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1 Introduction

In this paper, we discuss differences across Basque dialects in the accessibility of datives to absolutive-type agreement. In most varieties, including Standard Basque, datives control a dedicated series of dative suffixes. In some varieties however, their agreement 'displaces' to take over morphology otherwise reserved for the absolutive. To this phenomenon we refer as dative displacement. It is a rich domain in which to explore syntactic and morphological properties and parameters of dialectal variation: the basic morphology of more than fifty dative displacement dialects has been documented and four have been examined in more detail for this work. Recent work on comparable agreement displacements reveals that sometimes they affect syntax rather than only morphology. This appears to be true for at least some of Basque dative displacement as well, although much remains to be understood about the phenomenon. Our discussion first describes the phenomenon and its parametrization across Basque dialects in section 2, then outlines syntactic and morphological approaches to it and their different predictions about its properties and parametrizability in section 3, focusing on syntactic theories, to conclude with hints of its syntactic character in section 4.

Dative displacement lies at the crossroads of two ways to treat the argument added to the plain transitive and unaccusative structures. Transitives and unaccusatives have as core arguments the external argument EA and the internal argument O of transitives, and S of unaccusatives: She$_{EA}$ boils water$_O$, Water$_S$ boils. We will need differentiate O and S according to whether they stand in 'plain' transitives and unaccusatives, where we notate them O$_1$, S$_1$ as in send a letter$_{O1}$, or combine with an added argument, in which case we notate them O$_2$, S$_2$ as in send someone$_{O2}$ a letter. The added argument will be referred to as the indirect object IO across the variety of structures or interpretations in which it participates, such as goal or benefactive: send, bake someone$_{IO}$ a cake.

The addition of an IO to a plain structure leads to two results cross-linguistically: primary-IO and dative-IO systems (Dryer 1986, Haspelmath 2005, Malchukov, Haspelmath and Comrie forthc). In primary-IO systems, the IO behaves like the O$_1$/S$_1$ for case and agreement, while the remaining O$_2$/S$_2$ tends to behave differently.\footnote{\footnotesize We thank to Ane Barriola, Arantzazu Elordieta, Irantzu Epelde, Beñat Oyharçabal, Julen Manterola, Céline Mounole and an anonymous informant from Oñati for answering our questionnaire on Dative Displacement or collecting data for us and for sharing their insights. This work has been partially supported by Basque Government HM-2008-1-10, HM-2009-1-25 and IT4-14-10; the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación FFI2008-00240/FILO, and the Agence Nationale de la Recherche ANR-07-CORP-033.}

In symmetric primary-IO systems where the IO and O$_2$/S$_2$ show the same properties, see Baker (1988), Bresnan and Moshi (1990), MacKay and Trechsel (2008). A variant of primary object system unaccusatives treats IO as EA and S$_2$ as S$_1$; see Baker (1996), Rezac (2011). For systems capable of adding multiple IOs with the same behavior, see McGinnis (2001).
English (1), the IO is an accusative object in the active, but an agreeing nominative subject in the passive, like O1, while the remaining O2 is unaffected by passivization. In Inuit (2), the IO is an agreeing absolutive, like O1, and the remaining O2 is a nonagreeing instrumental. In Nahuatl (3), the IO controls the same agreement as O1, while the remaining O2 controls a special agreement restricted to 3SG/3PL. In Mohawk, O2/S2 incorporates (Baker 1996), and in Southern Tiwa it both incorporates and contributes special 3SG/3PL agreement distinctions of the Nahuatl type (Allen et al. 1990). The IO of a primary IO system behaves like O1/S1 not only for case and agreement but also for A-movement, as seen in English passives (1), although it may differ from O1/S1 on other properties (Baker 1996, Peterson 1999: 50).

(1)  a. She baked/sent us two cakes.
    b. We were baked/sent two cakes (them) by Kate
    c. *Two cakes were baked/sent us by Kate.

(2)  Juuna-p Kaali-atuakka-nik nassip-p-a-a.
    Juuna-ERG Kaali[ABS] books-PL.INS send-INDIC-[+tr]-3S1.3Sj
    Juuna sent the books to Kaali.

(3)  Ni-mitzi-im-maca in huē-hue'x̂ol-o-.  
    Is.SU-2.S-3p.O-give IN RED-turkey-PL
    I give you the turkeys.

(4)  a. Je les lui ai cuits/envoyés.
    I.NOM them.ACC him.DAT have.1S cooked/sent.PL
    I have baked them for him.
    b. Ils lui ont été cuits/envoyés.
    they.NOM him.DAT are.3P been cooked/sent.PL
    They have been baked for him.

(5)  Juuna-p atuakka-t Kaali-mut nassi-up-p-a-i.
    Juuna sent the books to Kaali.

---

2 This type of number-only agreement for O2/S2 will be important to us; for its occurrence in primary-IO systems, see further Baker (1996: 5.2.1., 2008: 3.3.3), Peterson (1999: 51f.).

3 We keep the glosses of the sources, save for the convention person 1/2/3 number [singular] / [plural] as in 1P; the abbreviations are FUT(ure), IMPERS(onal), IND(icative), INS(trumental), LOC(ative), OBJ(ect), RED(uplication), SU(bject).
Cross-linguistically, the different treatment of the IO in primary and dative systems is independent of the syntactico-semantic class of the IOs, such as ditransitive goals and possessors, or datives, with or without applicative morphology, although such factors may decide how an IO is treated within a given system such as Inuit (4) vs. (5) (Baker 1988, 1996, Cuervo 2003, Peterson 1999). Thus the differences between primary and dative IO systems must lie either in other selectional properties, such as the introduction of a bare DP versus a dative KP/PP in Spec,Appl, or in the higher functional architecture, which may for instance attach a dative KP/PP to the IO as it moves through it (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Kayne 2004, Svenonius forthc). We will return to these options when they become pertinent for Basque dative displacement.

2 Dative Displacement

Most Basque varieties are dative-IO systems, including Standard Basque. Basque is an ergative-absolutive language. S and O participate in one case-agreement pattern, the absolutive, and EA in another, the ergative. The pattern of case-agreement association is illustrated in (6). The absolutive controls the prefix, fusionally signalling the person and number of 1st/2nd person controllers, and the PL marker, which signals the plurality of 1/2/3.PL controllers. The ergative controls the ergative suffix, fusionally signalling person and number. The agreement controllers are also often detectable through root allomorphy: in (6), the root *u* is chosen when there is an ergative agreement controller, and hence we gloss it √EA for ergative-absolutive, while the root *iz* indicates that there is only an absolutive agreement controller, √A for absolutive.4

4 For a detailed and perspicuous presentations of Basque agreement, see Laka (1993), Albizu (2002). On nouns, we gloss plural as PL and case as ERG, ABS, DAT. Agreement is borne by an auxiliary root for most verbs. We use PL for the O/S pluralizer. PL2 for the O2/S2 pluralizer of dative displacement dialects; person 1/2/3 [singular]/[plural], e.g. 1r, and furthermore case E[rgative] / [D]ative, e.g. 1PE, if the controller always has a unique case (suffixes but not the prefix); √EDA, √DA, √A, √EA for roots according to whether their form indicates the presence of Ergative), D(ative), A(absolutive) agreement controllers; and D for the default prefix varying by tense and mood. The agreement morphemes of Standard Basque and largely shared across the dialects are given below for reference. 2SG *zu* is historically 2PL and so controls the PL as well as 2S, while 2PL is formed from it by the addition of a second pluralizer (*te*).

Standard Basque agreement markers for the auxiliary (without dative and ergative displacement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>ABS</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>ERG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phil Position</td>
<td>Prefix + PL</td>
<td>DAT suffix</td>
<td>ERG suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>-da-, -t</td>
<td>-da/-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>g- + -it-</td>
<td>-gu-</td>
<td>-gu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>z- + -it-</td>
<td>-zu-</td>
<td>-zu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>z- + -it- (+ -te-)</td>
<td>-zu-</td>
<td>-zu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-o-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>- + -it/-zki-</td>
<td>-e-</td>
<td>-te-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(6) a. zu-k gu  ekarri  ga-it-u-zu
you-ERG us.ABS brought 1P-PL-√EA-2SE
You invited us.
b. ni  etorri  na-iz
me.ABS come 1S-√A
I came.

(Standard Basque)

The addition of IO in (7) adds a dative argument to the clause and a dative agreement suffix before the ergative suffix. It may also influence the form of the root, indicated as √EDA for ergative-dative-absolutive and √DA for dative-ergative. The presence of an agreeing dative does not affect the other arguments or their case and agreement patterns, save that it limits absolutive O to being 3rd person (a restriction known as the Person Case Constraint, Laka 1993, Albizu 1997, Rezac 2008).

(7) a. zu-k gu-ri  sagarr-ak  ekarri  d-i- zki-gu- zu
you-ERG us-DAT apple-PL.ABS brought  D-√EDA-PL-1sD-2SE
You brought the apples to us.
b. gu  zu-ri  etorri  ga- tzai- zki-zu
we.ABS you-DAT come 1P-√DA-PL-2sD
We came to you.

(Standard Basque)

Some Basque dialects deviate from the foregoing system by dative displacement (Fernández 2001, 2002, 2004, Fernández and Ezeizabarrena 2003, Rezac 2006, 2008ab). The IO remains dative in case morphology, often continues to control dative suffixes, and often as well to trigger a form of the root indicating the presence of an agreeing dative. However, it usurps control of the prefix and PL morphology, otherwise reserved to O/S. This only occurs with 1st/2nd person IOs, and depends on other parameters that vary across dialects, such as the phi-features of the IO, tense, and transitivity. Thus within one and the same dialect, the prefix and PL morphology is controlled by O1/S1, and by O2/S2 if dative displacement does not occur, but by IO if it does. When the IO usurps PL morphology, O2/S2 cannot control it, as it does in standard Basque, and often introduces a second plural morpheme not found otherwise, PL2 (as in Standard Basque, O2/S2 can only be 3SG/PL in the presence of an agreeing IO).

We exemplify dative displacement from three varieties that illustrate these core properties and the range of parametric variation. In (8) is shown dative displacement in Sara Basque. Plain transitives are the same as in Standard Basque, (6). All 1st/2nd datives undergo dative displacement, in the present and past, but only in transitives. Under dative displacement, the dative IO gains control of prefix and PL. Sometimes it continues to control the dative suffix as well, as in (8)f, in a way that varies unpredictably across

---

5 The datives that can participate in dative displacement are thus those that could control the prefix, since it is reserved to 1st/2nd person controllers, but by undergoing dative displacement they control PL as well, which canonically has has 1/2/3PL.ABS controllers. Cf. the Appendix.
The plurality of O₂ is reflected by PL₂. The dialect does not distinguish roots according to whether an agreeing dative is present or not.

(8) a. **ni-ri i sagarr-aₖ** eman **na₁-u**
    me-DAT apple-ABS given 1S-\(VE\)(D)A
    She gave the apple to me. (Same form **nau** as for 'She saw me', cf. (6))

b. **ni-ri i sagarr-aₖₖ** eman **na₁_u-zkiₖ**
    me-DAT apple-PL.ABS given 1S-\(VE\)(D)A-PL₂
    She gave the apples to me.

c. **gu-ri i sagarr-aₖ** eman **gaitu₁-u**
    us-DAT apple-ABS given 1P-PL-\(VE\)(D)A
    She gave the apple to us. (Same form **gaitu** as for 'She saw us', cf. (6))

d. **gu-ri i sagarr-aₖₖ** eman **gaitu₁-u-zkiₖ**
    us-DAT apple-PL.ABS given 1P-PL-\(VE\)(D)A-PL₂
    She gave the apples to us.

e. **zu-ri i sagarr-aₖ** eman **za₁-it₁-u**
    you-DAT apple-ABS given 2S-PL-\(VE\)(D)A
    She gave the apple to you. (Same for **zaitu** as for 'She saw you')

f. **zu-ri i sagarr-aₖₖ** eman **za₁_u-zkiₖ-tzu**
    you-DAT apple-PL.ABS given 2S-\(VE\)(D)A-PL₂-2SD
    She gave the apples to you.

    (Dative displacement, Sara Basque, Fernández 2001)

Oñati Basque in (10) exhibits the same principles with different parameters. Plain transitics are again as in Standard Basque, save that 1ˢᵗ/2ⁿᵈ persons never control PL (for (6)a **gaitu** occurs **gau**). Dative displacement occurs only for 1ˢᵗ person datives, only in the past, and only in transitics. The dative control of the prefix, but always retains control of the dative suffix, and the root always continues to indicate the presence of an agreeing dative. In this dialect S₂/O₂ never agrees for PL when an agreeing dative is present, whether the dative undergoes dative displacement as 1ˢᵗ person or not as other persons.

(9) a. **ne-ri i sagarr-aₖ(k) emun n₁-os-ta₁-n**
    me-DAT apple-(PL.)ABS given 1S-\(VE\)(D)-1SD-PAST
    She gave the apple(s) to me.

b. **gu-ri i sagarr-aₖ(k) emun g₁-os-ku₁-n**
    us-DAT apple-(PL.)ABS given 1P-\(VE\)(D)-1PD-PAST
    She gave the apple(s) to me.

    (Dative displacement, Oñati Basque, Yrizar 1992, Badihardugun 2005)

Oiartzun Basque completes the illustration of the range of variation. The system is shown in Table 1 for reference. For 1SG datives, dative displacement is obligatory. For the remaining 1ˢᵗ/2ⁿᵈ person datives, it is obligatory in transitics with a singular O₂, but much more limited in transitics with a plural O₂ or in unaccusatives with singular S₂,

---

6 For instance, in the Sara variety shown doubling only in ERG-2.IO.DAT-3PL.O₂, but in the neighbouring Ahetze Sara it also occurs in ERG-1.IO.DAT-3PL.O₂ (**gaituzkigu** for **gaituzki** in (8)d; Yrizar 1997: 121).
and absent in unaccusatives with a plural S2. This pattern is characteristic of the area and reflects the diachronic spread of the phenomenon (Rezac 2008b).

Table 1: Dative displacement in Oiartzun present tense (cf. ex. (10))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive man 'give'</th>
<th>Unaccusative gustatzen 'liking'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SG sagarra 'apple'</strong></td>
<td><strong>SG sagarra 'apple'</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-DD</td>
<td>PL sagarrak 'apples'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Non-DD DD DD DD DD DD DD DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG nei</td>
<td>nazu - nazkizu - nau - nazki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL guri</td>
<td>gattuzu dizkizugu (gattuzu) digu (gattu) dizkigu -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG zuri</td>
<td>zattut dizkizut (zattut) dizu zattu dizkizu -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL zuei</td>
<td>zattuztet dizkizuet (zattuztet) dizute zattuzte dizkizute -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: bold = form has PL2; brackets = speakers other than our consultant

Between these three varieties, we have the following points of variation: the phi-features of the IO, the plurality of O2/S2, the transitivity of the construction, and tense. On the other hand, the nature of the dative does not play a role in any of the five varieties in which we have examined it. The foregoing examples have illustrated dative displacement for the goal of the basic ditransitive eman 'give', but all other datives undergo usually behave identically, as illustrated for Oiartzun in (10). In Standard Basque all these datives would also behave in the same way, controlling only the dative suffix (these agreement forms are in brackets, with the dative suffix in bold). Nevertheless, we will see hints in section 4 that the type of dative may condition dative displacement.

(10) a. Zu-k ne-i sagarr-a man na-zu. [d-i-da-zu]
you-ERG me-DAT apple-ABS given 1S-2SE You gave me an apple. *(goal of ditransitive)*

b. Zu-k ne-i sagarr-a man arazi na-zu. [d-i-da-zu]
you-ERG me-DAT apple-ABS given cause 1S-2SE You made me give an apple. *(causee of transitive)*

c. Zu-k ne-i besu-a hautsi na-zu. [d-i-da-zu]
you-ERG me-DAT arm-ABS broken 1S-2SE You broke my arm. *(possessor in transitive)*

d. Ne-i txakurr-a hil na-u. [zai-t]
me-DAT dog-ABS died 1S-√ My dog died / The dog died on me. *(dative of interest)*

e. Ne-i sagarr-ak gustatzen na-zki. [zai-zki-t]
me-DAT apple-PL.ABS liking 1S-PL2 I like apples. *(psych-verb experiencer)*

f. Ne-i lagun-ak torri na-zki. [zai-zki-t]
me-DAT friend-PL.ABS come 1S-PL2 Friends came to me. *(goal of motion)*

7 But gattu and gattu only for the motion verb etorri 'come' + dative; see Section 4.
Dative displacement modifies the agreement of dative IOs in a specific way that is more abstract than simple allomorphy, such as that of the English past participle suffix in *heav-ed*, *lef-t*, *though-t*, *clov-en*, *spat*, *cast*. It does not introduce its own exponents, such as a prefix *p* for 1PL.DAT, or arbitrarily recruit existing exponents, such as the prefix *n*-controlled by 1SG.ABS for agreement with 1PL.DAT. Rather, it maps the phi-features of the dative to existing positions of exponence, the prefix and PL, where they are realized by exponents that realizes the same phi-features when they come from the absolutive, for instance 1SG *n*-. The result is a syncretism between the exponents controlled by absolutive O1/S1 and by dative IO under dative displacement, illustrated in Table 2. However, Table 2 also shows that the syncretism does not extend to entire agreement forms, because the dative may retain control of its own dative suffix, trigger a dative-indicating root, and co-occur with PL2 controlled by O2/S2. If any of this occurs, the agreement forms used by dative displacement are unique to it.\(^8\)

Table 2: Dative displacement (DD) morphology in Sara Basque\(^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3SG.EA-O1.ABS</th>
<th>3SG.EA-IO.DAT-3SG.O2</th>
<th>3SG.EA-IO.DAT-3PL.O2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1/O2</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>non-DD</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>d-u&lt;sub&gt;EA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>d-i&lt;sub&gt;EDA&lt;/sub&gt;-o</td>
<td>d-i&lt;sub&gt;EDA&lt;/sub&gt;-o-zka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>na-u&lt;sub&gt;EA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>da-u&lt;sub&gt;EDA&lt;/sub&gt;-t</td>
<td>na-a&lt;sub&gt;EDA&lt;/sub&gt;-zki da-u&lt;sub&gt;EDA&lt;/sub&gt;-zki-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>ga-it-u&lt;sub&gt;EA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>da-u&lt;sub&gt;EDA&lt;/sub&gt;-ku</td>
<td>ga-it&lt;sub&gt;EDA&lt;/sub&gt;-zki da-u&lt;sub&gt;EDA&lt;/sub&gt;-zki-gu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>za-it-u&lt;sub&gt;EA&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>da-u&lt;sub&gt;EDA&lt;/sub&gt;-zcu</td>
<td>za-i-zki-tcu da-u&lt;sub&gt;EDA&lt;/sub&gt;-zki-tcu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: **person-number prefix** – PL, PL2, **dative suffix**.

Dative displacement is descriptively at the cross-roads of primary and dative IO systems. As in dative-IO systems such as Standard Basque, the IO is dative and may control dative agreement and root morphology. As in primary-IO systems such as Nahuatl, the dative control the prefix and PL morphology otherwise dedicated to O1/S1, and O2/S2 controls a special plural morpheme not found otherwise.

Dative displacement exists outside Basque, but it seems rare, if we set aside syncretisms due to paucity of morphological distinctions. A clear parallel is found in Itelmen, (11), analysed in Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2002) and connected to Basque in Rezac (2008ab). Under certain conditions, which as in Basque include phi-features of the IO and transitivity and are subject to variation, the IO beats O2/S2 for regular O1/S1 agreement. Section 4 adds Faroese and *laista* Spanish. Other examples may be Hyow in Haspelmath (2005) and Amharic in Malchukov and Haspelmath and Comrie (2007).

(11) a. isx-enk n-zal-al-<sub>i</sub> kza<sub>i</sub> kama-nk?
    father-LOC IMPRS-give-FUT-2s.O you me-DAT

\(^8\) Dative displacement may also affect allomorphy of elements not discussed here (Rezac 2006, 2008b).

\(^9\) The speaker of Sara Basque has access to both its dative displacement system and a minimally different one without it, permitting a contrast of two dialects with otherwise identical morphology (Fernández 2001).
Will father give you to me?

b. isx-enk n-zal-al-umₖ kəa kama-nkₖ?
father-LOC IMPRS-give-FUT-1s.O you me-DAT
Will father give you to me?

(Itelmen, Bobaljiik and Wurmbrand 2002: ex. 15, 14b)

3 Morphology and syntax

Two broad classes of approaches to dative displacement may be distinguished: syntactic and morphological. They differ on the type of information to which it may refer, including its parameters; the properties of the operations or structures that make it different from non-dative displacement; and the consequences that it may have for other phenomena (Rezac 2011). Our understanding of the phenomenon does not presently permit a sure choice among these alternatives, still less a concrete theory. However, a syntactic approach seems best fitted both to the parametric variation, to which it is applied in this section, and to the hints of syntactic correlates, discussed in the next. We outline the range of syntactic theories and compare them with morphological ones.

A syntactic approach to dative displacement is expected to exhibit the properties of syntactic computation: it manipulates syntactic rather than purely morphophonological information, it obeys constraints on syntactic dependencies such as locality and cyclicity, and it has the potential to affect realization and interpretation. Two types of syntactic approaches to agreement displacements have been explored for Basque. One is through head-movement, (i) (Laka 1993). The other is through feature transformations, (ii) (Fernández and Albizu 2000, Fernández 2001, 2004, Rezac 2003, 2006, 2008ac, Béjar and Rezac 2009). Both share the common core (iii).

(i) Positions of exponence, including the prefix and suffix, reflect a D° heads or clitic that double arguments. Agreement displacement occurs when head-movement displaces such a D-head, say DDAT°, to a position otherwise filled by another, say the v-adjoined position otherwise filled by DABS° (perhaps leaving a copy).

(ii) Positions of exponence reflect phi-features on clausal functional heads valued by Agree from or checked against arguments. Agreement displacement occurs when a head, say v°, Agrees with a different argument than otherwise.

(i,ii) The conditions under which displacement occurs are determined by syntactic properties of the configurations or derivations involved, such as the absence of the typical agreement controller, its underspecification, or movement that brings the de-facto controller closer to the target of agreement than the usual controller.

To dative displacement, the second type of approach has been applied. Figures 1 and 2 sketch its essentials, keeping to transitives for simplicity (Fernández 2001, 2004, Rezac 2006: chapter 3, 2008ab). The point of departure is the theory of Basque-type ergativity where the absolutive locus vABS is below the ergative locus TERG, so that the closest goal

10 The following proposals have been originally developed for ergative displacement, see the Appendix.
of \( v_{\text{ABS}} \) is the O/S and that of \( T_{\text{ERG}} \) the EA (cf. Ortiz de Urbina 1989, Laka 2000). The dative IO is base-generated in Spec, ApplIP between \( v \) and O for transitives, resulting in the c-command \( \text{EA} > \text{IO} > \text{O} \) that remains stable through A-movement (Elordieta 2001; see section 4 for datives with unaccusatives). Person and number phi-probes on \( v_{\text{ABS}} \) are the locus of prefix and PL agreement, while the nature of dative and ergative suffix agreement may be left open for our purposes as agreement or doubling clitics. In Figures 1 and 2, the IO is structurally higher than the O2/S2 and so should be the closer goal for \( v \), giving it control of \( v \)'s phi-probes and thus the prefix and PL. So it is in dative displacement, Figure 2, where the IO controls them if it is present, and the O1/S1 does otherwise. When dative displacement does not occur, some factor renders the IO's phi-features inaccessible to \( v \), indicated by the circle in Figure 1. The O2/S2 is then the closest goal, behaving like O1/S1 even in the presence of the IO. In dative displacement, \( v \) fails to Agree with the O2/S2, which might be expected to lead to a (Case) licensing problem for the O2/S2. Just in this situation, the special PL2 agreement for the O2/S2 appears. We treat it as a number-only phi-probe on Appl, the closest head above the O2/S2, and so correctly limited to Agree with it.

Figure 1: No dative displacement

Figure 2: Dative displacement

The nature of the parameter that differentiates between structures or derivations where dative displacement does or does not occur, between Figure 2 and 1, is unknown. Syntactic probes into the two structures currently reveal very little (section 4). The literature presents several options for why a dative IO might fail to control a phi-probe and let the O2/S2 do so. One, in Figure 3, is that the O2/S2 moves past the IO prior to Agree with \( v \). If this occurs, the phi-Agree of \( v \) is with the O2/S2, otherwise with the IO. McGinnis (1998) and Anagnostopoulou (2003) develop a similar proposal to differentiate primary IO systems where the IO ends up highest from those where the O2/S2 does.
Figure 3: O2/S2 parametrically by-passes dative IO

Another option, illustrated in Figure 4, is for datives to have a richer structure than bare DPs, an added KP or PP, which parametrically hides the phi-features of DP it contains, for instance because it is parametrically a phase. If the dative is transparent to Agree, v Agrees with it as the closest goal, otherwise past it with O2/S2 (Rezac 2006: chapter 3, 2008a, cf. Taraldsen 1995, Anagnostopoulou 2003 on the opacity of datives to some Agree). The parametric opacity of the dative KP/PP shell must reside in its structure or derivation. If the KP/PP is present around the DP upon base-generation, its opacity derives from the content of its functional architecture, which makes it a phase or not (Rezac 2008a, 2011). If the KP/PP is introduced around the DP by movement of the DP through the functional architecture of the clause, as Kayne (2002) proposes for French dative causees, its opacity to phi-Agree with v may be due to its introduction prior rather than subsequent to phi-Agree with v.\(^{11}\)

Figure 4: Dative IO is parametrically transparent to phi-Agree

---

\(^{11}\) Basque datives behave more but not quite like ergatives and absolutes on tests such as anaphora licensing and adnominal coding (Albizu 2001, Fernández and Sarasola 2010). Crosslinguistically such properties do not easily match visibility and transparency to agreement of various kinds (Rezac 2008a).
In either type of system, there is a difference between the syntactic structures or derivations with and without dative displacement. The difference may be detectable by its interaction with other syntactico-semantic phenomena. For instance, the difference in the height of the O2/S2 in Figure 3 could be detectable through c-command diagnostics or interaction with further A-movement, while the differences in the functional architectures of datives in Figure 4 could be detectable by elements that need bare DPs such as bare floating quantifiers. At the moment, these tools are either unavailable or inconclusive, as will be seen in section 4. The simplest difference, that of phi-Agree of v with IO or with O2/S2, is the most difficult to detect, since few phenomena depend on the valuation of uninterpretable phi-features (Rezac 2010).

Simpler to examine are the predictions that syntactic approaches make about the parameters that modulate dative displacement. The difference between datives that do and do not undergo dative displacement resides in the region circled in Figure 1, which contains the dative, its selector Appl, and the material between them and v as the locus of phi-Agree for prefix and PL morphology. The information in this region includes the phi-features of the dative, the properties of Appl, the properties of v. Information outside this region should not impinge on dative displacement, insofar as the properties of C, T, or Spec,vP should affect what occurs between v and Spec,AppP if selection is local and the construction of syntactic structures proceeds cyclically bottom-up.12

These predictions are partly but not entirely verified in the survey of the parameters that enter into dative displacement in Rezac (2006, 2008ab). The database is the fifty varieties of Basque that have dative displacement in Pedro de Yrizars's exhaustive survey of agreement morphology of the Basque verb (e.g. Yrizar 1992, 1997), confirmed by our investigation of the phenomenon in Lekeitio, Oiartzun, Hondarribia, and Ziburua:

(12) a. Factors that systematically influence dative displacement (see section 2):
   • The phi-features of the dative IO (Sara vs. Oñati, Oiartzun).
   • The phi-features of O2/S2 (Oiartzun)
   • Transitivity: unaccusatives only if transitives, and rarely (Oiartzun, Oñati).
   • Tense: past tense only (Oñati), present only (Ainhoa), both (Sara).

b. Factors that have no systematic effect on dative displacement:13
   • The phi-features of the ergative.
   • The phi-features of 'allocutive' agreement in C (q.v. Oyharçabal 1993).

By systematic factors we mean properties of the elements that participate in dative displacement, such as the dative, that govern it or of aspects of it such as doubling independently of some other variable. For instance, in Oñati transitivity determines the availability of dative displacement independently of the phi-features of the dative, and in the phi-features of the dative independently of the phi-features of the ergative. Beside systematic factors stand arbitrary ones, such as the exclusion of dative displacement with

---

12 Thus in systems that seem to have clausal functional architecture comparable to Basque, we do not seem to find the force or tense of a clause affecting object licensing or c-selection of verbs.

13
1PL.IO.DAT-3SG.O2.ABS in Oiartzun, or the limitation of prefix- suffix doubling in Sara to ERG-2.IO.DAT-3PL.O2. In arbitrary factors emerges the role of morphology in realizing syntax. Morphological realization often leads to arbitrary gaps, such as the absence of past participle for *stride* but not *ride* in English (Baerman et al. 2010). Across Basque dialects, arbitrary gaps are common in the agreement system, banning this or that form defined by an arbitrary set of information available in the agreement complex (Fernández 2001, Rezac 2006, forthcoming, Arregi and Nevins 2006).

The class of syntactic theories in Figures 1 and 2 properly differentiate between the factors that do and do not parametrize dative displacement, save for tense. There may be a plausible diachronic explanations (Rezac 2008b), but the synchronic effect of T on what happens in the vP remains to be understood. Tense also conditions a Basque agreement displacement phenomenon similar to dative displacement, namely ergative displacement which we discuss in the Appendix, by which the ergative controls the prefix if there is no absolutive controller. The role of T in it has been construed in different ways, among them through a T-v relationship that may be adapted to the above analyses (see further Laka 1993, Fernández and Albizu 2000, Rezac 2003, 2006: chapter 2). On the other hand, syntactic approaches make available a parameter that has not so far been revealed to play a role in dative displacement: dative types such as goals versus possessors, if they are associated with different syntactic structures or derivations (type of Appl, different heights, etc.). Section 4 hints that dative types may matter for dative displacement.

These outlines of a syntactic approach to dative displacement define a hypothesis space of its potential correlates and parameters. With them in hand, we may more briefly contrast morphological approaches, although none have been developed for dative displacement (but see Albizu 2002, Arregi and Nevins 2008 for ergative displacement). A morphological approach attributes dative displacement to an extra-syntactic realizational morphology component, such as that of Noyer (1992) and Bonet (1991, 1995), or to the extension of syntactic computation to morphophonological features after phrasal syntax and its transfer to LF, as in Halle and Marantz (1993) and Embick and Noyer (2001, 2007). The morphological operations of these approaches are predicted not to affect phrasal syntax or its interpretation and may differ from phrasal syntax in the information accessed and the mechanisms used. For instance, datives in Basque and Romance fall into different types according to their syntactic and interpretive properties, including ditransitive goals, causees, and possessors. However morphology neutralizes them in case and agreement or clitic morphology, thus accessing an impoverishment of syntactic information, and it manipulates this information in a way that appears to differ from syntax, by selecting allomorphs according to morphophonological context within but not outside the prosodic word. The result has no consequences for syntax and interpretation, even when it is syncretic with the realization of other syntactic structures (Rezac 2011).

We have seen that dative displacement is not the contextual selection of allomorphs, but the mapping of the phi-features of dative agreement to the prefix and PL positions of exponence, otherwise reserved for O/S. The morphology components cited above provide the mechanisms necessary for such morphosyntactic feature transfer, such as feature (de/re)-linking in Bonet (1991, 1995). Such an operation would take the phi-features of dative agreement linked by syntax to a terminal, say Appl° or v°-adjoined D_DAT°, and
move or copy them to the terminal that otherwise hosts the phi-features of O/S agreement, say v°. It is expected to obey the impoverishment of syntactic information reflected in morphology elsewhere, including that of differences between dative types in Basque. It is likewise expected to obey the constraints on morphological mechanisms, such restriction to phrase-structurally local domains like the morphological word. Finally, it is expected to have no consequences for syntax or interpretation. The properties of dative displacement in Basque seen so far match these predictions, although we shall see potential contraindications in the next section.

Like syntactic approaches, morphological approaches make predictions about the factors that can parametrize dative displacement. In a simple view, any morphological information in the morphological word hosting the dative agreement, prefix, and PL positions that dative displacement relates is expected to be visible. Different syntactic classes of datives should therefore be indistinguishable while the phi-features of all agreeing arguments as well as tense should be equipollent as conditioning factors. However, more nuanced theories of morphological feature transfers and their interaction with morphological hierarchical structure may nuance these predictions (Bobaljik 2000).

4 The syntactic effects of dative displacement

Some agreement displacement similar to Basque dative and ergative displacement affect syntax and so are syntactic (Rhodes 1994, Rezac 2011, Patel 2010). For dative displacement, Jónsson (2009) discovers a syntactic analogue in Faroese. Faroese and Icelandic both have 'quirky' datives, namely external arguments with theta-related dative case that mostly behave as DPs with structural Case for A-movement and subjecthood; for instance, they satisfy the EPP of T, bind subject-oriented anaphora, are PRO, and are subjected to the definiteness effect as expletive associates. In Icelandic the principal difference of quirky dative subjects with nominative subjects is in dative vs. nominative case, both on the DP and on dependents such as secondary predicates, and in the control of verb agreement by nominatives. Jónsson finds that in contemporary Faroese, 3rd person dative subjects have come to variably control verb agreement and antecede nominative floating quantifiers, (13) (Jónsson 2009: 155f., 159). This difference seems to correlate with the fact that unaccusatives with dative external arguments typically assign nominative to their object in Icelandic but accusative in Faroese. This has led Sigurðsson (2003: 250, 2004: 149) to suggest that in Faroese nominative is assigned to dative subjects in addition to their theta-related dative. The result is partly nominative syntax.14

(13) a. Nógyum kúnnum %dámarr%dáma mannfólk við eitt sindur av búki.
    many.DAT women.DAT like.3S/3P men.ACC with a bit of belly.
    Many women like men with a bit of belly.

    b. Mér [dámarr]*dámi hasa bókina.

14 For a similar effect in Korean Case-stacking, see Schütze (2001: 201, 207), and for an analysis in terms of structural on top of inherent Case, Yoon (1996). Similarly, Romero (2010) investigates one type of laísta Spanish, where a subset of 3rd person IOs are doubled by clitics syncretic with accusative clitics rather than by dative clitics as in Standard Spanish, and finds that these IOs adopt primary-IO syntax.
I.DAT like.3s/*1s this.ACC book.ACC
I like this book.

c. **self.DAT/NOM** like.3s **him.DAT** not to listen to music
He himself does not like to listen to music

(Jónsson 2009: 157, 159)

Dative displacement in Basque is parallel to Faroese in taking control of agreement that ordinarily falls to a controller with different, clearly structural case: the absolutive O/S. It does not have consequences for the case of floating quantifiers, but this is not in direct contrast with Faroese, since it only affects 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person. Yet other correlates to dative displacement have also proven difficult to find. As an example, consider reflexive detransitization (Etxepare 2003: 4.1.9.3, Artiagoitia 2003: 4.9.1.3, 4.9.2.3). In Basque, reflexives may be formed from plain transitives by eliminating the EA with its ergative case and agreement, resulting in a structure that is on the surface identical to an unaccusative from the same stem, (14). The resulting meaning identifies EA with O.

(14) a. Ikasle-ek ikasle-ak aurkeztu d-it-u-zte.
   student-PL.ERG student-PL.ABS introduced D-PL-√EA-3PE
   Students introduced (other) students.

b. **Ikasle-ak** aurkeztu **d-ira**.
   student-PL.ABS introduced D-√A+PL
   The students introduced themselves/each other.

The dative IO is generally invisible to this process. The IO in transitive (15) cannot be interpreted as reflexive to the EA (or O) whether it continues to be dative, (15)b, or is changed to absolutive, (15)c.\footnote{The same is true in unergatives where there is no O candidate for EA=O reflexivization; The girls.ERG looked [at] the boys.DAT (Neskek mutilei begiratu diete) cannot be detransitivized to The girls.ABS looked and mean The girls looked at each other, at themselves' (*Neskak begiratu dira).}

Some speakers do in fact allow some analogues of the latter, but independently of dative displacement (Albizu 2000, Etxepare 2003: 4.1.6.2). Thus the dative IO's control of O-type agreement in dative displacement does not confer on it O-like behavior for participating in reflexive detransitivizations.\footnote{Cross-linguistically, dative IOs in actives can correspond to nominatives in various detransitivizations, although it is not agreed whether the process is lexical or not (see e.g. Feldman 1978 on Ancient Greek passives, Folli and Harley 2007 on Japanese causative passives, Svenonius 2010 on Icelandic middles, Medová 2009: 6.3.2 on French reflexives).}

   student-PL.ERG girl-PL.DAT student-PL.ABS introduced D-√EDA-PL-3PD-3PE
   Students introduced students to the girls.

b. **Ikasle-ak** nesk-ei aurkeztu **zai-zki-e**
   students-PL.ABS girl-PL.DAT introduced √DA-PL-3PD
   The students introduced themselves/each other to the girls.
   *The girls introduced the studnets to themselves/each other.

The same is true in unergatives where there is no O candidate for EA=O reflexivization; The girls.ERG looked [at] the boys.DAT (Neskek mutilei begiratu diete) cannot be detransitivized to The girls.ABS looked and mean The girls looked at each other, at themselves' (*Neskak begiratu dira).
c. *Nesk-ak ikasle-ak aurkeztu d-ira.
girl-PL.ABS student-PL.ABS introduced D-√A+PL
The girls introduced students to themselves/each other.

We have found two hints of syntactic effects of dative displacement that further research may explore. The first is an effect on causativization described by Trask (1981). The relevant causative construction is illustrated in (18) (Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 4.8). The causative suffix *arazi attaches to the participle/infinitive of the causativized verb, the causer is introduced as the ergative EA, the O of a causativized (di)transitive remains absolutive and agrees with the auxiliary as in a simple clause, and the EA of the causativized verb is interpreted as the causee and becomes a dative that likewise agrees with the auxiliary. The resulting case-agreement profile is identical to a ditransitive.

(16) Eliza-k ni-ri diru-a eman-arazi d-i-ti
church-ERG me-DAT money-ABS give-cause D-√EDA-1sD
The church made me give money (to people).

When the causativized verb would itself take a dative IO, as is possible for eman in (18), its dative may remain present for some speakers, but it cannot itself agree with the matrix auxiliary, whose (unique) dative agreement suffix is obligatorily interpreted as dative EA-causee (Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 4.8.2). This is the property that dative displacement seems to change. Trask finds this constraint in the dialect of Milafranga, so that (17)a only has the reading where the agreeing dative signalled by the dative suffix –ta– is the causee. However, he also reports that if the agreement morphology of the auxiliary is that of dative displacement, (17)b, where the same set of phi-features controls both the dative suffix –ta– and the person prefix n–, the interpretation is one where these phi-features reflect that IO of the causativized ditransitive, rather than the causee.17

given-cause D-√E(D)A-1sD-2mE
You've made me give it away. (= Standard for Eastern varieties)
b. Eman-a(ra)zi na-u-ta-k.
given-cause 1s-√E(D)A-1sD-2mE
You've made him give it to me.

(Trask 1981: 294)

There are two striking aspects to Trask's pattern. One is that different dative types behave differently. It seems from his description that dative causees can only control the dative suffix (no dative displacement), while the datives of causativized ditransitives can only control the prefix + suffix (dative displacement). Since morphology otherwise never differentiates the two dative types, dative displacement seems to appeal to a syntactic distinction otherwise neutralized in morphology.

17 The gloss 2m is the masculine of the 2SG familiar, which we have not so far used in our presentation. Trask's other example is parallel to (17) with jan-a(ra)zi 'feed', sc. 'make eat', for eman-a(ra)zi.
Second, the occurrence of dative displacement permits agreement with a dative that is otherwise inaccessible to it. How it does so would be easier to understand if Trask's data were translated somewhat differently than above. He translates the non-agreeing argument of (17)b as *him, but that seems foreign to Basque, where the causee in arazi causatives is either an agreeing dative, overt or pro-dropped, or a nonagreeing overt oblique, or a nonagreeing and silent impersonal causee. The silent nonagreeing causee of (17) is thus most naturally taken as an impersonal causee. Such causatives behave as described above, save that the causee does not agree, and unlike agreeing datives does not restrict absolutes to 1st/2nd person, (18) (Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 4.8.2, Albizu 2001).

(18) a. (*Ni₁) etxe-ra eraman-arazi na₁-i-o (anaia-ri)
   me.ABS home-to bring-cause 1s-EDA-3sD brother-DAT
   She made him/brother bring me home.

b. Ni₁ etxe-ra eraman-arazi na₁-u
   me.ABS home-to bring-cause 1s-EDA
   She made someone/*him bring me home.

(Albizu 2001)

For some but not all speakers, an impersonal causee renders impossible agreement with the dative IO of the causativized verb, just as an agreeing causee does, (19). The restriction appears to be syntactic rather than morphological, since impersonal causees are not reflected in and do not otherwise constrain agreement morphology, (18).

(19) a. Eliza-k ni₁-ri₁ diru-a eman-arazi *d-i-t₁ / d-u
   church-ERG me-DAT money-ABS give-cause D-EDA-1sD / D-EDA
   The church makes proabh (=someone, people) give me.DAT money.
   (dit ok. as: The church makes me give money (to proabh))

b. Eman-arazi da-u-ta-k
   give-cause D-EDA(1)A-1sD-2MD
   You made me give it.
   You made someone give it to me.
   (He made me give it.)
   (He made some give it to me.)

---

18 The situation seems parallel to French, corresponding respectively to à-causes of direct causation (J'ai fait manger le gateau au chien 'I made the dog eat the cake'), par-causes of indirect causation (J'ai fait manger le gateau par le chien 'I had the dog eat the cake'), and silent impersonal causees (J'ai fait manger le gateau 'I had the cake eaten'). We are grateful to Beñat Oyharçabal (p.c.) for discussion of Trask's data and for pointing out the oblique causatives of Basque.

19 This variation recurs in French (i). It resembles situations where movement of a DP past another with the same but not different case is illegitimate, for instance wh-movement of a dative past a dative but not accusative object controller in French discussed in Milner (1979); similar phenomena vary in strength from parsing difficult to ungrammaticality (Rivas 1977, Milner 1979, Solà 2002, Dotlačil 2004, Rezac 2005).

(i) L'église m'a fait donner de l'argent.
   (a) The church has made me give money.
   (b) The church has made someone give me money.

   (b) ok for M. Jouitteau, p.c., B. Oyharçabal, p.c., * for A. Dagnac, p.c.)
If the causee in (17) is an impersonal causee, it blocks agreement with the IO of the causativized verb when it controls regular dative agreement, (17)a, but not when it also controls the prefix under dative displacement, (17)b. This effect of dative displacement could be naturally related to the fact that impersonal causees do not interfere in agreement with the absolutive O of the causativized verb, (18)b, since the effect of dative displacement is to attribute to the dative IO control of the prefix otherwise controlled by absolutive O (cf. Rezac 2008a: 102). Thus in Trask’s (17), dative displacement would control on the dative IO both a morphological property of the absolutive O, control of the prefix (while retaining control of the dative suffix), and a syntactic property, the ability to agree past an impersonal causee. Needless to say, we are far from understanding Trask’s pattern, including its spread in other dative displacement dialects.

The second syntactic correlate of dative displacement is similar in licensing an otherwise impossible agreeing dative. Basque unaccusatives combine with two syntactically different types of datives: high, applicative datives introduced above S, including psych-experiencers, possessors, datives of interest, and low, prepositional datives introduced below S, including animate goals of motion verbs (Rezac 2008c, 2011, forthc, Fernández and Ortiz de Urbina 2010). In Standard Basque, both types must agree, but in eastern dialects, only high datives control agreement, and low ones appear as nonagreeing datives (Etxepare and Oyharçabal 2008ab, Etxepare 2010, Fernández, Ortiz de Urbina and Landa 2010). In many western dialects, low datives not only fail to agree but are replaced by alternatives such as allative PPs (nonagreeing as all PPs). Among them is Hondarribia Basque in (20), where datives in unaccusatives may be psych-experiencers but not goals of motion. However, dative displacement permits both types of datives, (21), re-establishing their symmetric behavior in Standard Basque. Since the morphology of Basque agreement does not otherwise differentiate dative types, the effect seems syntactic.

(20)

a. Gu-ri sagarr-a gusta-tzen d-i-gu.
   us-DAT apple-ABS like-ing  D-√(E)D(A)-1PD
   We like apples.

b. Gu-ri Jon etorri --
   us-DAT Jon-ABS come
   Jon came to us.

(Hondarribia Basque, 1PL.DAT has no dative displacement)

(21)

a. Ni-ri sagarr-a gusta-tzen na-u.
   me-DAT apple-ABS like-ing 1S-√
   I like apples.

b. Ni-ri Jon etorri na-u
   me-DAT us-ABS come

---

20 In Hondarribia and Oiartzun Basque, the √DA root (/)zai has been morphologically replaced by √EDA i, giving digu, dit for Standard zaigu, zaiz, for which in turn dative displacement uses √EA u to give gattu, nau (Fernández 2004, Rezac 2008b).
Jon came to me.  

(Hondarribia Basque, 1SG.DAT with dative displacement)

A similar effect is found in Oiartzun Basque (see Table 1). In unaccusatives with a singular absolutive, our consultant has the option of using dative displacement for all psych-experiencer dative save 1PL (other speakers may have it here as well), but for dative goals of motion, she requires dative displacement for even for 1PL.

(22) a. Guri sagarra gustatzen d-i-gu   / (g-a-tt-u)  
   us.D apple.A liking  DFLT-D1P 1P-PL-√  
   We like the apple.

b. Guri Jon etorri --- / ga-tt-u  
   us.D Jon.A    come  1P-PL-√  
   Jon came to us.

(Oiartzun Basque, no dative displacement / dative displacement)

It remains ill-understood how to properly differentiate the high and low datives, apparently applicative versus prepositional, yet force both to agree in Standard Basque, unlike in eastern dialects where only high, applicative datives agree (see the literature cited). Therefore, it is not clear how to construe the effect of dative displacement that permits low yet agreeing datives. One possibility is that agreeing datives always involve a high configuration, and that Standard Basque but not the eastern and western varieties in question have a way for low datives to participate in it, perhaps by movement from their low position (Rezac forthc). Dative displacement would enable this mechanism when not otherwise available, but the mechanics remain unclear.

5 Conclusion

The study of dative displacement is at its beginnings. The foregoing hints of the syntactic correlates of it do not bring us to a concrete theory of it. They do suggest that the mechanism is syntactic and section 3 outlines the hypothesis space of syntactic analyses that lie within current approaches to IOs, datives, agreement, and agreement displacement. These analyses also predict reasonably what properties of the elements involved in the phenomenon should and should not parameterize dative displacement across Basque dialects, namely the phi-features of the dative and the properties of Appl and v. A syntactic approach does not eliminate a role for morphology. The output of syntax must be realized, and morphological effects surface in arbitrary gaps in the realization of dative displacement as of other agreement in Basque. The two the components of syntax and morphology are separate sources of dialectal variation, each identifiable by its formal properties such as information accessed, nature of operations, and effects on syntax and interpretation.

6 Appendix: Ergative displacement

Standard Basque and most Basque varieties have the phenomenon of *ergative displacement*, (23). In some varieties, the ergative EA only controls the ergative suffixes
under all circumstances (Bermeo Basque, Hualde 2002). In most, it controls the prefix but not the PL morphology if there is no absolutive O controller for it, that is when O is absent or 3rd person, in certain moods and tenses, sometimes also retaining control of the ergative suffix (Laka 1993, Fernández and Albizu 2000, Rezac 2003). In between these two extremes, there is a range of variation that depends on factors similar to dative displacement, for instance the phi-features of the ergative (Rezac 2006: chapter 2). The striking difference between ergative and dative displacement is that the former does not take control of prefix morphology from O, because it only occurs when O cannot control the prefix, and that it never affects PL morphology, which remains controlled by O.

(23) Zu-ki ne-ri j sagarr-ak/ak n eman zen-i- ∅/zki-n-dak- (zu-) n.
you-ERG me-DAT apple-SG.ABS given 2s- ∇EDA-∅/PL- 1sD-(2sE-)PAST
(ergative displacement)

Competition arises in systems that have both ergative and dative displacement whenever both could control the prefix. Which argument wins appears unpredictable, although there is preference for the dative to decide the tendency of a given system (Rezac 2006: chapter 3). Thus either of the options in (24) occur in dative displacement systems, and the choice of one or the other depends on apparently arbitrary factors.

(24) Gu-ki zu-ri k sagarr-a eman gen-i-zuk-n / zuk-it-u-gui-n
we-ERG you-DAT apple-ABS given 1p-∇EDA-2sD-PAST 2p-PL-vore-A-1sE-PST
(ergative vs. dative displacement)
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