

## Indeterminate pronouns and universal quantification in Basque

Ricardo Etxepare (IKER, CNRS) *retxepare@euskalnet.net*

Basque has two ways of expressing universal distributive quantifications: (i) lexically, through the quantifier *bakoitz* “each” (1a); (ii) configurationally, by means of the indeterminate pronouns (IndP) *nor/zein* “who/which”. In certain configurations, those pronouns appear to be associated to a universal-distributive (UD) quantification:

- (1) a. *Bakoitza-k bere ama ikusi du*      b. *Nor-k bere ama ikusi du*  
    each-erg his mother seen Aux      who-erg his mother seen Aux  
    “Each one saw his mother”      “Everyone saw his mother”

That the reading corresponds to strong distributivity (Beghelli,1995) is shown by the following asymmetry:

- (2) a. *Denek bere oparia jaso zuten*  
    all-erg his present received aux  
    “All (of them) received their present”  
    b. *nork bere oparia jaso zuen*  
    who-erg his present received Aux  
    “Everyone received his present”

Although a one-to-one mapping from persons to presents is not necessary in (2a), as is typically the case with group quantifiers and plurals (Beghelli,1995), that reading is obligatory in (2b), with the indeterminate pronoun.

For the UD reading to arise, the IndP and the share of the UD quantification (a term from Choe,1987) must be adjacent (3a vs. 3b):

- (3) a. *Nork<sub>i</sub> [bere<sub>i</sub> etxean]<sub>i</sub> esan du [ t<sub>i</sub> gertatu dela]*  
    who-erg his house-in said Aux happened Aux-Comp  
    “Everyone<sub>i</sub> said that it happened in his<sub>i</sub> house”  
    b. \**Nork<sub>i</sub> esan du bere<sub>i</sub> etxean gertatu dela*  
    who-erg said Aux his house-in happened Aux-Comp

In (3a), the share is an argument of the embedded sentence, but it must appear adjacent to the IndP in the matrix clause in order for the sentence to have a UD force. In this sense, UD readings of IndPs are a structural phenomenon.

The basque facts are reminiscent of the hungarian distributive quantifications, as discussed by Szabolcsi (1997) and Puskas (2000). In Hungarian shares are also foci, and occupy a designated position in the clause. Focus projections are in turn selected by a syntactic head checking features with distributive quantifiers. Basque IndPs do not have any lexically specified UD force. They can appear in other syntactic contexts associated to a different quantificational value, for instance in so called “multiple partitive constructions” (Liptak, 2001) (4a), or interrogatives (4b):

- (4) a. *Nor oinez, nor kotxez etorri da*      b. *Nork erosi du liburu bat?*  
    who walking who by car come has      Who-erg buy Aux book one  
    “Some came walking, some by car”      “Who bought a book?”

If the UD quantificational force is not directly linked to the indeterminate pronoun, it must come from the clausal architecture. I will claim that, as in Hungarian, Basque has a distributive operator (see also Link,1983; Lasnik, 1990, among others), realized as a syntactic head, in whose Spec indeterminate pronouns are merged, and which selects (as in Hungarian) a focus phrase which hosts shares. Szabolcsi (1997) claims that this distributive head attracts quantifiers which introduce set denoting discourse referents. Basque indeterminate pronouns can be shown to provide a plural set to the interpretation of the UD quantification. As in many other languages (see Haspelmath, 1997), basque IndPs associate to a wide range of logical operators, giving rise to different quantificational expressions:

- (5) *nor+bait*      *edo+nor*      *nor+ere*      *i+nor*

who+ptc      or+who                      who+even      neg+who  
 “someone”    “anyone(free choice)”    “whoever”    “anyone(neg polarity)”

I will follow Hagstrom (1998) and Shimoyama (2001) in the idea that the invariable part of those quantificational expressions is a set denoting element. This set denoting expression constitutes the restriction of the UD quantification.

The relevant distributive head can operate at both the clausal and the nominal level. Together with cases such as (1b), which I will call canonical, and where the IndP agrees with the auxiliary in person and number (3<sup>rd</sup> singular), there are also cases where a non-pronominal subject provides the relevant set for quantification. In those cases, the auxiliary agrees with the non-pronominal subject:

- (6) Adiskideok    nork    bere ama    maite dugu  
 friends-erg who-erg his mother-D love Aux (1<sup>st</sup> person plural)  
 “We friends each love his mother (each of us loves his mother)”

The IndP is anaphorically linked to the subject antecedent, and shares ergative case with the subject. We can show that in those cases the IndP (and the UD quantification associated to it) is merged internal to the DP-object. Compare the different extraction possibilities of canonical (7a) and non-canonical (7b) cases:

- (7) a. Nork<sub>i</sub> [bere ama]<sub>i</sub> uste du [ t<sub>i</sub> etorri dela]  
 who-erg his mother think Aux(3<sup>rd</sup> sing) come Aux-Comp  
 “Everyone<sub>i</sub> thinks his<sub>i</sub> mother came”  
 b. \*Guk nork [bere ama]<sub>i</sub> uste dugu [ t<sub>i</sub> etorri dela]  
 we-erg who-erg his mother we-think come Aux-Comp  
 “We each think that his mother came”

In (7a), the share has moved to the focus position of the matrix clause. In (7b), with an overt subject in the matrix sentence agreeing with the auxiliary, this is impossible. The movement would be non-cyclic, targeting a DP-internal focus projection. Although focus movement of the share is not possible, focus movement of the whole DP including the indeterminate pronoun and the possessive phrase is possible:

- (8) [Nork bere ama]<sub>i</sub> esan du Jonek [ t<sub>i</sub> maite dugula guk]  
 who-erg his mother said Aux Jon-erg love Aux-Comp we-erg  
 “(literally) EACH HIS MOTHER Jon said that we loved”