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The purpose of this article is to provide an analysis of the verbal element *ari* in Basque. We will claim that *ari* is not an auxiliary-like element, but, rather, a verb. Furthermore, we posit the existence of a restructuring process that turns the main verb *ari* and the nominalized verb of its complement into one single complex verbal unit. This restructuring process converts a complex biclausal structure into a monoclausal one, accounting in this way for the characteristics of *ari* constructions that we will point out in the course of the following discussion.

The article is organized in the following way. In section 1, we provide some background information on 'particles' which, like *ari*, appear between main verbs and the auxiliary forms in affirmative clauses. We will show that such elements do not pattern together as a group, but actually belong to different categories: inflectional elements (*bide, omen, ote*, etc.), auxiliary forms (*ahal*) and main verbs (*nahi, behar*). We will try to establish the status of *ari* with respect to these elements. The properties of *ari* constructions are described in section 2, and, finally, in section 3 we propose an analysis of *ari* as a main verb optionally undergoing restructuring in some contexts. This analysis is shown to be more explanatory than other alternatives examined in that section.

1. Introduction. Verbal 'particles'

Basque is a language with rather a free word order. Almost all permutations of main constituents in a clause give grammatical results, word order expressing such pragmatic notions as topic and focus. On
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the other hand, however, only a restricted set of elements may intervene between verb and auxiliary. An NP or an adverb in that position produces ungrammatical results:

(1) a. *Mikelek ederki ikusi txoria du
    Michael well see bird AUX
    Michael has seen the bird perfectly

   b. *Mikelek txoria ikusi ederki du

Among the elements that may occupy the pre-auxiliary position, being in fact restricted to that position in the clause, are particles such as ote 'perhaps', omen 'apparently', bide 'certainly' and a few others, which qualify the assertion of the proposition expressed in the sentence, and thus fulfil the same functions as adverbs or verbal periphrases in English or verbal affixes in other languages such as Japanese. These Basque particles, however, are neither adverbs, since adverbs cannot appear in pre-auxiliary position, nor verbs, since they lack verbal morphology and in general all properties that are characteristic of verbs. Examples are given in (2):

(2) a. zuk lan-egin ote duzu?
    you work-perf AUX
    Have you worked perhaps?

   b. elefante-ei bananak gustatzen omen zaizkie
    elephant-dat bananas like-imp AUX
    It is said that elephants like bananas

   c. gure helburuak iritsiko bide ditugu
    our goals reach-fut AUX
    We will certainly reach our goals

   The distribution of these elements is only limited semantically, but it is not subject to any syntactic restrictions of co-occurrence.

Also in pre-auxiliary position, we find bait 'since', (baldin) ba 'if', al yes-no question marker, and ez negative marker, which must precede these other particles if it co-occurs with them and causes auxiliary-preposing in main clauses. Examples containing particles of this second group are given in (3):

(3) a. ikusi bait dut
    see-perf AUX
    Since I have seen

   b. ikusten baldin baduzu
    see-imp AUX
    If you see it

   c. elefanteak ikusi al dituzu?
    elephants see-imp AUX
    Have you seen the elephants?

   d. elefantea ez baldin baduzu ikusten...
    elephant no AUX see-imp
    If you don't see the elephant...
Finally, we also find between main verb and auxiliary certain elements which one would a priori identify as defective verbs, such as *nahi* 'want', *behar* 'need, must', *ahal* 'can', *ezin* 'cannot', *ohi* 'be wont to', and *ari* 'be engaged in'. These elements lack verbal morphology, to a certain degree. They all lack a perfective form. They do have, on the other hand, a future form, at least dialectally (with the exception of *ohi*) in addition to their perfective/radical form.

Unlike those elements in (2) and (3), the ones that we are considering now impose restrictions on the verbal forms with which they can co-occur. *Nahi* 'want', *behar* 'must', *ohi* 'be wont to' and *ezin* 'cannot' do not appear with imperfective forms (in -t(z)en)\(^1\). *Ahal* 'can' requires the imperfective form in Northern dialects, but perfective forms in other dialects. *Ari* 'to be engaged in' appears with imperfective forms only. In addition, *nahi*, *behar*, and *ari* impose restrictions on the forms of the auxiliary. These elements, and not the verb with which they co-occur, determine the choice of auxiliary\(^2\). *Nahi* and *behar* select transitive auxiliaries, which will be used regardless of the transitivity or intransitivity of the accompanying verbs. *Ari* requires intransitive auxiliary forms, with all verbs. *Nahi*, *behar* and *ari*, but not *ahal*, *ezin* or *ohi*, can also be used as main verbs, without any other accompanying verb. These properties (i.e., selection of accompanying verb forms, selection of auxiliaries, and ability to appear as only verb) are summarized in (4) for all the elements in this group. One could advance than the more of these properties an element has, the more it will be like a verb:

\[(4) \text{TABLE 1} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Selected Verb Form</th>
<th>Selected Auxiliary</th>
<th>Main Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ohi</em></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ahal</em></td>
<td>imp</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ezin</em></td>
<td>imp</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>behar</em></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td>trans</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nahi</em></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td>trans</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ari</em></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td>intr</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 1 reflects the situation in the standard dialect).

In (5), examples are provided illustrating the facts in Table 1. For each element two examples are given, one with the intransitive verb *hurbildu* 'to approach' and the other with the transitive verb *jan* 'to eat':

(1) In Classical Literary Labourdin, which, with the incorporation of many Low Navarrese traits, forms the basis of Lafitte’s grammar, *ohi* is used with imperfective and not perfective forms; but this use has been discarded in today’s standard language. Alvarez Enparantza (1978) expressly condemns the use of *ohi* with imperfective forms in his grammar of standard Basque.

(2) For *nahi* and *behar* this is true in the standard language and in central dialects. In Bizkaian the choice of auxiliaries in constructions with *behar* depends often on the valency of the (main) verb, although this usage might have been due to purist influences (J. Lakarra). In northern dialects both *behar* and *nahi* may optionally appear with transitive auxiliaries or with auxiliaries reflecting the embedded verb valency (see Lafitte 1979: 348). Thus, the following contrast obtains:

(i) *joan behar dut* (standard)
(ii) *joan behar naiz* (Bizkaian, northern)

As mentioned above, though, forms like *joan biet* (*behar dot*) are common in Bizkaian.
(5) a. hurbildu /*hurbiltzen ohi naiz
   -perf -imp AUX-intr
   I usually get close
a'. jan /*jaten ohi dut
   -perf -imp AUX-trans
   I usually eat
b. hurbildu/*hurbiltzen ahal naiz
   I can get close
b'. jan/*jaten ahal dut
   I can eat
c. hurbildu/*hurbiltzen behar *naiz/dut
   I must get close
c'. jan/*jaten behar dut
   I must eat
d. *hurbildu/hurbiltzen ari naiz/*dut
   I am getting close
d'. *jan/jaten ari naiz
   I am eating

In this paper, the nature of *ari will be analyzed. Three hypotheses will be considered in turn. A first hypothesis that we shall entertain is that *ari is a detransitivizer (since it selects intransitive auxiliaries even when used in conjunction with transitive verbs). Arguments against this hypothesis will be given. Then, we shall consider together the hypothesis that *ari is an auxiliary (a modal) and the hypothesis that it is a verb. We will offer concluding evidence for the position that *ari is a main verb in every case. We will argue that *ari is indeed very different from elements such as *ahal ‘can’. Whereas *ahal is a modal element that intervenes between a verb and an auxiliary, *ari, we will argue, is a main verb with its own auxiliary which may take a nominalized clause as its complement. Arguments will be given for a restructuring rule in these constructions with *ari, the result of which is to convert a biclausal construction into a monoclausal construction, at two different levels of representation.

In section 2, the data to be analyzed are systematically described. We will present in turn the use of *ari in constructions with other verbs and its use as single verbal element. In section 3, our analysis will be presented.

2. The data

2.1. Verb + *ari + Aux constructions

*ari may appear between a verbal form and an auxiliary. In these instances, the verbal form will have a -t(ze)n ending, which is ambiguous between being an imperfective aspect marker and being a nominalized verbal form in the inessive case, a -t(ze)ra(t) ending, which signals a nominalized verbal form in the allative case, or a -t(ze)eari
ending, which is the mark of a nominalized verb in the dative case. The meaning of the construction is slightly different in each case. Examples are given in (6) (from Lafitte (1979)):

(6) a. irauten ari nuzu
    I am sewing
b. sendatzerat ari da
    (S)he is close to getting cured
c. sendatzeari ari da
    (S)he is making an effort to get cured

In this section we will show how the argument configuration of different verb types is encoded in constructions with ari. Since only constructions of the type illustrated in (a) are widely used in the standard language, we will limit our scope to these.

We may classify Basque verbs according to the number of argument NP's that they must minimally take in the clause, in simple, unmarked constructions (overtly or covertly) and the morphological case of these NP's. In (7) we offer such a classification with an example of each type. We use A as abbreviation for ‘absolutive’, E for ‘ergative’ and D for ‘dative’:

(7) a. NP(A); e.g.: mintzatu ‘to talk’
b. NP(E); e.g.: kurritu ‘to run’
c. NP(E), NP(A); e.g.: eraiki ‘to build’
d. NP(A), NP(D); e.g.: gustatu ‘to please’
e. NP(E) NP(D); e.g.: begiratu ‘to look at’
f. NP(E), NP(D), NP(A); e.g.: eman ‘to give’

Some verbs have different argument configurations in different dialects. Thus, irten/urten ‘to leave (intr)’ is type (a) in most dialects,

(3) ARI is not present in Bizkaian Basque, where forms of the verb ihardun are sometimes used with similar meaning and distribution. Other ways of expressing the action one is engaged in make use of different verbs, such as ibili ‘to walk’ and egon ‘to be’:

(i) a. igeri-an dabil
    swimming-in walks
    He is swimming
b. igeri egi-te-n dabil
    swimming do-nom-in
    He is swimming

(ii) a. lan-ean dago
    work-in
    He is working/at work
b. lan egi-te-n dago
    do-nom-in
    He is working

It is interesting to notice that in Lafitte’s dialect, egon is used in this context with the same range of governed cases in the complement as ari (Lafitte 1979: 351), with slightly different semantic connotations:

(iii) bero-tze-n dago
    heat-nom-in is
    ‘Je me chauffe’

(iv) jaus-te-ari dago
    descend-nom-dat
    ‘Il songe à descendre’

(v) jaus-te-ra dago
    nom-allative
    ‘Il est décidé à descendre’

(‘Présent continu’)  
(‘Futur d’intention’)  
(‘Futur arrêté’)
but type (b) in Bizkaian and part of Gipuzkoan (cfr. *irten naiz/urten dot*). Synchronically, the verb *jarraitu/jarraiki* 'to follow' can be of type (c), (d) or (e) in different dialects (e.g. *jarraiki dut/diot/natzaio 'I followed him') 4.

The auxiliary encodes in every instance the person, number and case features of ergative, absolutive and dative NP arguments of the verb. There are not any forms of the auxiliary without absolutive markers. Thus, with verbs of types (b) and (e), which do not take an absolutive argument, the auxiliary contains a default third person singular absolutive marker. The subject of the sentence, or external argument of the verb, is the ergative NP if there is one. Otherwise, the absolutive NP.

In constructions with *ari*, the following change in case marking takes place: the argument which would appear as ergative in a monoval verbal clause receives instead absolutive case marking. The case marking of the subject of the clause with a verb of types (b), (c), (e) and (f) is therefore changed to absolutive. A result is that with verb types (c), (e) and (f) there be will be two argument NP's marked for absolutive case. These two absolutive arguments now compete for the only absolutive 'slot' in the auxiliary. The one that is encoded in every case is the external argument of the verb; that is, the one that would appear as ergative in a basic clause. With verbs of types (a) and (d) there will be no changes either in the case marking of the arguments or in the form of the auxiliary in constructions with *ari*, since these verbs lack an ergative argument. Constructions with and without *ari* are exemplified for each of the verb types which we have identified in (7) in order to illustrate the changes in case marking and auxiliary form.

(8) (a) Jon mintzatzen da
John-A talk 3A
John talks

(a') Jon mintzatzen ari da
John-A 3A
John is talking

(b) berriek kurritzen dute
news-pE run 3sA-3pE
The news runs

4 The verb *jarraiki* can also be used with the meaning of 'to continue' (cfr. Spanish *seguir* 'to follow/to continue'). In this case, its auxiliary is marked either only for absolutive or absolutive/ergative. The examples are from Salaburu and Kintana (1984:99), who condemn this use of *jarraiki* as a calque from Spanish:

(i) burrukatzen jarraituko dugu
AUX-trans (A/E)
We will keep on fighting

(ii) ikasten jarraitzen dira
AUX-intr (A)
They are still studying
2.2. Ari as only verb

Ari can be used either in the company of another verb, as we have just seen, or by itself as only verb in the clause. In this second case, when ari is employed as a main and only verb, it generally takes minimally two arguments; one, the external argument, that is, the subject of the sentence, must appear in the absolutive case. The other argument can take a number of different morphological cases. The internal argument usually takes the inessive case, as in (9), and, less frequently, the instrumental case, as in (10):

(9) Mikel lanean ari da
    -A work-ine AUX
    Mikel is busy at work/ is working
Although inessive and, to a small extent, instrumental, are the most common case markings associated with ari nominal complements, the latter may also occasionally appear in dative case (11) or in the absolutive case (12). Arguments with these cases are normally marked in the inflection; however, with ari the only argument that is encoded in the auxiliary is the subject, and neither dative nor absolutive internal arguments are marked, as shown in the following examples (from Lafitte 1979:442):

(11) lanari ari zen suharki
work-D AUX ardently
He applied himself to the work ardently
(12) hura ere zerbait ari da
he-A too something-A AUX
He is also busy at something

The fact that an absolutive internal argument like the one in (12) is not encoded in the auxiliary when the external argument is also absolutive could be attributed to purely morphological constraints, i.e., the auxiliary can carry only one affix for each case. Then, if more than one argument NP is marked absolutive, agreement with the subject prevails over agreement with an object. The fact that in (11) a dative argument is not marked in the auxiliary is, however, not amenable to a simple explanation. This contrasts with dative arguments in verb+ari+aux constructions like those in (7d') (7e') and (7f'), which do appear marked in the auxiliary.

In some Eastern dialects, such as the Baztan variety described in Salaburu (1984), the marking of dative arguments in the auxiliary is either optional or disallowed when this argument is lexically realized in the sentence. The dialect that Lafitte describes, however, does not seem to be of this type, since in examples with other verbs, lexically present dative arguments are encoded in the auxiliary:

(13) amari eman dio
mother-D give AUX: 3sA-3sD-3sE
(S)he has given it to the mother
(14) ez zaitzue zueri ethorriko
no AUX: 3sA-2pD you-pD come-fut
(S)he will not come to you

Sentence (13) has a transitive auxiliary and (14) an intransitive auxiliary. Both sentences show a dative argument which is encoded in the auxiliary. This is what would be expected in sentences with any verb. However, we have seen that this is not the case in sentences
containing *ari* as main and only verb. The explanation for this peculiar behavior of *ari* lies, we believe, in the thematic role which the argument marked for morphological dative case is assigned. Noun phrases with dative case marking usually have a goal or benefactive thematic role. The dative argument in a sentence like (11) has, however, a very different thematic interpretation. The fact that the dative argument of *ari* in (11) is neither a goal nor a benefactive is what allows its free alternation with other cases such as the inessive case. We would suggest that the dative argument of *ari*, which as we have just pointed out does not have the same thematic role as typical dative noun phrases, is not a direct argument of the verb. This explains its not being encoded in the auxiliary. This could also apply to the absolute non-subject noun phrases in sentences such as (12), although we have noted that in these cases agreement is morphologically impossible, the only absolute slot being occupied by the subject argument marker.

It is possible for *ari* to appear with only one argument NP, its subject. This is the case when *ari* is employed with an adverbial in *ka*, which specifies the type of activity, as in (15):

(15) gizonak pilotaka *ari* dira
    *men-pA ball-adv 3pA*
    The men are playing ball

Dialectally and in older Basque, *ari* can be used without any NP or adverb specifying the activity. Lafon (1943: 143) reports that in Souletin
‘to be busy, to work’ can be expressed as *ari nüžü* with or without *lanian* 'in work', and also provides the two following examples from the sixteenth century author Dechepare:

(16) Iangoycua ariduçu hala gurequi
god-A arí-AUX that way with us
God has acted towards us in that manner

(17) Eci hala aríçaçu Ihesu Christo vera ere
since that way arí-AUX Jesus Christ self too
Because Jesus Christ himself has also acted in that way

**Ari**, thus, was originally an intransitive verb with the general meaning of 'being active, acting’. As such, its only argument is the actor. The type of activity could or could not be specified by means of a complement. Nowadays, in most dialects, the type of activity must necessarily be specified and this is done by means of an NP usually in the inesive but occasionally in a number of different morphological cases, by means of an adverbial, as we have seen above, or by means of a sentential complement. The valency of *ari* has remained constant: it is a monovalent intransitive verb.

3. The analysis

In this section, constructions with *ari* will be studied aiming at determining the nature and function of this element. The issue arises specially in connection with verb+*ari*+auxiliary constructions, where *ari* may be analyzed in radically different ways. Its status as main verb when it is the only verbal element of the clause, as in the constructions examined in 2.2. is quite uncontroversial. We will claim that *ari* is indeed a main verb in all contexts, but one subject to a reanalysis process with the verb in what we have described as verb+*ari*+auxiliary constructions.

3.1. The detransitivization hypothesis

We could start by comparing a regular present tense transitive sentence like the one in (18a) with (18b), where *ari* intervenes between main verb and auxiliary:

(18) a. Mikel-ek eskutitz-ak idazten ditu
    -E letter-pA write AUX:3pA-3sE
    Mikel writes letters

b. Mikel eskutitza-k idazten ari da
    -A -pA AUX:3sA
    Mikel is writing letters

If we compare (18a) and (18b), we notice several obvious differences. In (18a) we find that a) the subject is in the ergative case, and b) the auxiliary marks agreement with both subject and object. By contrast,
sentence (18b), where ari has been used, shows the following characteristics: a) the subject is in the absolutive (unmarked) case, and b) the auxiliary is monovalent, showing agreement only with the subject.

If we restricted our data to sentences of the types illustrated in (18), we would be led to conclude that the degree of transitivity of ari constructions is lower than that of corresponding simpler sentences with the same main verb and arguments (following the approach in Hopper and Thompson 1980). In the sentence with ari, the subject is in the case that subjects of intransitive sentences take and the object is not encoded in the auxiliary; which could be taken as an indication that it is no longer to be considered a direct argument of the verb. In a sentence such as (18b), one would conclude, the emphasis is on the activity of the subject and not on how this activity affects the object. Ari constructions could be viewed as antipassive constructions, similar to those found in many ergative languages, whose cross-linguistic characteristics are precisely that the subject of an otherwise transitive verb appears in the case that intransitive subjects take and the object is demoted. The result of the application of antipassivization is an intransitive sentence. Ari in this analysis would be an intransitivizer, whose function would be to allow an intransitive use of transitive verbs. Such analysis of ari has in fact been proposed in Postal (1977).

However, this analysis, which seems perfectly coherent if we restrict ourselves to examples such as those in (18) above, cannot possibly be maintained once we expand the range of data to be considered.

There are two compelling reasons why ari cannot be considered as intransitivizer. Firstly, its use is not restricted to sentences containing otherwise transitive verbs, but it is also used with intransitive verbs. Secondly, ari may also function as a main and only verb in its clause, in which case it does not make sense to say that it is modifying the valency of another verb.

Let us consider the examples in (19):

(19) a. Mikel hurbiltzen da
   -A approach AUX
   Mikel gets close

b. Mikel hubiltzen ari da
   Mikel is getting close

The relation between (19a) and (19b) is identical to that between (18a) and (18b). In each case, the (a) sentence contains a simple present, which is interpreted as habitual, and the (b) sentence is an ari construction. One could not maintain that (19b) is any way more intransitive than (19a), as one could have claimed with respect to the sentences in (18). Both sentences in (19) are purely intransitive. The difference in meaning between (19a) and (19b) is that the (b) sentence
expresses an action in progress, whereas (19a) has a habitual reading, as indicated before. And this difference is also found between (18a) and (18b).

As mentioned, *ari* can also function as a main verb. This is illustrated again in (20):

(20) Mikel borrokan *ari* da
    -A fight-ine AUX
    Mikel is fighting/is engaged in the struggle

As a main verb, *ari* conveys the meaning 'being engaged in' or 'being involved in', and takes an argument normally in the inesive case, but also in some other cases, as discussed above. Clearly, *ari* is not acting as a detransitivizer in (20), since there is no other predicate in the clause.

We must conclude from the examples presented that *ari* cannot be viewed as an intrasitivizer. Rather, the difference in meaning between the (a) and (b) sentences in (18) and (19) would indicate that *ari* is an aspectual marker, roughly, a progressive auxiliary marker. In the following section this hypothesis will be discussed: we will contrast the hypothesis that *ari* is a modal auxiliary element, at least when used together with a main verb, with the hypothesis that *ari* is always a verb and that (18-19b) are constructions containing two verbs and an auxiliary. The latter analysis will be shown to be adequate.

3.2. *Ari* as a modal element versus *ari* as a main verb

The two hypotheses (modal or main verbal nature of *ari*) are plausible due to a homophony existing in Basque morphology. Most Basque verbs are conjugated periphrastically: the auxiliary includes tense, person and mood information, and the main verb may appear marked with aspectual markers. There are three aspectual markers: perfective (*-i, -tu, -n*, etc.), future (*-ko, added to the perfective suffix) and imperfective (*-t(z)en*). Thus, *idazten* in (21a) is an imperfective form of the verb conjugated with an auxiliary. Some of the pre-auxiliary particles and modals briefly discussed in section 1 may appear between the imperfective form and the auxiliary, as in (21b), with the quotative particle *omen*, and in (21c) with the potential modal *ahal*:

(21) a. Mikel-ek eskutitzak *idaz-ten* ditu
    -E letter-A write-imp AUX
    Mikel writes letters

b. Mikel-ek eskutitzak *idaz-ten* *omen* ditu
    It is said that Mikel writes letters

c. Mikel-ek eskutitzak *idaz-ten* *ahal* ditu (Northern dialects)
    Mikel can write letters
Then, *ari* in a sentence like (22) could be also analysed as some type of pre-auxiliary particle appearing between the imperfective verb and the auxiliary:

(22) Mikel eskutizak idaz-ten ari da  
    ari AUX  
    Mikel is writing letters

On the other hand, tenseless embedded clauses in Basque are usually nominalized expressions: the verb is marked by the nominalizing suffix 

-\(t(z)e\), which is case marked according to the function of the nominalized clause in the matrix, as in (23):

(23) [eskutitzak idaz-te]-ak nazka-tzen nau  
    write-nom-E disgust-imp AUX  
    Writing letters disgusts me/is disgusting to me

Here the nominalized clause is marked ergative, as corresponds to the subject of a transitive clause. Nominalizations can be marked ergative \(-t(z)e-ak\), absolutive \(-t(z)e-a\), dative \(-t(z)e-ari\), purposive \(-t(z)e-ko\), etc. Crucially, they can also be marked inesive \(-t(z)e-n\), and in fact many Basque verbs mark their nominalized complements inesive, as in (24):

(24) [flauta jo-tze]-n ikasi dut  
    flute(ABS) play-nom-in learn AUX  
    I have learnt to play the flute

Then, *eskutitzak idaz-ten* in (22) can also be analyzed as a nominalized embedded clause marked inesive which is the complement of a main verb *ari*. *Ari* in this analysis is not one of the elements that can intervene between a main verb and its auxiliary, but a main verb conjugated with an intransitive auxiliary and having a tenseless nominalized complement marked inesive just like *ikasi* in (24). Support for the plausibility of the latter alternative analysis comes from the fact that as a main verb, *ari* usually appears with inesive complements too. Thus, in (20), *borroka-n* is marked inesive, and so is *lan-ean* in (25):

(25) lan-ean ari da  
    work-in AUX  
    (S)he is working

Furthermore, in Labourdin, where *ari* may appear as a main verb with nominal complements marked dative, nominalized complements may also be marked dative, as shown in (26), from Lafitte (1979):

(26) a. lan-ari ari da  
    work-D AUX  
    (S)he is applying himself to work  
    b. senda-tze-ari ari da  
    heal-nom-D AUX  
    (S)he is making an effort to get cured
Since in verb+ari+auxiliary constructions, the case ending of the verb coincides with the case ending of noun complements of the main verb ari, we can conclude that the -t(z)en ending usually associated with the verb appearing along with ari is to be identified as an inessive nominalization, rather than as the homophonous imperfective ending. Therefore, we will try to show that not only is -t(z)en in (22) quite a different ending from the one appearing in the sentences in (21), but also ari is different syntactically from pre-auxiliary particles like omen and ahal.

In order to check whether ari behaves as a modal-like element or as a main verb, we can compare its syntactic distribution with other modal auxiliaries like potential ahal ‘can’. Potentiality can be expressed in Basque by means of the potential infix -ke attached to subjunctive auxiliaries (27a), or by means of the modal particle ahal (27b):

\[
\begin{align*}
27a. & \text{ joan n-a-ite-ke} \\
& \text{ go 1A-prs-aux(subj)-pot} \\
& \text{ I can go} \\
27b. & \text{ joan ahal n-a-iz} \\
& \text{ go 1A-prs-aux} \\
& \text{ I can go}
\end{align*}
\]

Occasionally, both the infix and the modal particle can co-occur:

\[
\begin{align*}
28. & \text{ Joan ahal naiteke} \\
& \text{ I can go}
\end{align*}
\]

We will analyze ahal as appearing as a right sister to the main verbal head, with a structure as in (29):

\[
(29) \quad \text{V} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{joan} \\ \text{ahal} \end{array}
\]

This constituency explains the linear distribution of this modal element with respect to other pre-auxiliary particles mentioned above, like negative ez, conditional (baldin) ba, quotative omen, etc., which are cliticized to the auxiliary and which we will analyze as being attached to the inflection. First, since the inflection (auxiliary and particles) follows the main verb in declarative affirmative sentences, 'inflectional particles' like conditional ba will always follow modals, which are generated under the main verb node V, as seen in (30):

\[
(30) \text{ etxeak erosi ahal baditzute} \\
\text{ houses buy if AUX} \\
\text{ If they can buy the houses...}
\]

Second, in negative sentences, where the negative particle ez cliticized to the inflection is preposed along with it, modals like ahal should
be left behind to the right of the verb, rather than moved along with inflection. This is indeed the case, as shown in (31):

(31) ez badituzte etxeak erosi ahal
    neg
    If they can't buy the houses...

If modals are generated within the V node, it is predicted that aspectual elements which are attached to the right of the verb, will follow the main verb if ahal is not present but will be able to follow the modal when the latter is present. This is the case, as shown in (32), where future -ko or perfective izan are directly attached to the right of ahal:

(32) a. etxeak erosi ahal-ko badituzte
    -fut
    If they will be able to buy the houses...

    b. etxeak erosi ahal izan badituzte
    perf
    If they have been able to buy the houses...

Finally, a key feature of modals like ahal is that they do not subcategorize for any particular auxiliary, but, rather, the latter is determined by the transitivity of the main verb. Thus, in (27b) the auxiliary is intransitive izan, since joan 'to go' is intransitive, while in (30) it is transitive ukan due to the presence of the transitive verb erosi 'to buy'.

Returning now to ari, its distribution can be shown to differ from that of modals like ahal. In the first place, ahal, the same as the English modal auxiliary 'can', must occur modifying a verb, and cannot appear by itself (unlike, for instance, Spanish poder, cfr. 'lo puede todo'. See Lafitte (1979: 656)). On the other hand, ari can appear as an independent verb, as in the sentences described in 2.2. Moreover, ari can be nominalized (aritzea), while auxiliaries cannot be directly so: *nahitzea (nahi izatea), *ahaltzea (ahal izatea). This situation is similar to the one found in English, where the auxiliary can cannot be nominalized: *to can.

Secondly, ahal has a more restricted distribution than ari in interrogative clauses: wh-words in Basque must appear in a position immediately preceding the verb. In sentences with ahal and ari, the wh-word can appear immediately preceding the 'main' verb and also immediately preceding ari, but not preceding ahal:

(33) a. nork irakurri ahal du?
    who read   AUX
    Who can read?

    b. ??nork ahal du irakurri?
(34) a. nor ari da liburua irakurtzen?
   who AUX
   Who is reading the book?

b. nor irakurtzen ari da liburua?

An explanation of these data with respect to ari will be provided below. The point here is that this can be explained if ari is a verb, which, like other verbs, ‘defines’ a focus position to its left. On the other hand, ahal in (33) is a modal auxiliary modifying a verb and cannot ‘define’ a focus position by itself.

Finally, while ahal does not impose any auxiliary selection, as discussed above, ari does: it can appear only with the intransitive auxiliary izan regardless of the transitivity or intransitivity of the verb marked -t(z)en. As discussed in 2.1, ari seems to decrease the valency of the transitive verbs it appears with. This can be explained again if ari is an independent (intransitive) verb selecting izan auxiliary and occurring with a tenseless embedded nominalized clause case marked Inesive (and occasionally, dative or allative).

A final piece of evidence can be brought forth in support of the status of ari as a main verb subcategorizing for inesive nominalized clauses. The verbal base receiving the nominalizing affix -t(z)e shares both nominal and verbal properties. As a noun, it can be inflected for different cases, as discussed above. As a verb, it maintains its ability to case and α-mark its complements, and indirectly, the subject. In southern dialects, the case marking pattern in nominalized clauses is identical to the pattern found in tensed clauses. Thus, in (35), the expected distribution of ergative, absolutive and dative surfaces in the embedded nominalized clause, which is marked itself absolutive as corresponds to its intransitive subject function:

(35) [lagun-ek ni·ri eskutitz-ak idaz-te]-a gustatzen zait
   friend-E I-D letter-A write-nom-A like AUX
   I like my friends’ writing letters to me

In particular, the object of idazte is marked absolutive, the same as first objects of tensed verbs. This contrasts with noun objects, which are marked by the genitive case, as shown in (36):

(36) herri-en zapalketa
    people-gen oppression
    The oppression of countries

However, in northern dialects (and, as pointed out by J. Lakarra (p. c.) in archaic forms of southern dialects), nominalized verbs show further evidence of their shared nominal/verbal nature. While subjects are marked ergative or absolutive, depending on the transitivity of the nominalized verb (rather than genitive, which is also the case
assigned to noun subjects, as in *armadaren zapalketa* (the army's oppression'), objects are marked absolutive or, optionally, genitive, as in (37):

(37) lagunek niri eskutitz-en idaztea gustatzen zait

In contrast with (35), the object of the nominalized form *idaztea* appears with the genitive plural ending, in much the same way as the object of the noun *zapalketa* in (36). Crucially, in these dialects, imperfective (habitual) tenses marked by the homophonous *-t(z)en* may not occur with genitive objects:

(38) eskutitz-ak (*eskutitz-en) idazten ditut
    -A          -gen write AUX
    I write letters

If *ari* is a modal-like element occurring with imperfective main verbs, objects of the latter will be marked absolutive, but not genitive. On the other hand, if *ari* is a verb subcategorizing for nominalized clauses marked inesive, the object of the nominalized verb will be able to appear marked genitive in northern dialects. This is in fact the case, as shown by the following sentences (from Lafitte (1979) and the XIXth author Elissamburu):

(39) a. gu-re laguntzen-a ari da
    we gen help-nom-in AUX
    He is helping us

b. elkharr-en kitzika-tzen-n hari ziren
    each other-gen tease-nom-in AUX
    They were teasing each other

In (39a), *gure* is the genitive form of the pronoun *gu* 'we', a case marking possible if *laguntzen* is a nominalized verb complement of *ari*, but not otherwise. In the same vein, some main verbs show some variation in the case of their subcategorized nominalizations. Thus, a verb like *hasi* governs inesive complements as in (40a), but allative is also occasionally available as in (40b):

(40) a. kanta-tzen hasi nintzen
    sing-nom-in begin AUX
    I began to sing

b. kanta-tze-ra hasi nintzen
    -all
    I began to sing

Similarly, *ari* may occasionally occur with allative nominalized clauses, as in (41), (Lafitte 1979: 661):

(41) ha-ren senda-tze-rat ari da
    he-gen cure-nom-all AUX
    He is curing him
This is hardly expected if the verb marked -\(t(z)en\) in \(ari\) constructions is a main verb with the habitual ending, but follows the same pattern as (40) if \(ari\) is the main verb itself taking a nominalized complement, like \(hasi\) or \(ikasi\) in (24). A similar point has been made above with respect to dative nominal complements of \(ari\), in examples like (26).

One of the salient features of \(ari\) structures is that it is only here that we seem to find two clause-mate absolutive nominals. If \(ari\) is a pre-auxiliary particle and -\(t(z)en\) an imperfective marker, it is difficult to imagine how this fact can be handled unless as an exception to the generalization that only one ergative, dative or absolutive argument is allowed per clause. However, if \(ari\) is a main verb and -\(t(z)en\) a nominalization, we can claim that one of the absolutive arguments is the external argument (subject) of \(ari\), while the other is the absolutive object of the nominalized verb.

Up to now, we have shown that \(ari\) is a main verb which may appear with noun complements or with nominalized clauses, the latter being generally marked inessive. However, \(ari\) differs in rather interesting ways from other verbs which subcategorize for inessive nominalized clauses, like \(hasi\) and \(ikasi\). The following section is intended to present the data and to provide an analysis that accounts for the particular properties of the verb \(ari\).

3.3 Restructuring with \(ari\)

We have shown in the preceding pages that \(ari\) is a main verb which subcategorizes for both nominal and sentential complements. The latter type takes the form of a nominalized clause and includes a verb marked by the nominalizing suffix -\(t(z)e\) case marked by the inessive ending -\(n\). In this section we will show that some interesting peculiarities of \(ari\) with sentential complements can only be accounted for by assuming a restructuring process has taken place. In particular, we propose that a restructuring rule parallel to the one assumed in Rizzi (1982) for Italian is responsible for turning the bisentential representation of \(ari\) in (42a) to the one in (42b):

\[
(42) \quad \text{a. } NP_j \mathbin{\llarrow} PRO_i \mathbin{\llarrow} VP_i \mathbin{\llarrow} [\ldots V] \mathbin{\llarrow} \text{ari}
\]

\[
\text{b. } NP \mathbin{\llarrow} VP \mathbin{\llarrow} [\ldots V, [V \text{ari}]]
\]

Restructuring forms one single complex verb made up of both \(ari\) and the embedded nominalized verb (see Hualde (1986) and Ortiz de Urbina (1986) for other cases of restructuring in Basque). As in other restructuring or parallel processes, like clause reduction in Relational Grammar, complements of the embedded verb become complements of the new complex verb, and subject embedded PRO is no longer present. This is possible because both matrix and subordinate clause
in (42a) share the same subject, and in (42b) the superordinate NP is still the subject of the complex verb V'. The fact that sentential complements of *ari* require a PRO subject controlled by the subject of the matrix is far from exceptional. While nominalizations in Basque may have case marked subjects as in (35) above, some matrix verbs require nominalizations with controlled subjects, as in (43) and (44):

(43) a. [PRO₁ mandolina jotzen] ikazi zuen Peru-E
    play learn Aux Peru-E
    Peru learned (how) to play mandolin
b. *[Jon-ek mandolina jotzen] ikazi zuen Peruk
    John-E

(44) a. [PRO₁ eskutitzak idazten] ikusi nuen Peru,
    letters write see AUX Peru-A
    I saw Peru write letters
b. *[bere seme-ak eskutitzak idazten] ikusi nuen Peru
    his son-E

*Ikasi* 'to learn' in (43) is a subject control verb, and the subject of its nominalized complement must be an empty element interpreted as coreferential with the superordinate subject. In (44), *ikusi* 'to see' is an object control verb and the empty subject of its complement must be therefore understood as the matrix object *Peru*, rather than the matrix subject 'I'. No overt subject is possible in the nominalized complement, as shown in (43b) and (44b).

Then, in our analysis, a D-structure representation like (45a) would be restructured as (45b):

(45) a. Mikel₁ s[PRO₁ VP[eskutitzak idazten]] ari INFL
b. Mikel VP[eskutitzak V,[idazten ari]] INFL

It is precisely the fact that *ari* forms part of a complex verb at S-structure in these constructions that may have lent some support for the auxiliary analysis of *ari*. However, such analysis, as discussed in the preceding pages, is untenable and leaves most aspects of the *ari* construction described above unexplained. We turn now to show how the Restructuring analysis accounts for some interesting facts of sentential *ari* constructions.

In the first place we will consider focus/wh-question related facts. Wh-words and focalized constituents must appear immediately preceding the verb. Thus, *zer* 'what' in (46) must occur immediately preceding the verb *idazten du*, and the same holds true if *eskutitzak* in (47) is the focus of the clause:

(46) a. zer idazten du John?
    what write AUX John
    what does John write?

b. *zer John idazten du?
In (47b) the italicised constituent may not be considered focus, although *Jonek* might be so. Thus, a constituent immediately preceding the verb may be considered to be the focus, but it need not be so. Similar facts in Hungarian are analyzed in Horvath (1981) by assuming a preverbal FOCUS position which serves as landing site for wh-words and foci. Here we will follow Ortiz de Urbina’s (1986) analysis, although the particular analysis chosen is immaterial for the following discussion. In the latter analysis, wh-words and foci move to the SPEC position in CP in the syntax, and the verbal adjacency requirement is a reflex of the rule raising the inflected verb to the head C of CP, present also in English questions like (48):

Wh-question formation and focalization proceed in the same way in both matrix and embedded clauses. Wh-words and foci may undergo SPEC-to-SPEC ‘upward’ movement with bridge verbs, but not ‘downward’ movement, following the familiar pattern found in other languages with wh-movement in the syntax:

The same can be observed in -t(z)en complements of verbs like *saiatu* in (50):

The wh-word *nor* ‘who’ standing for the subject argument of the matrix verb *saiatu* has been lowered to the SPEC position of the embed-
ded clause, where it occurs immediately preceding the verb, and the sentence is ungrammatical. However, *ari* constructions deviate from the normal pattern found in other verbs with inessive nominalized complements in that the structural counterpart of (50b) although marginal, is acceptable for many speakers:

(51) a. nor irakurtzen ari da liburua?
   who read AUX book
   Who is reading the book?

b. ?nor ari da liburua irakurtzen?
   Who is reading the book?

Since nominalized complements have PRO subjects, *nor* in (51a,b) must correspond to an argument of *ari*. The fact that the interrogative element appears in the absolutive case also supports the contention that it is the subject of the intransitive *ari*, rather than the subject of the transitive embedded verb. However, the interrogative element appears immediately preceding the nominalized embedded verb. A curious restriction on the apparent downward *wh*-movement constructions with *ari* is that the nominalized verb must be adjacent to *ari*: presence of an intervening element induces ungrammaticality:

(52) *nor irakurtzen orain ari da?
   Who is reading now?

We can account for the grammaticality of (51a), as opposed to the ungrammaticality of its counterpart with the predicate *saiatu* in (50b), assuming a restructured analysis with [irakurtzen ari] as one single complex verb. Then, in (51a) there is no actual ‘downward’ movement, since the sentence is monoclausal. The *wh*-word occurs in the only SPEC position and the whole complex verb has moved to the C position. In (51b), on the other hand, only part of it (*ari*) has been moved to that position. The only instance where an apparent ‘downward’ movement of the interrogative pronoun appears to occur is when the whole verbal complex *V’* has moved to the C, in which case any *wh*-word occurring in the preverbal (SPEC) position will seem to have moved to the pre-verbal position of the ‘lower’ verb. Since the complex unit [V-t(z)en ari] moves as a single constituent, any element intervening between its two subcomponents will produce ungrammatical results, as in (52). Since restructuring reanalyzes *ari* sentential structures, but not parallel ones with *saiatu*, a sentence like (50b) is not acceptable, since *hurbiltzen* cannot be reanalyzed as forming part of a complex expression [*hurbiltzen saiatu*]. Thus, the possibility of apparent ‘downward moving’ structures like (51a) supports the restructuring analysis proposed here. Although (51a) is an acceptable sentence, matrix subject *wh*-words tend to be placed immediately preceding the matrix verb *ari* itself, as in (51b). Agreement facts seem to indicate
that in the latter type of questions restructuring has also taken place, but further research should be conducted on the distribution of the two alternatives.

A second argument for restructuring with *ari* comes from some agreement phenomena. Agreement in Basque is strictly local: the inflected element obligatorily includes markers for the ergative, absolutive and dative arguments in its clausal domain. Thus, in (53), the matrix inflection contains a marker for the subject ergative and a third person absolutive marker standing for the sentential object. The absolutive and dative arguments in the embedded clause are not cross-referenced in the inflection, since their clause is tenseless and they cannot be marked in the main clause, as shown in (53b):

\[
(53) \quad \begin{align*}
  a. \ & [\text{Pobre-}e\text{i laguntza ematen}] \text{ ikasi d-u-te} \\
  \text{poor-D help give learn 3A-AUX-3E} \\
  \text{They have learnt to give help to the poor} \\
  b. \ & *[\text{Pobre-}e\text{i laguntza ematen ikasi d-i-e-te}}
\end{align*}
\]

The matrix auxiliary in (53b) contains a marker cross-referencing the dative argument of the embedded clause, violating the locality of the agreement relation. The complex set of data on agreement with *ari* has been sketched in the section 2.1. Here it is sufficient to point out that such ‘locality’ seems to be exceptionally violated in *ari* constructions, since, as shown in (54i), the matrix inflection may contain a dative marker coindexed with a dative argument in the embedded clause:

\[
(54) \quad \begin{align*}
  i. \ & \text{Jon (} \text{guri} \text{ hurbiltzen} \text{)} \text{ ari za-igu} \\
  ii. \ & \text{Jon (} \text{guri hurbiltzen} \text{)} \text{ ari da} \\
  \text{Jon(A) we-D approach 3A-ID} \\
  \text{John is approaching us}
\end{align*}
\]

Here *guri* ‘to us’ receives the thematic role of ‘goal’ from the verb *hurbildu* ‘to approach’ (compare *guri hurbiltzen zaigu*, ‘he approaches us’), but, despite the fact that it is an argument of the embedded verb, it may show up in the matrix inflection. This can be explained if the structure corresponding to (54i) is not as indicated (that is, the one proposed for similar constructions like (53)), but a restructured uniclausal one like (55):

\[
(55) \quad \text{Jon (guri) } v, [\text{hurbiltzen ari}] \text{ zaigu}
\]

*guri* is here a complement of the complex verb, and as such it is cross-referenced in its own clause’s inflection. Thus, the restructuring hypothesis allows us to maintain in its full generality the locality restriction on agreement, without introducing unexplained exceptions for *ari* structures. Since *ari* is an intransitive verb, it may contain at most two indices, one for absolutive and one for dative, and therefore the absolutive marker must correspond to the subject of the complex
restricting with ari
verb. This means that only the dative maker is free to cross-mark the arguments of the embedded nominalized verb. It should be borne in mind that we are claiming the restructuring process to take place optionally only with ari. It seems to be the case that ari has been transformed into a typical control verb without restructuring in some varieties of Basque. Thus, in dialects where the derived verbal form

(i) zahartzen ari zaigu sitona
get old aux grandfather
Grandfather is getting old on us

(ii) hijketa-n ari zaigu
chat-in AUX
He is talking to us

(iii) Keizu-a ari zaigu
signal-AUX
He is waving (his hand) at us

The latter example forms part of a structure discussed for northern dialects in Lafitte (1979:815). Here ari takes absolutive nominal complements rather than inessive as seen in most of the examples in this article. Other examples include

(iv) zer ari da?
what (A) AUX
What is he doing?

(v) deus ez da ari
nothing (A) neg AUX
He is not doing anything

(iv) contrasts with its version in standard dialects (vi), with an inessive complement:

(vi) zer-tan ari da?
what-in AUX
What is he doing?

J. Lakerri (p.c.) points out that the parallel usage of zer and zertan, absolutive and inessive respectively, is not restricted to northern dialects, since questions like (iv) would be acceptable for many Gipuzkoan speakers, and in Bizkaian at least both (vii) and (viii) are possible:

(vii) zet zabiltz
what (A) walk
What are you doing?

(viii) zer-tan zabiltz?
what-in AUX
What are you doing?

George Rebuschi points out (p.c.) that the verbal root may be used in iterative contexts, rather than the standard inessive nominalized form, as in (vii):

(vii) Kanta eta kanta ari zen
sing and sing AUX
He kept on singing

The following example from Elissamburu's Pierres Adames illustrates the same type of structure:

(viii) Bazian apurutto bat han hari nintzela bil-bil
was little one there AUX gather-and-gather
I had been gathering and gathering [plums] for a while

There is one substandard case which can occasionally be found in some speakers where the absolutive marker (or part of it) may actually correspond to an embedded object, rather than to the matrix subject. Thus, some speakers accept sentences like (i):

(i) Jon gidariari maleta-k emetea ari zaizkio
driver-D suitcase-AUX give aux
John is giving the driver the suitcases

Despite much more research needs be done on this clearly deviant form in order to determine its actual use in natural environments. The problem is that when the subject is third person singular and the embedded object third person plural, the auxiliary form may (for those speakers) include the absolute pluralizer infix izk present for all plural absolute persons along with the absolute marker itself. Thus, zaizkio actually stands for 'they to him' rather than the 'he to him' that would appear in the standard form (zaio). There are several possible interpretations of this phenomenon. Under one possible analysis, the third plural absolute marking might actually correspond to the embedded third plural absolute argument, leaving the matrix subject unmarked. Under a different interpretation, such sentences would present a dissociation of the two components of plural absolute forms: the absolute third person marker (probably zero in this form) would cross-mark the matrix subject, while the pluralizer itself would correspond to the embedded plural object. Both analyses indicate the highly exceptional status of this phenomenon, which we include here with some reservations as to its genuine character.
aritzen (where ari receives the habitual aspectual marker -t(z)en) is used, agreement with embedded datives does not hold:

(56) a. [Pobre-ei laguntza ematen] aritzen da
    -hab aux-A
    He usually gives help to the poor
b. *[Pobreei laguntza ematen] aritzen za-ie
    aux-A/D

No restructuring takes place in such usages, and agreement proceeds as with other nominalized embedded clauses such as (53) above. On the other hand, restructuring is optional with ari, so that dative arguments of the embedded clause may (although they need not) appear cross-marked in the matrix auxiliary.

We have seen both syntactic ('focus') and morphological (agreement) evidence for a complex restructured verbal unit with ari. There is also some semantic evidence which points in the same direction. As mentioned at the outset of this article, Basque word order is fairly free, and constituents may appear scrambled in almost any of the permutational possibilities. This scrambling, however, is again clause internal: in (57a), gurekin ‘with us’ may be interpreted as an argument of the embedded nominalized verb kantatu, and the sentence means that John has learned to sing along with other people, say, a capella in our men's choir:

(57) a. Jon-ek [PRO gu-rekin kantatzen] ikasi. du
    John-E we-with sing learn AUX
b. Jonek [PRO kantatzen] ikasi du gurekin

If gurekin occurs outside its clause, as in (57b), it may not be interpreted as an argument of kantatu, but of the matrix verb ikasi ‘to learn’, so that the sentence must mean that John has learned with us, in our class, how to sing.

On the other hand, in a parallel structure with -t(z)en complements of ari, arguments that seem to be in the 'matrix' clause are interpreted as belonging to the embedded clause, as in

(58) a. Jon [gurekin kantatzen] ari da
    John is learning to sing with us
b. John [kantatzen] ari da gurekin

In (58b) the interpretation must be that he is 'singing' with us. Then scrambling seems to be local except with ari structures like (58), since arguments taken 'out' of its nominalized complement can still be interpreted as modifying the embedded verb. Again, we can account for (58) without giving up the locality condition on scrambling that we need elsewhere (as in (57)), by assuming restructuring has taken place and that the structure of (58) is actually better represented as in (59):

(59) Jon [kantatzen ari] da gurekin
Then *gurekin* is an argument of the reanalyzed verbal unit [\textit{kantatzen ari}], as required in the semantic interpretation.

Some dialects provide further evidence for the restructuring analysis proposed here. Agreement-related data occupy an important place in determining the type of structure assigned to *ari* constructions, as seen in the previous section. In most dialects, *ari* subcategorizes for intransitive auxiliaries, with both nominal and clausal complements. Intransitive auxiliaries contain an obligatory absolutive marker and an optional dative one. Since the absolutive marker crossmarks the subject of the complex verb, only the dative marker is left to cross-mark all of the possible complements of the lower verb. Then, dative complements of the latter can be marked in the inflection, but not absolutive complements, the absolutive marker being already 'occupied' by the subject. However, in some dialects, *ari* selects a transitive auxiliary. Examples of this use with nominal complements are given in (60):

$$
\begin{align*}
(60) & \quad \text{a. euri-a ari du} \\
& \quad \text{rain-A AUX} \\
& \quad \text{It is raining} \\
& \quad \text{b. igortzirak ari ditu} \\
& \quad \text{hale-pA AUX} \\
& \quad \text{It is haling}
\end{align*}
$$

In these weather expressions, the particular product of atmospheric activity is taken as the object, and the verb is marked by a dummy third person ergative (subject) marker. In (60b) the object is plural and hence the absolutive pluralizer infix -it- appears in the auxiliary. Transitive auxiliaries minimally include absolutive and ergative markers, with an optional dative marker available. Since the ergative marker is coindexed with the subject of the complex verb, this entails that these dialects have two markers available to cross-reference complements of the 'lower' verb, as opposed to the single dative marker in intransitive *ari* dialects. Then, direct objects of embedded verbs will be able to appear cross-referenced in the inflection, as in (61a), from Lafitte (1979:351), which contrasts with the same sentence in the intransitive *ari* dialect (61b):

$$
\begin{align*}
(61) & \quad \text{a. sendagile-ak gizonak sendatzen ari ditu} \\
& \quad \text{doctor-E man-pA heal AUX} \\
& \quad \text{The doctor is curing the men} \\
& \quad \text{b. sendagile-ak gizonak sendatzen ari da} \\
& \quad \text{-A -pA AUX} \\
& \quad \text{The doctor is curing the men}
\end{align*}
$$

The subject *sendagile* is marked ergative in the transitive (61a) and absolutive in the intransitive (61b). Then, the absolutive plural object *gizonak* may be marked in the inflection in (61a), where the absolu-
tive marker is available, but not in (61b). The presence of the absolute pluralizer infix -it- in (61a), just as in (60b) indicates that object agreement has indeed taken place.

Returning to the standard dialect considered here, (61b) shows that the absolute marking on the inflection corresponds to the subject of ari rather than to the object of sendatzen, since the latter is absolute plural and the verb is marked absolute singular like sendagilea. This indicates that when both subject and object of the complex verb are singular or plural, the absolute ending corresponds to the former, rather than the latter. An interesting side effect of this is that given the possibility of permuting clausal constituents in almost any possible order (and after Restructuring has taken place we have a monoclausal structure), some situations may arise where it is not clear which absolute constituent is the subject and which is the object. In a sentence like

(62) eskutitza Jon idazten ari da
    letter-A Jon(A) write AUX
    Jon is writing the letter

either of the two absolute nominals might be, in principle, the subject of the complex verb. However, pragmatic considerations favor the interpretation in which eskutitza 'letter' is the object and Jon is the subject. The situation, however, is different in a sentence like (63) where either nominal qualifies as a potential subject (or object):

(63) Jon Mikel jotzen ari da
    Jon(A) Mikel(A) hit aux
    Jon is hitting Mikel

Given word-order freedom, either interpretation (Jon hitting Mikel or Mikel hitting Jon) should be available. In these cases, however, and unless the extra-sentential linguistic context clarifies the function of each noun, the interpretation is one where the first noun is identified as the subject and the second one as the object. This interpretational strategy supplies further evidence for the contention that Basque has a basic SOV order. In all other contexts in the language, word order is largely irrelevant given the fact that function is easily recoverable from the morphology (case ending), as already noticed by as early authors as Lècluse (J. Lakarra, p.c.). In particular, other sentences involving clausemate subject and object have distinct correlations between case and function: subject will be marked ergative and object absolutive. It is only in ari clauses in the standard intransitive dialect that absolute subject and absolute object can be clausemate. And it is in this situation, where syntactic function is not recoverable from the morphology or, sometimes, from the context, that one would expect scrambling to be prevented from affecting the two elements. Positional relations are then significant to convey grammatical functions, just
as they are in languages where a relatively poor morphology requires a fixed word order to convey function. While the evidence to consider Basque verb final is quite strong (see de Rijk (1969), for instance), evidence for the relative order of subject and object is more elusive and ari-related data are important also in this respect.

In this article, we have tried to provide an account of an apparently bizarre ‘particle’ of Basque. We have shown that ari can function as main and only verb in some sentences. It is constructions where ari occurs with other verbs, however, that raise interesting questions as to the proper identification of this element as a pre-auxiliary particle like omen, a detransitivizing suffix, a modal like ahal or just another verb. We have proposed that the latter alternative is adequate: ari is a verb in all constructions it occurs in. Apparent deviations of ari structures from general syntactic patterns can be accounted for in a straightforward manner if we assume a restructuring process that creates monoclausal structures with one single complex verb out of biclausal structures with nominalized complements quite common elsewhere in the language. This is a marked property of ari and a few other elements examined in the literature cited above.

(8) A possibility which is not commented on in the text has been pointed out to us by George Rebuschi (p.c.), namely, the analysis according to which ari is an adjective, rather than a verb. Rebuschi points out that ari can be used with allocutive-like zuka forms in Gipuzkoan a dialect which only accepts such forms with adverbial verbal forms with the suffix -ta. Thus, ari in (i) would be equivalent to nekatuta ‘tired’ in (ii):

(i) lanean ari nauzu
aux
I am working (lit. ‘you have me working’)

(ii) nekatu-ta naukazu
tire-adv have
I am tired (lit. ‘you have me tired’)

A research path into this direction would have to establish the availability of naukazu for ari (??lanean ari naukazu) as well as of the auxiliary form nauzu for adverbial forms (‘nekatuta nauzu’). Furthermore, no explanation would be readily available for the restructuring data offered before, since adverbial forms with the -ta suffix behave as independent embedded clauses for agreement purposes etc.
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