

DEFECTIVE DOMAINS IN BASQUE NOMINALIZED DEPENDANTS

Itziar San Martin
UPV/EHU & HiTT

Introduction*

This paper investigates into the nature of Basque nominalized clauses in complement position. These are essentially (uninflected) infinitival clauses, and the unexpected presence of lexical subjects has been related to the fact that the nominalized clause itself is a DP that bears structural Case (1). In contrast, Control is licensed where the complement clause is marked with some other Case or postposition (2) (San Martin 2000, 2004; San Martin & Uriagereka 2002).

- (1) Jonek_i [pro_{i/j}/Mariak ogia egitea] lortu du.¹
Jon-E Maria-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A-3E)
'John has managed to make bread'
- (2) Jon_i [PRO_i ogia egiten] saiatu da.
Jon-A bread-Det-A make-Nom-Loc try Aux (3A)
'Jon has tried to make bread'

It is standardly assumed that the embedded subject in (1) is a free pronominal when it is phonetically null. This is supported by the interpretive and distributional properties of the embedded subject: Lexical subjects are permitted and loose interpretive possibilities are allowed. In fact, the literature on Basque infinitives has made no distinction between the null subjects in Nominalized dependants (1) and in finite contexts, such as (3).

- (3) Jonek_i [pro_{i/j} ogia egin duela] esan du.
Jon-E bread-Det-A make Aux (3A-3E)-C say Aux (3A-3E)
'Jon has said that he/she has made the/some bread'

* This research was supported by the research grants UPV-EHU:EHU06/94, 9/UPV 00114. 130-16009/2004 from the University of the Basque Country. It was also supported by El Fondo de Cooperación Aquitania-Euskadi 2006 as well as by the Basque Government (*Ayudas para apoyar la actividad de Grupos de Investigación del Sistema Universitario Vasco*). The material included in this paper was presented in the International Workshop on the structure of Basque Nominals (*Izen Sintagmaren Egitura Euskaraz: Sintaxia eta Interpretazioa*) that was held in Donostia in June 2007. I am grateful to the participants of the workshop and to the discussions that emerged from the meeting. All errors are mine.

¹ The following abbreviations have been used in the glosses: A (Absolute), E (Ergative), D (Dative), Loc (Locative), Det (Determiner), Dem (Demonstrative), Nom (Nominalizer), Aux (Auxiliary), C (Complementizer), sg (singular), pl (plural) and Subj (Subjunctive).

The pictures described in (1-2) regarding the correspondence between the complement types and the complementary distribution between PRO and *pro* is not valid for a phenomenon described in Etxepare (2003, 2005): optional Long Distance Agreement (henceforth LDA) that the matrix auxiliary displays with an element in the embedded clause. This phenomenon arises only with DP-Nominalizations and surprisingly, the embedded subject is PRO rather than *pro*: it is necessarily phonetically null and strictly coreferential to a matrix argument (4).

- (4) Jonek_i [PRO_{i/*j}; liburuak idaztea] lortu ditu.
 Jon-E book-Det.pl-A write-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A.pl-3E)
 'Jon has managed to write the books'

The existence of LDA leads us to the conclusion that lexical subjects (1) and PRO (4) are licensed in apparently identical contexts (DP-Nominalizations). The logical question to address is whether the opposition between Structural Case vs. non Structural Case suggested for the distribution of lexical DPs vs. PRO in (1-2) is correct or not. Despite the existence of LDA, I believe that it is desirable to maintain the hypothesis. After all, Basque is not unique in employing the opposition of Case-types in subordination contexts to restrict the shape and interpretation of the embedded subject: many languages employ "Same Subject" and "Different Subject" markers that correspond to Structural Case vs. Lexical Case in the left peripheries of embedded clauses to express coreference or disjointness, as described in Finer (1984) among others.

I assume that *pro* and PRO are in complementary distribution² and that their licensing conditions correspond to specific distinct structural properties. Thus, we expect that there is some structural difference between Basque DP-Nominalizations that display LDA and those that do not. One of the goals of this paper is to contribute to the understanding of the syntactic properties that underlie the licensing conditions of PRO and lexical subjects.

The paper is divided into three parts. Section 1 claims that we should distinguish between (1) and (3): whereas the empty subject in finite contexts is *pro*, the free pronominal reading that arises in nominalized complements is the consequence of the ambiguity in the structure. Section 2 investigates into the distribution of PRO and Lexical subjects in DP-Nominalizations. Although the Nominalized complement is morphologically identical, I will argue that the functional material in the Left Periphery is defective in LDA contexts. This will ultimately explain the distribution of PRO and DPs in DP-Nominalizations. Finally, section 3 is a conclusion.

1. Ambiguity in DP-Nominalizations

It is well-known that, unlike paratactic contexts, it is a universal characteristic of dependant or hypotactic domains to display restrictions in the shape and interpretation of the embedded subject with respect to matrix arguments. However, in Basque, the standard assumption is that the embedded subject in both regular finite comple-

² Contra this assumption, Borer (1989) argues that controlled subjects may be lexical.

ment clauses (5) and Nominalized dependants (6) is *pro* when it is phonetically null. This section is a detailed study of DP-Nominalizations in this respect. The conclusion is that the free pronominal reading that arises in these structures is the consequence of the structural ambiguity that they contain.

- (5) Jon_k_i [pro_i_j ogia egin duela] esan du.
 Jon-E bread-Det-A make Aux (3A-3E)-C say Aux (3A-3E)
 'Jon has said that he/she has made the/some bread'
- (6) Jon_k_i [pro_i_j ogia egitea] lortu du.
 Jon-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A-3E)
 'John has managed to make the/some bread'

1.1. Reviewing DP Nominalizations: Partial Control and Exhaustive Control

Since the early works on Basque complementation, it has been noted that the phenomenon of control is dependant on some lexical feature of predicates. Some predicates invariably correlate with phonetically null controlled subjects and others allow for looser coreferential possibilities. In his exhaustive study about Basque complementation, Goenaga (1984) contrasts (7) and (8) and reaches a rather exotic conclusion for the GB framework of the time: certain infinitival complements license *pro*. Specifically, whereas in (7) the embedded subject must be PRO for being phonetically null and strictly coreferential to the matrix object controller, the situation in (8) is different: the embedded null subject is understood as coreferential to the matrix subject when no further specific context is provided. However, Goenaga admits that it is not difficult to provide a context where the reference is not the controller (9).

- (7) Jon_k ni [___etxetik alde egitera] behartu ninduen.
 Jon-E I-A home-from side make-Nom-All oblige Aux (3A-3E)
 'Jon obliged me to go away from home'
- (8) Pentsatu dugu [___joatea].
 think/decide Aux (3A-1E) go-Nom-Det-A
 'We have decided to go/that someone else go'
- (9) Pentsatu dugu [zu joatea].
 think/decide Aux (3A-1E) you-A go-Nom-Det-A
 'We have decided that you go'

More recently, San Martin (2000) employed the test of split antecedents to determine the status of the embedded subject in Nominalized dependants. Specifically, the contrast between (10) and (11) shows that only DP Nominalizations allow for split antecedents, a characteristic of *pro* rather than of PRO.

- (10) Nik_i Mariari_j [pro_i_j elkarrekin joatea] erabaki dudala esan diot.
 I-E Mary-D together go-Nom-Det-A decide Aux-C say Aux (3A-3D-1E)
 'I have told Mary that I have decided to go together'
- (11) *Nik_i Mariari_j [PRO_i_j elkarrekin joaten] saiatu naizela esan diot.
 I-E Mary-D together go-Nom-Det-Loc try Aux-C say Aux (3A-3D-1E)
 Lit. 'I have told Mary that I have tried to go together'

Briefly, two facts support the pro status of the embedded subject in DP-Nominalizations (in contrast to non DP-Nominalizations): the possibility for lexical subjects and for loose interpretive possibilities, including split antecedents.

Interestingly, later work by Landau (1999) claims that the possibility of having split antecedents does not imply that the structure that is being tested does not trigger Obligatory Control (OC) properties (or, for that matter, that it involves Non Obligatory Control (NOC)). Specifically, although certain predicates allow for split antecedents with collective predicates, they maintain the rest of Obligatory Control properties and hence, should not be considered as instances of Non Obligatory Control. This observation leads Landau to make a distinction within Obligatory Control between Exhaustive Control (EC) and Partial Control (PC). These are exemplified in (13) and (14), respectively. NOC arises in clauses in subject position, as in (15)

(12)

	OC		NOC
	EC	PC	
Arbitrary Control	–	–	+
Long Distance Control	–	–	+
Strict Reading of PRO	–	–	+
DE re reading	–	–	+
Collective predicates	–	+	+

(13) *John_i began [PRO_{i+} to meet at 6].

(14) John_i preferred [PRO_{i+} to meet at 6].

(15) [PRO_{arb} to behave oneself in public] would help John.

Basque supports the existence of Partial Control: although split antecedents are permitted in DP-Nominalizations, as shown in (10) above, the rest of the OC properties are maintained. This suggests that these structures contain OC properties, which, in turn, indicates that, contrary to the standard assumption, the embedded subject is PRO_{i+} rather than pro when it is phonetically null.

To start with, (16) and (17) show that the Arbitrary Control and Long Distance Control readings are absent, an indication of Obligatory Control.

(16) *Jonek [e_{arb} ogia egitea] lortu du.
 Jon-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A-3E)
 'Jon has managed to make bread'

(17) *Jonek_i pentsatzen du Mariak_j lortu duela [e_i liburua idaztea].
 Jon-E think Aux(3A-3E) Mary-E manage Aux-C book-Det-A write-
 Nom-Det-A
 'John thinks that Mary managed to write the book'

Second, (18) exemplifies the fact that, under ellipsis, PRO must be interpreted strictly. In other words, the subject elided in the second part of the conjunct must refer to the local subject *Itziar* and not to the previously mentioned *Jon*.

- (18) Jonek_i [e_i garaiz heltzea] lortu du eta Itziarrek ere bai.
 Jon-E on time arrive-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A-3E) and Itziar-E also yes
 'Jon has managed to arrive on time and Itziar also (has managed to arrive on time)'

Finally, the test of the *de re/ de se* goes as follows: the situation is that of an amnesiac who is watching a situation on TV where he does not recognize himself. In this context (19) is not possible (*de-re*). Only a finite clause introduced by the indicative complementizer is valid (20), exactly as in English.

- (19) Gizarajoak_i [e_i domina bat jasotzea] espero du.
 unfortunate-Det-E medal one get-Nom-Det-A expect Aux (3A-3E)
 'The unfortunate expects to get a medal'
- (20) Gizarajoak_i [e_{ij} domina bat jasoko duela] espero du.
 unfortunate-Det-E medal one get-Fut Aux(3A-3E)-C expect Aux (3A-3E)
 'The unfortunate expects that he/she will get a medal'

Interestingly, the presence of LDA in DP-Nominalizations forces Exhaustive Control rather than Partial Control. It presents all the OC characteristics displayed by regular DP-Nominalizations except the possibility of split antecedents. It disallows collective predicates (21), arbitrary readings (22) and Long Distance Control (23). (24) shows that PRO must be interpreted strictly under ellipsis. Finally, The *de-se* reading in (25) is not a possible interpretation under the situation about the amnesiac described above.

- (21) *Jonek_i [PRO_{it} artikuluak elkarrekin egitea] lortu ditu.
 Jon-E article-Det.pl-A together make-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3.pl-A-3E)
 'John has managed to write the articles together'
- (22) *Jonek [PRO_{arb} ogiak egitea] lortu ditu.
 Jon-E bread-Det.pl-A make-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3.pl-A-3E)
 'Jon has managed to make breads'
- (23) *Jonek_i pentsatzen du Mariak_j lortu dituela [PRO_i liburuak idaztea].
 Jon-E think Aux (3A-3E) Mary-E manage Aux (3.pl-A-3E) -C book-Det.
 pl-A write-Nom-Det-A
 'John thinks that Mary managed to write the books'
- (24) Jonek_i [e_i artikuluak idaztea] lortu ditu eta Itziarrek ere bai.
 Jon-E article.Det.pl-A write-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A.pl-3E) and Itziar-E
 also yes
 'Jon has managed to write the articles and Itziar also (has managed to write the articles)'
- (25) Gizarajoak_i [e_i domina asko jasotzea] espero ditu.
 unfortunate-Det-E medal many get-Nom-Det-A expect Aux (3.pl-A-3E)
 'The unfortunate expects to get many medals'

To summarize, the standard belief that the embedded phonetically null subject of DP-Nominalizations is a free null pronominal (*pro*) is not correct. I have shown that these structures involve Partial Control: they display all the traditional OC properties plus the permissiveness of split antecedents with collective predicates. Thus, the

embedded subject should be represented as PRO_{i+} rather than *pro* (26). In contrast, the presence of LDA in DP-Nominalizations triggers genuine control or Exhaustive Control. In such instances, the embedded subject is PRO (27).

- (26) Jonek_i [PRO_{i+} ogia egitea] lortu du.
 Jon-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A-3E)
 'John has managed to make bread'
- (27) Jonek [PRO_{i+j} liburuak idaztea] lortu ditu.
 Jon-E book-Det.pl-A write-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A.pl-3E)
 'Jon has managed to write the books'

1.2. Reviewing DP-Nominalizations: obviation

The previous section has concluded that Basque DP-Nominalized infinitival complements license either PRO_{i+} or PRO rather than *pro* when the embedded subject is phonetically null. These restrictions in the interpretation of the embedded subjects are typical properties of subordination contexts. Another well-attested restriction that exists in many languages in such contexts is the existence of Obviation: the requirement that the embedded subject be disjoint in reference with respect to some matrix argument. This section investigates whether Obviation exists in Basque DP-nominalized dependants.³

Obviation is exemplified in Spanish sentence (28).

- (28) Juan_i ha conseguido que [$pro_{i/j}$ gane la partida].
 Juan has managed that he win-Subj. the game
 Lit. 'Juan has managed that he win the game'

Obviation typically arises in Subjunctive Complements. The blocking approach to Obviation (Farkas 1992, Hornstein & San Martin 2001, among others) claims that Obviation is due to the existence of another complement type in the language to express Control. In other words, the existence of Infinitives in a language blocks free reference in Subjunctives and forces obviation. This is the situation in Spanish, which contains infinitives (29). As expected, languages that lack infinitives display free reference rather than Obviation in Subjunctive complements. This is exemplified by Romanian (30).

- (29) Juan ha conseguido ganar la partida.
 Juan has managed win-INF the game
 'Juan has managed to win the game'
- (30) Ana_i vrea [ca ea_{i/j} să nina cu noi].
 Ana want.3sg C she Subj. come with us
 'Ana wants (her) to come with us' [Kempchinsky 1990]

³ Ortiz de Urbina (1989) describes that volitional predicates systematically induce Obviation in Nominalizations and coreference in Participial complements. However, not all dialects of Basque follow this pattern. Many dialects do not treat volitionals as special and they allow for Partial Control in Nominalizations.

San Martin (in press) in a synchronic and diachronic study of Obviation claims that Obviation is not directly related to whether a language contains genuine infinitival clauses or not but rather to the nature of the Left Periphery of the embedded clause in each language. In Basque Subjunctive clauses are selected by a few predicates (volitional) and they display Obviation (31).

- (31) Jonek_i [pro_j/hura_{i/j} etxera joan dadin] nahi du.
 Jon-E he/she home-to go Aux (3A.Subj) want Aux (3A-3E)
 'Jon wants him/her to go home'

Apart from the expected subjunctive clauses, Basque DP-Nominalizations also display Obviation. In fact, we find generalized Obviation in the sense that the disjoint reading is not dependent on whether the matrix predicate is volitional. For example, (32) shows that an overt pronominal in the embedded subject position must be disjoint in reference with respect to the matrix subject with predicate *lortu* 'manage'.

- (32) Jonek_i lortu du [hura_{i/j} gurekin etortzea].
 Jon-E manage Aux he/she with us come-Nom-Det-A
 Lit. 'Juan has managed he/she to come with us'

The fact that we find Partial Control when the embedded subject is phonetically null (33) (section 1.1.) and Obviation when it is lexically realized raises suspicions about the real binding status of the embedded subject position in DP-Nominalizations. In other words, one might wonder whether Obviation in (32) is the result of some Avoid Pronoun Principle. This hypothesis suggests that a lexical pronoun is preferably Obviative where a null controlled pronoun is licensed. Crucially, according to this view, Obviation arises just as a preferred reading and not as a genuine binding effect on the embedded subject.

- (33) Jonek_i lortu du [PRO_i gurekin etortzea].
 Jon-E manage Aux with us come-Nomin-Det-A
 Lit. 'Juan has managed to come with us'

However, there is a way to determine whether what we find in Basque DP-Nominalizations is genuine Obviation or a preferred Obviative reading. Let us compare two pro-drop languages, Basque and Romanian. In Romanian, although the preferred reading of the embedded lexical subject is Obviation, Control is also available (30). In contrast, in Basque, the embedded lexical pronoun can only be obviative and there is no room for coreference (32). From this we may conclude that Basque DP-Nominalized dependents display Obviation as other languages do in subordination contexts.

1.3. DP-Nominalizations are three-way ambiguous

Table 1 summarizes the results obtained so far. To start with, Non-DP Nominalizations invariably trigger Exhaustive Control properties. Contra the standard view, DP-Nominalizations involve Obligatory Control properties when the embedded subject is phonetically null (section 1.1.): Exhaustive Control in the presence of LDA or Partial Control without LDA. Besides, Obviation is also a generalized option for DP-Nominalizations, as argued in section 1.2. The correct representations of the embedded subjects are provided in (34-37) below.

Table 1

	Subject	LDA	Obligatory Control	Interpretation	Examples
Non-DP Nominalizations (tzen)	null	no	Exhaustive Control	PRO _i	(34)
DP-Nominal. (tzea)	null	no	Partial Control	PRO _{i+}	(35)
		yes	Exhaustive Control	PRO _i	(36)
	lexical	no	—	DP _j	(37)

- (34) a. Jon [PRO_i ogia egiten] saiatu da/*dira.
Jon-A bread-Det-A make-Nom-Loc try Aux(3A)
'Jon has tried to make bread'
- b. Nik_i Mariari_j [PRO_{i+}_j elkarrekin joaten] saiatu naizela esan diot.
I-E Mary-D together go-Nom-Loc try Aux-C say Aux (3A-3D-1E)
'I have told Mary that I have tried to go together'
- (35) a. Jonek_i [PRO_{i+} ogiak egitea] lortu du/*ditu.
Jon-E bread-Det.pl-A make-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A-3E)/(3A.pl-3E)
'John has managed to make bread'
- b. Nik_i Mariari_j [PRO_{i+}_j elkarrekin joatea] erabaki dudala esan diot.
I-E Mary-D together go-Nom-Det-A decide Aux-C say
Aux (3A-3D-1E)
'I have told Mary that I have decided to go together.'
- (36) a. Jonek_i [PRO_i artikuluak idaztea] lortu ditu.
Jon-E article-Det.pl-A write-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A.pl-3E)
'John has managed to write the articles'
- b. *Jonek_i [PRO_{i+} artikuluak elkarrekin egitea] lortu ditu.
Jon-E article-Det.pl-A together make-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A.pl-3E)
'John has managed to write the articles together'
- (37) Jonek_i [harek_j ogia egitea] lortu du/*ditu.
Jon-E he-E bread-Det-A make-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A-3E)/(3A.pl-3E)
Lit. 'John has managed he to make bread'

Leaving aside the structural conditions that license Partial Control,⁴ we find that PRO and lexical subjects are licensed in morphologically identical contexts (36-37).

⁴ See Landau (1999) for a proposal to derive the Partial Control effect.

In other words, PRO and lexical subjects are not in complementary distribution. This is a rather uncommon scenario across languages and quite surprising for Basque, since Exhaustive Control is a characteristic feature of non-DP Nominalizations (34). The relevant question is whether there is any structural difference between DP-Nominalizations that license lexical subjects and those that demand PRO (i.e., LDA contexts). The following section investigates into this matter.⁵

2. Degrees of defectiveness in Nominalized clauses

This section investigates into the properties of the Left Peripheries of DP-Nominalizations. DP-Nominalizations display an identical morphological shape in regular contexts and in contexts that display LDA. However, this section will show that, beyond this apparent similarity, the former are more complete than the latter in the sense that they contain the [person] feature, which is absent in contexts of Control. This conclusion supports the analysis about the distribution of PRO and lexical subjects in San Martín (2004), whereby lexical subjects are licensed in contexts that involve full Probes, i.e., those containing Tense as well as Person features.

The section is divided into two parts. The first part is a summary about the literature on Basque data regarding the complementary distribution of PRO and lexical subjects. The second part provides various types of evidence in favor of the completeness and the defectiveness of the left peripheries in licensing lexical subjects and PRO, respectively. These include issues related to Propositionality, Tense and the presence of the feature [person].

2.1. Complement clauses with Case: Basque, European Portuguese and English Gerunds

There is a persistent idea in the literature regarding the distribution of lexical subjects and PRO: the structures that license the latter are somehow more defective than the ones that license lexical subjects. In GB it was the opposition between finite and non-finite complements that explained the complementary distribution between lexical subjects and PRO. In the Minimalist context, Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2005), for example, maintains that both are licensed in CPs but that T in Control is more defective than the T that serves as the Probe for lexical DPs.

In the context of Basque Nominalizations, Ortiz de Urbina (1989) observes that lexical subjects are licensed in those infinitivals that bear some type of Case themselves. San Martín (2000) restricts the description and claims that only Nominalizations that participate in the case system (marked Absolutive, Dative or Ergative) license lexical subjects. This asymmetry is exemplified by (38-39): Unlike *try*-type predicates, *manage*-type predicates select for Nominalizations that participate in the Case system, as is reflected in the matrix Auxiliary.

- (38) Jon [PRO/*Mariak liburua idazten] saiatu da.
 Jon-A Mary-E book-Det-A write-Nom-Loc try Aux (3A)
 'John has tried to write the book'

⁵ Of course, if Control is syntactic, we expect that its licensing conditions are essentially the same in regular non DP-Nominalizations and in LDA contexts.

- (39) Jonek [Mariak liburua idaztea] lortu du.
 Jon-E Mary-E book-Det-A write-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A-3E)
 Lit. 'John has managed Mary to write the book'

This descriptive observation is not solely found in Basque. European Portuguese also employs infinitives that are somehow more complete when lexical subjects are licensed internally. These are the so called *inflected infinitives*, i.e., infinitives whose INFL displays some person agreement morphology that corresponds to the subject of the embedded clause. Raposo (1987) proposes that, only in such instances do lexical subjects get Case via transmission. In other words, embedded AGR assigns Case to the local subject only when AGR is itself Case marked. This takes place when there is an external case assigner for AGR (some predicate or preposition) but not otherwise (in EC contexts where PRO is involved). This asymmetry is exemplified in (40-41). Predicate *regret* (40) selects for an inflected infinitive, whereas the Exhaustive Control predicate *avoid* may only select for regular uninflected infinitives (41-42).

- (40) nos lamentamos [eles ter-em recibido pouco dinheiro].
 we regret they to-have-AGR received little money
 (41) Eles evitaram [salir]. (42) *Eles evitaram [salirem].
 They avoid.3pl go.out-INF They avoid.3pl go.out-INF
 'They avoided going out' 'They avoided going out'

Interestingly, a similar mechanism has been proposed for English gerunds (Reuland 1983, Pires 2001). The observation is that only Case marked gerund clauses license lexical subjects internally. This is shown by the contrast in (43-44) and (45). Unlike in (43-44), the clausal gerund in (45) is not in a case position and, hence, according to Pires, cannot license lexical subjects internally.

- (43) [John reading the book] was preferred.
 (44) I prefer [him reading the book].
 (45) *It is expected [John reading the book].

The property that Basque DP-Nominalizations, Portuguese inflected infinitives and English gerunds have in common is that in all such instances the embedded clause participates in the case system of the matrix predicate. These complement clauses are exceptional in the sense that regular clauses resist Case as was shown by Stowell (1981). In syntactic terms, we need to determine what it means for certain complement clauses to participate in the Case system as other DPs do and how this property of the mechanism licenses lexical subjects in dependant contexts.

San Martin & Uriagereka (2002) relate Structural Case with the person system. In fact, it is widely attested that predicates typically display person agreement only with elements that are marked with Structural Case, not with inherently marked arguments. The relation between the Case and the person systems is straightforward in Basque, which displays overt morphological reflexes of the relevant Case-person relations. Generalizing, San Martin (2004) concludes that the left periphery of the embedded clauses that participate in the Structural Case system is endowed with the feature [person]. Specifically, C, by virtue of containing Structural Case includes a [person] feature in it. Evidence for relating [person] to C comes from various languages where Complementizers display overt agreement morphology

with the subject itself as well as with the predicate, such as certain dialects of German and Dutch (Bayer 1984), West Flemish (Bennis and Haegeman 1990, 1992) and Irish (McCloskey 1992a).

2.2. Basque LDA: dependency and defectiveness

The LDA data that arises in DP-Nominalizations is, in principle, inconsistent with the observation that Structural Case/[person] feature in C renders the embedded clause Complete for licensing lexical subjects: contrary to the expectations, LDA contexts disallow lexical DPs and force PRO, as described in section 1.

- (46) Jonek_i [PRO_i ogiak egitea] lortu ditu.
 Jon-E bread-Det.pl-A make-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A.pl-3E)
 'John has managed to make breads'

This section investigates into the nature of DP-Nominalizations in regular and LDA contexts with the aim of revealing the precise property that is responsible for the complementary distribution between lexical DPs and PRO. The conclusion is that the left peripheries are distinct in various respects. I provide evidence showing that DP-Nominalizations that display LDA are more defective in that they lack [person]. Conversely, lexical DPs correlate with Complete C endowed with [person].

Although the embedded Nominalized clause looks morphologically identical in contexts that involve LDA and those that do not, certain syntactic effects reveal that they are distinct in nature. To start with, propositionality tests indicate that LDA does not correlate with Phase-like properties. This is shown by the contrast in displacement possibilities of the embedded clause in (47-49). Assuming that Propositionality tests indicate some degree of independence at the PF and LF interfaces, it is reasonable to conclude that LDA involves more dependent complement clauses than regular DP-Nominalizations without LDA.

- (47) a. *Rubenek zera(k) lortu ditu, [PRO ogiak erostea].
 Ruben-E what(pl.) manage Aux (3A.pl.3E) bread.pl.A buy-Nom.Det.A
 Lit. 'Ruben what has managed, breads to buy'
 b. Rubenek zera lortu du, [zuk ogiak erostea].
 Ruben-E what (sg.) manage Aux (3A.3E) bread.pl buy-Nom.Det.A
 Lit. 'Ruben what has managed, bread to buy'
- (48) a. *[Rubenek liburuak erretzea] da(dira) lortu dituzunak.
 Ruben-E books burn-Nom.Det-A is/are manage Aux (3A.pl.2E-relat.Det.pl).
 'Ruben to burn books is what you have obtained'
- b. [Rubenek liburuak erretzea] da lortu duzuna.
 Ruben-E books burn-Nom.Det-Ais manage Aux (3A.2E-relat.Det.).
 'Ruben to burn books is what you have obtained.'
- (49) a. *Rubenek lortu dituenak da(dira) [ogiak erostea].
 Ruben-E manage Aux (3A.pl.3E.Relat. Det.pl) is/are bread.pl.A
 buy.Nom-Det.A
 'What Ruben has managed to do is to buy the breads'

- b. Rubenek lortu duena da [Mariak ogiak erosteak].
 Ruben-E manage Aux (3A. 3E.Relat.Det) is Mary-E bread.pl.A buy.Nom-Det.A

‘What Ruben has managed to do is to buy the breads.’

The reason why the LDA data are not compatible with displacement of the embedded clause cannot be the mismatch in number agreement between the matrix Auxiliary (which shows plural number in LDA) and the Nominalized clause. Notice that, unlike other Nominalizations that involve arbitrary subjects (50), nominalizations in complement position do not contain Number. This is exemplified in (51), where the coordination of two Nominalized clauses never triggers plural agreement in the matrix Auxiliary.

- (50) Apezpikuak [elizararian jolastea] eta [dantza lotuan aritzea] debekatu ditu.
 bishop-E church.front-Loc play-Nom-Det-A and dance-Det.A tie-Loc engage.in-Nom.Det-A prohibit Aux (3A.pl-3E)
 ‘The Bishop has prohibited to play in the front of the church and to dance’
- (51) Jonak [kalera joatea] eta [liburua erosteak] lortu du/*ditu.
 Jon-E street-to go-Nom-Det-A and book-Det-A buy-Nom-Det-A manage Aux (3A-3E)/ /Aux (3A.pl-3E)
 ‘Jon has managed to go out and buy the book’

Second, the Tense properties of DP-Nominalizations also show that LDA contexts are more dependent than non-LDA counterparts. As Etxepare (2005) notes, the presence of LDA has an effect on the temporal properties of the DP-nominal clause: the temporal modifier is anchored to the speech Time in regular DP-Nominalizations (52) but this is not a possible temporal relation in contexts of LDA, which only accept structures where the embedded tense is a dependent tense, as is exemplified in (53).

- (52) [Bihar/bi egun barru liburu batzuk saltzea] pentsatu genuen.
 tomorrow/two days in book some sell-Nom.Det.A plan Aux (1pl.E-3.sg.A)
 ‘We decided to buy some books within two days from now/tomorrow’
- (53) *[Bihar/bi egun barru liburu batzuskaltzea] pentsatugenuen.
 tomorrow/two days in book some sell-Nom.Det.A plan Aux (1pl.E-3.pl.A)
 ‘We decided to buy some books within two days from now/tomorrow’

The final evidence in favor of the idea that LDA induces more defective complement clauses comes from the use of the Demonstrative. DP-Nominalizations are headed by the Determiner. However, in standard Basque, it is assumed that certain types of nominalizations admit the Demonstrative *hori* (that) instead. These are nominalizations in the subject position of the matrix predicate (54), infinitivals which involve Arbitrary Control (55) and certain infinitival complements of factive predicates (56). DP-Nominalizations complements to other predicates do not allow the use of the Demonstrative (57). The examples are from Zabala and Odriozola (1996).

- (54) [Miren egunero berandu heltze hori] parkaezina da.
 Miren.A every day late come that.A unforgivable is
 ‘That business of Mary coming late every day is unforgivable’

- (55) [PRO_{arb} egunero bi pakete erretze hori] kaltegarria da.
 every day two packets smoke that.A harmful is
 'That business of smoking two packets of cigarettes every day is harmful'
- (56) Gorroto dut [Jonek jakin gabe hitz egite hori].
 hate Aux (3sg.A.1sg.E) Jon-E know without word make that.A
 'I hate Jon speaking without knowing what he's talking about'
- (57) *[Jonek astiro hitz egite hori] nahi dut.
 Jon-E slowly word make that.A want Aux (3sg.A.1sg.E)
 'I want that business of Jon speaking slowly'

However, at the dialectal and idiolectal level, it seems that the use of the demonstrative is more extended, especially among the younger generations (p.c. Etxepare). For example, in the Eastern Biscayan dialects apart from the use of the Determiner (58), speakers admit the Demonstrative in DP-Nominalizations as complements of predicates such as 'manage' (59). Interestingly, the Demonstrative is not accepted in Parallel contexts with LDA (61), only the Determiner (60).

- (58) Rubenek [Mariak bi artikulu idaztea] lortu du.
 Ruben-E Mary-E two article write-Nom.Det.A manage Aux (3A-3E)
 Lit. 'Ruben has managed Mary to write two articles'
- (59) Rubenek [Mariak bi artikulu idazte hori] lortu du.
 Ruben-E Mary-E two article write-Nom.Dem.A manage Aux (3A-3E)
 Lit. 'Ruben has managed Mary to write two articles'
- (60) Rubenek [PRO bi artikulu idaztea] lortu ditu.
 Ruben-E two article write-Nom.Det.A manage Aux (3.pl.A-3E)
 'Ruben has managed to write two articles'
- (61) *Rubenek [PRO bi artikulu idazte hori] lortu ditu.
 Ruben-E two article write-Nom.Dem.A manage Aux (3.pl.A-3E)
 'Ruben has managed to write two articles'

The incompatibility between the Demonstrative and LDA (61) cannot be attributed to Number mismatch between the embedded clause and the matrix Auxiliary, which displays plural number agreement. In fact, parallel to DP-Nominalizations headed by the Determiner in (51) above, DP-Nominalizations headed by the demonstrative do not contain Number. Thus, such coordinated nominalizations never trigger plural agreement in the matrix Auxiliary, as is shown by (62).

- (62) *Rubenek [PRO ogiak saltze hori] eta [PRO pastak eroste hori] lortu ditu.
 Ruben-E bread.Det.pl sell-Nom.Dem and cookie.Det.pl buy-Nom-Dem
 manage Aux (3A.pl.3E)
 Lit. 'Ruben has managed (that business of) selling breads and buying cookies'

To summarize, certain Basque speakers admit the use of the Demonstrative in regular DP-Nominalizations in a generalized way, but systematically disallow it in the presence of LDA. This phenomenology that exists at a dialectal/idiolectal level may reveal an interesting asymmetry in the system. In fact, the Demonstrative is closely related to [person] in Basque, since third person pronouns and Demonstratives are homophonous. Thus, it is reasonable to suggest that the Demonstrative in

the Left periphery of the embedded DP-Nominalization is endowed with [person] only in regular DP-Nominalizations and not in contexts involving LDA. If correct, this supports the general idea in San Martin (2004) for accounting for the distribution of lexical subjects vs. PRO. The former are allowed with a Complete Probe including the feature [+person], whereas PRO is licensed in defective domains that contain a deficient Probe [-person].

3. Conclusion

This paper has investigated into the nature of Basque Nominalized clauses in complement position. I have made two central claims: one, regarding the complexity of DP-Nominalizations and the other related to the complementary distribution of PRO and lexical DPs in Nominalized clauses.

The idea that Basque DP-nominalizations involve a free empty pronominal (pro) in the embedded subject position is an oversimplification. These clauses are ambiguous among various types of structures. In fact, rather than free reference, they display the typical restrictions that arise in Subordination contexts in natural languages: Partial Control, Exhaustive Control and Obviation.

In Basque the asymmetry Structural Case vs. Non Structural Case on the Nominalized clause systematically correlates with lexical subjects vs. PRO, respectively. Surprisingly, the LDA phenomenon that arises in DP-Nominalizations forces Control (PRO). Rather than being an exception to the system, further inquiry into LDA reveals an interesting general property of the system: only those Nominalizations whose C is endowed with [person] are capable of Probing lexical subjects. In contrast, PRO correlates with defective Domains that lack this feature.

References

- Arregi, K. & G. Molina-Azaola, 2004, "Restructuring in Basque and the Theory of Agreement", in G. Garding and M. Tsujimura (eds.) *Proceeding of WCCFL23*, Cascadilla Press, Sommersville, 101-114.
- Artiagoitia, X., 1994, "Verbal projection in Basque and Minimal Structure", *ASJU* 28: 2, 339-504.
- , 2002, "The Functional Structure of Basque NPs", in X. Artiagoitia et al. (eds.), 73-90.
- , 2004, "Izen Sintagmaren Birziklatzea: Izen Sintagmatik Izen Sintagmaren inguruko Bueretara", in P. Albizu & B. Fernandez (eds.), *Euskal Gramatika XXI. mendearen atarian: arazo zaharrak, azterbide berriak*, 13-38.
- , P. Goenaga & J. A. Lakarra, (eds.), 2002, *Erramu Boneta. Frstschrift for R. P. G. de Rijk*, Supplements of *ASJU* 44, UPV/EHU, Bilbao.
- Bayer, J., 1984, "COMP in Bavarian syntax", *The Linguistic Review* 3, 209-274.
- Bennis, H. & L. Haegeman, 1984, "On the Status of Agreement and Relative Clauses in West-Flemish", in W. de Geest, Y. Putseys & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Sentential Complementation: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at UFSAL*, Foris, Dordrecht, 33-53.
- Borer, H., 1989, "Anaphoric AGR", in O. Jaeggli & K. J. Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Parameter*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 69-109.
- Chomsky, N., 2000, "Minimalist Inquiries: the Framework", in R. Martin & J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by Step: Papers in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 89-147.

- , 2001, “Derivation by Phase”, in M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: a Life in Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1-52.
- , 2005, “On Phases”, Ms. MIT.
- Elordieta, A., 2002, “The Role of Verbal Agreement in Licensing Null Arguments”, in P. Albizu & B. Fernandez (eds.), *Kasu eta Komunztaduraren gainean. On Case and Agreement*, EHU, Bilbao.
- Ettxepare, R., 2003, “Urruneko Komunztadura eta menpeko infinitiboak euskaraz”, *Lapur-dum* VIII, 167-206.
- , 2006, “Long Distance Agreement in Substandard Basque”, *ASJU* XL: 1-2, 303-350.
- Farkas, D., 1992, “On Obviation” in I. Sag and A. Szabolsci (eds.), *Lexical Matters*, CSLI, Stanford CA, 85-109.
- Finer, D. L., 1984, *The Formal Grammar of switch-reference*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Goenaga, P., 1984, *Euskal Sintaxia: komplementazioa eta Nominalizazioa*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of the Basque Country.
- Hornstein, N., 2000, *Move! A Minimalist theory of Construal*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- , & I. San Martin, 2001, “Obviation as Anti-Control”, *ASJU* XXXV-1, 367-384.
- Kempchinsky, P., 1990, “Más sobre el efecto de referencia disjunta del subjuntivo”, in Bosque, I. (eds.), *Indicativo y Subjuntivo*, Taurus, Madrid, 234-258.
- Landau, I., 2001, *Elements of Control*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- McCloskey, J., 1996, “On the Scope of Verb Movement in Irish”, *NLLT* 14: 1, 47-104.
- Ormazabal, J., 1995, *The Syntax of Complementation: on the connection between Syntactic structure and selection*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Ortiz de Urbina, J., 1989, *Parameters in the grammar of Basque*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- , 2006, “Nominalizazioak eta Modua: aukera bikoitzeko predikatuak”, in B. Fernández & I. Laka (eds.), *Andolin Gogoan. Essays in Honour of Professor Eguzkitza*, UPV/EHU, Bilbao.
- Oyarcabal, B., 2003, “Tense, aspect and Mood”, in J. I. Hualde & J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *A Grammar of Basque*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 249-284.
- Pires, A., 2001, *The syntax of Gerunds and Infinitives: Subjects, Case and Control*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland at College Park.
- Raposo, E., 1987, “Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: The Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese”, *LI* 18, 85-109.
- San Martin, I., 2000, “Control in Basque”, *Proceedings of WCCFL19*, Cascadilla Press.
- , 2004, *On Subordination and the Distribution of PRO*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Maryland at College Park.
- , in press, “Beyond the Infinitive vs. Subjunctive Rivalry: surviving changes in Mood”, in L. Eguren & O. Fernández Soriano (eds.), *Issues in Syntax and Interpretation: Coreference, Scope and Focus*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.
- , & J. Uriagereka, 2002, “Infinitival Complementation in Basque”, in Artiagoitia et al. (eds.), 597-610.
- Stowell, T., 2001, *Origins of Phrase Structure*, Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge MA.
- Uriagereka, J., 2001, “Some concepts and questions regarding the I system”, *ASJU* XXXV: 1, 1-28.
- Zabala, I. and J. C. Odriozola, 1996, “On the Relation between DP and TP. The Structure of Basque Infinitivals”, *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 5: 2, 231-281.