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John is similar to all girl
see Hauser (1974).
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SOME RELATING TRANSFORMATIONS IN BANAO

Jeffrey S. Roth
University of Chicago

I will briefly describe a few simple transformations in the Labovian dialect of Banao, then comment on the nature of their mutual relationships. I will also discuss the fact of syntactic reifications with respect to those transformations involving morphological ergativity.

Banao has [nq]-SP deletion much as in English, but differing in some details. As in English, the [nq]-SP rule deletes the lower-clause subject WP in certain constructions if it is coreferential to a 'controller' VP in the matrix clause. Consider this simple intransitive sentence:

(1) jaa - ten da
    go imperf Aux(3sp)
    'He is going.'

The main verb is here in the imperfective form, one of three possible aspect categories. The auxiliary, which acts mainly as a prep for pronominal elements, is here marked for third singular nominative.

When (1) is subordinated to "to want" and the lower-clause subject is coreferential to the controller (the wanter) we get this surface structure:

(2) nahi da jaa - go perf
    desire have(3sp/3pl)
    'He wants to go.'

The matrix clause consists of the noun nahi followed by da 'he has it' . The 'it' refers to nahi and is thus invariable in this construction; only the (ergative) subject is variable. (The verb 'to have' is identical to the transitive auxiliary, exemplified below.)

The lower clause in (2) shows deletion of the coreferential third singular nominative element, and hence of the auxiliary which prop it up in (1). The verb is now obligatorily in the perfective form, which is -g for this verb but -q or -p for others. The perfective form here functions as an infinitive rather than a true aspect form.

When the controller and lower-clause subject are
noncoreferential, we get this structure:

(3) nahi du joan dadin go Aux(3sg subj)
   'He wants him to go.'

The matrix clause is as in (2). In the lower clause, the auxiliary with its pronominal marker(s) remains, but is put in the subjunctive form. The verb loses its aspect markers and is put in the suffixless 'radical form'.

(For some verbs the perfective and radical forms are overtly distinct, e.g. ihhus -i and ihhus for 'to see'.)

The details are not very important. What does matter is that Basque is able to overtly distinguish (2) from (3), and thus provide the addressee with reasonably unambiguous surface structures. We should also note that this differentiation is possible only because Equi-NP Deletion applies in (2). Thus this rule has a beneficial disambiguating function (as it does in English), and does not merely delete 'redundant' material.

However, the Basque rule results in certain unpleasant side effects which have no parallel in English. The nature of these side effects will become apparent after we discuss constructions with transitive lower clauses. A simple transitive main clause looks like this:

(4) ihhus - ten nau
    see imperf Aux(3sg/1sg)
    'He sees me.'

Note that the auxiliary is marked for pronominal category of both ergative (subject) and nominative (object) NP's. Furthermore, when there is a dative NP its category is also marked in the auxiliary:

(5) ema - ten diot
    give imperf Aux(1sg/3sg/3sg)
    'I give it to him.'

Now let us suppose that (4) is subordinated to 'to want'. If the matrix clause has a subject NP coreferential to 'He' in the lower clause, Equi-NP Deletion will apply, and this is the result:

(6) (He has desire) ihhus - i
    see perf
    'He wants to see me.'

(We temporarily disregard the form of the matrix clause.) Similarly, if (5) is subordinated to 'I have desire', Equi-NP Deletion applies once more and we get:

(7) (I have desire) ema - φ
    give perf
    'I want to give it to him.'

If the controller and lower-clause subject are not coreferential we again get subjunctive complements:

(8) nahi du ihhus nazan
    desire have(3sg/3sg) see Aux(3sg/1sg subj)
    'He wants him to see me.'

Whether the lower clause is intransitive as in (2) and (3), or transitive as in (6) and (8), the choice between perfective (nonfinite) and subjunctive (finite) complements depends on whether the main-clause controller NP is coreferential to the lower-clause subject. This last notion is defined as the nominative NP in intransitive clauses and the ergative NP in transitive clauses. Thus, although Basque is thoroughly ergative morphologically--both in nominal morphology and with respect to the forms of the pronominal affixes in auxiliary verbs--and English accusative, both languages have an identical syntactic notion of subject including the sole NP of intransitive clauses and the agent NP in transitives, excluding the patient NP in transitives. More generally, I can see no evidence whatever that morphological ergativity in Basque has any implications for syntax except for rules directly related to surface morphology (e.g. the agreement rule which accounts for pronominal affixes in auxiliary verbs). Equi-NP Deletion and similar rules operate exactly in the same way as in English, Turkish, and other morphologically accusative languages.

Getting back to our main topic, we can see that the application of Equi-NP Deletion in (6), for example, is beneficial inasmuch as (6) can be overtly distinguished from (8). This if course means less ambiguity in surface
However, while resolving ambiguity between (6) and (8), Equi-NP Deletion in (6) created a new problem. By converting 1hun-ten nau in (4) into 1hun-m in (6), the rule deletes the auxiliary nau, which marks both third singular ergative and first singular nominative (object). The ergative element in the underlying structure can be easily recovered by interpretive conventions, just as English speakers interpret the surface structure he wants me to see as 'he wants to see me.' However, deletion of nau also brings about the loss of the nominative element, which is not recoverable. Note that as surface structure (6) stands, there is no indication (direct or indirect) of the pronoun category of the underlying lower-clause object, so we could also translate 'he wants to see you,' 'he wants to see them,' etc. This is the unpleasant side effect of Basque Equi-NP Deletion alluded to earlier.

There are various potential solutions to this difficulty which come to mind, but some would not be appropriate in the context of Basque grammar. One way would not be to delete the whole auxiliary of transitive lower clauses, but merely to delete the ergative element, such as English deletes the reflexential lower-clause subject but not other lower-clause TP's. By deleting the third singular ergative element in nau in (4), we would end up with an auxiliary marked only for first singular nominative—in other words, with what is formally an intransitive auxiliary. However, the addition of intransitive auxiliaries to transitive lower-clause verb stems is already used in another function; namely, to indicate (media-)passive:

(3) 1hun - ten nau
    see imperf Aux(lac)
    'I am seen.'

Perhaps with 1hun-m the (media-)passive is infrequent or even of doubtful grammaticality, but there are certainly many verbs which frequently take intransitive auxiliaries in the passive. Therefore this solution is not possible for Basque—the entire auxiliary must be deleted when Equi-NP Deletion applies.

Another alternative would be the regular use of independent pronouns to clear up ambiguities. Thus in (6) we could add ni (first singular nominative) to the lower clause

and in this way ensure the reading: 'he wants to see me' instead of 'he wants to see you' or the libe. However, independent pronouns are optional, sparingly used, and basically emphatic. Since in (6) there may be no special emphasis on the lower-clause object, the reliance on independent pronouns to clear up ambiguities would be undesirable.

There is, however, one potential solution which does not merely deflect the problem to another area, and this solution is ingeniously exploited by the language. Recall that nahi do 'desire he-hasu-it' in the matrix clauses of (5) and other examples has only one variable NP; namely, the ergative NP indicating the wanna. The 'ti't refers to the noun nahi and so is not variable. The dative slot in the verb 'to have' is vacant.

Then Equi-NP Deletion is about to apply in the 'to want' construction, the NP's threatened with unrecoverable deletion are always in nominative or dative case. A lower-clause ergative NP cannot be unrecoverably deleted in this construction because it can always be recovered by the simple interpretive conventions mentioned earlier. So we have potentially doomed nominative and/or dative NP's in the lower clause, and vacar or variable (hence uninformative) nominative and dative slots in the verb of the main clause. The obvious move—raise pronominial copies of the doomed lower-clause NP's into the main clause in the form of affixes added to the main clause verb (eliminating the uninformative and expendable 'ti' referring to nahi).

This is exactly what the language does, as we can see in this example:

(10) nahi nau 1hun - i
desire have(lac/laq) see perf
    'He wants to see me.'

This is the real surface structure of (6). Similarly, (7) in reality shows up as (11):

(11) nahi diot eman - g
    desire have(laq/laq/laq) give perf
    'I want to give it to him.'

By raising these pronominial copies into the matrix clause the language protects them from the deletion which does apply to the original pronominial in the lower clause.
The resulting surface structures, like (10) and (11), are clear and precise. The application of equi-NP deletion tells the addresser that the underlying subject of the lower clause is coreferential to the marker in the matrix clause, and the thinly veiled action of the copy-raising rule involves obligatory surface indication of pronominal categories of underlying non-subject NPs in the lower clause. This additional manifestation of the copy-raising rule shows up in the 'to be going to' construction, at least in some dialects and some historical periods. The construction is formally much like that of English, and shares its ambiguous reference to actual motion or to simple intention. The simple verb 'to go' has been exemplified in (1). The complex construction with copy-raising can be seen in (12):

(12) ira-nu - tae - rat amen - do-nega - read infin to apparently go(ing/to)

"He is apparently going to read them."

In this particular construction, the lower clause shows up in the infinitive form, with suffix -to or -tto, to which is added the allative suffix -nu. This type of clause, like the perfective clause in (15) or (16), does not have auxiliary verbs and so has no obligatory marking of pronominal category of non-subject NPs. To remedy this, copies of these pronouns are raised into the main clause and attached to the verb 'to go'. The verb is one of the few which can occur either with an auxiliary or in (1), or can incorporate pronominal affixes directly in the particular construction (12) this direct incorporation is preferred. Hence 'to go' is marked in (12) for third plural subject.

The type (12) occurs only sporadically and shows various irregularities (e.g. in the form of pronominal affixes with 'to go'). However, its occurrence reflects the operation of the same principle which underlies the copy-raising rule applying in (10) and (11), since it functions to preserve desired non-subject NP's of the lower clause by transferring copies of them into vacant slots in the matrix clause. There is one other interesting transformation which is appropriately discussed here. This is a rather unusual sentivization rule which applies to independent NP's and pronouns in infinitive constructions:

Since Nounes has ergative morphology, and since the nominative case is morphologically and structurally unmarked,
(17) nech'a hat - e: errai - te - te xo da pollit
         girl - a cry say infl for not lux(jaj) nice
       'It isn't nice for a girl to cry that.'

This shows that ergative NPs such as nech'a bota:
are not genitivized.
The rule should be formulated as follows: a NP not
already having a case suffix is genitivized in infinitive
clauses, unless it is the subject of that clause. Note
once again that we have a syntactic notion of subject
(including transitive agent NP's) distinct from the
morphological nominative case (which includes transitive
patient NP's).
I believe we can understand the motivation for the
historical development of the genitivization rule by
observing the beneficial synchronic contribution it makes
in the process of communication. We can see the nature
of this contribution in the light of certain peculiarities
of morphological case-marking in Kavay
The basic paradigm for definite nouns is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>-ak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note particularly the double function of -ak. In some
southern Basque dialects there are tonal differences (e.g.
gison-ed, gison-ak) which help differentiate the two, but
in the Labourdi dialect which we are considering: this is
not the case.
Consider these sentences:

(19) gison-ak zeme-a ikhun - ten du
         man son see imper lux(jaj/jaj)
       'The man sees the son.'

(20) gison-ak zeme-a ikhun - ten ditute
         man son see imper lux(jpl/jpl)
       'The son sees the man.'

(21) gison-ak zeme-a ikhun - ten ditu
         man son see imper lux(jaj/jpl)
       'The son sees the man.'
       'The man sees the son.'

As can be seen, gison-ak is clear in (19-20), and
ambiguously only in (21). In (19), zeme-a can only be
nominative (singular), so gison-ak is ergative (singular)
by elimination. Similarly, in (20) zeme-a must be
ergative (plural) so gison-ak can only be nominative
(plural). This is because gison- and zeme- cannot both
be in the same case without the conjunction ditu 'and'.
Only in (21) is there ambiguity, since both NPs are in
-ak. Word-order is not distinctive, so either of the
translations given is possible.
Suppose now that gison- is deleted in (19-21). This
is always possible, since deletion is the Basque correlate
of English pronounization. Then zeme- is deleted and
leaves behind only a pronominal suffix in the auxiliary,
so (19-21) become (19-21)'

(19') gison-ak iikun-ten du
       'The man sees him.'

(20') gison-ak iikun-ten ditute
       'They see the men.'

(21') gison-ak iikun-ten ditu
       'The men see them.'
       'The men see the man.'

Despite the absence of gison-, we are able to arrive at
the same degree of clarity as in (19-21). This is because
the form of the auxiliary verb helps narrow down the
possibilities. Thus du in (19') indicates third singular
ergative and third singular nominative. Therefore gison-ak
can not be nominative plural and so must be ergative
singular. The auxiliary ditute in (20') indicates that
both ergative and nominative NPs are third plural, so
gison-ak can not be ergative singular but rather must be
nominative plural. (21') is ambiguous since ditu indicates
third singular ergative and third plural nominative, and
gison-ak could be either of these.

The basic point to be noted is that the auxiliary is
very helpful in disambiguating -ak. Since in main clauses
it's may be deleted but the auxiliary may not, the latter is
the most reliable constituent for disambiguating the
meaning of -ak in NP's which survive deletion.
We have seen that Equi-IT Deletion creates infinitive,
perfective, and radical complement clauses which lack
auxiliaries and so do not have obligatory indication of
pronominal categories of underlying lower-clause NP's. There are also other sources of infinitive clauses, such as nomina actionis of the type seen in (17).

Suppose that \( (19' \rightarrow 21') \) are infinitivized in expressions meaning 'It is not good' for X to see Y'. Without genitivization \( (19' \rightarrow 21') \) would all be collapsed into (22):

\[
(22) \quad \text{gizon-ak ikhus-te-}
\]

There would no longer be any indirect clues telling us whether ak was here ergative singular or nominative plural.

In fact, however, genitivization does apply when gizon-ak is an underlying nominative. Therefore \( (20') \) and \( (21') \) on the second reading become:

\[
(23) \quad \text{gizon-en ikhus-te-
\text{man gen.pl. see infin}
\]

Therefore (22) can only mean 'seeing by the man' with ergative singular ak, and (23) can only mean 'seeing the men' with nominative plural ak. Genitivization is also helpful in the original complete clauses \( (19-21) \) when they are infinitivized. For example, it permits overt differentiation of the two readings of (21), as readers can easily verify by applying the genitivization rule.

Two of the rules we have discussed, copy-raising and direct-object genitivization, are rather bizarre at first sight. While raising and genitivization are familiar, the specific conditions and details of operation of the Basque rules are unusual and perhaps unique. What I have tried to show is that these idiosyncrasies are motivated by other peculiarities of Basque grammar. Copy-raising is necessary because Basque Equi-IP Deletion deletes entire bundles of pronominal affixes instead of just affixes referring to lower-clause subjects. Genitivization is a response to potential ambiguity created by the absence of auxiliaries in infinitive constructions—an ambiguity made more ominous by the chance syncretism of ergative singular and nominative plural. While individual rules would be bizarre if grafted onto English, the overall system created by the interaction of the various Basque rules is perfectly reasonable and efficient. The parts make sense only in terms of the whole.

Footnotes

1. Research on Basque was supported by the University of Nevada Basque summer program in Europe, summer 1972. I wish to thank Rudolf de Rijk and Luis Michelsen for worthwhile and interesting lectures. I also wish to thank Claudia Corum for nagging me into writing this paper.

The standard reference on Labourdin Basque is Lafitte's Grammaire, which I have consulted repeatedly. I would mention pp. 188-189, 221-223, 227-228, 255-256, and 449 as especially relevant to this paper. However, Lafitte's work is nongenerative, so the analysis presented here is mine and some data were obtained from readings in other sources. The notation 'ls/3s/3s' means first singular object (nominative) acted on by third singular subject (ergative). In 'ls/3s/3s' the last item is dative, and no forth.

2. Actually, it may be that the 'it' refers to the complement clause and is thus parallel to English sentential it. This is of no importance since the point to be made here is simply that the 'it' is invariable in this construction.

3. What follows is a brief description of the genitivization rule excluding some details. A fuller discussion will appear as my contribution to a volume of papers resulting from the summer program mentioned in footnote 1, to be edited by de Rijk.

4. For more details concerning such paradigms in various Basque dialects see H. Jacobsen's paper in the volume described in footnote 3.
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