THE SYNTAX OF *-(K)I,* A BASQUE PREPOSITION[1]

Beatriz FERNÁNDEZ

Universidad del País Vasco / Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea

beatriz.fernandezf@ehu.eus

Abstract

In this paper, we aim at analyzing the Basque inflectional morpheme *-(k)i* called *dative flag* after Trask (1997). We will propose this morpheme *-(k)i* to be an applicative head, as suggested in Elordieta (2001) or Rezac (2006) among others. Moreover, we will propose this applicative to be an incorporated preposition in the spirit of Trask (1981: 289). The idea of *-(k)i* being an applicative/incorporated preposition can be combined with both the derivational account for applicatives (Baker 1988) and the base-generation analysis (McGinnis 1988), developed also for Basque.

Nonetheless, the applicative/incorporated preposition analysis of *-(k)i* departs considerably from the typological definition of Bantu applicatives. Actually, the presence of *-(k)i* is more pervasive in Basque than applicatives in Bantu languages, as it is attested in both differential object marking (Odria 2014) (vs. Bantu languages, Bresnan & Mchombo 1988) and allocutives (Oyharçabal 1993; Haddican 2015).

Although this paper will not give an alternative analysis to those already developed in Basque, it aims at raising some questions on the nature of *-(k)i* that might have consequences in the general discussion on applicatives.

LA SINTAXIS DE *-(K)I,* UNA PREPOSICIÓN INCORPORADA

Resumen

En este artículo, analizaremos el morfema inflexional vasco *-(k)i*, conocido como *dative flag* (Trask 1997). El análisis se basará en dos hipótesis fundamentales. Por una parte, que dicho morfema es un aplicativo, tal y como habían sugerido previamente Elordieta (2001) y Rezac (2006) entre otros. Por otra parte, que dicho aplicativo es una preposición incorporada (Trask 1981: 289). Este análisis es compatible tanto con la aproximación derivacional a los aplicativos (Baker 1988) como con la que defiende la generación en la base (McGinnis 1988), ambas desarrolladas también en euskera.

Sin embargo, el análisis de *-(k)i* como aplicativo/preposición incorporada dista considerablemente de la definición tipológica de los aplicativos bantúes. En general, la presencia de *-(k)i* es más predominante que los aplicativos en lenguas bantúes ya que se manifiesta tanto en instancias de marcado de caso diferencial (Odria 2014) (vs lenguas bantúes, Bresnan & Mchombo 1988) como en alocutivos (Oyharçabal 1993; Haddican 2015)

Aunque este artículo no propondrá un análisis alternativo a los ya desarrollados en euskera, aspira a poner de manifiesto ciertas cuestiones sobre la naturaleza de *-(k)i* que podrían tener consecuencias en la discusión general sobre los aplicativos.

Palabras clave

inflexión verbal vasca, dative flag, aplicativo/preposición incorporada, doblado de clítico

Introduction

In this paper, we will analyze the Basque inflectional morpheme *-(k)i* called *dative flag* after Trask (1997). Whenever this morpheme *-(k)i* appears in the inflected verbal form, a dative object is added to the structure. This morpheme appears mostly to the left of the root and precedes the dative clitic. Besides, it is generalized across Basque varieties with some morphological variation, but no syntactic differences.

This morpheme *-(k)i* has been theoretically analyzed as an applicative head (Elordieta 2001; Rezac 2006; Fernández 2012; 2015) introducing datives. In this paper, we will assume this hypothesis. Nevertheless, two main approaches have been proposed in order to account for applicatives: the derivational one in Baker (1988) and the base-generation analysis in McGinnis (1998) and Pylkkänen (2002/2008). These two main hypotheses have been also explored and developed for Basque datives: the

former in Albizu (1998, 2001) and Ormazabal & Romero (2015), and the latter in Oyharçabal (2010) among others.

-(K)i can be also analyzed as preposition in the spirit of Trask (1981: 289). This hypothesis is reminiscent of and compatible with Baker's, as he proposes the applicative head to be the realization of an incorporated preposition. On the other hand, the idea of *-(k)i* being a preposition is harder to explain in base-generation analyses of applicatives, as Oyharçabal's. Nevertheless, we can take *-(k)i* to be a preposition even in this second scenario: Merged in two different positions, and arising as an applicative above the verb or as a preposition below (Rezac 2006). Thus, in this paper, we will claim *-(k)i* to be both an applicative and a preposition.

Nevertheless, the Appl/P analysis of *-(k)i* departs considerably from the typological definition of Bantu applicatives. Broadly speaking, the presence of *-(k)i* is more pervasive in Basque than applicatives in Bantu languages. For instance, *-(k)i* is attested in Basque *differential object marking* (Odria 2014, in progress), but no applicative strategy is available for the same phenomenon in Bantu languages (Bresnan & Mchombo 1988). Besides, *-(k)i* introduces non-argumental clitics as allocutives (Oyharçabal 1993; Haddican 2015).

Besides, constructions containing *-(k)i* resemble *clitic doubling constructions*, as those attested in Romance languages such as Spanish (Jaeggli 1982, 1986). As the matter of fact, *-(k)i* is amazingly similar to Spanish P *a* and places Basque in a syntactic scenario closer to neighbor languages such as Spanish than to distant languages such as Kynyarwanda.

Although this paper will not give an alternative analysis to those already developed in Basque, it aims at raising some questions on the nature of *-(k)i* that might have consequences in the general discussion on Appls.

This paper will be structured as follows. In section 1, the P *-(k)i* will be introduced and the Appl-analysis of Basque datives will be discussed; in section 2, the basic facts on *-(k)i* will be presented; in section 3, *-(k)i* constructions and clitic doubling constructions will be compared; applicative constructions will be briefly presented in section 4.1 and a discussion on the applicative analysis of *-(k)i* will be provided in section 4.2. Section 5 will shortly present a hint and some consequences of the analysis

of *-(k)i* constructions as clitic doubling constructions. The sixth and last section will present the main conclusions.

1. *-(K)i,* a preposition introducing dative clitics

Basque dative clitics are immediately preceded by a morpheme *-(k)i* known as *dative flag* after Trask (1997: 227).[2] Whenever this morpheme *-(k)i* appears, a dative clitic also arises in the inflected verbal form. Therefore, (1a) is grammatical as it shows both the morpheme *-(k)i* and the first person singular dative clitic *-t.* On the other hand, (1b, c) are both ungrammatical, since the former shows the morpheme *-(k)i* without the subsequent dative clitic and the latter exhibits the dative clitic without the morpheme *-(k)i.*

(1)   a.   d-a-tor-ki-t[3]

                   TM-TM-come-KI-1sgDAT

                   '(S)he/it comes to me.'

         b.   *d-a-tor-ki

                   TM-TM -come-KI

         c.   *d-a-tor-t

                   TM-TM-come-1sgDAT

This morpheme *-(k)i* has been theoretically analyzed as an applicative (Appl) head (Elordieta 2001; Rezac 2006; Fernández 2012; 2015) introducing datives. In this paper, we will assume this hypothesis. Nevertheless, the Appl-analysis of Basque datives has been explored from at least two different (and opposite) perspectives that

---

[2] This morpheme has also been called *affixe pré-datif* (Rebuschi 1984: 617) and *dative pre-suffix* (Hualde 2003: 201, 210).

[3] The following abbreviations will be used in this paper: ABS = absolutive; ALLO = allocutive; Appl = applicative; ASP = aspect; DAT = dative; BEN = benefactive; DP = determiner phrase; epen = epenthetic vowel; ERG = ergative; FAM = familiar; FEM = feminine; PAST = past; MAS = masculine; P = preposition, postposition; PP = preposition, postposition phrase; pl = plural; sg = singular; TM = tesnse/mode; TR = transitive; vow = vowel; 1-2-3 = first, second and third person.

84

are intrinsically linked to the syntactic nature of Basque datives, that is, determiner phrases (DP) or postpositional phrases (PP).

The former can be represented by Elordieta (2001). Elordieta convincingly showed that Basque datives are DPs. One of the main arguments in favor of this DP-hypothesis is the obligatory presence of a dative clitic in the finite verbal form, preceded by *-(k)i*, contrary to PPs that show neither clitic nor *-(k)i* in the inflection. Elordieta also showed that constructions with ditransitive verbs of the *eman* 'give' type including datives are *double object constructions* (DOC) as those in English –see also Montoya (1998). However, contrary to English, there is no Basque P-construction alternating with DOCs in her approach. Thus, for Elordieta, datives are DPs with no exception and not related to PPs. Also, Elordieta's intuition is captured in base-generation approaches to applicatives, as in Oyharçabal (2010) mainly based on Pylkkänen (2002/2008) – see also Fernández & Ortiz de Urbina (2010) for a discussion. In Pylkkänen's approach, the Appl construction and the P construction do not share the same base-generation – see also, McGinnins (1998) and Anagnostopoulou (2003).

The latter is the derivational approach inspired by Baker's (1988) analysis of Bantu applicatives. The derivational analysis of Basque datives is defended by Albizu (1998, 2001). In his approach, as in Elordieta's, Basque datives accompanied by dative clitics are DPs. Nevertheless, Albizu shows that some datives are not always accompanied by dative clitics, such as goal-datives in causatives. With regards to these datives, Albizu claims that they are no DPs but PPs. Thus, the P-like behavior of these datives is due to their derivational DP nature: these datives are derived from the incorporation of a P (and its object) to the verb. Therefore, for Albizu, the source of Basque datives is always P and the incorporation of this P (and its object) to the verb gives rise to an applicative construction. This perspective is also developed by Albizu and Fernández (2006), Arregi (2003) and Arregi and Ormazabal (2003) and Ormazabal & Romero in a recent paper (2015). In this approach, an Appl construction alternates with a prepositional one and the alternation arises as a consequence of the preposition (P) being or not incorporated: if P incorporates, then an Appl construction is available; if not, then only the prepositional construction is present.

There is an alternative analysis of *-(k)i* as a preposition, in the spirit of Trask (1981: 289). Trask claims that *-(k)i* is a P, as it always precedes pronominal elements and assigns a particular case, i.e. the dative. As the matter of fact, *-(k)i* invariably precedes dative clitics. The analysis of *-(k)i* as a P is reminiscent of the derivational analysis of Basque applicatives. If *-(k)i* is an incorporated P, then it is an applicative too, as proposed by Baker for Bantu languages and extended by Albizu to Basque. Actually, Trask explicitly mentions the incorporation of Ps into verbs in languages such as Amharic and the Munda languages of North India. Therefore, the two hypotheses, i.d., *-(k)i* as an Appl or as a P are not necessarily exclusive of one another, at least from this perspective.

On the other hand, the analysis of *-(k)i* as a P seems to be more difficult to assume in a base-generation analysis of Basque datives, such as Oyharçabal (2010). In this approach, as the (non derivational) DP nature of datives is claimed, the presence of a P is harder to explain. Nevertheless, the relationship between Appl and P is not necessarily denied in this second scenario. In particular, it has been suggested that P and Appl are the same element, Merged with the object directly and then the whole with the verb (that is, P), versus Merged above the verb and selecting the object in its specifier (Appl) (see Rezac 2006, chapter 3, section 6).

In this paper, we will assume *-(k)i* to be an Appl/P. The presence of this Appl/P can be assumed in both Appl-analyses of *-(k)i*. Nonetheless, as we will see, the Appl/P analysis of *-(k)i* departs considerably from the typological definition of Bantu applicatives and hides some aspects that might be crucial for the proper understanding of Appls in general and *-(k)i* in particular. Generally speaking, the presence of *-(k)i* is more prevalent than the (incorporated) P in Bantu Appl constructions. Actually, it is attested in Basque *differential object marking (DOM)* (Odria 2014, in progress). This is a striking fact, as the Bantu strategy for DOM is not Appl, but agreement (Bresnan & Mchombo 1988). Moreover, *-(k)i* introduces non-argumental clitics as allocutives (Oyharçabal 1993; Haddican 2015). Therefore, if *-(k)i* is Appl, then it does not necessarily follow the genuine typological definition of Appls of the Bantu type.

Far from providing the reader with an alternative analysis to the Appl/P that goes beyond our limits, this paper aims at presenting *-(k)i* and making some questions that

may be answered in future studies.

2. Basic facts on *-(k)i*

The Basque P *-(k)i* is attested from the earliest texts and generalized across dialects with no exception. Besides, the presence of this preposition is not restricted to synthetic verbal forms, consisting of a single inflected verbal word with no auxiliary, like those in (1) above and (2) bellow, as it is also present in analytical ones, constituted by a participle and by an inflected auxiliary, as those in (3) – for a detailed description of Basque synthetic and analytic verbal forms, see Hualde (2003). Moreover, P *-(k)i* is both attested in intransitive and transitive forms – (2a, 3a) and (2b, 3b), respectively.

(2)   a.   d-a-tor-ki-t

                   TM-TM-come-P-1sgDAT

                   '(S)he/it comes to me.'

         b.   d-a-kar-ki-t

                   TM-TM-bring-P-1sgDAT-(3sgERG)

                   '(S)he/it brings her/him/it to me.'

(3)   a.   etorri   z-a-i-t

                   come.ASP   TM-TM-(be)-P-1sgDAT

                   '(S)he/it has come to me.'

         b.   ekarri   d-i-t

                   bring.ASP   TM-(have)-P-1sgDAT-(3sgERG)

                   '(S)he/it has brought her/him/it to me.'

These *-(k)i* constructions show an added argument to their counterparts without *-(k)i*. In the examples in (4), we can see both the intransitive form with no *-(k)i* in (4a) and its bivalent counterpart with it in (4b). On the other hand, a transitive form with no *-(k)i* is attested in (5a) whereas its correspondent ditransitive form with *-(k)i* is available in (5b). Thus, whenever we have *-(k)i*, a new argument is available in the

structure giving rise to bivalent intransitive and ditransitive configurations (Etxepare, 2003; Fernández & Ortiz de Urbina 2010) – compare (4a, 5a) to (4b, 5b).

(4)   a.   d-a-tor

                        TM-TM-come

                        '(S)he/it comes.'

      b.   d-a-tor-ki-t

                        TM-TM-come-P-1sgDAT

                        '(S)he/it comes to me.'

(5)   a.   d-a-kar

                        TM-TM-bring-P-(3sgERG)

                        '(S)he/it brings her/him/it .'

      b.   d-a-kar-ki-t

                        TM-TM-bring-P-1sgDAT-(3sgERG)

                        '(S)he/it brings her/him/it to me.'

Besides, as can be observed in the examples presented so far, P *-(k)i* can be morphologically realized by both *-ki* or *-i*. This allomorphy becomes even more complex, when dialectal data are observed, as *-ts* or *-k* are also available – see Lafon (1980 [1944], 1999 [1961]) and Fernández (2012). For instance, the Western counterparts to the Central and Standard *dakarkit* (2b) and *ekarri dit* (3b) are the following forms, with *-ts* (instead of *-ki*):

(6)   a.   d-a-kar-(t)s-t

                        TM-TM-bring-P-1sgDAT

                        '(S)he/it brings her/him/it to me.'

      b.   ekarri   d-e-u-(t)s-t

                        bring.ASP   TM-TM-(have)-P-1sgDAT

                        '(S)he/it has brought her/him/it to me.'

Leaving aside the great morphological variation of Basque verbal forms, we want to suggest that *-(k)i* might be a complex P morphologically decomposable into two elements, both surely Ps: on the one side *-ts* or *-k,* and on the other side, *-i*. Indeed,

88

when Trask (1981: 289) suggests the prepositional nature of *-(k)i,* he is referring to *-k* and *-ts*, and not to *-i* itself. Although a more refined analysis of *-(k)i* would be desirable, for the time being, I will take *-(k)i* to be syntactically a single P. This P is a syntactically active head, and not a historical vestige of an ancient preposition, as suggested by Trask.

Besides, although there is some agreement in relating *-(k)i* to *-ts* after Trask, some linguists depart from the analysis of the *i* attested in ditransitive finite forms (such as *dit* in example 3b) as the same morpheme preceding dative clitics. As the matter of fact, this *i* morpheme has also been analyzed as a root of *eman* 'give' in most historical approaches to Basque verbal inflection (see for instance, Lakarra 2008), even in the most recent ones (see Ariztimuño 2013, 2014 and Mounole 2015, among others). This perspective has some consequences in auxiliary selection, as there is accepted to be not two auxiliaries, i.e. *izan* 'be' and **edun* 'have', as generally assumed in Basque linguistics, but three, including the so-called *ditransitive auxiliary *i* 'give'. Moreover, historical linguistics assume ditransitive auxiliaries to be not only **i* 'give' but also **edutsi* (Trask 1995) and **eradun* (Gómez & Sainz 1995). Actually, the finite analytical verbal form in (6b) is alternatively analyzed by some authors as a ditransitive **edutsi* form. As we have previously shown, we depart from this analysis and assume *ekarri deust* in (6b) to be a form of the same transitive auxiliary **edun* 'have', as can be noticed by the presence of the vowel *u* of the root, along with the P *ts* under discussion. Even the existence of **eradun*, the third alleged ditransitive auxiliary is controversial. This reconstructed **eradun* is supposed to give rise to forms such as *ekarri derautzut*, the (historical) Eastern counterpart to the Western (5b). Nevertheless, it seems more plausible to analyze *de-ra-u-t-zu-t* as a form including a causative *ra*, the transitive root *u*, and a P *ts* preceding the dative clitic *zu* (this form might be paraphrased as *I have made you to have*). Thus, once again, it is P which introduces the dative clitic (and not the causative itself, as one might speculate) – for further details and discussion, see Fernández 2012 and references therein. Besides, the combination of a causative and a preposition is not so surprising, as also attested in Spanish with causative *hacer* plus a P *a*, similarly to many other languages. Even in the best-case scenario, the existence of three ditransitive auxiliaries is controversial. In our

opinion, the hypothesis of a transitive auxiliary *have* combined with a P instead of three different ditransitive auxiliaries is, with no doubts, more elegant and parsimonious.

3. The P -*(k)i* and dative -*i* in seemingly clitic doubling constructions

The dative clitic introduced by P -*(k)i* is invariably doubled by a full DP in argument position, resembling a *clitic doubling* construction (Jaeggli 1982 and 1986, among many others; see Anagnostopoulou 2006, for an overview).

(7) a. Niri   d-a-tor-ki-t

       I.DAT   TM-TM-come-P-1sgDAT

       '(S)he/it comes to me.'

    b. Niri   d-a-kar-ki-t

       I.DAT   TM-TM-bring-P-1sgDAT-(3sgERG)

       '(S)he/it brings her/him/it to me.'

Also, in Basque seemingly clitic doubling constructions, the doubled DP with a strong pronoun *ni* 'I' shows a morpheme -*i* generally considered to be a dative case and not a postposition marking a PP (see Elordieta 2001 for a detailed discussion and Albizu 2001, for an alternative analysis of some of these datives as PPs). With regards to this morpheme -*i*, its morphological similarity with -*(k)i* is beyond any doubt: -*i* marks the strong first person singular pronoun whereas -*(k)i* marks the weak one. Despite this similarity, we will assume -*(k)i* to be a P and -*i* to be a (dative) case marker, and not an adposition in contexts as those in (6).[4]

Alternatively, assuming that the examples in (7) were actually exponents of a clitic doubling construction, the presence of a P-marked DP doubling the dative clitic would not be a surprising fact, as according to Kayne's Generalization (Jaeggli 1982), the presence of a P is the requirement for an object to be doubled, as happens to be in

---

[4] Maybe the morphological more complex nature of -*(k)i* decomposable in both -*(k)* and -*i* might be the key to distinguish one from the other. I will leave this issue for further research.

90

Spanish, but also in other Romance languages like Romanian and Semitic languages among others.

(8)	a.	Le	he	dado	un libro	a Juan
		Cl.DAT	have	give	a book	to John

'*I have given a book to John.*'

	b.	*Le	he	dado	un libro	Juan
		Cl.DAT	have	give	a book	John

In (8a) the presence of the P *a* preceding the indirect object *Juan* gives rise to a clitic doubling construction; on the other hand, in (8b), the presence of the dative clitic is blocked, as no P is attested. This is a systematic fact in Spanish. Besides, the clitic doubling construction alternates with a no-doubling construction, where only the *a-* marked DP is attested.

(9)	He	dado	un libro	a Juan
	have	give	a book	to John

'*I have given a book to John.*'

Thus, the hypothesis of *-i* being an adposition, as in Albizu (2001) might be considered too. Nevertheless, if *-i* were an adposition, then two adpositions would be available in the structure: the one preceding the pronominal element and the other one following the full DP. In contrast, as far as we know, there is no P preceding and case-marking the clitic in languages with double object constructions but a sole P preceding and marking the full DP. This is something to explore, as it is not only an observational fact but an issue with theoretical consequences.

Also, structures like (8a) and (9) have been analyzed as the Spanish counterpart to the structures involved in English dative alternation: whereas (8a) resembles the double object construction, (9) corresponds to the English prepositional ditransitive construction with *to* (Demonte 1995; Romero 1997). Likewise, Basque shows similar structures to those in Spanish, as shown in the following examples.

(10) a. Joni liburua eman d-i-o-t

John.DAT a book give.ASP TM-(have)-P-3sgDAT-1sgERG

'I have given a book to John.'

b. *Jon liburua eman diot

John a book give.ASP TM-(have)-P-3sgDAT-1sgERG

c. */✓Liburua eman dut Joni

a book give.ASP TM-(have)-1sgERG John.DAT

The first example (10a) corresponds to the clitic doubling construction, which is generally assumed to be a double object construction after Elordieta (2001). The second one, (10b), is ungrammatical (with no dialectal exception), as expected, since Jon lacks the dative; the third and last one (10c) shows a dative phrase with neither *-(k)i* nor dative clitic. This construction is ungrammatical in most of Basque dialects (Western, Central and Standard Basque), contrary to its Spanish counterpart in (9). Nevertheless, it is accepted in North-eastern dialects, where dative clitics and their preceding P *-(k)i* do not necessarily appear in sentences with an *-i*-marked DP (an indirect object in our example (9c)). Some authors have suggested (10c) to be the Basque (dialectal) counterpart to the English prepositional construction with *to* (Etxepare & Oyharçabal 2009).

Ditransitive constructions such as (10a) have been extensively discussed in Basque linguistics. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that *-(k)i*'s (and the subsequent clitic's) analysis cannot be restricted to such constructions, as *-(k)i* is also attested in bivalent intransitive configurations. Therefore, the analysis of *-(k)i* in a general context of clitic doubling is more desirable than an analysis restricted to double object constructions. Moreover, in some of bivalent intransitive configurations the presence of the P *-(k)i* and the clitic is obligatory with no dialectal exception, Likewise, Spanish clitics are obligatory in related constructions, as in inalienable possession contexts.

(11) a. Joni ilea hazi z-a-i-o / *da

John.DAT hair.DET grow.ASP TM-TM-(be)-P-3sgDAT / TM-(be)

'John's hair has grown.'

b.	A Juan	*(le)	ha crecido	el pelo
	P Juan	Cl.DAT	have grow	DET hair

In short, the formal similarity between *-(k)i* constructions and clitic doubling constructions gives us the opportunity to analyze *-(k)i* under the general perspective of clitic doubling. If this claim is on the right track, then there are some theoretical issues to be clarified, as I will briefly discussed in section 5.

4. Discussing the Appl-approach to *-(k)i*

Basque linguists have been aware of the existence of this morpheme *-(k)i* since the earliest modern grammar works. As a matter of fact, Lafon (1999 [1961]), one of the most detailed and remarkable studies on the morphology of *-(k)i* goes back to the sixties. Nevertheless, save exceptions (Trask 1981), no theoretical status has been attributed to *-(k)i* till the late nineties and the beginning of the twentieth century, when *-(k)i* has been generally claimed to be an Appl morpheme (Elordieta 2001: 62; Rezac 2006 and Fernández 2012, 2013, 2015). Indeed, as we have previously said (section 1), both the derivational and the base-generation Appl-analysis of Basque datives have been explored in many papers: the former in Albizu 1998, 2001; Albizu & Fernández 2006; Arregi 2003; Arregi & Ormazabal 2003; Ormazabal & Romero 2015 among others; the latter, in Oyharçabal (2010) also discussed by Fernández & Ortiz de Urbina (2010).

In principle, the hypothesis of *-(k)i* being an Appl morpheme is an attractive one. On the one side, it gives theoretical status to a morpheme condemned otherwise to be a *dative flag*, that is, nothing theoretically meaningful. On the other side, two of the main typologically relevant characteristics of Appl constructions are met in Basque *-(k)i* constructions, namely, Appl being morphologically overt and an object being added to the construction (Polinsky 2013). Thus, the hypothesis might be also typologically convincing. Moreover, the Appl-hypothesis can be combined with the analysis of *-(k)i* as a P, along the lines of Trask (1981: 289). *-(K)i*'s position in the structure preceding a

dative marked pronoun points in that direction. Nevertheless, the Appl-analysis of Basque *-(k)i* faces some typological objections, as discussed by Fernández (2013). Although we have no alternative analysis to the Appl-aproach, we would want to suggest that not every (Basque) dative is introduced by Appl, as convincingly shown by Odria (in progress) for differentially marked objects. On the other hand, the great similarity of Basque *-(k)i* and Spanish *a* leads us to think that Basque is closer to neighbor languages such as Spanish than to Bantu languages such as Kynyarwanda.

In this section, we will start presenting briefly applicative constructions (§4.1), and then we will address some of the typological objections to the Appl-analysis of *-(k)i* (§4.2).

4.1. Applicatives in a nutshell

In applicatives constructions, a dedicated affix appears in the verbal form and an argument is added to the construction. The added argument is syntactically an object, as in Kynyarwanda, a Bantu language (Dryer 1983: 129):

(12)   Yohaâni   y-oher-**er**-eje   Maríya   íbárúwa
         John   he-send-BEN-ASP   Mary   letter
         'John sent a letter to Mary.'

In (12), the dedicated affix is *-er*, the so-called Appl morpheme and the applied argument is Mary. The abbreviation used by Dryer for *-er* corresponds to the term benefactive, as this is the (peripheral) thematic role of the applied argument Mary. This argument is an object and shares many properties with direct objects, as the hability to relativize, reflexivize, passivize and to be incorporated to the verb (Dryer 1983; Polinsky 2003, among others). Besides, Appl constructions alternate with prepositional constructions, as in the following examples in Kynyarwanda (Dryer 1983: 134):

(13)   a.   Umwáana   y-a-taa-ye   igitabo   **mu**   máazi
              child   he-PAST-throw-ASP   book   in   water

		'The child has thrown the book into the water.'		
b.	Umwáana	y-a-taa-yé-**mo**	amáazi	igitabo
	umea	he-PAST-throw-ASP-**IN**	water	book

'The child has thrown the book into the water.'

Although the Appl in (13b) paraphrases the construction containing a PP in (13a), both constructions are syntactically different. On the one side, (13a) exhibits a PP headed by a P. This PP is syntactically an adjunct: it appears in a peripheral syntactic position and shows the also peripheral thematic role of locative. Thus, there are only two arguments in (13a), the subject and the object. On the other side, (13b) shows an applicative construction with an applied locative object. This time, the locative lacks the P which is incorporated to the verb. Besides, the locative appears immediately after the verb, in a canonical object position. This locative is not syntactically an adjunct but an object. Therefore, the number of arguments in (13b) has been increased by one by adding this new locative object. As we have said before, some authors have interpreted applicative constructions as derived preposition incorporation constructions (Baker 1988), as illustrated in (13b).

4.2. The cons of the Appl-analysis

Having presented the basis of applicative constructions, now let us explore some typological issues of *-(k)i*'s Appl-analysis.

First of all, the geographical areas of applicatives are Africa (Bantu), Western Pacific region (Austronesian) and North and Central America (Salish, Mayan and Uto-Aztecan), as pointed out by Polinsky (2013). The main generalization identified by this author is that applicatives are common in languages with little or no case marking on noun phrases, but at the same time with verbal inflection rich enough to mark the Appl construction.

With regards to this typological generalization, Basque does have a morphologically complex verbal inflection, which includes among others the *-(k)i* morpheme itself and the clitic corresponding to the added object. Nevertheless,

Basque is at the same time a language with rich case morphology, typologically distant from what is observed in languages such as Kinyarwanda (Dryer 1983) for instance. In a hypothetical Basque with genuine applicatives, a sentence like (10b) *Jon liburua eman diot* 'I have given the book to John' with no overt case marking on *Jon* should be grammatical, but it is not. As we have seen in section 3, the *-(k)i* morpheme introducing the dative clitic is doubled by an *-i*-marked *Jon* (except for North-eastern varieties where some datives can be attested with neither *-(k)i* nor dative clitic). Although the Appl-analysis has been also extended to languages with both rich case marking and verbal inflection as Romance languages, such as Spanish (Ormazabal & Romero 1998) and even to Basque by the same authors (2015), the typological correlation between no case marking and Appl constructions attested in Bantu languages disappears.

Second, as discussed in the literature, an Appl can be based on both transitive and intransitive constructions, but the intransitive base is less common than the transitive one and even impossible with unaccusatives in some languages (Polinsky 2013). On the contrary, *-(k)i* shows no transitivity restrictions, as we have seen in section 2 – see examples (4) and (5). The examples in (4) repeated as (14) show the unaccusative verb *etorri* 'come' in both monovalent and bivalent configurations – (14a) and (14b), respectively –, that is, without and with *-(k)i*.

(14)   a.   d-a-tor

TM-TM-come-3sgABS

'(S)he/it comes.'

b.   d-a-tor-ki-t

TM-TM-come-P-1sgDAT

'(S)he/it comes to me.'

Actually, the presence of unaccusatives plus *-(k)i* is remarkable in synthetic forms since the earliest texts, although most of these forms are nowadays reserved to written language and formal varieties of language:

96

(15) a.   d-a-go-ki-t

           TM-TM-be-P-1sgDAT

           '(S)he/it corresponds to me.'

     b.   d-a-txe-ki-o

           TM-TM-hold-P-3sgDAT

           '(S)he/it holds to her/him/it.'

     c.   d-a-rrai-ki-o

           TM-TM-follow-P-3sgDAT

           '(S)he/it follows to her/him/it.'

Besides, as shown in section 2, *-(k)i* is also available with both unaccusatives and transitives in analytical forms, giving rise to bivalent unaccusative (16b) and ditransitive configurations (17b), alternating with the non-*(k)i* counterparts, in (16a) and (17a) respectively.

(16) a.   etorri   d-a

           come.ASP   TM-TM-(be)

           '(S)he/it has come.'

     b.   etorri   z-a-i-t

           come.ASP   TM-TM-(be)-P-1sgDAT

           '(S)he/it has come to me.'

(17) a.   ekarri   d-u

           bring.ASP   TM-(have)-(3sgERG)

           '(S)he/it has brought her/him/it.'

     b.   ekarri   d-i-t

           bring.ASP   TM-(have)-P-1sgDAT-(3sgERG)

           '(S)he/it has brought her/him/it to me.'

In short, *-(k)i* is available independently of (in)transitivity. Consequently, this question might be controversial from a typological perspective, if *-(k)i* were an Appl.

Third, an Appl applies an argument, i.e. an object to the construction, and generally speaking this seems to be the case also in Basque *-(k)i* constructions, since an argument is systematically added to the structure. Nevertheless, the syntactic nature

of the added argument is more controversial, in particular in bivalent intransitive constructions as (15a, b, c), where the applied argument is not strictly speaking an object. Even, in those (standard) cases where the argument introduced by *-(k)i* is an object, the applied object is mainly an indirect object and not a direct one (in many cases syntactically competing with the theme argument) as in Bantu languages.

Four, the thematic roles of the applied objects are mostly goals and benefactives, but also locatives, instruments and commitatives. As Baker points out (1988: 237-239), benefactive/malefactive applicatives are as common as goals and they are available in Bantu, Mayan and Austronesian languages among others. Instrumental applicatives are mostly African, and in Baker's opinion locative applicatives are available productively only in Kinyarwanda, although many other languages can show locative objects.

Although goals and benefactives/malefactives are also common for arguments introduced by *-(k)i*, locatives, instruments and commitatives are completely unknown in Basque *-(k)i* constructions. In contrast, arguments introduced by *-(k)i*, are thematically similar to those available with some Ps. For instance, arguments introduced by *-(k)i*, are strikingly similar to Spanish *a*-marked arguments.

(18)   a.   Joni   liburua   eman   d-i-o-t
            John.DAT a book   give.ASP   TM-(have)-P-3sgDAT-1sgERG
            'I have given a book to John.'

       b.   Le   he   dado   un libro   a Juan
            Cl.DAT   have   give   a book   to John
            'I have given a book to John.'   *(Goal/Benefactive)*

(19)   a.   Joni   liburua   gustatu   z-a-i-o
            John.DAT book.DET   like.ASP   TM-TM-(be)-P-3sgDAT
            'John has liked the book.'

       b.   A Juan   le   ha gustado   el libro
            P Juan   Cl.DAT   have like   DET book   *(Experiencer)*

(20)   a.   Joni   ilea   hazi   z-a-i-o
            John.DAT hair.DET   grow.ASP   TM-TM-(be)-P-3sgDAT
            'John's hair has grown.'

98

b.	A Juan	le	ha crecido	el pelo
	P Juan	Cl.DAT	have grow	DET hair *(Possessor/Affected argument)*

Therefore, with regards to the thematic roles of the argument introduced by *-(k)i,* the *-(k)i* construction is closer to Romance clitic doubling constructions (section 3) than to Bantu applicatives.

Next, *-(k)i* is also present in constructions with DOM attested in some Basque varieties (Fernández & Rezac 2010, to appear, Odria 2014, in progress) – example (21a). With regards to this, the presence of *-(k)i* deviates from applicative constructions' typology, as there is no applied object in DOM but an animate/specific object differentially marked. Besides, the thematic role of this animate/specific object is a theme, something completely absent from applied objects in Appl constructions, which always exhibit peripheral thematic roles and not core ones. As the matter of fact, although DOM is attested in Bantu languages, it is marked by agreement (Bresnan & Mchombo 1988) not by an Appl-strategy. On the contrary, a similar strategy is available in both Spanish and Basque DOM. The Spanish of the Basque Country, a *leísta* variety, combines *leísmo* with a doubled *a*-marked object (Fernández-Ordoñez 1999; Ormazabal & Romero 1998, 2001, 2007) in a clitic doubling construction (21c) strikingly similar to its Basque counterpart in (21a):

(21)	a.	Joni	ikusi	d-i-o-t	
		John.DAT	see.ASP	TM-(have)-P-3sgDAT-1sgERG	
		'I have seen John.'			
	b.	He visto	a	Juan	
		have see	P	John	
	c.	Le	he	visto	a Juan
		Cl.DAT	have	see	P John

Consequently, the analysis of *-(k)i* independently from Appl seems to be desirable, as far as Basque DOM is concerned. A recent formal analysis on Basque DOM points in that direction (see Odria 2014, in progress).

Fifth, *-(k)i* is also attested in allocutives (Rebuschi 1984; Oyharçabal 1993; Alberdi 1995; Haddican 2015), as in (22b). Let us compare (22a) and (22b). Both sentences mean exactly the same. Nevertheless, the allocutive form includes a second person singular clitic, masculine or feminine, corresponding to a familiar addressee. This allocutive clitic is also preceded by *-(k)i.*

(22)   a.   Liburua   d-u-t

        book.ABS   TM-(have)-1sgERG

        'I have brought the book.'

        b.   Liburua   ekarri   d-i-a/na-t

        book.ABS   bring.ASP   TM-(have)-P-2sgALLO.MAS/FEM-1sgERG

        'I have brought the book.'

Allocutive agreement can appear in analytical forms such as (22b) or synthetical ones with no (in)transitive restriction. The examples in (23b, c, d) show several allocutive alternatives to the non-allocutive intransitive form (23a) – (23b, c) are obtained from Oregi (1973: 268):

(23)   a.   n-a-tor

        1sgABS-TM- come

        'I come'

        b.   n-a-tor-ki-k

        1sgABS-TM-come-P-ALLO.MAS

        c.   n-a-i-a-tor-ki-k

        1sgABS-TM-P-vow-come-P-ALLO.MAS

        d.   n-i-a-torr-e-k

        1sgABS-P-TM-come-epen-ALLO.MAS

These examples are far more intricate than the forms presented before: (23c) includes *twin Ps* – an *i* to the left of the root and a *-(k)i* to the right of it, immediately preceding the allocutive masculine clitic *-k.* Both Ps are related to the allocutive clitic. On the other hand, (23d) presents a single *i* to the right of the root, distant from the allocutive clitic. (23b) shows the allocutive form with the P to the right of the root

100

immediately preceding the allocutive clitic. As can be seen, the morphological variation in Basque allocutive forms is amazing although hard to explain.

Leaving details aside, if *-(k)i* introduces (some) allocutives, as defended here and also discussed by Fernández (2015) – see also Schuchardt (1893) –, then non-argumental clitics are due to the alleged Appl. However, as far as we know, there is nothing similar to non-argumental clitics attributed to Appl constructions in Bantu languages. Besides, if these allocutive clitics are related to ethical datives, as suggested by Schuchardt (1893) (vs. Lafon 1980 [1944]), then once again, Basque seems to be closer to Spanish than to Bantu languages.

Last, some Basque verbs involved mostly in *-(k)i* constructions, such as *atxiki* 'adhere, hold' (13b), *ekin* 'engage in something', *eutsi* 'hold' or *jarraiki* 'follow' (13c) show a lexicalized *-(k)i* morpheme (Fernández 2013) in their participial forms. These verbs select a dative and correspond to prepositional verbs in other languages. For instance, the Spanish preposition *a* mentioned above is also available with semantically similar verbs: *atxiki* 'adherirse a', *ekin* 'dedicarse a/comenzar a', *eutsi* 'aferrarse a', *jarraiki* 'seguir a', etcetera (Fernández & Ortiz de Urbina 2010, 2012). These *-(k)i*-final verbs do not seem necessarily related to Bantu applicatives.

In short, some of the typological characteristics attributed to Appl do not seem to be met in Basque *-(k)i* constructions. Thus, we can talk about Appl heads and constructions to derive Basque datives among others, but doing so, we might be ignoring crucial details that need at least this short reflection.

5. -(K)i constructions as clitic doubling constructions: a hint and some consequences

As presented so far *-(k)i* is a P selecting and case marking a clitic. In addition, *-(k)i* constructions resemble clitic doubling constructions. Therefore, both aspects might be related to each other.[5] In principle, the presence of a P in clitic doubling constructions

---

[5] This might be the case, although not only dative clitics can be doubled in Basque, since ergative and absolutive clitics are also doubled. Therefore, an explanation on clitic doubling that goes beyond dative clitics and *-(k)i* should be required in order to understand the phenomenon in general terms.

is not a surprising fact, as it is generally attested in languages with clitic doubling as in the Spanish example in (7) repeated here as (24a). Nevertheless, in Spanish the P precedes and marks the full DP and not the clitic itself. On the contrary, the P *-(k)i* appears preceding the clitic and examples with no *-(k)i* are out.

(24) a. (*A)   le   he   dado   un libro   *(a) Juan

          to   Cl.DAT   have give   a book   to John

          'I have given a book to John.'

      b. Joni   liburua   eman   d-*(i)-o-t

          John.DAT a book   give.ASP   TM-(have)-P-3sgDAT-1sgERG

          'I have given a book to John.'

Thus, the presence of P *-(k)i* preceding the dative clitic should be explained as its presence has theoretical consequences. First of all, nothing intervenes between the Spanish clitic *le* and the (auxiliary)-verb, something expected as far as clitics are concerned – see also Kayne (1975) for French which shows clitic constructions with no doubling. On the contrary, Basque P *-(k)i* intervenes between the verb and the dative clitic in (24b). Second, *-(k)i* seems to be the responsible of the dative case marking of the clitic. Therefore, the case assignment mechanism regarding the Basque clitic *-o* and its Spanish counterpart *le* might be slightly different. Third, as a consequence of the argument just mentioned, the case assignment of *Joni* in (24b) might also differ from the case assignment of *Juan* in (24a). If we take the morpheme *-i* in *Joni* to be a dative marker and not an adposition, then this dative case marker might be also due to the P *-(k)i*. Instead, if the morpheme *-i* in *Joni* were an adposition related to Spanish *a,* then a double adposition construction should be available in (24b): on the one hand, the preposition *-(k)i* preceding the dative clitic; on the other hand, the postposition *-i* marking Jon. As far as I know, there is nothing similar to double preposition constructions in clitic doubling.

In short, the analysis of *-(k)i* constructions as clitic doubling constructions requires a theoretical analysis that exceeds the limits of this paper, as a general theory of Basque verbal inflection is required. Nevertheless, the main hypothesis of *-(k)i* being a P seems to be true, although the hypothesis of *-(k)i* constructions being clitic

doubling constructions remains open.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, I have presented and analyzed a Basque morpheme *-(k)i*. As I have shown, this morpheme can be analyzed as a P, a hypothesis compatible with the Appl-approach to *-(k)i*. Nevertheless, the Appl-analysis of *-(k)i* posits some typological problems that need to be at least revisited. Departing from applicative constructions as those attested in Bantu languages among others, I have compared *-(k)i* constructions to Spanish clitic doubling constructions which seem to be closer to Basque than some Bantu Appls.

References

ALBERDI, Xabier (1995) "The development of the Basque System of terms of address and the allocutive conjugation", in José Ignacio Hualde, Joseba A. Lakarra & Robert L. Trask (eds.), *Towards a history of the Basque language,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 275-295.

ALBIZU, Pablo (1998) "Generalized Person-Case Constraint: A Case for a Syntax-Driven Inflectional Morphology", in Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria & Amaia Mendikoetxea (eds.), *Theoretical Issues on the Morphology-Syntax Interface,* Supplements of ASJU XL, Donostia: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia & UPV/EHU, 1-33.

ALBIZU, Pablo (2001) "Datibo sintagmen izaera sintaktikoaren inguruan: eztabaidarako oinarrizko zenbait datu", in Beatriz Fernández & Pablo Albizu (eds.), *Kasu eta komunztaduraren gainean. On case and agreement,* Bilbo: UPV/EHU, 49-69.

ALBIZU, Pablo & Beatriz FERNÁNDEZ (2006) "Licit and illicit ERG-DAT pairings", in Beatriz Fernández & Itziar Laka (eds.), *Andolin gogoan. Essays in honour of Professor Eguzkitza,* Bilbo: UPV/EHU, 69-96.

ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, Elena (2003) *The syntax of ditransitives. Evidence from clitics*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena (2006) "Clitic doubling", in Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax,* vol. I, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 519-581.

Ariztimuño, Borja (2014) "Euskal aditz jokatuaren osaeraz eta jatorriaz zenbait ohar", in Ricardo Gómez, Joaquín Gorrochategui, Joseba A. Lakarra & Céline Mounole (eds.), *3rd Conference of the Luis Michelena Chair* ("Koldo Mitxelena" Katedraren Argitalpenak, 5), Vitoria-Gasteiz: Publishing Service of the UPV/EHU, 41-60.

Ariztimuño, Borja (2014) "Finite verbal morphology", in Mikel Martínez-Areta (ed.), *Basque and Proto-Basque. Language-internal and typological approaches to linguistic reconstruction,* (Mikroglottika 5), Berna: Peter Lang, 359-427.

Arregi, Eurídice (2003) "On Dative Alternations in Basque", manuscript, UPV/EHU.

Arregi, Eurídice & Javier Ormazabal (2003) "Aditz ditrantsitiboen barne-egitura", in Jesus Mari Makazaga & Bernard Oyharçabal (eds.), *Euskal gramatikari buruzko eta literaturari buruzko ikerketak XXI. mendearen atarian. Gramatika gaiak,* Iker-14 (I), Bilbo: Euskaltzaindia, 119-136.

Baker, Mark (1988) *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bresnan, Joan & Sam A. Mchombo (1987) "Topic, pronoun nand agreement in Chichewa", *Language,* 63, 741-782.

Demonte, Violeta (1995) "Dative alternation in Spanish", *Probus,* 7, 5-30.

Dryer, Matthew S. (1983) "Indirect objects in Kinyarwanda revisited", in David M. Perlmutter (ed.), *Studies in Relational Grammar* 1, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 129-140.

Elordieta, Arantzazu (2001) *Verb Movement and Constituent Permutation in Basque,* Utrecht: LOT.

Etxepare, Ricardo (2003) "Valency and argument structure in the Basque Verb", in José Ignacio Hualde & Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *A grammar of Basque,* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 363-425.

Etxepare, Ricardo & Beñat Oihartzabal (2009) "Bi datibo egitura ifar-ekialdeko hizkeretan", *Lapurdum,* XIII, 145-158.

Fernández, Beatriz (2010) "Goi- eta behe-datiboak eta Datibo-komunztaduraren murriztapena: ipar-ekaildeko hizkerak eta euskara estandarra", in Irantzu Epelde (ed.), Euskal dialektologia: lehena eta oraind. Supplements of the *International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology (ASJU)* 69, Bilbo: UPV/EHU, 37-63.

104

FERNÁNDEZ, Beatriz (2012) "-(K)i eta -ra", *International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology (ASJU),* 46-2, Bilbo: UPV/EHU.

FERNÁNDEZ, Beatriz (2015) "-(K)i", in Beatriz Fernández & Pello Salaburu (eds.), *Ibon Sarasola, Gorazarre. Homenatge, Homenaje,* Bilbo: Publishing Service of the UPV/EHU, 213-228.

FERNÁNDEZ, Beatriz (2013) "-(K)i hiztegian, eta hiztegian harantzago", *International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology (ASJU),* Bilbo: UPV/EHU, 1-26.

FERNÁNDEZ, Beatriz & Jon ORTIZ DE URBINA (2010) *Datiboa hiztegian,* Bilbo: Publishing Service of the UPV/EHU.

FERNÁNDEZ, Beatriz & Jon ORTIZ DE URBINA (2012) "Dative (first) complements in Basque", in Ernestina Carrilho & Beatriz Fernández (eds.), *Syntactic microvariation in Westmost European Languages. Journal of Portuguese Linguistics (Special Issue)*, 11-1, Universidade de Lisboa: Ediçoes Colibrí, 83-98.

FERNÁNDEZ, Beatriz & Milan REZAC (2010) "Datibo osagarri bitxiak eta Datiboaren Lekualdatzea: ari nai diyot eta kanta egin nazu bidegurutzean", in Beatriz Fernandez & Pablo Albizu/Ricardo Etxepare (eds.), *Euskara eta euskarak: aldakortasun sintaktikoa aztergai. Supplements of the International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology (ASJU)*, LII, UPV/EHU, 113-149.

FERNÁNDEZ, Beatriz & Milan REZAC (to appear) "Differential Object Marking in Basque varieties", in Beatriz Fernández & Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *Microparameters in the Grammar of Basque,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

FERNÁNDEZ-ORDOÑEZ, Inés (1999) "Leísmo, laísmo y loísmo", in Ignacio Bosque/Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española I*, Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1317-1394.

GÓMEZ, Ricardo & Koldo SAINZ (1995) "On the origin of the finite forms of the Basque verb", in José Ignacio Hualde, Joseba A. Lakarra & Robert L. Trask (eds.), *Towards a history of the Basque language*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 235-274.

HUALDE, José Ignacio (2003) "Verbs. Finite forms", in José Ignacio Hualde & Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *A grammar of Basque,* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 205-246.

JAEGGLI, Osvaldo A. (1982) *Topics in Romance Syntax*, Dordrecht: Foris.

JAEGGLI, Osvaldo A. (1986) "Three issues in the theory of clitics: case, doubled NPs and extraction", in Hagit Borer (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics,* 19, New York: Accademic Press, 15-42.

KAYNE, Richard S. (1975) *French Syntax: the transformational cycle*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Lakarra, Joseba A. (2008) "Aitzineuskararen gramatikarantz (malkar eta osinetan zehar)", in Xabier Artiagoitia & Joseba A. Lakarra (arg.), *Gramatika jaietan: Patxi Goenagaren omenez,* Bilbo: UPV/EHU, 451-490.

Lafon, René (1944) *Le systéme du verbe basque au XVIe siècle.* Bordele. [Republished. 1980. Donostia: Elkar.]

Lafon, René (1961) "Sur les forms verbales basques qui contiennent un indice datif", *BSL* 56-1, 139-162. [Republished. 1999. In Jean Haritschelhar & Piarres Xarriton (eds.), *Vasconiana. IKER* 11, Bilbo: Euskaltzaindia, 411-430.]

McGinnis, Martha (1998) *Locality in A-movement*, Ph.D. Diss. MIT.

Montoya, Estibaliz (1998) "Objektu bikoitzeko egiturak euskaraz", manuscript, UPV/EHU.

Mounole, Céline (2015) "Datibo-komunztaduraz eta laguntzaile hirupertsonalen diakroniaz", in Beatriz Fernández & Pello Salaburu (eds.), *Ibon Sarasola, Gorazarre. Homenatge, Homenaje,* Bilbo: Publishing Service of the UPV/EHU, 473-490.

Odria, Ane (2014) "Differential object marking and the nature of dative case in Basque varieties", *Linguistic Variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 289-317.

Odria, Ane (in progress) *Differential Object Marking in Basque Syntax. A microcomparative survey,* manuscript, UPV/EHU.

Oyharçabal, Bernard (1993) «Verb Agreement with Nonarguments : On Allocutive Agreement", in J. Ortiz de Urbina & J. Hualde (eds), *Generative Studies in Basque Linguistics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 89-114.

Oyharçabal, Bernard (2010) "Basque ditransitives", in Maia Duguine, Susana Huidobro & Nerea Madariaga (arg.), *Argument structure and syntactic relations: A cross-linguistic perspective,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 233-260.

Ormazabal, Javier & Juan Romero (1998) "On the syntactic nature of the me-lui and the Person-Case Constraint", *ASJU,* XXXII-2, 415-433.

Ormazabal, Javier & Juan Romero (2015) *Historical changes in Basque dative alternations: evidence for a derivational analysis*, manuscript, UPV/EHU and Cáceres Univ.

Polinsky, Maria (2013) "Applicative constructions", in Matthew S. Dryer, Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online,* Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. [http://wals.info/chapter/109].

Pylkkänen, Lisa (2002/2008) *Introducing arguments,* Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press.

Rebuschi, Georgés (1984) *Structure de l'énoncé en basque*, Paris: SELAF.

Rezac, Milan (2006) *Basque morphosyntax,* manuscript, University of Nantes/CNRS.

ROMERO, Juan (1997) *Construcciones de doble objeto y gramática universal,* PhD. Diss. Univ. Autónoma de Madrid.

SCHUCHARDT, Hugo (1893) "Sobre la formación de las flexiones de relación del verbo vasco", *Boletín de la Real Sociedad Vascongada de los Amigos del País,* 28, 2-3, 217-337.

TRASK, Robert L. (1981) "Basque Verbal Morphology", in *Euskalarien Nazioarteko Jardunaldiak. IKER 1*, Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia, 285-304.

TRASK, Robert. L. (1995) "On the history of the non-finite forms in Basque", in José Igancio Hualde, Joseba A. Lakarra & Robert L. Trask (eds.), *Towards a history of the Basque language,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 207-234.

TRASK, Robert L. (1997) *The history of Basque*. London: Routledge.