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since this bimorphy analysis would predict identical footing in (aːhra=kaldərə) and (aːhra=kaldə,hra) so that feet can be assigned independently from (e.g. before) word boundaries.

A last point is that we gave the learners too much information about syllable weight. Real children have to learn the heaviens of CVC syllables by themselves. In some languages, CVC is light (e.g. final, monomorphic CVC-feet in Chuukese, as described in Kennedy 2003), while in others it is heavy (e.g. in Latin).

In sum, it all smells like we need a more emergentist modelling of representations and constraints, meaning that much less is given to the learner than is assumed in Tesar & Smolensky’s (2000) and our simulations.
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1. Introduction

Current syntactic literature within the Principles and Parameters framework contains two different theories of case and agreement. In the Unitary Theory, case and agreement are the result of the same operation (see Chomsky 2000, 2001); in the Split Theory, case and agreement are the result of separate, but related, operations (see Marantz 1991, Bittner and Hale 1996, Bhatt 2003). In this paper, we argue that long distance agreement in restructuring contexts in Basque provides evidence for Bhatt’s (2003) version of the Split Theory.

In Basque restructuring contexts, a matrix auxiliary can agree with both embedded dative and absolute arguments. This is exemplified in the following sentence with the restructuring verb *amaitu* ‘finish’:

(1) Berak [zuri babak egiten] amaitu dautsuz.

‘He finished cooking the beans for you.’

However, there is a class of restructuring verbs, exemplified below with *hasti* ‘begin’, that only allow long distance agreement for dative:

(2) a. Bera [zuri babak egiten] hasi jatzu.

‘He began cooking the beans for you.’

* We would like to thank Abbas Bemamoun and James Yoon for helpful comments and suggestions. We would also like to thank our informant Ikuosa Ansola-Badiola. All errors are our own.

1. We use the following abbreviations in the examples: A(bsolutive), D(ative), F(rgative), N(Finite), P(plural), S(ingular). For reasons of space, we identify a tensed auxiliary in the glosses by only specifying the agreement morphemes it contains.

2. All the examples we give in this paper are from the Bizkaian dialect. As far as we are aware, there is no great dialectal variation with respect to restructuring in Basque.

The basic facts to be explained are the following. Basque has three cases, ergative, absolutive, and dative, that trigger agreement on finite auxiliaries, as illustrated in the following examples:

(3) a. Zuk liburu irakurri zu.
    you.E book.A read_AGR_A(3S).AGR_E(2S)
    'You read the book.'

b. Zuk niri liburu emon daustatz.
    'You gave me the book.'

We assume, following Chomsky 1993, Bobaljik 1993 and Fernández 1997, that ergative case on (transitive) subjects is parallel to nominative case, and that absolutive case on objects is parallel to accusative case. This means that ergative is assigned by T, and absolutive by v:

(4) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{vP} \quad \text{Erg} \\
\text{Sbj} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{DO} \quad \text{v} \quad \text{Abs} \\
\end{array}
\]

In ditransitive clauses, indirect objects are introduced by a 'low' applicative head APPL (see Pylkkänen 2002).

---

3. More specifically, H contains unvalued (uninterpretable) φ-features which are valued by matching φ-features on DP. This is agreement. DP contains an unvalued case feature which is not matched by an equivalent feature on H, but is valued as a byproduct of the matching/valuing of the φ-features. These specific details of the Agree operation are not important for what follows.
Finally, $v$ licenses dative case on the indirect object (in addition to absolutive on the direct object; see Ormazabal and Romero 2003, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Bejar and Rezac 2003).  

\[
(5) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{APPL} \\
\text{IO} \quad \text{DO} \quad \text{APPL}
\end{array}
\]

\[
(6) \quad [v_p \text{ Sbj} [v_p \text{ IO DO APPL} V]_{VP} v]_{TP}
\]

All of these Agree operations satisfy Locality. This is clear in the case of the T-Sbj relation: the subject is the closest DP to T in (4). In (6), the $v$-IO relation also satisfies Locality, but the $v$-DO relation does not. We assume this is permitted due to Richards’ (1997) Principle of Minimal Compliance: satisfaction of Locality by the $v$-IO relation licenses violation of Locality by the $v$-DO relation.

In the Unitary Theory, case assignment to DP by H implies agreement of H with DP. As can be seen in all the examples so far, all agreement morphemes in Basque cluster together on the tensed auxiliary. Thus, all heads involved in case/agreement, i.e. $v$ and T, must end up together to form the auxiliary. This is achieved by head movement of $v$ to T:

\[
(7) \quad [\text{TP} [v_p \text{ Sbj} [v_p \text{ IO}_0 \text{ DO}_A \text{ APPL} V]_{VP} v]_{TP} v]_{TP} [v_A + \text{APPL}_D + T_E]_{TP}
\]

This imposes serious constraints on possible analyses of Basque case and agreement within the Unitary Theory. Specifically, all heads involved in case/agreement must be high enough in the clause to be able to end up in T.

In this example, the predicate mozkoartua ‘drunk’ can be predicative of the subject ‘I’ or the direct object ‘the kid’, but not of the dative object ‘you’.

5. Note that, in this analysis, we must stipulate which DP is assigned which case by $v$: the highest one dative, and the lowest one absolutive.

6. Fernández (1997, 1999) proposes an analysis of case and agreement in Basque essentially along the lines of the Unitary Theory, but which predicts that case and agreement can be split in certain well-defined cases (i.e. in so-called ‘ergative displacement’ contexts). These cases are not relevant for our purposes, so this analysis counts as belonging to the Unitary Theory.

As noted above, this property of the Unitary Theory will be in part responsible for its inability to account for the long distance agreement facts discussed in the introduction.

2.2. The Split Theory

In a Split Theory of case and agreement, these are morphological realizations of separate operations. For instance, Marantz (1991) and Bitner and Hale (1996) provide different split analyses of case and agreement in different
languages. In this paper, we shall assume the Split Theory proposed in Bhatt 2003, which can be summarized as follows. Case and agreement are separate operations: case is assigned by a head to a DP in its c-command domain, and a (possibly different) head agrees with a DP with a particular case in its c-command domain (see below for details). As in the Unitary Theory, both case and agreement are constrained by Locality, but in the case of agreement, in a slightly different way that will be explained below.

With respect to case in Basque, as in the Unitary Theory, T assigns ergative to the subject, and v absolutive to the direct object. However, unlike the Unitary Theory, dative is assigned by APPL to the indirect object in its specifier.\(^7\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Erg} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Abs} \\
\downarrow \\
(11) [\text{TP} [\text{Sbj} [\text{VP} \text{IO DO APPL V}]_\text{VP} \downarrow \text{v} \downarrow \text{DO}_\sigma \text{TP}]
\end{array}
\]

As stated above, agreement in this theory is a separate operation. Specifically, we assume that Basque has three agreement morphemes, Agr\(_e\), Agr\(_a\), and Agr\(_o\), each of which targets (agrees with) a DP with a specific case: ergative, absolutive, and dative, respectively. These morphemes are generated forming a complex head with T.\(^8\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{vP} \\
\downarrow \\
[Agr\(_e\)+Agr\(_a\)+Agr\(_o\)] \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Sbj} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{IO}_\sigma \text{DO}_\lambda \text{APPL V}
\end{array}
\]

Ergative agreement clearly respects Locality, since Agr\(_e\) agrees with the closest DP (the subject). However, the subject seems to intervene in the Agr\(_o\)-IO relation, and both the subject and indirect object seem to intervene in the Agr\(_a\)-DO relation. However, these are not violations of Locality. Since each Agr morpheme targets a DP with a particular case, only DPs with the same case can intervene. This interpretation of Locality is in fact not different from the one needed in the Unitary Theory. In both theories, only elements with the relevant features can be interveners. In the Unitary Theory, the relevant feature is case, since agreeing heads look for elements with (unspecified) case. Thus, only elements with case features (i.e. DPs but not APs or VPs) can intervene. However, an agreeing head in this theory cannot target a DP with a particular case, since the case feature of that DP is valued precisely as a result of the Agree operation. Thus, Locality in the Unitary Theory cannot refer to the case value of the potential intervener. In the Split Theory, an agreeing head targets elements with a particular case, so only elements with that particular case can intervene.

To summarize so far, one of the main differences between the two theories is that Locality in agreement is relativized to case in the Split Theory, but it is not in the Unitary Theory. As we will see in the following sections, restructuring contexts in Basque show that Locality in agreement must in fact be relativized to case, which will thus provide evidence for the Split Theory.

3. Restructuring in Basque

In restructuring contexts, a non-finite embedded clause and a main clause behave as if they were only one clause. In Basque, this can be seen in long distance dative agreement (LDA\(_o\)), which is allowed with certain matrix verbs, such as hasi ‘begin’ and amaitu ‘finish’. As illustrated in the following examples, in LDA\(_o\), the matrix auxiliary agrees with an embedded dative argument:

\[
(13) \text{Bera [zuri liburu irakurten] hasi jatzu.} \quad \text{he.A [you.D book.A read.NF] began AGR\(_A\)(3S) AGR\(_o\)(2S)}
\]

‘He began reading the book to you.’

\[
(14) \text{Nik [zuri liburu irakurten] amaitu dautsuk.} \quad \text{I.E [you.D book.A read.NF] finished AGR\(_A\)(3S) AGR\(_o\)(2S) AGR\(_e\)(1S)}
\]

‘I finished reading the book to you.’

\(^7\) We assume that dative case in Basque is inherent. That is why it is assigned by APPL to its specifier (and not by the case operation described in the previous paragraph). Furthermore, since DPs with inherent case are ignored by Locality, the dative DP does not intervene in the assignment of absolutive to the direct object by v.

\(^8\) Alternatively, they head their own Agr projections, or, following Chomsky 1995, they are features generated on certain functional heads. All that is needed for the analysis is that they are generated high enough in the structure to end up together with T to form the tensed auxiliary.
We adopt a monoclausal theory of restructuring. Following Cinque and Wurmbrand 2001, we assume that a sentence with a restructuring verb only adds one projection to what a simple clause would have (as opposed to all the projections associated with a clause, as in true sentence embedding). Therefore, in this account, there is not really such a thing as restructuring or long distance agreement. The facts are straightforward consequences of there being only one clause.

Even though all restructuring verbs in Basque behave the same way with respect to LDA(3p), there are two separate types of restructuring verbs with respect to long distance absolute agreement (LDA(5p)) between the matrix auxiliary and the embedded direct object. The verbs hasi ‘begin’ and amaitu ‘finish’ are representative of these two types. With the former, LDA(3p) is possible, but it is not with the latter:

(15) *Bera [liburua irakurten] hasi dira.
‘He began reading books.’

(16) Berak [liburua irakurten] amaitu duzu.
he.E [books.A read.NF] finished AGR(3p), AGR(5s)  
‘He finished reading books.’

This fact can easily be derived from other properties of these verbs. With begin, the subject is absolutive (see (13)); no LDA(3p) is possible with the direct object because absolute agreement is ‘used up’ by the subject. With finish, the subject has to be ergative (see (14, 16)). Thus, unlike begin, absolute agreement is not used up by the subject, the consequence being that matrix absolute agreement is free to agree with the embedded object. That is, LDA(3p) is possible with finish, but not with begin.

A crucial ingredient in this explanation is that only an absolutive subject can intervene in LDA(3p); an ergative subject does not. This shows that Locality in agreement is relativized to case. We saw in the previous section that this is predicted by the Split Theory, but not by the Unitary Theory. As explained in more detail in the following sections, this provides an argument for the Split Theory.

4. Restructuring and the Split Theory

The Split Theory can provide a straightforward account for the differences between finish and begin described in the previous section. Within a monoclausal theory of restructuring (see Cinque and Wurmbrand 2001), we need to make two assumptions: (i) both finish and begin are functional heads that, like v, assign absolutive case; and (ii) finish is generated below v, and begin above v:

(17)  
[TP vP T]

(18)  
[TP beginP T]

Case assignment with both restructuring verbs works as follows:

(19) [TP vP Sbj [vP IO DO APPL V] [vP finish] [vP v] T]_TP

(20) [TP beginP vP Sbj [vP IO DO APPL V] [vP v] T]_TP

Case assignment with finish is essentially as in simple clauses (see (19)): the subject is assigned ergative by T, the indirect object dative by APPL, and the direct object absolutive by finish. Recall that, with begin, the subject is absolutive, not ergative. This is a direct consequence of the structure in (18). Since begin is above the base position of the subject, the latter is assigned case by begin, not by T. Otherwise, case is as in simple clauses (see (20)).

This difference in case in turn explains the difference in LDA between the two classes of restructuring verbs described in the previous section. Recall
that $\text{LDA}_D$ is possible with both $\text{finish}$ and $\text{begin}$, but $\text{LDA}_A$ is only possible with $\text{finish}$. In the case of $\text{finish}$, the sentence contains a finite $T$ with three Agr morphemes ($\text{Agr}_A$, $\text{Agr}_D$, and $\text{Agr}_E$) and an absolutive, a dative, and an ergative DP (see (17, 19)). Each Agr morpheme targets the corresponding DP, the result being a finite auxiliary agreeing with three DPs. Locality, which is relativized to case in the Split Theory, is respected by all these agreement relations: for each Agr morpheme, there is only one potential target (i.e., a DP with the relevant case), so there are no potential interveners.

However, Locality is an issue with $\text{begin}$. In sentences with this verb, both the subject and the direct object are absolutive (see (18, 20)), but there is only one Agr$_A$ morpheme in $T$. Because of Locality, this Agr$_A$ targets only the highest DP. The result is that there is absolute agreement with the subject, but not with the direct object. In other words, $\text{LDA}_A$ is not possible with $\text{begin}$. The crucial difference with respect to $\text{finish}$ is that the subject of the latter is ergative; since Locality in the Split Theory is relativized to case, Agr$_A$ in $T$ does not agree with the subject and is free to agree with the absolutive direct object.

Thus, the Split Theory is able to incorporate in a very natural way the relation between the case of the subject and the presence or absence of $\text{LDA}_A$ in restructuring contexts in Basque. The crucial aspect of the theory that allows it to account for the facts is the hypothesis that Locality in agreement is relativized to case. As we argue in the next section, the Unitary Theory cannot explain the facts precisely because it cannot adopt this hypothesis.

5. Restructuring and the Unitary Theory

In this section, we argue that the Unitary Theory cannot explain the differences between $\text{begin}$ and $\text{finish}$ described in previous sections. In particular, although this theory can account for the restructuring properties of $\text{finish}$, it cannot explain all the relevant facts about case and agreement in sentences with $\text{begin}$.

As described in previous sections, case and agreement in sentences with $\text{finish}$ work in essentially the same way as in simple clauses without restructuring verbs: the subject, indirect object and direct object have ergative, dative, and absolutive case, respectively, and the finite auxiliary agrees with all three arguments. As the reader can easily check, the Unitary Theory can account for this by simply assuming the structure in (17) and the analysis of case and agreement in Basque sketched in section 2.1.

The fact that case and agreement are part of the same operation in the Unitary Theory poses severe restrictions on possible analyses of restructuring with $\text{begin}$. In this theory, whatever head assigns case to a DP also agrees with it. Thus, for every DP with case, there must be a head that agrees with it.

However, with $\text{begin}$, both the subject and direct object are absolutive, and the finite auxiliary agrees with the dative indirect object and with the absolutive subject, but, crucially, not with the absolutive direct object (i.e., there is no $\text{LDA}_A$). This seems problematic, since the direct object has (absolutive) case, but there is no apparent head that agrees with it. This can be solved easily by assuming that agreement on a head $H$ is realized morphologically iff $H$ ends up forming a complex head with finite $T$ (by head movement). Thus, we can assume that there is a head that agrees with the direct object, and that assigns absolutive case to it.

Therefore, whatever head or heads assign case to the subject and indirect object must end up adjoined to finite $T$ by head movement, and whatever head assigns case to the direct object must not end up as part of $T$. Because of the HMC, this means that the former must be higher in the structure than the latter. This means that the Unitary Theory cannot assume the structure for $\text{begin}$ proposed in the previous section, repeated below:

(21)

```
TP
   /
beginP T
   /
   /
   v P
begin
   /
Sbj v
   /
      /
      /
VP v
      /
IO DO APPL V
```

In the unitary analysis sketched in section 2.1, both absolutive and dative are assigned by $v$. Furthermore, we can also assume that $\text{begin}$ is a $v$-like head that can assign absolutive and dative cases. However, in this structure, neither heads can assign case to the subject or the indirect object. Whatever head or heads assign case to them must end up as part of the auxiliary in $T$. This head cannot be $\text{begin}$, since it is not part of the finite auxiliary; it cannot be $v$ either, since it would have to move to $T$, crossing $\text{begin}$ in violation of the HMC. In other words, whatever head or heads assign case to the subject and indirect object must be higher in the structure than $\text{begin}$.

In order to solve this problem, we could assume that $\text{begin}$ involves the same structure as $\text{finish}$, with the restructuring verb generated below $v$:
Let us assume that, with begin, v can exceptionally assign absolutive case to the subject in its specifier. Furthermore, as assumed in section 2.1, v also assigns dative to the indirect object. Since v is above begin, it can move to T, so that absolutive and dative agreement with the subject and indirect object is realized morphologically on the finite auxiliary. However, this raises a problem with case assignment to the direct object. The only head that could assign it absolutive case is begin (since this head does not end up as part of the finite auxiliary, its agreement features would not be realized morphologically):

The problem is that this would constitute a violation of Locality, due to the intervening indirect object. Since Locality is not relativized to case in the Unitary Theory, any intervening DP, including an indirect object, can cause a Locality violation. Thus, this structure cannot account for restructuring with begin either.

Alternatively, we could assume the structure in (21), with begin above v, but with the addition of some head X above begin that would assign case to the subject and the indirect object. This would not solve the problem either: the indirect object would still block the Agree relation between begin and the direct object.

To summarize so far, given the restrictions that were imposed on the Unitary Theory in section 2.1, this theory has no way of accounting for the restructuring properties of begin in Basque. In order to save the Unitary Theory, we would need to abandon at least one of these restrictions. For instance, we could abandon Locality as a condition on agreement and case assignment. This would obviously remove the Locality problem with (22–23). However, there would be no natural way of ensuring that the right DPs get the right cases. In particular, the only thing that ensures that v in (22) assigns dative to the indirect object is Locality; if this principle is abandoned, it should be possible to have sentences in which v assigns dative to the direct object and begin assigns absolutive to the indirect object. As might be expected, this is not possible. For instance, in (13), the indirect object must be dative, and the direct object must be absolutive.

Another way of solving the problem would be to adopt a different analysis of indirect objects in Basque. The Locality problem discussed above could be solved if we assumed the structure in (22), but with APPL and the indirect object generated between v and begin:

In this structure, case assignment to the direct object by begin would not be blocked by the indirect object. However, this would imply that, in general, indirect objects are generated in the specifier of a head that is higher than VP. That is, they would be ‘high applicatives’, in Pylkkänen’s (2002) sense. As argued in footnote 4, this is not correct: dative objects in Basque are introduced by a low applicative head.

To conclude this section, the Unitary Theory cannot account in a satisfactory way for the differences between the two classes of restructuring verbs in Basque.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we have provided evidence for a theory of case and agreement in which these morphological phenomena are the result of separate operations, as proposed in Bhatt 2003, Marantz 1991 and Bittner and Hale 1996. In the specific implementation of this theory discussed in section 2.2, Locality in agreement is relativized to case: an agreement head targets a DP with a particular case, and only DPs with this case can block agreement. As was
shown in sections 3-4, restructuring in Basque provides evidence for this aspect of the theory. On the other hand, in a theory in which case and agreement are part of the same operation, Locality cannot be relativized to case, and as shown in section 5, this theory fails to account for the relevant facts.
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Finiteness, Case and Agreement

Gülşat Aygen
Northern Illinois University

1. Introduction

The core theoretical claim questioned in this paper is the exclusively [+Tense] oriented theory of Nominative case-licensing that parametrizes languages according to the feature on T, i.e. [+tense] or [+phi features/Agreement] (Chomsky 1981, 2001, George & Kornfilt 1981, Raposo 1987, among others). The core data to be analyzed is Turkish inflected embedded clauses with agreement and ECM with optional agreement: Nominative-Subject Complement Clause (Declarative) in (1a) and Accusative-Subject Complement Clause (Declarative) in (1b).

(1) a. Ben-Ø [sen-Ø gel -di-n] sandi-m.
   I-Nom you-Nom come-Perf/Past-3sg think-Perf/Past-1 s
   'I thought you came/have come'

b. Ben-Ø [sen-i gel-di-n] san-di-m.
   I-Nom you-Acc come-Perf/Past-3sg think-Perf/Past-1 s
   'I thought you came/have come'

Turkish has been argued to be a language like European Portuguese (Raposo 1987) in which not tense but agreement defines finiteness (George and Kornfilt 1981), and licenses nominative case. I argue that in Turkic languages and possibly in Romance Inflected Infinitives, the feature licensing Nominative Case is a not Agreement per se as claimed (Kornfilt 1984, 2002) but a complex feature consisting of a feature in the C(omp) system, i.e. mood, and a feature in the I(nf)/T(ense) system, i.e. epistemic modality. The prediction of the proposed analysis is the ECM Hypothesis: lack of either one or both components of nominative case feature on I/T and C renders the structure non-finite. Non-nominative subject case, i.e. Accusative or Genitive, must then be licensed by the functional head available above the embedded clause: vP or DP. This prediction is attested in English, European Portuguese, Catalan, and Greek, among others. The major theoretical implication of this study is un-coupling case and agreement.