Strategies of Verb and Verb Phrase Focus across Basque Dialects

Arantzazu Elordieta (UPV/EHU)

Bill Haddican (CUNY-Queens College)

1. Introduction[1]

This chapter describes four verb (phrase) focalization constructions, which vary across dialects and also by verb class and focus interpretation. We argue that the four constructions reflect different ways of complying with morphophonological requirements of foci, including the requirement that foci be capable of bearing sentence stress. In particular, we argue that these strategies reflect scattered deletion of material that would otherwise violate these constraints (Boskovic and Nunes 2007). In so doing, the discussion provides a partially unified analysis of these four constructions.

The discussion is organized as follows. In section 2, we describe the verb doubling strategy found in a handful of western dialects. This strategy, which is restricted to synthetic verb constructions, expresses polarity and contrastive focus. Section 3 describes the *ba*-insertion strategy, which applies in synthetic verb constructions in a larger set of dialects and has a set of interpretations similar to the verb doubling strategy. Section 4 presents the V1 strategy, which, across dialects, marks polarity focus and in some dialects is used to mark event focus. Section 5 deals with expletive *egin* insertion, which applies in analytic constructions with new information focus and contrastive focus on the verb or VP. Section 6 summarizes the chapter and discusses remaining challenges for the analysis presented.

2. The verb doubling strategy

We begin by describing the verb doubling construction. As illustrated in (1)-(5), this construction involves doubling of the verb root in a restricted set of contexts to be described shortly. In such constructions, the word containing the verb marker, verb root and infinitival marker appears to the left of a copy of the verb root along with tense and agreement morphology. This constituent obligatorily bears main intonational prominence. [2]

(1) Ni-k **j-akin** **d-aki-t** egia.

---

[2] The list of abbreviations used in the examples are the following<<. xxxxx

I-ERG VM-know-INF 3SG.know-1SG truth

'I know the truth.' [as opposed to'think' or 'believe it']

(Etxepare & Ortiz de Urbina 2003:476, (831))

(2) **J-ue-n**   **d-oie**, ala **e-torr-i** **dator**,   ba?

VM-go-INF   3SG-go or   VM-come-INF come.3SG then

'Well, is he leaving (right now), or is he coming?'

(Mallabia, Zuazo 1998:207)

(3) Orasiño i-tten bere **y-aki-n**   **d-aki-tzu**   faltzo horrek.

pray *do*-ASP too   VM-know-INF 3SG-knows.to.you false that

'That fake (guy) even knows to pray'

(Urduliz, Gilisasti 1997)

(4) **I-bil-i**   **d-abil**   beti   kale-a-n.

VM-walk-INF 3SG-walk always street-DET-LOC

'She is always WALKING in the street.'/

'She IS always walking in the street.'

(5) Kostaten da-na   kostaten dala   **e-karr-i** **da-kar-gu**   te   kittu.

Cost-INF AUX-RELAT cost   AUX-C   VM-bring-INF 3SG-bring-1PL and that's it

'Whatever it costs, we will indeed bring it, and end of the story.'

(Urduliz, Gilisasti 1997)

Such sentences can be interpreted with contrastive focus on the verb as reflected in the translations for (1)-(4) (Etxepare and Ortiz de Urbina 2003:476), but can also express positive polarity focus (affirmative denial), as reflected in the translations in (4)-(5)(Altube 1929, Arejita 1980, Euskaltzaindia 1985, Osa 1990). Doubling sentences are infelicitous in out of the blue ('What happened?') contexts and as answers to *wh*-questions questioning the verb, 'What is X doing?' In the relevant dialects, verb doubling is obligatory in synthetic contexts on these interpretations. Sentences without a double on such interpretations, on any stress pattern, are bad:

(6) *Ni-k, **d-aki-t**   egia.

I-ERG 3SG.know-1SG truth

'I KNOW the truth.' (as opposed to'think' or 'believe it')

The verb doubling construction is restricted to a handful of Western dialects including Urduliz-Gatika, Mallabia and Arratia dialects, and for some speakers in dialects further east between Western and Central Basque (Altube 1929, Arejita, 1980, 1984, 1988; Aurrekoetxea 1985, Osa, 1990; Zuazo, 1998, 2003, 2008, 2010). In addition, the verb doubling construction is restricted syntactically in several ways, which we describe below.

A first restriction on the doubling construction concerns verb class. A closed class of verbs in Basque is formed synthetically such that in imperfective finite contexts, tense and agreement morphology appears affixed to the verb root as in (1)-(6). With synthetic verbs in other aspectual contexts and open class "analytic" verbs in all finite contexts, tense and agreement morphemes do not appear affixed to the verb root, but rather on a separate auxiliary verb (Azkue 1923, Altube 1929, Arejita 1980, Euskaltzaindia 1977, 1985, Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina 2003). The inventory of verbs that behave synthetically varies to some degree from dialect to dialect. Euskaltzaindia (1977) and de Rijk (2008) cite 25 synthetic verbs with relatively regular usage, both transitives and intransitives. We illustrate the different behavior of synthetic and analytic verbs in these two aspectual environments in (7) and (8) respectively.

(7)   *Synthetic verbs*
        a. Jon dator.   b. Jon etorr-i   da.
           Jon come.3SG   Jon come-PERF AUX.3SG
           'Jon is coming.' [imperfective]   'Jon has come.' [perfective]

(8)   *Analytic verbs*
        a. Jon bazkal-tzen ari   da.   b. Jon-ek bazkal-du du.
           Jon lunch-IMPERF PROG AUX.3SG   Jon-ERG lunch-PERF AUX.3SG
           'Jon is eating lunch.' [imperfective] 'Jon has eaten lunch.' [perfective]

The relevance of these facts for verb focus constructions is that verb doubling is only available in synthetic contexts. As shown in (9), analytic verbs never double.

(9) *Bazkal-du bazkal-tzen   ari   da.

lunch-INF   lunch-IMPERF PROG AUX

'Jon is EATING LUNCH.'

Similarly, synthetic class verbs do not double when they behave analytically, that is, in non-imperfective contexts[3]:

(10)   *Ibil-i   ibil-i   da.

        walk-INF   walk-PERF AUX

        'She has WALKED.'

A second restriction on verb doubling is that it occurs only in contexts where polarity or the verb itself is contrastively focused, as reflected in the translations in (1)-(6). Verb-doubling is blocked in contexts in which additional VP material is focused along with the verb (Elordieta and Jouitteau 2010; Elordieta, 2013).

(11) *[Kalean ibil-i]   dabil.   (12)*[Ingeles eta frantses jakin] daki.

     street.in walk-INF walk.3SG   English and French know-INF know.3SG

     'She is WALKING IN THE STREET.'   '(S)he KNOWS ENGLISH AND FRENCH.'

A third restriction on doubling concerns word order. A well-known property of foci in Basque is that they must appear left-adjacent to the tense-bearing verb in synthetic constructions or left-adjacent to the verb cluster in analytic constructions (Altube 1929, Euskaltzaindia 1985, Ortiz de Urbina, 1989; Uriagereka, 1999). We illustrate this constraint for synthetic and analytic verbs in (13) and (14) respectively.

(13) *Synthetic verbs*

    a. Bost-etan JON dator.   b. *JON bost-etan dator.

       five-at Jon come.3SG   Jon five-at come.3SG

       'JON is coming at five.'   'JON is coming at five.'

(14) *Analytic verbs*

    a. Miren JON-EK ikus-i du.   b. *JON-EK Miren ikus-i du.

       Miren Jon-ERG see-PERF aux   Jon-ERG Miren see-PERF aux

---

[3] This sets aside instances where the first verb is topicalized and separated from the lower copy by a pause. This construction is called the V1 strategy and discussed in section 3.

‘JON has seen Mary.’   ‘JON has seen Mary.’

The only elements that can intervene between the verb cluster/tense bearing verb and the focused element are the negative morpheme *ez* (15), and a class of evidential and speech act particles including *ei* ‘allegedly’, as in (16).

(15) JON ez dator.   (16) JON ei dator.
    Jon   NEG come.3SG   Jon   EVID come.3SG
    ‘JON isn’t coming.’   ‘JON is allegedly coming.’

Importantly, in verb doubling contexts, no element can intervene between the copies, as shown in (17).

(17) *Jakin   ez/ei   dakizu   zuk hori.
     know   NEG/EVID know.2SG you that
     ‘You don’t/ allegedly KNOW that.’

These facts are plausibly related to the further fact that doubled verbs differ from argument and adjunct foci in Basque in being clause-bound. Another well-described property of argument/adjunct foci in Basque is that they can raise out of embedded clauses (Ortiz de Urbina, 1989).

(18) Nor esan duzu [~~nor~~ dabil-ela]?
    Who say AUX   walk.3SG-C
    ‘Who did you say is walking?’
(19) JON esan dute   [~~JON~~ dabil-ela]
     Jon   say AUX   walk.3SG-C
    ‘They said JON is walking.’

The verb doubling strategy is restricted to main contexts for some speakers (G. Aurrekoetxea, p.c.). However, other speakers also use it in embedded contexts (Arejita 1984, Osa 1990), as illustrated in (20). Importantly, as noted by Elordieta (2010), for such speakers, a “doubled” verb copy cannot raise out of its first-merged clause in this way (21).   In this

respect, it differs from V and VP focus in analytic contexts, to be described in section 4, which can move cyclically across finite clause boundaries.

(20) a. [I-bil-i   dabil-tza-n]   txartelak

     VM-walk-INF walk-3PL-C   credit.cards

    'Credit cards that WORK.'

    (Bank advertisement)

  b. Eztakitt   [j-oa-n six-oi-an   ala etorri etorren]

     NEG know   VM-go-INF go.PAST-C or come come.PAST-C

    'I don't know whether he was coming or going.'

    (Osa 1990)

(21) *Etorri esan dute [~~etorri~~ datorr-ela]

    come say AUX   comes-C

    'They said she is COMING.'

Verb doubling constructions akin to the Basque strategy discussed so far have described in a now considerable body of literature on languages including Nupe (Kandybowicz, 2007), Kwa (Aboh 2007), Russian (Abels 2001), European Portuguese (Martins, 2007), Haitian (Koopman 1984, Manfredi 1993, Harbour, 2008), Korean (Jo 2003), Hebrew (Landau 2006, 2007) and Breton (Jouitteau 2005, 2007, 2008, 2010). All such constructions involve doubling in the context of some topic or focus interpretation. This literature generally distinguishes two kinds of verb doubling constructions. In some languages, the higher copy appears to raise as an XP, in e.g. VP/predicate fronting in Russian (Abels 2001), Hebrew (Landau 2006, 2007) and Haitian Kreyol (Manfredi 1993, Harbour, 2008). A second scenario described for European Portuguese by Martins (2007) and Nupe (Kandybowicz 2007) is where the higher copy of the verb seems to have raised from the position of the lower copy by head movement.[4]

In the case of Basque, the facts that doubling constructions can never focus a VP and that the movement is clause-bound and can skip no intervening heads suggests that Basque belongs to the latter class, that is, that the verb raises as a head. In particular, we assume that the higher copy of the verb raises to the head of the same focus projection targeted by

---

[4] Another possibility is Elordieta & Jouitteau's (2010), and Jouitteau's (2011) analysis of doubling in Breton as postsyntactic excorporation.

argument/adjunct foci. One piece of evidence to this effect is that argument/adjunct foci can never co-occur as shown in (22).

(22) *Nor-k   j-akin   d-aki   egia.
     who-ERG VM-know-INF 3SG.know truth
     'Who KNOWS the truth.' [as opposed to 'think' or 'believe it']

We assume the functional sequence shown in (23), adapted from Laka (1990) and Ortiz de Urbina (1994, 1999) and assumed in much subsequent literature (Elordieta 2001, Elordieta and Haddican 2013, Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria 2011). Here Evid and Σ stand for the first-merged positions of evidential particle and polarity morphemes respectively.

(23) [Top* [Focus [Σ [Evid [T …]]]]]

Specifically, we propose that the higher copy raises from T to Foc, as in (24), which corresponds to the example in (1).

(24) [TopP *Nik* Top [FocusP *jakin*-Focus [TP *dakit …egia*]]]]

From the perspective of this proposal, a question that arises is why the tense-bearing verb cannot raise to Foc without need for doubling. Such a derivation, presumably, would lead to the ill-formed example in (6). A further question is why the higher copy appears with infinitival morphology and not in its finite form. These issues are plausibly related to the status of the lower copy as a tense-bearing verb. Given that V-doubling may apply in all synthetic (V-T raising) contexts and never in synthetic contexts where the verb root does not raise to T, V-T movement appears to be crucially implicated in doubling. Specifically, we propose that the inability of the tense-bearing verb to move to Focus is related to a well-known ban on tense-bearing verbs in sentence initial position, discounting topics (Altube 1929, Euskaltzaindia 1985, Ortiz de Urbina 1989, 1994, Uriagereka 1999, Etxepare and Ortiz de Urbina 2003, Elordieta and Jouitteau 2010). We illustrate this constraint, which we will refer to as "*T1" in (25). In (25a), the tense-bearing verb sits in sentence initial position and the result is bad. (25b,c) show word orders where the verb is shielded from the left edge of the sentence by negation and foci, which are fine. (25d) shows that topics, which are

obligatorily separated from material to their right by an intonational break, do not count as first position elements.

(25) a. *Dator   Mikel   b. Ez dator   Mikel

    come.3SG Mikel   NEG come.3SG Mikel

    'Mikel is coming.'   'Mikel is not coming.'

  c. MIKEL/Nor dator./?   b. *Mikel, dator./?

    Mikel/who come.3SG   Mikel come.3SG

    'MIKEL/who is coming./?'   'As for Mikel, he is coming.'

*T1 is violable, however in some embedded clause types, as in the temporal adjunct clause and the embedded yes/no questions in (26) and (27) respectively (Ortiz de Urbina 1994, Elordieta and Haddican 2014).

(26)   Jon   ikusi-ko dut [datorr-en-ean/%ba-datorr-en-ean].

    Jon-ABS see-FUT AUX come.3SG-C-in/ba-come.3SG-C-in

    'I will see Jon when he comes.'

(27)   Ez daki-t   [datorr-en/%ba-datorr-en]   ala ez.

    NEG know-1SG come.3SG-C/ba-come.3SG-C or not

    'I don't know if (s)he's coming or not.'

It has been suggested that the above pattern is akin to V2, in light of the fact that V2 effects in Germanic languages other than English do not apply in some kinds of embeddings (Ortiz de Urbina 1989, 1994; Uriagereka 1999). According to Ortiz de Urbina's (1989) influential approach to I-to-C in Basque, Basque instantiates the standard analysis of V2 in Germanic, which models V2 as a conspiracy of an EPP feature on a C-field head and a verb-raising feature on this same head (Chomsky 2000, Roberts 2004, Julien 2009, Jouitteau 2008, Holmberg to appear, Leu 2011). On such an approach, the contrast in (25a) vs. (26)/(27) might be taken to reflect the need for EPP-driven XP movement to C in root clauses but not in embedded clauses. Haddican and Elordieta (2013, in preparation) nevertheless describe several sets of word order facts that are problematic for this approach and argue instead that the tensed verb does not raise to the same C-head that attracts XP-movement (see also Uriagereka 1999 for a similar proposal). To mention some, the linearization of the verb+aspect complex with respect to focalized constituents raises some problems. We saw in

(30) that the main verb in analytic contexts can be a first position element. Under the V2 approach, this means that it raises as an XP. Nevertheless, when a constituent is focalized the non-finite verb appears between the focus and the tensed auxiliary, resulting in the order XP$_{foc}$-V-Aux:

(28)   Liburua   eros-i   du Jon-ek

      book-DET buy-PERF AUX Jon-ERG

    'Jon has bought THE BOOK.' (focus on the object)

If we want to maintain that the finite verb in second position is in a spec-head configuration with the focused XP, as on the standard V2 approach, the main verb should not be able to intervene between them. It seems thus that in such contexts the lexical verb instead is head-adjoined to the finite auxiliary. In fact, in Ortiz de Urbina's (1989, 1994), and Elordieta's (2001) analysis, the [verb+aspect] complex head-adjoins to T to satisfy a lexicalization requirement on the morphologically weak auxiliary. The [Verb+Aux] then head-adjoins to a C-related head when there is movement to the left periphery, namely in *wh*-questions and focalizations. But then, this analysis faces the non-trivial obstacle of explaining why the verb can behave like a first-position XP in some contexts but a head in "C" in others.

We adopt from Ortiz de Urbina's proposal the idea that *T1 is phonological in nature. We assume that Focus projects in all root clauses, and that this projection must contain an element bearing main stress. (See Elordieta and Haddican, 2013, 2014 for a discussion of the difference between root and non-root contexts in terms of *T1.) A well-known property of finite verbs in Basque is that they are never prominent, that is, they can never bear main stress (Ortiz de Urbina 1989, 1994, Elordieta 2001). This restriction is certainly due some explanation, which we are not able to provide here. Rather, we simply observe this as a property of finite verbs in Basque:

(29) Finite verbs in Basque are not stress-bearing.

In the well-formed example in (25c), the foci will occupy FocusP, and in (25d) the negative morpheme *ez*, which bears main intonational prominence in the sentence, will occupy FocusP, having raised from ΣP. The ill-formed examples in (25a,b), however, cannot be parsed with a stress-bearing element in FocusP, since, in both cases, the only possible

element that could occupy this position is the prosodically weak finite verb. For the same reason, in the case of verb doubling, what blocks T-Focus movement in sentences like (6) is the absence of a stress-bearing item in FocusP. In such cases, this constraint is therefore in conflict with the need for the element interpreted as the focus—the verb—to raise to Focus and bear stress prominence.

Our proposal for verb doubling in Basque is that it reflects PF repair by "scattered deletion" of copies, that is, spell out of multiple and/or lower copies in a way that accommodates these conflicting needs (Nunes 2004, Boskovic and Nunes 2007). Specifically, we take the verb doubling construction to involve spell out of two copies of the verb root—one in T and one in Focus. On the higher copy, tense and agreement morphology will be deleted in compliance with (29). (See Landau 2006 for a similar analysis of doubling in Hebrew.) We assume that the morphology associated with infinitives—the verb marker and the infinitival marker—is inserted after deletion of the tense/agreement morphology at vocabulary insertion. That is, these are the vocabulary items associated with these verbs in the bare form. We illustrate this proposal in (30), which represents the two verb copies in (1). Here, for expositional convenience, we use "ϕ" as shorthand for person/number agreement features on the verb.

(30) a. ***Spell out structure (following T-Foc movement)***

$[_{\text{FocusP}} \ [[[know_{[\text{FOC}]}]\text{-}T_\phi]\text{-Focus} \ [_{\text{TP}} \ [[[know_{[\text{FOC}]}]\text{-}T_\phi] \ \ldots]]]]$

b. ***Deletion of the higher copy of T (pursuant to (29))***

$[_{\text{FocusP}} \ [[[know_{[\text{FOC}]}]\text{-}\cancel{T_\phi}]\text{-}\cancel{\text{Focus}} \ [_{\text{TP}} \ [[[know_{[\text{FOC}]}]\text{-}T_\phi] \ \ldots]]]]$

c. ***Vocabulary insertion***

$[_{\text{FocusP}} \ jakin \ [_{\text{TP}} \ dakit \ \ldots]]$

We consider additional evidence implicating *T1 in this derivation in the following section.

3. The *ba*-insertion strategy

As described in the previous section, verb doubling constructions are restricted to dialects on the western edge of the Basque dialect area. In this section, we discuss an alternative verb focus strategy in these same dialects and in some dialects further east where

doubling is disallowed, which involves insertion a morpheme *ba-* to the left of the finite verb as in (31).[5]

(31) Ba-daki-t.

   ba-know-1SG

   'I KNOW (not just think)'/'I DO know'.

In all dialects, it is possible to combine doubling with *ba-*, as in (32), but in such sentences the verb is necessarily interpreted as a topic rather than as focus.

(32)   Etorri, ba-dato-z.

       come-INF *ba*-come-3PL

       'As for coming, they are indeed coming.'

Importantly, restrictions on *ba*-insertion are similar to those described above for verb-doubling particularly in central and western dialects. First, in central and western dialects, the *ba-* strategy is restricted to synthetic verbs, like doubling constructions. In some eastern dialects of Basque, however, *ba-* also occurs with the finite auxiliary of analytic constructions:

(33)   Ba-dut bazkal-du

       Ba-AUX lunch-PERF

       'I DID have lunch/I HAD LUNCH' (eastern dialects)

Second, in central and western dialects, *ba*-insertion constructions are limited to polarity focus interpretations and contrastive verb focus interpretations. In these dialects, they are not possible with contrastive or new information focus on the VP, or with new information focus on the verb. (34), for example, is not a felicitous answer to the Basque

[5] This morpheme is distinct from the homophonous morpheme corresponding to English complementizer 'if'. Some grammarians hypothesize that the *ba-* morpheme may be historically related to the affirmative particle *bai*, 'yes' (see Altube 1929, Arejita 1980, Laka 1990, Osa 1990), but they do not seem to pattern together in its extended usage in non-standard speech. As opposed to *bai*, which may occur in informal non-standard speech as a contrastive assertive particle preceding a finite auxiliary/synthetic verb, *ba-* only appears with synthetic verbs:

(i) **bai**dot   / *****ba**dot   ikusi zure ama.

    yes-AUX   *ba*-AUX   see your mum

    'I HAVE seen your mum.'

counterpart of *What are they doing?* Some eastern, however the *ba-* construction is indeed possible with new information on the verb phrase.

The placement of *ba-* left-adjacent to the tense-bearing verb suggests the possibility that *ba-* sits in the same position occupied by the verb double in verb doubling contexts. A difference between the two constructions, from this perspective, however, is that *ba-* , unlike the verb double, need not be left-adjacent to the tense bearing verb. It can be separated from the verb by *omen* 'allegedly' and its western dialectal variant, *ei* (cf. (16)).

(34) Ba omen/ei   dato-z   gu-regana.
    ba allegedly come-3PL we-to
    'They are COMING towards us.'/'They ARE coming towards us.'

Like verb copies in the doubling construction, *ba-* is clause bound, i.e. cannot extract to a higher clause unlike argument/adjunct foci.

(35) *Ba esan   dute [~~ba~~ datorr-ela]
    ba say AUX   comes-C
    'They said she is COMING.'

We take the appearance of *ba-* in verb focus sentences like (34) to be a special case of a more general repair strategy involving the morpheme *ba-* that Ortiz de Urbina (1994) calls "*ba*-support", that is, insertion of an expletive *ba-* morpheme. Ortiz de Urbina's (1994) analysis of *ba-,* which we adopt, is that *ba-* is inserted at PF to rescue configurations that would otherwise violate the *T1 restriction discussed above. In addition, as Ortiz de Urbina (1994) notes, *ba-* insertion is a last resort strategy—it cannot apply in contexts where it does not repair *T1. We illustrate this in (36), which shows the distribution of *ba-* in the contexts introduced in (25). (36a,d) shows that *ba-* repairs *T1 violations, where the finite verb abuts the left edge of the clause or is preceded only by a topic. (36b,c) show that *ba-* is not possible where it is not needed, that is, in the presence of negation or foci, which separate the verb from the left edge of the sentence.

(36) a. *(Ba)-dator   Mikel   b. Ez (*ba-)dator   Mikel
       ba-come.3SG Mikel   NEG *ba*-come.3SG Mikel

'Mikel is coming.'   'Mikel is not coming.'

   c. MIKEL/Nor (*ba-)dator./?   d. Mikel, *(ba-)dator./?

     Mikel/who   *ba*-come.3SG   Mikel   *ba*-come.3SG

     'MIKEL/who is coming./?'   'As for Mikel, he is coming.'

In comparing the *ba-* strategy to the verb doubling strategy (and two other strategies to be discussed shortly), we will focus on central and western dialects and set aside eastern dialects, where, as we have noted, the *ba-* strategy has a different set of interpretations and applies in analytic contexts as well. For central and western dialects, where the *ba-* strategy is similar in distribution to verb doubling, we propose that the *ba-* construction differs from verb doubling constructions in that the entire higher copy of the verb, in Foc, deletes rather than just the *T1-offending morphology. *Ba*-support then applies in the usual way to fix the *T1 violation. We illustrate this proposal in (37) which corresponds to (31).

(37) a. ***Spell out structure (following T-Foc movement)***

     [$_{\text{FocusP}}$ [[[*know*$_{[\text{FOC}]}$]-T$_\phi$]-Focus [$_{\text{TP}}$ [[[*know*$_{[\text{FOC}]}$]-T$_\phi$] …]]]]

   b. ***Deletion of the higher copy of V (pursuant to (29))***

     [$_{\text{FocusP}}$ ~~[[[*know*$_{[\text{FOC}]}$]-T$_\phi$]-Focus~~ [$_{\text{TP}}$ [[[know$_{[\text{FOC}]}$]-T$_\phi$] …]]]]

   c. ***Ba-support and vocabulary insertion***

     [$_{\text{FocusP}}$ *ba-* [$_{\text{TP}}$ *dakit* …]]

On this approach, something more will be required to explain a difference we have noted between the *ba*-insertion strategy and the verb doubling strategy, namely that, in the doubling construction, the higher copy of the verb must be strictly adjacent to the verb unlike *ba-*. Specifically, if we take T-Foc movement to happen in the syntax, and if we take the head movement constraint to be a narrow syntactic phenomenon, then T-Foc movement should be blocked by an intervening evidential particle. This blocking appears to apply in the verb-doubling construction as illustrated in (17), but not in the *ba-* construction in (34). We speculate that head movement constraint violations are evaluated at PF after chain reduction has applied.

4. The V1 strategy

The two strategies discussed so far apply only in synthetic verb constructions in the central and western dialects that we have focused on. A prediction of the foregoing analysis

is that, in analytic contexts, where tense and agreement morphology is not realized on the verb root-containing cluster, but rather on an auxiliary, focalized verbs should be able to raise to focus.   In this section, we propose that a construction we call the V1 construction is indeed evidence to this effect and aim to reconcile it with the syntax proposed for verb doubling and the *ba-* strategy just discussed.   We illustrate this construction in (38), from Ortiz de Urbina (1994).   Here the verb root+aspect cluster bears stress prominence and appears clause initially (excepting topics), with arguments following.

(38)   Eros-i   du Jon-ek liburu-a.
        buy-PERF AUX Jon-ERG book-DET
        'Jon HAS bought the book.' (general verum focus reading across dialects)
        /'Jon has BOUGHT the book' (also verb focus in Eastern dialects)
        (Ortiz de Urbina, 1994)

Ortiz de Urbina (1994) gives the sentence in (38) as an example of polarity focus, and across dialects this construction can have this interpretation.   In addition, in eastern dialects this construction is also available for corrective and new information focus on the verb.   This fact may be related to the fact that eastern dialects lack a fourth construction to be discussed shortly—the dummy *egin* strategy—which marks contrastive and new information focus on verbs in analytic contexts in western dialects.   (In central and western dialects, we propose that this *egin* construction blocks the *V1 construction on the contrastive focus interpretation.)

        The fact that this construction never focuses phrasal constituents but always either the verb or polarity suggests that the constituent that raises is a head rather than as an XP, as suggested by Ortiz de Urbina (1994). On the other hand, if this movement is head movement all the way to Foc, then the V+aspect cluster will have needed to raise past the auxiliary, apparently skipping intervening heads.   In modeling these facts, we propose to take full advantage of the scattered deletion approached embraced in the previous two sections.   In particular, we assume that the verb+aspect cluster raises all the way to Focus, by successive head adjunction, skipping no intervening heads including T. Through this movement, the focused verb can be in FocusP at PF as required, apparently, of all foci in Basque.   The ban on finite verbs in Focus, however, will necessitate a repair, and we propose that this repair involves deleting the tense and agreement morphology from the higher copy, with the consequence that the auxiliary will spell out in a lower position, in T.   The verb root+aspect

cluster spells out in the higher position in the usual way. (39) illustrates this proposal for the higher portion of (38).

(39) a. ***Spell out structure (following V-Asp-T-Foc movement)***

   [$_{FocusP}$ [[[*buy*$_{[FOC]}$]-Asp]-T$_\phi$]-Focus [$_{TP}$ [[[*buy*$_{[FOC]}$]-Asp]-T$_\phi$] …]]]]

   b. ***Deletion of the higher copy of T (pursuant to (29))***

   [$_{FocusP}$ [[[*buy*$_{[FOC]}$]-Asp]~~-T$_\phi$]-Focus~~ [$_{TP}$ ~~[[[buy$_{[FOC]}$]-Asp]~~-T$_\phi$] …]]]]

   c. ***Vocabulary insertion***

   [$_{FocusP}$ *erosi* [$_{TP}$ *du* …]]

To summarize, we have proposed that three strategies for verb focus in Central and Western Basque dialects—verb doubling, *ba*-support and V1 orders—differ in two main ways: (i) the way syntax feeds chain reduction; and (ii) the way that chain reduction/copy deletion accommodates prosodic requirements of foci in Basque. We have argued that chain reduction/copy deletion is sensitive to a requirement that FocusP contain intonationally prominent material.

5. The dummy *egin* strategy

A final member of our menagerie of Basque Verb focus constructions is one in Central and Western Basque dialects where, with all verbs (synthetic and analytic) in non-imperfective contexts and with the open class of analytic verbs independently of their aspect, a focus interpretation on V co-occurs with a dummy or light verb *egin* 'do'. We illustrate this in (41), a felicitous answer to 'What has Miren done?'

(41)   Miren-ek   bazkal-du   egi-n   du.
         Miren-ERG   eat.lunch-INF   do-PERF   AUX
         'Miren has EATEN LUNCH.'

Such sentences with *egin* necessarily have a verb focus interpretation. *Egin* cannot appear in out-of-the-blue, wide focus contexts like (42), as an answer to 'What happened?' but rather co-occurs with narrow contrastive or new information focus strictly on the verb (rather than VP) in most dialects.

(42)   a. #Miren-ek   bazkal-du   egin   du.
            Miren-ERG have.lunch-INF do-PERF AUX
        b. Miren-ek   bazkal-du   du.
           Miren-ERG have.lunch-INF   AUX
           'Miren has eaten lunch.'

Rebuschi (1983) and Haddican (2005, 2007) argue that in sentences such as (41), the verb raises to the same left-peripheral focus position targeted by argument and adjunct foci as in (43). As Haddican (2005, 2007) discusses in detail, the focused VP in (41) behaves like other kinds of left-peripheral foci in Basque in terms of word order, scope and intonation. Indeed, as regular foci in (43), the focused verb in (41) bears intonational prominence and immediately precedes the verbal complex bearing aspectual, tense and agreement-features:

(43)   a. Nork   eros-i   ditu hainbeste liburu?
           who-ERG buy-PERF AUX so many book
           'Who has bought so many books?'
        b. **Miren-ek**   eros-i   ditu hainbeste liburu
           Miren-ERG buy-PERF AUX so many book
           'MIREN has bought so many books.'

Haddican (2005, 2007), based on data mainly from the Oiartzun dialect, argues that like other left peripheral foci, the verb in sentences like (41) raises to the focus projection as an XP rather than as a head. The facts are clearest in dialects like Oiartzun's that allow for remnant topicalization (Ortiz de Urbina, 2002). In the representation in (44), for example, the non-focalized portion of the sentence *Mirenek egin ditu . . .* raises as a remnant topic leaving the focused VP right-peripherally.

(44) a. Mirenek egin   ditu(,) den-denak jan.
         Miren   do-PERF AUX   all-all   eat
     b.[Top Mirenek egin ditu [Foc den-denak jan] [~~Mirenek den-denak jan egin ditu~~]]
         Miren do-PERF AUX   all-all   eat
         'Miren has EATEN THEM ALL'

It seems, though, that the operation of remnant topicalization must apply in order to obtain a VP-focus interpretation with dummy *egin*. Without topicalization we obtain a focus reading on the verb itself, excluding the object from being interpreted as focus.[6]

(45) Mirenek den-denak jan egin ditu

    Miren   all-all   eat do-PERF AUX

    'Miren has EATEN them all'/'*Miren has EATEN THEM ALL.'

In addition, as we noted earlier, all dialects with the *egin* focus construction allow for verbal foci, like other kinds of foci, to extract to a higher clause as in (46). This is straightforwardly predicted if the verb raises as an XP, but mysterious if the verb raises as a head, a movement which is more restricted locally:

(46) Erosi esan didate   [~~erosi~~ egi-n   zenue-la etxe-a].

    buy   say AUX   do-PERF AUX-C house-DET

    'They have told me that you BOUGHT the house.'(as opposed to, say, rent it)

Importantly, in constructions with *egin*, the dummy verb bears the aspectual morphemes that normally appear on the main verb and the main form appears in its infinitival citation. In (47), for example, the imperfective morpheme *-ten* appears affixed on *egin*, rather than on the main verb *sinetsi*, 'believe'.

(47) Hori sinets-i   egi-ten   dugu.

    that believe-INF do-IMPERF AUX

    'We BELIEVE that.'

Based on this last fact, Haddican (2005, 2007) and Elordieta (2009, 2010) propose that *egin* is merged to provide lexical support for the aspectual morphemes only in environments where the main verb has more pressing commitments in the left periphery. Haddican (2007)

---

[6] This may be related to the fact that Basque has a more 'economic' strategy to mark information focus on VP, namely leaving the focus in-situ, without any movement involved. As argued in Elordieta (2001) and Irurtzun (2007), information focus in Basque applies in-situ as a result of the NSR (Cinque 1993, Reinhart 1995, Reinhart & Neeleman 1998), and by occurring left-adjacent to the finite verb. The idea behind these proposals is that by being SOV, either O, [OV] or [SOV], the whole sentence, may be interpreted as information focus. Thus, there would be no need to insert *egin* in (27), in the absence of any movement.

argues it is an expletive element, whereas Elordieta (2010) treats it as a pseudocopy of the verb root, which bears aspectual features.

The question that arises with this strategy is similar to the one considered above in the case of T-Focus movement with synthetic verbs, namely why the aspect-bearing verb cannot raise as an XP to FocusP without need for *egin* in the derivation. We cannot offer a particularly explanatory answer to this question, nor do Haddican (2007) nor Elordieta (2010). Manfredi (1993), however, notes that, cross-linguistically, focalized verb phrases tend to bear nominalizing morphology, and proposes that this is a condition on VP focus constructions. We propose that this requirement is related to the appearance of *egin* in Basque. That is, *egin* is inserted to host aspectual morphology, so that the focused verb in FocusP may appear with in its infinitival morphology, which we take to contain a nominalizing morpheme (Haddican 2007).

6. Conclusion

This chapter has outlined four strategies for focusing verbs and VPs in Basque. The constructions differ in kinds of focus interpretations they may have, as well as the contexts in which they apply—that is, whether they appear with synthetic or analytic verb forms. We summarize the distribution of these four constructions in Table 1.

	Synthetic contexts		Analytic contexts	
Focus type	**V-doubling**	***Ba-***	**V1**	***Egin***
New information focus	* all dialects	* all dialects	* all dialects	✓ centr./west. * eastern
Polarity Focus	✓ western * centr./east.	✓ all dialects	✓ all dialects	* all dialects
Contrastive Focus	✓ western * centr./east.	✓ all dialects	* centr./west. ✓ eastern	✓ centr./west. * eastern

Table 1: Focus properties of Verb and VP focus constructions in Central/Western/Eastern dialects

We have outlined a partially unified approach to the first three of these constructions—the V doubling *ba*-support and V1 constructions—which are similar in their ranges of interpretation, and in being head movement rather than XP movement

constructions. We have proposed that these constructions differ in the way that chain reduction accommodates phonological needs of foci in Basque. We propose that the *egin* construction is of a different nature involving XP movement of foci that can receive new information interpretations.

Many questions remain, the most important among these concerning the source of the differences in interpretation among these constructions, and particularly between the *egin* construction in central/western dialects and the other three. Future work might usefully address these issues, which have not so far received extensive formal analysis.

References:

Abels, K. 2001. The predicate cleft construction in Russian. Formal Approaches to Slavic linguistics (FALS) 9:1-18. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Aboh, E.O. 2007. Leftward Focus versus Rightward Focus: the Kwa-Bantu Conspiracy. SOAS WPiL 15: 81-104.

Altube, S., 1929. Erderismos. Indauchu, Bilbao, 2 edn.

Arejita, A., 1980. Aditzaren galdegai funtzioaz. Euskera: Euskaltzaindiaren lan eta agiriak 25, 355–369.

Azkue, M. R., 1923. Morfología vasca (gramática básica dialectal del euskera). Tomo i: Los afijos vascos; tomo ii: Categorías gramaticales.

Boskovic, Z., Nunes, J., 2007. The copy theory of movement: a view from PF. In Corver, N., Nunes, J., The Copy Theory of Movement. Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 13-74.

Chomsky, N. 2000, Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In: Roger Martin, D. M., Uriagereka, J. (Eds.), Step by step. Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., pp. 83–155.

Elordieta, A. 2009. Aldaera sintaktikoak aditzaren fokalizazioan. *Lapurdum* 13: 99-112.

Elordieta, A., 2010. Aditzaren bikoizketa foku-topikoa denean. Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca" Julio de Urquijo" , 37–54.

Elordieta, A., Jouitteau, M. 2010. Verb-doubling in Basque and Breton, talk delivered at the 4th european dialect syntax meeting, Donostia.

Etxepare, R., Ortiz de Urbina, J., 2003. Focalization. In: Hualde, J. I., de Urbina, J. O. (Eds.), A Grammar of Basque. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 460–516.

Etxepare, R., Uribe-Etxebarria, M., 2011. Hitz hurrenkera eta birregituraketa euskaraz.

Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca Julio de Urquijo 43.

Euskaltzaindia, 1985. Euskal Gramatika. Lehen Urratsak-I. Bilbo: Euskaltzaindia.

Gilisasti I., 2003 [1997]. Urduliz aldeko Berba lapikokoa. Bilbao: Uribe Kostako
	Mankomunitatea.

Haddican, B., 2005. Aspects of language variation and change in contemporary
	Basque. Ph.D. thesis, New York University.

Haddican, B., 2007. On *egin*: Do-support and VP focus in Central and Western
	Basque. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 25, 735–764.

Harbour, D., 2008. *klivaj predika*, or predicate clefts in Haitian. Lingua
	118, 853–871.

Holmberg, A. to appear, Verb second. In: Kiss, T., Alexiadou, A. (Eds.), Syntax: an
	International Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Research. 2nd Edition. Walter de
	Gruyter, Berlin.

Jo, J.M. 2003. Variations in predicate cleft constructions in Korean: epiphenomena at the
	syntax-PF interface. Presented at the 10th Harvard International Symposium on
	Korean Linguistics.

Jouitteau 2008, The brythonic reconciliation. Linguistic Variation Yearbook 7, 163–200.

Jouitteau, M. 2011. Post-syntactic excorporation in realizational morphology: Evidence from
	Breton. In Carnie, A., (Ed.) Formal Approaches to Celtic Linguistics. Cambridge
	Scholars Publishing, 115-142.

Julien, M. 2009, Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish. Working Papers in Scandinavian
	Syntax 80, 103–161.

Kandybowicz, J., 2007. On fusion and multiple copy spell-out. In: Corver, N.,
	Nunes, J. (Eds.), The Copy Theory of Movement. John Benjamins, Amsterdam,
	pp. 119–150.

Koopman, H. 1984. The syntax of verbs: from verb movement rules in the Kru languages to
	Universal Grammar. Dordrecht: Foris.

Laka, I., 1990. Negation in syntax, on the nature of functional categories and projections.
	Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dept. of Linguistics and
	Philosophy.

Landau, I. 2006. Chain reduction in Hebrew V(P)-fronting. Syntax 9: 32-66.

Leu, T. 2011. Generalized x-to-c in germanic. Ms. UQAM.

Manfredi, V. 1993. Verb focus in the typology of Kwa/Kru and Haitian. In: Byrne, F.,
	Winford, D. (Eds.), Focus and grammatical relations in Creole languages.

Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 3-51.

Martins, A. M., 2007. Double realization of verbal copies in European Portuguese emphatic affirmation. In: Corver, N., Nunes, J. (Eds.), The Copy Theory of Movement. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 77–118.

Nunes, J. 2004. Linearization of Chains and sideward movement. Cambridge, MA:MIT Press.

Ortiz de Urbina, J., 1989. Some Parameters in the Grammar of Basque. Foris Publications, Dordrecht.

Ortiz de Urbina, J., 1994. Verb-initial patterns in basque and breton. Lingua 94, 125–153.

Ortiz de Urbina, J., 2002. Focus of correction and remnant movement in Basque. In: Artiagoitia, X. (Ed.), Erramu Boneta. Festschrift for Rudolf PG de Rijk. University of the Basque Country, Bilbao, Basque Country, pp. 511–524.

Osa, E., 1990. Euskararen hitzordena komunikazio zereginaren arauera. Ph.D. thesis, University of the Basque Country.

Rebuschi, G., 1983. A note on focalization in Basque. ASJU-Journal of Basque Studies 4, 29–42.

de Rijk, R. 2008. Standard Basque: A progressive gramar. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.

Roberts, I., 2004. The C-system in Brythonic Celtic languages, V2, and the EPP. In: Rizzi, L. (Ed.), The cartography of syntactic structures, volume 2. Oxford University Press, New York/Oxford, pp. 297–327.

Uriagereka, J., 1999. Minimal restrictions on Basque movements. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 17, 403–444.

Zuazo, K., 1998. Euskalkiak, gaur. Fontes linguae vasconum: Studia et documenta 30, 191–234.

Zuazo, K., 2003. Euskalkiak: Herriaren Lekukoak. Elkar, Donostia.

Zuazo, K., 2008. Euskalkiak: Euskararen Dialektoak. Elkar, Donostia.

Zuazo, K., 2010. El euskera y sus dialectos. Alberdania, Donostia.