 49-73.
- TIFFOU, Etienne, & Richard PATRY. 1995. 'La relative en bourouchaski du Yasin'. *BSL* 90.1, 335-390.
- ZRIBI-HERTZ, Anne, & HANNE, Jean-François. 1995. 'Pronoms, déterminants et relatives en bambara de Bamako'. *Linguistique africaine* 15, 91-135.

**Basque sources**

- DUVOISIN, Jean. 1859-65. *Bible edo Testament Zahar eta Berria [...]*. London. Facsim., Bilbao: Gran Enciclopedia Vasca, 1972.
- ETXEBERRI SARAOKA, Joannes. [1712]. *Lan osoa* [Complete works]. Ed. by Julio de Urquijo under the title *Obras vascongadas del doctor laborioso Joannes d'Etcheberri (1712)*, Paris: Geuthner, 1907. Facsim., Biarritz: Atlantica, 1999.
- EZKILA (anon.) (1973). *Jesu Kristoren Berri Ona*. Bonloc, Pyrénées Atlantiques: Ezkila.
- HARANEDER, Joannes. [1740]. *Jesu Christoren Evangelio Saindua*. Ms., ed. by P. Altuna, Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia, 1990.
- HARRIET, Maurice (1855). *Jesu-Christo gure Jaunaren Testament Berria [...]*. Bayonne: E. Lasserre.
- HIRIART-URRUTY, Jean. 1893. 'Gure indarrak'. In J. H.-U., *Zezenak errepublikan*, ed. by J. Intxausti, Oñate, Guipuzcoa: Ed. Franciscana Aranzazu, 1972.
- LEIZARRAGA / LIÇARRAGUE, Johannes. 1571. *Iesus Christ Gure Jaunaren Testamentu Berria; Kalendera; ABC edo Christinoen Instruconeia*. La Rochelle. Facsim., Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia, 1990.
- LÉON, Léon. 1929. *Jesu-Kristoren Imitazionea*. Turnhout (Belgium): Brepols.
- LÉON, Léon. 1946. *Jesu-Kristo gure Jaunaren Ebanjelio Saindua*. Ustaritz, Pyrénées Atlantiques: published by the author.

\* \* \* \* \*