1. BACKGROUND

I-languages in contact:

Most of the work on language contact during the last decennies may be included within the notion of E-language correspondences: case studies in which the borrowing is defined in terms of morphemes, constructions, or other superficial categories belonging in the domain of the immediately observable. The comparison between the languages in contact in those cases is established in terms of similarities (constructional similarities, lexical similarities, or more general notions of similarity at the level of communicative strategies, languages or typological generalizations). The notion of similarity, convergence, or the usual technical lexicon employed in most of the work on language contact is deeply rooted in E-language notions. We will try to show by means of some illustrative cases, that such an approach to contact induced change is not appropriate to (i) describe the relevant change, and (ii) set the basis for an explanatory account of the change.

Take for instance the zero complementizer borrowed by Spanish in contact with English in the United States (Silva-Corbalán, 1994; 2008:216):

(1) a. She told me Ø she was delighted with the vase Ø she had bought
   b. Me dijo *(que) estaba feliz con el jarrón *(que) había comprado (Standard Spanish)

(2) Yo creo Ø inventaron el nombre que le pusieron
   I think they.invented the name that they.gave
   ‘I think they invented the name they gave him’

Etxepare (1999), building on work by Ormazabal (1995) and Boskovic (1997), notes that null complementizers in Spanish come in two guises: modal null C, apparent in subjunctive complements (3a), and indicative null C, involved in the syntax of extraction:

(3) a. *Les ruego alguien me devuelva el pasaporte (cf. Le ruego que usted...) 3PL.DAT I.beg someone 1S.DAT give.back.SUBJ the passport
   b. *El vino que Pedro asegura a sus amigos les recomendaron (cf. que a sus amigos...) the wine that Pedro claims to his friends 3.pl.dat they.recommended

Etxepare proposes a C-to-V cliticization process happening at PF, and requiring the adjacency of the null C and the V (blocked by the fronted material in (4a,b)). Boskovic and Lasnik (2003) propose a similar analysis for null C in verbal dependents, keeping it separate from the null C in relative clauses. The null C of declarative dependents is an affix with the selectional feature [+V]. Looked at from this perspective, the change in Los Angeles Spanish is a change from null Cs which have a complex morphosyntactic content: [+V-morphology, +wh] and [+V-morphology, +modal], to a null C à l’anglaise ([+V]). It does not extend to relatives, which do not share the same dependency vis-à-vis the verb.

What is borrowed is not just a zero complementizer Ø (an E-language category), but the zero complementizer as it relates to a particular array of features, a given pair [Exponent, (F1, F2, ..., Fn)] which operates selectively over the English configurations in the bilingual mind (see recently Aboh, 2015).

The induction problem in SLA

Poverty of stimulus arguments have been put forward within the context of L2 acquisition. They typically present an scenario in which a particular grammatical regularity, which does not exist in the grammar of the learner, and for which negative evidence is not available, nevertheless ends up being part of the interlanguage of even not very advanced learners. A well known case is the French structure investigated by Dekydspotter and Sprouse (2001):

(5) a. Qui de célèbre fumait au bistro dans les années 70?
   b. Qui fumait de célèbre au bistro dans les années 70?

The meaning of (5a,b) is not identical. A possible answer to the question in (3a) may involve a person who is currently famous but was not famous in the 70s. The discontinuous interrogative can only be answered with a celebrity of the 70s. The structure does not exist in English, to start with, and cannot be taught except by having recourse to negative evidence. Dekydspotter and Sprouse showed that English L2 learners of French, even not very proficient ones, demonstrated a statistically significant difference in the acceptance of the available and unavailable interpretations.

Overt Pronoun Constraint

In languages that permit null arguments, an overt pronoun cannot be interpreted as a bound variable.

The OPC provides a straightforward account of the following asymmetry in the interpretive possibilities of null and overt pronouns in Japanese:

(7) a. Tanaka-san, wa [∅_other kaisya de itiban da to] itte-iru
Tanaka-Mr TOP company in best is that saying-is
‘Mr Tanaka says that I/you/he/she…is the best in the company’

b. Dare ga [∅_other sore o mita to] itta no?
who NOM that ACC saw that said Q
‘Who said that I/you/he/she… saw that?’

c. Tanaka-san, wa [kare_other kaisya de itiban da to] itte-iru
Tanaka-Mr TOP he company in best is that saying-is
‘Mr Tanaka says that he is the best in the company’

d. Dare ga [kare_other sore o mita to] itta no?
who NOM that ACC saw that said Q
‘Who said that he saw that?’

In (7a), the null subject of the embedded clause can be interpreted referentially, as coreferential with the matrix subject or with an extra-sentential antecedent (other). In (7b), the null subject of the embedded clause can be interpreted referentially or as a bound variable. In (7c), kare ‘he’, can be interpreted referentially, again as coreferential to either the subject antecedent or to some other extra-sentential referent. However, while kare in (5d) can also be interpreted referentially (that is, as linked to an extra-sentential referent), the bound variable interpretation is impossible. Schwartz and Sprouse qualify this situation as an example of «bankruptcy of the stimulus». The direct evidence available in the input for the acquirer is summarized in (8):

(8) Referential interpretation | Bound interpretation
---|---
Null pronoun | Attested in the input
Overt pronoun | Attested in the input

This should provide a child exposed to Japanese with evidence for the grammaticality of these three cells, as in (9):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referential interpretation</th>
<th>Bound interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null pronoun</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt pronoun</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Natural analogical extension would lead to the conclusion that the overt pronoun can also receive a bound interpretation, as (10):

(10) Referential interpretation | Bound interpretation
---|---
Null pronoun | OK | OK |
Overt pronoun | OK | OK |

But this doesn’t happen. Children exposed to Japanese know that the interpretation of an overt pronoun as a bound variable is not possible.

(11) Referential interpretation | Bound interpretation
---|---
Null pronoun | OK | OK |
Overt pronoun | OK | *OK |

This conclusion about the impossible bound-variable interpretation occurs in the absence of any PLD directly relevant to just that interpretation. Japanese children do not receive instruction on this paradigm, and negative evidence is not available.

Kanno showed that the same constraint was operative for adult English native speakers (four semester instruction) learning Japanese, despite the fact that English, not being a null subject language, does not obey that constraint:

(12) Who, said that he_other saw that?

Kanno used this type of evidence to argue for full access to UG in the course of second language acquisition.

The poverty of stimulus situations in SLA illustrated by cases such as the Overt Pronoun Constraint bear witness to the availability of UG principles in constraining successive steps in bilingual acquisition. It is what the SLA literature calls “full access” (see White, 2003, for an
Emerging forms

Contact induced change may result in structures which belong neither to the model language nor to the replica language, another poverty of stimulus scenario.

Emerging forms are apparent in Code-Switching, for instance in the well documented use of light verb constructions in code-switching pairs which are otherwise unattested in either of the languages present in the switch. One such instance are structures like (13), coming from Spanish-German code-switching as studied by Gonzalez-Vilbazo and Lopez (2011):

(13) Juan *hace* nähen das Hemd

Juan does sew the shirt

« Juan sews the shirt »

_Hacer+_V cannot be used as a light verb construction in monolingual Spanish. There is no equivalent either in monolingual German. The light verb can only be realized in one language (Spanish), but not the other (German).

This type of asymmetry has also been described for:

Telugu/English contact (Den Dikken and Rao, 2003)
Marathi/English (Joshi, 1985)
Hindi/English (Ritchie and Bhattia, 1996)
Turkish/Dutch (Boschoeten and Verhoeven, 1985)

How does a structure like (13) emerge?

Ingredient 1: A basic clausal structure that divides the verbal phrase into a functional v and a lexical V

(13) \[CP...T[vP v [vP V...]]\]

Ingredient number 2: Spanish verbs have conjugation classes:

(14) a. cant-“sing” -ar class 1 -> cantar (ex: cantas = you sing)
    b. beb-“drink” -er class 2 -> beber (ex: bebes = you drink)
    c. viv-“live” -ir class 3 -> vivir (ex: vives = you live)

Ingredient number 3: small v possesses a morphological feature conjclass, that must be satisfied by a lexical verb.

The rest follows from general computational restrictions. German verbs do not have a conjugation class, so they cannot satisfy the conjugation class feature of small v. This means that the German lexical verb does not raise to merge with v. It stays in-situ. In its in-situ position, it adopts an unmarked form corresponding to the infinitive. The absence of V-to-v makes necessary the presence of a last resort empty verb: _hacer_, that can satisfy the conjugation class feature. This phenomenon can be compared to dummy-do insertion in English. The light verb must be the Spanish one. Why? An alternative in which v would lack a conjugation class feature would be satisfied by ordinary V-to-v movement, so no light verb would be required, and therefore, by economy, it would not be introduced.

The reason why the order of the inner VP corresponds to the Spanish one is because the v-probe corresponds to the Spanish one, and Spanish v does not trigger object shift (the reason why the basic order of German is SOV).

Lopez and Gonzalez-Vilbazo note the following contrast:

(16) a. Juan hizo bauen ein Haus
    Juan made build a house
    'Juan built a house'

    b. Juan hizo a Pedro ein Haus bauen
    Juan made PREP Pedro a house build
    'Juan made Pedro build a house'

What’s the difference in the VP between (17a,b)? Structure of causatives with an inner agent (Guasti, 1992; Folli and Harley, 2009):

(17) a. \[vP1 EA v^o \ [vP2 EA v^o \ [v^o ...]]\]
    b. \[vP1 Juan hiz^a \ [vP2 a Pedro v^oGerman \ [v^o...]]\]

The second v is a German v. It has no conjugation class feature. It attracts the lexical verb. The syntax of the inner VP corresponds to German (object shift).

Lopez and Gonzalez-Vilbazo: ‘The I-language of Esplugish speakers is also the outcome of the interaction of UG with the environment. The resulting I-language may contain a feature – a free standing light verb- that is not present in the input grammars, but is available in the universal pool’.
Although the relation of this phenomenon with acquisition is not clear (not clear that the light verb constructions survive outside the code-switching context), it attests to the mediating role of UG AND of the two grammars involved in the contact situation. It is thus an example of Full Transfer, Full Access.

The process of bilingual acquisition and of “partially restructured vernaculars” (Holm, 2003) is thus UG-constrained, part of the UG restrictions being whatever follows from the parameter options already in place in unbalanced bilingual acquisition (the general case).

2. Third Factor Effects in Language Contact

One element that is lacking in this picture is what Chomsky (2005) calls “third factor considerations”. This constitutes a fundamental ingredient of neo-emergentist approaches to language variation. Let me start with Biberauer’s idea that acquisition biases AND structure building are driven by a third factor principle, not part of UG, that she describes as Maximize Minimal Means (2019). In the context of language, Maximize Minimal Means will result in the combined action of the two principles below:

Roberts and Roussou (2003:201):

(18) **Feature Economy** (FE, intuitive formulation): “Postulate as few FFs as possible, given the PLD”

In the context of L1 acquisition, this may read as follows (Roberts, 2019: 93)

(18') Given a pair of adequate structural representations R, R’ for a substring of input text of the PLD S, choose R iff R has n distinct FFs and R’ has m>n distinct FFs

(19) **Input Generalization** (IG): Maximize already postulated features (from Roberts, 2007)

The particular interest of Maximize Minimal Means with regard to (18) and (19) is that it is at the same time a principle of structure building and a bias guiding acquisition. Take the following quote regarding Feature Economy (under what conditions must the learner postulate a feature in his grammar?):

“...an acquirer who does not pick up on a systematic departure from Saussurean arbitrariness in the input will not pose the ‘F present?’ question, with the result that the initial NO is a default which the comparatively oriented linguist can juxtapose with the initial YES, the answer that necessarily results when some form of triggering data [Agreement, doubling and expletives, systematic null exponence, multifunctionality, and so on] leads to the question being posed. The initial NO then respects both FE and IG...The initial YES violates FE, but...respects IG as the newly identified F is assumed to be present on all heads in the relevant domain...”

If the postulated ALL does not help account for the domain distribution of the trigger, then further subdivisions of F must be entertained (SOME).

(20) **NONE>ALL>SOME** learning path (Biberauer and Roberts, 2016, 2017)

Imagine a 2L1 situation, one where a child is trying to make sense of the varying input in his/her bilingual environment. The child must attend to possible alternative ways to parse the PLD, and I will assume that this parse is as conservative as possible. That is, if Maximize Minimal Means is as much a learning bias as it is a principle of structure building, we may expect something like (20):

(20) Avoid constructing more than one grammar (favor overlap)

Feature Economy (revised for bilingual acquisition)

(21) Given an adequate structural representation R for a substring of input text of the PLD S, keep postulating R for new incoming input of a language S’. Add R’ only if forced.

(21) is intended as a rendition of the intuitive (1) in the context of the construction of two grammatical systems in parallel (bilingual acquisition). (21) should be coupled with Input Generalisation:

(22) Maximize already postulated features

As this is a principle that governs both learning and structure building, it must apply across the border (it must encompass both languages).

In a context like this, in which input is going to be more varied than in L1 acquisition, we can expect initial NOs to be less frequent. This basically means that language contact (bilingual acquisition) is a powerful engine of language change. The idea is in line with other recent approaches to language contact in the context of creoles (De Graff, 2003 ; Aboh, 2015), now understood as extreme cases of language restructuring under contact (with the Language Bioprogram hypothesis –Bickerton 1984- largely discredited).
In this handout I examine two instances of «partial restructuring» that are led by the third factor MMM, as spelled out in (21) and (22). The first case concerns Basque-Spanish contact, in which the Basque setting (the hypothesis for the existence of a given Feature F in Basque) leads to a somewhat narrower Spanish grammar, as the Spanish setting and the Basque one are in a subset relation. The second case concerns work on Basque-French contact made by Duguine and Irurtzun (2014), that I re-examine on the basis of (21)-(22). In the context of French-Basque contact, with French as an initial setting, it will bring important changes (a superset grammar that combines the Basque and the French setting).

3. Partial interrogatives and adjacency in the Spanish of the Basque Country (Dold, Etxepare and Kaiser, in progress)

Both Basque and Spanish are wh-fronting languages which typically display wh-phrase-verb adjacency, as the subject inverts in wh-questions (Bosque and Gutierrez-Rexach, 2011: 449; Etxepare and Ortiz de Urbina, 2003: 495ff; Aldai, 2011):

(22) a. Qué compra Pedro?
    what buys Pedro
    ‘What does Pedro buy?’

   b. Zer erosten du Pellok?
   what buy.NOM.LOC AUX Pello.ERG
   ‘What does Pello buy?’

(23) a. *Qué Pedro compra?
  what Pedro buys

   b. *Zer Pellok erosten du!
  what Pello.ERG BUY.NOM.LOC AUX

Torrego (1984), among others, showed that in Spanish, non-argumental wh-phrases don’t have to display subject inversion obligatorily, in particular porque ‘why’:

(24) Porqué (Juan) quiere salir (Juan) antes que los demás?
    Why Juan wants leave Juan before than the others
    ‘Why does Juan want to leave before the others?’

For causal wh-words specifically, Basque also allows intervening subjects:

(25) Zergatik (Jon) bestek baino lehenago atera nahi du (Jon)?
    why Jon.ERG others.ERG than before leave want AUX Jon.ERG
    ‘Why does Jon want to leave before the others?’

Basque and Spanish part ways when complex wh-phrases are at stake. In that case, Spanish does not require wh-phrase-verb adjacency (Ordoñez, 1998), but Basque still does:

(26) A cuál de las chicas (tu hermana) había visitado ya (tu hermana) antes?
    PREP which of the girls your sister had visited already your sister before
    ‘Which of the girls your sister had already visited before?’

Wh-phrase-verb adjacency is still required in Basque in those cases:

(27) Neska horietako zein (*zure arrebak) bisitatua zien aurretik (zure arrebak)?
    Girl that.of which your sister.ERG visited had before your sister.ERG
    ‘Which of the girls your sister had already visited before?’

3.1. Dold (2018)

There is a significant statistical difference in the acceptability of non-adjacent wh-phrase-verb configurations among Basque/Spanish bilinguals with regard to monolingual Spanish speakers. This statistical difference affects complex wh-words, not why-questions.

Dold has interviewed 114 subjects in the Basque Country and Spain, divided according to their bilingual/monolingual status, and within the bilingual group, according to the age of exposure to Basque and Spanish. All bilingual speakers interviewed are fluent speakers of Basque.

(28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker groups</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous Learners:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2L1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential Learners:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSce = Basque - Spanish, child early</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BScl = Basque - Spanish, child late</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBce = Spanish - Basque, child early</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBcl = Spanish - Basque, child late</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monolingual Speakers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MonoPV = monolinguals, Basque Country</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MonoE = monolinguals, rest of Spain</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age steps for the sequential learners after Meisel (2001) and Montrul (2008)
Differences between bilinguals and monolinguals regarding sentences like (29):

(29) A cuál de los enfermos el médico examinó durante más de media hora?

'Which of the sick people did the doctor examine for more than half an hour?'

Significantly lower acceptance rate by all bilingual speakers compared to monolinguals (p<0.01)

Significant higher acceptance rate by monolinguals from outside the Basque Country, as compared to monolinguals from the Basque Country.

Significantly lower acceptance rate by 2L1 speakers as compared to the sequential bilinguals (p< 0.03)

No clear differences between the sequential learners, probably also due to the small number of participants in three of the four groups.

One of the possible explanations of the different acceptability patterns of bilingual and monolingual populations, and of the early bilinguals as compared to late bilinguals is that this reflects the effect of the L1 Basque on the L2 Spanish.

How should we model this effect? From an E-language perspective, the learner has evidence that Spanish admits sequences such as (29): they are present (to which extent is a different matter) in the input. Somehow this evidence is neglected.

3.2. An excursus in Basque word order

Basque is a language with basic subject-object-verb (SOV) order, but with a relatively free word order. However, SOV is statistically the most frequent order and pragmatically the more neutral (Rijk 1969, Ortiz de Urbina 1995, 2003, Elordieta 2001), as in (30).

(30) Atzo JONEK Mireni liburua eman zion.

'Yesterday John给了 Miren the book.'

Basque has postpositions, possessors precede possesseees, relative clauses precede their antecedents and embedded clauses precede the complementizer. Basque also shows unexpected noun-adjective order:

(31) JONEK datorren astean liburu garesti bat erosiko duela esan du John.

'John said that he will buy an expensive book next week.'

Differences from the neutral sentential order are possible, as far as the immediate preverbal element is focalized (and assigned contrastive stress) (Itxepare & Ortiz de Urbina 2003, an observation due originally to Altube 1929, and called in the Basque grammatical tradition "Altube’s generalization"). Note that "preverbal" here means preceding the "aspect bearing lexical verb":


 ('Yesterday JON gave the book to Miren')

b. Atzo MIRENI eman zion Jonek liburua

 ('Yesterday Jon gave the book to MIREN')

c. Atzo LIBURUA eman zion Jonek Mireni.

 ('Yesterday John gave Mary the BOOK.')

3.3. Where are wh-phrases in Basque?

The received view is that Basque focus and wh-questions are displaced to a dedicated position in the left periphery of the clause. In the traditional view, this was the specifier of Comp (Ortiz de Urbina 1989):

(33) a. Nork erosi du liburua?

 'Who bought the book?'

b. [CP Nork [ erosi+du C [IP (nork) (erosi+du) [[vP (nork) liburua (erosi)]]]]]

(34) a. JONEK erosi du liburua

 'It is Jon who bought the book.'

b. [CP Jonek [ erosi+du C [IP (Jonek) (erosi+du) [[vP (nork) liburua (erosi)]]]]]

The unitary treatment of wh- and focus-syntax makes sense in Basque. We can put forward several arguments in favour of this approach or some related approach. Note that both precede negation in Basque (an IP-external category). Consider (35):
As observed by Laka (1990), negation can be shown to dominate the inflectional phrase in Basque. One structural configuration that shows this is ellipsis:

    Jon.ERG book.the read AUX but Miren.ERG NEG
    ‘Jon read the book but Miren didn’t’

    b. Jonek liburua leitu du baina [NegP Miren ez [IP leitu du]]

The presence of negation licenses IP-ellipsis in Basque, showing that it dominates the Inflection Phrase. The obligatory position of wh-phrases in Basque is preceding negation, not following it:

(37) a. Nork ez du liburua leitu?
    Who NEG AUX book.the read
    ‘Who didn’t read the book?’

    b. Zer ez du Jonek leitu?
    What NEG AUX Jon.ERG read
    ‘What didn’t Jon read?’

The same goes for focus (but see later):

(38) a. JONEK ez du liburua leitu
    Jon.ERG NEG AUX book.the read
    ‘It is JON who didn’t read the book’

    b. LIBURUA ez du Jonek leitu
    book.the NEG AUX Jon.ERG read
    ‘John didn’t read THE BOOK’

If negation dominates the inflectional phrase and the wh-phrases precede negation, we must conclude that wh-phrases occupy a syntactic position above Negation Phrase.

3.4. Shared syntactic properties of foci and wh-phrases in Basque

Basque foci and wh-phrases share a number of parallel properties. We note: (i) the possibility of long distance extraction; (ii) cyclicity; (iii) mutual intervention; (iv) massive pied-piping; and (v) sensitivity to islands.

3.5. Long distance extraction

(39) a. Nor, esan dute [uste dutela [ _ etorri dela]]?
    Who said AUX.3PL think AUX.COMP come AUX.COMP
    ‘Who did they say that they think has come?’

    b. JON, esan dute [uste dutela [ _ etorri dela]]
    Jon said AUX.3PL think AUX.COMP come AUX.COMP
    ‘It is JON who they said that they think has come’

3.5.2. Cyclicity

(40) a. Nor, esan du Mikelek [uste duela Jonek [ _ etorriko dela]]?
    Who said AUX Mikelek.ERG think AUX.COMP Jon.ERG come.PROSP AUX.COMP
    ‘Who did Mikel say that Jon thinks will come?’

    b. *Nor, esan du Mikelek [Jonek uste duela [ _ etorriko dela]]
    who said AUX Mikelek.ERG Jon.ERG think AUX.COMP come.FUT AUX.COMP
    ‘Who did Mikel say that Jon thinks will come?’

    (41) a. JON, esan du Mikelek [uste duela Aitorrek [ _ etorriko dela]]
    Jon said AUX Mikelek.ERG think AUX.COMP Aitor.ERG come.FUT AUX.COMP
    ‘It is JON that Mikel said that Aitor thinks will come.’

    b. *JON, esan du Mikelek [Aitorrek uste duela [ _ etorriko dela]]

3.5.3. Mutual intervention in long distance movement

(42) *Zer, uste du Mikelek [ETXEAN _ aurkitu duela Jonek]?
    What asked AUX Mikelek.ERG home.LOC found AUX.COMP Jon.ERG
    ‘What does Mikel think that it is at HOME that John has found?’

(43) *Zer, galdetu du Mikelek [jon _ aurkitu duen Jonek]?
    What asked AUX Mikelek.ERG where found AUX.COMP Jon.ERG
    ‘What did Mikel ask where Jon had found?’

3.5.4. Massive pied-piping

3.6. What are interrogative clause-types made of?

Focus constructions and interrogative constructions share important semantic similarities, that have syntactic structural correlates of the type we have seen. A common semantic treatment of partial questions is that they denote sets of alternative propositions, understood to be the set of all the potential answers to the question. So the meaning of (48a), in the discourse universe in which (48b) are the possible alternatives Peter may have entertained, is the set of propositions in (48c). The abstract denotation of the question in (46a) can be modeled as in (48d):

(48) a. What did Peter eat today?
   b. Alternatives in the discourse universe: {pasta, vegetables, lamb}
   c. {{Peter ate pasta}, {Peter ate vegetables}, {Peter ate lamb}}
   d. $\lambda p \ [Ex \in \text{human}. p \models \text{Peter ate x}]$

Foci present a very similar semantics, where alternatives to the focused element constitute a basic element of their denotation. In the alternatives approach to foci (Rooth, 1992), focused elements have both an ordinary denotation, and a special one, formed by all the alternatives of the same semantic type that may have occupied the place of the focus in the sentence (the alternatives):

(49) a. JOHN came
   b. Ordinary denotation (assertion): John came
   c. Focus semantic value: $\lambda p \ [Ex \in \text{human}. p \models \text{x came}]$

The answer to a question is the assertion component of a focused sentence.

On the other hand, interrogative clauses have something that focused sentences such as (49) don’t have: they constitute requests for information. They possess a particular force, which assertions lack, and which must be somehow read from the clausal structure. Following Rizzi (1997) let us call Force that part of the clausal structure which is related to the typing of a sentence as interrogative; and Focus, that part of the interrogative clause which is related to the basic alternatives introduced by questions and focused sentences. The left periphery of the clause is endowed with syntactic positions which allow us to identify those two aspects of the meaning of questions.

(50) Force…Focus…

It is quite plausible that other aspects of the meaning of interrogatives lead us to enrich (33). We are thinking particularly on recent work on the syntax of Q-particles (Reinhart, 1995; Hagstrom, 2008; Cable, 2010; Slade, 2012; Chernova, 2014, among others). In any case, those approaches must also assume at least this much.
3.6.1. On the distribution of wh-phrases

We may wonder whether wh-phrases cross-linguistically relate in the same way to Force and Focus. Here’s what I mean by this. Take Spanish, a Romance language in contact with Basque. It has a wh-word paradigm (51) whose use is limited to contexts that we would define as +wh, or in other words, as involving clausal typing.

(51) a. Quién ‘who’
   b. Qué ‘what’
   c. Cuál ‘which’
   d. Dónde ‘where’
   e. Cuándo ‘when’
   f. Cómo ‘how’

Those wh-phrases only occur in (free) relatives, and in questions.

(52) a. Quién ha venido?
    Who has come
    ‘Who came?’

b. Quién venga antes se llevará el premio.
    who come.SUBJ before CL take.FUT the prize
    ‘The one who comes earlier will get the prize’

Basque wh-phrases do not occur in relatives, not even in free ones. Basque ordinary relatives have no overt wh-word operator:

(53) a. Etorri den gizona (headed relative)
    come AUX.REL man.DET
    ‘The man who came’

b. Etorri dena (free relative)
    come AUX.REL.DET
    ‘Who came’

Then, Basque wh-phrases occur outside wh-constructions, constructions that have no interrogative force. Take the following cases, from Etxepare (2002; Etxepare, forthcoming, for an analysis in terms of an underlying distributive operator, cf. Chinese dou):

(54) a. Nork bere lekua hartu du
    who.ERG his/her place the taken AUX
    ‘Everyone took his/her place’

Those wh-phrases only occur in (free) relatives, and in questions.

(55a,b) differ minimally from questions. They become interrogative constructions if the wh-word immediately preceeds the verbal complex:

(56) Nork hartu du bere lekua?
    who.ERG taken AUX his/her place
    ‘Who has taken his/her place?’

In other words, converting (56a,b) into a question requires focalizing the wh-word. Also multiple wh-partitive constructions (Liptak, 2001):

(57) Nor oinez nor zaldiz iritsi ginen
    who walk.by who horse.by arrive.PARTC AUX.PAST
    ‘We arrived some walking some on horse’

If we look at the relation that wh-phrases establish with the two basic elements of the interrogative left periphery, Force and Focus, we could say that Basque wh-phrases, unlike Spanish ones, do not seem to be related to the expression of Force. They do not determine clausal type, they are absent from wh-structures like relatives, and they can be used outside interrogative constructions.

3.6.2. Wh-word based quantifiers

Basque has a relatively rich system of quantificational expressions based on “indeterminate pronouns” (Kuroda, 1968); indefinite bases formally identical to wh-words. Consider the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wh-words</th>
<th>Existential “Someone”</th>
<th>Polarity “Anyone”</th>
<th>Free Choice 1</th>
<th>Free Choice 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>nor</td>
<td>nor-bait</td>
<td>i-nor</td>
<td>edo-nor</td>
<td>nor-naI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHICH</td>
<td>zein</td>
<td>zein-bait</td>
<td>(e-zein)</td>
<td>edo-zein</td>
<td>zein-naI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT</td>
<td>zer</td>
<td>zer-bait</td>
<td>e-zer</td>
<td>edo-zer</td>
<td>zer-naI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE</td>
<td>non</td>
<td>non-bait</td>
<td>i-non</td>
<td>edo-non</td>
<td>non-naI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEN</td>
<td>noiz</td>
<td>noiz-bait</td>
<td>i-noiz</td>
<td>edo-noiz</td>
<td>noiz-naI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW</td>
<td>nola</td>
<td>nola-bait</td>
<td>i-nola</td>
<td>edo-nola</td>
<td>nola-naI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The prefixes:

*i/-e* for polarity indefinites has been claimed to be a reduced form of negation *ez* “not, no” (Agud and Tovar, 1991, apud Azkue). The combination of i/-e and the wh-word gives rise to NPIs (see Etxepare, 2003):

(59) a. Ez da inor/*norbait etorri (Negation)
    NEG AUX anyone/someone come
    “Noone came”

b. Inor/*norbait baino lehenago iritsi da (Comparatives)
    anyone/someone than earlier arrived AUX
    “He/she got here before anyone else”

c. Inor etortzen bada,... (Conditional Protases)
    anyone come if.is
    “If anyone comes”

d. Inor etorri al da? (Interrogatives)
    anyone come INT is
    “Did anyone come?”

*edo-* is identical to the disjunction “or” as in (60):

(60) Xabier edo Miren
    Xabier or Miren

In combination with wh-words it yields free-choice indefinites, which are licensed in non-veridical, non-episodic contexts (see Giannakidou, 2001):

(61) a. Edozeinek egin dezake
    or.which do can
    “Anyone can do it”

b. Hori edozeinek egiten du gaur egunean
    that anyone.ERG do.HAB has today day.in
    “These days anyone does that”

c. *Edozeinek egin zuen
    or.which.ERG done he.had
    **“Anyone did it”

The suffixes:

-nahi is the lexical verb “want”. The free-choice series based on want is derived from the grammaticalization of an impersonal free relative (cf. Latin *qui-libet*, Spanish *quienquiera* or Roumanian *cine*-va (Haspelmath, 1997; Aloni, 2016):

(62) a. Nor nahi den, eta nolakoa nahi den zarela
    WHO.ABS want is.REL, and how want is.REL you are.COMP
    “Whoever it is, and however it is that you are” (Axular, 1643)

b. Entzun, nornahi zarela ere
    listen.IMP who.want you are.COMP even
    “Listen, whoever you are”

-bait in the existential pronouns is identical to the complementizer –bait in finite subordination (Azkue, 1925; Lafon, 1944, 1966; Trask, 1997; Michelena, 1970; Etxepare, 2001; Rebuschi, 2003). I have argued (Etxepare, forthcoming), that those indefinite pronouns come from correlative protases:

(63) Nor ere bait-a -> Norbait
    who even COMP-is who.COMP
    “Who (ever) it is” “Someone”

The paradigm in (58) invites the conclusion that Basque wh-pronouns provide the nominal base (the domain of quantification) for complex quantificational structures. Basque is thus typologically similar in this regard to other languages in which polarity items, certain quantifiers and interrogative pronouns share a common core (see Haspelmath, 1997; Bhatt, 2001, for a typological survey and discussion). How should we characterize wh-phrases in this context?

Let us start with the previous observation regarding the deep similarities between focus and wh-questions. Let us adopt the following idea, from Beck (2006):

(64) The denotation of wh-phrases is their focus semantic value. Wh-phrases do not have an ordinary denotation, they only denote a set of alternatives.

Semantics of zer ‘what’:

(65) a. Normal semantics [[zer]] = undefined

b. Focus semantics [[zer]true] = \{x:x \in inanimate\}
Semantics of *nor* ‘who’:

(66) a. Normal semantics \([\text{nor}] = \text{undefined}\)
    
    b. Focus semantics \([\text{nor}_\text{focal}] = \{x : x \in \text{animate}\}\)

The alternative semantics of wh-phrases provides the basis for the logical operations represented in the table (58). Take the suffix –*bait*, used to create the existential *someone/something* series in Basque. A suffix like –*bait* may be taken to introduce a choice function (Reinhart, 1995; 2006) over the alternatives contributed by the wh-word. Choice functions are functions that take a set as their argument and yield a member of that set as its value. If the alternatives contributed by *nor* in a given discourse universe are, say, \{Jon, Miren, Peru\} the application of the choice function \(f\) to this set will yield a particular member of that set:

\(f(\text{Jon, Miren, Peru}) = \text{Miren}\)

Consider next the free choice pronoun *edonor*, formed by combining the disjunction *edo* “or” and the wh-word. For these cases we will adopt Jayaselaan’s idea (1999) that disjunction behaves as a logical operator inducing generalized disjunction. That is, if *nor* “who” in a given discourse context, represents the set of alternatives \{Jon, Miren, Peru\}, *edonor* yields the set \{Jon or Miren or Peru\}.

\(f_{\text{DES}}(\text{Jon, Miren, Peru}) = (\text{Jon or Miren or Peru})\)

And so on. In languages like Basque, the wh-word providing the alternative basis for quantification can be isolated morphologically and syntactically, as shown by other complex quantifications involving overt binomial conjunctions:

(69) Nor *edo* nor
    
    ‘Someone or other’

In languages like Spanish, the irregular morphological shape of the wh-word series, and the absence of a regular paradigm of the sort in (46) make it difficult to isolate the alternatives component of the interrogative phrase as an independent element.

3.6.3. Massive pied-piping

One of the noteworthy aspects of Basque wh-constructions concerns the possibility of massive pied-piping, a fact we mentioned previously. We repeat the relevant examples below:

(70) a. [Nor etorri delako] (*Jonek) aldegin du Jonek?
    who come AUX.COMP.CAUSAL (Jon.ERG) left AUX Jon.ERG
    ‘Who is such that Jon left because he/she came?’

    b. [JON etorri delako] (*Mirenek) aldegin du Mirenek
    Jon come AUX.COMP.CAUSAL (Miren.erg) left AUX Miren.ERG
    ‘Miren left because JON came’

In massive pied-piping, island structures seem to be carried over by the wh-operator inside the island. Pied-piping is obviously an ordinary thing when it comes to wh-questions or focus, as in Spanish:

(71) Acerca de qué habéis hablado?
    ‘What did you talk about?’

Pied-piping is a general problem for those approaches of wh-movement that postulate a checking or agreement relation between the wh-word and \(C\), on the basis of a shared wh-feature. The reason is that all pied-piping configurations are configurations in which the wh-word is not in the right structural relation with \(C\) to allow agreement or checking. The wh-word does not head the structure. A different issue has to do with the range of variation that the phenomenon allows: pied-piping is an ordinary fact of wh-movement, but massive pied-piping is not. The latter is only available to a subset of those languages that allow pied-piping. We can define massive pied piping as the type of pied piping that allows avoiding strong islands.

Cable (2010) proposes a general approach to pied piping that combines well with the alternative semantics analysis we provided of wh-phrases. Cable finds morphological evidence in languages like Tlingit, Sinhala or Japanese, that in fact there is no relation whatsoever between the higher interrogative feature (call it Force) and the wh-word inside the pied-piped structure. The relation between Force and the constituent embedding the wh-word is mediated by what he calls a Q particle, as in Tlingit below:

(72) a. Waa sh tudinoookw i eesh?
    How Q he feels your father
    ‘How does your father feel?’

    b. Aadoo yaagu sa ysiteen?
    whose boat Q you.saw.it
    ‘Whose boat did you see?’
In Tlingit, all wh-phrases are headed by a particle Q, which attaches to the left of the entire wh-phrase. In cases where massive pied-piping occurs, the particle is merged with the entire island. Cable’s analysis of these and similar facts in other languages is that there is no direct relation between Force and wh-s generally, but the relevant relation is established between an interrogative feature in Force and the particle. The particle is, according to Cable, a choice function variable f, one that when applied to a set denoting element, yields an entity of that set as its value. The alternatives in (73a,b,c) correspond to the possible values of the variable contributed by the wh-word:

(73) a. {manners x of feeling} 
  b. {boats of x} 
  c. {Girls who are x-way}

The semantic import of an interrogative would thus be something like: give me all the functions f such that when they apply to the alternatives encoded by the wh-word yield the true propositions that constitute the answer to the question.

3.6.4. Merging Q and locality restrictions in pied-piping

The thing is, how can we account within this view for the difference between the languages that have massive pied-piping and those that don’t? Cable suggests that the difference relates to the way in which the particle merges with the constituent containing the wh-word. In some languages, this particle merges as a head with that constituent (74a); in others it merges as an adjunct (74b):

(74) a. [Qf Q [XP...wh...]] 
  b. [XP Q [XP...wh...]]

The structure in (74a) is one that allows agreement between the Q and something in its agreement domain. For languages represented in (74a), it is conceivable that an agreement relation is established between the particle and the wh-word, and this restricts the domain in which pied-piping is possible. Spanish for instance:

(75) a. *No sabía [CP [en abrir qué lata], habíais tardado tanto _] 
  Neg.knew.1sg in opening that can had.2pl lasted so.much 'I didn’t know which can you required so much time to open'

b. *No sabía [CP que [en abrir esa lata], habíais tardado tanto _].
  neg.knew.1sg that in opening that can had.2pl lasted so.much 'I didn’t know that in opening that can, you required so much time'

c. No sabía [CP que [en abrir esa lata], habíais tardado tanto _].
  neg.knew.1sg that in opening that can had.2pl lasted so.much 'I didn’t know that in opening that can, you required so much time'

Pied-piping of an infinitive is not possible in Spanish, as shown in (75b). Note that there is nothing against the displacement of that constituent (75c), as there is no wh-word inside. One possibility is that agreement between Q and the wh-word, cannot be established across lexical categories such as infinitivals, which block agreement in Spanish.

In languages like Basque, we could postulate that Q merges as an adjunct to the phrase containing the wh-word, and that agreement is not an option under such a configuration. In Spanish, Q is merged as a head with the phrase containing the wh-word, and agreement restricts the domain in which pied-piping is possible. This agreement is reflected in the form of wh-phrases, as the qu-part (qu-ien, cu-ando, qu-é…)
Dold (2018) observes that if this is correct, then (76b) constitutes evidence that the Q particle must have undergone movement to some position in the left periphery. Assuming that the phrase containing the wh-word raises to focus in Basque, the other plausible target for this displacement is Force.

For languages like Spanish, in which Q is a head, we can assume that it is the Q-particle and its complement (the constituent that contains the wh-word) that raise as a whole to a position in the Agreeing domain of Force (on the basis of the different behavior of simple wh-words like qué and complex ones in adjacency, he proposes they raise to a position encoding Contrast (see also Vermeulen, 2012).

3.7. Back to Basque Spanish questions

3.7.1. Distinguishing Basque from Spanish

We could tie those differences to the different derivations that wh-questions undergo in Basque and Spanish. In Basque, only the Q-particle raises to Force, a high left periphery head, whereas wh-phrases only move to Focus, a position that in Basque is adjacent to the verbal complex. In Spanish, the Q-particle and the wh-phrase are merged together and must move as a single constituent. The first step in this movement will be the focus projection, which in Spanish is also a lower position.

The second step in the movement would be raising the Q-particle and the wh-phrase to Force, or to a projection higher than Foc. The final landing site of this movement opens the possibility of inserting topics in between Force and the focus head, that precedes IP. That is impossible in Basque (see 78b), because the wh-word is in the focus position, and nothing can intervene between the focus and the verbal phrase.

(78) a. [FocP [Q-WhPh] Force$^0$ [TopP [DP] Top$^0$ [FocP (Q-WhPh) Foc$^0$ [IP ...]]]]

If the relevant position is not available to simple wh-words like qué “what” in Spanish, then we expect them to require adjacency (they will only raise to focus):

(79) *Qué el médico te ha dicho...
   'What did the doctor tell you...’

3.7.2. What about why?

Zergatik ‘why’ occupies a very particular position in the wh-paradigm of Basque. It does not allow complex quantification. Compare:

(80) a. Nonbait ‘somewhere’ (< non ‘where’ + bait)
   b. *Zergatikbait ‘for some reason’ (zergatik ‘why’ + bait)
   c. Zerbaitsengan ‘for some reason’ (zerbait ‘something’ + -engan ‘because of’)

Zergatik can be used as a relative pronoun/complementizer in colloquial registers:

(81) A: Zergatik joan zara?
   Why      left you.have
   ‘Why did you leave’?

   B: Zergatik aspertzen nintzen
   Because bore.imp I was
   ‘Because I was getting bored’

And it is compatible with preverbal focus:

(82) Zergatik INORK ere ez du liburu hori erosi?
   Why       anyone.ERG even AUX book that bought
   ‘Why didn’t ANYONE buy that book?’

Compare:

(82) *Nori INORK ERE ez dio liburu hori erosi?
   Who.DAT anyone.ERG even neg AUX book that bought
   ‘Who didn’t anyone buy this book to’?

The natural thing to conclude for zergatik “why” in Basque ist hat it belongs in a different class.

3.7.3. Cues for parameters and the subset trap

What is the most direct evidence for the lexical parameter that distinguishes Basque from Spanish? We note two fundamental and robust ones:

- Separateability of wh-words from any quantificational/D value (therefore including f)
- Massive pied-piping

Spanish has only residual Q-wh constructions, such as (83):
Cada cual se dedica a lo suyo  
'Everyone cares about his/her business' 

Not productive at least in Peninsular Spanish (cf. *cada quién, *cada cuando, *cada qué)

Massive pied-piping is a robust phenomenon that shows there cannot be a Q-probe in the lexical configuration of the wh-phrase. The Q-feature is an adjunct. Now, from the point of view of a child that is a sequential or an early bilingual with Basque dominance, and that has set the initial parameter in the Basque way:

What is the evidence that can make him/her retreat from this option? The Spanish pied-piping cases are a subclass of the Basque ones, and therefore they are included in the set of potential structures that the Basque setting allows. This is a typical subset trap (Berwick, 1985; Manzini and Wexler, 1987). In the absence of negative evidence, positive evidence of the Spanish type is not enough to reset the initial choice. All Spanish pied-piping cases are compatible with the Basque grammar. The Basque setting therefore is maintained for Spanish in the bilingual mind.

Ancillary assumption: the non-adjacency cases must be relatively infrequent in colloquial Spanish. There is no count on that, but the intuition is that they are infrequent. Also, Paradis and Genesee (1996) ‘it seems reasonable to conjecture that bilingual children have their input space divided, so their frequency of exposure to each language at any given time is smaller than that of monolinguals acquiring each language’.

The Basque setting applies across-the-board (also in Spanish). An instance of Input Generalization.

4. In-situ wh-phrases in Labourdin Basque (Duguine and Irurtzun, 2014).

4.1. Young Labourdin Basque

Remember the basic word order in Basque, as well as the adjacency requirement imposed on focal elements:

(85) a. Pellori gerezia jan ditu  
Pello.ERG cherries eaten has  "Pello ate the cherries"

b. Nork jan ditu gerezia?  
Who.ERG eaten has cherries  "Who ate the cherries?"

c. Zer jan du Pellori?  
What eaten has Pello.ERG  "What did Pello eat?"

The classical analysis of the adjacency requirement (Ortiz de Urbina, 1989; Irurtzun, 2007) has the wh-phrase move to a left peripheral position, say C, followed by movement of the verbal complex to the head of that projection:

(86) [CP nork jan+ditu [IP (jan+ditu) gerezia]]?

Verb fronting following wh-movement accounts for why the embedded clause also shows inversion in successive cyclic movement:

(87) a. Nork esan du Jon.ERG edan duela  
Who.ERG said has Jon.ERG drunk has.COMP water  "Who did Jon say that had drunk water?"

b. Nork esan du Jon.ERG [CP (nork) edan duela [IP ...ura... (edan+du)]]?

A very different pattern has emerged in young speakers of Labourdin Basque. In the speech of those young speakers, along with the standard construction in (85,87), we also find wh-constructions in which the wh-word and the verbal complex are not adjacent:

(89) Nork gerezia jan ditu?  
Who.ERG cherries eaten has  "Who ate the cherries?"

In principle a sequence such as (89) has two possible parses: either both the wh-phrase and the verb are in-situ, or the wh-phrase is leftward moved without the verb following. But if we expand the data range we see that the second option is not possible:

(90) a. *Zer Jon.ERG jan du?  
What Jon.ERG eaten has  "What did Jon eat?"

b. ??Zer Pellori eman dakozu?  
What Pello.DAT given you.have  "What did you give to Pello?"

c. Nori gerezia eman dakozu?  
Who.DAT cherries given you.have  "Who did you give the cherries to?"
Generalization: the wh-words occupy the unmarked place they would have in an ordinary declarative sentence (S-IO-O-V-Aux).

4.2. French in-situ questions

Duguine and Irurtzun (2014) note that this strategy shares many properties with French in-situ questions, such as (91):

(91) Tu as vu qui?
You have seen who
“Who have you seen?”

Boskovic (1998, 2000) and Mathieu (1999) have noted that wh-in-situ in French displays intervention effects with negation:

(92) a. *Jean ne mange pas quoi?
Jon NEG eats not what
“What doesn’t Jean eat?”

b. Qu’est-ce que Jean ne mange pas?
what.EST-CE QUE Jean NEG eats not
“What doesn’t Jean eat?”

Likewise, wh-in-situ is ungrammatical in wh-islands, whereas arguments can undergo wh-movement out of them (Mathieu, 1999; Shlonsky, 2013):

(93) a. *Tu te demandes [comment aider qui]?
You cl wonder how to help who
“Who do you wonder how to help?”

b. ?Qui te demandes-tu [comment aider (qui)]?
Who cl wonder-cl how to help
“What do you wonder how to help?”

Young Basque Labourdine displays the same sensitivity to intervention:

(94) a. *Jonek ez du zer jaten?
Jon.ERG NEG AUX what eat.ASP
“What doesn’t Jon eat?”

b. Zer ez du Jonek jaten?
what NEG AUX Jon.ERG eat.ASP
“What doesn’t Jon eat?”

And to wh-islands:

(95) a. Ez dakizu [nola nori opari bat eskeini]?
NEG you know how who.DAT present one offer
“Who don’t you know how to give a present to?”

b. Nori ez dakizu nola eskeini opari bat?
who.DAT NEG you know how to.offer present one?
“Who don’t you know how to give a present to?”

Another characteristic property of wh-in-situ constructions in French is that they can be embedded within strong islands (Obenauer, 1994; Shlonsky, 2013). Compare with extraction:

(96) a. *Qu’est-il tombé sur la solution en faisant?
What.is-he fallen on the solution in doing
“What has he fallen on the solution by doing?”

b. Il est tombé sur la solution en faisant quoi?
He is fallen on the solution in doing what
“He has fallen on the solution by doing what?”

YLB shows the same asymmetry (Duguine and Irurtzun, 2014: 9)

(97) a. *Nori piztu dute jendearen kexua [AdvP (nori) etxea kentzean]?
Who.DAT light aux people’s anger house remove.when
“Who did they light people’s anger when they took the house to?”

b. [AdvP Nori etxea kentzean] piztu dute jendearen kexua?
Who.DAT house remove when light aux people’s anger
“They lit people’s anger when they took the house to whom?”

YLB in-situ questions present the following properties:

(i) The wh-phrases occupy the same position they would occupy in an unmarked declarative sentence
(ii) They show intervention effects with negation
(iii) They show wh-island effects
(iv) They are possible in strong islands (with pied-piping)
Conclusion: something like the French in-situ strategy has been transferred into Basque (in contact with French). Note that this convergence cannot be established in terms of E-language correspondences. What is “transferred” is a rule: don’t move your wh-s. Superficially, the order that results from applying this rule to Basque maximally separates Basque from French in terms of word order.

(98) a. Qu’as t-il acheté?
   (Movement into C)
   “What did he/she buy?”

b. Zer erozi du Jonek?
   (Movement into C)
   what bought AUX Jon.ERG
   “What did Jon buy?”

(99) a. Jonek zer erozi du?
   (in-situ)
   Jon.ERG what bought has
   “What did Jon buy?”

b. Jean a acheté quoi?
   (in-situ)
   Jean has bought what
   “What did Jean buy?”

How may this transfer have come about? Why is it that unlike the Basque-Spanish cases, the Basque setting for the parameter (move wh-phrases) is not enough to discard a French parse of the data in terms of a wh-in-situ representation? This is a genuine innovation in the grammar of Basque, but one that leaves the previous system alive. YBL is clearly a superset of the previous Basque grammar (see Biberauer and Roberts, 2009): A Move AND in-situ language.

4.3. Ambiguous input in Basque partial questions

The starting point of Duguine and Irurtzun’s proposal: “one of the crucial factors triggering the change is the abundance of critically underspecified data in the PLD that Labourdin Basque learners have to parse” (p.12). They mention three properties of Basque that give rise to such an ambiguity: (i) the generalized pro-drop system of the language, coupled with its SOV status; (ii) ambiguous parse of intransitive sentences; (iii) topicalization patterns.

For the first property, consider the fact that all arguments in Basque can be null:

(100) a. Zuk Mireni gereziak eman dizkiozu
       you.ERG Miren.DAT cherries.ABS given you.have.to.her
       “You gave (the) cherries to Miren”

b. pro pro pro eman dizkiozu
   given you.have.to.her
   “You gave them to her”

Generalized pro-drop does not correlate with finiteness in Basque. It is also available in clausal nominalizations, which like finite forms:

(101) [Clausal Nomp pro pro pro ematea] keinu polita da
give.NOM.DET gesture nice is
   “That you gave it to her is a nice gesture”

Now consider a sentence such as (102):

(102) Zer eman duzu zuk?
   what given you.have you.ERG
   “What did you give?”

The basic cue telling us that both the wh-word and the verb have moved to C is the overt ergative subject, left behind by these movements. But if we eliminate the overt subject from the sentence (pro), then this cue disappears, and the string can be parsed as one where the arguments are in-situ in an basic SOV clausal structure:

(103) [[[...zer...p] eman apro duzu tp] Cwa]?

The ambiguity of the input extends to intransitive clauses. The neutral order of Basque for intransitives is SV. This order will remain unchanged whether the subject is a wh-phrase or not, under any analysis (same for unergatives):

(104) a. Nor hil da?
   b. Jon hil da
   Who died is Jon died is
   “Who died?” “Jon died”

A third property of Basque that generates structural ambiguities in wh-questions is the syntax of topicalization. The topic position stands above the wh-position in Basque:

(105) a. Gereziak nork jan ditu?
       Cherries who.ERG eaten has
       “Who ate (the) cherries?”

b. *Ezer, nork jan du?
   Anything, who.ERG eaten has

In certain configurations, the availability of topicalization will trigger ambiguity. Take (84):

(106) Mirenek zer jan du?
   Miren.ERG what eaten has
   “What did Miren eat?”
(106) is compatible with an analysis in which both the wh-word and the verbal complex have moved to C, but it is also compatible with an in-situ position for the wh, and an IP internal position for the subject:

(107)  \[
    ([Jonek \ldots \text{zer} \ldots \text{vP} \text{jan} \ A_{\text{spec}} \ du \ \text{tr} \] C_{\text{wh}}) \ ?\]

Duguine and Irurtzun (2014) quantify the amount of ambiguous input in a CHILDES corpus (the Luque corpus) composed of informal and spontaneous (non-elicited) conversations (23,833 utterances in total) between teachers and caretakers and 38 children aged from 2 to 4. This is not a labourdin corpus. It helps to set the base of ambiguous input before the development of the in-situ strategy. The corpus presents unambiguous examples such as (86a,b), and ambiguous strings such as those in (108a,b).

Unambiguous input

(108) a. Nork egin dau puzzlea?
    Who.ERG done has the.puzzle
    “Who made the puzzle?”

    b. A ver, zelan abesten dau igelak?
    Let’s see, how sing.ASP aux frog.ERG
    “Let’s see, how does the frog sing?”

Ambiguous input

(109) a. Burua aterata nork deko?
    Head stick.out who.ERG has?
    “Who has the head stuck out?”

    b. Hau norena da?
    this.ABS whose is
    “Whose is this?”

This is suggestive, but as Duguine and Irurtzun point out, it is not enough to trigger grammatical change. If this were enough, all Basque dialects would have developed in-situ wh-questions. The extra factor that intervenes here is contact with French.

4.4. The sociolinguistic factor

Basque is a “severely endangered” language (UNESCO) in the French (Northern) Basque Country. According to the Basque Government survey of 2013, slightly more than a fifth of the population speaks Basque in the Northern Basque Country.

-21.4% bilinguals
-9.1% passive bilinguals
-69.5% French monolinguals
4.4. The in-situ setting

Duguine and Irurtzun propose that there is a crucial factor in the transfer of the in-situ strategy to Basque. They suggest that the in-situ strategy is computationally simpler than the one involving displacement. They point at work by Jakubowicz (2011) according to which children acquiring French (both typically developing children and children with SLI) attempt to avoid those syntactic patterns that involve a long-distance relation between the surface and the thematic position of the wh-phrase by resorting to in-situ constructions that can be target-deviant. English speaking L2 learners of French show preference for in-situ wh-questions over movement-based wh-questions, even though the in-situ strategy is not available in their language (this is questionable) (Scheidnes and Tuller, 2010). Creoles tend to choose in-situ questions if the mixed input to creolization presents this strategy (Clements and Mahboob, 2000). Again, this cannot be the trigger of the change.
Could transfer follow from Feature Economy?

Consider (21) again, repeated here:

(21) Given an adequate structural representation R for a substring of input text of the PLD $S$, keep postulating R for new incoming input of a language $S'$. Add $R'$ only if forced.

Assume R corresponds to moving the wh-phrase, an option available in French. Upon hitting the Basque unambiguous examples, the bilingual learner can keep using R as a means to parse the input from $S'$. The setting R is thus retained. The logic of the Basque influence in wh-word-verb adjacency in Spanish follows this logic of retention.

Consider now the alternative setting $R'$, corresponding to the in-situ strategy, available in French too. The bilingual learner can use $R'$ to parse a substantial amount of $S'$ input, the one that corresponds to ambiguous input. This result is adding $R'$ as an additional possible setting for $S'$. 
Handout II. Contact Issues in Case and Agreement. Differential Object Marking in Basque
Ricardo Etxepare (CNRS IKER UMR 5478)

1. DOM in Spanish

In contact with Spanish, a Differential Object Marking (DOM) language, dialects of Basque in contact with Spanish have also developed DOM (Rezac and Fernández, 2016; Rodriguez-Ordoñez, 2016; Odria, 2017, among others; Austin, 2014). DOM describes the fact that under certain semantic conditions having to do with the referential status of the object, this object arises with an overt case marking. In Spanish, this marking is the dative preposition a. The relevant deictic parameters that allow DOM in Spanish are animacy and specificity (data from the variety of Spanish spoken in the Basque Country, a leísta dialect) (from Romero and Ormazabal, 2013):

(1)

a. Te he visto a ti
2P.DAT.CL I have seen you
‘I have seen you’

b. Le he visto *(a) la niña
3P.DAT.CL I have seen the girl
‘I have seen the girl’

c. Le enviaron (a) un especialista a su casa
3P.DAT.CL sent a specialist to his house
‘They sent a specialist to his house’

(2)

a. Busco un médico
1look.for a doctor
‘I am looking for a doctor’

b. Busco a un médico
1look for a doctor
‘I am looking for a (particular) doctor’

(3)

a. He visto uno
1have seen one
‘I have seen one (object/non-specific human)’

b. Le he visto a uno
3P.DAT.CL I have seen you
‘I have seen one (human specific/object)’

DOM extends to other types of objects whose status as specific is not clear, and for which animacy looks like the only option:

(4)

a. No le he visto *(a) nadie
NEG 3P.DAT.CL I have seen PREP anyone
‘I haven’t seen anyone’

b. No se ha visto *(a) sí mismo en el espejo
NEG 3P.CL I have seen PREP SE self in the mirror
‘He/she didn’t see himself/herself in the mirror’

(5)

DOM: add a marked case (dative) to objects showing either of the following high features in the referentiality scale: [animate] AND/OR [specific].

2. DOM in Basque

Some Basque dialects, and only those that are in contact with Spanish, have developed Differential Object Marking in their objects (Fernandez and Rezac, 2016; Rodriguez, 2016; Odria, 2017, among many others). Thus ordinary transitive predicates in Basque present an ERGATIVE ABSOLUTIVE alignment, with the transitive subject being marked Ergative and the object being (morphologically) unmarked (absolutive)

(6)

a. Nik zu ikusi zintudan
1ERG you.ABS seen I have you.PAST
‘I saw you’

b. Nik zu ri ikusi nizun
1ERG you.DAT seen I have it.to you.PAST
‘I saw you’

Whereas the object of transitives in standard Basque is unmarked (absolutive), it can show up with dative case marking in the relevant dialects. This dative case also triggers dative agreement in the auxiliary (which corresponds to the ditransitive one). The structure is parallel to the DOM structures existing in the Spanish spoken in the Basque Country, with the clitic le the equivalent of dative agreement in Basque.

Despite this highly transparent structural equivalence, Basque does not allow DOM in all those cases in which it is possible in Spanish. For instance, in many varieties, DOM is only possible with 1st and 2nd person (in Dima, Arratia and Uizarra, see Zuazo, 2003; Mounole, 2011; Fernandez and Rezac, 2016). Something like the Spanish equivalent of (1b) would be impossible in those varieties:
(7) *Neskari ikusi diot
   girl.DAT seen PRES.ROOT.3DAT.1ERG
   ‘I have seen the girl’

Even in those varieties in which (7) is not completely discarded, it is less common or less preferred than ½ person. Specificity, on the other hand, does not play a role in Basque DOM. So (8) is not possible either:

(8) *Aditu bati bialdu zioten
    specialist one.DAT sent AUX
    ‘They sent a specialist’ (cf. Spanish Envieron a un especialista)

Also, Basque DOM is impossible with (4a,b) in those same varieties. Both Odria (2017) and Rodriguez (2017) have found equivalents of (7) in spontaneous speech in Gernika, although the same speakers tend to declare those ungrammatical. The following table synthesizes the distribution of DOM in Basque.

(9) Comparing DOM in Basque and Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Basque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2 person</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animate Definite</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>%OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animate Specific</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animate non-specific</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-animate specific</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animate non referential</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here’s the question: The direct evidence that informs the rule of DOM for a (bilingual) Basque speaker is based on the occurrences of dative marked DPs in Spanish. What prevents the Basque learner to generalize DOM to all those instances in which it is possible in Spanish, based on his/her acquired knowledge of Spanish?

The existence of variable referential conditions in the distribution of DOM cross-linguistically is obviously a well known fact. Languages seem to restrict DOM to varying subsets of the feature combinations expressed in (9) (see Dalrymple and Nikolaeva, 2011). Examples:

Russian (from Bossong, 1991:160): only the animacy of the object matters

(10) a. Ja vstrečaju dorogix gostej
    I receive.1SG dear.GEN.PL guest.GEN.PL
    ‘I receive beloved guests’

b. Ja pokupaju dorogiye vešči
    I buy.1SG dear.NOM.PL thing.NOM.PL
    ‘I receive expensive things’

Turkish (Enç, 1991: 4-5): only specificity. The accusative marking –(y)i correlates with the specific interpretation of the object.

(11) a. Ali bir pianoyu kiramalak istiyor
    Ali one piano ACC rent-INF wants
    ‘Ali wants to rent a certain piano’

b. Ali bir piyano kiramalak istiyor
    Ali one piano rent-INF wants
    ‘Ali wants to rent a piano (anyone would do)’

Hebrew (Danon, 2006: 3): only definiteness.

(12) a. Dan kara *(et) ha-itionim
    Dan read DOM the.newspapers
    ‘Dan read the newspapers’

b. Dan kara (*et) (kama) itonim
    Dan read DOM some newspapers
    ‘Dan read (some) newspapers’

Hindi (Mohannan, 1994: 80, 85): both animacy and specificity trigger the presence of DOM. -ko identical to the dative marker.

(13) a. Ilaane bacce-ko uTaayaa
    Ilaa.ERG child-DOM lift.PERF
    ‘Ila lifted a/the child’

b. Ilaane haar uTaayaa
    Ilaa.ERG necklace lift.PERF
    ‘Ila lifted a/the necklace’

From this point of view, there is nothing particularly noteworthy in the Basque cases, beyond what is due to account for this variation cross-linguistically. But the contact situation has the potential to underline specific inductive problems that L1 acquisition doesn’t have to adress. Why is it that the effects of contact stop at that precise point? Why isn’t it the case that contact-induced change goes all the way in Basque to mimic the
Spanish system? Let’s call this the failed generalization problem of contact-induced change.

3. Syntactic Conditions on DOM

The restriction in Basque DOM as it compares to Spanish DOM, the source of the grammatical change in Basque, has an arbitrary character from the point of view of Elanguage. But what if the correspondence between the grammars of Basque and Spanish are not established on the basis of surface similarities or constructional parallelisms?

3.1. Raising to Object

Romero and Ormazabal (2013): DOM as a condition on agreement/case. ECM:

(14) Vimos al barco estrellarse contra los arrecifes
    ‘We saw the ship crash on the reef’

(15) a. Vimos al avión estrellarse contra la montaña
    saw.1pl A-the plane crash.down against the mountain
    ‘We saw the plane crash into the mountain’

b. *Vimos el avión estrellarse contra la montaña
    saw.1pl crash the plane against the mountain
    ‘We saw the plane crash into the mountain’

c. Vimos estrellarse el avión contra la montaña
    saw.1pl crash the plane against the mountain
    ‘We saw the plane crash into the mountain’

In Northern Peninsular leísta dialects, where 3rd person animates are doubled by the agreement clitic le (see section 2 above and references), Raising-to-Object DOM is accompanied by doubling with the agreement-clitic, minimally contrasting with the impossibility of clitic doubling when the DP is not marked with DOM, as expected (see also Zdrojevsky 2008; Ormazabal and Romero 2013a for Rioplatense Spanish).

(16) a. Le vimos al avión estrellarse contra la montaña
    3s saw.1pl A-the plane crash against the mountain
    ‘We saw the plane crash into the mountain’

b. (*Le) vimos estrellarse el avión contra la montaña
    3s saw.1pl crash the plane against the mountain
    ‘We saw the plane crash into the mountain’

Interestingly, Clitic Doubling in Northern Peninsular varieties (the Spanish of the Basque Country) is only possible in Raising to Object. It is not otherwise possible with the bare transitive structures in (17):

(17) *Le has visto al barco?
    3s,DAT you.have seen PREP.DET ship
    ‘Have you seen the ship’

Laca (1995) notes that similar non-animate DOM objects arise in causative constructions.

(18) El mago hizo levitar a las sillas
    the magician made levitate.INFO PREP the chairs
    ‘The magician made the chairs levitate’

And Small Clause predications (Laca, 1985; apud Ormazabal and Romero, 2013):

(19) a. Luis dejó a ese árbol sin una aceituna
    Luis left PREP that tree without an olive
    ‘Luis left that tree without a single olive’

b. Veía a la ciudad
    I.watched far.away PREP the city
    ‘I was watching the city in the distance’

Compare *Veía a la ciudad

If Ormazabal and Romero are right, DOM reflects a Case/Agree relation between v and the DOM object.

(20) [v,IT…V…DP-DOM,AT]

In Basque, equivalents of (14), (18) and (19) are not possible with DOM:

(21) a. *Itsasonzietari urretan hondoratzen ikusi genion
    ship.DAT,DAT waters.LOC sink.ASP seen 1.ERG.ROOT.3SA.3DAT,PAST
    ‘We saw the ship sink in the waters’

b. *Aztia auktei lebitatu-arazi zien
    magician.ERG chair.DAT levitate-cause PAST.3S.ERG.ROOT.3SA.3PL,DAT
    ‘The magician caused the chairs to levitate’
Those structures require dative clitic doubling in Spanish:

(24) *Hiria urrutian ikusten zion
    city.DAT distant.LOC see.ASP PAST.3S.ERG.ROOT.3SA.3SDAT
    “He/she watched the city in the distance”

The way you would say that is by using ordinary transitive structures of the ergative-absolutive sort:

(22) a. Itsasontzi untan hondoratzen ikusi genuen
    ship.DET.ABS waters.LOC sink.ASP seen 1.ERG.ROOT.3SA.PAST
    “We saw the ship sink in the waters”

 b. Aztik aulkiak lebitatu-arazi zituen
    magician.ERG chair.DET.ABS levitate-cause PAST.3S.ERG.ROOT.3PL.ABS
    “The magician caused the chairs to levitate”

 c. Hiria urrutian ikusten zuen
    city.ABS distant.LOC see.ASP PAST.3S.ERG.ROOT.3SA.3SDAT
    “He/she watched the city in the distance”

But alternations similar to Spanish in the nature of Case marking can be found in Basque, even in those dialects which do not present DOM. For instance, the equivalents of (23) contain an animate object, which could be the target of DOM independently of the structure for at least some speakers. But the important thing is that dative case marking arises also in those varieties in which DOM is not operative. Basically the equivalents of arbitrary SE structures in Spanish have raising of the object (to Subject?), which is marked by DOM:

(23) a. Se le vio a Javier leer un libro una vez
    SE 3S.DAT saw PREP Javier read.CL a book one time
    “Javier was seen to read a book once”

 b. Xabierri liburu bat leitzien ikusi zitzaion aspaldian
    Xabier.ERG book one.ABS read.ASP seen AUX.3S.ABS.3.S.DAT long.time.ago
    “Xabier was seen to read a book long time ago”

(23) contains an animate object, which could be the target of DOM independently of the structure for at least some speakers. But the important thing is that dative case marking arises also in those varieties in which DOM is not operative. Basically the equivalents of arbitrary SE structures in Spanish have raising of the object (to Subject?), which is marked by DOM:

(24) Xabierri ez zaio aspaldian ikusten
    Xabier.ERG NEG root.3S.ABS.3SA.3SDAT long time see.ASP
    “Xabier hasn’t been seen for a long time”

Those structures require dative clitic doubling in Spanish:

(25) A Javier no se *(le) ve desde hace tiempo
    PREP Javier NEG SE 3S.DAT see since long time
    “Javier hasn’t been seen for a long time”

The structure can be reproduced with non-animate objects in Raising to Object contexts. In this case, there is no DOM outside the raising cases:

(26) a. Itsasontziari ikusi zitzaion
    ship.DAT seen AUX.3S.ABS.3S.DAT
    “The ship was seen”

 b. *Itsasontziari ikusi zitzaion
    ship.DAT seen AUX.3S.ABS.3S.DAT
    “The ship was seen”

That arbitrary subjects of the SE-sort are crucial here is shown by the following contrast, in which the case-status of the object depends on the aspect of the clause:

(27) a. *Hegazkina uretan hondoratzen ikusia
    Plane.DET.ABS water.in sink.ASP seen was
    “The plane was seen to sink in the waters”

 b. Hegazkina uretan hondoratzen ikusten da (argazki horretan)
    plane.DET.ABS waters.LOC sink.ASP .ASP is picture that.loc
    “The plane was seen to sink in the waters in that picture”

Where imperfective aspect seems to license an arbitrary/generic subject, which otherwise needs the support of a raising object (which then requires dative case marking). (27b), unlike (26a), does not require clitic doubling:

(28) a. En esa fotografía, se ve al barco hundirse
    in that picture, CL sees PREP.DET ship sink.SE
    “In that picture, the ship is seen to sink” (imperfective)

 b. En esa fotografía, se *(le) vio hundirse al barco
    in that picture, SE 3S.DAT saw sink.SE PREP.DET ship
    “In that picture the ship was seen to sink” (perfective)

Summary

In both DOM and non-DOM varieties of Basque there is Differential Object Marking in at least a subset of the Raising to Object/Subject? Constructions. Those cases seem to
correlate with the presence of a dative clitic in their Spanish counterparts. Obligatorily, at least in Basque Spanish.

3.2. DOM restrictions and the PCC

If we focus on the possible and impossible cases along the “referential scale”, we will find that the objects that admit DOM are the same that trigger PCC (Person-Case) effects in ditransitive clauses.

PCC (Bonet, 1991:36)

(29) Person-Case Constraint: if DAT, then ACC/ABS=3rd person

In the Romance domain, the PCC is also known as the Me-Lui constraint (Perlmutter, 1971), a restriction that operates on clitic clusters. Compare (30a,b):

(30) a. Pedro te lo envía
       Pedro 2DAT 3ACC he.sends
    “Pedro sends it to you”

b. *Pedro te me envía
       Pedro 2DAT 1ACC he.sends
    “Pedro sends me to you”

The PCC also restricts agreement systems (Albizu, 1997). Basque (31a,b):

(31) a. Zuk niri liburua saldu d-Ø-i-da-zu
       you.ERG me.DAT book.the.ABS sold  PRES-3ABS-ROOT-1SDAT-2S.ERG
    “You sold me the book”

b. *Zuk etsaiari ni saldu naiezu
       you.ERG enemies.DAT me.ABS sold 1ABS-ROOT-3PL.DAT-2S.ERG
    “You sold me to the enemies”

Is this a morphological or a syntactic restriction? It is worth noting that in Basque, the PCC seems not to arise in non-finite contexts:

(32) [Zuk ni etsaiari saltzea] eskandalagarria da
       you.ERG me.ABS enemy.DAT sell.nom.det scandalous is
    “It is scandalous that you should sell me to the enemies”

This type of asymmetry has been adduced as an argument in favour of a morphological approach to the PCC (Albizu, 1997; Bonet, 1991). But in fact, you may notice that the order of the constituents is not the unmarked one in (32). If we invert the relative order of absolutive and dative, the sentence is degraded for me also in non-finite sentences:

(33) ??[Zuk etsaiari ni saltzea] eskandalagarria da
       you.ERG enemy.dat me.abs sell.nom.det scandalous is
    “That you should send me to the enemies is scandalous”

The order in (33) is the one that corresponds to an ordinary declarative sentence in Basque. The other order, the one in (32) is the one that corresponds to the repair order in cases of PCC conflict. Speakers of Basque resort to several strategies to cope with a PCC configuration. One of them is not to agree with the dative, in which case the dative argument follows the absolutive one:

(34) Zuk ni etsaiari saldu nauzu
       you.ERG me.ABS enemy.DAT sold 1S.ABS.2S.ERG
    “You sold me to the enemy”

So I will assume that the PCC is related to Case/Agree.

As Ormazabal and Romero (2007) note, the actual restriction does not involve person, but animacy. Consider (35):

(35) a. Pedro te lo envía
       Pedro 2DAT 3ACC he.sends
    “Pedro sends it to you”

b. *Pedro te le envía
       Pedro 2DAT 3ACC(ANIMATE) he.sends
    “Pedro sends him/her to you”

That the constraint has nothing to do with clitic clusters in and of itself is shown by the contrast in (36)-(37) (from Ormazabal and Romero, 2007:15-16)

(36) a. Mateo, piensa que lo entregaste a la policía
       Mateo  thinks that 3ACC handed to the police
    “Mateo thinks that you handed him to the police”

b. *Mateo, piensa que se lo entregaste a la policía
       Mateo  thinks that 3DAT 3ACC(ANIMATE) you.handed to the police
    “Mateo thinks that you handed him to the police”
are also proper names and overt pronouns
Basque and the DPs that can be marked by DOM in Basque. Besides 1 and 2 person, there
There is a perfect correlation between the type of DP that part
is not enough.
where more than one potentially agreeing element appears, only one can in fact agree with
The verbal complex may only
(4)
Ormazabal and Romero derive (3)
Cambridge University, 3-4 March 2020
In Basque too, the restriction is a bit more complicated in the sense that 3rd person may not
always rescue the structure. Third person overt pronouns behave as ½ person:
(38)
Ormazabal and Romero propose to formulate the relevant generalization as in (39):
(39)
Ormazabal and Romero derive (39) from two independent principles that affect v-relations:
(40)
The verbal complex may only encode one agreement relation. In ditransitive constructions
where more than one potentially agreeing element appears, only one can in fact agree with
v. This is at the basis of the PCC. The Basque cases show in any case, that animacy
is not enough.
There is a perfect correlation between the type of DP that participates in PCC constraints in
Basque and the DPs that can be marked by DOM in Basque. Besides 1 and 2 person, there
are also proper names and overt pronouns, in many of those varieties:
(41)
If Romero and Ormazabal are right, the DOM marked DPs must enter an Agree relation
with v. One thing that we could say is that the relevant feature here is animacy as it is
expressed in D (pronouns). There is an issue as to the status of null pronouns, which can be
the object in introduce type predicates:
(42)
3.3. Person behaves like a clitic in Basque
There is a clear divide in Basque between Person and Number agreement (Etxepare, 2003,
2006, 2012, among others). Person agreement behaves as a clitic. Number agreement
doesn’t. This can be seen in Long Distance Agreement:
(43)
Long Distance Person agreement across a dative argument is possible. Long Distance
Number Agreement is not. Without the dative argument, the sentence is good:
(44)
In the abstract structure (43), with the dative DP as an intervener person can circumvent the
intervention condition by clitic climbing into the higher T, via the outer edge of v or
internal T, and therefore allowing the number probe in the higher v to agree with the
absolutive DP inside the dependent clause. Number agreement surfaces in the higher finite
verb. This possibility is not available to DPs without a person feature.
Number/Person generalization in Basque (Etxepare, 2012):

a. Person affixes in the finite verb are clitics in Basque
b. Number affixes are agreeing probes

3.4. DOM objects behave as DPs (unlike other datives)

As in many languages, and for reasons we don’t understand very well, indirect objects fail to license secondary predicates:

(46) a. Person affixes in the finite verb are clitics in Basque
b. Number affixes are agreeing probes

(47) Mirenek, Peruri liburuak pozik laga dizkio
Miren.ERG Peru.DAT books.DET.ABS happy lend she.aux.it.to.him

The same phenomenon occurs in Spanish (Demonte, 1995), and it has been related to the prepositional status of the controller (I don’t believe a word):

(48) a. Person affixes in the finite verb are clitics in Basque
b. Number affixes are agreeing probes

(49) a. Zuk, ni ostendute jarrape nozu
you.ERG me.ABS hidden caught you.aux.me
“You caught me hidden”

Elgoibar Basque (Biscayan variety):

(50) Amak, haurrari gaixorik, joan-araiz zion eskolara
Mother.ERG child.DAT sick go.cause she.aux.it.to.him school.to
“The mother, made the child go sick, to the school”

3.5. DOM objects as absolutive objects in predication

Odria (2017), and Fernandez and Rezac (2016) observe that DOM marked objects behave as absolutive object DPs in licensing secondary predication (Larrabetzu Basque, Biscay). Data from Odria (2017):

(51) Gurasoek, umeari txupetea negarrez kendu diote
Parents.ERG child.DET.DAT pacifier.DET.ABS crying removed they.aux.it.to.him
“The parents removed the pacifier from the child crying”

(52) a. Maria le ha dejado a Pedro los libros contenta
Maria 3s.dat has left PREP Pedro the books happy
“Maria left the books to Pedro happy”

Elgoibar Basque (Biscayan variety):

(53) Hegazkinari, urretan osorik, honoratzen ikusitzaiplane.det. water.in of.a.piece sink.ASP seen AUX.3P.S.ABS-3P.S.DAT
“The plane was seen to sink of-a-piece, in the waters”

What does being a “high dative” mean? It basically means that it is gonna be realized in a position higher than the absolutive. This is not the case with a subset of datives, typically Goal denoting ones. For instance, the unmarked word order for a predicate like hurbildu “approach” is one where the absolutive precedes the absolutive:

(54) a. Jon Miren hurbildu zaio
Jon.ABS Miren.DAT approached is.to.her
“Jon approached Miren”

b. Miren Jon hurbildu zaio
Miren.DAT Jon.ABS approached is.to.her
“Miren was approached by JON”
The optionality of DOM)

PCC violation by just not agreeing.

construction.

one reminds us that case

The first three properties suggest that the object enters into an Agree relation with v (T?).

The analysis of DOM must take into account:

(i) Raising to Object – Subject?–(with arbitrary subjects)
(ii) PCC-triggering objects
(iii) The relevant feature (D/1/2 person) belongs in the clitic system
(iv) The DOM marked DP aligns with high datives in licensing secondary predicates
(v) It is dative-marked

The first three properties suggest that the object enters into an Agree relation with v (T?). The fourth one that it ends up in a relatively high position of the verbal predicate. The last one reminds us that case-wise, this is not unlike an ordinary Goal dative in a ditransitive construction. Goal datives look prepositional. Remember that they can be used to repair a PCC violation by just not agreeing. Let me propose the following underlying representation for DOM (animacy in v optional, as required by Ormazabal and Romero, and as shown by the optionality of DOM):

(55) a. Amak haurrari gozokiak utzi-arazi dizkio
   Mother.ERG.child.DAT sweets.ABS leave-cause PRESENT.ROOT.3PL.ABS.3S.DAT
   “Mother forced the child to leave the sweets”

b. Amak gozokiak haurrari utzi-arazi dizkio
   Mother.ERG.sweets.ABS.child.DAT leave-cause PRESENT.ROOT.3PL.ABS.3S.DAT
   “Mother forced the CHILD (not someone else) to leave the sweets”

Reflexive licensing:

(56) a. Jon bere buruari mintzatu zaio
   Jon.ABS his head.DAT talk is.it.to.him
   “Jon talked to himself”

b. *Bere buruari Jon gustatzen zaio
   his.head.DAT Jon.ABS like.ASP is.it.to.him
   “John is pleasant to himself”

c. Joni bere burua gustatzen zaio
   Jon.DAT his head.ABS like.ASP is.it.to.him
   “Jon likes himself”

3.5. The analysis

The analysis of DOM must take into account:

(57) a. v_{animacy_Case}...V [P_O [CP [DP K], Cl]]] -> incorporation of P (i=animacy)
   b. ...V+ O [CP [DP K] Cl]]] -> Raising of the clitic to small v, and Merger
   c. ...CL+V_{animacy_Case}...V+O [CP [DP K], Cl]]] -> Raising of KP to outer edge
   d. ...[P [DP K] CL+V_{animacy_Case}...V+O [P_O... (High dative behaviour)

Clitic raising (a D category, realized by the dative affix, the only 3rd person affix in the Basque verbal paradigm) is crucial in the process. This excludes all those cases of animacy which are not expressed in D. The P that we see there is the same P that licenses Goals, I will assume. Unlike in Goals, this P incorporates into V, extending the phase to the verbal domain.

The incorporation of the preposition should perhaps be related to another general feature of Basque: animate DPs cannot directly express Grounds in spatial relations:

(58) a. In me
   b. In John
   c. To me
   d. To John

(59) a. *Ni-n
   b. *Jon-en
   c. *Ni-ra
   d. *Jonera
   l-in Jon-in 1-to Jon-to

The only way to have an animate DP in a spatial relation is by adding another locative particle, -ga-, specific for those occasions:

(60) a. Ni-ga-n
   b. Zu-ga-n-a
   l-suffix-in you-suffix-in-to
   “In me”  “To you” (spatial)

With animate DPs, preposition incorporation would be a type of repair from the impossible configuration in (59a-d). Also, primary spatial adpositions in Basque present D-dropping:

(61) a. Etxe-ra
   b. Etxe-an
   c. Etxe-tik
   house-to house-in house-from
   “To the house” “In the house” “From the house”

(62) P is incompatible with the overt realization of D in Basque

Unless you insert more spatial structure, like spatial nouns (Axial Parts, Jackendoff/Svenonius)

(63) Etxearen aurre-tik
   house.det gén from
   “From the front oft he house"
For Goal datives, I will assume that the verbal semantics is able to provide some extra spatial ground inside the PP, so that animate DPs are good without preposition incorporation. In those cases, only the clitic raises, via the edge of the PP (yielding dative agreement):

So what is “borrowed“ from Spanish?

Franco (1995): the distribution of clitic le in leista Basque Spanish, always accompanies DOM.

(64) a. (le) hemos visto a un niño (Standard Spanish)
    3S.DAT we.have seen PREP a child
    “We have seen a child”

b. *(le) hemos visto a un niño (Basque Spanish)
    3S.DAT we.have seen PREP a child
    “We have seen a child”

Let us say that the borrowing can be interpreted in the following terms:

(65) Insert a clitic in the object position (clitic doubling)

The rest follows. Once you add a clitic you must worry about case licensing both the clitic and the DP, so you need a P for the internal DP, and you must raise the clitic outside for Case/Agree. This much is necessary for any dative (indirect object argument). What is special is the animacy restriction related to the DOM. What I would lie to suggest ist hat this narrowing effect in the interpretation of DOM objects is a result of competition with ordinary objects, which are also possible in those dialects. That is, objects in general can be licensed in the absolutive configuration. If you license an object in some other configuration, let it be to get some special interpretation. In Romero and Ormazabal’s approach, that means that you will add a feature [animate] in v. Obligatorily in those cases, and only in those cases.

As for (65), this is I think a clear case of Input Generalization.

(66) Maximize already postulated features

Coupled with the general principle in (67), which says that you will treat the two languages alike:

(67) Avoid constructing more than one grammar