

Tense and Mood in Basque Nominalizations

JON ORTIZ DE URBINA

Abstract

This article examines the role of tense and mood factors in the selection of complement clauses in Basque, arguing against apparent cases of free variation, discussed here with respect to choice of complement types. In particular, the article concentrates on the ability of some verb classes to take complements in the nominalized form. As with Spanish infinitives, the availability of nominalized complements correlates with the class membership of the main predicate into one of the subjunctive-taking groups. Apparent counterexamples, i.e., predicates which can take both a nominalized/subjunctive complement and an indicative one, will be shown to stem from differences in modality and tense. Variation is considered from a cross-linguistic perspective, and the discussion of the Basque examples is linked to 'double selection' phenomena in Spanish and Romance complements. Particular attention is paid to prospective complements, and a semantic approach is offered to explain why double selection phenomena emerge in this particular case. As expected, while the morphology of Basque and Spanish complement types is strikingly different, the semantic factors intervening in the choice and distribution of complement types will be shown not display the same degree of variation.

This article* addresses the issue of variation in language from two very different perspectives. First, it supports analyses which try to eliminate

* Work on this paper has been made possible by using the *Ereduzko prosa gaur* ('Model prose today') corpus and search program at <http://www.ehu.es/euskara-orria/euskara/ereduzkoa/>. I have checked complement types and temporal cooccurrences in the examples contained in that corpus. Examples from contemporary authors quoted throughout the examples also come from this corpus. (Mendiguren HPSH: Iñaki Mendiguren *Harri Potter eta Sorgin harria*; Olano FIB: Olano, Antton. *Fidel izan beharrez*; Saizar GNL: Saizarbitoria, Ramón. *Gorde Nazazu Lurpean*). I would also like to thank Elena Artaza and José Ignacio Hualde for comments and encouragement. They are not responsible for my errors, though.

apparent cases of free variation, discussed here with respect to choice of complement types. I will examine the role of tense and mood factors in the selection of complement clauses in Basque. In particular, the article concentrates on the ability of some verb classes to take complements in the nominalized form, the tenseless verbal form most closely resembling Spanish infinitives. As with Spanish infinitives, however, the availability of nominalized complements correlates with the class membership of the main predicate into one of the subjunctive-taking groups. Apparent counter-examples, i.e., predicates which can apparently take *both* a nominalized/subjunctive complement *and* an indicative one, will be shown to stem from differences in modality and tense. Secondly, variation will also be considered in a cross-linguistic way, so that the discussion of the Basque examples will be linked to similar phenomena in Spanish and Romance languages. As is expected, while the morphology of Basque and Spanish complement types is strikingly different, the semantic factors intervening in the choice and distribution of complement types do not display the same degree of variation.

The paper is organized as follows. First some background information on tensed and tenseless complementation is given in section 1. Section 2 turns to the tense and mood factors governing nominalized complement selection. Different types of ‘double selection’ will be presented in section 3, where special attention is devoted to variation in prospective complements. A semantic approach is offered to explain why double selection phenomena emerge in this particular case.

1. Tensed and tenseless complements in Basque

Tensed complements in Basque are marked with a complementizer $-(e)la$ for declaratives or $-(e)n$ for indirect questions and most subjunctive complements), a bound morpheme attached to the right of the tense-bearing verbal form (the auxiliary in (1a,b)):

- (1) a. *ikusi duda-la*
 seen AUX-COMP
 ‘that (I) have seen’
 b. *ikus dezada-n*
 see AUX-COMP
 ‘that (I) see’

As in the previous examples, most tensed verbal forms are periphrastic. The lexical verb bears some aspectual information (*ikusi* in (1a), glossed as ‘seen’, is a participial form; *ikus* in (1b) is a verbal root), while the auxiliary provides information such as tense, person(s), etc. The auxiliary also provides mood information, since indicative and subjunctive are constructed using different auxiliaries. Thus, the indicative auxiliary in (1a) is a form of

transitive **edun*, while the subjunctive auxiliary of (1b) is a form of the auxiliary **ezan*.

There are two tenseless forms which are of direct interest to what follows, since most complement clauses contain either of them: the participial form (like *ikusi* ‘seen’ above or in (2) below) and the nominalized form, where the suffix *-t(z)e* is added to the verbal root, giving forms like *ikuste-* ‘see/seeing’ in (3), and *joate-* ‘go/going’ (*joa-n* ‘go’) or *hartze-* ‘take/taking’ (*har-tu* ‘take’):

(2) Ez dakit zer ikusi.
not know what see
‘I do not know what to see.’

(3) Gorrotatzen du [zu hor ikus-te-a].
hate.IMPF AUX you there see-NOM-DET
‘He hates seeing you there.’

Like other nominal expressions, nominalized forms will in turn receive the case ending corresponding to their function in the clause. Since we will be concerned with complements of transitive verbs, the tenseless verb in (3) and in the examples below are marked with the absolutive determiner (*-a*), as corresponds to direct objects in ergative morphologies.

The tenseless form in (2) is morphologically participial, but that aspectual content is missing in many environments where it is used. In fact, the participial form is also the citation form of the verb, given, for instance, as translation for a Spanish or English infinitive. It can also be found in bare verbal expressions and in verb topicalizations:

(4) Hemendik itsasoa ikus-i? Ezinezkoa!
here.from sea see impossible
‘See the sea from here? Impossible!’

(5) Ikus-i, neuk ikusiko dut.
see I see.FUT AUX
‘As for seeing, I will see it.’

However, the bulk of complement clauses are found not with this ‘default form’, but with the nominalized verb.¹ In the course of the following discussion, I will try to show that this nominalized verb is the tenseless equivalent of the subjunctive tensed verb in (1b), as opposed to the indicative one in (1a).

¹ Tenseless indirect questions (in western dialects) like (2) are the most common cases of ‘participial’ complements. Participial forms are also found with *behar* ‘need’ and *nahi* ‘want’ complements, but these are restructuring, mono-clausal constructions.

2. Nominalizations and mood

In his pioneering work on Basque nominalizations, Goenaga (1985) already pointed out that the choice of a tensed *-(e)la* complement as opposed to a tenseless nominalized one was guided by the semantic class of complement selected by the main verb. In particular, only propositions would occur as tensed indicative *-(e)la* forms, while other semantic types (eventualities) would take the shape of nominalized clauses. Thus, using the classification into ‘verb classes’ so familiar from mood descriptions in Romance languages, epistemic and declarative verbs take tensed *-(e)la* complements, while emotive factives, volitive, and order and influence verbs take nominalized complements; the two complements occur in virtual complementary distribution:

- (6) a. [Jonek liburua irakurri du-ela] sinisten dut.
 Jon book read AUX-COMP believe AUX
 ‘I believe that John has read the book.’
 b.* [Jonek liburua irakur-tze-a] sinisten dut.
 c.* Jonek liburua irakur deza-la sinisten dut.
 AUX(SUBJ)
- (7) a.* [Jonek liburua irakurri du-ela] desiratzen dut.
 Jon book read AUX-COMP desire AUX
 ‘I desire that John has read the book.’
 b. [Jonek liburua irakur-tze-a] desiratzen dut.
 c. Jonek liburua irakur deza-la desiratzen dut.
 AUX(SUBJ)

In his study of Basque nominalizations, Goenaga (1985) bypasses the question of mood: the [\pm propositional] semantic feature he proposes is applied to the contrast between the tensed and tenseless complements, while the same semantic factors are not discussed with respect to their role in the choice of indicative versus subjunctive tensed complements. Thus, he only considers examples (a) and (b) in the paradigm in (6) and (7). But the connection between nominalizations and subjunctive mood brought out by the (c) examples is at least implicitly established.^{2,3}

² The reason why subjunctive tensed forms are not considered might be related to the fact that subjunctive complements are far less prominent in Basque than in Spanish. In the extremely complex Basque tensed verbal system, they are often associated with higher registers and are typically replaced by the nominalized verb (Oyharçabal, 2003:277).

³ On the other hand, as we will see, a very similar relationship between subjunctive complements and tenseless infinitival complements has been pointed out explicitly for Spanish: “los predicados que seleccionan subordinadas en subjuntivo son asimismo compatibles con el infinitivo, mientras que aquellos que seleccionan

There are other phenomena which further highlight similarities between Basque nominalizations and subjunctives, while also pointing at differences between Basque nominalizations and Spanish infinitives. Thus, in complements of volitional predicates Spanish infinitives are used for like-subject constructions, while disjoint reference between the main and subordinate verb is expressed by the subjunctive. On the other hand, like-subject constructions are expressed with the participial tenseless form in Basque (8a), while disjoint reference is marked by the nominalized complement (8b); as expected, a subjunctive tensed form is also possible in the latter case, so that (8b) and (8c) are equivalent:

- (8) a. Jonek etxera joan nahi du.
 Jon home go want AUX
 ‘Jon wants to go home.’
- b. Jonek Mikel etxera joatea nahi du.
 go.NOM.DET
 ‘Jon wants Mikel to go home.’
- c. Jonek [Mikel etxera joan dadi-n] nahi du.
 AUX(SUBJ)
- (9) a. Juan quiere ir a casa.
 ‘Juan wants to go home.’
- b. Juan quiere que Miguel vaya a casa.
 ‘Juan wants Miguel to go home.’

The apparent divergence between Spanish infinitives and Basque nominalizations observed in the expression of like-subject complements of volitional *nahi* ‘want; *querer*’ actually hides yet another case of the similarity. The use of participial complements in such contexts in Basque is clearly linked to the presence of restructuring in this language: these may be lexical restructuring constructions where the volitional predicate is taking a VP complement (Wurmbrand, 2004; Etxepare, 2004). In any event, when restructuring is not possible, the complement type is realized as a nominalized verb. This is the case where negation blocks restructuring, as it does in other languages (Ortiz de Urbina, 1999; see Rizzi, 1982 for Italian):

subordinadas en indicativo suelen excluir dicha forma no personal” (Hernanz, 1999:2285-2286).

- (10) Jonek nahi du etxera ez joatea.
 Jon want AUX home not go.NOM.DET
 ‘Jon wants not to go home.’

The connection between nominalized and subjunctive complements inside Basque and their opposition to indicative ones seems therefore quite robust. In the following section, I will show that apparent counterexamples (typically, predicates which admit both indicative and nominalized complements) actually reinforce this generalization and stem from interesting interactions between temporal and modal factors. The situation will turn out to be quite similar to that presented by double selection (of both indicative and subjunctive complements) in Romance languages.

3. Double selection: tense and mood

There are different types of cases which seem to depart from the complementary distribution between nominalized/subjunctive and indicative complements observed above. One can find that a) a main predicate selects both complement types or b) that a predicate selects a nominalized complement but not a subjunctive one, or viceversa. Thus, while acknowledging the connection laid out in the previous section, Artiagoitia (2003: 664-665) raises some doubts on its extent. In particular, he points out that “even though most volitional, emotive and influence verbs and predicative adjectives which select subjunctive clauses will also select *-t(z)ea* nominalizations ... the reverse ... is not necessarily true. Nominalized clauses, thus, can also be complements to other kinds of verbs”. In the following lines I will try to show that the types of examples he brings forth do not challenge the generalization above, and, in fact, closely parallel similar phenomena in Spanish.

As a start, some remarks about what constitutes counterevidence to the generalization are in order. It should be pointed out that tensed subjunctive complements in contemporary Basque are highly marked and generally avoided in less formal registers. It is sometimes not quite easy to simply check whether a given verb can occur with that complement type. Moreover, it is also possible for a given verb to only take tenseless complements, excluding tensed ones so that no subjunctive complement can truly be found. Thus, English *try* only accepts infinitival complements, while its Spanish counterpart *intentar* takes both tensed (subjunctive) and infinitive complements. While the latter provides positive evidence for the infinitive/subjunctive relation, a situation similar to the one found in English does not present any counterevidence to the claim. Therefore, the lack (or marked status) of tensed subjunctive complements for a given predicate which does admit a nominalization complement does not show *per se* that the latter does not correspond to subjunctive modality. Whether it does or not is an empirical

question that can only be clarified by checking the types of meanings and properties of the complement clause, which can be similar to that of indicative or subjunctive complements. At the same time, the fact that a predicate taking a nominalized complement can *also* be found with an indicative tensed complement does not present counterevidence to the claim supported here. It would if there were no semantic or syntactic differences between the two. However, as I will show in what follows, where these two complement types are found with the same predicate, the syntactic and semantic evidence shows that the nominalized complement patterns with regular subjunctive complements, and not with indicative ones.⁴ As indicated above, both the types of predicates which allow alternative complements and the factors which differentiate one from the other are quite often similar to what research addressing double selection in Romance languages like Spanish has also pointed out. This is expected in that we will be dealing with an interface area between semantic systems and morphosyntax, and the idiosyncrasies of the latter will interact here with more general features of the former. At the same time, we will be concentrating on contemporary (mostly) western forms of Basque, spoken by bilingual speakers of Basque and Spanish, so we should not perhaps expect to find excessive variation in the semantic systems underlying more language-specific morphosyntactic realizations.

3.1 One example of double selection: *espero izan* ‘expect/hope’

Let’s begin with a predicate which can take both indicative tensed complements and nominalized ones, and which displays interesting temporal and modal properties. Our task will be to connect these on a one-to-one basis with each of the morphological realizations of the complement verb. In one of the meanings of this verb, there is a wish for a certain state/event to hold true. Temporal relations are free here, and the complement which is expected to hold true may occur in any time, past, present or future, or even be a bare event.⁵ This is exemplified in the following paradigm with a present reference time in the main verb. The types of situations are given in English and in Basque:

⁴ In fact, Goenaga (1985) already mentioned one predicate that can occur both with a nominalized and a tensed indicative complement: *ahaztu* ‘forget’, showing precisely that their semantics differed along the expected lines.

⁵ It is also possible to add some aspectual marking, but then a different nominalization, based on the participle, is typically used:

(i) aski argi utzi izana espero nuen (Saizar GNL 217)
 rather clearly leave be.PRF.DET hope AUX
 ‘I hope I had left it rather clearly’

I will not consider perfective nominalizations of this type, concentrating on *-t(z)e* nominalizations instead.

- (11) a. I hope you arrived on time.
 b. Atzo garaiz hel-tze-a espero dut.
 yesterday on.time arrive-NOM-DET hope AUX
 'I hope you arrived on time.' *(e)la/nom
- (12) a. I hope he arrives on time to all his meetings.
 b. Bere batzar guztietara garaiz hel-tze-a espero dut.
 his meeting all.to on.time arrive-NOM-DET hope AUX
 'I hope he arrives on time to all his meetings.' *(e)la/nom
- (13) a. I hope he'll arrive on time tomorrow.
 b. Bihar garaiz helduko de-la/hel-tze-a espero dut
 arrive.fut aux-that/ arrive-NOM-DET
 'I hope he'll arrive on time tomorrow.' -(e)la/nom

The general pattern that emerges here is that the tensed complement is possible only in prospective contexts.⁶

Let's concentrate on the tense-related generalization before proceeding to examine the connection with mood. It is important first to screen out an important group of apparent exceptions to this temporal generalization, which, in fact, actually hide an independent subregularity. The following sentences present some instances of this group, where an indicative past verbal form cooccurring with the future marker *-ko* is found with a matrix present form of *espero*. The morphology is identical to future-in-the-past forms,⁷ but the temporal reference is exclusively past with respect to the present:

- (14) Espero dut garaiz *heldu zinela /helduko zinela.
 hope aux on.time arrive AUX.that /arrive.FUT AUX.that
 'I hope you arrived on time.'
- (15) Espero dut ez zela ongi bukatuko!
 not AUX.that well finish.fut
 'I hope s/he/it did not finish well!' (Olano *FIB* 68,70)
- (16) Espero dut muggleek ez zizutela iskanbilarik sortuko.
 not AUX.that problem create.FUT
 'I hope the muggles did not bother you.' (Mendiguren *HPSH* 13)

⁶ Notice the similarity with Spanish: as Ridruejo (1999: 3229) says with respect to Sp. *esperar*, 'El empleo del indicativo es posible cuando el proceso referido en la oración subordinada se localiza en futuro'. In both Basque and Spanish, some speakers find the examples slightly odd. Example (11b) can also occur with a tensed complement in a different situation, as will be presently discussed.

⁷ As in *helduko zela* 'that he would arrive', identical to the past form but with the addition of the prospective marker *-ko*.

I would like to claim, though, that this pattern reflects an independent modal-like meaning which gets superimposed on the complement relationship between the matrix verb and the subordinate, and which closely follows Spanish: the use of future morphology to signal supposition. Both in Basque and Spanish future can be used to indicate supposition in the present, and future-in-the-past (*conditional* in Spanish) to indicate supposition in the past.⁸

- (17) Nekatuta egongo da/Estará cansado.
tired be.fut AUX(PRS)
'(I guess) he is tired.'
- (18) Nekatuta egongo zen/Estaría cansado.
tired be.fut AUX(PST)
'(I guess) he was tired.'

This is mostly found in root contexts, where it has been usually described, but it is also possible to encounter it in embedded clauses complement to verbs of supposition:

- (19) Supongo/imagino que estará cansado/estaría cansado.
suppose/imagine
'I suppose imagine he is/was tired.'

This type of marking in embedded contexts is independent of subjunctive marking, as shown in the following Spanish examples with past supposition. Subjunctive-inducing but non-suppositive verbs like *alegrarse* (a) can occur with subjunctive but not with conditional complements. Non-subjunctive, suppositive predicates like *suponer* can take the conditional but not the past subjunctive (b). Finally, a verb like *esperar* 'expect, hope', equivalent to Basque *espero izan*, can take both the subjunctive complement (*llegaras* 'arrived') and the conditional suppositive complement (*llegarías* 'arrived') corresponding to its semantics (c):

- (20) a. Me alegro de que llegaras/*llegarías a tiempo.
'I'm glad you arrived on time.'
- b. Supongo que *llegaras/llegarías a tiempo.
'I supposed you arrived on time.'
- c. Espero que llegaras/llegarías a tiempo.
'I hope you arrived on time.'

If Basque also follows closely this type of pattern, examples (14) through (16) above do not in fact present counterevidence to the claim that nominal-

⁸ These are what Guillermo Rojo & Alexandre Veiga (1999) call 'dislocated' uses as opposed to the basic *uso recto*.

3.2 Prospective tense and mood

As indicated above, prospective temporal relations of the embedded complement clause with respect to the main reference point can be expressed by both nominalizations and indicative tensed clauses. Prospective includes, as usual, future with a past reference point, as in footnote 7 and in (25):

- (25) "no seas patético" esango zidala espero nuen (Saizar *GNL* 206)
 say.fut AUX(PST).that hope AUX(PST)
 'I hoped he would tell me "Don't be pathetic!"'

The availability of both indicative and nominalized complements, though, does not constitute any counterevidence to the claim defended here that each of these morphological types differ in modality. Notice that the occurrence of a nominalized complement here correlates with the possibility of using subjunctive complements. These are possible in this context, albeit in a very formal register:

- (26) espero bainuen zeremoniara haren ordezkari gonbida nintzaten
 hope since.AUX ceremony.to his substitute invite AUX.(SUBJ.PST)
 'since I hoped that they would invite me to the ceremony as his substitute.'
 (Saizar *GNL* 434)

Nominalized complements in future contexts can then be construed as the normal register equivalent of subjunctive complements. If so, the problem is not exactly the apparent free alternation between nominalizations and indicative complements, but the alternation between indicative and subjunctive complements with the same predicate. The pairing nominalization/subjunctive can be maintained provided that they can still be shown to differ in distribution from the indicative complements with which they seem to freely alternate. In fact, we can understand this alternation better if we see it under the light of similar 'double selection' phenomena one finds in languages like Spanish. It is not only the phenomenon that is parallel in the two languages, but the connection extends to the fact that it is the same type of predicate that displays it, a remarkable coincidence otherwise. Thus, *espero/esperar* 'hope', and *erabaki/decidir* 'to decide' can also take both complements in prospective time situations (see footnote 6):

- (27) a. Espero que lleguemos/llegaremos a las tres.
 'I hope we'll arrive at three.'
 b. Espero que venga/vendrá mi hermano. (Ridruejo 1999: 3229)
 'I hope mi brother will come.'

- (28) a. El comité ha decidido que mañana sea/será fiesta.
 ‘The committee has decided that tomorrow will be a holiday.’
 b. Erakundeak bihar jaia izatea/izango dela erabaki du.
 institution tomorrow hol. be.NOM/be.FUT AUX.thatdecide AUX
 ‘The institution has decided that tomorrow will be a holiday.’

The future tense in the preceding example need not be suppositive but can correspond to a regular future reference. We will discuss below why the indicative/subjunctive alternation is found in this type of temporal reference as opposed to others, but, difficult though this question is, it only arises if the connection between nominalized and subjunctive complements does exist and the former are not just tenseless counterparts of any type of tensed clause, regardless of mood.

A general line of explanation which links tense and mood selection and correctly groups tenseless forms with subjunctive is summarized in Hernanz (1999), following Bosque (1990). Both subjunctive and infinitival verbs are defective in their temporal referentiality and would fit only in contexts where the latter can be fixed by the main verb that takes them as complements. One such case of ‘inherent’ ordering imposed by the predicate meaning occurs when the eventuality in the complement must hold *after* that in the main predicate, as with *desear* ‘to desire’, *prometer* ‘to promise’, etc. This prospective dependency induced by the main predicate meaning provides the temporal interpretation for the embedded verb, making temporal marking on the latter redundant and unnecessary. In this way, the occurrence of temporally defective forms like infinitives and subjunctives is accounted for. Where no constraint is imposed on the temporal ordering of the complement by the main predicate, as with epistemic verbs, the indicative will be required.

There are some problems with this explanation. An initial problem is presented by the other major context where infinitive/subjunctives are required, namely, factive complements of emotive-evaluative verbs like *detestar* ‘detest’, *encantar* ‘love’, *molestar* ‘disturb’, etc. The temporal reference of the complement is independent from that of the emotive predicate, and it is not clear why the defective forms can, indeed must be used. Thus, while the use of subjunctive/infinitive in prospective relations can be, as expected, more meaningfully linked with temporal relations at large, other cases of mood selection seem less easily amenable to temporal explanations.

A related problem comes from the observation that even if this type of explanation accounts for the licensing of temporally defective forms in the complement clause, it does not by itself explain why fully tensed indicative forms are excluded. The existence of tense recoverability conditions for the former does not explain why fully referential forms should not be acceptable in examples like the following:

- (29)a. ??Espero dut garaiz heldu zinela. (=14)
 b. *Espero que llegaste a tiempo.
 'I hope you arrived on time.'

Conversely, the approach does not fully explain the question at hand, that is, why both subjunctive/tenseless and indicative are available in prospective tenses, as in (27) above.

Finally, a slight problem for this approach may come from a different direction. Bare subjunctive clauses in Basque, marked with the same complementizer one finds in subjunctive complement clauses, receive a final interpretation easily relatable to unrealized, prospective tense:

- (30) Garaiz hel dedi-n egin dut.
 on.time arrive AUX(SUB)-COMP force AUX
 'I've forced him/her to arrive on time.'

Since these are adjunct clauses whose temporal reference is not inherently controlled by the main predicate, it is tempting to think that this prospective orientation is a consequence of the use of subjunctive itself. The connection may be of course coincidental, but it is certainly suggestive.

3.3 Homonymy and double selection

As indicated, the tense-related approach to mood/finiteness selection sketched above cannot directly account for double selection cases where the same predicate apparently takes both subjunctive/infinitive *and* indicative complements. A common explanation for double selection holds that this is just a case of homonymy, where each of the different complements is selected by distinct senses of the predicate, as Hernanz (1999: 2289), for instance, claims.

It is clear that many double selection cases can be simply reduced to homonymy, but there is an important residue of unsolved issues. Consider for instance the cases of *suposatu* 'suppose, guess, assume' or *erabaki* 'decide'. In its basic meaning, the weakly assertive verb *suposatu* 'suppose' takes temporally free indicative complements in Basque and Spanish, and does not occur with tenseless ones in either (31). However, in a different sense similar to *entail*, where something follows logically from something else, a prospective relation can take both complement types (32):

- (31) a. Supone que llegarán a tiempo.
 'He assumes they will arrive on time.'
 b. Garaiz helduko direla suposatzen du.
 on.time arrive.FUT AUX.that suppose AUX
 'He assumes they will arrive on time.'

difference associated with each mood, so that deriving mood from meaning may be a circular procedure.

Perhaps a possible line of explanation for the double selection situation in prospective contexts can be supported on propositionality à la Vendler. Ironically, the idea is that there is *no* semantic difference in the complement types in the prospective contexts under examination. Thus, if we use Vendler's tag to check whether the prospective complement is a proposition, we find that the propositional nature of the complement does not seem to be so clear even for indicative morphologies:

- (35) a. Espero dut garaiz helduko garela/heltzea,
 hope AUX on.time arrive.FUT AUX.that/arrive.NOM.DET
 ??baina ez da egia.
 'I hope we'll arrive on time, but it is not true.'
 b. Espero que llegue/llegará a tiempo, ??pero no es verdad.
 'I hope s/he arrives on time, but it is not true.'
- (36) a. Erabaki dute bihar jaia izango dela/izatea, ??baina ez da egia.
 decide AUX tomorrow holiday be.FUT AUX.that/be.NOM.DET
 'They have decided that tomorrow will be a holiday, but it is not true.'
 b. Han decidido que mañana sea/será fiesta, ??pero no es verdad.
- (37) a. Geldialdi honek berandu helduko garela/heltzea suposatzen du,
 stop this late arrive.FUT AUX.that/arrive.NOM.DET suppose AUX
 ??baina ez da egia.
 'This stop means we will arrive late, but it is not true.'
 b. Esta parada supone que lleguemos/llegaremos tarde, ??pero no es verdad.
 'This stop means we will arrive late, but it is not true.'

Neither complement type is as clearly acceptable as the non-future tense was in (34a). This obviously falls from the semantic fact that, even if there is a propositional interpretation forced by the indicative mood, a proposition about an unrealized state of affairs cannot be true or false in the same way as a proposition on a realized present or past fact. We can relate this semantic blurring of an otherwise sharp difference between propositional and non-propositional complements to the availability of both complement types precisely in this context. Where the distinction holds, the morphological type of the complement is maintained, as Goenaga (1985) described. Where the distinction is disrupted and does not obtain, either complement type is grammatical.¹⁰ Paradoxically, the claim that each complement type represents

¹⁰ Notice I am not claiming that *all* syntactic and morphological differences between the two complement types are, as it were, *cancelled* in this context. In particular,

a different semantic type also entails that in contexts where that semantic distinction does not fully obtain both complement types can cooccur. This semantic blurring, though, cannot be ascribed to different ‘meanings’ of the main predicate, since it is a property of the tense of the complement. In the same way, a root, unembedded sentence in the present and in the future would differ in terms of the evaluation possibilities for its truth conditions, but this would not imply its predicate should be analyzed as involving any special case of homonymy.

In this paper, I have tried to provide support for a view of complement types in Basque and Spanish which links morphological shape and semantic type. In this approach, the apparent variation displayed by some predicates in the shape of their complement is far from being free. I have identified some of the factors which account for the occurrence of a nominalized complement versus an indicative one in Basque (propositionality, its blurring in prospective contexts, suppositive modality, etc.). At the same time, since the apparent variation in morphological shape is linked to semantic factors, I have shown that the situation found in Basque differs little from the one found in Spanish and probably other Romance languages, in spite of obvious morphological diversity.

References

- Artiagoitia, X. (2003) Complementation. In *A Grammar of Basque* (Hualde, J.I. & Ortiz de Urbina, J., editors), pp. 634-710. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bosque, I. (1990) Las bases gramaticales de la alternancia modal. Repaso y balance. In *Indicativo y Subjuntivo* (Bosque, I. editor), pp. 13-65 Madrid: Taurus.
- Etxepare, R. (2004) Menpeko infinitiboak eta urruneko komuntadura [Embedded infinitives and long-distance agreement]. *Lapurdum*, VIII
- Goenaga, P. (1985) Complementización y nominalización en euskara. *ASJU* XIX-2, 495-570
- Hernanz, M.L. (1999) El infinitivo. In *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española* (Bosque, I. & Demonte, V., editors), pp. 2197-2356. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, vol. II.
- Ortiz de Urbina, J. (1999) Complementation in Basque. EURO-TYP Complementation and Subordination Group Final Report
- Rojo, G. & Veiga, A. (1999) El tiempo verbal. Los tiempos simples. In *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española* (Bosque, I. & Demonte, V., editors), pp. 2867-2934. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, vol. II.
- Ridruejo, E. (1999) Modo y Modalidad. El modo en las subordinadas sustantivas. In *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española* (Bosque, I. & Demonte, V., editors), pp. 3209-3251 Madrid: Espasa Calpe, vol. II.

one would have to check other well-known differences between indicative and subjunctives such as, extraction possibilities, polarity licensing, etc.

- Oyharçabal, B. (2003) Tense, Aspect and Mood. In *A Grammar of Basque* (Hualde, J.I. & Ortiz de Urbina, J., editors), pp. 249-284. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ormazabal, X. (1995) *The Syntax of Complementation: On the Connection between Syntactic Structure and Selection*, University of Connecticut Ph.D. dissertation
- Rizzi, L. (1982) *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Foris, Dordrecht
- Vendler, Z. (1967) *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Wurmbrand, S. (2004) Two types of restructures – Lexical vs. functional. *Lingua* **114**, 991-1014.

Jon Ortiz de Urbina
Universidad de Deusto