

combines with T at PF by Morphological Merger (no overt material can stand between T and the root), and which selects the Aspectual Phrase. In central dialects, on the other hand, the auxiliaries can only correspond to the lexicalization of purely functional material (T/Agr, as argued for by Ortiz de Urbina, 1986; Elordieta, 1997; Rezac, 2011, and Haddican, 2005; or T/C, as in Arregi and Nevins, 2012). (6a,b) illustrate the relevant structures:

- (6) a. [_{PolP1} Pol⁰ [_{TP} T [_{PolP} (ez) Pol⁰ [_{AspP...} *etorri...*]]]] Central and Eastern
 b. [_{PolP1} Pol⁰ [_{TP} T... [_{PolP} ∅ [_{VP} v [**root** [_{AspP...} *etorri...*]]]]] Eastern

The insertion of this verbal root has consequences for the cyclic derivation of the sentence: the lower Polarity Phrase goes to Spell Out upon insertion of the root (see Boskovic, 2014) and cannot be accessed by the higher Polarity Head. The closest PolP values the unvalued polarity feature of Polarity/Sigma in the computational component, but is unable to satisfy its edge/EPP condition at PF, as v is a bound form that must obligatorily merge with T (a so-called *synthetic* verb in the Basque grammatical tradition, see De Rijk, 2008). What happens in such a case? The expected outcome, from a view in which displacement to the outer edge is part of the syntactic derivation, is that the derivation will crash, as the root configuration is one that fails to comply with the ban on empty Specs. The derivation nevertheless does not crash: it recruits a higher head, Focus, and attracts a focus operator to its outer edge. That is, in Eastern dialects, unlike in Central ones, something like (7) is possible:

- (7) a. Jonek du liburua erosi
 Jon has book.the bought
 “It is JON who bought the book”
 b. [_{FocP} JONEK FOC [_{PolP1} Pol⁰ [_{TP} T... [_{VP} v **root** [_{AspP...} *erosi...*]]]]]]

(7a,b) is not always possible. I show that the configuration in (7) is not possible in those contexts in which Morphological Merger of the root with T is blocked, as in cases of restructuring, in which aspectual material intervenes between the root and T, or in double auxiliatio, as in (8a): (8) a. *Jonek ditu liburua erosi izan

- Jon.erg has books bought frequentative.be
 “It is JON who used to buy books”
 b. Jonek erosi izan ditu liburua
 Jon.erg bought frequentative.be has books
 “It is JON who used to buy books”

The ungrammatical status of (8a) shows that focus movement cannot be invoked as a general rescuing strategy for the edge condition. The configuration in (7a) is only possible under insertion of a bound auxiliary root. This suggests that the edge condition is subject to an earliness condition: satisfy it in PolP if possible, try the next head up otherwise. Attraction of focus is independent of the edge/EPP feature of Sigma/Polarity, as shown by (8b), but from the point of view of the PF component this is irrelevant, as the strict adjacency condition upon which the EPP/Edge condition is defined is met (*Tense-first). In other words, the EPP/Edge condition, which materializes in the higher Polarity head in ordinary sentences, is alternatively met by Focus at PF in those cases in which the affixal status of the closest v does not allow attracting the vP into Spec of Sigma. This particular rescuing operation is incompatible with a view in which movement is parasitic on Agree. It is expected, on the other hand, in a distributed architecture in which PF and CS impose different demands and EPP related movement is motivated in the former. The detailed comparison of two closely related varieties, in this case central and eastern dialects of Basque, can allow us to factor out the grammatical conditions behind EPP-related movement, and the precise locus of the phenomenon in the general architecture of the grammar. The paper includes careful discussion of the evidence showing the presence of a separate auxiliary root in the relevant varieties, following recent work by Etxepare (2016).