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0. Introduction

The term ‘allocutive’ refers to the verb agreeing with the addressee which doesn’t belong to the set of arguments of the verb in question. In Basque the allocutives are used in case of so called familiar treatment / intimacy, when the addressee and the speaker share some background (see Alberdi (1994), Aurrekoetxea (2003)). Basque Allocutive Marker (BAM) is a suffix with two gender variations: -k/-a- for masculine, -n/-na- for feminine addressee, (1) presents a neutral and a pair of allocutive forms:

(1) Ataun-en jaio n-aiz / n-au-k / n-au-n
Ataun-LOC born 1SG.ABS-AUX 1SG.ABS-AUX-BAM.M 1SG.ABS-AUX-BAM.F

I was born in Ataun.

Previous approaches to allocutive include Oyharçabal (1993)’s generative account, Eguren (2000)’s and Albizu (2003)’s analyses in terms of Distributed Morphology. B. Oyharçabal introduces an allocutive operator e_ALLO which is generated in the Spec-TP thus forcing out complementizers. This analysis explains the fact that, according to Oyharçabal and others, allocutive forms can’t be used in embedded clauses (see below). L. Eguren shows that allocutive resembles to ergative or — in some cases — dative argument morphologically, and to neither of them syntactically; basing on this he concludes that the allocutive is generated on an autonomous post-syntactic level. P. Albizu redefines Basque cases and allocutivity in terms of following clusters of features organized in a hierarchical manner: [±MARK(ed)], [±OBL(ique)], [±ARG(ument)].

1. Morphological properties of BAMs

- BAMs occupy an argument-like position in the verb triggering stem vowel changes in ABS and ABS-ERG auxiliaries and initial consonant change in ABS-DAT-ERG auxiliaries:

(2) beste-a-k ez dira / d-it-u-k etor-ri
other-DET.PL NEG 3.ABS.AUX / 3.ABS-PLZ-AUX-BAM.M come-PFV

The others haven’t come.

(3) ema-n-go d-i-zki-o-gu / z-i-zki-o-na-gu

We will give him/her these things.

- BAMs are always placed into a pre-ergative position in a verb, as shown in Adaskina (2006) (opposite to as suggested in Eguren (2000), Gómez, Saintz (1995), Hualde, Ortiz de Urbina (2003), Rebuschi (1981), Zubiri, Zubiri (2000)), resulting in the following generalized morpheme chain:

(4) ABS-Root-PLZ.ABS-DAT-PLZ.ERG-BAM-ERG

Note that the morpheme order can be changed in case of application of Ergative Displacement, the rule which moves the Ergative marker to the prefix position under certain circumstances (on Ergative Displacement see Albizu, Eguren (2000), Fernández, Albizu (2000), Laka (1993) among others)
2. Syntactic properties of BAMs

⇒ Distributional Fact 1 ⇐

• BAM-marked and non-BAM verb forms can’t be coordinated:
(5) etor-ri-ko d-u-k eta hitzegi-n-go *d-u-gu / d-i-a-gu
He will come and we will talk (Zubimendi, Esnal 1993: 272)

⇒ Distributional Fact 2 ⇐

• If any form of familiar treatment second person singular pronoun hi ‘you [thou]’ is present in the sentence, the use of BAM is obligatory:
(6) hi-rekin etor-ri *n-aiz / n-au-k
you.FAM.COMIT come-PFV 1SG.ABS AUX 1SG.ABS-AUX.BAM.M
I came with you (Alberdi 1995: 277)

⇒ Distributional Fact 3 ⇐

• It is suggested in traditional grammars and (not numerous) theoretical approaches to allocutive that it can’t be used in embedded clauses.

However, basing on the data from the Internet and native speaker judgments, see Adaskina (to appear) for details, we claim that BAMs can be and are extensively used in embedded clauses, especially, as pointed out by de Rijk (2008), in the dialect of Gipuzkoa:
(7) emen ori baño aundiago-a-k egin d-it-u-k-ela
here this than bigger-DET-PL make 3.ABS-PL-AUX.BAM.M-COMP
ziur ba-zeki-a-gu
sure AFF-know.BAM.M-IPL.ERG
We know for sure that here they make them bigger than that one.

• Although the absence of BAM in embedded clause along with BAM-marked form in matrix clause doesn’t lead to ungrammaticality yet. However, the use of BAM in embedded clause and non-BAM form in the matrix is ungrammatical. Relevant data is presented below:
(8) a. martxa-rik ez dago-ela / zego-k-ela uste
march-PARTITIVE NEG 3SG.ABS.be-COMP / 3SG.ABS.be-BAM.M-COMP think
al d-u-k?
Q 3.ABS-AUX-2SG.ERG.M.FAM / 3.ABS-AUX-2SG.ERG
Do you think there will be no march?

b. martxa-rik ez zego-k-ela uste al
march-PARTITIVE NEG 3SG.ABS.be-BAM.M-COMP think Q
d-u-k / *d-u-zu?
3.ABS-AUX-2SG.ERG.M.FAM / 3.ABS-AUX-2SG.ERG
Do you think there will be no march?

3. Analysis
3.1. Function and Interpretation of BAM

We analyse BAM as a marker of some special discourse register placed in Force head of CP (cf. Rizzi (1997) etc.). Allocutive under such interpretation resembles to imperative in terms of Platzack, Rosengren (1998), both marking speech register and occupying Force head. Thus, it is possible to analyse allocutive and imperative as two different features of Force head.
Basque allocutive clauses exhibit constraints with respect to coordination with the finite phrase, see (5). If we treat allocutives as full-fledged CPs with some special feature (+fam) on C, this constraint follows directly from the featural mismatch (not from the different amount of structures involved).

So, we suppose the constraint on coordination — to the ungrammaticality of coordinating two XPs with different bunches of features — being due to the Law of Coordination of Likes, LCL (see Williams (1978)):

(9) *Peter saw an elephant and the dog.

3.2. Morpheme Order and Clause Structure (with special attention to allocutive)

Theoretical foundations of the analysis:
- Baker (1985)’s Mirror Principle: Morphological derivations must directly reflect syntactic derivations;
- Ergative, dative and absolutive affixes in Basque display (the agreement with) respective arguments, see Laka (1995);
- Elordieta (2002) attributes verb argument markers to the agreement with pros that can be potentially bound by overt DPs in A’-positions, see also Baker (1996);
- Ergative DPs often function as topic/focus markers, see, for instance, Genetti (2007), Coupe (2007), Saxena (to appear), among others.

Adopting Laka’s structure and reconsidering ergative as CP-level phenomenon, ergative DP being a topic merged on a high level and ergative affix — CP-internal functional head, we get:

(10)

To sum up, ergative (and other agreement) marking is obligatory, if relevant. On the other hand, Basque does not need to express corresponding overt DPs.

What happens if the familiar speech addressee pronouns are used, (6)? In this case the familiar treatment speech register is switched on, and that should be done by means of allocutive markers. This is why one can’t omit BAMs with any form of the pronoun hi present.

Thus, we get the following (simplified) structure for Basque allocutive clauses:

---

1 Cited from Claire Bowern, http://listserv.linguistlist.org/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0808a&L=lingtyp&D=1&T=0&P=330&F=P
Here we suggest that BAM corresponds to second person singular pronoun hi (if present) in a way ergative marker corresponds to ergative DP (contrary to the idea expressed in Oyharçabal (1993) among others).

**Questions and problems:**

**Q1:** Why the canonical Rizzian order [ForceP [TopP* [FocusP [IP… is not preserved?  

**A1:** Possible solutions: either treat ergative DPs as adjuncts or allow variability for the CP-internal projections.

### 3.3. Allocutive and Interrogative Clauses

The other parallels to the allocutive features may be found in the *wh*-domain, also located in CP. According to Huang (1982), a language can choose one of the two strategies to form *wh*-clauses: either it overtly moves a *wh*-phrase (English), or the *wh*-phrase remains in situ and what needs to be moved is *wh*-features (Chinese). So, the matrix C attracts *wh*-features in *wh*-in-situ languages. Basque is basically a *wh*-in-situ language:

(12) **emakumea-k zer leku d-u-Ø literature-ren imajinario hor-retan?**  

*woman-ERG what place 3.ABS-AUX-3SG.ERG literature-GEN imaginary that-LOC*  

What is the role of a woman in this kind of imaginary literature?

(But see Arregi (2000), Jeong (2008) also Ginsburg (2009) for more discussion)

Thus we expect that other CP-related features may move upwards to the matrix C as well:

(13) Raising of the CP-level abstract feature $f1\{=wh, fam\}$ from dependent to matrix clause

```
[CPmatr  [CPemb  [TPemb ]  Cemb {+f1}]  Cmatr {+f1}]  
```

$\Rightarrow$ Explanation of Distributional Fact 3 ↔!

Hence just as in the case of *wh*-clause derivation, the derivation of allocutive requires all the allocutive features to be moved upwards. The difference between *wh*- and allocutive clauses is that allocutive clauses have an overt instantiation of the allocutive features, namely, BAM.
Questions and problems:

**Q2:** Why Basque exhibits not only *wh*-in-situ but also movement strategy with respect to *wh*-question formation?

**A2:** As shown in Jeong (2008), this movement is most probably due to topicalization, not question formation, cf. also Vicente (2005), who argues that *wh*-movement in Basque is driven prosodically, not syntactically.

**Q3:** Why yes/no question markers in Basque do not exhibit the same behavior, i.e. why they do not spread over all CPs involved?

**A3:** We suggest that this is because of some general constraint on yes/no question in dependent clauses. Indeed, yes/no questions in natural language can not target the embedded clause, cf.:

(14)

a. Does John agree?
b. You know (that) John agreed.
c. *You know (that) John does agree? / *You know (that) does John agree?

(We won’t discuss possible semantic or syntactic factors accounting for this fact here.)

**Q4:** While there is a strong constraint *[CP_{matr} – fam] [CP_{emb} + fam]*, there is but a tendency not to use *[CP_{matr} + fam] [CP_{emb} – fam]*. Why?

**A4:** Both the mechanism of allocutive feature percolation to the matrix C and the observation that yes/no questions in natural language can not target the embedded clauses exclude *[CP_{matr} – fam] [CP_{emb} + fam]* structure. At the same time there is just a tendency to agree allocutive features in complex CPs, i.e. to avoid *[CP_{matr} + fam] [CP_{emb} – fam]*.

Finally, we return to Distributional Fact 1, i.e. to the constraint on coordination of allocutive and non-allocutive clauses. This constraint may also be due to the fact that coordination in such cases holds on CP level and a covert matrix C should also have +fam feature so that Distributional Fact 1 may be described in terms of Coordinate Structure Constraint:

(15)

\[ [CP_{matr} \& \{CP_1 \{–fam \} \& CP_2 \{+fam \}\} \} \] & C_{matr}\{+fam\} \]

cf. also similar constraints on coordination of finite and interrogative / subjunctive clauses:

(16)

a. *Peter came and did John bring Mary flowers?*
b. *Peter came and John would bring Mary flowers.*

4. Conclusion

Distributional observations:
- We propose generalized morpheme order for Basque auxiliaries;
- BAM corresponds to overt pronoun *hi* if present;
- Allocutive forms can be used in embedded clauses (contrary to as stated traditionally).

Analytical observations:
- Allocutive is located in CP and is similar in several ways to such CP-based phenomena as *wh*, Subjunctive and Imperative;
- BAM occupies Force Head;
- We explain the fact that BAM can’t be omitted from the matrix clause if used in the embedded clause by the mechanism of feature movement to C.
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