INFINITIVAL COMPLEMENTATION IN BASQUE

Itziar San Martin

University of Maryland

Juan Uriagereka

University of Maryland & UPV/EHU

1. Introduction*

In this paper we analyze the core instances of infinitival complementation in Basque. Some familiar facts are discussed, and also a surprising one which has never been analyzed: the peculiar Case/agreement distributions apparent in instances of obligatory control. If valid, our analysis has potentially important consequences for the theory at large.

The paper has seven parts. We present the interesting fact in section 2. Section 3 discusses a handful of auxiliary assumptions, familiar to Basque linguists but relatively unknown elsewhere in the field. Sections 4 and 5 constitute the skeleton of our account, with the punch-line presented in section 6. Conclusions are reached in section 7. An Appendix presents apparent exceptions that, in their own right, serve to strengthen the overall picture.

2. A Surprising Fact

Consider predicates which select infinitival complements in Basque. Each of the examples below corresponds to a verbal class. The subject in all the embedded clauses is phonetically null and co-referent with some argument of the matrix clause. This indicates that we are dealing with control structures:[1]

(1) Jon   [ogia   egiten]   saiatu da.
     Jon-A bread-Det-A make-Nom-LOC try Aux (3A)
     'Jon has tried to make bread'

---

[1] The following abbreviations have been used in the glosses: A (Absolutive), E (Ergative), D (Dative), LOC (Locative), ALL (Allative), Det (Determiner), NOM (Nominalization), Aux (Auxiliary).

(2)   Jonek [ogia   egitea]   pentsatu du.
       Jon-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-A decide Aux (3A-3E)
       'Jon has decided to make bread'

(3)   Jonek ni [ogia   egitera]   bidali nau.
       Jon-E I-A bread-Det-A make-Nom-ALL send Aux (1A-3E)
       'Jon has sent me to make bread'

(4)   Jonek niri [ogia   egitea]   gomendatu dit.
       Jon-E I-D bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-A recommend Aux (3A-1D-3E)
       'Jon has recommended me to make bread'

Interestingly, the selecting predicates display different agreement patterns vis-à-vis their complement clause. The matrix Auxiliaries for the 'decide' (2) and 'recommend' (4) classes exhibit agreement not only with the matrix arguments but also with the embedded clause as a whole (Absolutive 3rd person). This is as expected. What is surprising is that, for the 'try' (1) and 'send' (3) classes, the Auxiliary only agrees with the non-clausal arguments, and thus relevant agreement patterns essentially bypass this complement clause.

Other predicates that behave like 'try' are *ausartu* 'dare', *hasi* 'start', *joan* 'go', *libratu* 'be exempt from', *gelditu* 'stop', *aritu/ibili* 'be doing'. Verbs that behave like 'decide' are *nahi* 'want' and *nahiago* 'prefer', *atsegin* 'like' and *lortu* 'manage/achieve'. Examples of the 'send' class include *behartu* 'oblige', *gonbidatu* 'invite', *zigortu* 'punish', *lagundu* 'help' and *utzi* 'abandon'. Predicate *utzi* in the sense of 'allow', as well as *agindu* 'promise', *debekatu* 'prohibit', and *proposatu* 'propose' all belong to the 'recommend' class. Notice also that the 'try' and 'decide' classes clearly exemplify Subject Control, whereas the 'send' and 'recommend' classes exemplify Object Control.

Consider the Subject Control cases in more detail, now shown in schematic guise:

(5)   Jon-A [GAP bread make]-LOC try Aux (3A)

(6)   Jon-E [GAP bread make]-A decide Aux (3A-3E)

The 'decide' class in (6) shows agreement both with the matrix subject (E) and the embedded clause (A). The particular case marking implicit in this agreement pattern is the expected one considering that Basque has an Ergabsolutive case system. The bizarre fact arises for the 'try' class in (5), as it seems to neglect the presence of the embedded clause. The matrix auxiliary only shows agreement with the matrix subject, which surfaces as Absolutive, the case marking corresponding to unaccusative subjects. That is, agreement in this instance manifests itself as a surprising unaccusative array for the otherwise transitive 'try'.

That the case/agreement pattern has to do only with the clausal nature of the complement is proven by the fact that, were we to replace the embedded clause with a pronoun, such as *hau* 'this', the normal agreement array would be restored, as in (7) —and cf. (1):[2]

---

[2] We owe the observation of this important fact to Rikardo Etxepare.

(7) Jonek hau   saiatu du.
Jon-E this-A try   Aux (3A-3E)
'Jon has tried this'

Similar conclusions can be reached for Object Control predicates, schematized below. The 'recommend' class in (9) shows agreement with the matrix subject (E), the matrix indirect object (D), and the embedded clause (A). The case marking correlating with this agreement pattern is entirely normal for Basque. But the 'send' class in (8) neglects the presence of the embedded clause. The matrix auxiliary only shows agreement with the matrix subject, surfacing as ergative, and the matrix indirect object, this time surfacing as absolutive. This transitive agreement pattern is not the normal one for an otherwise ditransitive 'send'.

(8) Jon–E me–A [GAP bread make]-ALL send Aux (1A-3E)

(9) Jon–E me–D [GAP bread make]-A recommend Aux (3A-1D-3E)

Again, if we substitute a pronoun for the clausal complement, the expected agreement pattern is restored, as in (10) —and cf. (3).

(10) Jonek niri hau   bidali dit.
Jon-E I-D this-A send   Aux (3A-1D-3E)
'Jon has sent me this'

3. Some Auxiliary Considerations

Let us discuss next the nature and distribution of the empty categories in (1-2). Since Basque exhibits systematic pro-drop of the three major arguments, in principle the subjects represented as GAPS could be either pro or PRO.

'Try' class predicates in Basque take infinitival clauses whose subject must be both phonetically null and co-referential to the matrix subject. This subject looks like what has been traditionally called Obligatory Control (OC) PRO. Thus observe the ungrammatical examples below, involving overt embedded subjects:

(11) * Jon [hark/Jonek/nik   ogia   egiten]   saiatu da.
Jon-A (s)he-E/Jon-E/I-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-LOC try   Aux (3A)
('John has tried for him/her/Jon/me to make bread')

As expected, overt subjects are impossible in the contexts where PRO is acceptable.

'Decide'-class predicates display a different behavior. In appropriate contexts it is possible for the subject of the complement clause not to co-refer with the matrix controller. Moreover, lexical DPs are possible in this position. These facts suggest that the embedded subject GAP in these sorts of circumstances is pro rather than PRO, exhibiting the phenomenology of Non-obligatory Control (NOC).[3] Thus compare (12) below to (11) above:

---

[3] We adopt the traditional terminology of NOC wherever coreference does not obtain between Controler and Controlee. For a refinement of Control typology see Landau 2000 and San Martin (in progress).

(12)   Nik$_i$ [GAP$_{i+k}$/guk   ogia   egitea]   pentsatu dut.
        I-E   we-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-A decide   Aux (3A-1E)
        'I have decided for you/him/us etc. us to make bread'

Tying these facts together with those observed in the previous section, we are lead to conclude that it is only NOC predicates that display agreement with the embedded clause they take as complement.

The same abstract pattern can be found for Object Control predicates (3-4). Recall that 'send' in (3) displays no agreement with the embedded clause; in contrast 'recommend' agrees with the embedded clause in Absolutive form, as the Auxiliary shows in (4). Correspondingly, 'send' class predicates take an infinitival complement whose subject must be phonetically null and co-referential with the matrix object, signaling obligatory control:

(13)   *Jonek ni$_i$ [GAP$_j$/zuk   ogia   egitera]   bidali nau.
        Jon-E I-A   you-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-ALL send   Aux (1A-3E)
        ('Jon has sent me for us/you/etc. to make bread')

(14)   Jonek ni$_i$ [GAP$_i$ ogia   egitera]   bidali nau.
        Jon-E I-A   bread-Det-A make-Nom-ALL send   Aux (1A-3E)
        'Jon has sent me to make bread'

In contrast, 'recommend' predicates are clearly of the NOC type: the embedded gap does not have to be strictly co-referential with its 'controller' (15) and it is in free variation with lexical DPs, naturally suggesting that the subject gap is pro rather than PRO:

(15)   Jonek niri$_i$ [GAP$_{i+k}$/zuk   ogia   egitea]   gomendatu dit.
        Jon-E I-D   you-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-A recommend Aux
                                                                     (3A-1D-3E)
        'Jon has recommended me that I/we/you/etc. make bread.'

We thus confirm that it is NOC predicates, this time of the Object Control sort, which display agreement with the embedded clause. Then the question is *why OC predicates* are special in that they *do not exhibit normal agreement with their complement clauses*, apparently ignoring them for structural purposes.

An obvious issue arises with regards to the NOC constructions just shown. Unlike OC counterparts, which license PRO in the subject position of infinitival complements, NOC structures in Basque are unusual in that they license both phonetically null and lexical subjects in nonfinite contexts.[4] Several authors have been concerned with the licensing mechanism of lexical subjects in these circumstances.

Ortiz de Urbina 1989 suggests that Tenseless clauses may be inflected in Basque, along the lines of Reuland 1983 for English gerunds and Raposo 1987 for Portuguese

---

[4] Although for present purposes we exclusively concentrate on Subject arguments, an even more puzzling situation arises for Direct and Indirect Objects, also licensed in these contexts as null categories. It is also puzzling that, as Laka 1993 notes, although there are serious co-occurrence restrictions for arguments in clauses showing regular agreement patterns (e.g. one cannot express a thought like 'They have sent you to me', where neither direct nor indirect object are third person), similar restrictions do not arise in these infinitival contexts.

Inflected Infinitivals. In his terms Lexical Subjects get Case via Case Transmission, whereby embedded AGR assigns Case to the embedded subject when AGR is Case marked, which is when the embedded clause is itself marked with morphological case. San Martin 1999 refines this correlation, arguing that only structurally (Ergative, Absolutive, Dative) case-marked complements license lexical subjects, in contrast to those complement clauses marked with Inherent Case. Keep in mind that all relevant clauses are marked with some form of Case (structural or inherent), although it is only structurally Case-marked clauses that exhibit agreement with the auxiliary.

Moreover, NOC vs. OC correlates with Structural vs. Inherent Case marking on the embedded clause, respectively.[5] The predicate classes in (1-4) exemplify the presence of Structural Case marking on NOC and its absence in OC in Basque, both for Subject Control and Objects Control structures. Given this, the question posed above can be refined to *why OC predicates correlate with inherently Case marked complement clauses.*

Our descriptive paradigm can be schematically presented as follows:

(16)   Subj. OC: [DP-A..............[PRO.....]-Inherent Case Aux (A)] try

(17)   Obj. OC: [DP-E....DP-A...[PRO.....]-Inherent Case Aux (A-E)] send

(18)   Subj. NOC: [DP-E......[pro.......]-A (Structural Case) Aux (A-E)] decide

(19)   Obj. NOC: [DP-E...DP-D....[pro...]-A (Structural Case) Aux (A-D-E)] recommend

4. Towards an Explanation: NOC as a Default

NOC complement clauses in Basque behave like nominal arguments in several respects. As we saw, they are structurally Case-marked and must agree with the auxiliary as other nominal arguments would. In addition, they are headed by a determiner, highlighted below, unlike OC counterparts, which present none of these properties:

(20)   Jonek [ogia   egitea]   pentsatu du.
        Jon-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-**Det**-A decide   Aux (3A-3E)
        'Jon has decided to make bread'

(21)   Jonek niri [ogia   egitea]   gomendatu dit.
        Jon-E I-D bread-Det-A make-Nom-**Det**-A recommend Aux (3A-1D-3E)
        'Jon has recommended me to make bread'

Observe in the schema in (16)-(19) how NOC instances constitute a natural class, in that the domain where the process (of NOC) obtains is always an absolutive clause/DP agreeing with the auxiliary.[6] In contrast, the OC instances involve genuine

---

[5] See Pires 2000 for a recent presentation of these matters and a proposal in Minimalist terms.

[6] Of course there are also instances of NOC, not discussed here because they involve non-complement clauses, which also take the nominal (DP) format and carry either ERG or DAT Case.

(non-DP) clauses which may be marked either inherent Locative or inherent Allative.[7] It is then reasonable to attempt an explanation for the paradigm in terms of the uniform NOC process in complement clauses, instead of the apparently more haphazard (at least in Case terms) OC phenomenon.

Suppose that the grammar always attempts an NOC analysis of empty pronominal categories, resorting to the more marked OC analysis only if the default mechanism is for some reason forbidden.

That thesis presupposes two auxiliary hypotheses. First of all, derivations with pro and PRO compete with one another. This is easy to state if we assume that both these elements are [+pronominal], and we take that particular feature to be listed in the lexicon. Of course, we also need [+anaphoric] features in (relevant) derivations. We propose that these be added to categories in lexical arrays leading to given derivations, instead of being listed in lexical entries. Thus, for instance, a [+pronominal] element can be coerced into a [+pronominal, +anaphoric] type in a particular lexical array.[8] The mere addition of this feature ought to be derivationally costly, and the grammar should avoid it whenever possible. In addition, the feature entails a complex syntax (of the Move/Agree sort) and a complex semantics (see fn. 8), which would be immediately avoided if the feature were absent.

The second presupposition of our analysis is that in some instances the default NOC mechanism involving (mere) [+pronominal] features is not grammatical. In that case the more costly OC alternative is forced onto the system. Consider what the relevant circumstances for this may be.

5. Some Conjectures on the Nature of NOC and structural Case

At the very least, NOC is a phenomenon of perspective. That is, the licensing of pro in relevant domains is contextually determined in syntactically restricted ways. It does not matter for our purposes how this takes place precisely. What is crucial is *that* this sort of 'surface', peripheral interpretive process should be at issue.

In turn, observe that the phenomenon of structural Case also involves perspective, albeit indirectly: in the fact that the categories that manifest structural case morphology exhibit person morphology as well (as noted by Ormazabal 2000). Of course, person as a phenomenon is the epitome of perspective.[9] Clauses do not participate on the person system, unlike nominals. Stowell 1981 already argued that clauses resist structural Case, which is consistent with the fact observed here that genuine clausal complements do not carry structural case morphology.

Now we are ready for a tighter connection between NOC as a perspective phenomenon and structural Case as a property of person-endowed categories. We may express the idea as in (22):

(22)   NOC is only possible in structurally Case-marked domains.

---

[7] Actually, also Adlative in some instances.

[8] This syntactic coertion arguably has a direct consequence for semantic typing, if anaphoric expressions turn the constructions they head into predicates of a certain sort.

[9] That is, person is a speaker-dependent process, as has been traditionally observed.

It is not our intention here to derive (22) from something deeper, although there is an obvious way to proceed if we establish that NOC is a perspective phenomenon *because* it is essentially a person process. This would, in itself, account for why pro licensing strongly correlates with (full or null, but not mixed)[10] person paradigms. From that perspective, (22) holds accidentally: only because both NOC and structural Case are ultimately person-related phenomena, in some sense to be fully understood (see Uriagereka 2001 on this).

Regardless of what derives (22), it has the effect of barring NOC from clauses that are not structurally Case-marked, the observed pattern. Furthermore, if pure complement clauses resist structural Case, we rationalize why transitive OC constructions may behave as unaccusative and ditransitive ones as transitive. Consider this next.

6. Case Valuation in the Lexical Array

To understand the fact that genuine complement clauses do not take structural Case, and how this relates to the actual Case specifications that given nominal expressions take, we have to assume that Case values are determined in the initial lexical array from which a (cyclic) derivation is constructed. Case values include the following:

(23) *Case Values*
    a. Default structural Case (bare or citation forms)
    b. Marked structural Case (morphologically specified forms)
    c. Special structural Case (oblique forms correlating with lexical selection).

The procedure of value specification, cyclically confined to a CP phase, ought to be as simple-minded as:[11]

(24) *Structural Case Value Specification*
    a. Assign default structural Case value to the first/last D to merge.
    b. Assign marked structural Case value to the last/first D to merge.
    c. Elsewhere, assign special structural Case values.

Condition (24) is an input requirement to be matched with a derivational process of checking; that is, a D which carries structural Case value x will have to check its Case properties against a particular structure where x (and not some other Case value) is sanctioned. The condition makes reference to natural notions needed elsewhere in the model: thus for instance *first* merge determines complements, and the *last* morpheme to fuse to a head is its morphological head. In addition (24) includes a parametric choice.

Languages come in two basic formats: those assigning bare or citation forms first or last. Ergabsolutive languages assign the bare form first (absolutive). Nominaccusative languages assign the bare form last (nominative). Conversely, in those languages

---

marked forms come last (ergative) or first (accusative). When last and first coincide in the single argument of a given predicate, that unaccusative dependent will come out absolutive in one type of language (an otherwise typical object case) and nominative in the other type (an otherwise typical subject case).

The elsewhere case is dative, which has three properties. First, it is not either first or last, but a middle instance, structurally higher and lower than Case in other arguments. Related to this is the second fact, that dative is normally the least common case,[12] and it appears on optional arguments or dependents more generally. This may also be related to the third robust property of datives: they can be multiple, for instance showing up as ethical or illocutive expressions, and even lexical relations of the possessive, partitive, or locative sorts and others.

It is important to emphasize that we need a system of Case valuation that is not sensitive to the absolute intransitive, transitive or ditransitive nature of predicates, but rather to the number of DP arguments they present. This is proven by contrasts of the sort seen in (1) vs. (7) and (3) vs. (10), repeated now:

> (25) Jon [ogia egiten] saiatu da.
> Jon-A bread-Det-A make-Nom-LOC try Aux (3A)
> 'Jon has tried to make bread'

> (26) Jonek hau saiatu du.
> Jon-E this-A try Aux (3A-3E)
> 'Jon has tried this'

> (27) Jonek ni [ogia egitera] bidali nau.
> Jon-E I-A bread-Det-A make-Nom-ALL send Aux (1A-3E)
> 'Jon has sent me to make bread'

> (28) Jonek niri hau bidali dit.
> Jon-E I-D this-A send Aux (3A-1D-3E)
> 'Jon has sent me this'

That is, the very same verbs *saiatu* 'try' and *bidali* 'send' come out in unaccusative vs. transitive, and transitive vs. ditransitive guise, respectively, depending on whether their internal argument is nominal or clausal.

(Intermediate) lexical arrays for (25) and (26), or (27) and (28), are quite different in identifying only one (25) vs. two (26) DP arguments for Case valuation, or only two (27) vs. three (28) DP arguments for Case valuation. Once this fact is detected, the rankings implicit in condition (24) take care of things directly, assuming in this instance an Ergabsolutive system.

It is not clear how this state of affairs could be straightforwardly accounted for if Case valuation were simply a configurational correlate of unaccusativity, transitivity, or ditransitivity.[13]

---

[12] Meaning by this that ditransitive predicates are relatively rare, and dative typically occurs only in these sorts of predicates (it is not normally manifested on more common transitives or intransitives).

[13] Unless one is prepared to say, for instance, that nominal complements involve a Larsonian *v*, while clausal complements do not. This seems like the wrong move, however, if these sorts of elements involve standard lexical interpretations in familiar terms (e.g. causality markers, etc.).

Note, also, that the domains where pro and PRO are hypothesized participate in the mechanics of (24), indicating that these empty categories are regular nominal expressions. Thus, observe for instance (29):[14]

(29) Jon [PRO Mireni   ogia   bidaltzen] ·   saiatu da.
      Jon-A   Miren-D bread-Det-A send-Nom-LOC try   Aux (3A)
      'Jon has tried to send bread to Miren'

If PRO did not participate in the valuation dynamics in (24), it is not clear why *Mireni* would be forced into the dative value: the normal marked value to have here would have been ergative. The fact that the third argument is left with the special value indicates that, somehow, the elsewhere ergative Case is in some sense, perhaps a special one, dedicated to or suppressed in terms of PRO:[15]

7. Conclusions

We have presented four classes of infinitival complements in Basque, two involving obligatory control and two non-obligatory control; two determining control in terms of subjects and two in terms of objects. Given binary variables for obligatoriness of control and for controlers being subjects or objects within phases, it can be argued that these four are logical possibilities that the theory allows, not a specific fact of Basque.

The nature of complement clauses, whether they are nominal or not, affects not only their Case/agreement distributions, but also the possibility of obligatory vs. non-obligatory control. Not surprisingly, infinitivals of a DP sort participate in Case/agreement systems. A bit surprisingly, they disallow obligatory control.

In turn, infinitivals of a genuine clausal (non-DP) sort do not participate in Case/agreement systems and force obligatory control. From a certain perspective, both of these facts are curious. Thus, one may have thought that clausal or not, arguments should either participate in Case/agreement systems or at the very least affect the configurations where they constitute arguments, and thus alter Case/agreement patterns by their mere presence. But neither of these conditions is true in Basque. So one needs to devise a system that relativizes Case/agreement valuation to DP presence (as opposed to argument presence). Hopefully, in the process that relative system also tells us why contexts of genuine clausal infinitivals do not tolerate non-obligatory control.

Our analysis relates those two facts, albeit accidentally (pending a deeper understanding of person systems involved in perspective phenomena). First of all, we capitalize on the correlation existing between perspective, person, and Case valuation. Admittedly, we do not understand why it is that Case is valued in categories for which person is valued as well.[16] At any rate, given the correlation, and given that person is perhaps the most

---

[14] A similar point can be made with the equivalent of *John has tried PRO to be sent t to Miren*, where a PRO that moves in the absolutive-ergative space does not affect the dative space related to *Miren*.

[15] This constitutes a prima-facie argument against the idea that PRO has no Case, or is otherwise a mere trace, and not a separate formative on its own right.

[16] Which incidentally might mean that the facts discussed here are possibly not universal. If they are not, then there is nothing more to understand. If as we suspect they are indeed universal, then of course we need to devise a theory for which the person system is co-extensive with the Case system.

obvious perspective phenomenon, then there is an approach to be had to what constitutes the proper licensing of non-obligatory control (in essence, the licensing of pro). Plausibly pro is only licensed in domains which have been Case assigned, where person is thus determined.[17] If so we do not expect non-obligatory control/pro in Caseless clauses.

Once we assume that genuine clausal complements do not participate in Case/ agreement systems, we develop a relative system of Case valuation whereby only DPs identified in the initial lexical array line up for various Case values: a default one, a marked one, and potentially several special ones. The relevant phenomenology is related to the account of the distribution of pro only inasmuch as in both instances the Case system is invoked: either indirectly because the person system is too, or directly, in that the distribution of Case values is at stake.

If in addition non-obligatory control is the default (most economic) system that the grammar goes into for given derivational alternatives, then its inability to happen in Caseless clauses entails that only the more costly obligatory control process may have a chance there. Indeed, nothing seems to prevent it in those instances.

Two more issues are worth emphasizing. First, genuine complement clauses in Basque are *inherently* Case marked (recall (1) and (3)). If this turns out to be general across languages, then perhaps it will still be the case that Universal Grammar demands that all arguments be Case marked, the difference between clausal and nominal ones then being only in terms of whether their Case is structural. Evidently, that still needs an explanation, but perhaps this is related to the other peculiar fact noted above: that nominal arguments are involved in the person system.

Second, it would be important to understand why each sort of lexical predicate goes with the various syntactic frames. For example, is there something deep about the lexico-semantic nature of 'try' that it should involve a domain of the sort discussed, vis-à-vis what obtains for the a priori rather similar 'decide'? Could things have been otherwise, or are they indeed different in other languages? Evidently, these are issues for future research.

Appendix: Apparent Exceptions

Above we have presented the general pattern of infinitival complements in Basque. There are some exceptions that are worth considering, since they add interesting twists to the overall analysis. They all involve instances of OC. In our view they actually strengthen the analysis, since they can be shown to be only apparent exceptions.

A first group of those arises with aspectual predicates, which appear in two different paradigms, one exemplified by *jarraitu* 'continue' (1) and another one exemplified by *utzi* 'quit' (2):

(1)   Jonek [PRO ogia   egiten]   jarraitu du
        Jon-E   bread-Det-A make-Nom-LOC continue Aux (3A-3E)
        'Jon has continued making bread'

---

[17] Posing a question about licensing of pro in matrix clauses, suggesting that perhaps these too are Case marked in some abstract sense (a variant of Ross's 'performative' analysis, and see Etxepare 1997 on this possibility).

(2) Jonek [PRO ogia   egiteari]   utzi dio
     Jon-E   bread-Det-A make-Nom-D quit Aux (3A-3D-3E)
     'Jon has quit making bread'

Observe the differences between the two instances. The embedded clause in the 'continue' class in (1) is marked locative, whereas the same element in the 'quit' class in (2) is marked dative. In both instances the clause involves a nominalization, but the different Cases it takes in (1) and (2) correlate with the differences in the auxiliary: only in (2) does the dative dependent see its properties reflected in the auxiliary form. In addition, in both these instances there seems to exist a hidden absolutive.

Hidden absolutives are common in Basque, where they typically surface in unergative expressions:

(3) Aizkolariak   lan egin   du
     lumberjack-Det-E work-make Aux (3A-3E)
     'The lumberjack has worked.'

The intransitive *lan egin* 'work' takes ergative in its subject and shows absolutive agreement with a ghost absolutive. By the same token, we conjecture that the aspectual predicates in (1)/(2) are unergative, and their absolutive agreements correspond to ghost themes. Intuitively, such themes may be akin to the English *it* in such aspectual expressions as *keep it coming/going/rolling/moving*. If so, the type of control in (1) and (2) is rather different from anything we have seen in this paper: it is control into adjuncts, as opposed to complement clauses. This may account for why this type of control has the familiar properties of OC, a fact that would be surprising in our terms if the embedded structures in (1) and (2) are genuine complement clauses (for as we saw nominalized clauses do not involve OC). We will not go in this paper into what it means to control into adjuncts, however.

A second group of apparent exceptions revolves around psychological predicates. These come in several guises, all of which take an infinitival complement of the DP type. On one hand, we have *ahaztu* 'forget' (the single instance of this class) or *gustatu* 'please', whose complement is marked with absolutive structural Case, and at the same time their experiencer is dative (both elements agree with the auxiliary):

(4) Joni$_i$ [GAP$_i$ ogia   egitea]   ahaztu zaio
     Jon-D   bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-A forget Aux (3A-3D)
     'Jon has forgotten to make bread.'

(5) Joni [pro/zuk ogia   egitea]   gustatu zaio
     Jon-D you-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-A please   Aux (3A-3D)
     '(Your) making bread is pleasing to John.'

On the other hand, we have a pair whose 'complement' is marked with ergative structural Case: *arduratu* vs. *kezkatu*, which can be seen as two types of 'worry'. For one 'worry' type the complement clause is the subject-matter of the worry and for the other one it is its cause:

(6) Joni [pro/zuk   ogia   egiteak]   arduratu   dio
     Jon-D   you-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-E subject-matter-worry Aux
                                                          | (3A-3D-3E)

     'Jon has worried about (your) making bread.'

(7)   Jon [pro/zuk   ogia   egiteak]   kezkatu   du
      Jon-A   you-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-E cause-worry Aux (3A-3E)
      '(Your) making bread has worried Jon.'

In the latter pair, the case distribution and corresponding auxiliaries are different. In the subject-matter 'worry' the experiencer is dative and the auxiliary ditransitive. In contrast, in the cause 'worry' the experiencer is absolutive and the auxiliary transitive.

It is impossible for us to provide an analysis of psych predicates in Basque and how they correlate with the various thematic and Case properties that a mere cursory look at these examples immediately attests to. But we do want to note that, as it stands, the 'forget' instance is unexpected in our system. Given that the infinitival clause in all these instances is marked with structural Case, we expect it to exhibit NOC, for reasons discussed in the main text. This is the case for the 'please' class and the two manifestations of the 'worry' class, as can be easily seen by noting that these examples tolerate pro or an overt subject. However, the 'forget' class in (4) does not tolerate an overt subject, suggesting that the null subject, which we have glossed as GAP, is not pro. We do not expect that.

Compare the two English sentences below:

(8)   I remembered (him) giving the Blood, Sweat and Tears speech.

(9)   I forgot (*him) giving the Blood, Sweat and Tears speech.

For unclear reasons, whereas *remember* is an (optional) Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) verb *forget* is not. This suggests that something in the semantics of *forget* prevents its subject from being disjoint from the subject of its object clause. Of course, this does not generalize to regular (non-ECM) complement clauses or nominalized ones:

(10) I forgot that he/I gave the Blood, Sweat and Tears speech.

(11) I forgot his giving the Blood, Sweat and Tears speech.

Therefore the restriction must apply only when a complex restructure event is formed, including the matrix psych predicate and the embedded verb. Such a complex event can denote both the remembering of a private thought or that of a public event; however, the complex event can denote forgetting a private thought, but not forgetting a public event. Now note that (9) is analogous to (4), and whatever prevents the overt subject in (9), we submit, prevents also a comparable element in (4). If so we can argue that the GAP in (4) is pro instead of PRO, as our analysis predicts and as the rest of the psychological paradigm attests to. The idiosyncratic behavior of *ahaztu* 'forget' is thus a semantic consequence of the restriction involved in (9), rather than an unexpected OC example.

References

Etxepare, R., 1997, *The Syntax of Illocutionary Force*, PhD Dissertation, University of Maryland at College Park.

Goenaga, P., 1985, *Euskal Sintaxia. Konplementazio eta Nominalizazioa*, PhD Dissertation, University of Basque Country: Gasteiz.

Hornstein, N., 1999, "Movement and Control", *LI* 30: 69-96.

Jaeggli, O., and K. J. Safir, 1989, "The Null Subject Parameter and Parametric Theory". In O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Paramater*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kuroda, S.-Y., 1978, "Case-marking, canonical Sentence Patterns and counter Equi in Japanese". In Hinds, J. and I. Howards, eds., *Problems in Japanese Suntax and Semantics*, Tokio, Kaitakusha, 30-51.

Laka, I., 1993, "Unergatives that Assign Ergative, Unaccusatives that Assign Accusative". In *Papers on Case and Agreement*, MITWPL 18, 149-172.

Landau, I., 2000, "Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions", *NLLT* 51.

Manzini, R., and A. Roussou, 1998 (1999), "A Minimalist Theory of A-Movement and Control". UCL Working Papers in Linguistics volume 11.

Martin, R., 1996, *A Minimalist Theory of PRO and Control*, Doctoral Dissertation, U. of Connecticut, Storrs.

Ormazabal, J., 2000, "A Conspiracy Theory of Case and Agreement". In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Ortiz de Urbina, J., 1989, *Some Parameters in the grammar of Basque*, Foris, Dordrecht.

Pires, A., 2000, *The Syntax of Gerunds and Infinitives: Subjects, Case and Control*. PhD, U. of Maryland at College Park.

Raposo, E., 1987, "Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: The Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese", *LI* 18: 85-109.

Reuland, E., 1983, "Governing -*ing*", *LI* 14, 101-136.

San Martin, I., 1999, "Control in Basque". *Proceedings of WCCFL XIX*, Cascadilla, 425-438.

—, in progress, Doctoral dissertation. University of Maryland.

Stowell, T., 1981, *Origins of Phrase Structure*, PhD.Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Uriagereka, J., 2001, "Some Concepts and Questions regarding the I system", *ASJU-International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology* (Forthcoming).

Zabala, I., and J. C. Odriozola, 1995, "On the relation between DP and TP in Basque Infinitival Clauses", ms, EHU-UPV, Leioa.