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Abstract

This paper develops an account of do-support in verb focalisation constructions in Central and Western Basque (CWB) dialects. In particular, this paper argues that CWB dialects, along with Korean, form a class of do-support languages whose dummy verb insertion mechanism differs slightly from that in English (Chomsky 1957, Pollock 1989) and Monnese (Benincà and Polletto 2004). In all four of these languages, the dummy verb occupies the position that is, in marked environments, inaccessible to the verb. However, in Korean and CWB, unlike in English and Monnese, the verb’s inability to raise is not due to its inflectional poverty, but rather because it must bear a nominalising infinitival affix for independent reasons; this nominal infinitive may not bear aspectual morphology, and a dummy verb is merged to do so instead.

I further propose that merger of egin is not a last-resort phenomenon as in Chomsky’s classic analysis of English do-support (Chomsky 1957, 1995). That is, the unavailability of egin in non-verb focalisation constructions such as (1b) is not due to competition with the more economical1 egin-less alternative in (2); rather, (1b) is independently excluded. A virtue of this approach is that it avoids a violation of the Inclusiveness Condition (Chomsky 2000, 2001) inherent in economy-based approaches to do-support that treat the dummy verb as non-lexical material generated in the computational component (Chomsky 1995).

Section 2 of this paper briefly reviews previous approaches to do-support in English. In section 3, I discuss some key properties of focalised VPs in Basque that will be crucial to the analysis of egin developed here. Section 4 develops an analysis of the dummy verb egin.

1. Introduction

This paper is a study of do-support in VP focus constructions in Central and Western Basque (CWB) dialects. In such constructions, a focused verb phrase triggers the appearance of a dummy verb egin, which as a lexical verb is akin to English ‘make’ or ‘do.’ (Rebuschi 1983, Ortiz de Urbina 1989, Zasaz 1998, Etxepare and Ortiz de Urbina 2003). An example of this phenomenon is given in (1), which contrasts with the neutral example, without do-support, in (2).

(1) Ines egorri egin da.
   Ines come do AUX
   a. "Ines has COME.
   b. *"Ines has come." (non-verb focalisation reading)

(2) Ines egorri da.
   Ines come AUX
   "Ines has come."

The goal of this paper is to explain how do-support comes about in sentences such as (1a). In particular, I argue that CWB dialects, along with Korean (Hagstrom 1995, 1996), form a class of do-support languages whose dummy verb insertion mechanism differs slightly from that in English (Chomsky 1957, 1995, Pollock 1989) and Monnese (Benincà and Polletto 2004). In all four of these languages, the dummy verb occupies a position that is, in marked environments, inaccessible to the verb. However, in Korean and CWB, unlike in English and Monnese, the verb’s inability to raise is not due to its

2. Previous approaches to do-support in English

In certain marked environments, standard English requires a semantically empty “dummy” verb do. In environments where this do appears, it bears tense and agreement morphology that in other environments is borne by the main verb. Do-support in some of these environments is illustrated in the following examples.

(3) Negatives
   Ines doesn’t smoke.

(4) I-C movement (yes/no and non-subject wh-questions)
   a. Who didn’t Ines see?
   b. Did Ines leave?

(5) VP-ellipsis
   Ines ate Pasta and Ira did too.

   By contrast, do-support does not obtain in other environments including neutral declaratives.1

(6) Neutral declaratives
   a. Ines smokes.
   b. *Ines does smoke. (without stress on do)

English do-support has often been related to the absence of verb raising, which is in turn frequently attributed to the inflectional “poverty” of the language (Lighfoot 1979, Pollock 1989).2 In a seminal analysis, Pollock (1989) connected the inflectional poverty of English to the relative placement of verbs and certain adverbs in English vs. other languages. For example, (7) shows that main verbs in English must follow adverbs of frequency, such as often.
work from a limited lexical palate, rather than the unwieldy full lexicon: “If the derivation accesses the lexicon at every point, it must carry along this huge beast, rather like ears that constantly have to replenish their fuel supply. Derivations that map LA [lexical array] to expressions require lexical access only once, thus reducing operative complexity in a way that might well matter for optimal design” (2000:100-1). Second, the lexical array allows for a more precise notion of competition. A naïve comparison of the sentences in (9a) and (9b) suggests that the example in (9b) is less complex than that in (9a), since the latter contains more lexical material—the expletive there—and therefore requires more steps in assembling this material.

(9) a. I expected [there to be a proof discovered].
    b. I expected [a proof to be discovered].
    (Chomsky 2000:104)

If the computational component has direct access to the lexicon, and if simpler derivations always block more complex ones, then (9b) should always be able to block (9a), since the former involves fewer steps, and (9a) is therefore incorrectly excluded as a possible English sentence. This problem is avoided, however, if evaluations of economy are restricted to derivations built from identical lexical arrays. Under this assumption, (9a) and (9b) are not in competition, since their lexical arrays are non-identical sets of lexical elements, and (9b) therefore does not block (9a). In this way, the lexical array helps limit evaluations of economy to derivations with the same lexical input, an intuitively attractive result.

Consider, then, how an economy approach to do-support might work within this framework in view of the following examples.

(10a) Ines doesn’t live here.
(11) Ines lives here.
(12) “Ines does live here.” (non-emphatic do.)

As discussed above, a traditional understanding of do-support is that it serves to host inflectional morphology in sentences like (11), because negation blocks affixation of this morphology onto the main verb. In the absence of negation, as in (12), do-support is not required, and it therefore bldeclines. That is, because in neutral declaratives a more economical derivation without do-support is available—namely (12)—the more “expensive” derivation with do-support is blocked. Do-insertion, then, applies only as a “last resort.”

This approach, however, is problematic from the perspective of approaches to economy that make use of a lexical array. Crucially, if the dummy element do is taken to be part of the numeration, then (12) and (13) do not compete, since they have different lexical arrays—one with do and one without. This approach, then, fails to exclude (13). Another possible solution is that the dummy verb is not included in the lexical array, but is rather non-lexical material generated by the computational component in the course of the derivation (Chomsky, 2000:200, 2001:200). A derivation with the insertion of do is presumably more costly than its minimally different competitor without do-insertion and (13) is therefore correctly excluded on economy considerations. This second approach, however, entails a substantial enrichment of the grammar, since it requires the computational component to be more than an assembly algorithm; rather, this approach crucially requires the computational component to generate non-lexical material. In terms of recent minimalist theory, then,
this approach entails a violation of the Inclusiveness Condition (Chomsky 2000), which precludes the introduction of material in the computational component?

In section 3 of this paper, I will argue that Basque do-support is not a last-resort phenomenon as in Chomsky’s analysis of English. That is, the unavailability of egin in non-focalsation environments is not blocked by a cheaper egin-less alternative, but rather is excluded independently. By this approach, then, egin need not be generated in the narrow syntax, a welcome result from the perspective of recent theory.

3. Some properties of the focalised verb in Basque verb focalsation constructions

This section discusses some properties of the main verb in verb focalisation constructions that will be relevant to the analysis of do-support developed below.

3.1 Focalised verbal constituents are infinitives.

Main verbs in VP focus constructions bear one of four affixes—\textit{–tu/-u/-u/-}\textit{∅}—which vary by verb class. The open class affix is \textit{–u} as in (13a). Three smaller classes of (typically older) verbs take the affixes \textit{–k/-} and \textit{–∅} in (13b–d), respectively.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Toles-tu ega du.}
\textit{bind-3s do AUX 'She has BENT IT.'}
\item \textit{Eor(i)-u ega da.}
\textit{come-3s do AUX 'She has COME.'}
\item \textit{Ema-a egi da idate.}
\textit{give-3s do AUX 'They have GIVEN IT TO ME.'}
\item \textit{Hil--u ega da gure aita.}
\textit{die-3s do AUX our father 'Our father has DIED.'} \hspace{1cm} \textit{(Ortiz de Urbina 1989)}
\end{enumerate}

In the following discussion, I will treat these affixes as (underlyingly) infinitival markers. This is not a standard treatment of these elements in the literature on Basque, so I will devote some discussion to defending this approach.

In the Basque literature, \textit{–tu/-u/-u/-∅} are typically described as perfective markers (Laka 1990, Ortiz de Urbina 1989, Zabala and Odriotzola 1995) or participial affixes in view of the fact that, on main verb complements of auxiliaries, they necessarily cooccur with a perfective interpretation, as reflected in the gloss in (16).

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ines-ek ikus-∅ du.}
\textit{Ines-ERG see-PERF AUX 'Ines has seen (it).'}
\end{enumerate}

In this environment, \textit{–tu/-u/-u/-∅} are in complementary distribution with the affix \textit{–(i)en}, as in (15), which may have several different kinds of imperfective interpretations.

\begin{enumerate}
\item In view of this distribution, Laka (1990), proposes that \textit{–tu/-u/-u/-∅} and imperfective \textit{–(i)en} are alternate values of a single aspectual head, Asp (cf. Zabala and Odriotzola 1996). Nevertheless, the behavior of \textit{–tu/-u/-u/-∅} in other environments is problematic for an approach to these elements as always and everywhere merged as perfective markers. One such environment is verb focalisation constructions involving the dummy verb egin as shown in (16).

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Eor(i)-u egi da extea.}
\textit{fall-3s do-PERF AUX house 'The house has FALLEN.'}
\item \textit{Eor(i)-u egi-∅ da extea.}
\textit{fall-3s do-IMPERF AUX house 'The house FALLS.'}
\item \textit{Eor(i)-u egi-go da extea.}
\textit{fall-3s do-PRT AUX house 'The house is going to FALL.'}
\end{enumerate}

In (16), \textit{–i} appears on the focalised main verb, while aspectual markers such as the imperfective affix \textit{–(i)en} and future \textit{–to} are realised on the dummy verb, egin. Crucially, in sentences such as (16), the aspectual interpretation is invariably determined by the aspectual morpheme on the dummy verb, egin, as reflected in the glosses. Assuming Laka’s AspP proposal and an analysis of \textit{–tu/-u/-u/-∅} as (always) perfective markers, then the data in (16) are perplexing since they seem to require the realisation of different values of a single aspectual head on different items in a single clause. (Evidence is provided below that these constructions are in fact monoclusal rather than bidirectional.)

The behavior of \textit{–tu/-u/-u/-∅} on verbs selected by modal provides additional reason for skepticism toward the traditional analysis of these elements. In particular, verbs selected by the modals \textit{ahal, 'can,' nahi, 'want' and behar, 'need'} obligatorily bear \textit{–tu/-u/-u/-∅} regardless of the perfectiveness of the action.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Egun hartan egi da zidan, ahamo eor(i)-i nahi zuela.}
\textit{Day that-on say AUX everyday come-3s do want AUX-COMP 'That day she told me she wanted to come everyday.' (want>every)}
\item \textit{Eor(i)-u egi-∅ de extea.}
\textit{fall-3s do-IMPERF AUX house 'She used to come everyday.'}
\end{enumerate}

Iterative readings of this kind are not possible in the past tense in the absence of a modal; instead, the imperfective affix \textit{–(i)en} is required.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Kigueno ('corto-i)-i eor(-∅)-e en}}
\textit{everyday come-s-IMPERF AUX 'She used to come everyday.'}
\end{enumerate}

Hence, on verbs under modals and in verb focalisation constructions, \textit{–tu/-u/-u/-∅} are not plausibly understood as perfective markers (Artigaolita 1995, Aleskar 2002); rather, in these environments, these affixes seem more akin to infinitival markers. In fact, the distribution of verbs in \textit{–tu/-u/-u/-∅} is similar in three other ways to infinitives
cross-linguistically. First, the verb+ -tu/-i/-n/-∅ is the citation form for the verb. While
ininitives are commonplace as citation forms, an aspectually-marked verb as a citation
form, is less expected. Second, verbs + -tu/-i/-n/-∅ are also selected by certain
prepositions and postpositions including nahiè ‘despite’ and gabe ‘without.’ (Other
postpositions take a gerund complement headed by an affix -tejen homophonous with
the imperfective affix discussed above.)

(19) nahiè gazte a=na
    despite young be-INFN
    ‘despite being young.’
(20) ikus-i gabe
    see-i without
    ‘without seeing.’

Third, these constituents participate in short wh-movement, as in (21) (Ortiz de
Urbina 1989).

(21) Ez dakíte zer abes-tu,
    not know what sing-to
    ‘I don’t know what to sing.’

In view of these facts, I will assume that verbs + -tu/-i/-n/-∅ in VP focus cases are
in fact infinitives. From this perspective, however, a question that arises is how to
account for the behavior of these affixes in perfective environments such as such as (16)
(repeated here).

(22) = (15)
    ines-ek ikus-i da,
    ines-ERG see-PERF AUX
    ‘Ies has seen.’

I propose that perceptive examples such as these involve adjunction of the verb
root + -tu/-i/-n/-∅ to a null aspectual head, as illustrated in (23).

```
      AspP
         \  
         Asp∅
     \  /     \  /
    InfinP  Infin∅  VP
        \   /         
         ikus
```

(23) AspP

Such a derivation, in fact, seems to be independently required for future forms,
which are formed by stacking the future affix -ko onto the verb + -tu/-i/-n/-∅, as shown
in (24).

(24) Abes-tu-ko du.
    sing-tu-PERF-AUX-PRES
    ‘I will sing.’

Crucially, -tu/-i/-n/-∅ in future constructions lack properties of true perfective
beads (Aristegi 1995, chapter 3). In particular, with -ko stative exogenous, ‘to know (a
person, place etc.)’ need not have an ‘ingressive’ interpretation marking the beginning
of a state as illustrated in (30) (cf. Spanish conocer ‘to know’).

(25) Nesk, nere kardiologoa, oso ongi ezagutu-ko du
    kardiologi, very well know-tu-PERF AUX
    ‘Ines, my cardiologist, must know (lit. ‘will know’) the anatomy of the heart very
    well.’

In canonical perfective environments, by contrast, -tu does force such an
ingressive interpretation with this class of verbs.

(26) Ezagutu-nu.
    know-PERF AUX-PAST
    ‘I met him.’
    ‘I knew him.’

Similarly, future forms with -tu/-i/-n/-∅ allow intransitive interpretations as in (27).

(27) Meiz ettoro-i-ko da.
    often come-tu-PERF-AUX-PRES
    ‘She’ll come often.’

In light of these facts, then, I will assume: (i) that the verb roots + -tu/-i/-n/-∅ in
verb focalisations are in fact infinitives; and (ii) that the perfective guise of these affixes
is derived by adjoining the verb root + -tu/-i/-n/-∅ to a null aspectual head. I will return
to these assumptions later in the analysis of do-support developed below.

3.2 Focalised VPs raise to spec. FocP.

Following a proposal by Rebuschi’s (1983) in a brief discussion of verb focus
constructions with egim, I will assume that in these environments the focussed VP raises
to the same left-peripheral designated focus position targeted by other kinds of
information focus. In the following discussion, I present evidence in favor of this
position from based on the behavior of focalised VPs in terms of word-order, extraction
from copular clauses and clausal pied-piping.

3.2.1 Word order

The positioning of arguments in Basque is discourse-sensitive. Canonicality, foci and
wh-phrases must appear left-adjacent to the main (aspect-bearing) verb in positive
sentences and left-adjacent to the negative morpheme ez in negatives as illustrated in (29) and (29).

(29) Nor-k/ON-UK ez du (VMiren) ikus-i (VMiren).  
Who-ERG/ON-ERG not AUX (Miren) see-SERF (Miren)  
‘Who/ON hasn’t seen Miren.’

(30) and (31) show that when non-localised material intervenes between the focus and the main verb or ez, the result is unacceptable.

(30) Nor-k/ON-UK (*Miren) ikus-i du (VMiren).  
Who-ERG/ON-ERG (Miren) see-SERF AUX (Miren)  
‘Who/ON has seen Miren.’

(31) Nor-k/ON-UK (*Miren) ez du (VMiren) ikus-i (VMiren).  
Who-ERG/ON-ERG (Miren) not AUX (Miren) see-SERF (Miren)  
‘Who/ON hasn’t seen Miren.’

(32) and (33), below, show that localised VPs behave like other kinds of foci in requiring left-adjacency to the main (aspect-bearing) verb in affirmatives, and left-adjacency to ez in negatives.

die-SERF do-SERF AUX this year our father  
‘Our father has DIED this year.’

(33) (*Ibon) (*Jon) ez du egin-O (Jon).  
Come-SERF NEG AUX do-SERF (Jon).  
‘Jon hasn’t COME.’

A more marked and less-well studied focalisation strategy is also available for some speakers, in which focalised constituents appear right-peripherally, as in (34).

(34) Elordieta (2001)  
Ardoru elkart dioi(#) ANDONI-RI.  
wine brought AUX Andoni-DAT  
‘I brought the wine to Andoni.’

(35) shows that in Gasteiz Basque and neighboring dialects, VPs in egin-constructions may also appear right-peripherally. In these examples, the most natural reading is one in which the entire verbal constituent (in brackets) or a verbal complement receives focus interpretation.

(35) Horrek egi-ten du zuzen-du.  
That egin-IMPERF AUX correct-INFNN  
‘The latter CORRECTS IT.’

(36) Monjak egin zizun [harreau utzi-i.]  
Now do AUX inside leave-INFNN  
‘The now LEFT US INSIDE.’

(37) Berek egin behar zitzen [bi etxien jar(i)-i.]  
He/she do need AUX two small put-INFNN  
‘He/she had to PUT TWO SMALL ONES.’

(38) Egin behar duru hurrengo egun-ean [dona enbotelatu-to.]  
egin AUX next day-on all bottle-INFNN  
‘The next day you have to BOTTLE IT ALL.’

Crucially, this strategy seems to be most marked precisely in those dialects in which other kinds of right-peripheral foci are highly marked. For example, in the dialect of Leketio, which is conservative with respect to post-verbal foci generally, right-peripheral verb focalisations such as that in (35) are also marginal (A. Elordieta, p.c.).

3.2.2 Extraction from complement clauses and clausal pied-piping

Another well-documented property of wh-phrases and foci in Basque is that they may extract from complement clauses, especially under verbs of saying, as shown in (39) and (40) (Ortiz de Urbina 1989, Uriagregca 1999).

(39) Esparza and Ortiz de Urbina (2003)  
Nola eman du Josek [usta du-ela Peruk [egin behar-ko litzateke-de]]  
how say AUX Jon think AUX-COMP Peru make need-PUT AUX-COMP  
‘How did Jon say Peru thinks it should be made?’ (Downstairs interpretation)

(40) Esparza and Ortiz de Urbina (2003)  
HOR(R)-ELA ustet dut [egin behar-ko litzateko-elaskeramena.]  
this-way think AUX make need-PUT AUX-COMP choice  
‘IN THIS WAY do I think the choice should be made.’

(41) shows that, at least for some speakers, focalised verbs behave like other kinds of foci in their ability to extract from complement clauses. (Why sentences of this kind are only marginal for many speakers is not clear to me.) The availability of extraction in such cases, then, to the extent that they are available, is further evidence that verb raising in egin-constructions is a movement.

(41) * Etorri(i)-i, esan didate [u, egin zene-ta].  
come-INFNN say AUX do AUX-COMP  
‘They have told me that you CAME.’
Similarly, wh-phrases and foci may also pied-pipe entire clauses to the front of the matrix clause as in (42) and (43) (Ortiz de Urbina 1993, Arregi 2003).

(42) Ortiz de Urbina (1993)
[Not etorriko dela bihar] esa dixouz Miren-i?
who come-FUT AUX-COMP tomorrow say AUX MIREN-DAT.
That who will come tomorrow have you told Miren?

(43) Ortiz de Urbina (1993)
[Jon etorriko dela bihar] esa dixouz Miren-i.
Jon come-FUT AUX-COMP tomorrow say AUX MIREN-DAT.
That it is Jon that will come tomorrow I have told Miren.

Example (44) shows that clausal pied-piping is also available with verb focalisations with egin. This property of egin focalisation constructions is again expected if focalised main verbs move to the same left-peripheral position as focalised arguments and adjuncts.

(44) (Etorriko egina zine-la) esa didiate.
come-INFIN do AUX-COMP say AUX
They say you CAME.

To review, focalised VPs behave like other kinds of foci in terms of word order, extraction from embeddings and clausal pied-piping. Following Rebuschi (1983), then, I will assume that these elements move to the same designated left-peripheral position targeted by focalised arguments and adjuncts (Ortiz de Urbina 1989, Rizzi 1997).

4. Do-support

4.1 Egin as a dummy verb

Three sets of facts presented so far support an understanding of egin in verb-focalisation constructions as a "dummy" verb, i.e. as an element occupying the canonical position of the main verb, when the latter has other obligations. First, egin in this semantically empty guise only and always appears in verb focalisation environments in which the main verb raises to the left periphery.19 Second, as discussed above, egin has the same word order properties as main verbs in negative/affirmative word order alternations: in affirmative sentences, egin appears immediately left-adjacent to the auxiliary, and in negative sentences, it appears to the right of the auxiliary and may be separated by arguments and other material. (45) and (46) (repeating (32) and (33), respectively) illustrate this alternation.

(45)= (32)
Hil-0 (*aurten gure aita) egin da aurten gure aita.
die-INFIN do AUX this year our father
Our father has DIED this year.

(46)= (33)
Etorriko (*Jon) ez da egin (Jon).
come-INFIN NEG AUX do (Jon).
‘Jon hasn’t COME.’

Third, egin bears one of three aspectual markers—perfective -O, imperfective -Z/en and future -K/ normally realised on the main verb, which appears without aspectual marking in the infinitival citation form. These facts, then, suggest that egin only appears when the main verb cannot occupy its normal position.

(47) verb focalisation
Etorriko (egin-go‘egi-ten) da etexa.
fall-INFIN do-FUT/do-IMPERF AUX house
‘The house is going to FALL.’ ‘The house is FALLING.’

(48) argument/adjunct focalisation
etexa (etorriko/etorri-ten) da house fall-FUT/fall-IMPERF AUX
‘The house is going to fall.’ ‘The house is falling.’

Why, then, is egin merged? From the standpoint of an understanding of do-support as motivated by the need to value an uninterpretable inflectional (or C) feature (Beninc and Polotto 2004), examples such as (47) and (48) suggest that egin is merged to check aspectual features when the main verb cannot. The remainder of this paper will develop this intuition.

In the received approach to Basque verb syntax, analytic main verbs pick up their aspectual morphology via head-adjunction (Ortiz de Urbina 1989, Laka 1990, Elizondo 2000).11 (50) shows Laka’s (1990) IP structure for (49), showing raising of the main verb to Asp:

(49) (Laka 1990)
Etex-a erro-i da
house the fall-IMPERF AUX
‘The house has fallen down.’

(50) (Laka 1990)
IP

etexa
Infl'

AspP

VP

dv

eva

An appealing account of egin from the perspective of this proposal is that egin’s role is to value an uninterpretable feature in Asp, because the main verb is unable to. Specifically, because the focused VP raises to spec, FocP, the verb cannot head-adjoin
to these morphemes, and the dummy verb egin fulfills this role. In non-verb focalisation contexts, in which the main verb can raise to Asp, egin does not appear. (Later, I will return to the question of how to exclude egin in non-focalisation environments.)

Nevertheless, this approach leaves unexplained the apparent fact that, in such constructions, the verb cannot head-adjoin to Asp and subsequently pied-pipe AspP to Spec, FocP. (This derivation is illustrated in (51)). Indeed, the inability of the verb to pied-pipe AspP as in (51) is especially curious in view of the fact that foci in Basque are notorious pied-pipers in other contexts (see 2.2).

Evidence from similar phenomena in Korean suggests an answer to this question. In neutral declarative sentences in Korean, tense and inflectional morphology appears as affixes on the main verb, as in (52).

(52) (Hagstrom 1996)
Chebwa-ka chay-uk ilk-si-ja
Chebwa-NOM book-ACC read-PAST-DECL
‘Chebwa read the book.’

However, in two marked environments, in which the main verb appears to raise out of its normal position, the canonical position of the main verb is occupied by a dummy verb, ha, which as a lexical verb is akin to English do. One such environment is “long-negation,” an example of which appears in (53). Here, the main verb ilk ‘read’ appears to the left of the negative marker and with the nominaliser, -ni.

(53) (Hagstrom 1996)
Chebwa-ka chay-uk ilk-ci ni ha-ess-ja
Chebwa-NOM book-ACC read-ni NEG do-PAST-DECL
‘Chebwa did not read the book.’

The presence of this nominalising affix in Korean suggests an account of the Basque data discussed above. Recall that Basque focalised VPs obligatorily appear with one of the infinitival affixes -tu/-ti/-tuO which vary by verb class. In view of the Korean data in (54), I propose that the infinitival markers -tu/-ti/-tuO also bear the feature [+noun] and further that it is this property that is central to understanding do-support in CBW and Korean. In particular, in both CBW and Korean, the inability of the VP to pied-pipe inflectional material is plausibly a consequence of a requirement that verbal constituents in spec, FocP be [+noun], i.e. be headed by a nominalising affix. This constraint is given in (55).

(55) CBW/Korean: Verbal constituents that move to FocP must be [+noun], i.e. be headed by a nominalising affix. (cf. Manfredi 1993)

An account of (55) will be developed below. For the moment, it bears observing that (55) appears to be more general (and in fact may be universal). In Edò and Yoruba, for example, focalised main verbs must likewise bear nominal morphology, as in (56) and (57), below. In view of data such as these from different West African languages and Haitian Créole, Manfredi (1993) proposes that, in fact, in all cases in which a verb moves overtly to a focal position, the verb is nominalised.

(56) Edò (Stewart 2001)
a. Odo dé.
   Odo fell.
b. aden-mwen én òdè
   nom-fall-NOM FOC Odo fall
   ‘It is falling that Odo did, (not, say, rolling).’

(57) Yoruba (Adapted from Manfredi 1993)
Riṣa na Ajé ra jù
   nom-buy COMP Ajé buy paper
   ‘It is buying paper that Ajé is doing (not stealing).’

This account of do-support in Basque depends crucially on the claim that Basque infinitives are nominal in nature, as is often claimed for infinitives in Germanic in Romance. Indeed, three independent kinds of evidence support this view.

Do-Support and VP Focus in Central and Western Basque
agreement is obligatory for most speakers. (As just noted, some speakers also accept constructions in which the infinitive triggers agreement, as in (62).) Examples (63) and (64) show that, in both cases, the auxiliary marks agreement with complements of the lower (main) verb.

(63) a. Joan ahal naiz
    go-INFIN can izan.1s(ABS)
    'I can go.'
    (unaccusative)

    b. Torrea ikusi ahal dur
    tower.ABS see-INFIN can 3s(ABS).*edun.1s(ERG)
    'I can see the tower.'
    (monotransitive)

    c. Jon-i hirura emon ahal diot
    Jon-DAT book.ABS give-INFIN can 3s(Abs).*edun.3s(DAT).1s(ERG)
    'I can give Jon the book.'
    (ditransitive)

(64) a. Jon-n egin naiz
    go-INFIN do izan.1s(ABS)
    'I have GONE.'
    (unaccusative)

    b. Torrea bui-i egin dur
    tower.ABS see-INFIN do 3s(Abs).*edun.1s(ERG)
    'I have SEEN the tower.'
    (monotransitive)

    c. Jon hirura eza-n egin diot
    Jon-DAT book.ABS give-INFIN do 3s(Abs).*edun.3s(DAT).1s(ERG)
    'I have GIVEN Jon the book.'
    (ditransitive)

Third, in both cases, auxiliary switch obtains. (63a) and (64a) show that unaccusative main verbs determine izan, 'be,' on the auxiliary while, transitive main verbs determine *edun, 'have.' Fourth and finally, in both cases, -tu-nil-Ø complements under egin and ahal may not include negation.

(65) *Ez joan ahal naiz.
    not go-INFIN can AUX
    'I cannot go.'

(66) *Ez etor-i egin da.
    not come-INFIN do AUX
    'He has NOT COME.'

Hence, in key respects, verb focalisation constructions are like restructurings with ahal. Following much recent work on "restructuring" infinitives (Wurmbrand 2001, Cirque 2004, Cardinaleti and Shlonsky 2004), I will assume that verb focalisation constructions with egin, like modal constructions with ahal, are nonoclusal, i.e. constitute a single iteration of the clausal functional sequence (Cinque 1999, 2004), and that the main verb is merged as the matrix V. (See Hastrøm (1995) for evidence that Korean do-support constructions are also nonoclusal.) This entails, however, that egin cannot be merged in V. A plausible identity for egin, then, is light-verb head v (Chemsky 1995, cf. Katz 1996). Evidence in favor of this approach comes from the fact that egin appears in canonical light verb constructions such as (67), well known from previous literature (Laka 1993, Bobaljik 1993, Rodriguez & García Murga 2001, Fernández 1997). In this example, egin supports the unincorporated object ian, 'work.' 

4.2 Egin is merged in φ

There remains to be addressed where in the derivation egin is merged. One kind of evidence that may illuminate this question in the fact that main verbs in verb focalisation constructions behave like verbs under the modal ahal, 'can,' in several key respects. First main verbs under both ahal and egin obligatorily bear the affixes -tu-nil-Ø as shown in (63) and (64). Second, with both ahal and egin, long distance
(67) Jon-ak lan egin-go du.
    Jon-ERG work egin-FUT AUX-ERG

    'Jon will work.'

I will assume, then, that egin in its do-support guise is merged in v.26

Nevertheless, under this assumption, some account is needed of certain properties of

dummy egin that are unexpected of v elements. In particular, egin may co-occur with

unaccusative verbs as in (64a), repeated below.

(68) = (64a)

    Jon-ak egin maiz
go-INFN do ean1s(AES)

    'I have GONE.'

In such constructions, ergative case is not assigned. On the standard assumption

that T assigns absolutive case in unaccusative constructions, then the v in which egin is

merged appears not to assign case in these examples. Following Chomsky (2001, 2004),

then, I will assume that dummy egin may head a "defective" v, i.e. one that does

not assign case or an agent theta-role.

4.3 A non-economy based approach to egin

Let us now consider a sample derivation of the VP focus construction in (69a). I will

return shortly to the problem of how to exclude egin in the non-verb focalisation

construction in (69b).

(69) Ines etorr-1 egi-n-go3 da.
    Ines-ABS come-INFN do-INFN-FUT AUX

     a. 'Ines will COME.'
     b. * 'Ines will come.' (non-verb focus reading)

(70) derives the lower portion of (69a), beginning with a lexical array [Ines, etorr- ('come'), -1 (INFN), egi- ('do'), -n (INFN), -ko (FUT), T]. (I will later present a

slightly modified derivation)

Following Cinqué (2000) and in the spirit of Kayne's (1993) participial phrase

proposal, I assume that infinitival affixes on the main verb —til-if-un-∅ are merged in an

infinitival phrase (InfP) above the main verb. The head of this projection bears the

feature +tense. Note that if this nominalising infinitival head were not merged,

movement of the VP to FocP would violate (55), which requires focalised verbal

constituents to be headed by a nominalising affix. (I will return to this requirement

shortly). The dummy verb root, egi-, is subsequently merged in v, and raises to adjoin

to a higher infinitival marker —n following merger of the latter. The future marker —ko is

then merged and the dummy verb root+infinitival marker egi-n, raise to adjunction to it.

I further assume that InfP cannot be merged above Asp3. If it could, the verb

could presumably raise to Asp3, and then to InfP. Subsequent XP movement of the

verbal constituent to spec, FocP would then yield the unattested morpheme sequence

*V+Asp—til-if-un-∅.27

How, then, is do-support excluded in non-focalisation environments? Crucially,

nothing proposed so far rules out sentences such as (69b) (repeated below), in which

the verb does not receive focus interpretation.

(71) = (69)

    Ines etorr-1 egi-n-go3 da.
    Ines-ABS come-INFN do-INFN-FUT AUX

     a. 'Ines will COME.'
     b. * 'Ines will come.' (non-verb focus reading)

In the following discussion, I will propose an approach to do-support in Basque

that does not violate the Inclusiveness Condition and instead treats dummy egin as a

fully lexical element, merged from the lexical array. Specifically, I will argue that the

unavailable egin sentence without a verb focus reading in (69b) is not in competition

with the egin-less alternative in (72). In other words, (69b) is not "blocked" by the

derivationally "cheaper" option in (72), but rather is excluded for independent reasons.28
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(72) Ines etor-tzen da.
Ines come-INF1 AUX
‘Ines comes.’

Note that, from the perspective of the derivation of sketched above, (69a) and (69b) differ crucially in that the lower infinitive in (69a) moves to the left periphery—spec, FocP—while in (69b) it does not. This suggests that the unavailability of (69b) is connected to the fact that the infinitive does not raise. This contrast is reminiscent of certain properties of infinitives in French and Italian (and other languages) discussed by Kayne (2000, chapter 14). In particular, Kayne proposes that bare infinitives in these languages—i.e. infinitives not headed by a determiner—raise to the specifier position of prepositional complementizers de/di as in (72) and (74). (Subsequent movement raises de/di to the left of the infinitive, and the matrix verb above de/di, yielding the correct word order.)

(73) French (adapted from Kayne 2000:282)
Jean a essayé de chanter.
Jean has tried de sing-INF1
‘Jean has tried to sing.’

(74) Italian (adapted from Kayne 2000:282)
Gianni ha tuntato di cantare.
John has tried di sing-INF1
‘John has tried to sing.’

Kayne argues that this raising is motivated by licensing requirements of the bare infinitival in a way unrelated to case. Specifically, according to Kayne, these infinitives are NPs that need to be licensed in some way, such as by a prepositional complementizer or by a determiner head as in (69).27

(75) Italian (adapted from Kayne 2000:284)
il mangiare la carne il venerdì
the eat-INF1 the meat the Friday
‘The eating the meat on Friday.’

Basque infinitives with -tu-i-l- are like in a way discussed previously in this paper. In particular, as shown in (58) (repeated below), these elements may combine with a determiner head as in Italian and other Romance varieties.

(76) = (58)
Sentitizez dut [Miren berandu etorri izana.]
regret AUX Miren late come have.the
‘I regret Miren having come late.’ (Zabala and Odriozola 1996:239, fn. 3)

In addition, as noted above, some infinitives may cooccur with adjectives.

(77) = (60)
Guk irabazi handi-ak atera dira
we gain-INF1 big-PL take out AUX
‘We’ve had big gains.’ (cf. irabazi ‘to gain’) (Artiagoria 1995:433)

Following Kayne’s proposal for Italian and French, then, I will assume that those bare infinitives are NPs rather than DP,F and as such, are not assigned case, as also suggested by San Martin (1999).

In light of Kayne’s discussion, one possible approach to the contrast between (69a) and (69b) is that the infinitive in (69a) is licensed in a way that the infinitive in (69b) is not. For the sake of conciseness, let us assume that this licensing requirement involves an uninterpretable feature [nominal] on the infinitival head that may be valued by a class of probes including prepositions and determiners with a matching uninterpretable feature. This approach then, will require that both members of at least some feature matching pairs may be unvalued (Chomsky 1984). In the case of focused infinitives, then, a plausible licensor is a wh-determiner. Specifically, I propose that the non-finite verbal constituent that raises to FocP is in fact a complex wh-phrase headed by a null wh-determiner and that it is this null determiner that values the uninterpretable [nominal] feature on -tu-i-l- that heads its complement. Like other wh-elements, this null head has an uninterpretable focus feature [uf] that drives movement to FocP, but differs from wh-elements like English what in that it lacks a question feature [Q]. Under this approach, then, the focalized infinitive in (69a) would have the structure shown in (78).

(78) [as null [pre [v etorri] -/]]

By contrast, the unavailable neutral sentence in (71b) lacks this null wh-head. In the spirit of Kayne’s (2000) proposal, then, a possible explanation of the deviance of (71b) is that the derivation contains no preposition or determiner available to value the uninterpretable [nominal] feature on -tu-i-l-. This will be made a bit more explicit shortly.

As a reviewer notes, indirect evidence for such a null wh-determiner comes from the fact that certain members of the class of wh-items in Basque fulfill quantificational roles outside of interrogative contexts. In particular, morphemes phonetically identical to wh-words, zer ‘what’ and nor ‘who’ may also appear in polarity items and as free choice quantifiers.

(79) e-zer
not-a what (e < ez ‘not’) ‘anything’ (NPI)

(80) edo-zer
or-a what ‘anything’ (free choice)

In addition, nor ‘who’ may also be a distributive quantifier, as in (81).

(81) (Exekpe 2002)
Nor bere ezekoa sartu do.
Who his house-in enter AUX

Who his house to enter AUX
'Everyone went into his house.'

As Exepepare (2002) notes, these facts then, suggest a decompositional approach to wh-phrases with nor and zer (cf. Arregi 2003), which lends some credence to the possibility of a null wh-determiner. That is, the fact that zer and nor may appear outside of interrogative contexts suggests that, in wh-questions, some other apparently null element must be responsible focus and interrogative force.

In addition, indirect evidence that the null wh-determiner in (78) indeed selects a nominal complement comes from the fact that, in the question counterpart to (69)—i.e., in wh-questions questioning the verb—the wh-element is zer ‘what’ a nominal whenement.

(82) Q: Zer egin du ines-ek?
what do AUX Ines-ERG
‘What did you do?’
A: Jan egin du eat do AUX
‘(She) has EATEN.’

For question-answer pairs such as in (82), a standard assumption is that the focus in the answer in some sense substitutes for the wh-element in the corresponding question. That is, both of these elements are fact that share a single presupposition, namely, that there is some x such that las did x. In this sense, focalised intransitives such as fut ‘eat’ in (82) are distributionally similar to the nominal wh-element, zer, in wh-questions questioning the verb. The fact, then, that zer, like English what takes nominal complements in complex wh-phrases, such as (81), lends credence to the proposal that the null wh-determiner posited here indeed takes a nominal complement.

(83) Zer exte rusti dutz?
What house seen AUX
‘What house have you seen?’

This proposal now allows for an explanation of the constraint in (55) (repeated below), formulated in view of data on verb focalisations in Basque and Korean (and other languages discussed by Manfredi 1992). Specifically, the requirement that focalised verbs be nominal may now be understood as a familiar selectional requirement of the null wh-element on its complement.

(84)= (55) CWB/Korean Verbal constituents that move to FocP must be [+noun], i.e., be headed by a nominalising affix.

On the Kayyeem licensing approach to intransitives adopted here, an additional question to be addressed concerns the licensing of intransitives in perfective and future constructions such as (14) and (69) (repeated below).

(85) (15)
Ines-ek Ines-i-0 du.
Ines-ERG see-INFL-TPERF AUX
‘Ines has seen it.’

(86)= (69)
Aber-tu ko dut.
sing-INFL-FUT AUX PRES
‘I will sing.’

The assumption of such a licensing requirement on intransitives together with the preceding analysis of perfective and future constructions as involving adjunction of the verb root + _[-s]-[-t]-[a]-[o] to an aspectual head (section 2.1), suggests that two aspectual morphemes—future + ko and perfective + o—are also able to license the intransitive. As a reviewer notes, this possibility again recalls Kayye’s (2000) proposal for intransitives under do/ek. In particular, the fact that + ko is a genitive postposition akin to de/ek—as in (87) below—supports a view of this affix as a licensor of the intransitive. I will set aside the question of how exactly the aspectual gase of + ko might be reconciled with its behavior in environments like (87).

(87) Bilbo-ko udala
Bilbao-GEN city council
City Council of Bilbao

In summarising the proposal, let us consider an updated version of the sample derivation presented earlier. The tree in (88) derives the focus construction in (69) repeated below.

(88) (69)
Nes eror-i egi-n-go da.
Nes-ABS come-INFL do-INFL-IMPERF AUX
a. ‘Ines will COME.’
b. ‘ + * ‘Ines will come.’ (non-verb focus reading)

(89) Basque do-support (final version)

\[
\text{AspP} \quad \text{Asp}^P \quad \text{InfinP} \quad \text{Infin}^P \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{Infl} \quad \text{Infl}^r \quad \text{v}^r \quad \text{v}^l \quad \text{eg}'
\]

(to spec, FocP)
In (89), a null wh-head selects a nominal infinitival complement. (The [focus] feature of the wh-head later drives movement to FocP.) As in the preliminary derivation in (70), merger and successive head-adjunction of the verb root egí, the infinitival marker -n and the future morpheme -ko follow next. Without egí in the derivation, there would be no infinitive available to raise to -ko, and the derivation would crash.

The unattested non-localisation reading in (69b) is ruled out by the absence of a licensor for the infinitive. Crucially, as a non-focused infinitival, it lacks the null wh-determiner that values the uninterpretable [nominal] feature on the infinitive in focalised cases such as (69a). Furthermore, the other potential licensor in the derivation—the aspectual marker -ko—cannot value this feature because its uninterpretable [nominal] feature is matched by a corresponding feature on the infinitival dummy verb, egí-ko. The uninterpretable [nominal] feature on -ko, then, goes unvalued and the derivation crashes.

Under this proposal, then, the unavailability of do-support with non-VF focus readings as in (69b) (88b) is not a consequence of competition with a more economical egí-less alternative, but rather is excluded for independent reasons. This approach does not require generation of egí as non-lexical material in the compositional component (in violation of the Inclusiveness Condition) and thereby accommodates a more parsimonious theory of grammar.

5. Conclusion

This paper presents an analysis of do-support in Basque. In particular, I argue that do-support in Central and Western Basque and Korean is of a slightly different nature to do-support in English (Chomsky 1957, 1995, Pollock 1989) and Monforte and Bénnic (Bénnic and Poletto 2004). In all four cases a standard verbal value an uninterpretable feature in a functional projection that is, in marked environments, inaccessible to the main verb. However, in Korean and Basque, unlike in English and Monforte, the main verb's inability to raise to a IP position is not a consequence of its functional property, but rather because it must be nominalised: i.e. bear a nominalising infinitival affix—for independent reasons. This infinitival constituent may not bear verbal aspectual features and a dummy verb is merged to bear these features, so that the derivation may converge.

I have further proposed that do-support in Basque is not a last-resort strategy as in Chomsky's classic analysis for English (1957, 1995). That is, the unavailability of egí in non-verbal focalisation environments is not a consequence of competition with a 'cheaper' egí-less alternative, rather it is excluded for independent reasons. A theoretical advantage to this approach is that it avoids violation of the Inclusiveness Condition (Chomsky 2008, 2001) inherent in approaches in which a dummy element is generated by the computational component.
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Notes

1 As Beninco and Poletto (2000) argue, do-support in the Northern Italian dialect Monforte is strikingly similar to English do-support in movement with Wh-movement. I will discuss the Monforte facts here. Do-support in both (standard) English and Monforte is also available with et al. modal verbs. I abstract away from these facts here.

(a) John isn't tall.

(b) John can't swim.

2 Compared to many other languages, English seems to be rather "poor" in reflection. On lexical verbs in the present tense, for example, English has only two distinct configurations: -r for 3sg subjects and -r for 3pl subjects and -r for all other subject persons. For lexical verbs in the past tense, the agreement morpheme for all subject persons is -r. In French, by contrast, overt subject-verb agreement is much richer, distinguishing (eg. morphologically, at least) among up to five or six subjects persons across tenses, depending on the verb class.

3 See also Grimshaw (1997), Bresnan (2000), Vekler (2001) for approaches to do-support in Optimality Theory.

4 It must also be assumed that only convergent derivations compete and that derivations must exhaust the items in the lexical array.

5 A third possibility is that do-support is a PF-phenomenon as suggested by Chomsky (2001). I will not pursue this possibility here. See Emick and Noyer (2001) and Beninco and Poletto (2004) for evidence against this approach.

6 As a reviewer notes, if we do not adopt Laka's Argo proposal for Basque, and instead posit different merged positions in the covalent functional sequence are allowed for these different aspectual heads (Culkey 1999), then this problem may not arise.

7 See Arriagudia (1995 chapter 3) for an extensive discussion of the dual nature of these affixes. A more detailed argument for the unified analysis of these two genders of -n is provided in Hiddorn (to appear).

8 Another possible reply to the negative wh-questions here is (ii).

(i) The Jon ONK-EK Miren iko.

Not: AUX LUKA Miren iko.

"Jon hasn't seen Miren.

9 In affirmative contexts, focalised verbs are interpretable as both contrastive/ corrective foci and information focus (i.e., as an answer to a wh-question questioning the focalised element). For negative foci such as (33), which some speakers find somewhat marginal, a contrastive/ corrective interpretation is preferred.

10 In fact, for some speakers, right- peripheral foci need not be strictly right peripheral (cf. Ortiz de Urbina 2002). In particular the "right- peripheral" focalised constituent can be followed by a topic particle if it is set off by a clause as in (i), below.

(i) Josek emon dio BIZITZ PAKAT # Miren.-i

Jon give AUX bicycle one Miren to

"Jon has given a BICYCLE to Miren."
12. The most thorough generative treatment of postverbal foci in Basque is by Ortiz de Urbina (2002), who argues that in both pronominal and postverbal focus constructions, the focalised constituent moves to the same position: spec, FocP.

(i) \( \text{foc} \left[ \text{XP}, \text{FocP} \right] \left[ \text{XP}, \text{FocP} \right] \) 

The two constructions differ minimally in that postverbal focalisation constructions involve an additional movement step in which the remnant constituent below FocP raises to the left of FocP, leaving the focalised constituent as the most deeply embedded material in the tree. This movement step is illustrated in (i). (See also Uribe-Etxebarria 2003.)

(ii) \( (\text{Ortiz de Urbina}, 2002) \)

\( \text{tov}(\text{VP}, \left[ \text{Top} \right] \text{foc} \left[ \text{XP}, \text{FocP} \right] \left[ \text{XP}, \text{FocP} \right] \) 

I will set aside the issue of how such rightward foci are derived. For the purposes of the present discussion, what will be crucial is that VP foci behave like other kinds of foci according to the available diagnostics.

13. Etxepare and Ortiz de Urbina (2003) however, describe a topicalisation strategy with the dummy verb \( \text{egin} \) as in (i). As Etxepare and Ortiz de Urbina note, constructions of this type are marginal and restricted to certain predicates, and will be set aside for the purposes of the present discussion.

(i) \( (\text{Etxepare and Ortiz de Urbina 2003}) \)

\( \text{Saistantzuntzua, egin go gassu.} \)

\( \text{Try, at least do-FUT AUX} \)

\( \text{Try, at least we will.} \)

In the following discussion, I will also set aside discussion of a different kind of focus construction illustrated in (ii) in which the verb is focalised in the absence of a dummy verb \( \text{egin} \) (Laka 1990:146-7, Etxepare and Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 470-473). As reflected in the gloss, the interpretation of such sentences tends to be one of polarity focus rather than information focus, which suggests that these configurations are likely a (partially) independent phenomenon.

(ii) \( (\text{Etxepare and Ortiz de Urbina 2003}) \)

\( \text{Xabier come aux Xabier.} \)

\( \text{Xabier HAS come.} \)

14. The \( \text{foc} \) of the affix -\( \text{e} \) assimilates in voicing to the preceding nasal. This phenomenon is presumably orthogonal to the claims made here.

15. These authors assume as underlyingly mixed-head structure for Basque. See also Etxepare 1997 for a head movement approach to these main verbs that attains antisymmetry.

16. The derivation in (51) would produce (i) below.

(i) \( (\text{Etxepare}) \)

\( \text{BERIKO da.} \)

\( \text{house BILL-FUT AUX} \)

\( \text{The house is going to FALL.} \)

In other dialects without \( \text{egin} \) in verb focalisation constructions, sentences such as (i) are available. More data are needed, however, to determine the nature of these constructions, and whether they might be derived as in (51).

17. A second kind of negation in Korean is "short-negation" shown in (i), which does not involve de-support.

(i) \( (\text{Hagstrom 1996}) \)

\( \text{Cheslu-ja ppang-ul an azek-e coat.} \)

\( \text{Cheslu-NOM bread-ACC NEG est-PAST-DECL} \)

"Cheslu didn't eat the bread."

18. Hagstrom glosses the affix -\( \text{e} \) as a topic marker, and I have preserved this gloss here. Hagstrom's discussion of the interpretation of these sentences, however, suggests that the VP in such constructions is in fact a focus and not a topic.

19. Basque speakers as well as frown parallel examples with focus on a verbal dependent, however full VP-focus interpretations are also available.

20. In other dialects however, the non-finite clause boundary is transparent to agreement marking (see below). I will set aside the problem of how to account for this variation, though Sean Martin and Uribe-Etxebarria (2002) for relevant discussion.

21. The verb *\( \text{edo} \) is starred in observance of the fact that it always appears in a finite form and never as an infinitive, except in citations.

22. Unergative, i.e., light verb predicates of the kind in (67) are notable for the fact that, although they are apparently intransitive, they require ergative case marking on the subject and auxiliary unlike unergative predicates, such as in (i).

(i) \( (\text{Jon-\text{etorri da.}}) \)

\( \text{Jon-ABS come AUX-ABS} \)

"Jon has come."

In view of constructions like (67), Laka (1993) proposes that in English, unlike in Basque, unergative predicates involve incorporation of an argument prior to syntax (in the Lexical Relational Structure) (Haider and Kayser 1993). In Basque, however, incorporation does not take place, and consequently, as true transitive constructions, these sentences require ergative case marking on both the subject and the auxiliary.

23. Cf. Embick and Noyer (2001) who propose that English dummy do is also merged in.\( \text{v.} \)

24. As noted earlier, the do of -\( \text{e} \) assimilates in voicing to the preceding nasal in this example. This process is presumably orthogonally to the claims made here.


26. See Schütze (2004) and Embick and Noyer (2001) for recent approaches to do-support in English that each notions of economy/fast resort.

27. In a footnote, (6,11, p.305-6) Kayne notes that other peripheral elements, including wh-elements, may also license bare infinitives as in (i). The discussion modal constructions in 3.2 suggest that modals must be able to license infinitives as well, as in Romance.

(i) \( (\text{Italian (adapted from Kayne 2000:305)}) \)

\( \text{So do andante.} \)

I know where go-INFIN

\( \text{I know where to go.} \)

28. It bears noting, however, that the null wh-element in (78) cannot head all four phrases in Basque since focus in Basque need not be nominal. As (i) and (ii) show, adverbs and adjectives may also be focalised.

(i) \( (\text{Kazkar-A\text{zkar etorri da.}}) \)

\( \text{fast-fast come AUX} \)

\( \text{(He) has come FAST.} \)

(ii) \( (\text{Etxe here HAUNDIA da.}) \)

\( \text{House that big} \)

\( \text{‘That house is BIG.’} \)

From the perspective of the present proposal, these facts suggest that other kinds of null wh-determiners are also available, which take non-nominal complements. This null determiner might perhaps be likened to how.

29. As in the case of preverbal focalisations, the appearance of egin in the question in (83) is plausibly related to movement of the wh-element questioning the verb, *zor* to the left periphery. This is suggested by the unavailability of such questions without egin.
The English light verb do in wh-questions questioning the verb behaves similarly in this regard.

(ii) Q: What will she do?
A: Run

As in Basque, these questions are unanswerable without a light verb, do.

(iii) *What will she t?

The idea that the appearance of light verb do is related to movement of what to the left periphery is supported by the fact that do need not appear in echo questions questioning the verb.

(iv) She'll what?

Similarly, an answer to a question like that in (v) cannot include do, and in this respect, do differs from lexical verbs, such as eat.

(v) Q: What will she do t?
A: She'll (**do**) run.
(vi) Q: What will she eat t?
A: She'll eat pasta.

These facts, then, suggest that light verbs eg/ndo in wh-questions questioning the verb are parallel to eg in verb localisations discussed in this paper. Specifically, in view of the foregoing discussion, these data suggest that eg in wh-questions questioning the verb is merged to support verbal morphology that cannot be hosted by zer; the nominal wh-element questioning the verb.
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