

THE FORMS OF DATIVE DISPLACEMENT: FROM BASAURI TO ITELLEN

Milan Rezac*

Laboratoire de Linguistique de Nantes

This article offers comparative notes on “dative displacement”, whereby a dative controls canonically absolutive agreement. The comparison is both dialectal across Basque and cross-linguistic with Itelmen and Georgian, discussing interaction with split person and number agreement, ergative displacement, dedicated dative agreement, and applicative morphology.¹

1. Dative displacement

In most dialects of Basque, an agreeing dative controls a dedicated suffix reflecting its person and number, henceforth *canonically dative agreement*. It does not interact with the morphemes controlled by the absolutive in clauses without a dative, or *canonically absolutive agreement*, which remain under the control of the absolutive when a dative is present:¹ the “*person*” prefix and an affix indicating plurality of diverse shapes and positions, the *pluralizer*.² Thus, using underlining to undicate target-controller relationships:

- | | |
|---|--|
| (1) Intransitive ABS-(DAT) | (2) Transitive ABS-(DAT)-ERG |
| a. <i>goaz</i> ‘ <u>we</u> (abs) go’ | a. <i>gakartza</i> ‘he (erg) brings <u>us</u> (abs)’ |
| b. <i>doakigu</i> ‘he (abs) goes to <u>us</u> (dat)’ | b. <i>dakarkigu</i> ‘he (erg) brings <u>us</u> (dat) it (abs)’ |
| c. <i>doazkigu</i> ‘ <u>they</u> (abs) go to <u>us</u> (dat)’ | c. <i>dakarzkigu</i> ‘he (erg) brings <u>us</u> (dat) <u>them</u> (abs)’ |

In these examples dative agreement also brings along an additional element, *ki* (also *tz*, etc.), the “dative flag”, and for auxiliary verb roots it may affect the selection of the root allomorph (Lafon 1961, Albizu 2002). The Bermeo form *dxasku* ‘it (abs)

* I am grateful to the participants in a 2006 UPV/EHU seminar at Gasteiz for discussion; among them I met Patxi Goenaga, and it is a pleasure to participate in this volume for him. Additional thanks go to Aritz Irurtzun and Julen Agirre. This article is mostly drawn from Rezac (2006), whose empirical basis is the Basque verb morphology volumes of Pedro de Yrizar (e.g. 1992, 1997); unless specified, dialect names refer to these. That work was supported by SSHRC grant #756-2004-0389 and UPV-EHU grant #9 UPV 00114.130-160.09-2004 U.

¹ Except insofar as the presence of dative agreement blocks (agreement with) a 1st/2nd person absolutive: the *Person Case Constraint* (Albizu 1997, Ormazabal & Romero 1998), as in Georgian but not in Itelmen.

² “Person” in this sense distinguishes 1SG *n-*, 1PL *g-*, 2nd respectful / 2PL *z-*, 2nd familiar *b-*, 3SG/PL $\emptyset-$. Similar “person” distinctions hold for Itelmen (1SG, 1PL, 2SG, 2PL, 3) and Georgian (1SG, 1PL, 2, 3).

is to us (dat)' reflects both: *s* is the dative flag (**tz*), and the shape of the root as *dx* rather than (*s*)*a* is also due to the dative.

Some varieties present a different picture: some or all 1st/2nd person datives control the canonically absolutive person prefix (px in the glosses) and pluralizer (glossed PL). This is *dative displacement*, illustrated for different dialects in (3).³ The forms in square brackets give regular dative agreement forms in the same dialect. Worth noting are the different position and shape of the morphemes that the dative controls canonically on the one hand, and under dative displacement on the other, e.g. *-ta-* and *n-* in (3c). 3rd person datives are not affected.⁴

- (3) a. Guri_i sagarrak_j eman g_i-a-it_i-u-zki_j-(gu_i) [vs. d-a-u-zki_k-gu_i]
 us.DAT apples.ABS given IPL(px)-TM-PL-√-PL2-IPL(sx)
 You gave us the apples. (based on Sara, St. Pée and Ahetze, Yrizar 1997: 93, 119)
- b. Guri_i bokatak_j gustatzen g_i-a-tt_i-u-zte_j [vs. zai-zki_j-gu_i]
 us.DAT sandwiches.ABS liking IPL(px)-TM-PL-√-PL2
 We like the sandwiches. (Errenteria, Aritz Irurtzun p.c.)
- c. Harek_k neri_i sagarra(k)_j emun n_i-o-s-ta_i-n [vs. d-o-s-t_i]
 he.ERG me.DAT apple(s).ABS given 1SG(px)-√-DF-1SG(sx)-PAST
 He had given me the apple(s). (Oñate, Collective 2005: 5)

Fernández (2001) introduces the phenomenon to theoretical inquiry, names it, and draws a parallel with the more familiar *ergative displacement*. In the latter, exemplified in (4) (cf. esp. (3a)), a 1st/2nd person ergative controls the canonically absolutive person prefix if the absolutive is not itself 1st/2nd person, while also sometimes in some varieties retaining its own person + number suffix. Ergative displacement presents a systematic and pan-dialectal contrast with dative displacement: the ergative gains control of the person prefix only, and not of the pluralizer PL, even if its canonical absolutive controller is singular and does not trigger it.⁵ The dative in dative displacement, by contrast, takes over both, and if the absolutive is itself plural it controls an extra morpheme, here called the *second plural* (PL2 in (3ab)). A particular configuration may allow either ergative or dative displacement, as in Sara (Urdax) *ginatzun* beside *zintugun* 'we (erg) had it to you (dat)'. However, the two cannot combine: it is not possible to have in Basque multiple person prefixes, and moreover it is not possible for the dative to control just the pluralizer PL and the ergative to control the person prefix, giving **gintu(tzu)n* for the preceding. All these properties of the two phenomena will persist in Itelmen and Georgian; parochially in Basque, ergative but not dative displacement is limited to the non-present tenses.

- (4) Askak_j guk_i bodegan g_i-en-it_j-u-(gu_i)-n.
 throughs.the.ABS we.ERG store.room.in 1PL(px)-PL*-PL-√-1PL(sx)-PAST
 The troughs, we had them in the store-room (based on Fernández and Albizu 2006).

³ Non-obvious glosses: px prefix, sx suffix; TM theme marker; DF dative flag; PL plural and PL2 second plural.

⁴ Thus *die* 'he has it to them (dat)' is never expressed as *ditu* 'he (erg) has them (abs)', *dizkie* 'he has them to them'.

⁵ The ergative seems to control its own plural affix in ergative displacement, PL* (Albizu 2002: 15, Rezac 2006).

The most conspicuous aspect of dative displacement is the control of control absolutive agreement by a DP that retains dative case. This seems to be a rare phenomenon, between two better-studied options for adding an indirect object to a transitive or an unaccusative to form an “applicative construction” (Ormazabal & Romero 1998). One type, standard Basque, codes the added object in a special way for case and agreement, as a dative, and the direct object / subject is treated in the same way as in a plain transitive / unaccusative (thus Greek or Yimas). The other type, English, codes the indirect object in the same way as the direct object / subject of a plain transitives / unaccusatives, leaving various options for the remaining theme (thus English, Mohawk, Chimwiini, or Kinyarwanda). Dative displacement is at the crossroads of these two strategies, and should have much to tell us about the relationship of case and agreement (Fernández 2001, Rezac to appear). The rest of this article surveys the morphology of the phenomenon across and outside Basque, underlining the similarities and differences.

2. Basque

Dative displacement assumes a variety of forms across Basque, exemplified in Table 1. These show that it does not generally collapse the ABS-DAT-ERG paradigm with the ABS-ERG paradigm for the same ϕ -features of dative and absolutive. The dative controls canonically absolutive person and number agreement, (5ab), but other differences may subsist, (5c-g).

Table 1

Dative displacement formations⁶

Group	ϕ , tense	3SG.ERG: ϕ :DAT: 3PL.ABS		3SG.ERG: ϕ :ABS
		Dative displacement	Dative undispl.	Plain transitive
Northern, mostly Lab	1PL pres.	G-a-IT- <u>u</u> -zki(-gu)	d- <u>a</u> -u-zki-gu	G-a-IT- <u>u</u>
Northern, mostly Gip†	1PL pres.	G-a-IT- <u>u</u> -zki‡	d- <u>i</u> -tt/zki-gu	G-a-IT- <u>u</u>
Lekeitio (Biz)	1PL pres.	G-a-ITT- <u>u</u> -s	d-e- <u>u</u> -s-ku-s	G-a-ITT- <u>u</u>
Burunda (Gip)	1PL pres.	G-e-R- <u>u</u> -zk-u?/u?	d- <u>e</u> -zki-(g)u	G-e-R- <u>u</u>
Echarri-Aranaz (Gip)	1PL pres.	G- <u>ie</u> -zki-	d- <u>uu</u> -zki-e?-gu	G- <u>ie</u> -
Oñate (Biz)	1PL past	G- <u>o</u> -s-ku-n	<u>o</u> -s-ku-n	G-indd- <u>u</u> -an
Basauri (Biz)†	1PL pres.	N- <u>o</u> -s-te-s	d- <u>o</u> -s-te-s	N-a- <u>u</u>
	1PL pres.	G-a-T- <u>u</u> -S-s (ss > s)	d- <u>o</u> -s-ku-s	G-a-T- <u>u</u> -S

⁶ Lab - Labourd, Gip - Gipuzkoa, Biz - Bizkaia. CAPS = absolutive-type person prefix (*g* 1PL, *n* 1SG), pluralizer (-*it*-, -*s* PL); SMALL CAPS = dative-type person+number suffix (*gu* 1PL, *te* 1SG). Other: root; dative flag; theme marker; **second plural**; -(a)n = past; ? = analysis unclear. †: Dative displacement affects the ABS-DAT paradigm as well. ‡: In ABS-DAT, second plural is also *te* ‘they are to me’ *Nauzki, naute = zaizkit*.

1PL dative is chosen because it illustrates both person and number control, and happens to be instantiated in each group, although 1SG dative is more susceptible to the phenomenon everywhere save Echarri-Aranaz. Basauri has two modes of formation, see below. Oñate dative displacement is restricted to the past, elsewhere the present is most affected. In Basauri, *nostes* is implied by the description; cf. *nastas/yastas = zaizkit* beside *nastalyasta = zait*. Oñate belongs to dialects that do not distinguish 3SG/PL.ABS in the presence of a dative, i.e. *dosku = di(zki)gu*.

- (5) Morphological properties of dative displacement (dative limited to 1st/2nd person)
- Person displacement: The dative controls the person prefix (e.g. 1PL *g-*), canonically controlled by the absolutive, and by the ergative in ergative displacement.⁷
 - Number displacement: The dative controls the canonically abs. pluralizer (e.g. *-it-*).
 - Second plural: If there is a (3)PL absolutive, a new pluralizer may appear (e.g. *zki*).
 - Dative doubling: The dative may remain coded by its canonical suffix (e.g. 1PL *gu*).
 - Interaction with ergative displacement: incompatible.
 - Base: In Gipuzkoan and in Lekeitio, dative displacement uses the ABS-ERG base rather than the ABS-DAT-ERG one; in Bizkaian and Labourdin (see below), it uses the ABS-DAT-ERG base with its special “dative flag” or distinctive root.
 - Dative displacement depends systematically on the following parameters: \emptyset -features of the dative (e.g. 1SG only in Hernáni, 1PL in Burunda, 1SG and 1PL in Oñate, all 1st/2nd person in Sara); tense (e.g. present in Ainhoa, past in Oñate); transitivity (rare in the ABS-DAT paradigm); plurality of the absolutive.

Tables 2 and 3 furnish some concrete paradigms (partial for brevity). Ahetze has dative displacement for all 1st/2nd person datives (and no 3rd person ones), beside the undisplaced *dauzkigu*. The displacement forms exemplify both the second plural *zki*, and dative doubling in *gaituzkigu*, *zaizkitzu*. The base of the displacement forms looks at first sight like the ABS-ERG base *u*, not the ABS-DAT-ERG *i* appearing with undisplaced 3rd person datives; the last column compares the ABS-ERG forms. In Oñate, dative displacement occurs for 1st person datives in the past. Here the displacement forms contrasts strikingly with the plain transitive ABS-ERG ones because they use the ABS-DAT-ERG base, seen in the undisplaced form *oskuen*, with its dative flag *s*, canonically dative suffix *ku*, and the absence of the past theme marker *in̄dd*.

Table 2

Present ERG: DAT: 3.PL.ABS in Sara, Ahetze (Yrizar 1997: 121)

DAT	3SG.ERG	3PL.ERG	1SG.ERG	1PL.ERG	2R.ERG	ABS	3SG.ERG
3SG	diozka	diozkate	diozkat	diozkau	diozkatzu	3SG	du
1SG	nauzki	nauzkite	—	—	nauzkitzu	1SG	nau
1PL	gaituzkigu (dauzkigu)	gaituzkigute	—	—	gaituzkitzu	1PL	gaitu
2R	zaizkitzu	zaizkitzute	zaizkitzut	zaizkitzugu	—	2R	zaitu

⁷ There is also some *partial* 1PL > 1SG dative displacement, Oñate var. *noskun* &c. for *goskun* &c. ‘he has it to us’.

Table 3

Past ERG: (DAT): ABS in Vergara, Oñate (Yrizar 1992: 469)

DAT	3.SG.ERG	3.PL.ERG	2R.ERG	ABS	3SG.ERG	3PL.ERG	2R.ERG
1SG	nostan	nostañ	nostatzun	1SG	niñdun	niñduen	niñdusun
1PL	gokun	gokuen (oskue-n)	gokutzun	1PL	giñduan	giñduen	giñdusun

Some differences among the groups in Table 1 are simply a matter of the origin of dative displacement and its gradual spread: in 1SG or 1PL dative, in the present or past, and whether it has spread to ABS-DAT intransitives. The “second plural” recruited to agree with 3PL absolutive when the regular plural PL is taken over by the dative seems to reflect the most unmarked plural allomorph of the regular ABS-DAT-ERG paradigm: Bizkaian *z/s*, elsewhere *zki*, but also *te* for intransitives. On the remaining differences, some light is shed by a comparison of the groups.

Two groups stand out from the others: Oñate (generally) and Basauri (for 1SG). As elsewhere the dative controls canonically absolutive agreement, but the similarity to the plain ABS-ERG paradigm stops there, and the dative displacement forms use the base of undisplaced ABS-DAT-ERG forms. *Ostan* ‘he had it to me’, *oskun* ‘he had it to us’, become *nostan*, *gokun* in Oñate, retaining both the canonically dative suffixes 1SG *ta*, 1PL *ku*, and the dative flag *s*. This does not occur in the other groups, and some distinctive property of these two dialects would be welcome. It is suggested by the limitation of Oñate dative displacement to the past. Oñate and Basauri share the Bizkaian characteristics of having no “default” prefix when the absolutive is 3rd person (the only absolutive permitted in forms with dative agreement, note 1), while other dialects use *z/s*-. Oñate *ostan* ‘he had it to me’ beside Salinas (*s*)-*ustan*, Labourdin *z-autan*, Gipuzkoan *z-idan*. To yield dative displacement for all 1SG/PL datives, Oñate only needs to tack 1SG *n*, 1PL *g* onto this base, because of two additional properties of this variety. First, it belongs to a small group where 1PL/2PL do not control the pluralizer PL: Oñate *gau* ‘he has us (abs)’ beside the *gaitu*, *gaitus*, *gauts* elsewhere with PL *it*, *s*. Second, it participates in the more widespread phenomenon of not agreeing with 3PL absolutives in the presence of (even undisplaced) dative agreement, so no second plural is needed.⁸

The presence of a default prefix is not an insurmountable obstacle to the Oñate type formation. Basauri deploys it for 1SG datives in the present as well as the past,

⁸ The «theme marker» *iñdd* found between the root and the person prefixes in the ABS-ERG past in Oñate is not extended to dative displacement, perhaps a testimony to the fossil status of this morpheme. Since agreement with 1st/2nd person absolutives is impossible in Basque in the presence of dative agreement (note 1), there is no way to see what this theme marker would look like if there were a 1st/2nd person-controlled prefix in the ABS-DAT-ERG or ABS-DAT paradigms, unless dative displacement occurs. It is thus of great interest that the theme marker proper to ABS-ERG is not extended here. In the northern group it sometimes is and sometimes is not, so that dialects with ABS-ERG type *gintuen* ‘he had us (abs)’ have dative displacement ‘he had it to us (dat)’ either as *gintuen* &c. or as *gattuen* (Hondarribia). (Basauri has little to say about the theme marker: *nosten* does not use *iñdd* or its variants, but such forms are also gone from its ABS-ERG paradigm because of «leismo», Arretxe 1994: 159 note 83).

where the undisplaced type *d-oste* ‘he has it to me (dat)’ has the default prefix *d-*, as in Basque generally. *Doste* becomes *noste* under dative displacement. Similarly, Basauri extends dative displacement to the consonant-initial ABS-DAT paradigm, transforming *yastu(n)* ‘he is (was) to me (dat)’, where *y* is part of the root allomorph found in the context of dative agreement, to *n-astu(n)*. Basauri also indicates the plurality of 3PL absolutes in the presence of a dative, displaced or not; the displaced forms adopt the earlier ones’ pluralizer *s* as their “second plural”.⁹

In the other groups, dative displacement looks quite different. To a first approximation, it seems as if it basically adopts the ABS-ERG forms in consequence of the dative’s control of the absolute-type person and number agreement: *gaitu* ‘he has us (abs)’ comes to be used for ‘he has it to us (dat)’, beside undisplaced *digu/dauku*. The *gaitu*-type forms are then sometimes enriched with pieces coming from the undisplaced ABS-DAT-ERG forms, namely the second plural (*zki*, *s*, but often \emptyset : ‘he has them to us’ undisplaced *dauzkigu* → displaced *gaitu(zki)*), and the canonical dative suffixes (*gaituzki(gu)*). The distribution of dative displacement suggests why this might be so and how it relates to the Oñate mode of formation.

Dative displacement is earliest recorded, most widely spread, and most often discussed for the Northern Group of Table 1.¹⁰ This seemingly contiguous region splits into two areas as regards the (older) forms with undisplaced dative agreement. The geographically mostly Gipuzkoan area differentiates the ABS-DAT-ERG base *i* from the ABS-ERG base *u*, giving *dio* ‘he (erg) has it (abs) to him (dat)’ vs. *du* ‘he (erg) has it (abs)’, *digu* ‘he has it to us’ vs. *gaitu* ‘he has us’: the dialects of Irún and Hernani, and the Urdax variety of Sara. However, the majority of the Labourdin area of this group, namely Ainhoa, Arcangues, St. Jean de Luz, and some Sara varieties, has the peculiarity of appearing to use the ABS-ERG base for the *undisplaced* ABS-DAT-ERG formations, with 1st/2nd person datives. Thus in Ainhoa, beside the same *dio* - *du* contrast for 3SG dative as for Gipuzkoan, we get for 1PL dative the form *dauku* ‘he (erg) has it (abs) to us (dat)’, to be compared to *gaitu* ‘he (erg) has us (abs)’.

This identity of bases seems to be only superficial. The dative-controlled suffixes of Basque are generally drawn from the same set as the ergative-controlled suffixes. In these Labourdin varieties however, a dative-controlled suffix assumes a special form, *if it is contiguous to the root u*. Consider the 1PL-controlled suffix: *gu* when the controller is ergative, *dugu* ‘we have it’, *diogu* ‘we have it to him’, and when the controller is dative and the suffix is separated from the root *u*, *dauzkigu* ‘he has them to us’, but *ku* when the controller is dative and the suffix is right-adjacent to the root, *dauku* ‘he has it to us’ (beside other varieties’ uniform *gu* in *dugu*, *diogu*, *dizkigu*, *digu*, respectively). This reveals the influence of an underlying morpheme identifiable as the “dative flag”, the special morpheme that in many varieties shows up overtly between the root and a dative-controlled suffix, often with the phonetic effect found in the *gu/ku* alternation. Thus in Bizkaian the dative flag takes the form *s* before *gu*, which it

⁹ Only 1SG datives use this formation in Basauri, so plural + second plural combinations cannot be investigated.

¹⁰ Bonaparte’s attention to the phenomenon in the mid-19C permits its evolution to be tracked during more than a century between his study and Yrizar’s. For other works, see Sagarzazu (1994), Fernández (2004).

devoices to *ku*: Biz. *deusku* (*dosku*) for Lab. *dauku* ‘he has it to us’, versus *dogu* = Lab. *dugu* ‘we have it’. So *dauku* is really *da-u-X-gu*: the root *u*, shared with ABS-ERG forms, followed by the dative flag *X* (Lafon 1961).

In turn, it follows that the dative displacement form *gaitu* ‘he has it to us’ need be only superficially identical to the ABS-ERG form *gaitu* ‘he has us’; it may reflect *gaituX* with the dative flag *X*, and thus correspond partly to Oñate *gosku* with its dative flag *s*.¹¹ *gaituX* still differs from *gosku* in missing the canonically dative-controlled suffix doubling the newly dative-controlled prefix, i.e. *gosku* = **gaituku* < *gaituXgu*. However, Labourdin varieties do sometimes show the expected doubling: mostly when some material intervenes between the prefix and the suffix, like the second plural *zki* in *gaituzkigu* ‘he has them to us’, but also in Trask’s (1981: 294) *eman arazi nautak* ‘thou (erg) madest me (dat) give it to him’. Here *nauta-* = *na-u-X-da-*, with the dative flag *X* revealed by devoicing the 1SG suffix *da*, parallel to Oñate *nosta-* = *n-a-u-s-da-*.¹²

Interestingly, it is in these Labourdin varieties with *dauku* - *gaitu* that dative displacement is by far the most entrenched in Basque, affecting sometimes all ABS-DAT-ERG forms with 1st/2nd person datives (as in Ainhua proper, Artola, Yrizar 1997). The neighbouring Gipuzkoan varieties have less of the phenomenon, essentially for 1SG datives in the present and variable spread to 1PL, past, and some 2nd person (they innovate in extension to the ABS-DAT intransitives). This suggests that dative displacement started out in Labourdin, and spread out to the Gipuzkoan varieties. Now, the latter do not have *dauku* for ‘he has it to us’; they have *digu*, that is, they use the special root *i* throughout the ABS-DAT-ERG paradigm, in contrast to the *u* of ABS-ERG *gaitu* ‘he has us’. If in spreading, the Labourdin forms themselves were adopted along with the phenomenon, identical as they were on the surface to the independently existing ABS-ERG forms, there would come into being a previously non-existent conflation of dative displacement forms with ABS-ERG forms. The Lab. *gaitu* ‘he has it to us’, which in Lab. = *gaituX*, spreads to a zone using *digu* rather than *dauku* = *dauXgu* for ‘he has it to us’, and it is identified with plain ABS-ERG *gaitu* ‘he has us’, with no *X*, because the *digu* variety has no *X*. This creates a situation where on the surface, dative displacement is basically using ABS-ERG forms and bears no relationship to the ABS-DAT-ERG base.¹³

On this story, there is nothing essential to dative displacement that has it relate to the ABS-ERG forms, beyond the elementary fact of controlling the same person and

¹¹ With the irrelevant difference noted above that in Oñate 1PL generally fails to control the plural *it*, and *au* > *o*.

¹² The intervening material that enables dative doubling plays the same role in ergative doubling of the type *genitugun* (4), and «sufficient» for this purpose favours the second pluralizer *zki* or non-auxiliary roots (Azkue 1923-5: 709/§948, Fernández 2002, Rezac 2006 noting the same condition on doubling in other languages).

¹³ An analysis keeping the dative flag or dative doubling at an abstract level may be motivated even in its new area, because there do remain various small differences between the regular ABS-ERG and dative displacement paradigms (Rezac 2006). Thus Sara, Urdax 1PL.ABS-ERG *gintuen*, *gintuzten*, *gintutzun*, *gintutzuen*, are also dative displacement forms for 1PL.DAT, except for *gintuzten* where there is a gap. Other differences are in the theme marker (note 8), or allomorphy of the type *gattuzia* ‘you have us’ vs. *gattuzue* ‘you have it to us’.

number morphemes. It does not characterize the phenomenon in what seem to be its hearths, like the Labourdin area of the Northern Group and Oñate, and occurs elsewhere through the spread of actual forms along with the abstract phenomenon. The same tale of importation might be told of the other groups in Table 1 that build dative displacement on the ABS-ERG rather than clearly distinct ABS-DAT-ERG base. Best documented is the situation for the sea-port of Lekeitio, where the incipient phenomenon is noted by Azkue (1923-5: II:539/§770, 576/§810), along with a re-making of the past tense on the basis of the present, and documented seventy years later in careful detail by Hualde et al. (1994), Fernández (2001). In Basauri the two modes of formation coexist, the Oñate type for 1SG datives, and the probably newer Gipuzkoa / Lekeitio type for 1PL datives.¹⁴

The following sections seek to cast a wider net, looking at dative displacement in other languages whose agreement systems have many commonalities with Basque, in particular split person and number control and “ergative displacement”, with an eye on some of the questions that the Basque variation brings to the fore: which datives are the controllers; how dative displacement interacts with the split control of person and number; whether it uses the regular dative-agreement base or whether the dative behaves completely like an absolutive.

3. Itelmen

The relevant properties of Itelmen agreement are given in (6), using EA for the external argument of transitives, O for the object of transitives, and S for the argument of intransitives:¹⁵

- (6) Itelmen agreement
- a. Prefixal agreement (AgrPx): controlled by the person (note 2) of EA/S, not O.
 - b. Suffixal agreement (AgrSx): controlled by the person+number of O/S, except that if O is 3rd person, AgrSx codes the person of EA.

Table 4 exemplifies this system (the rightmost IO column is to be ignored for a moment). The generalizations about the distribution of person and number control among arguments are virtually the same as in the Basque ergative displacement system, if AgrPx is treated as the suffix series and AgrSx as the person prefix + the pluralizer PL. In the combination 1PL EA > 2SG O, *nt-___-[/ʃ]in*, AgrPx and AgrSx are fully independent, as in Basque *hinderamagun* ‘we carried thee’, where the person prefix *h* = AgrSx is controlled by O, and the suffix *gu* = AgrPx is controlled by EA. In the combination 1PL EA > 3SG O, *nt-___-čen*, the AgrPx = *gu* remains the same. However, here O does not contribute a person feature to AgrSx because it is 3rd person, and EA person takes over, so that the form of AgrSx varies according to the person of the EA: the suffixes vary going down third column. At the same time,

¹⁴ The spread is dative displacement is small in Burunda and Etxarri-Aranaz, but Burunda imparts an important lesson: the phenomenon begins with 1PL datives, not as in all other groups it seems, 1SG.

¹⁵ The analysis of Itelmen is derived from Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2001), henceforth BW, except as noted.

the number of the EA does not influence AgrSx even if O is 3SG: regardless of the number of the EA, the suffixes of the third column remain distinct from the fourth column, and only a plural O can contribute the pluralizer *ʔ*. This is exactly like ergative displacement + dialectal ergative doubling in Basque *generamagun* 'we carried him': the suffix = AgrPx is unaffected, the person prefix = AgrSx gets its person value from the EA since O is 3rd person, but the pluralizer PL *tza* is not triggered and only a plural O can contribute it, *generamatzagun* 'we carried them'.¹⁶

Table 4

Itelmen agreement (partial; realis mood, class I)

φ	S	EA + 3SG.O	EA + 3PL.O	EA	O	IO
1SG	t-__k(ičen)	t-__-čen	t-__-čeʔn	t-	-βum	-βum
1PL	nt-__k(iče/n)	nt-__-čen	nt-__-čeʔn	nt-	-βuʔm	-βuʔm
2SG	__-č	__-ən	__-əʔn		-[ʏ]in	-[ʏ]in
3SG	__-n	__-nen	__-neʔn			-nen
3PL	-ʔn	n-__-nen	n-__-neʔn	n-		-peʔnen

Unlike in Basque, dative indirect objects (IO) in Itelmen lack their own agreement morphology. However, BW show that they can optionally take control of AgrSx from its canonical controller, O/S, and when they do so, they remain dative: dative displacement. In (7a), the controller of AgrSx is the unmarked O, but in (7b) it is the dative IO. It seems possible that the optionality of dative displacement reflects the difference between applicative and prepositional constructions, with the dative controlling AgrSx only if it is applicative.¹⁷

- (7) a. isx-enk n-zəl-ał-in kza kəma-nkʔ
 father-LOC IMPRS-give-FUT-2SG.OBJ you me-DAT
 Will father give you to me? (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001: ex. 15)

¹⁶ The most salient difference with Basque is that all intransitive subjects (i) control AgrPx in the same way as EA (exception in 3PL), and (ii) both their person and number features count for AgrSx, plural S triggering the pluralizer *ʔ* just like O but the person of S triggering different allomorphs than the same person of O. As if Basque had **goatzagu* 'we go' rather than *goatza*, cf. Lekeitio *giñiki-gun* = *leikigun* (Hualde et al. 1994: 119-120).

¹⁷ This is not BW's proposal. A hint in this direction is that the language lacks the Basque agreement restriction of note 1, the «Person Case Constraint»: AgrSx is not restricted to 3rd person O/S in the presence of a dative (necessarily non-agreeing, since it is not controlling AgrSx). It seems to be generally the case that where «applicative» constructions are affected by the said agreement constraint, the corresponding prepositional construction is not (Ormazabal & Romero 1998). The class of datives capable of controlling AgrSx in transitives is limited and of variable membership, e.g. the obligatory goal of 'give', the optional goal of 'bring', 'tell', the affected theme of 'watch', the causee of the lexical causative 'make wear'. BW investigate the conditions under which IO vs. O/S control AgrSx: when both are 3rd person, the more topical of the two does; when both are 1st/2nd person either can; and when one is 1st/2nd person, it tends to control AgrSx but, the other can also even though 3rd person. These facts might be related to applicativity as follows: topicality = non-new information, so if new information is VP-peripheral, it will be IO rather than O in the prepositional construction, and O rather than IO in the applicative one.

- b. isx-enk n-zəl-ał-um kza kəma-nk?
 father-LOC IMPRS-give-FUT-1SG.OBJ you me-DAT
 Will father give you to me? (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001: ex. 14b)

The principal difference between Itelmen dative displacement and the Basque one is that 3rd person datives participate in it in Itelmen. Yet they also show themselves thereby not to be the same unmarked 3rd person as are O and S. When a dative is not 3rd person, its control of AgrSx gives the same result as the control of AgrSx by a direct object; not so when it is 3rd person. A 3rd person O/S contribute no person features to AgrSx, which looks to EA à la “ergative displacement”, as discussed. In (8a), this is indicated by the gloss 1 > 3 under AgrSx (cf. Table 4). Remarkably, a 3rd person dative blocks this reference of AgrSx to EA, and provides it with a unique person feature: this is the rightmost column of Table 4 and the AgrSx in (8b).

- (8) a. kma tʃe-ank t-ʃintʃi-čeʔn pexal-eʔn
 I them-DAT 1SG-put-1>3PL hat-PL
 I put hats on them. (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001, ex. 16a)
 b. kma tʃe-ank t-ʃintʃi-peʔnen pexal-eʔn
 I them-DAT 1SG-put-3PL.OBL hat-PL
 I put hats on them. (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001, ex. 16b)

BW propose that 3rd person datives differ from 3rd person O/S in being specified for some variety of person (cf. their note 14). This idea appears in various guises in the literature, e.g. a specification on the dative for [local], [participant], or [-person], vs. its absence on O/S (Anagnostopoulou 2003: 271-2). So the first-look contrast between Basque and Itelmen dative displacement yields a deeper commonality: the phenomenon crucially refers to some person specification. The reason why Basque does not displace 3rd person datives might be localized either in the features of the dative, which in Basque could be person-less like O/S, or in the “cut-off” point for dative displacement: just as Oñate displaces only 1st person datives while Ainhua displace both 1st and 2nd person, Itelmen might go farther still and displace all DPs specified for person. The second suggestion allows the supposition that even Basque datives are more person-like than 3rd person O/S, perhaps as a universal fact about agreeing datives or datives in the “applicative construction” with its familiar animacy / possessor effects (Ormazabal & Romero 1998: 422). Indeed, Basque indicates as much in surface morphology: its (undisplaced) 3SG datives control the suffix *o*, unlike the \emptyset of 3SG ergatives and absolutes, and *o* is revealed as a person marker by comparison with 3PL dative *o-te* (*e*, etc.), 3PL ergative $\emptyset-te$.

Intransitives may also participate in dative displacement in Itelmen. The control of AgrSx then falls not to S, as in a plain intransitive (S column in Table 4), but to IO. S retains its normal control of AgrPx, for which it behaves just like EA (note 16). However, the oblique controller in the intransitive examples is not dative, but a possessor (9a) or a locative (9b). BW suggest a covert affected dative of the type in *My child was crying on me all night*.

- (9) a. ənan p'eč kəma-nk k'ot-it-əs-kinen
 his son me-DAT come-DISTRIB?-PRES-3.OBL
His son keeps coming to me. (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001: ex. 31c)

- b. nt-čaja-kinen ənna-nk
 1PL-drink.tea-3SG.OBL him-LOC
 We had tea at/by him (i.e. 'at his place'). (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001: ex. 33)

A striking commonality between Itelmen and Basque is the interaction of dative displacement with the splittable person-number control of canonically absolutive agreement. In each language's version of "ergative displacement", EA provides the person feature to canonically O-controlled agreement if O is 3rd person, but it does not provide number even if O is singular. Itelmen differs from Basque in that S both controls AgrPx like EA, and provides person and number to AgrSx like O (note 16, S column in Table 4). In dative displacement in both languages, the dative provides both the person and the number features canonically provided by O, and this forestalls all influence on AgrSx by EA/S. Thus in (9b), the 3SG dative is the sole controller of AgrSx (*ki*)*nen*, and the 1PL S influences it neither for person (expected to = 1PL.EA + 3SG.O in Table 4), number (no pluralizer ?), or both (expected to = 1PL.S).

To this last generalization, BW note an anomaly in the data. In examples like (10), the 3SG dative (covert, corresponding to possessor *his* of the subject) controls AgrSx as in (9a), except that the plural marker ? turns up. The two examples with this property involve a singular possessor and plural S, which suggests that S is providing the plural feature. One might propose that in dative displacement, the pluralizer ? is triggered by whichever of the IO or O/S is plural, which seems consistent with the examples in BW. In Basque when the dative controls the canonically absolutive person and number in dative displacement, as in *gattu* 'he is to us' (1PL *g-*, PL *-tt-*), *nau* 'he is to me' (1SG *n*), a plural absolutive controls a second plural marker, *gattuzte* 'they are to us' (3b), *nauzki/naute* 'they are to me'. This second plural is drawn from the same stock of basic pluralizers as the ordinary plural. In the Basauri and Lekeitio varieties, both the normal and second plural can be *s*: Basauri *ga(t)u_s* 'he has it/them to us', where *-s* tracks both controllers (Arretxe 1994: 152, note 65). It may be that in Itelmen ? serves as the second plural for S/O in dative displacement, as well as the ordinary plural controlled by the dative.

- (10) əna?n †qzanom †-qz-a†-kine?n
 his traces be-ASP-FUT-3.OBL
 there should be traces of him (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2001, ex. 31a, cf. also 31b)

There is a further point shared by dative displacement in the two languages: dialectal and diachronic variation. Basque dative displacement varies chiefly according to the ϕ -features of the dative and the transitivity of the construction. BW report that their consultants have the dative control AgrSx easily for 1st/2nd person as well as 3rd person in transitives, but in intransitives allow it only for 3rd person possessors/obliques. Earlier sources however had found that dative control of AgrSx was limited to 2PL and 3.SG/PL in transitives, while on the other hand it included 2PL for intransitives (BW, note 16 and ex. 34).

4. Georgian

In Georgian, datives also control absolutive-type agreement, obligatorily. The agreement markers of the Georgian verb are given in Table 5. The relevant element is the prefix, a unique position of person exponence (see note 2). The absolutive and ergative compete for its control according to the pattern of Basque ergative displacement: the absolutive controls it if it is 1st/2nd person, otherwise the ergative does if it is 1st/2nd person (Béjar 2003).¹⁸ The dative behaves like the absolutive, and obligatorily controls the prefix if it is present, in which case the direct object controls no agreement: dative displacement.¹⁹ As in Itelmen, 3rd person datives control a prefix marker that is missing for 3rd person absolutives and ergatives, *s/h/∅* in TABLE, indicating that they have a special person specification beyond plain 3rd person (Anagnostopoulou 2003: 271).²⁰

Table 5

Georgian agreement (Harris 1981: 29, Hewitt 1995: 128)

Person	EA, S		O		IO	
	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL
1st	v-__	v-__-t	m-__	gv-__	m-__	gv-__
2nd	∅-__	__-t	g-__	g-__-t	g-__	g-__-t
3rd	__-s/a/o	__-en/es/etc.	∅	∅	s/h/∅-__	s/h/∅-__-t

The particular interest of Georgian, beyond Itelmen, lies in the “object version” marker. This is its analogue of the Basque “dative flag”, a morpheme that correlates with a dative added to a plain (in)transitive in the applicative construction (Harris 1981: chapter 6). (11a) shows the person prefix *m-* controlled by the direct object *me* in a plain transitive. In (11b), this prefix is controlled by the indirect object *me* in an applicative transitive, and the agreement complex includes also the version marker *i*. Thus Georgian dative displacement co-occurs with the version marker, just like Basque dative displacement does in the Oñate mode of

¹⁸ Georgian has a case-marking split according to tense: an ergative-absolutive system beside a nominative-accusative one, where absolutive = nominative. The agreement facts are identical in both, e.g. a direct object controls the same agreement whether nominative/absolutive or accusative. The accusative and the dative happen to be syncretic, but they can be told apart by the fact that the indirect object always retains this «dative-accusative», while the direct object changes it to the absolutive/nominative in the ergative system and under detransitivization. In the text, I speak in terms of the ergative-(dative)-absolutive system for brevity.

¹⁹ In intransitives the subject controls it, but unlike in Basque the morphemes are those controlled by the subject of transitives, i.e. under «ergative displacement» (cf. Itelmen, note 16): as if Basque had *noan* for *nindoan* ‘I went’.

²⁰ As for the number suffixes, any plural 1st/2nd person plural controls them, including the dative. For 3PL matters are complicated and variable, depending on subjecthood, case, etc.: see Tuite (1998).

sent from the morphology of standard Basque itself, as it is from Itelmen, although it fits Georgian. Some Basque dialects do go partly towards creating this syncretism for direct objects through an analogue of the Spanish “leísmo” phenomenon, by which animate direct objects are treated as dative for *both* case and agreement: *Kepari ikusi dio* ‘she (erg) saw *Kepa* (dat), *le vió a Kepa*’ for *Kepa ikusi du* ‘she (erg) saw *Kepa* (abs), *lo vió a Kepa*’. The origin and distribution of leísmo and dative displacement are distinct in Basque, with the latter but not the former found in Labourdin for example, but they do overlap in dialects like Lekeitio, Basauri, Irun, and Hernani, and they can interact in such a way as to nearly cobble together a single paradigm for all combinations of ERG- α .ABS / ERG- α .DAT-3SG.ABS out of the distinct ones proper to each. In the neighbouring Basque Spanish, leísmo is common (*le vi a Kepa*), but an analogue of dative displacement belongs to distinct varieties. This is *laismo* and *loismo*, whereby some 3rd person datives (depending on gender and number) are coded by the clitic-doubling system as accusatives: *A esa camisa la quite el cuello* ‘I removed the collar from this shirt’, *No lo doy ninguna importancia a eso* ‘I give this no importance’ (Fernández-Ordóñez 1999). These datives evidently retain the dative case marker *a*, which here it cannot be the *animate* accusative marker *a*. If clitics can be treated as agreement markers (Franco 1994), this resembles dative displacement, though an analysis in terms of a surface *le-lo/la* syncretism might be tenable. This is not a possibility for Basque: its canonically dative and canonically absolutive agreement exponents use radically different positions, forms, and patterns of person-number splitting, and dative displacement can be doubled by canonically dative agreement.

References

- Albizu, P., 1997, “Generalized Person-Case Constraint”, in M. Uribe-Etxebarria & A. Mendikoetxea (eds.), *Theoretical issues on the morphology-syntax interface*, Supplements of *ASJU* 40, UPV/EHU, Donostia, 1-33.
- , 2002, “Basque verbal morphology: Redefining cases”, in X. Artiagoitia, P. Goenaga & J. A. Lakarra (eds.), *Erramu Boneta: Festschrift for Rudolf P. G. de Rijk*, Supplements of *ASJU* 44, UPV/EHU, Bilbao, 1-19.
- Anagnostopoulou, E., 2003, *The syntax of ditransitives*, Mouton de Gruyter, The Hague.
- Arretxe, J., 1994, *Basauriko euskara*, Basauriko Udala, Basauri.
- Azkue, R. M. de., 1923-5 [1969], *Morfología vasca*, La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca, Bilbao.
- Baker, M., 1996, *The polysynthesis parameter*, Oxford U. P., Oxford.
- Béjar, S., 2003, *Phi-syntax: A theory of agreement*, Doctoral thesis, University of Toronto.
- Bobaljik, J. D., Wurmbrand, S., 2001, “Notes on agreement in Itelmen”, *Linguistic Discovery* 1.
- Bonet, E., 1991, *Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance*, Doctoral thesis, MIT.
- Collective, 2005, *Oñatiko aditz-taulak*, Badihardugu Euskara Elkarte, Oñati.
- Fernández, B., 2001, “Absolutibo komunztaduradun ergatiboak, absolutibo komunztaduradun datiboak: Ergatiboaren lekualdatzetik datiboaren lekualdatzera”, in B. Fernández & P. Albizu (eds.), *Kasu eta komunztaduraren gainean / On Case and Agreement*, UPV/EHU, Bilbao, 147-165.

- , 2002, “Komunztadura bikoitza eta lekualdatzea,” Ms., UPV/EHU.
- , 2004, “*Gustatzen nau gustatzen dizu*”, in P. Albizu & B. Fernández (eds.), *Euskal gramatika XXI. mendearen atarian*, Arabako Foru Aldundia, Vitoria-Gasteiz, 87-112.
- , Albizu, P., 2006, “Agreement doubling in Basque dialects”, Ms., <http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/projecten/edisyn/>
- Fernández-Ordóñez, I., 1999, “Leísmo, láismo y loísmo”, in I. Bosque & V. Demonte (eds.), *Nueva gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 1, Espasa-Calpe, Madrid, 1317-1397.
- Franco, J., 1994, “The morphological, syntactic, and semantic agreement status of Spanish object clitics”, *ASJU* 27, 707-789.
- Harris, A., 1981, *Georgian syntax*, Cambridge U. P., Cambridge.
- Hewitt, B. G., 1995, *Georgian: A structural reference grammar*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Holmer, N., 1964, *El idioma vasco hablado*, *ASJU*, Donostia.
- Hualde, J. I., A. Elordieta & G. Elordieta, 1994, *The Basque dialect of Lekeitio*, Supplements of *ASJU-UPV/EHU*, Bilbao.
- Lafon, R., 1961, “Sur les formes verbales basques qui contiennent un indice datif”, *BSL* 56, 139-162.
- Nash, L., 1995, *Portée argumentale et marquage casuel dans les langues SOV et dans les langues ergatives: l'exemple du géorgien*, Thèse de Doctorat, Université de Paris VIII.
- Ormazabal, J. & J. Romero, 1998, “On the syntactic nature of the *me-lui* and the Person-Case Constraint”, *ASJU* 32, 415-434.
- Rezac, M., 2006, “Agreement displacement in Basque”, Ms., Université de Nantes, <http://loargann.batcave.net/index.html>.
- , to appear, “ Φ -Agree and θ -related Case”, in D. Harbour, D. Adger, S. Béjar (eds.), *Φ theory: Φ -features across interfaces and modules*, Oxford U., Oxford.
- Rood, D., 1976, *Wichita grammar*, Garland, New York.
- Sagarzazu, T., 1994. “Hondarribiko mintzairazko ikuspegiak”, in R. Gómez & J. A. Lakarra (eds.), *Euskal Dialektologiako Kongresua*, Supplements of *ASJU* 27, Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia, Donostia, 589-631.
- Trask, L., 1981, “Basque verbal morphology”, *Iker* 1, 285-304.
- Tuite, K., 1998, *Kartvelian morphosyntax*, Lincom, München.
- Yrizar, P. de, 1992, *Morfología del verbo auxiliar vizcaíno*, vol. 2, Euskaltzaindia, Zarautz.
- , 1997, *Morfología del verbo auxiliar labortano*, Euskaltzaindia, Pamplona.