

4.4. Focalization

R. Etxepare & J. Ortiz de Urbina

4.4.1. General remarks

As will be seen in the following sections, *wh*-words and foci occur immediately to the left of verbal elements. Moreover, the position occupied by the operator+verb pair can be described as clause-initial, since any elements occurring to their left are interpreted as topics or scrambled material. This is the case of the constituents to the left of *nori* ‘to whom’ or *berari* ‘to him’ in the following examples:

- (1) *NOR-I/BERA-RI azaldu zion Jonek atzo bere erabakia.*
who-DAT/him-DAT explain AUX Jon yesterday his decision
‘To whom did Jon explain his decision yesterday?’
‘Jon explained his decision *to him* yesterday.’
- (2) *Jonek atzo NORI/BERARI azaldu zion bere erabakia.*
- (3) *Jonek NORI/BERARI azaldu zion atzo bere erabakia.*
- (4) *Atzo NORI/BERARI azaldu zion Jonek bere erabakia.*
- (5) *Atzo Jonek NORI/BERARI azaldu zion bere erabakia.*
- (6) *Bere erabakia NORI/BERARI azaldu zion Jonek.*
- (7) *Bere erabakia Jonek NORI/BERARI azaldu zion.*

In fact, where topics occur to the left of the clause, some element is usually interpreted as focalized. Thus, in the following sentence *niri* ‘to me’ appears displaced to the left of the clause, interpreted as topic (separable from the rest of the clause by a pause, indicated by a comma), and as a result either *Jonek* or the verb itself will most likely be interpreted as focalized:

- (8) *Ni-ri, Jonek azaldu zidan.*
I-DAT Jon explain AUX
‘JON explained that to me.’

The verb may also be topicalized and focused at the same time; the topicalized verb appears then in the citation form (participial):

- (9) *Hartu ere har-tzen dut erabakia.* [Atx. *Ob.*:111]
take also take-IMPF AUX decision
‘As for taking, I TAKE my decision.’

Since *hartu* ‘take’ has been topicalized here, some element is expected to be focalized; in this case the verb itself, which is then fronted inside its clause (see 4.4.3.2.2 below). Topicalized verbs may be substituted by the dummy verb *egin* ‘do’ inside the clause (4.3.4):

- (10) *Saiatu behintzat egingo gara.* [Atx. *Ob.*:24]
try at.least do.FUT AUX
‘At least try, we WILL.’

The tendency to have a focalized element in the presence of topicalized material is also made responsible for the apparent need to focalize the verb in the following sentences:

- (11) *Jonek, behintzat, *(ba)daki.*
 Jon at.least ba-knows
 ‘Jon, at least, does know.’

The presence of *behintzat* ‘at least’ forces *Jonek* to be interpreted as a topic (de Rijk 1978), and the existence of this focus forces in turn the synthetic verb to receive focal interpretation, reflected here by the prefix *ba-* (see. 4.4.3.2.2). However, this argument for the topic/focus relationship is weakened if *ba* is interpreted not as a focus marker but as a particle supporting the tensed verb, a clitic, in a context where no clausemate element to its left is found (Ortiz de Urbina 1994). This situation emerges when the verb is fronted to the left in focalization, but also if no other element is present in the clause, as in the previous example.

At least in some varieties of the language, SOV sentences need not have a focalized constituent. The situation may be different in some dialects like the Lekeitio variety described in Hualde et al. (1994), where all main clauses must contain an element with focal stress. This is no doubt related to the fact that most words lack lexical accent in this dialect. Even there, though, an SOV sentence with focal stress on the object may receive both object emphatic *or neutral* interpretation. On the other hand, neutral interpretations are not found in clauses with a different word order.

At the same time, it is possible to have more than one constituent focalized. Just as two *wh*-words may cooccur in preverbal position, with paired readings, two constituents may be emphasized with the same type of interpretation:

- (12) *KOTXEA ETXEAN utzi nuen atzo (ez giltza bulegoan).*
 car at.home leave AUX yesterday not key office.the.in
 ‘I left THE CAR AT HOME yesterday, not the key in the office.’

- (13) *NEUK HEMENTXE ikusi dudalako.* [Osa 1990:74]
 I right.here see AUX.because
 ‘Because I saw it HERE.’

It is not possible to insert any non-focalized material intervening between the focalized constituents. In any event, outside of cases like ‘*From where to where*’, this focalization strategy is found in highly contrastive contexts.

Multiple *wh*-questions can be formed by coordinating *wh*-words:

- (14) *Noiz eta nola sortua da Sail hori?* [Mitx. *EIG* I:115]
 when and how born is section that
 ‘When and how was that section born?’
- (15) *Non, norekin eta zertako eginen dugu gerla?* [Eliss. *P.A.*:89]
 where, who.with and why make.FUT AUX war
 ‘Where, with whom and why will we make war?’

Occasionally, stacked *wh*-words may be found in some texts:

- (16) *Eta zure prestutasunaz... nork zer erranen du?* [Ax. 2]
 and your virtue.on who what say.FUT AUX
 ‘And who will say what on your virtue?’
- (17) *Noiz nun entzun duzu?* [Lafitte 1944:224]
 when where hear AUX
 ‘When (and) where did you hear it?’

Stacked foci and questions must be placed in an order corresponding to the ‘neutral’ order; thus, in (16) the order *zer nork* ‘what who’ and the order *etxean kotxea* ‘at home the car’ in (12) would not be acceptable. See section 6 for pre-verbal foci and wh-words coexisting with yet other such elements in different positions in the sentence.

Some morphological and syntactic devices produce emphasis which quite often results in syntactic focalization of the marked constituent. Thus, demonstratives and some adverbials may be attached the suffix *-xe*: *horixe* ‘that very one’, *hementxe* ‘right here’, *oraintxe* ‘right now’; pronouns have special intensive forms: *ni* ‘I’ vs. *neu* ‘I myself’, *zu* ‘you’ vs. *zeu* ‘you yourself’; adjectives may be reduplicated for emphasis: *zuri-zuria* ‘very white’, *handi-handia* ‘very big’; phrases can also be emphasized by adding the demonstrative *bera* in apposition, marked with the same ending: *Jonek berak* ‘Jon himself’, *zuzendariarentzat berarentzat* ‘for the director himself’. While elements thus marked are perfectly felicitous in pre-verbal position, there seems to be some variation as to whether they can appear in non-focus position. Many speakers reject intensive pronouns in non-focus position, and the same is often reported for elements marked with the intensive marker *-xe* (de Rijk 1978:106). However sentences like the following are certainly acceptable for many speakers:

- (18) *Orain irakurri dituzun liburu horiexek nik aspaldian irakurri nituen.*
 now read AUX.COMP book those.INTS I long.ago read AUX
 ‘Those very books which you have read now, I read long ago.’

It seems therefore that, at least for some of these strategies, emphasis need not correspond to syntactic focalization.

Echo-questions usually respect left-adjacency with the verb, so that the wh-word, rather than occupying the position it would in the basic declarative sentence, is typically moved to the pre-verbal position:

- (19) *-Zugandik atera dira kontu zikin guzti horiek.* [Atx. Ob.:64]
 you.from come AUX story dirty all those
-Nigandik ZER atera dela?
 me.from what come AUX.that
 ‘All those dirty stories have come from you. (That) what has come from me?’
- (20) *-Jonek kontu zikin guzti horiek atera ditu.*
 Jon story dirty all those invent AUX
-Kontu horiek nork atera ditu(ela)?
 story those who invent AUX(that)
 ‘Jon invented all those dirty stories. Who invented all those stories?’

The adjacency phenomena described above for foci and wh-words are fairly conspicuous and recognized in traditional grammars of Basque. The behaviour of foci is sometimes claimed to be less strict than normative grammar suggests, especially in narrative or discursive contexts (Mitzelena 1977, Villasante's preface to the second edition of Altube 1929). It has also been mentioned that the situation may be different depending on the dialects. With respect to the former remark, de Rijk (1996) has pointed out that special effects obtained in narration by 'breaking' focalization rules presuppose the existence of such rules. As to the latter, dialectal differences will certainly occur, but in the absence of detailed and reliable studies of focalization in most dialects, this is a fairly impressionistic criticism. In-depth studies from this perspective only exist for southern dialects, where the focalization strategies described below are generally held to be more robust: Hualde et al. (1994) in fact describes a dialect with a more strict, rather than looser, focalization system. In any event, the focalization (and certainly question formation) strategies described in this chapter are generally respected in conversational style in southern dialects, and, more or less consciously, in the standard written language. Section 4.4.8 below will present some less standard patterns. Except where indicated otherwise, the grammatical system which will be described in this chapter corresponds to an educated standard central variety of the language close to Northern High Navarrese (Irun).

In order to emphasize the essential similarities between focalization and question formation, we will be discussing the two processes simultaneously. Thus, we will consider wh-questions and non-verbal focalization under the same heading (section 4.4.2), and include yes/no questions and wh-questions, in a different joint section (section 4.4.3). Subconstituent question and focalization will be the topic of section 4.4.4, where different pied-piping possibilities are mentioned for operators inside different non-clausal phrases. On the other hand, questions and focalization of elements inside embedded clauses is discussed separately in section 4.4.5, whether the operator originating in an embedded clause is maintained there, as in indirect questions, or moved to a different higher clause. Since both foci and interrogative elements seem to vie for the same pre-verbal 'position', an obvious question which emerges is whether two or more wh-words, foci, or combination thereof are compatible, and this issue is addressed in section 4.4.6. The special problems associated with focalization in negative clauses will be examined in section 4.4.7. Finally, section 4.4.8 will deal with cases where foci or wh-words occur in a position other than the immediately pre-verbal one.

4.4.2. Wh-questions and non-verbal focalization

As mentioned at the outset of this section, in positive clauses, wh-words and focalized constituents occur immediately to the left of the verb, whether analytical or synthetic:

- (21) ... *hi hau ume horrek aita. Ez ... gizon gaiztoa.* [Atx. Ob.:20]
 you have.2A/3E child that father not man mischievous
 'That child has you as his father. Not ... that mischievous man.'
- (22) *Zer egiten duzu zuk hemen?* [Atx. Ob.:56]
 what do.IMPf AUX you here
 'What are you doing here?'

Inflectional particles (3.5.7), however, may intervene between the wh-word or focus and a

synthetic verb:

- (23) *Zergatik ote dago hainbeste tximeleta?* [Atx. Ob.:220]
why Q is so.many butterfly
'Why are there so many butterflies?'
- (24) *JONEK omen daki hori*
Jon apparently knows that
'Apparently, Jon knows that.'

Occasionally, parenthetical elements may be found between the two elements:

- (25) *Zein idazle, gaurko edo denbora bateko, iruditzen zaizu*
which writer today.REL or time other.REL seem.IMPF AUX
gidaririk zuzenena hitz kontuan? [Mitx. EIG I:92]
guide.PRTT correct.most.DET word matter.in
'Which writer, from today or from other times, seems to you the best guide in terms of words?'

The operator-verb adjacency is occasionally absent, especially with *zergatik* and other causal wh-words:

- (26) *Zertako baratze hartako ogiak ekhartzen du horrenbertze buru?*
why land that.from wheat bring.IMPF AUX so.many head
'Why does the wheat in that land produce so many heads?' [Duv. Lab.:55]
- (27) *Zergatik Christok hautatu zuen beretzat pobrezaren bidea?* [Mogel CB:263]
why Christ choose AUX for.him poverty.GEN way
'Why did Christ choose the way of poverty for himself?'

Examples of this sort abound in the earliest texts, such as Leizarraga's XVIth century religious translations. Most examples involve *zergatik* 'why', *nolatan* 'how, how come', although other wh-word types are also found:

- (28) *...zer horrek erran nahi du?* [Leiz. 1297]
what that say want AUX
'... what does that mean?'
- (29) *Zer gehiago hemen erraiten da?* [Leiz. 1324]
what more here say.IMPF AUX
'What else is said here?'

Most present-day speakers find examples like (28) and (29) ungrammatical.

As indicated in the previous section, the position of the wh/focus+verb group is clause initial, although topics/scrambled elements may occur to their left:

- (30) *Euskalerria eta euskal gauzak nola ikusten dituzu?* [Mitx. EIG I:56]
Basque.Country and Basque things how see.IMPF AUX
'How do you see the Basque Country and Basque affairs?'
- (31) *Sail hori, nola dago eratu?* [Mitx. EIG I:116]

section that how is organized
 ‘How is that section organized?’

In the case of analytical verbal forms, northern dialects admit a second focusing or interrogative strategy, where the operator occurs immediately to the left of the auxiliary, which is proposed to the auxiliary. The auxiliary is then separated from the participle, and any number of constituents may intervene between the auxiliary and the participle. This strategy is exemplified here both with *wh*-questions and foci:

- (32) *Zer bide du hartzen idazlariak?* [Etch. *Id.* I:293]
 which way AUX take.IMPF writer
 ‘Which way does the writer take?’
- (33) [*onetsi*] *EUSKAL-HERRIAREN BIHOTZ-BIHOTZEAN zituela*
 admit Basque-Country.GEN heart-heart.in AUX.that
Axularek iragan bere biziko lehen urteak. [Etch. *Id.* I:236]
 Axular.ERG spend his life.of first years
 ‘[admit] that it was at the very heart of the Basque Country that Axular spent the first years of his life.’
- (34) *Hunek du egin Euskal-Herria.* [Etch. *Id.* I:198]
 this AUX do Basque-Country
 ‘This one has made the Basque Country.’

Lafitte (1944) indicates that these patterns are more markedly emphatic than the alternative where the auxiliary remains after the participle.

4.4.3. *Yes/no questions and verb focalization*

4.4.3.1. *Direct yes/no questions*

Yes/no questions need not be signalled by any mark other than interrogative intonation:

- (35) *Jonek liburu hori irakurri du?*
 Jon book that read AUX
 ‘Has Jon read that book?’

Some dialects possess overt morphological markers for yes/no questions, such as *G al* or eastern (LN, Z, R and Sal.) *-a*; the former is a verbal particle (3.5.7), while the latter occupies the same position as complementizers (3.5.7.3). *-a* is restricted to direct questions, while *al* may also be found in embedded contexts:

- (36) *Gure literaturak aurrerakada haundirik egin al du urte hauetan?*
 our literature improvement great.PRTT make *al* AUX year these.in
 ‘Has our literature made any great improvements in the last years?’
 [Mitx. *EIG* I:96]
- (37) *Oro egin eta desegin, ez dea lur huntako legea?* [Etch. *Id.* I:336]
 all do and undo not is.*a* earth this.of law
 ‘To do and undo everything; isn’t that the law of this world?’

There are also syntactic means to mark clauses as direct questions, in particular verb fronting:

- (38) *Baretuko ote lituzke zertxobait erdal-euskal hiztegi batek*
 appease Q AUX a.bit Spanish-Basque dictionary a.ERG
eztabaidak? [Mitx. *EIG* I:96]
 controversies
 ‘Would a Spanish-Basque dictionary appease the controversies a bit?’
- (39) *Esango al zeniguke zerbait azkenik?* [Mitx. *EIG* I:68]
 say.FUT *al* AUX something finally
 ‘Would you tell us something finally?’
- (40) *Entzun duziera gure auzo Biarnesek berek nola goresten (...)*
 hear AUX.a our neighbor Bearnese themselves how praise
duten beren hizkuntza? [Etch. *Id.* I:200]
 AUX.COMP their language
 ‘Have you heard how our neighbors from Béarn themselves praise their language?’

The last two examples show that verb-fronting may cooccur with the interrogative particle *al* as well as the yes/no marker *-a*. As usual, a clause initial verb may be preceded in turn by any number of topicalized/scrambled elements and a focalized constituent. Since subjects tend to be topics and objects are often focalized (see Hualde, Elordieta & Elordieta 1994), this means that it is not clear whether SOV sentences like the following exclusively involve interrogative intonation on a neutral word order or whether the object has been focalized:

- (41) *Baina entzuleak egilearen esan-nahi berbera aditzen al du?*
 but listener author.GEN meaning same hear.IMPF *al* AUX
 ‘But does the listener hear the same meaning as the author?’ [Mitx. *EIG* I:51]
- (42) *Musikak (...) gertakari bat adieraz al dezake?* [Mitx. *EIG* I:50]
 music event a express *al* AUX
 ‘Can music express an event?’

Verb-fronting is perhaps more clearly perceived in yes/no questions with synthetic verbs. These are clitic-like elements which lean on the element to their left and which cannot therefore occur in absolute initial position in a main clause. Where verb-fronting to that position takes place, they are supplemented by the particle *ba* to their left:

- (43) *Ba al dugu musikan euskal eskolarik?* [Mitx. *EIG* I:49]
ba al have music.in Basque school.PRTT
 ‘Do we have any Basque school in music?’
- (44) *Ba al duzue idazlanik aski?* [Mitx. *EIG* I:83]
ba al have manuscript.PRTT enough
 ‘Do you have enough manuscripts?’

Topics may occur to the left of the initial verb, which will then also appear with *ba-* (45); however, this is not the case if a focalized constituent precedes it: that constituent ‘counts’ as first element to support the synthetic verb, as in (46):

- (45) *Euskal doinuek ba al dute berezkotasunik?* [Mitx. *EIG* I:48]
 Basque songs *ba al* have peculiarity.PRTT
 ‘Do Basque songs have any peculiarities?’
- (46) *Kaltegarritzat al daukazue joera hori?* [Mitx. *EIG* I:86]
 harmful.as *al* have tendency that
 ‘Do you consider that tendency harmful?’

4.4.3.2. Verb Focalization

Verb focalization stands out from the main focalization strategy described in the preceding sections in that it seems to employ, at least in part, different mechanisms. Since Altube (1929), a distinction has been drawn between two types of ‘verb focalization’: a) cases where the event itself is emphasized, contrasting it with other type of events, and b) cases where ‘the positive or negative quality of the verb is emphasized’, i.e. where what is emphasized is that the action or state did take place or is true, as opposed to not taking place or not being true. *A priori*, the contrastive overtones of the former seem more akin to the types of constituent focalization discussed in section 4.4.2, while positive verbal emphasis falls fully in line with the yes/no questions discussed in 4.4.3.1 However, both types of verb focalization will be discussed in this section in order to prevent dispersion and to facilitate a sharper distinction between the two. Contrastive event focalization will be dealt with in 4.4.3.2.1, and 4.4.3.2.2 will be devoted to polar emphasis. Since negation presents additional problems which will be examined in section 4.4.7 below, we will concentrate here on positive polar emphasis.

4.4.3.2.1. Event focalization

By event focalization we refer to those cases of focus which do not emphasize the truth value of the sentence (thus, we also include focalization of stative verbs). Two different strategies are usually mentioned in this respect, depending on whether the verbal form is synthetic or analytical. In Bizkaian, including Bizkaian-speaking areas of Gipuzkoa, according to Osa (1990), the action expressed by synthetic forms may be emphasized by placing the participial form of the verb immediately to its left:

- (47) *Bizia, ibilli dabillan itzala baño ez da.*
 life walk.PRF walks.that shadow but not is
 ‘Life is not but a walking shadow.’ [Osa 1990:175]
- (48) *Nik jakin dakit egia.*
 I know.PRF I.know truth
 ‘I know the truth.’ [*as opposed to ‘think’ or ‘believe it’*]

Only verbal particles like dubitative *ote* (B *ete*) ‘by any chance’, conditional *ba* or quotative *ei* ‘reportedly’ may intervene between the two verbal forms. Since synthetic verbs, whether bare or preceded by these particles, are barred from clause-initial position, even in immediate post-topic position, it is clear that the participle in this strategy is not a topic, and that the two make up a single syntactic and phonological unit. For those dialects that do not use this strategy, there is no difference between event/state emphasis and positive emphasis with synthetic verbs, and *ba* is used for both.

A second strategy is found in the case of analytical verbal forms, also in western dialects, although reaching further to the east than the previous one (up to the coast of Lapurdi, according to Lafitte 1944:352). In this strategy, a dummy participle *egin* ‘do’ is placed between the verb and the auxiliary:

- (49) *Ama, behintzat, txoratu egin zen pozez.* [Atx. Ob.:28]
 mother at.least get.excited do AUX joy.with
 ‘Our mother, at least, got excited with joy.’
- (50) *Bigarren irakurketa batek ere susmo hori zilegiztatu egiten du.*
 second reading a also suspicion that support do.IMPF AUX
 ‘A second reading also supports that suspicion.’ [Atx. Ob.:22]

As the last example shows, aspectual marks (imperfective *-ten*) are borne by *egin*; inflectional particles will also occur between *egin* and the auxiliary. The presence of *egin* ‘do’ does not affect auxiliary choice, so that the latter will be intransitive or transitive depending on the emphasized verb: it is intransitive *izan* in the first example above, and transitive **edun* in the second. Intuitively, the participle seems to be occupying the usual pre-verbal position of foci, in this case pre-verbal with respect to the dummy verb *egin* ‘do’ (see Rebuschi 1983 for a more formal instantiation of this idea). In the Lekeitio dialect, where the phonological realization of focus has been best described, focal stress falls on the pre-*egin* participle, just as on pre-verbal foci (Hualde et al. 1994:168).

It is not clear at all whether the *egin* strategy involves verb fronting, and we have included examples with verb in initial, second and final position. In example (49) above, the presence of a marked topic (*ama*, marked by *behintzat*) requires, or at least favors, the existence of a focalized constituent (see above 4.4.1), and the *egin* strategy can be seen to fulfil that requirement (here perhaps with fronting).

In dialects where *egin* is not used there is no formal difference between event and positive emphasis, so the fronting strategy described in 4.4.3.2.2 will also be used for event emphasis.

4.4.3.2.2. Positive polar emphasis

Verbal forms with positive emphasis are fronted to the left of the clause (where, as usual, they may be preceded by any number of topicalized elements). In addition, they also receive focal stress. In this type of focalization, *synthetic forms* appear with the prefix *ba*:

- (51) *Jonek badakar hori.*
 Jon.ERG ba.brings that
 ‘Jon IS bringing that.’

As indicated above, the usage of this particle seems to be a reflection of the clitic status of synthetic forms, which usually lean on a host to their left. Such element is missing in clause-initial position, and the particle *ba* is then used to support the conjugated verbal form. From this perspective, this particle typically appears as a consequence of verb-fronting, rather than as a marker of focalization per se. At least since Altube (1929), it has often been assumed that the particle *ba* itself is the marker of positive emphasis, an analysis supported by the relation of this element to the positive particle *bai* ‘yes’. However, this does not explain its restriction to synthetic verbal forms and, more importantly, disregards

the usage of *ba* in other contexts where verb fronting takes place, such as yes/no questions (see section 4.4.3.1 above) and existential sentences like the following:

- (52) *Bada Sein Floreten Pillardit izeneko fraile doktrino bat.* [Lertx. *O.P.*:390]
ba.is St. Floret.in name.of friar preaching a
 ‘There is in St. Floret a preaching friar called Pillardit.’

Sometimes different factors may be combined: in the last example there is clear contrastive emphasis on the existential verb. See Oyharçabal (1986), Rebuschi (1982) for more details on this particle.

The absence of *ba* makes positive emphatic *analytical forms* less conspicuous, and Altube (1929:57) claimed that these are exclusively marked by focal stress. Euskaltzaindia (1985) points out verb initiality as an important syntactic property. However, given the availability of scrambling to the left of the clause, this property is often anything but salient. Some examples are given below:

- (53) *Eta bukatu zuten gizonek beren lana.* [Atx. *Ob.*:39]
 and finish AUX men their work
 ‘And the men did finish their work.’
- (54) *Joan dira enarak, hasi da negua.* [Atx. *Ob.*:43]
 go AUX sparrows begin AUX winter
 ‘The sparrows have left, winter has begun.’

Note that, even though the traditional description of sentences like these in Basque grammars assigns them ‘contrastive’ positive focus, most of these patterns with analytical verbs seem to be merely emphatic and not contrastive. The emphatic nature of many verb-initial verb constructions is also clear in exhortative and imperative sentences, where, if no other element is focalized, the verb is often preposed (Euskaltzaindia 1985:33):

- (55) *Ekin diezaiogun, beraz, bigarren pasarteari.* [Atx. *Ob.* 30]
 focus AUX(SUBJ) therefore second paragraph.DAT
 ‘Let’s, therefore, focus on the second paragraph.’
- (56) *...zu joan zaitez errotara eta gelditu zaitez han,* [Atx. *Ob.*:33]
 you go AUX mill.to and stay AUX there
eta bidal ezazu alaba lehen bait lehen
 and send AUX daughter as.soon.as.possible
 ‘As for you, go to the mill, and stay there, and send your daughter as soon as possible.’

A heavily emphatic positive contrastive focus is found in a marked and apparently archaic strategy like the following, where only the auxiliary has been preposed:

- (57) *Badut ikusi!*
ba.AUX see
 ‘I HAVE seen.’
- (58) *Banintzan egon* [Altube 1929:53, ft. 3]
ba.AUX be

‘I WAS [there].’

These resemble negative patterns (see 4.4.7.2) where the auxiliary precedes the participle (and may be separated from it by intervening constituents). As in emphatic sentences without *do* support in English, positive focus is achieved here by focalizing the auxiliary element. As claimed above, emphasis will then involve fronting and *ba*-support for the clitic auxiliary which can no longer take the participle as a host.

4.4.4. Subconstituent questions and focalization

4.4.4.1. Questions and foci inside noun phrases

Foci and wh-words embedded within other constituents cause the latter to occur pre-verbally. Thus, in the following examples the whole noun phrase must occur pre-verbally if any of its subconstituents is given focal emphasis:

- (59) [JONEN /NOREN etxeko teilatuak] izan ditu itoginak
Jon.GEN/whose house.REL roof.ERG have AUX leaks
‘The roof of JON’S/WHOSE house has had leaks.’
- (60) [Jonen ETXEKO /NONGO teilatuak] izan ditu itoginak
Jon.GEN house.REL /where.REL roof.ERG
‘The roof of Jon’S HOUSE/WHERE has had leaks.’
- (61) [Jonen etxeko TEILATUAK /ZERK] izan ditu itoginak
Jon.GEN house.REL roof.ERG /what.ERG
‘Jon’S house ROOF/WHAT has had leaks.’

Since extraction from inside noun phrases is not acceptable, pied-piping is the only option for these structures. The situation is not identical in all dialects. For instance, Hualde et al. (1994:61-64) show that in the Lekeitio variety of Basque, which distinguishes accented and non-accented morphemes, only accented words may be focalized inside an NP; unaccented words may not receive focal stress. Such tight constraints may be restricted to dialects with pitch-accent patterns, and are certainly absent from the variety described here.

Question-words may ask about different constituents inside nominal phrases:

- (62) *Iazko zein kontuak ikertu dituzte?*
last.year.REL which accounts examine AUX
‘Which accounts from last year did they examine?’
- (63) *Norako presa duk?* [Lertx. O.P.:247]
where.to.REL hurry have
‘Where are you hurrying?’ (Lit. ‘Hurry to where do you have?’)

Adnominal wh-words such as *noren* ‘whose’, *nongo* ‘from where’, *noizko* ‘from when’, *nolako* ‘what type of’, *norantzako* ‘whereto’, *zertarako* ‘for what’ must be adjacent to the head noun:

- (64) a.??*Noren Axularren erretratoa aurkitu dute?*
whose Axular.GEN portrait find AUX

- ‘Whose portrait of Axular did they find?’
 b. *Axularren noren erretratoa aurkitu dute?*
- (65) a. **Nongo iazko kontabilitatea ikertu dute?*
 where.REL last.year.REL accounting examine AUX
 ‘Last year’s accounts from where did they examine?’
 b. *Iazko nongo kontabilitatea ikertu dute?*
- (66) a. **Noizko gure kontabilitatea ikertu dute?*
 when.REL our accounting examine AUX
 ‘Our accounts from when did they examine?’
 b. *Gure noizko kontabilitatea ikertu dute?*
- (67) a. **Nolako Frantziako jendea atsegin duzu?*
 how.REL France.REL people like AUX
 ‘What type of people from France do you like?’
 b. *Frantziako nolako jendea atsegin duzu?*
- (68) a. **Norantzako unziaren bidea dago erratua?*
 where.to.REL ship.GEN way is mistaken
 ‘The direction of the ship where is mistaken?’
 b. *Unzi horren norantzako bidea dago erratua?*
- (69) a. **Zertarako zure botikak ditu ondorio txarrak?*
 what.for your medicine has consequence bad
 ‘Your medicine for what has bad consequences?’
 b. *Zure zertarako botikak ditu ondorio txarrak?*

However, other adnominal wh-words may be separated from the head they inquire about:

- (70) a. *Norekiko zure hartuemanak ez dituzte onetsi?*
 who.with.REL your relations not AUX admit
 ‘Your relationship with whom don’t they admit?’
 b. *Zure norekiko hartuemanak ez dituzte onetsi?*
- (71) a. *Norenganako Aitorren errespetua onesten dute?*
 who.toward.REL Aitor.GEN respect admit AUX
 ‘Aitor’s respect toward whom do they admit?’
 b. *Aitorren norenganako errespetua onesten dute?*
- (72) a. *Zeri buruzko Gavrasen filmak astindu zintuen?*
 what.DAT about.REL Gavras.GEN film shock AUX
 ‘Gavras’ film about what shocked you?’
 b. *Gavrasen zeri buruzko filmak astindu zintuen?*

Multiple questions are also possible inside nominals, without apparent restrictions of order among them. This is indicated by the slash in the following examples:

- (73) *Noren/Noizko kontuak ikertu dituzte?*
 whose/when.REL accounts examine AUX
 ‘Whose accounts from when did they examine?’
- (74) *Nolako /zein jende atsegin duzu?*
 how.REL /which people like AUX
 ‘Which people of which type do you like?’

- (75) *Noranzko /zeinen bidea dago erratua?*
 where.to.REL/which.GEN way is mistaken?
 ‘Whose way where is mistaken?’

Sequences of genitive interrogatives bearing thematic relationships to the head noun seem to be grammatical, but difficult to parse:

- (76) *#Noren noren erretratoa aurkitu dute?*
 who.GEN who.GEN portrait find AUX
 ‘Whose whose portrait did they find?’

Where the interrogative is itself the head of the phrase, a second genitive or locative interrogative is possible; acceptability decreases in other adnominals:

- (77) *Noren/nongo /noizko zer ikertu dute?*
 whose/where.REL /when.REL what examine AUX
 ‘Whose what did they examine?/What from where/when did they examine?’
- (78) *Nolako /??noranzko /*zertarako zer ikertu dute?*
 how.REL /where.to.REL /what.for what examine AUX
 ‘What type of what did they examine?/What to where/for what did they examine?’
- (79) *Nortzuen arteko nor aukeratu dute?*
 who.GEN among.REL who select AUX
 ‘Who among whom did they select?’

4.4.4.2. Questions and foci inside adjective and adverb phrases

It is not possible to question degree words inside adjective and adverb phrases:

- (80) **Zein hurbil/urrun jarri dute?*
 how close/far put AUX
 ‘How far/close did they put it?’
- (81) **Zein harro dago zurekin?*
 how proud is you.with
 ‘How proud is he with you?’

On the other hand, the same sequences are possible with exclamatory interpretation. Some western speakers accept interrogative *zelako* in *zelako txikia?* ‘how small?’. Adjective and adverb complements may usually be questioned inside their phrases:

- (82) *Zertarako prest ikusi dituzu zure lagunak?*
 what.for ready see AUX your friends
 ‘What did you see your friends ready for?’
- (83) *Zeren zale ikusi dituzu zure lagunak?*
 what.GEN fond see AUX your friends
 ‘What did you see your friends fond of?’
- (84) *Zeren beldur da Xabier?*
 what.GEN afraid is Xabier?
 ‘What is Xabier afraid of?’

- (85) *Zertan trebe ikusi dituzu zure lagunak?*
 what.in skilled see AUX your friends
 ‘What did you see your friends good at?’
- (86) *Zerekin haserre ikusi dituzu zure lagunak?*
 what.with annoyed see AUX your friends
 ‘What did you see your friends annoyed at?’
- (87) *Nondik hurbil ikusi dituzu ehiztariak?*
 where.from close see AUX hunters
 ‘Close to where did you see the hunters?’

This option is not always available, in which case the wh-word must be separated from the adjective head and placed in pre-verbal position:

- (88) a. *?Zerekin ados jarri dira?*
 what.with in.agreement become AUX
 ‘What do they agree with?’
 b. *Zerekin jarri dira ados?*
- (89) a. *?Zerekin lasai ikusi dituzu zure lagunak?*
 what.with relaxed see AUX your friends
 ‘What did you see your friends relaxed with?’
 b. *Zerekin ikusi dituzu zure lagunak lasai?*
- (90) a. **Zertan abilak ikusten dituzu zure lagunak?*
 what.in skilled see AUX your friends
 ‘What did you see your friends skilled in?’
 b. *Zertan ikusten dituzu zure lagunak abilak?*

However, the questioned complement may not cooccur with a degree word, and must be detached from the rest of the phrase to occupy the preverbal position. This option is not available for genitive modifiers:

- (91) **Zeren oso hurbil dago?*
 what.GEN very close is
 ‘What is he close to?’
- (92) **Zeren oso beldur da?*
 what.GEN very afraid is
 ‘What is he very much afraid of?’
- (93) a. **Zerekin guztiz ados zaude?*
 what.with totally in.agreement are
 ‘What are you totally in agreement with?’
 b. *Zerekin zaude guztiz ados?*

This test cannot be extended to adjuncts, which do not seem to form a constituent with adjectives and adverbs.

4.4.5. *Embedded questions and foci*

This section examines wh-words which enquire about constituents belonging to embedded

clauses, as well as focalized constituents in the same environments. In 4.4.5.1 we will describe cases where the operator remains in the embedded clause, devoting section 4.4.5.2 to wh-word or focus extraction into superordinate clauses. Finally, 4.4.5.3 will deal with clausal pied-piping, where wh-words or foci contained within embedded clauses turn the latter into interrogative-like or focal-like constituents.

4.4.5.1. Embedded focalization and indirect questions

4.4.5.1.1. Embedded focalization

Foci may be found inside an embedded clause. Tensed complement clauses and intransitive subject clauses, in particular, may contain foci, which will be positioned immediately to the left of the verbal element, as in

- (94) *Eta okerrena zen kartazaleari botatzen zizkiola erru guztiak.*
 and worst was postman.DAT throw AUX.that blame all
 ‘And the worst thing was that she blamed the POSTMAN.’ [Atx. Ob.:28]
- (95) *Maistrak mintzatu egiten zitzaioala sentitu zuen.* [Atx. Ob.:61]
 female teacher talk do.IMPf AUX.that feel AUX
 ‘He felt that the teacher TALKED to him.’

The *egin* verbal focalization pattern displayed by the preceding example is not found in tenseless contexts in the dialect described here, though they are occasionally found in the west:

- (96) **Zuk hartu egitea nahi dut.*
 you take do.NOM.DET want AUX
 ‘I want you to TAKE it.’
- (97) **Damu dut Jonek erosi egin izana.*
 regret AUX Jon buy do be.PRF.DET
 ‘I regret Jon’s having BOUGHT it.’
- (98) **Ez dakit erosi egin ala ez.*
 not know buy do or not
 ‘I don’t know whether to BUY it or not.’

Most dialects admit focalization of constituents other than the verb in embedded adjunct clauses:

- (99) *jan ere dezente jaten zuenez* [Itur. K.R.:31]
 eat also a.lot eat.IMPf AUX.since
 ‘since, as for eating, he ate A LOT’

Here the adjunct clause contains a canonical topic+focus pattern, where the topic is marked with *ere* and the focus is *dezente* ‘a lot’. Outside of complement clauses, embedded *verb focalization* is far less common than matrix verb focalization. In fact, there is lack of agreement among Basque grammarians as to what extent it is possible to find emphatic *egin* or *ba* in such contexts. Hualde, Elordieta & Elordieta (1994), for example, claim that in the Lekeitio variety of Basque, subordinate clauses other than completives may not contain focalized constituents in general. Similarly, de Rijk (1978) claims that neither *egin* nor *ba* is

found in relative clauses; in general, it seems clear that these devices are far less common in adjunct clauses than in complement clauses, but occasional examples are found, usually with a strong contrastive flavor (Osa 1990:164,198):

- (100) *erran horietan badelarik zerbait egiarik...* [Duv. *L.L.*:110]
 saying those.in *ba*.being some truth.PRTT
 ‘although there is some truth in those sayings...’
- (101) *badakidan arren ez dituela goresmenak gogoko...*
ba.know.COMP though not AUX.COMP praise like
 ‘although I do know that he does not like being praised...’ [Mitz. *EIG* VI:98]
- (102) *agian ohitu egin zelako (...) bakardadera* [Atx. *Ob.*:316]
 perhaps get.used do AUX.because loneliness.to
 ‘perhaps because he got used to loneliness’
- (103) *bost arraultze jarri eta gero hil egiten den panguana izutia*
 five egg lay and laterdie do.IMPF AUX.COMP panguana timid
 ‘the timid panguana that dies after laying five eggs’ [Atx. *Ob.*:235]

Verb focalization with *egin* is not found in tenseless adjuncts other than those constructed with postpositions, and the latter is also ungrammatical for many speakers of western dialects:

- (104) *Ama hiltzean (*hil egitean) hasi ziren.*
 mother die.upon die do.NOM.upon begin AUX
 ‘They began after mother died.’
- (105) *Hori ordaindu egin ondoren emango dizut.*
 that pay do after give.FUT AUX
 ‘I’ll give you that after paying.’
- (106) *Ordaindu egin gabe utzi zituen bere zorrak.*
 pay do without leave AUX his debts
 ‘He left his debts unpaid (without paying).’

It is worth pointing out that aux-fronting in negative clauses is also far less common in adjunct clauses, ranging from impossible in relatives to only optional in many others (explicatives, conditionals, etc.); in fact the contexts of lack of obligatoriness of aux-fronting in negatives coincide to a large extent with those in which *egin* and *ba* are less common. It is precisely in relatives, which are obligatorily verb final, that these strategies are more marked. If the latter, as suggested above, also involve fronting to the left of the clause, the difficulty might be in verb fronting in those contexts in general.

4.4.5.1.2. Indirect questions

All indirect questions may be marked by the complementizer *-n*, attached to the conjugated verbal form. If true questions (as opposed to semiquestions), they may be preceded by the interrogative particle *ea*, which may in turn be preceded by scrambled material. Some examples will be given in 4.4.5.1.2.2.

4.4.5.1.2.1. Indirect yes/no questions

As an alternative to *-n*, yes/no questions may also be marked by *-n(e)z*, *-nen(t)z* in eastern

dialects. Moreover, in substandard southern usages it is common to find the conditional particle *ba* (usually with a suprasegmental pattern which differentiates it from the emphatic marker *ba*) as the only marker of indirect questions (cf. Spanish conditional and interrogative *si*):

- (107) *Ez dakit zure laguna etorriko d-en /ba-da.* [Hualde et al. 1994:186]
 not know your friend come.FUT AUX-COMP /if-AUX
 ‘I don’t know whether your friend will come.’
- (108) *Iruñen eman zuenez bere lehen meza,*
 Pamplona.in give AUX.COMP his first mass
ala Baionan, ezin jakin dugu. [Etx. *Id.* I:236]
 or Baiona.in cannot know AUX
 ‘Whether he sang mass first in Pamplona or in Baiona, we can’t tell.’

Abstracting away from the effects produced by scrambling, indirect yes/no questions tend to be verb final, unless they contain any focalized material, in which case the verbal element will immediately follow the focus in the left periphery of the clause. Thus, in the last example above, *Iruñen* has been contrasted with *Baionan*, and as a consequence of their left-position the object appears to the right of the verb. When no constituent has been focalized, there is no apparent leftward movement of the verb (unlike what happens in many direct yes/no questions). Due to the lack of verb fronting, *ba* is less common in indirect than in direct questions, although examples do exist:

- (109) *Bidriosek ea bazuen Institutuko berririk galdetu zion.* [Itur. *K.R.*:57]
 Bidrios.ERG *ea ba*.AUX school.REL new.PRTT ask AUX
 ‘Bidrios asked him whether he had any news from the school.’
- (110) *Erregeak zerbait egiten ba al zekien galdetu zion.* [Atx. *Ob.*:274]
 king.ERG something do.IMPF *ba* Q knew.COMP ask AUX
 ‘The king asked him whether he knew [how] to do anything.’

Verb focalization with *egin* is also possible, just like in direct yes/no questions:

- (111) *ea denak lotsatu egiten ziren beren lanaz* [Atx. *Ob.*:138]
ea all be.embarrassed do.IMPF AUX their work.INSTR
 ‘[I asked him] whether all got embarrassed because of their job’

It is difficult to form tenseless indirect yes/no questions, perhaps because the only overt marker (-*n*) can only be attached to tensed forms and nothing would signal the presence of an indirect question in a tenseless clause. However, they can be formed by adding question identifiers such as *ala ez* to the participial form (or to the root in eastern dialects):

- (112) **Ez dakit gelditu.*
 not know remain
 ‘I don’t know whether to remain.’
- (113) *Ez dakit gelditu ala ez.*
 remain or not
 ‘I don’t know whether to remain or not.’

- (114) *?Ez dakit gelditu ala joan.*
 remain or go
 ‘I don’t know whether to remain or to leave.’

4.4.5.1.2.2. Indirect wh-questions

Indirect wh-questions are marked by the complementizer *-n*. As in direct wh-questions, the interrogative element will occur to the left of the clause, optionally preceded by *ea* and topics/scrambled elements and immediately followed by the verbal element:

- (115) *Ez dakit hargatik nola daitekeen hori.* [Duv. *L.L.*:141]
 not know however how can.be that
 ‘I don’t know, however, how that can be.’
- (116) *galderak (...) dira: ze eratan egingo dugun hitzen*
 questions are which way.in make.FUT AUX.COMP word.GEN
euskal-bihurrera, gramatika-aldetik nola azalduko ditugun,
 Basque-translation grammar-side.from how explain.FUT AUX.COMP
adibideak nola eta nondik hartu behar diren,
 examples how and where.from take need AUX.COMP
abezez nola jarriko ditugun ordenan...
 alphabetically how put.FUT AUX.COMP order.in
 ‘the questions are... in which way we will make the Basque translation, how we will explain them in grammatical terms, how and from where examples must be taken, how they can be alphabetically ordered...’ [Mitx. *EIG* VII:76]

Indirect wh-questions, just like direct wh-questions, are incompatible with emphatic *egin*:

- (117) **Galdetu du nork ikusi egin duen istripua?*
 ask AUX who see do AUX.COMP accident
 ‘Has he asked who SAW the accident?’

Tenseless indirect questions are formed by placing the past participle (the root in eastern dialects) to the right of the wh-word:

- (118) *Badakigu nola joka(tu).*
 ba.know how play(PRF)
 ‘We know how to play.’

4.4.5.2. Displaced wh-words and foci

Wh-words and foci may be extracted from the complement clauses of some verbs, typically verbs of saying or thinking:

- (119) *...nola uste duzu egin beharko litzatekeela aukeramena*
 how think AUX make must.FUT AUX.COMP selection
literatur euskaran? [Mitx. *EIG* I:94]
 literary Basque.in
 ‘How do you think the choice should be made in literary Basque?’
- (120) *HORRELA uste dut egin beharko litzetekeela aukeramena.*

this.way think AUX

“In this way do I think the choice should be made.”

Where the wh-word or focus has been extracted from a lower tensed clause, the latter tends to be verb-initial. This effect is even perceivable where the displaced element occurs several sentences higher than the clause it enquires about or focalizes:

- (121) *Nola esan du Jonek uste duela Peruk egin beharko litzatekeela?*
how say AUX Jon think AUX.COMP Peter make
‘How did Jon say Peter thinks it should be made?’

Foci or wh-words originating in a transitive subject clause may not show up to the left of the matrix verb, while those extracted from subjects of intransitive predicates are generally acceptable:

- (122) **Non/UNIBERTSITATE HORRETAN esaten du asko zutaz [onartua izateak]?*
where/university this.in say.IMPF AUX a.lot you.about admitted being
‘Where/In that university does it say a lot about you being admitted?’
- (123) **?Non/UNIBERTSITATE HORRETAN da garrantzitsua [onartua izatea]?*
is important admitted being
‘Where/In that university is it important to be admitted?’
- (124) *Non/UNIBERTSITATE HORRETAN iruditzen zaie [onartu dutela Jon]?*
seems AUX admit AUX.COMP Jon
‘Where/In that university does it seem to them they admitted Jon?’

However, extraction from complements of factive verbs are deviant. This is shown with foci in the following example:

- (125) **??JONEK konturatu nintzen egin zuela eskaera.*
Jon.ERG realized AUX make AUX.COMP petition
‘It was Jon that I realized had made the petition.’

It is unacceptable to relate a focus or a wh-word in a matrix clause with a position inside an adjunct clause, as the following examples with temporal subordinates show:

- (126) **Zer harritu zinen [entzun ondoren / entzun zenuenean]?*
what surprise AUX hear after / hear AUX.when
‘What were you surprised after hearing/when you heard?’
- (127) **Nork harritu zara [agiria sinatu duelako / duenez]?*
who surprise AUX document sign AUX.because/ AUX.since
‘Who are you surprised because [he] signed the document?’

4.4.5.3. Clausal pied-piping

Foci and wh-words originating inside clauses may also pied-pipe the whole embedded clause in which they appear. As a result, on top of the wh-word embedded verb adjacency, the embedded clause itself will also appear immediately preceding the matrix verb. Thus, nothing will intervene between the embedded clause and the matrix verb, as indicated in the

first example:

- (128) *eta nola erabili behar liratekeela uste duzue gai horiek?*
 and how treat must AUX.COMP think AUX subject those
 ‘And how do you think that those subjects should be treated?’ [Mitx. *EIG* I:84]
- (129) *Dugun on gucia, norenganic dugula eçagutu behar dugu?*
 have.COMP good all who.from have.COMP know should AUX
 ‘All good we have, who should we know we have it from?’ [Leiz. 1423]
- (130) *Zertara eramango gaituztela uste duk? Bataiatzera?* [Atx. *Ob.*:156]
 what.to take.FUT AUX.COMP think AUX baptize.NOM.to
 ‘What do you think they will take us to? To be baptized?’
- (131) *Umeak zer egitera behartuak daude?* [Mogel *CB*:233]
 children what do.NOM.to required are
 ‘What are the children required to do?’

Notice that even though the wh-word remains inside the embedded clause, when the latter is a completive clause it is marked by the declarative complementizer *-la* rather than by the interrogative one *-n*.

Clausal pied-piping may occur with all types of complement clauses, indicative, subjunctive and nominalized. This is shown in the following examples, which contrast the extraction and pied-piping strategies in complement clauses:

- (132) a. *Nor etor dadin (*zuek) nahi duzue (zuek)?* (pied-piping)
 who come AUX.COMP you.PL want AUX you.PL
 ‘Who do you want to come?’
 b. *Nor nahi duzue (zuek) etor dedin?* (extraction)
- (133) a. *XABIER etor dadin (*guk) nahi dugu (guk)* (pied-piping)
 Xabier come AUX.COMP we want AUX we
 ‘It is Xabier that we want to come.’
 b. *XABIER nahi dugu (guk) etor dedin* (extraction)

On the other hand, wh-words in indirect questions selected by the matrix verb may not pied-pipe the embedded interrogative clause:

- (134) **Nola erabili behar liratekeen galdetu duzue zuek?*
 how treated should AUX.COMP ask AUX zu.PL
 ‘How should they be treated have you asked?’

The preceding sentence is acceptable as a yes/no question on the matrix verb *galdetu* ‘ask’, but not as a direct wh-question about *nola* ‘how’. However, the same pied-piping structure is possible if the wh-word is emphasized. In that case the whole sentence is not a direct question: the embedded clause is not behaving as a single interrogative constituent, but as a single focalized element:

- (135) *Liburua NORK idatzi duen galdetu dit Jonk.*
 book who write AUX.COMP ask AUX Jon
 ‘It is WHO wrote the book that Jon asked me.’

- (136) *Bigarrenak ZE BURUTAPEN ote darabiltzan galdetzen diot*
 second what invention Q use.COMP ask.IMPF AUX
nire buruari hurrena [Atx. Ob.:115]
 my head.DAT next
 ‘Next, I ask myself what inventions the second one may be using.’

Where a wh-word pied-pipes a clause, the latter behaves as a wh-word itself. However, when a verb selects an interrogative complement, a pied-piped clause does not match this selection. Thus, while a wh-word extracted from a declarative embedded clause may ‘count’ as the interrogative element required in an interrogative complement, as in (a), a pied-piped declarative clause containing such wh-word may not (b):

- (137) a. *Jonek galdetu du nor uste duten haiek etorriko dela.*
 Jon ask AUX who think AUX.COMP they come.FUT AUX.COMP
 ‘Jon asked who they think will come tomorrow.’
 b. **Jonek galdetu du [nor etorri dela] uste duten haiek.*
 Jon ask AUX who come AUX.COMP think AUX.COMP they
 ‘Jon asked that who has arrived have they asked’

On the other hand, non-complement clauses in the same positions are acceptable:

- (138) *Galdetu du nor etortzen denean irekiko duten txanpaña.*
 ask AUX who come.IMPF AUX.when open AUX.COMP champagne
 ‘He asked when who arrives will they open the champagne’

Factive complements also sound degraded in pied-piping configurations:

- (139) ??*Nor etorri dela ohartu dira?*
 who come AUX.COMP realize AUX
 ‘That who has arrived have they realized?’

Clausal pied-piping is the only strategy available for constituents inside adjuncts or subject clauses, which may not be extracted (4.4.5.2):

- (140) *GAI BAT BAKARRIK suspenditu zuten ikasleak pasa ziren aurrera.*
 subject one only fail AUX.COMP students pass AUX ahead
 ‘It is students who failed one exam only that went ahead.’
 (141) *GAI BAT BAKARRIK suspenditzen denean pasa daiteke hurrengo urtera.*
 fail AUX.when pass AUX following course.to
 ‘Only when one fails one subject can he pass to the following course.’
 (142) *NEUK nahi dudanean joango naiz etxera.*
 I.INTS want AUX.when go.FUT AUX home.to
 ‘It is when I want that I will go home.’
 (143) *Zenbat gai suspenditzen denean pasa daiteke hurrengo urtera?*
 how.many subject fail.IMPF AUX.when pass AUX next course.to
 ‘When one fails how many subjects can he pass to the following course?’
 (144) *Zer egin gabe ezin gaitzke bizi?*

what do without cannot AUX live
 “Without doing what wouldn’t we be able to live?”

As before, nothing may intervene between the pied-piped adjunct (or noun modified by the relative clause adjunct) and the matrix verb.

4.4.5.3.1. Restrictions on the class of pied-piped elements

Not all types of clauses may be pied-piped. Thus, among causal adjuncts *-lako* clauses may, while those marked with *-nez*, *bait-* or introduced by *bada*, *ze* ‘since’ may not. We illustrate this with interrogative operators:

- (145) [*Nor etorri delako*] *aldegin duzu?*
 who come AUX.because leave AUX
 “Because who arrived did you leave?”
- (146) * [*Nor gonbidatu dutenez*] *aldegin duzu?*
 who invite AUX.since
 “Since who did they invite did you leave?”
- (147) * [*Nor etorri baita*] *aldegin duzu?*
 who come since.AUX
 “Since who arrived did you leave?”
- (148) * [*Bada nor ez duzu ezagutu*] *ez duzu agurtu?*
 for who not AUX recognize not AUX greet
 “For who didn’t you recognize didn’t you greet?”
- (149) * [*Ze nor agertu da*] *aldegin duzu?*
 because who show.up AUX leave AUX
 “Because who showed up did you leave?”

This may be related to the fact that the causal adjuncts in the unacceptable examples usually occupy topic positions in the sentence, while *-lako* ‘because’ adjuncts may also be used where the whole embedded clause is focalized. Thus, such adjuncts do not occur in the focus position, whether as a result of an attempt to focalize the whole adjunct or as a result of pied-piping. Similar results are obtained in other adjunct clauses:

- (150) *Nor etortzen bada aldegingo duzu?* (Conditionals)
 who come.IMPF if.AUX leave.FUT AUX
 “If who comes will you leave?”
- (151) *Nor etorritz gero aldegingo zenuke?*
 who come.INSTR later leave.FUT AUX.POT
 “If who comes would you leave?”
- (152) ?*Nor etortzekotan aldegingo zenuke?*
 who come.NOM.REL.LOC leave.FUT AUX.POT
 “In the event of who coming would you leave?”
- (153) **Zer gertatzera ibiliko zinateke kontuz?*
 what happen.NOM.ALL walk.FUT AUX.POT care.INSTR
 “In the event of happening what would you be careful?”
- (154) *Zer tresna erabiliaz konpondu zenuen hura?* (Manner adjuncts)
 what tool use.INSTR fix AUX that

- “Using what tool did you fix that?”
- (155) **Zer erabiltzen dutelarik ezin da konpondu?*
 what use.IMPF AUX.COMP.PRTT cannot AUX fix
 “Using what can’t they fix it?”
- (156) **Zer dagoela bere lekuan ez da galduko den beldurrik?*
 what is.COMP its place.in notAUX lose.FUT AUX.COMP fear.PRTT
 “Being what in its place is there no fear that it will get lost?”

4.4.5.3.2. Restrictions on pied-piping elements

Non-referential adjuncts like *zergatik* ‘why’, *nolatan* ‘how come’, etc. sound from slightly deviant to very marginal when pied-piping complement clauses:

- (157) (?) *Zergatik aspertu dela uste duzu?*
 why get.bored AUX.COMP think AUX
 “That why did he get bored do you think?”
- (158) (?) *Nola portatu dela uste duzue?*
 how behave AUX.COMP
 “That how did he behave do you think?”
- (159) **Nolatan etorri dela uste duzu?*
 how.come come AUX.COMP
 “That how come did he come do you think?”

However, acceptability decreases sharply when these adjuncts pied-pipe adjunct clauses:

- (160) **Zergatik aldegin duen ikaslea atsegin duzu?*
 why leave AUX.COMP student like AUX
 “The student that left why do you like?”
- (161) **Zergatik erosten dutenean harrituko zara?*
 why buy.IMPF AUX.when surprise.FUT AUX
 “When they buy it why will you be surprised?”
- (162) **Nola portatzen denean sarituko dute?*
 how behave AUX.when reward.FUT AUX
 “When he behaves how will they reward him?”

4.4.5.3.3. Recursive pied-piping

In all of the preceding examples, the embedded clause has been pied-piped to the immediate left of the superordinate verb. However, if more bridge verbs intervene, the whole embedded clause may also show up in clauses higher up (with subsequent verb initial effects in the intervening clauses, 4.4.5.2):

- (163) *Nork irabaziko duela esan du Jonek uste duela Mikelek?*
 who win.FUT AUX.COMP say AUX Jon think AUX.COMP Mikel
 “That who will win did Jon say Mikel thinks?”

Moreover, the mechanism is recursive in that a pied-piped clause moved to a higher clause may pied-pipe the latter in turn:

- (164) [*Nor etorri dela uste duela Mikelek*] *esan dute horiek?*
 who come AUX.COMP think AUX.COMP Mikel say AUX those
 ‘Who did those say Mikel thinks has come?’

What precedes the root verb *esan* ‘say’ in this example is not the most deeply embedded clause *nor etorri dela* ‘who has come’, but the intermediate one *uste duela Mikelek* ‘that Mikel thinks’ containing *nor etorri dela* in the wh-position. Similarly, adjuncts inside adjuncts can also be pied-piped:

- (165) [[*Nor agertu denean*] *aldegin dutelako*] *haserratu da Mikel?*
 who show.up AUX.when leave AUX.because annoy AUX
 ‘‘Because they left when who showed up did Mikel get annoyed?’’
- (166) [[*Nor agertzen denean*] *aldegiten badu*] *hasiko dira denak marmarka?*
 who show.up AUX.when leave.IMPF if.AUX begin.FUT AUX all gossiping
 ‘‘If he leaves when who shows up will all begin to gossip?’’
- (167) [[*Zer saltzen duen tipoa*] *salatu duen gizona*] *hil dute?*
 what sell.IMPF AUX.COMP guy denounce AUX.COMP man kill AUX
 ‘‘The man who denounced the guy who sells what did they kill?’’

In the preceding examples the root verb is immediately preceded by adjuncts which contain pied-piped clauses in their interrogative, pre-verbal position. In the last example the adjunct clause is the relative modifying the noun.

4.4.5.3.4. Pied-piping vs. embedded clause focalization

In clausal pied-piping structures, an element inside a clause turns the latter into a wh-like or focus-like constituent. This is slightly different from cases where apparently the whole embedded clause is emphasized:

- (168) *Soilik kolpe hartu nuen lekuan ukitzen badut egiten dit min.*
 only hit take AUX.COMP place.in touch.IMPF if.AUX do.IMPF AUX pain
 ‘‘Only if I touch where I was hit does it hurt.’’ [Itur. *K.R.*:80]
- (169) *Irtenbiderik ez zeukatelako gelditu dira, gogoz bestera,*
 exit.PRTT not had.because remain AUX mind.INSTR other.ALL
ez daukatenari baliorik ematen diotelako. [Atx. *Ob.*:139]
 not have.COMP.DAT value.PRTT give.IMPF AUX.because
 ‘‘They remained because they didn’t have any alternative, against their will, not because they attached any value to what they have.’’

The first sentence has two interpretations: a less likely one where *soilik* emphasizes *lekuan* ‘only in that place’, in which case the locative constituent pied-pipes the conditional clause, and a second one where *soilik* emphasizes the conditional statement itself ‘only if’. The latter case could be conceivably construed as embedded clause focalization (unless *soilik* can be said to pied-pipe the whole embedded clause).

4.4.6. Wh- and focus compatibility

Since wh-words and non-verbal foci may occupy the pre-verbal position, it is important to

consider whether, in general, focalization is compatible with interrogation. We will address this issue first with respect to focalization+interrogation inside a single clause, turning later to examine the compatibility of the two in different clauses of the same sentence. Multiple questions and multiple foci will be considered in section 4.4.6.3

4.4.6.1. Clausemate operators

This section examines sentences where more than one operator (focal or interrogative) occur in the same clause. Cooccurrence of foci with wh-words and focalization in yes/no questions will be dealt with in turn.

4.4.6.1.1. Wh-questions and foci

Combinations of wh-words and foci are acceptable for some speakers; in such cases, the wh-word must occupy the pre-verbal position; the focalized constituent does not occupy any designated position and is mainly distinguished by bearing contrastive stress:

- (170) *Nork erosi dio MIRENI liburua/liburua MIRENI?*
 who buy AUX Miren.DAT book /book Miren.DAT
 ‘Who bought MARY the book?’
- (171) **MIRENI erosi dio nork liburua?*
 Miren.DAT buy AUX who book
 ‘Who bought MARY the book?’

4.4.6.1.2. Yes/no questions and foci

Foci may occur inside yes/no questions. In these cases, as usual, foci must occupy the pre-verbal position.

- (172) *MIRENI erosi diote liburua?*
 Miren.DAT buy AUX book
 ‘Did they buy MARY the book?’
- (173) *NEU ikusi nahi ninduzun atzo?*
 I.INTS see want AUX yesterday
 ‘Did you want to see ME yesterday?’

Verb focalization is occasionally found in yes/no questions. This is possible in the event emphasis type of focalization described in 4.4.3.2.1. Thus, the following questions contain a verb emphasized with *egin*

- (174) *Ahaztu egin al zarete nirekin?* [Atx. Ob.:54]
 forget do Q AUX I.with
 ‘Have you forgotten me?’
- (175) *‘Hil egin al da?’ galdetu nuen.* [Atx. Ob.:125]
 die do Q AUX ask AUX
 ‘Has he died?’, I asked.’

As for positive polar emphasis, it uses the same verb-fronting mechanism as yes/no questions, and is therefore virtually indistinguishable from it.

4.4.6.2. Operators in different clauses

Question words and focalization may cooccur in matrix and complement clauses:

- (176) *Badukete hor zer ikas orok.* [Etx. *Id.* I:347]
ba.have there what learn all
'They WILL have there what to learn.'
- (177) *Nork esan du liburua JONEK erosi duela?*
who say AUX book Jon buy AUX.COMP
'Who said that JON bought the book?'
- (178) *JONEK galdetu du nork erosi duen.*
Jon ask AUX who buy AUX.COMP
'JON asked who bought it.'

However, focus is degraded inside interrogative dependents, unless the particle *ea* (see section 4.4.5.1.2) is present:

- (179) *Nork galdetu du ??(ea) neuk erosi dudan?*
who ask AUX ea I.INTS buy AUX.COMP
'Who asked whether it was me that bought it?'
- (180) *Nork galdetu du ??(ea) liburua JONEK erosi duen?*
who ask AUX ea book Jon buy AUX.COMP
'Who asked whether it was Jon that bought the book?'

4.4.6.3. Multiple questions and multiple foci

This section examines the possibility of finding more than one wh-word or focus in the same clause (4.4.6.3.1) or in different clauses (4.4.6.3.2).

4.4.6.3.1. Multiple clausemate operators

This section addresses the question of the grammaticality of multiple operators in the same clause. We will differentiate three different possibilities, depending on whether the multiple operators are foci (4.4.6.3.1.1), wh-words (4.4.6.3.1.2), or whether the operator group originates as a consequence of raising operators from a lower clause into a clause already containing some (4.4.6.3.1.3).

4.4.6.3.1.1. Multiple clausemate foci

Foci may not cooccur in the same clause in 'multiple fronting' structures:

- (181) **NEUK ARDOA ekarri dut, ez Mikelek liburua.*
I.INTS wine bring AUX not Mikel book
'It was me that brought THE WINE, not Mikel the book.'
- (182) **JONEK ekarri EGIN du ardoa.*
Jon bring do AUX wine
'It was Jon that BROUGHT the wine.'
- (183) **JONEK BADAKAR liburua.*
Jon ba.brings book
'It is Jon that IS bringing the book.'

However, as noted in section 4.4.1, it is possible to emphasize more than one constituent as a unit in pre-verbal position, in highly contrastive contexts. In that case, emphasized constituents must follow the neutral order (Subjec-Adjuncts-Ind. Object-Dir. Object; cf. section 4.3), as if focalization were spreading to bigger and bigger chunks of the basic structure:

- (184) *KOTXEA ETXEAN (*etxean kotxea) utzi nuen atzo*
 car home.at leave AUX yesterday
 ‘I left yesterday THE CAR AT HOME.’
- (185) *NEUK HEMENTXE (*hementxe neuk) ikusi dudalako*
 I.INTS here.INTS see AUX.because
 ‘Because it was me that saw it RIGHT HERE.’

The same neutral order is also found in de Rijk’s examples (1978:103-104) showing that multiple foci are possible. It is possible to find preverbal foci cooccurring with focalized constituents in the postverbal domain, provided a ‘correcting’ interpretation is assigned to the foci. Such a correction can be directed to a previously made statement or can be raised against the presupposed situation:

- (186) *Liburua MIRENEK ekarri dit goizean NEURI.*
 book Miren bring AUX morning.in me.INTS.DAT
 ‘MARY brought the book this morning TO ME.’

Multiple fronting is also deviant when a focalized constituent is extracted from a lower clause and placed in a higher one already containing a focalized constituent:

- (187) **JONEK KOTXEA uste du hondatu dela.*
 Jon car think AUX ruin AUX.COMP
 ‘It is the car that JON thinks has been wrecked.’

In the preceding example *kotxea* ‘the car’ has been raised to the preverbal position of the upper verb, whose subject *Jonek* we also want to focalize. See section 4.4.6.3.1.3 for similar cases with *wh*-words.

4.4.6.3.1.2. Multiple clausemate *wh*-words

As for *wh*-words, we have already mentioned in the introduction to this chapter that, very occasionally, several *wh*-words may coexist preverbally in the same clause:

- (188) *Eta zure prestutasunaz ... nork zer erranen du?* [Ax. 2]
 and your virtue.on who what say.FUT AUX
 ‘And about your virtue, who will say what?’

In such cases, as with multiple foci, the *wh*-words involved must occur in the neutral order, so that the sequence *zer nork* in the previous sentence would not be acceptable. Moreover, no other non-interrogative element may intervene between the *wh*-words:

- (189) **Nork horretaz/beraz /Joni zer erranen dio?*

who that.on /therefore /Jon.DAT what say.FUT AUX
 ‘Who will say what to Jon/therefore/on that?’

A wh-word in the preverbal position may cooccur with another wh-word in postverbal position. In that case there is no difference as to which interrogative word occupies which position:

(190) *Nork ekarri du zer?*
 who bring AUX what
 ‘Who brought what?’

(191) *Zer ekarri du nork?*

Similarly, word order is not fixed if more than one wh-word occurs post-verbally, and other elements may intervene between wh-words:

(192) *Nork ekarri dio zer nori?*
 who bring AUX what who.to
 ‘Who brought what to whom?’

(193) *Nork ekarri dio nori zer?*
 ‘Who brought what to whom?’

(194) *Nork ekarri dio nori etxera zer?*
 home.to
 ‘Who brought what to whom home?’

(195) *Nork ekarri dio zer gaur nori?*
 today
 ‘Who brought what to whom today?’

It is possible to extract multiple wh-words to the pre-verbal position of a higher clause. In such case the wh-complex will also occur in a fixed order identical to the neutral one:

(196) *Nork zer esan dute ekarri duela?*
 who what say AUX bring AUX.COMP
 ‘Who did they say brought what?’

(197) **Zer nork esan dute ekarri duela?*

4.4.6.3.1.3. Multiple wh-word complexes from different clauses

The pre-verbal wh-complex may result from the combination of a wh-word extracted from a lower clause with a wh-word originating in the upper one:

(198) *Nork zer uste du gertatu dela?*
 who what think AUX happen AUX.COMP
 ‘Who thinks that what happened?’

(199) *Nork nori zer uste du gertatu zaiola?*
 who who.to what think AUX happen AUX.COMP
 ‘Who thinks that what happened to whom?’

In these cases there is always an intonation break separating the wh-words from different

clauses (*nork/zer* and *nork/nori zer*), similar to the break usually observed with topics. We mark this break with a slash sign in the following examples. With two wh-words, any order may be acceptable. Where more than two wh-words meet, the wh-words coming from the lower clause may be placed as a group before or after the matrix wh-word; in no case can they be interspersed. Notice that in the examples with *iruditu* ‘seem’ the dative argument is interpreted as belonging to this psychological verb, rather than to the lower verb *esan* ‘say’, as made clear by the absence of a dative marker in the latter’s auxiliary:

- (200) a. *Nori /nork zer iruditu zaio esan duela?*
 who.to who what seem AUX say AUX.COMP
 ‘To whom does it seem that who said what?’
 b. *Nork zer /nori iruditu zaio esan duela?*
 who what who.to
 c. **Zer nori nork iruditu zaio esan duela?*
 d. **Nork nori zer iruditu zaio esan duela?*
- (201) a. *Zer /nork nori esan dio erosi duela Peruk?*
 what who who.to say AUX buy AUX.COMP Peter
 ‘What did who say to whom that Peter bought?’
 b. **Nork zer nori esan dio erosi duela Peruk?*

Thus, the only acceptable possibilities in the first example above are those where the ergative *nork* and absolutive *zer*, which inquire about arguments of the lower verb, occur as a group either to the left or to the right of the wh-word corresponding to the upper verb (*nori* ‘to whom’, the dative associated with *iruditu* ‘seem’). Similarly, in the second example *nork* ‘who’ and *nori* ‘to whom’ belong to the matrix verb *esan* ‘say’, while *zer* ‘what’ asks about the theme argument of the lower verb *erosi* ‘buy’. Where the latter appears in between the two wh-words corresponding to a different clause, the sentence is unacceptable.

4.4.6.3.2. Multiple operators in different clauses

It is possible to have wh-words in both matrix and embedded clause, provided the latter is selected as an indirect question by the matrix verb:

- (202) *NORK galdetu du ZER egin behar den?*
 who ask AUX what do must AUX.COMP
 ‘Who asked what must be done?’

It is difficult to have constituent focalization and verbal emphasis in both matrix and embedded clause:

- (203) ??*JONEK esan du GAUR dela merkatu eguna.*
 Jon say AUX today is.COMP market day
 ‘JON said that TODAY is market day.’
- (204) ??*JONEK esan du liburua agortu EGIN dela*
 Jon say AUX book sell.out do AUX.COMP
 ‘JON said that the book SOLD out.’

However, the situation improves if one of the foci is *ba*:

- (205) *HORREXEGATIK BERAGATIK uste dut BADutela ikuskizunik*
 that.INTS.because itself.because think AUX *ba*.have.COMP relation.PRTT
euskaldunekin. [Mitx. *EIG* VI:108]
 Basques.with
 ‘For that very reason do I think that they do have some relation with Basque’
- (206) *BAdakit bere azken liburu hori agortu EGIN zela hiru egunetan.*
ba.know his last book that sell.out do AUX.COMP three day.in
 ‘I do know that his last book GOT SOLD out in three days.’

See however the remarks on *ba* in section 4.4.3.2.2, which cast some doubt on the status of *ba* as a verbal focus marker. In the previous examples, all of the foci have been left inside their original clauses. It is not possible to extract one focalized constituent from a lower clause, leaving yet another one in the original clause:

- (207) a. ??*ATZO uste dut liburua XABIERREK erosi zuela.*
 yesterday think AUX book Xabier buy AUX.COMP
 ‘I think that XABIER bought the book YESTERDAY.’
 b. ??*XABIERREK uste dut liburua ATZO erosi zuela.*
- (208) a. ??*MIRENI uste dut liburua XABIERREK erosi ziola.*
 Miren.DAT think AUX book Xabier buy AUX.COMP
 ‘I think that XABIER bought MARY the book.’
 b. ?*XABIERREK uste dut liburua MIRENI erosi ziola.*

4.4.7. Focalization and interrogation in negative clauses

4.4.7.1. Negative questions

Negative *wh*-questions are formed in the same way as positive questions: the *wh*-word will occur immediately to the left of the tensed verbal form. However, when the latter is an auxiliary, it will appear displaced to the left of the clause, away from the position to the right of the participle it occupies in positive sentences (see 4.5). Indirect negative *wh*-questions are formed in the same way, differing only in that their tensed verbal form is marked with the complementizer *-n*:

- (209) *Nork ez du ulertu esan dudana?*
 who not AUX understand say AUX.COMP.DET
 ‘Who did not understand what I said?’
- (210) *Zergatik ez duk deitzen ostatura?* [Atx. *Ob.*:205]
 why not AUX call.IMP bar.to
 ‘Why don’t you call the bar?’
- (211) *Zergatik ez erregutu hari bitxi batzuk utz ziezazkion?* [Atx. *Ob.*:219]
 why not beg he.DAT jewel some lend AUX.COMP
 ‘Why not beg him to lend you some jewels?’

In the first two examples the constituents to the right of the participle could also have been

placed in between the neg+auxiliary unit and the participle. The third sentence provides an example of a tenseless negative question. Some dialects occasionally admit negative questions where no split between the auxiliary and the main verb takes place. Such uninverted negative questions have a rhetorical flavor. The ‘unbroken’ negative pattern was more widespread in older stages of the language.

Eastern dialects possess an alternative strategy, whereby only the auxiliary is preposed and the negative element appears joined with the participle:

- (212) *Nork du liburua ez irakurri?*
 who AUX book not read
 ‘Who hasn’t read the book?’

Such construction is totally impossible in western dialects. It is not clear whether this pattern represents a different strategy or whether it corresponds to constituent negation. See Lafitte (1944) and Oyharçabal (1985).

Negative yes/no questions are not marked in any special way other than the presence of the negative particle *ez*. The yes/no interrogative particle *al* and the northern yes/no complementizer *-a* may be found in these negative questions:

- (213) *Ez al gara lagun handiak?* [Atx. Ob.:143]
 not Q are friend great
 ‘Aren’t they great friends?’
- (214) *Ez al zaizu poeta haundi bat iruditzen?* [Atx. Ob.:173]
 not Q AUX poet great one seem.IMPF
 ‘Doesn’t he seem a great poet to you?’
- (215) *Oro egin eta desegin, ez dea lur huntako legea?* [Etch. Id. I:336]
 all do and undo not is.Q earth this.REL law
 ‘To do and undo everything, isn’t that this world’s law?’

Indirect negative yes/no questions differ from direct ones in that auxiliary preposing is not obligatory. This correlates with the tendency towards verb-final orders in positive indirect yes/no questions:

- (216) a. *Galdetu dit ea ez zaion poeta haundi bat iruditzen.*
 ask AUX *ea* not AUX.COMP poet great one seem
 ‘He asked whether he does not seem a great poet to him.’
 b. *Galdetu dit ea poeta haundi bat iruditzen ez zaion.*

4.4.7.2. Focalization in negative clauses

Just like wh-words, foci may appear immediately to the left of the tensed verbal form. The focalized constituent is pronounced with contrastive stress:

- (217) *JONEK ez du eskaera sinatu.*
 Jon not AUX petition sign
 ‘JON did not sign the petition’
- (218) *HORREGATIK ez nien lagunei arrapostu,*
 that.because not AUX friend.to reply

beren proposamena nire mesedetan zetorrelako. [Atx. Ob.:77]
 their proposal my favor.in came.because
 ‘That is why I did not reply to my friends, because their proposal was beneficial to me.’

This focus is interpreted outside of the scope of negation: in the first example above, we identify *Jon* as the person about whom the presupposed negative statement *not sign the petition* is true. Similarly, in the following example, a reason is identified that explains why the event *answering my friends* did not take place. Thus, continuations like the following are unfelicitous:

- (219) #*JONEK ez du eskaera sinatu, Peruk baizik.* (cf. (229))
 ‘JON did not sign the petition, but Peter.’
- (220) #*HORREGATIK ez nien lagunei arrapostu, beste arrazoi bategatik baizik.*
 other reason one.because but
 ‘That is why I did not reply to my friends, but because of other reason.’

On the other hand, other elements dependent on negation for their interpretation do fall under the scope of negation when focalized in this position. This is illustrated below with the polarity item *inor* ‘anyone’ and with *ere* ‘also’, which, although not strictly speaking a polarity element, often takes on the interpretation ‘(not) even’ when in association with the negative element (4.5.4.5.2). Just like with polarity elements, this interpretation may be achieved in a position following the negative element but also in the immediate pre-*ez* position if the element is focalized:

- (221) *BEHIN ERE ez diagu jakingo muskerrarekin gertatu zena.*
 once also not AUX know.FUT lizard.with happen AUX.COMP.DET
 ‘Never will we learn what happened with the lizard.’ [Atx. Ob.:210]
- (222) *NIRI AGUR ESATEA ERE ez zitzaion gogoratu.* [Itur. K.R.:120]
 me.to bye say.NOM.DET also not AUX remember
 ‘He did not even remember to say goodbye to me.’
- (223) *INOR ez zen ezertaz enteratu.*
 anybody not AUX anything.INSTR find.out
 ‘NOBODY found out anything.’
- (224) *Nik EDUKI ERE ez daukat gogoan.* [Atx. Ob.:27]
 I have also not have mind.in
 ‘I don’t even HAVE it in mind.’
- (225) *IKUSI ERE ez du egin.*
 see also not AUX do
 ‘He hasn’t even SEEN it.’

In the preceding examples, *behin ere* receives the interpretation ‘not once’, rather than ‘once not’, and the polarity element *inor* is licensed in the interpretation ‘nobody’. Moreover, unlike with the regular focalized elements, there is no presupposed proposition, negative or otherwise. The last example shows that verbs may be focalized in negative sentences; the pre-negation position is then occupied by the participle (usually reinforced with *ere* ‘also’), while the ‘original’ position the verb would occupy to the right of negation

is filled with the dummy verb *egin*. Sentence (224) contains a focalized verb where the ‘original’ position is occupied by a synthetic form of the verb itself. This strategy emphasizes the event/state denoted by the verb, as in verb-focalization with *egin* in positive clauses (see 4.4.3.2.1 above).

If not focalized, pre-negative elements are interpreted as topics/scrambled elements:

- (226) *Halere, aukera hura ez nuen burutik kentzen.* [Atx. Ob. 204]
 however choice that not AUX head.from take.away
 ‘However, I couldn’t eliminate that possibility from my head.’
- (227) *Kalte behintzat ez dizu horrek egingo.* [Itur. K.R.:63]
 harm at.least not AUX that make.FUT
 ‘At least that will not do any harm.’

Eastern dialects present another alternative for negative focalization, where only the auxiliary is preposed. The negative particle is left behind along with the participle:

- (228) *JONEK du liburua ez irakurri.*
 Jon AUX book not read
 ‘It is Jon that has not read the book.’

This strategy corresponds to the equivalent negative question structure mentioned in 4.4.7.1. See references quoted there.

4.4.7.2.1. Foci following negation

There exists a second focalization position in negative clauses. This is found to the right of negation and immediately preceding the tenseless verbal form of periphrastic verbs:

- (229) *Ez du eskaera JONEK sinatu.*
 not AUX petition Jon sign
 ‘JON did not sign the petition.’
- (230) *Ez nien lagunei HORREGATIK arrapostu.*
 not AUX friends.to that.because reply
 ‘I did not reply to my friends BECAUSE OF THAT.’
- (231) *Ez nien horregatik LAGUNEI arrapostu.*
 not AUX that.because friends.to reply
 ‘I did not reply TO MY FRIENDS because of that.’

This position is also marked by emphatic intonation; an element thus emphasized will then occur immediately to the left of the tenseless verbal form. Thus, contrast the first two sentences above with the following ones, where another constituent intervenes between the emphasized element and the participle:

- (232) ??*Ez du ESKAERA Jonek sinatu*
 (233) ??*Ez nien LAGUNEI horregatik arrapostu*

However, the post-verbal focus in non-pre-participial position is acceptable provided it appears in the position it would occupy in a ‘neutral’ word order:

- (234) *Ez du JONEK eskaera sinatu.*
 ‘JON did not sign the petition.’
- (235) *Ez nien HORREGATIK lagunei arrapostu.*
 ‘I did not reply to my friends BECAUSE OF THAT.’
- (236) *Ez dio Jonek MIKELI eskaera sinatu.*
 not AUX Jon Mikel.to petition sign
 ‘Jon did not sign MIKEL the petition.’

Focalization may ‘spread’ from the absolutive in neutral position up to the full sentence. In the following examples, what is focalized could be *liburua* ‘book’, *liburua bidali*, *Mikeli liburua*, *Mikeli liburua eman*:

- (237) *Ez diot Mikeli LIBURUA eman, eskutitza baizik.*
 not AUX Mikel.to book give letter but
 ‘I did not give Mikel the BOOK, but the letter.’
- (238) *Ez diot MIKELI LIBURUA eman, Joni eskutitza baizik.*
 Jon.to letter but
 ‘I did not give THE BOOK TO MIKEL, but the letter to Jon.’
- (239) *Ez diot MIKELI LIBURUA EMAN, Joni eskutitza bidali baizik.*
 Jon.to letter send but
 ‘I did not GIVE THE BOOK TO MIKEL, but sent the letter to Jon.’

When the order is not neutral, the only contrastive set is the element to which the stress is assigned:

- (240) a. *Ez diot LIBURUA eman Mikeli...*
*eskutitza baizik/*Joni eskutitza baizik/*Joni eskutitza bidali baizik.*
 letter but Jon.to letter but Jon.to letter send but
 ‘... but the letter/*but the letter to Jon/*but sent the letter to Jon.’
- b. *Ez diot liburua MIKELI eman...*
*Peruri baizik/*eskutitza baizik/*eskutitza Joni baizik/*eskutitza Joni bidali baizik.*
 ‘... but to Peter/*but the letter/*but the letter to Jon/*but sent the letter to Jon.’

In the preceding examples, we have been considering sentences with several constituents intervening between the auxiliary and the participle. In all these cases, negation takes scope over the focus. There are also cases where the post-auxiliary focus can take scope over negation, as in:

- (241) *Ez diot MIKELI eman liburua, eta ez Aitorri.*
 not AUX Mikel.to give book and not Aitor.to
 ‘I did not give the book to Mikel, and not to Aitor.’

Here, the continuation ‘and not to Aitor’ indicates that negation is part of the presupposition, or, in other words, that the focus takes scope over negation. This interpretation is only available where the focus is in its original position, as are the other arguments of the clause.

Where a non-polarity element is emphasized, negation is usually linked to it, and a contrastive, constituent-negation like interpretation is found; the remaining part is presupposed. Thus, in the examples below, a petition has been signed by someone, but the latter is not Jon; in the following examples ‘I answered my friends’ is presupposed, but that event did not take place ‘because of that reason’. Negation takes scope over the emphatic constituent. As a consequence, the continuations are felicitous:

- (242) *Ez du eskaera JONEK sinatu, Peruk baizik.*
 not AUX petition Jon sign, Peru but
 ‘It is not Jon that signed the petition, but Peter.’
- (243) *Ez nien lagunei HORREGATIK arrapostu, beste arrazoi bategatik baizik.*
 not AUX friend.to that.because reply other reason one.because but
 ‘I did not reply to my friends BECAUSE OF THAT, but because of another reason.’
- (244) *...ez naizela hemen BAKARRIK bizi,*
 not AUX.COMP here alone live
Meharra eta Mateorekin bizi naizela. [Itur. K.R.:131]
 Meharra and Mateo.with live AUX.COMP
 ‘... that I do not live here ALONE, that I live with Meharra and Mateo.’

When polarity elements are emphasized in this way, no presupposition arises, and, in fact, there does not seem to be any major semantic difference between this focalization position and the one to the left of negation:

- (245) *Gizon ttiki hura ez zen BEHINERE okertzen bere irudipenekin.*
 man small that not AUX once also err his appreciations.with
 ‘The small man NEVER EVER erred in his appreciations.’ [Atx. Ob.:188]
- (246) *Baina Heinrichek ez zien entzun ere egiten.* [Atx. Ob.:322]
 but Heinrich not AUX hear also do.IMPF
 ‘But Heinrich did not even HEAR them.’
- (247) *Ez zion inork erantzun nere galderari.*
 not AUX anyone answer my question.to
 ‘NOONE answered my question.’

This type of post-auxiliary focalization (*quasifocus* in de Rijk’s 1996 terminology) may also be found with synthetic verbal forms, but given the absence of any participle, the position occupied by the emphasized element is harder to chart. Some examples with synthetic forms are given below. As the first one shows, where several constituents follow, the contrast (or the reinforcement if the emphasized constituent is a polarity element) is usually established with the last one:

- (248) *Ez da beraien aztarrenik inon.*
 not is their trace.PRTT anywhere
Ez tabernetan, ez herri ingurumarian, ez basoan. [Atx. Ob.:190]
 not bars.in not village neighborhood.in not forest.in
 ‘Nowhere was any trace of them. Not in the bars, not around the village, not in the forest.’
- (249) *Ez, ez zegoen kalean, baizik eta etxean.* [Atx. Ob.:292]

no not was street.in but and home.at
 ‘No, he was not in the street, but at home.’

However, de Rijk (1996) shows that positions other than the final one may be contrasted:

(250) *Nik ez daukat dirurik orain zuretzat, bai, ordea, maitasuna.*
 I not have money.PRTT now you.for yes instead love
 ‘I don’t have any money for you now, but [I have] love, instead.’

Notice that the main identificational criterion for this quasifocus position comes from the availability of contrastive tags like the preceding ones, under the assumption that a constituent that admits them is a pragmatic focus perhaps associated with some syntactic position. However, this assumption may not be warranted, since contrastive tags seem to be available for a wide range of positions. Thus, Osa (1990) gives as acceptable all of the following alternatives, not just the first one (corresponding to the quasifocus position):

- (251) *Ez da aita etorri, ama baizik.* (pre-participial constituent)
 not has father come mother but
 ‘Father has not come, but mother.’
- (252) *Aita ez da etorri, ama baizik.* (pre-negation constituent without contrastive stress)
- (253) *Ez da etorri aita, ama baizik.* (post-participial constituent)

This contrastive quasifocus is thus very different from the regular structural focus of negative questions and positive clauses. Let us examine now further similarities and differences between focus and quasifocus, other than the semantic and positional differences discussed above.

4.4.7.2.2. Further differences and similarities between negative foci and quasifoci

In this section we will examine whether the grammatical phenomena that can affect foci in positive contexts may affect negative foci and quasifoci in similar ways.

a) Pied piping. This is available with foci in pre- and post-auxiliary positions:

- (254) *BEHIN ERE ez zuela jomugan jotzen egin zuen amets.*
 once also not AUX.COMP target hit do AUX dream
 ‘He dreamt that he did not hit the target EVEN ONCE.’
- (255) *Jomugan ez zuela BEHIN ERE jotzen egin zuen amets.*
- (256) [*JONEK ez duela egin*] *uste du Mikelek.*
 Jon not AUX.COMP do think AUX Mikel
 ‘Mikel think that it was not Jon that did it.’
- (257) [*Ez duela JONEK egin*] *uste du Mikelek.*

As the last example shows, focalized *Jonek* can ‘drag’ the whole negative embedded clause to the pre-verbal position of the matrix, whether it occurs in the pre- or post-auxiliary position.

b) Elements occurring in the focus position of a higher verb are interpreted as foci of the

lower negative clause, rather than as quasifoci:

- (258) *HORREGATIK esan dute ez duela erantzun.*
that.because say AUX not AUX.COMP answer
'That's why they said he did not answer.'

Here, in the relevant interpretation where *horregatik* 'for that reason' is an adjunct of *erantzun* 'answer', the adjunct is interpreted as a (pre-negation) focus of the lower clause, with scope over negation, not as a contrastive quasifocus. Contrastive tags are then unfelicitous:

- (259) #*Horregatik esan dute ez duela erantzun, beste arrazoi bategatik baizik.*
other reason one.because but
'The said he did not answer BECAUSE OF THAT, but because of another reason.'

c) Both positions behave alike in that they can't serve as targets for focus extraction from the lower clause. Thus, a matrix negated verb may not host an emphasized element raised from a lower clause, whether in the focus or in the quasifocus position:

- (260) **ZURI ez dut uste saria emango dizutenik.*
you.to not AUX think prize give.FUT AUX.COMP.PRTT
'To you I don't think they will give the prize.'
(261) **Ez dut ZURI uste saria emango dizutenik.*

d) De Rijk (1996) claims that emphatic pronouns and, in general, constituents intensified by the suffix *-xe* may not occur in quasifocus position, although they are acceptable in focus position:

- (262) *Ez dizut orain (*oraintxe) ekarriko, bihar baizik.*
not AUX now now.INTS bring.FUT tomorrow but
'I will not bring this to you now, but tomorrow.'
(263) *Ez dizut nik (*neuk) ekarriko, Jonek baizik.*
I I.INTS
'It is not me that will bring this to you myself, but Jon.'

There is however some disagreement as to whether these emphatic elements may occur in focus position in negative clauses. The grammar sketch from the Academy of the Basque language (EGLU I:84) claims emphatic pronouns are excluded from that position, while Osa (1990:212) finds them acceptable in certain environments. In the dialect described here, such elements may in fact be found in non-focal positions, whether in positive or negative sentences. Therefore, sentences like the following, where an element in quasifocus position to which the emphatic marker *-xe* has been attached, are also acceptable:

- (264) *Ez dizut oraintxe ekarriko, bihar baizik.*
not AUX now.INTS bring.FUT tomorrow but
'I won't bring it to you right now, but tomorrow.'

e) Both focus positions may be filled simultaneously:

- (265) *JONEK ez du INOR ikusi.*
 Jon not AUX anyone see
 ‘It is Jon that has not seen ANYONE.’
- (266) *JONEK ez du Peru ikusi ere egin.*
 see also do
 ‘It is Jon that did not even SEE Peter.’
- (267) *Nork ez du JON ikusi?*
 who not AUX Jon see
 ‘Who did not see JON?’
- (268) *Nork ez du Jon ikusi ere egin?*
 see also do
 ‘Who did not even SEE Jon?’

f) In the Lekeitio dialect described in Hualde et al. (1994:170-171), where focalized elements bear distinct focal stress, this can only be borne by the pre-negative focus. Although it is possible to emphasize the post-negation, pre-participial constituent, even using contrastive tags, it may not receive focal stress (indicated by the circumflex accent):

- (269) *Txakurrâ estau sure lagunak ekarri.*
 dog not.AUX your friend bring
 ‘Your friend did not bring THE DOG.’
- (270) *Txakurra estâu sure lagunak (*lagunâk) ekarri, amak báíño.*
 mother but
 ‘It was not your friend that brought the dog, but mother.’

Since some element must bear focal stress in this dialect, and the pre-negative constituent is not focalized, the auxiliary itself receives focal stress, in spite of the fact that some contrastive emphasis on the pre-participial element is indicated by the tag.

4.4.8. Non-preverbal foci?

We will describe now two types of situations where pre-’verbal’ adjacency is not found for foci or wh-words. First, we will examine the final position as a possible locus for foci and wh-words. Secondly, we will turn to cases where an object intervenes between the two elements. Beginning with the first strategy, it is sometimes possible, as a marked alternative, to find foci and wh-words in final position:

- (271) *Etorri da AITA.*
 come AUX father
 ‘FATHER has come.’
- (272) *Nigandik atera dela zer?*
 I.from come.out AUX.COMP what
 ‘That what has come out from me?’
- (273) *Kontua ez duk, hainbeste, istorio bat asmatzea....* [Atx. Ob.:222]
 point not is so.much story a invent.NOM.DET
Kontua duk egilearen begirada, bere ikuspuntua.

point is author.GEN outlook his view.point

‘The point is not so much to invent a story. The point is the author’s approach, his point of view.’

Examples like these are reported in Villasante (1980:259), Osa (1990:114), Hualde et al. (1994:169-170) and Hidalgo (1996) among others. The operator in these sentences is separated from the rest of the clause to its left by a pause or intonational break. Where the constituent to the right is a focalized element the usual interpretation is that of a corrective focus: somebody’s utterance or presupposition is corrected with respect to that constituent. Where it is a wh-word, it is interpreted as a marked echo-question. This position for marked emphasis is not just post-verbal, but final in the clause.

Pied-piped clauses may also occur in this marked position. When the pied-piping operator is a wh-word, they cannot be interpreted as regular wh-questions, but rather as marked, echo-questions

(274) *Etxera joango naiz NEUK nahi dudanean.*
home.to go.FUT AUX I.INTS want AUX.when

‘I will go home when I want to.’

(275) *Etxera joango haiz nork nahi duenean?*
‘You will go home when who wants?’

As mentioned in the introduction, there are cases where some constituents intervene between the wh-word and the verb. This is particularly common with cause wh-words. Moreover, it seems that the objects may intervene between a wh-word or focus and the verb, producing sentences marginally better than those involving other cases of lack of adjacency:

(276) *??Nork liburua atera du?*
who book take.out AUX

‘Who took out the book?’

(277) *Nork bekaturik egiten ez du Jaiegunean meza ez entzunaz?*
who sin.PRTT make.IMPF not AUX holy.day.in mass not hear.INSTR

‘Who does not sin not hearing mass on a holiday?’ [Mogel CB:175]

(278) *Noiz begiak edukiko dituzue ezagutzeko...* [Mogel CB:227]
when eyes have.FUT AUX know.NOM.REL

‘When will you have eyes to know...’