The Basque language is the only living language in Western Europe which does not belong to the Indo-European family, and the only surviving language of those spoken in the south of Gaul and on the Iberian Peninsula before the Indo-European invasions.

All works of any value on the Basque language, with the exception of a book by the Hungarian Ribáry (1877), have been produced in Western European countries: primarily in Spain and France, then England, Germany, Austria, The Netherlands, Italy, and Norway.

For many years, Basque studies were conducted under conditions quite different from those of the Classical, Romance, Germanic, etc. languages, which were taught in the universities. For a long while, there was not a single chair for the Basque language in any university. The first to be established was that of the Basque Language and Literature at the Université de Bordeaux, in the year 1948. Since then, several chairs and study centers have been created, in France at Pau, and in Spain at San Sebastian, Salamanca, Pamplona, and Deusto (near Bilbao). In contrast to other philologists or linguists — Latinists, Hellenists, Germanic specialists, specialists in Indian languages, etc. — Basque scholars have, until recently, trained themselves by studying the language directly and in the works of their predecessors, whose example they often follow, and finally by utilizing their own knowledge and linguistic experience acquired in other areas (classical philology, Indo-European linguistics, Romance languages, Caucasian languages, Tamil, Eskimo, and American Indian languages).

Few truly qualified researchers have specialized exclusively in Basque philology and linguistics. This is due to the fact that these disciplines did not lead to any teaching position and were of no use to students in their examinations and degree requirements. Some progress has been made recently in France. Since 1966, one can select the Basque language, at the University of Bordeaux, as a second living language, in preparation for the teaching degree.

I. REMARKS ON SOME IMPORTANT WORKS APPEARING BEFORE 1918

For a long time, attempts were made to describe and analyze the Basque language by fitting its declension and conjugation into the framework of Latin, Greek, French,
and Spanish grammars, all the while emphasizing that its construction was completely
different from the geographically adjacent languages, Spanish, French, and Gascon.
All the works by earlier Basque specialists should not be underestimated, however, for
they contain some valid observations and bring to light some important material. But
these scholars were too little concerned with defining, according to their written or
oral context, the exact function of noun and verb forms, and with determining their
morphological and syntactical relationships. In addition, they ignored certain facts,
of which they must have been aware, but which did not strike them as being important.
Thus, everyone knew that, in the conjugation, the suffix \(-\text{ke}\) expresses possibility: \(\text{du il l'a}'\), \(\text{dük il peut ou pourra l'avoir}'\). It was also known that, in the Souletin dialect,
\(-\text{ke}\) serves as an expression of the future, on the one hand, and probability, on the
other: \(\text{du il l'a}'\), \(\text{düke il l'aura}'\, 'il l'a sans doute, il doit l'avoir'. But no one asked
what these various uses could have had in common, and what the original meaning of
the suffix might have been. Moreover, no one had noticed that, even in the modern
language, \(-\text{ke}\) could have yet another meaning. For \(\text{dakarke}\) signifies 'il le porte'
(without consideration of termination) compared with \(\text{dakar il l'apporte}'. Neither
had anyone noticed that, in the sixteenth century, the present tense with the suffix \(-\text{ke}\)
was often used, especially in proverbs, to express a timeless truth. No one had studied
the facts together, in order to find a unifying factor in these several meanings, to
determine the original function and to find the place of the forms with suffix \(-\text{ke}\)
in the conjugation system (see below, p. 1770, and Lafon 1943:1.446–54).

For many years, the scholars, grammarians, philologists, and occasionally even
linguists who wrote on the Basque language were primarily concerned with arranging
or presenting in tables the greatest possible number of forms, especially verb forms,
and variants. For the Basque language is very rich in verb forms; and these forms may
contain from one to three person markers. In addition, Basque exists in dialectal
forms: eight dialects, according to Prince Louis-Lucien Bonaparte, these being divided
into sub-dialects (see below, p. 1781). Even the name of the language varies according
to various regions: \(\text{euskara, heuskara, euskera, uskera, uskara, iiskara (pronounced iiská)},
\text{eskuara, eskara). This superabundance of detail discouraged a consideration
of the general characteristics of the language, and, even more, the search for a system.
The result of this was a mass of lists and tables of forms which often came from dif-
ferent regions and epochs, sometimes invented by grammarians, which lacked a
certain homogeneity, and which respected neither the distinction between synchrony
and diachrony, nor the real synchronic situation.

We are going to cite some examples which show the flaws found in certain impor-
tant works, and indicate the precautions which it is necessary to take in order to make
use of them.

The \(\text{Baskische Studien (1893)}\) of Hugo Schuchardt contain, p. 4, a three or four
line comment which is one of the most profound ever made on the structure of the
Basque verb system. Its significance has not however been fully appreciated (Lafon
1943:1.504), because of typographical considerations: it does not stand out and is lost
in the middle of a list of forms. Moreover, this illustrious linguist made an ill-founded comparison of his subject with the Arabic verbal system. His memoir, which is very important, has not been read or utilized as it deserves, for it is too compact, and the reader, overwhelmed by the richness and the variety of documentation, sometimes finds it difficult to follow the author's argument.

Another very important work is Le verbe basque by Bonaparte (1869). Schuchardt made great use of it. The exceedingly long title is: “Le verbe basque en tableaux accompagné de notes grammaticales selon les huit dialectes de l'euskara ... avec les différences de leurs sous-dialectes et de leurs variétés, recueilli sur les lieux mêmes de la bouche des gens de la campagne, dans cinq excursions linguistiques faites dans les sept provinces basques d’Espagne et de France pendant les années 1856, 1857, 1866, 1867, 1869”. This work, never completed, was conceived in a rather strange manner, unfit in itself to suggest any idea of a systematic whole. The initial ‘observations’ contain, though not in any logical order, phonetic, morphological, and lexical material, much of which is important, but which is not systematized. Bonaparte does not take into consideration the fact that Yiscayan occupies a place apart in the group of Basque dialects. The dialects known as literary, i.e. Viscayan, Guipuzcoan, Labourdin, and Souletin, are placed in the foreground, separate from the others. It is often unclear if the forms which the author gives for them are those in current use by the ‘gens de la campagne’, or those of the literary language. Moreover, it would appear unlikely that the ‘gens de la campagne’ had given him, for certain rarely used moods and tenses, complete series of forms, including all the theoretically possible combinations of person markers. As Bonaparte himself admitted (note 1 of the 14th supplementary table) the ‘vernacular Labourdin’ does not present all of the forms which he included in his 10th preliminary table, ‘quoique le dialecte littéraire n’hésite pas à s’en servir’. Finally, the two tables in which he presents ‘les voix, les modes et les temps simples’ and ‘les temps dits composés’ of the four literary dialects do not give a clear and exact picture of the verbal system at all. Bonaparte tried to compile the most exhaustive lists possible. He arrived, finally, at a total of 32 ‘simple tenses’ and 104 ‘compound tenses’. It is this ‘last inventory’ that Henri Gavel and Georges Lacombe reproduced in their Grammar (1937:§24, pp. 50–62), because it is, they say, ‘the most detailed and the most exact’ which, to their knowledge, has ever been made. ‘Il est à peine besoin de faire observer’, write the two authors (1937:51), ‘qu’il est obtenu en tenant compte à la fois de tous les dialectes littéraires et de Liçarrague [a writer of the sixteenth century]; il en résulte qu’aucune variété dialectale, au moins dans son état actuel, ne présente intégralement tous les temps qui figurent dans cette liste.’ Thus we see how tenacious this passion for detail was, and how it led even the Basque specialists who were obviously among those with the greatest knowledge of the Basque language, to consider, on the same level, facts with different dates and from different locations, and fundamental parts of conjugation as well as variants of only minor importance, so that it was impossible to see the major features of the verbal system.
In 1903, C.C. Uhlenbeck published, in German, a memoir whose French translation, made by Lacombe, appeared in 1909 and 1910 in the *RIEB*, and which is a fundamentally important work: *Contribution à une phonétique comparative des dialectes basques*. This work was even more praiseworthy since Azkue's *Dictionnaire* did not yet exist. It is only natural that a great number of the dialectal forms which he cites should be verified. Yet it is surprising that a linguist of his caliber did not think to draw up, if only for one or two dialects, tables of vowels and consonants such as was already being done for other languages. In addition, he did not adequately indicate that certain consonants are not found in final position, others in initial position, and that, if one considers the dialects as a whole, it is within words, between vowels, that the entire series of consonants is found. Finally, he employed terms which are inexact, and which could be misleading, by speaking of 'aspirated n', 'aspirated r', and 'aspirated I'. For if in Basque *ph, th, kh* are indeed aspirated occlusives, which can occur in the middle and at the beginning of words, the digraphs *nh, rh,* and *lh,* on the contrary, mark disjointed groups, where the syllabic boundary passes between *n, r,* or *l* and *h,* and which only occur in the middle of words.

It is impossible to neglect the other dialects, except by proceeding directly to a strictly synchronic description and analysis of a local idiom, or of a literary dialect which possesses a norm. Bonaparte was an incomparable innovator in the field of Basque dialectology, and should be considered as one of the founders of linguistic geography for his beautiful *Carte des sept provinces basques*, which bears the date 1863, but was actually completed in 1871 or 1872. Although his knowledge of the relationships between the dialects was among the most profound, the picture which he presented on page iv of his *Verbe* does not at all reflect the affinities which really exist, and which he notes elsewhere, between the dialects of the eastern half of the country (Lafon 1955).

In any case, Bonaparte's classification of the dialects, sub-dialects, and varieties is solid and valuable even today. It is to be regretted that Azkue did not follow him more closely in his monumental *Dictionnaire* (1905), for he thought it wise to classify under the rubrics AN and BN, the Northern and Southern upper Navarrese and the Western and Eastern lower Navarrese, respectively; moreover, he links to Labourdin the dialect of Bardos, which belongs geographically to Labourd, but which is a distinct variety of Eastern lower Navarrese.

Of course it is not difficult to criticize, especially from a distance of sixty or even one hundred years. The faults which a Basque specialist of today can find in the works just discussed should not, however, make one forget that they are fundamental and are still indispensable instruments of study.

II. BASQUE LANGUAGE STUDIES IN 1918

Between 1905 and 1920, between the *Dictionnaire* of Azkue and the *Eléments de
phonétique basque of Gavel, there appeared no important books on the Basque language. There was, however, a great deal of work being done in this period, thanks to the *Revue internationale des études basques, Revista internacional de estudios vascos*. Founded in 1907 by Julio de Urquijo and Georges Lacombe, both Basques, it continued publication until the beginning of the Spanish Civil War in 1936. It was open to all branches of Basque studies, but it always assigned a privileged position to philology and linguistics, and thus rendered them an inestimable service. It would be impossible to adequately express our gratitude to those who created and directed it. Schuchardt, Uhlenbeck, Vinson, Lacombe, Urquijo, Gavel, and a number of others published articles and reviews in it. In addition, the *RIEB* had published, or had begun to publish, in 1918, some ancient Basque texts which were difficult to obtain, thus making it possible for philologists to study them: *Onsa hilceco bidia* (1666), by Jean de Tartas; *Guero* (1643), by Axular; the *Refranes y Sentencias* of 1596, with a valuable commentary by Urquijo.

The foundation, in 1918, of the Académie de la langue basque (*Euskaltzaindia*), which philologists and linguists along with writers and historians joined from the start, contributed greatly to the development of Basque language studies. A large space is devoted to these studies in the proceedings of the Academy, and in *Euskera*, the journal which it has published since 1920.

**AFTER 1918**

**I. THE PENETRATION OF BASQUE STUDIES BY STRUCTURALISM**

Until 1918, each Basque scholar had maintained his own particular method of approach, and had not been influenced by the structuralist ideas. There was one exception: Uhlenbeck, who was receptive to new concepts in both linguistics and psychoanalysis. It should be remembered that, after 1918 as well as before that date, comments on structural elements can be found in works which are themselves of a traditional point of view.

The expression 'structural linguistics' has been given several different interpretations. The linguists who are now working on the Basque language have adopted, if unaware, the concept which E. Benveniste defines in these terms: ‘La langue forme un système ... De la base au sommet, depuis les sons jusqu'aux formes d'expression les plus complexes, la langue est un arrangement systématique de parties. Elle se compose d'éléments formels articulés en combinaisons variables, d'après certains principes de structure’ (1967:21).

None of the Basque scholars who have adopted the structuralist point of view, or who have been inspired by it, have ever been willing to disregard the meaning of individual words and forms to define the relationships existing between form and meaning in terms of behavior. None of them seems to reject the concepts of balance
and tendency as teleologically vitiated. It is quite doubtful, in fact, that the notion of ‘tendency’ can ever be eliminated from the study of human activities. Likewise, the idea of a hierarchy among the elements of the structure should not be discarded by linguistics, as long as, it goes without saying, it is precisely defined and is not anthropomorphic.

From the methodological point of view, the structuralist spirit is capable of rendering a great service to Basque specialists. It frees them 'de la tyrannie du détail, source de stagnation, de la crainte qu'on éprouve parfois devant la multitude et l'enchevêtrement formidable des faits de langage, car, sur le fond confus des données brutes, se dégageront les traits essentiels de la structure offrant, pour la recherche ultérieure, un cadre adéquat à l'objet'; these remarks, made by A. Martinet in regard to the services which structural linguistics can render to studies of comparative grammar (1956:21), can be applied just as well to studies of the Basque language, which is many-faceted, due to its dialects, but unified in its structure.

Excluding the veteran Uhlenbeck (1866–1951), who always took great interest in general linguistics, the structuralist ideas were introduced into the study of Basque by linguists who, due to their age, came into prominence only in the second quarter of this century. L. Michelena showed himself to be highly influenced by structuralist ideas in his very first works (around 1950). In 1951, a leader of the structuralist school, A. Martinet, tackled the problems of the Basque consonant system, its primitive state, as well as the question of accent in Basque. Later, by studying ‘la construction ergative et les structures élémentaires de l’énoncé’, he recorded the Basque forms and gives them a personal interpretation, believing that Basque belongs to a type of language ‘qui ignore le syntagme sujet-prédicat et qui construit régulièrement ses énoncés par déterminations successives d’un prédicat d’existence’. According to him, everything in Basque can be traced to the relationship ‘determinant-determined’. In 1956, H. Vogt published his Remarques sur la structure formelle du verbe basque.

Having begun my study of Basque and Caucasian languages in 1926, I was a witness to this period in which structural linguistics was born. I would like, at this point, to state briefly how I became involved in these studies, and in what manner I conducted them. I was originally trained as a professor of philosophy. My early orientation towards linguistics was influenced, on the one hand, by the reading of A. Meillet’s Aperçu d’une histoire de la langue grecque, near the end of 1918, and, on the other, by reflection upon the problem of the relationship between thought and language, in particular the problem of the relationship between mental and grammatical categories. I then read F. de Saussure’s Cours de linguistique générale. I did not fully comprehend its importance but found in his distinction between ‘la langue’ and ‘la parole’ the essence of the definition of the social phenomenon given by Durkheim. Moreover, the distinction that Saussure made between the synchronic and the diachronic reminded me of the distinction that Auguste Comte, in founding the study of ‘social physics’, or sociology, established between the static and the dynamic point of view. I had never studied under Meillet or Vendryes, but I found in their books and articles an applica-
tion of the principle, proclaimed by Saussure and themselves, of 'l'accord indispensable entre la philologie et la linguistique'. Furthermore, Meillet had affirmed the importance of the concepts of system and structure several years before the birth of structuralism. In an article on linguistics written in 1915 for a publication entitled *La Science française* (for the San Francisco Exposition), Meillet said, referring to F. de Saussure: 'Toute langue est un système rigoureusement articulé ... Grâce à lui, on a été amené à voir comment tout se tient dans le système d'une langue'. In his *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*, he ends his 'remarques générales sur les éléments morphologiques' with this note: 'On ne remarque pas assez à quel point tout se tient dans la structure d'une langue' (6th ed., 1924:155). In the prefatory note to the revised seventh edition (1934), the last to appear in his lifetime, he alluded to the developments that Saussure's views had initiated in Geneva and Prague. The remark cited above had developed into the following affirmation of principle (p. 187): 'Tout se tient dans la structure d'une langue.'

Two readings had a decisive influence on my orientation; on the one hand, *Les langues du monde*, by a group of linguists under the direction of Antoine Meillet and Marcel Cohen (1924); on the other, the review by Meillet of Alfredo Trombetti's book, *Le origini della lingua basca* (*BSL* XXVI.273, 1925). I realized that no one in France was studying the southern Caucasian languages. Moreover, I was struck when Meillet discussed the composition of a comparative grammar of the Caucasian and Cushitic languages, considered by Trombetti to be the most closely related to the Basque language, as 'deux tâches urgentes qui attendent les jeunes linguistes courageux'. I decided to study Georgian, and then the other Caucasian languages of the South, which form a well-defined and rather homogeneous group. I revealed my plans in a letter in 1926 to M. Cohen, who, in agreement with Meillet, encouraged me. He advised me to look into Basque in order to evaluate Marr's theory on the genetic relationships of Basque and the Caucasian languages. In September of 1926, I met at Larrau (Haute-Soule) the Russian Caucasian specialist Nikolaj Jakovlev, professor at the Oriental Institute of Moscow, who, sent to Paris by his government, had come to spend a few days in this Basque mountain village in order to complete some research. He told me that it was necessary not to limit my study to Caucasian languages of the South, and even advised me to begin with those on the Northern side, a more archaic type, Abxaz, and then Circassian. He explained to me the importance of Baudouin de Courtenay's ideas. Upon his return to Russia, he sent me his *Tablicy fonetiki kabardinskogo jazyka* (Moscow, 1923), in which I saw, for the first time, presented in tabular form, the phonemic system of a spoken language observed first-hand in the field, Kabardian or Eastern Circassian. The author based his study on the ideas of Baudouin de Courtenay, who assigned a differential function to phonemes, and in so doing, became a precursor of phonology. Thus I studied Georgian, Kabardian, and Basque concurrently. I approached the Basque language in two ways: I read texts, books, and articles, especially the admirable linguistic commentary which, in 34 pages, Schuchardt had made of the translation by Liçarrague (1571) of the parable of the
prodigal son, *Primitiae Linguae Vasconum*. In addition, I learned first-hand the idiom of Larrau in the village itself. Gavel and Lacombe provided me with advice and information during this time. Finally, the articles by N.S. Trubetzkoy, notably on the consonantal system of Caucasian languages, made it possible for me to become familiar with phonology at an early date, and to follow its development.

II. INTRODUCTION TO THE LANGUAGE — JOURNALS

Hugo Schuchardt (1842–1927) published towards the end of his long career two short, but important works: *Primitiae Linguae Vasconum: Einführung ins Baskische* (1923), which was mentioned above, and *Das Baskische und die Sprachwissenschaft* (1925), which was reviewed by Meillet (*BSL* XXVI.18–22, 1926).

Brief exposés of the Basque language and its general characteristics: C.C. Uhlenbeck, *La langue basque et la linguistique générale* (1947) — it is possible to measure the progress made in Basque linguistics since the article by the same scholar, *Caractère de la grammaire basque*, which appeared in *RIEB* 11.505–34 (1908); G. Lacombe, *La langue basque in Les langues du monde* (1952) — this chapter had been written between 1938 and 1940 and the bibliography by R. Lafon appeared until February 1953, and the chapter was reviewed by R. Lafon (1953); R. Lafon, *Quelques traits essentiels de la langue basque* (1951a).

Several journals of Basque studies have published, or are publishing, articles and reports on the language, and either ancient or modern texts. The *Revue internationale des études basques* (*RIEB*) appeared until 1936. An index of everything published in volumes I to XX (1929) appeared in 1930, arranged alphabetically by author. The *Boletín de la Real Sociedad Vascongada de Amigos del País* (San Sebastián) (*BRSVAP*) has replaced the *RIEB* since 1945. *Euskera* (Bilbao, 1920–35 and after 1956) is the periodical collection of the works and proceedings of the Académie de la langue basque. *Gure Herria* (*GH*) ‘Notre pays’ (Ustaritz, Basses-Pyrénées), since 1921; the *Bulletin du Musée Basque* (Bayonne), founded in 1924; *Eusko-Jakintza* (*EJ*) ‘Connaissance des choses basques’ (Bayonne, from 1947 to 1957). In 1967 there appeared the first issue of the *Anuario del Seminario de filología vasca ‘Julio de Urquijo’*, devoted to Basque philology and linguistics, and directed by Manuel Agud and Luis Michelena. This journal will have one or two issues per year.

The *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* (*BSL*) previously published, and has continued to publish since 1947, articles and reports dealing with the Basque language. *Via Domitia* (*VD*), published in Toulouse since 1952, often publishes articles on Basque linguistics, philology, and dialectology (with maps).

Since the Basque language splits into various dialects, all those who have written a 'Basque grammar' before or after 1918 have chosen as a base a dialect in which there was a rather well-defined norm, i.e. a so-called 'literary' dialect: this is most often a central dialect, Labourdin or Guipuzcoan, or, less frequently, one of the marginal dialects, Viscayan or Souletin. All of these dialects have been used in the composition of literary works. Cizain, however, a sub-dialect of Eastern lower Navarrese, has been overlooked in this regard — it served, during the sixteenth century, as the language of one of the most beautiful works of Basque literature, the verses of Bernard Dechepare. In any case, the grammars which have been published are not consistent, for they also note characteristics of the spoken language, and sometimes of other dialects. In addition to this, a structuralist could object to the fact that they fail to emphasize the structure of the system, even when they devote a chapter to general characteristics of the language.

It is sufficient to cite La lengua vasca of I. López-Mendizabal (1949), based on Guipuzcoan, and the Gramática vasca (dialecto vizcaíno), of Pablo de Zamarripa y Uranga (1928, 7th ed. 1955). The Grammaire basque of Gavel (1929) is devoted to the 'parties du discours autres que le verbe'. Although meant to be practical above all, it contains some important theoretical insights. It is literary Labourdin which constitutes the base of this grammar; but Souletin is often cited, as well as Viscayan. The second volume, devoted to verbs — on which Lacombe collaborated with Gavel — was never completed; only 80 pages of it were published, in 1937.

The Grammaire basque of Canon Pierre Lafitte (1944, 2nd ed. 1962) is excellent. The author is one of today's best Basque writers. Not being a linguist — as he says himself — he did not try to produce a linguistic study. His book represents a practical and normative approach. The author attempts to define correct usage and to reveal norms of a literary language which, for sixty years, has been based on Labourdin, with an admixture of numerous Navarrese elements, and even traces of Souletin. There is a tendency towards its becoming 'commune à presque tout le Pays basque continental'; the author calls it literary Navarro-Labourdin. The spirit of this grammar is thus quite different from that of structural linguistics. In spite of this, it is indispensable to any Basque specialist, and to general linguists who wish to have a clear idea of the construction of Basque and of its functions. The categories into which the material is divided, even if disputable, do not prevent one from understanding the exact function of the various forms, since the author, who has a profound knowledge of the language, has illustrated his presentation with a large number of expressions and sentences, with exact translations. In addition, he has observed two important features of the verbal system, namely, the opposition between the present and the 'passé-éventuel' forms, and the opposition between simple forms ('sans caractéristique') and those with -ke suffix (§415-417).
In trying to classify the works which have been written on the subject of the sound system of Basque, one immediately runs into difficulty; some works deal with the dialects as a whole, and others only attempt to describe what occurs in one dialect, or even in a local idiom. The latter studies should be included under the rubric ‘dialectology’, but there are some which, although devoted to a dialect or even a local idiom, have a larger significance and present information on structure or evolution common to several dialects. The classification is thus arbitrary, and we will include them here.

The period following 1918 was marked by the publication of two large works: *Eléments de phonétique basque*, by Henri Gavel, in 1920, and *Fonética histórica vasca*, by Luis Michelena, in 1961.

H. Gavel (1878–1959) was born in Normandy. He was a specialist in Romance languages before becoming a Basque specialist, and remained so. He had a thorough knowledge of Spanish and the Gascon language, among other Romance languages. His wife, a Souletine, was quite attached to her native dialect, which was highly regarded in her family circle. Gavel quickly became one of the most respected authorities on Basque. His book, which is his doctoral thesis, is the first general report to be made on Basque phonetics, and it is a fundamental work. No dialect is neglected. Of course, he did not systematize the facts as a phonologist would, but it is usually easy to translate the data which he reports into the vocabulary of the phonologist.

It is sufficient to cite, among the works published in the following years: Azkue, *Fonética vasca* (1919), which contains interesting dialectal material; C. C. Uhlenbeck, *Zur vergleichenden Lautlehre der baskischen Dialekte. Berichtigungen* (1923), which completes and corrects his first memoir; T. Navarro Tomás, *Pronunciación guipuzcoana* (1925); the two books on instrumental phonetics by Abbot Jean Larrasquet, on Souletin (1938, 1939), with drawings, sketches, and palatograms.

Phonological studies. The *Fonética histórica vasca* of L. Michelena represents two important developments: the total application of the phonological approach to Basque; and the consideration of very ancient forms of the Basque language (Aquitanian and the Vasconian language, medieval Basque). The author makes use of all previous important works. He does not of course claim to replace Uhlenbeck’s memoir and Gavel’s work, but his remarkable book goes beyond them while integrating the important points which they contain with the author’s own conceptions, inspired by the principles of phonology. The book contains and keeps separate both the synchronic and diachronic aspects of phonology. The author cites much unpublished data drawn from his own idiom, that of Rentería (Guipúzcoan). He takes all the dialects into consideration, and the northern and southern upper Navarrese, as well as Souletin and Roncalese occupy a much greater place in this work than in any previous study. He examines all the largest problems, including that of accent, which is approached for the first time, in this work, in a direct and comprehensive manner.
It is also the first time that a Basque specialist has, in a work on Basque phonology, included the language of the Aquitanians and the Vasconians (which is, in the opinion of all specialists, an early form of Basque), as well as the Basque common nouns, adjectives, and proper nouns found in medieval documents. The history of the development of the phonetic system of Basque thus begins a little before the Christian era, and, after a lapse of some centuries, can be traced again from the Middle Ages on. Most of the works mentioned in what follows appeared previous to Michelena’s book, and are quoted in it.

A. Synchronic Phonology

Essential characteristics of the Basque system. As a whole, the Basque dialects possess the five vowels $i$, $e$, $a$, $o$, $u$, which are as many phonemes, and serve in the formation of diphthongs, $ei$, $ai$, $oi$; $eu$, $au$. The most striking traits of the consonantal system are the existence of an apical $r$ called hard, written $rr$ between vowels, phonologically distinct from the soft $r$ (as Spanish $r$); alveolar-palatal sibilants, distinct both from pure sibilants, and hushed sibilants (the latter always softened); finally, in the Basque-French idioms, aspirated occlusives, variants of mute occlusives. Basque does not possess the voiced, labio-dental spirant corresponding to mute $f$; the latter does not seem to occur in true Basque words, only in certain expressive words. Several consonants can be softened. $N$, $l$, $t$, $d$ conserve their fundamental articulation, but soft $r$ softens into $ll$. The pure, unvoiced sibilant, with the notation $z$, the alveolar-palatal sibilant, written $s$, and the corresponding unvoiced affricates, when softened, are transformed into palatal sibilants, with the notations $x$ and $tx$. To the four non-softened sibilants, two spirants and two affricates, correspond two softened sounds, a palatalized spirant and affricate. Softening often has an affective function, either diminutive or caressing: $zokho$ ‘corner’, $xokho$ ‘little corner, familiar corner’. But this is not always the case: $jan$ ‘eaten’, $jo$ ‘struck’, $jaun$ ‘seigneur, monsieur’, whose initial sound is pronounced in Labourdin as a softened $d$, do not have an affective function; this softened $d$, moreover, does not stem from an earlier, ordinary $d$, in this case. In the other dialects, the initial letter of these words is pronounced as a $jod$, or as a Spanish $jota$, or as a French $j$ (but softened).

Aspiration (see Lafon 1948). The spirant $h$ and aspirated occlusives are only found in the Basque spoken in the north of the Pyrenees. It is the only case in which the political frontier, which is here a natural boundary, constitutes a linguistic boundary. It is necessary to distinguish between the case of initial $h$, that of the occlusives $ph$, $th$, and $kh$, and that of the sequences $nh$, $lh$, and $rh$ (where the syllabic boundary passes between $n$, $l$, $r$ and $h$; see above p. 1747). Initial $h$ is, in certain dialects, a phoneme which is in contrast to zero (initial vocalic): $hala$ ‘thus’, $ala$ ‘or’. The aspirated occlusives are phonetic variants of ordinary mute occlusives. Nowhere can an $ekhari$, distinct from $ekarri$ ‘carried, brought’, be found. One finds either one or the other, depending on the dialect, and sometimes even depending on the subjects speaking,
which is contrasted with *egarri* ‘thirsty, thirst’. These aspirates are not original forms, as is seen, for example, in *bortha* ‘door’, from Latin *porta*, and *aphirila* ‘April’, from *aprilis*. Finally, the presence of an *h* after *n*, *l*, or *r* (*alhor* ‘field’ is a variation of *alor*), does not determine words or grammatical forms.

There is no Basque word, in any dialect, which terminates with a labial (*m*, *p*, *b*), with a voiced stop, with *f*, *h*, or with the consonant represented by *j*. A Basque word never begins with an *r*, hard or soft. When Basque borrows words beginning with *r*, a prothetic vowel (usually *e* or *a*) precedes, and *r* becomes hard: *errege* ‘king’, *arrapostu*, *errepostu*, ‘answer, response’.

A Basque word cannot contain a double consonant.

Between vowels, voiceless stops undergo no change; voiced stops are liable to become spirants, which are simple variants of stops, or even to disappear.

The vowel *ü* (of the type of *u* in Fr. *lune*) is only found before a consonant or at the end of a word in Souletin (but not in Roncalesse) and in eastern lower Navarrese of the area of Mixe and Bardos. The sequences *üa*, *üi* can be observed in some eastern and western lower Navarrese dialects.

Not all of the Basque dialects have exactly the same phonetic system. That of modern, literary Labourdin (Lafon 1952a:11–21) includes the five vowels and five diphthongs indicated above, and the following twenty consonantal phonemes: the labials *p* and *ph*, *b*, *m*; the labio-dental *f*; the apico-dentals *t* and *th*, *d*, *n*, *j* (indicating softened *d*); the lateral *l*; the apical liquids *r* and *rr*; the sibilants *z* and *tz*; the alveolar-palatal sibilants *s* and *ts*; the palatal sibilants (softened) *x* and *tx*; the dorsals *k* and *kh*, *g*; the laryngal *h*. Softened *n*, *t*, and *l* are not phonemes.

The richest and most complex of the Basque phonetic systems is that of common Souletin, except that it has lost its soft, intervocalic *r*, and consequently the phonological opposition between the soft and the hard *r*: *hari* ‘thread’ has become *hai* (monosyllabic), and *harri* ‘stone’ has not changed (Lafon 1958).

Accent and intonation. We shall indicate only some of the material available on Souletin; in the other dialects, there is no fixed position of accent. The end of the assertive sentence, at least in Basque-French dialects, is marked by a lowering of the voice. The melodic contour of the sentence has been studied, only in an insufficient manner. The Souletin accent is an accent of intensity and at the same time of pitch. Its position is fixed by rules, and falls, in principle, on the penultimate syllable. It shifts according to inflection. Moreover, it is placed on the last syllable in certain verb forms (allocutive forms of familiar address and some forms of the plural), in some of the words which have a diphthong in the final syllable, and in loanwords. Examples: *mendi* ‘mountain’, *mendi* ‘the mountain’, *mendiètan* ‘in the mountains’; *dù* ‘he has it’, *die* ‘they have it’ (indifferent form), *died* and *diñe* ‘id.’ (allocutive forms of familiar address); *diñat* ‘I have it’, *diñágü* ‘we have it’ (allocutive forms of familiar address); *zia* ‘you are’ (polite form); *ziadé, zidé* ‘you (pi.) are’; *ziñán* ‘tree’ (from *zühān*), *ühāitz* ‘mountain stream, river’, but *hōgai* ‘twenty’. The sequences -*ia*, -*úa*, especially in the final syllable, are often reduced to -*i*, -*ú*, even in literary usage, a situation which
greatly increases the number of oxytones: mendian ‘in the mountain’, leihúak ‘the windows’, semia bezála ‘like the son’, günian ‘we had it’ (imperfect), banúak ‘I go’ (masc. alloc.), become mendin, leihúk, semí’bezála, günín, banúk. In the examples listed above, the full form coexists with the contracted form, but this is not always the case. For example, eliza ‘church’. It is easy to see here that elizá ‘the church’ comes from a full form *elizá-a which is not used. The position of the accent on the last syllable thus often indicates that a contraction of vowels has occurred. It is thus possible to reconstruct the earlier forms for which no examples have been found. The study of present-day accentuation thus contributes to diachronic phonology and morphology.

For example, it is certain that ginén ‘we were’ (imperfect), in regard to gináte ‘we would be’, stems from *giná-en, where the past tense suffix took the form -en. The Souletin final elements of the plural ergative, genitive, dative, and instrumental -ék, -én, -ér, -éz stem from the addition of unaccented suffixes, -e-k, -en, -er, -e-z to a plural suffix *-ág, which, constituting the penultimate syllable of the word, receives full stress. The final -ak, unaccented, of the nominative plural, is simply *-ag, whose *-g became mute at the end of the word.

The position of the accent sometimes has a distinctive, morphological function: eliza ‘church’, elizá ‘the church’; bi gizùnen ‘of two men’, bi gizunén ‘of the two men’; die and dié ‘they have it’ (indifferent form; masc.fam. form of address); zía ‘you are’, zitá ‘he was’ (imperfect; masc.alloc.); idi, indefinite ergative of idi ‘ox’, idik, variant of idiak, nominative plural and singular ergative.

The unit of accentuation is most often the word, but certain words have no accent: e.g. eta ‘and’, which is normally a paroxytone, is not accented in zú eta ní ‘you and I’; in ikhúsi dit ‘I saw it’, the auxiliary (dit) is often unaccented. The accent contributes to the demarcation of words. Thus, in the sentence, ikhúsi dit zúe alhabà háen amaéki, ‘j’ai vu votre fille avec sa mère’, literally, ‘vu, je l’ai, de vous, la fille, d’elle, avec la mère’, the position of accents makes it possible to single out a syntagm, whose elements are easy to identify, and four words. But this is not always the case. One quite often has the impression that the word ends with the accented syllable and that the unaccented syllable which follows it, consequently its last syllable, is attached to the following word: the end of the sentence would appear sometimes to be cut into há en-amaéki. Similarly, the syntagms Larrañeko uháitza ‘the mountain stream of Larrau’ (Larráñe ‘Larrau’), alhabáen begiak ‘the eyes of the girl’, are sometimes articulated in another way: Larrañé ko-uháitza, alhabá em-begiak. Examples of such cutting and demarcation have never been noted. They should be studied more closely, the pauses measured, and the melodic curves established.

How, in Souletin, is the lowering of the voice which marks the end of the sentence combined with pitch? There have been no precise studies devoted to this question. It is only possible to present here some personal observations, made without the aid of instruments. Consider the sentence ikhúsi dit zúe alhabà ‘I saw your daughter’. The final a is pronounced on a lower note than the u of zue. If alhabà is no longer the last word, as in the sentence ikhúsi tit zúe alhabà eta arrebà ‘I saw your daughter and (your)
sister', this is no longer the final a of alhabá, but that of arrêbá, which is pronounced on a lower note. In the sentence i khûsi dit zûe alhabá háen amaêki, the e of the final word is pronounced on a note lower than the two accented a's which precede it; the final, unaccented syllable -ki is pronounced with less force than é, and on an even lower note.

Phenomena identical or analogous to those in Souletin have been observed in geographically adjacent dialects, in the eastern lower Navarrese region (districts of Mixe and Bardos). The accentuation of Roncalese, a sub-dialect of Souletin now nearly extinct, corresponds to that of Souletin on certain points, and differs from it on others (Michelena 1961).

Michelena has collected and studied, in chapters 20 and 21 of his Fonética, much important material coming from diverse epochs and dialects. It is to be hoped that he will continue his research and that he will draw from it a theory of accentuation and its development within the group of Basque dialects.

B. Diachronic Phonology

For any question concerning diachronic phonology, I refer the reader to Michelena 1961. The study of the Aquitanian, Vasconian, and Medieval forms has made it possible for him to throw some new light on certain questions, e.g. those of intervocals I and h. The voicing of voiceless stops in initial position, the origins of h and aspirated stops, syllabification, and accentuation, questions which still remain unanswered, have been the object of important works by Martinet and Michelena.

In several articles, the first of which goes back to 1934, Lafon has shown that the change from k to w before a consonant (except soft r and s) and at the end of a word in the Souletin dialect and in some adjacent dialects, is the most striking example of a tendency towards the palatalization of the semi-vowel u which is revealed in the eastern half of the Basque region, and more particularly in the north-east region. For example, in regard to zu 'you', su 'fire', banu 'if I had it', nuen 'I had it', eskua 'the hand', in Labourdin and the Basque-Spanish dialects of the West, there are, in certain regions of the east, zûi, sûi, banûi, nûîn, nîn, nian, eskuia, eskûia, eskia; gauza 'thing' (from Lat. causa) has become gaiza. This tendency is strongest in Soule. It becomes weaker the farther one goes towards the west. It is due to the contact of Basque with languages possessing the vowel û (Gascon; Provençal in Navarre, from the second half of the eleventh century to the fourteenth century.)

V. VERSIFICATION

Song, that is to say poetry which is sung, holds an important position among the Basques. Basque verse, today as in other times, is almost always composed with the intention of being sung, and usually to traditional tunes. Julio Caro Baroja states,
with reason (Caro Baroja 1949:477): ‘On ne conçoit pas un vers basque sans musique, si élémentaire qu'elle soit, à moins qu'il ne s'agisse d'une œuvre savante, d'un auteur qui a subi directement et nettement l'influence de la littérature écrite espagnole ou française.’

Basque verse rhymes; but there is no attempt made to use rich or rare rhyme. Sometimes only simple assonance is involved. Each verse has, in principle, a fixed number of syllables. There are several metrical schemes: among others, 8 plus 7 syllables, 7 plus 6, 7 plus 7. The syllabic count often provides some interesting indications as to the pronunciation. Thus it can be seen, for example, that in Cizain, in the time of Dechepare (1545) as today, the nominative singular *semia* ‘the son’ was sometimes pronounced with three syllables and sometimes with two, that the final vowels are elided before a word beginning with a vowel, and that the soft r’s were suppressed between vowels, after which the two vowels were contracted into one, or a diphthong made. The Souletin poets vary widely in their choice of the full and contracted forms possible. This could provide some interesting material for a statistical analysis.

J. Haritschelhar, from Saint-Etienne-de-Baïgorry, beginning in 1961, published some important articles on the structure of Basque verse compared with Spanish, French, and Gascon verse. In September 1968 he completed his doctoral thesis, devoted to the Souletine peasant-poet Etchahoun (1786–1862), which greatly adds to our knowledge of the techniques of popular Basque poetry and oral transmission, sometimes with the aid of notebooks of songs. ‘There is a tendency to believe that in a song, the Basque appreciates the words much more than the melody. Certainly, the poet’s primary concern is to say something; but he does so by means of the music. One can even say that the music is the very heart of poetic expression. In general, the popular poet does not create the melody. He adopts an old tune in order to compose a new song. The indication of the tune by the poet is a relatively recent thing: it dates from the middle of the nineteenth century. However, as in the manner of the French song, the Basque song leads us into the labyrinth of “false timbres”, which, to the extent to which they can be perceived and understood, permit us to establish a chronology of songs, which are for the most part undatable. It should be noted that occasionally a song may change its melody. Basque melodies are characterized by the use of short intervals, a certain preference given to the minor, an evident simplicity, and, an important point, its syllabification. Musicologists have discerned numerous foreign influences, principally from the eighteenth century. However, the Basque song form existed well before this time, and among those which have reached us are some which date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Any study of Basque metrics should include a consideration of the verse, the stanza, and the music which in general took part in the poetic creation. But this is made difficult by the absence of a chronology and by the essentially movable character of this oral literature’ (Haritschelhar 1969).
VI. MORPHOLOGY

Besides in the grammars, morphology has been studied by Azkue, in his _Morfologia vasca_ (1925), a book of 930 pages in which he has utilized the results of his investigations and his examinations of texts. The report is often confused, and lacks order. ‘Le but de l’ouvrage’, says George Lacombe (BSL XXVI/2.274, 1925), ‘n’apparaît pas nettement: ce n’est ni une grammaire comparée des différents dialectes, ni une grammaire historique d’un dialecte déterminé, ni une description d’un parler pris à part, mais un peu de tout cela à la fois.’ Moreover, the author has not made any attempt to present the general outlines of the system. This book nevertheless contains a great deal of information and quotation, as well as many verb forms, especially Viscayan, some of which preserve an archaic form, while others reveal a tendency towards innovation. Its reading is indispensable.

Basque is a language in which words can often be analyzed without difficulty, and in which the markers which are added to roots, to stems, and to other markers are clearly perceived. In other words, it often proceeds by agglutination. Sometimes, however, the affixation of markers to roots, stems, and other markers has given rise to phonetic changes, which have in turn given rise to unpredictable, irregular forms. But the comparison of dialects and the study of texts of various epochs sometimes make it possible to reconstruct forms older than those which are in evidence, forms in which the markers are regularly affixed to basic, or previously marked, forms can easily be seen.

The conjugation utilizes both prefixes and suffixes, the declension only suffixes. The morphological elements used in conjugation are different from those of declension. Derivation is obtained mainly by means of suffixes; the prefixes play only a minor role.

A. The Root

Uhlenbeck has studied the different types of structure of the Basque roots in his memoir of 1942, translated into French under the title _Les couches anciennes du vocabulaire basque_ (EJ, 1947).

The root is sometimes used in its simple state, with neither prefix nor suffix. This is the case for the noun-roots in the indefinite nominative, for some verb radicals, and for 2nd pers. sing. forms of intransitive verbs whose root begins with a vowel: _ni_ ‘I’, _su_ ‘fire’, _ur_ ‘water’, _hitz_ ‘speech, word’, _harri_ ‘stone’, _har_ ‘to take’, _oa_ ‘you go (fam.), go!’, Soul. _aigü_ ‘come! (fam.)’. Two roots, one verbal and the other nominal, may be homonyms: thus _har_ ‘to take’ and _har_ ‘worm’ (see Lafon 1950).

The roots of words ending in _e_ or _o_ sometimes change this vowel into _a_: thus, from _luze_ ‘long’ one gets _luzatu_ ‘to elongate’, from _zilho_ ‘hole’, _zilhatu_ ‘to dig’. This is the only type of alternation that Basque roots exhibit.

B. Categories

On the categories of gender and number, see Lafon 1947, 1954b, and 1957b.
# TABLE OF CASE SUFFIXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proper nouns</th>
<th>Indefinite declension</th>
<th>Definite declension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>(e) k</td>
<td>A k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>[r] i</td>
<td>AR i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st genitive</td>
<td>[r] en</td>
<td>AR en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitive</td>
<td>[r] ekin</td>
<td>AR ekin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd genitive</td>
<td>(e) ko</td>
<td>(e) ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>(e) z</td>
<td>A z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inessive</td>
<td>(e) n</td>
<td>A n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lative</td>
<td>(e) ra(t)</td>
<td>(e) ra(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>(e) tik</td>
<td>(e) tik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td>[r] ik</td>
<td>does not exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e): vowel interpolated between two consonants; [r]: consonant interpolated between two vowels.

* In Souletin, the plural endings -ek, -er, -en, -ez are accented.

## C. Declension

The declension does not involve any distinction between grammatical genders. All the substantives and adjectives are declined in the same way, by the use of case endings added to the stem, and of postpositions affixed to the stem, or to a form with a case ending.

The declension in literary Labourdin has not changed since the time of the oldest texts.

The attributive adjective is placed after the substantive and is the one element that receives the case ending. If there are several adjectives, only the last is declined. Examples: etxe ‘house’, berri ‘new’, etxe berri ‘new house’, etxearen ‘of the house’, etxe berriaren ‘of the new house’, etxe berri handiaren ‘of the big new house’. The syntagm formed by a substantive followed by one or more attributive adjectives, acts as a single substantive.

The declension of all common nouns or adjectives includes three form modifications which constitute what is called the indefinite, singular, and plural. The definite declension, with both singular and plural, contrasts with the indefinite declension, which does not distinguish number. The indefinite nominative is the stem of the noun: harri ‘stone(s)’, harria ‘the stone’, harriak ‘the stones’. Harriz bethe can be translated ‘full of stone’ or ‘full of stones’. With a numeral the indefinite is used, except in the case of a specified group: lau harri ‘four stones’, lau harriak ‘the four stones’.

The final consonant of a stem may not occur next to another consonant belonging to a case ending. An e is interpolated between the two. On the other hand, in the
declension of proper nouns and other nouns in the indefinite, vowels cannot, under these same conditions, occur next to one another. A soft r is placed between them: *seme* 'son', indef.gen. *seme-r-en*, as opposed to gen.sing. *semearen* and gen.pl. *seme-en*.

In literary Labourdin, the affixation to the stem of case suffixes in the singular and plural takes place with no other modifications of the stem than the following two: a stem ending in a loses this a before a suffix beginning with a or e; when a stem ends with e and the suffix begins with e, the two e’s may be contracted to form one. But in most dialects, contact of the final vowel of a stem with an a or an e belonging to the suffix, gives rise to phonetic changes: *seme, semia* 'the son'; *zeru* 'sky', *zeria* or *zeria* 'the sky'. In Souletin, the addition of case endings produces also displacements of accent: *zelu* 'sky', *zelako* 'of the sky', *zelia* 'the sky'; *eliza* 'church', *eliza* 'the church' (in the other dialects, excluding Viscayan, *eliza* is given the same pronunciation in the indefinite nominative and singular nominative).

The case endings are affixed directly to the stem in the declension of proper nouns of location and person, which is a continuation of an earlier system. In the declension of common nouns and adjectives, the case endings are sometimes affixed to the stem, sometimes to the stem with a marker. In the plural, only the marker e appears clearly in Souletin, because it receives the accent in the final syllable. In this dialect, for example, the plural ergative *gizunek* (from *gizun* 'man') is distinguished from the indefinite ergative *gizonek*. The plural ergative does not differ in any way from the indefinite (gizonak), but a comparison with Souletin shows that the e of the indefinite (gizonek) is a connecting vowel (*gizon-e-k*), while the e of the plural -ek belongs to the ending of the plural ergative (-ek in contrast to -ak of the singular and -k of the indefinite). The same holds for the endings of the first genitive and the instrumental.

This system is not homogeneous, and diverse levels can be distinguished within it (e.g. work by Bonaparte, Vinson, van Eys, Schuchardt, Gavel, Lacombe; Lafon 1960:192–9). *Ta* was originally a derivational suffix whose exact function is not known; *a/ar* is the stem of the 3rd person demonstrative; *e* (accented in Souletin) comes from *-ag-e-* (see above, p. 1756); *eta*, which is found in many toponyms, is, without doubt, the plural of the Latin collective suffix -etum. The unitive was originally a syntagm signifying ‘in the company of’. The suffix *-tik*, in certain dialects -ti, is none other than the suffix -ti which serves in the formation of adjectives; the -k of the partitive has been added to it almost universally. The suffix -ko, which may be added not only to the basic stem, but to the suffixes of the instrumental, the inessive, and the lative, originally served in the formation of complements of nouns, which are sometimes treated as adjectives; it has been integrated into the declension. It may not be added to nouns designating living beings. The partitive formerly functioned like the ablative and served to express the place from which one came; Souletin and Viscayan have preserved traces of this use.

A noun or a nominal syntagm in the genitive (in -en, -e, -ko) constitutes a new noun or syntagm which can be declined: *gizonarena* 'celui de l’homme', *gizonenak* 'ceux des
homines'. In Basque, an active or ergative case, always marked, is opposed to the unmarked nominative. The subject of verbs which express a state, or change of state, or an activity which does not concern an external object, appears in the nominative; but with verbs expressing an action that implies the distinction between agent and recipient, the latter is in the nominative and the agent in the ergative: haurra hemen dago 'the child remains here'; haurrak ikusi du gizona 'the child saw the man'; gizonak ikusi du haurra 'the man saw the child'. Three cases of the declension are functionally related to the person markers contained in the verbs: the nominative, the ergative, and the dative: d- indicates the subject in dago 'he remains', and the recipient of the action in du 'he has it'; in this last form, the agent of the 3rd pers. singular is characterized by the absence of a marker (zero suffix). Gizona dagoka haurrari aldean 'the man remains beside the child' means, literally, 'the man to him remains to the child at the side'; -ka signifies 'to him'.

The partitive replaces the indefinite nominative of common nouns and adjectives in negative and interrogative propositions: ez dago hemen haurrik 'There is (are) no child (children) left here'.

The declension of personal pronouns and especially of demonstratives presents some peculiarities.

Personal pronouns:
1st sing. ni, gen. ene 1st pl. gu, gen. gure
2nd sing. hi, i, gen. (h)ire 2nd polite zu (old pl. become sg. polite, gen. zure)
2nd pl. zuek, gen. zuen

Three demonstratives used as personal pronouns: haur, hau, au, Latin 'hic', hori, ori 'iste', hura, urala, Visc. a 'ille'. The 3rd pers. demonstrative is also used anaphorically. The stems of the other cases in the singular are of the type (h)on-, (h)orr-, (h)ar-. The 3rd pers. demonstrative has furnished the definite declension with the marker a/ar for several cases in the singular.

Interrogatives: nor 'who?', zer 'what?'. In the old language, they also served as indefinite: 'one', 'something'.

Here and there one finds the remains of older systems, for example a plural suffix -(t)zu in baizu 'some (pl.—)' in regard to bat 'one', and an ablative-partitive suffix -r-ean in Old Viscayan.

D. The Verb

The complexity of the verb contrasts with the simplicity of the declension. A verb form in Basque may contain up to three person markers, as well as the marker of its role in the sentence. The basic outline of the conjugation is simple; but the details are often very complex.

Around 1936, I began a comprehensive study of the verb forms contained in sixteenth century texts, and tried to define the functions of the various markers which
could be affixed to roots or to other markers and to describe their system. This was done without any preconceived notions of Romance, Caucasian, or any other origin. Vendryes' comments on the fragility of the distinction between active and passive, transitive and intransitive categories (Le langage, p. 125) were taken into account. I attempted to show how these markers were combined or kept separate, and which ones necessitated the use of the others. As a result, in several articles, some aspects of the ideas presented in my book of 1943, Le système du verbe basque au XVIe siècle, were corrected and clarified. I ceased to translate the verb forms of the 2nd class with the passive forms in French, for this procedure, which Schuchardt had followed and recommended because of his 'passive conception' of the transitive verb in Basque, appeared unjustified to me. Moreover, I sought to determine to what extent the forms of the 3rd person, of the 'non-person' as E. Benveniste calls it, resembled those of the 'person' (1st or 2nd) and in what way they differed.

In order to understand the structure and functioning of the Basque verbal system, it is necessary to examine the following points:

1. The opposition between two verb classes
2. Personal and impersonal forms
3. Simple and compound forms
4. Base forms:
   a) person markers:
      i) subject
      ii) recipient and agent
      iii) object of the reference
      iv) interlocutor taken as witness
      (There exist two types of subject markers, as well as recipient and agent, which characterize two groups of forms; in contrast to this, the markers of object of reference are common to the two groups.)
   b) past tense suffix
5. Morphemes without a syntactic role, affixed to base forms:
   a) suffix of indetermination — -ke, -te, -teke
   b) prefixes ai- (votive) and albait- (prescriptive)
6. Morphemes with a syntactic role, affixed to base forms and forms with a suffix of indetermination:
   a) relative suffix -n
   b) suffix -la
   c) prefix ba-
   d) prefix bait-
7. Tables of moods and tenses
8. Significance of the opposition between the two groups of forms

Ever examples of Personal Verbal Forms

Class I: root go- 'rester', radical ego-. 1st group: nago 'je reste', ago 'tu restes; reste!'
The Two Classes of Verbs. Basque verbs are divided, according to their syntactic behavior and the structure of their personal forms, into two classes. These are called intransitives and transitives. But these two terms do not have, in Basque, the same meaning as, for example, in Latin and the Romance languages. The verbs of the 1st class contain no indication of the agent and cannot be used in conjunction with a substantive or a pronoun in the ergative; those of the 2nd class contain a marker for an agent and a recipient, and can be used in conjunction with an ergative. Those of the first express states, changes of states, and actions which do not involve an object: ‘to be’, ‘to remain, stay’, ‘to become’, ‘to go’, ‘to fall’, ‘to walk’, ‘to speak’. They always have a person marker, which is a prefix and functions as a nominative, and are used in conjunction with a substantive or a nominative pronoun, which is their subject. They may contain, in addition, a suffix in the dative, which indicates in relation to whom or to what the action takes place (referent). ‘To follow’ is a combination of a subject in the nominative and a referent in the dative. Verbs of Class II express actions which one being or object (agent) exercises on another (recipient). They express polar processes. They have an agent marker in the ergative and a recipient in the nominative. Nevertheless, certain verbs of this class always have a recipient marker in the 3rd pers. singular, which designates some undetermined thing, and are never accompanied by a noun in the nominative: thus iraun ‘to last’, and iraki ‘to boil’; that which lasts, that which boils is in the ergative; duration and boiling are treated as actions involving something indefinite and impersonal.

Since, on the one hand, the personal recipient prefixes are identical to those of the subject and, on the other hand, the personal forms of transitive verbs are constructed with the ergative as their past participles, Schuchardt concludes that the transitive verb in Basque is of a passive nature. In effect, d- indicates the 3rd pers., without distinction of gender, in dakusa ‘he sees it’ as in da ‘he is’, and it is possible to add the ergative haurrak, from haur ‘child’, to dakusa, as to the past participle ikusi ‘seen’. Thus, as haurrak ikusi gizona signifies ‘the man seen by the child’, haurrak dakusa gizona ‘the child sees the man’ in reality signifies ‘the man is seen (he-is-seen-by-him) by the child’.

But this passive interpretation of the ‘transitive’ in Basque is open to serious objections. First, Basque possesses forms which may seem passive, and which are all formed by means of the auxiliaries ‘to be’ and ‘to become’. To the simple form dakusa ‘he sees it’ and to the equivalent compound form ikusten du, literally ‘he has it in sight’, corresponds ikusten da, literally ‘it is in sight’, which may mean ‘it is seen’, or one
sees it’ or ‘it sees itself (il se voit)’. But it is not possible to add to this last form a substantive or a pronoun in the ergative designating the agent.

_Dakusa_ ‘he sees it’ and _daroa_ ‘he makes it go’ have as significant elements only the root (kus-, roa-) and the recipient prefix of 3rd pers. d-; -a- is a connecting vowel: the final a in _dakusa_ has no morphological function (in some dialects one says _dakus_). These forms of the 2nd class may be superimposed on _dago_ ‘he stays’, _da_ ‘he is’, forms of the 1st (roots _go, a_). If _dakusa_ ‘he sees it’ is compared with _dakusat_ ‘I see it’, _dakusak_ ‘you (fam.) see it’, it is immediately noticed that the agent of the 3rd pers. sing. is unmarked. It is not however possible to conclude from this that the verb _kus-_ ‘to see’ is conceived of and formed passively, and that _dakusa_ signifies exactly ‘it is seen (by him)’ and _dakusat_ ‘it is seen by me’. The fact that _d_- expresses the recipient and not the agent does not in the least imply that the forms of Class II, in which it occurs, are passive. It is incorrect to state that, in principle, what is not active is passive. One only has to consider those languages where it is the middle voice, and not the passive, which is opposed to the active. This being the case, the verbs of the first class express processes which do not involve a distinction between an agent and a recipient. Those of Class II express actions which do involve this distinction. A marker is necessary apart from the verb only when the process concerns two beings or objects which are different and should be distinguished. This is not the case for verbs of Class I; their subject need not be marked. With verbs of Class II, it is important to mark, especially in the non-personal, the agent, the one with whom the action originates. It is put in the ergative. In order to distinguish the agent from the recipient, the latter is left unmarked. It is thus treated separately from the verb, in the same way as the subject of a verb of Class I. It is thus natural that it also be expressed in the verb itself by the same markers as the subject of a Class I verb. At the same time, this explains the fact that the forms with an agent in the 3rd pers. sing. are capable of being superimposed on the forms of the first class, with a subject in the same person. The 3rd pers. sing. being the impersonal, it may not be indicated in the verb itself, since it is indicated, if the agent is expressed apart from the verb, by the ergative ending. Thus an economy of markers is realized in making some personal forms of Class II capable of being superimposed on forms of the first. When it is necessary to indicate the person (properly speaking, the 1st or 2nd), or the impersonal plural, certain endings marking the person of the agent or the plural are added to these superimposed forms.

2. Personal and Impersonal Forms. The first, which vary according to mood and tense, may contain from one to four person markers; they are quite numerous. The impersonal forms, in the French-Basque dialects (including their sub-dialects on the southern side of the Pyrenees), are, for the majority of verbs, only three in number: the past participle, the verb radical, and the verbal noun: _ebili, ebil, ebilte_ ‘to walk’; _ikusi, ikus, ikuste_ ‘to see’; _hartu, har, hartze_ ‘to take’.

The past participle and the verbal noun are formed by adding suffixes to the radical: -_i, -tu_ (the latter borrowed from Latin); -_te, -tze_. It is in the form of the past participle
that verbs are given and listed in dictionaries. The past participle and the verbal noun are declined like any adjective or substantive. The verb radical cannot be declined. It simply expresses the verbal idea. It may be employed as a verb, with diverse modal values, which depend on the context (e.g. intemporal indicative, infinitive of narration, imperative), or as an attributive adjective accompanying an auxiliary verb: *ebil dadin* 'qu'il marche' (subj.), lit. 'qu'il devienne marchant'; *har dezan* 'qu'il le prenne', lit. 'qu'il le fasse pris'. It is now active, now passive in meaning; its diathesis is ambivalent. Certain personal forms are made from the verb radical, which can be conjugated.

When the past participle ends in *-n, -ki, or -o*, there is no radical distinct from the participle; the latter combines both functions. On the other hand, Viscayan, Guipuzcoan, and northern and southern upper Navarrese today do not make the distinction between the radical and the participle in the conjugation; one says *ebili dadin, artu dezan*.

The radical of denominative verbs is identical with the substantives or adjectives from which they are derived, for their past participle is obtained by adding to these substantives or adjectives the ending *-tu*, and if this suffix is removed from the participle, the substantive or adjective with which we began is found. From *handi* 'large', *gizon* 'man', *gure* 'our', gen. of *gu* 'us', *diziplina* 'discipline', the participles *handitu* 'grown (up)', *gizondu* 'become or rendered man', *guretu* 'become or rendered ours', *diziplinatu* 'disciplined' are made. The corresponding radicals, without *-tu*, are identical with the words which served as a point of departure.

3. **Simple and compound forms.** Some of the personal forms are simple (or strong), others are composed of a simple personal form of one of four auxiliaries ('to be', 'to become', 'to have', 'to do') and an impersonal form of the principal verb: past participle in the form of the base stem or the genitive with *-en* or *-ko*; verb radical, or, if lacking, the past participle; verbal substantive with the suffix *-n* (inessive). There are double compound forms of the past tense, as in French, of the type *ebili izan naiz* 'j'ai eu marche'. In modern literary Labourdin, besides auxiliaries, there remain only eight verbs with certain simple forms. There were at least fifty in the sixteenth century. But even at that time, many of them possessed only a small number of them. By far the richest in simple forms were the four which now serve as auxiliaries.

In any Basque dialect, if you know the conjugation of auxiliaries, you can conjugate almost all the other verbs. The rules for the combination of the impersonal forms of the main verb with the personal forms of the auxiliary are simple. The latter are quite numerous; many of them are not highly predictable, and some are completely anomalous.

4. **Basic forms.** These are forms which contain only the root or radical and the person markers, plus, when necessary, the past ending. The addition of the affirmative particle *ba-* or the negation *ez* does not modify their nature: *dakit* and *badakit* 'I know it', *ez dakit* or *eztakit* 'I do not know it'.

3. **Some personal forms are simple (or strong), others are composed of a simple personal form of one of four auxiliaries ('to be', 'to become', 'to have', 'to do') and an impersonal form of the principal verb: past participle in the form of the base stem or the genitive with *-en* or *-ko*; verb radical, or, if lacking, the past participle; verbal substantive with the suffix *-n* (inessive). There are double compound forms of the past tense, as in French, of the type *ebili izan naiz* 'j'ai eu marche'. In modern literary Labourdin, besides auxiliaries, there remain only eight verbs with certain simple forms. There were at least fifty in the sixteenth century. But even at that time, many of them possessed only a small number of them. By far the richest in simple forms were the four which now serve as auxiliaries.

In any Basque dialect, if you know the conjugation of auxiliaries, you can conjugate almost all the other verbs. The rules for the combination of the impersonal forms of the main verb with the personal forms of the auxiliary are simple. The latter are quite numerous; many of them are not highly predictable, and some are completely anomalous.

4. **Basic forms.** These are forms which contain only the root or radical and the person markers, plus, when necessary, the past ending. The addition of the affirmative particle *ba-* or the negation *ez* does not modify their nature: *dakit* and *badakit* 'I know it', *ez dakit* or *eztakit* 'I do not know it'.
a) Person markers:
There are two types of person markers of subject and agent/recipient. The two groups of simple forms which they characterize, respectively, are clearly distinguishable by their meanings. The markers of the first type indicate the present indicative and all that which expresses neither a command involving the 3rd person, nor an eventuality, nor the past. The markers of the second type occur in the forms which express the last three ideas. The past tense ending, -n, can only occur in forms which contain markers of the second type. This contrast between the two groups of forms is expressed, moreover, rather often, but not always, by the timbre of the vowel which, in many forms, precedes the root.

(i) Subject markers. These are always prefixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>first type</th>
<th>second type</th>
<th>pers. pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>n-</td>
<td>n-en-, n-in-</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>zero, h-</td>
<td>(h)-en-, (h)-in-</td>
<td>hi, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>g-</td>
<td>g-en-, g-in-</td>
<td>gu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r</td>
<td>z-</td>
<td>z-en-, z-in-</td>
<td>zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>d-</td>
<td>zero, z-, l-, b-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In texts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the marker for 2nd pers. sing. is usually zero; in French-Basque, however, the pronoun is hi. In the present state of research, it is not known if the initial letter of this pronoun and the marker were both h, another consonant (dorsal? laryngal?), or zero. New 2nd pers. pl. forms have been created by adding plural suffixes to the old forms, which had become polite singular forms. The prefix d-, which expresses the impersonal without any distinction of number, does not resemble any other pronoun. The marker -en-, -in- has not been explained; -en- would appear to be older. The z- of the second type is without doubt not an original form; it must come from zen, zan 'he (it) was', the older form was zero. l- is perhaps a result of ahal, al 'possible'; b- is no doubt the initial consonant of the pronoun and adjective ber 'same'. In order to form the plural of the 3rd pers., plural suffixes are added. The 3rd pers. corresponds with the first two persons in the forms of the first group; it is distinct from them in those of the second.

(ii) Recipient and agent markers
First group of forms. These are formed like those of Class I; but they contain, in addition, the agent marker, which is a suffix. The recipient is expressed by those prefixes which indicate the subject in Class I verbs. If these markers are indicated by S, the root by R, and the agent suffixes by A, the forms of the first group of the first and second classes may be represented, respectively, by the acronyms SR and SRA.

Agent suffixes:
Second group of forms. It is necessary to distinguish between several sub-groups, corresponding to the following cases:

- recipient of 1st and 2nd pers.;
- recipient of 3rd: agent of 3rd;
- recipient of 3rd: agent of 1st and 2nd.

The recipient forms of 1st and 2nd pers. are formed like those of Class I; but they contain, in addition, an agent suffix, which is the same as in the corresponding forms of the first group. If one lets S' stand for the subject markers of the 1st and 2nd pers. of the second type, the subject/recipient forms of the 1st and 2nd pers. of the second type may be represented as: S'R and S'RA. Example: menkarren 'il m’amena' (agent: zero suffix).

3rd pers. recipient and agent. These forms, in Viscayan, do not contain any person marker in the preterite: ekarren 'il l’apportait', elsewhere zekarren. They were originally formed from the radical, but sometimes the vowel e- of the radical was replaced by a (zakarren), due to the force of analogy. Ekarren is morphologically parallel with egoan, zekarren with zegoen 'il restait', and bekar 'qu’il l’apporte!' with bego ‘qu’il reste!’.

Recipient of 3rd pers. and agent of 1st or 2nd. Here the mechanism breaks down. These forms are obtained by adding to the radical, to indicate the agent, the prefixes n-, h-, or zero, sometimes g-, z-, most often gen-, gin-, zen-, zin-, which, when added to the root, express the recipient: nekarren 'je l’apportais'. In nakusan ‘je le voyais’, zenakusan ‘vous le voyiez’ (root kus-), the vowel e of the radical has been replaced later by a. These forms are not parallel to any other form of Class I or II. The agent of the 2nd pers. sing. being expressed, in this case, by a prefix, the masculine gender is no longer distinguished from the feminine: (h)uen ‘tu l’avais’.

The imperative forms with recipient of the 3rd pers. and agent of the 2nd occupy a special place: they are formed from the radical by adding to it the agent suffix: ekark ‘bring it’.

(iii) Referent markers. There exist in Basque verbal forms which contain a personal suffix indicating to whom the process is destined, or in relation to whom or to what it takes place. This suffix expresses the grammatical person of the complement of attribution or of the referent. If this complement is expressed apart from the verb in the form of a substantive or pronoun, it is in the dative. The person markers in the dative
are identical with the agent person markers, or differ only slightly from them (occasionally -ku instead of -gu). They are sometimes preceded by an impersonal element -k or -ki, which has undergone various modifications. In the 3rd pers. sing., although the agent is unmarked (zero suffix), the complement of the referent is always marked.

Examples: nagok ‘I remain in relation to you’; (nagok aldean ‘I remain at your side’, aldean signifying ‘beside’), Class I form with two person markers; dautak ‘tu me l’as’, Class II form with three person markers. Except in very rare cases, the forms of Class II which contain a dative marker have a recipient in the 3rd pers.

(iv) Speaker taken as witness. The Basque conjugation includes an entire series of forms called allocutives, which constitute one of its most original characteristics. They exist in all the dialects. When one addresses a person with whom one normally uses the familiar address, forms are necessarily employed, in the literary language as well as in ordinary conversation, in an independent or principal assertive clause, which, in addition to the necessary person markers, contain a suffix of the 2nd pers. sing., masculine or feminine, -k or -n, depending upon the sex of this person. These forms, which indicate that the speaker considers the person addressed a witness to what is being said, contain one person marker more than the usual corresponding forms, i.e. two or three (Class I), or three or four (Class II). These allocutive endings are not functionally related to any case of the declension. They may only be used in forms which do not already contain a marker of the 2nd pers. sing. or plural (of the subject, recipient, agent, or referent).

Examples: Class I: niagok, niagon ‘je reste’; diagotak, diagotan ‘il me reste’; Class II: diat (the masc. gender marker has disappeared), dinat ‘je l’ai’; ziaukutek, ziaukuten ‘ils nous l’ont’ (neutral form: daukute).

Souletin and a part of Eastern lower Navarrese possess, in addition, several polite allocutive forms, which should be used when speaking to a person with whom the familiar form of address is not used. They contain a suffix which is identical with the personal pronoun of the 2nd polite form, or comes from it, and which does not indicate the sex of the interlocutor: Soul, dik, din, dizii; neutral form, diu.

Thus, in Basque, the distinction between masculine and feminine, which is absent in the declension, is achieved in the conjugation by means of suffixes, in order to indicate the sex of whomever one is speaking to. It is certainly an early form. The endings -k (doubtless from *-g) and -n do not resemble anything else in the language, no more than the ending -t (doubtless from *-d) of the 1st pers. sing. The distinction between the masculine and the feminine is not made when the person to whom one is speaking is the subject or recipient, since it is then indicated by a prefix. Since the 2nd pers. sing. has taken on a tone of familiarity, in order to maintain and indicate the distinction between genders in a verb form it is necessary that the person speaking should use the familiar form of address with the person he is speaking to. Because of this, the distinction between genders, which formerly indicated only the sex of the addressee, now also indicates degrees of familiarity. Only women or children of the female sex are addressed with the familiar form in the feminine. When an animal or inanimate object is addressed, it is treated in the masculine.
b) Past-tense ending. This ending, -n (-en, -an), only occurs in forms which contain person markers of the second type, or which, as Visc. egoan ‘il restait’, ekarren ‘il l’apportait’, are formed from the radical and contain no person marker. It is identical with the -n which serves to mark certain past participles.

The outstanding characteristic of the verbal system is that the simple forms which signify a past event are not formed like those which signify one in the present or future, but rather like those which signify an eventuality, or a command concerning a third person. In other words, an event in the past is not put on the same level as one in the present or future, but on the same level as an eventuality or a command in the 3rd person. In Basque, the past and reality are mutually exclusive; that which is past is not real; that which is real does not belong to the past. The past is an ‘ex-real’. The past, unreal, and what is seen as only eventual or as indirect command, share, in this conception, the same aspect of unreality. Events thus belong to two levels of thought: the real (forms of the first group: present or future) and the unreal (forms of the second group: commands involving the non-personal, eventual, and past).

The perfect tense (always compound) sartu da ‘il est entré’, ikusi du ‘il l’a vu’ signifies that the result of a past action is achieved at the moment of speaking: the past is projected into the present. The following statement by E. Benveniste may be applied to the Basque perfect. ‘Le parfait établit un lien vivant entre l’événement passé et le présent où son évocation trouve place’ (1967:244). In contrast to this, the preterite of the perfect or past-perfect, sartu zen ‘il était entré, il entra’, ikusi zuen ‘il l’avait vu, il le vit’, signify, like the imperfect, a past which does not touch at all upon the present.

5. Morphemes with no syntactic role, added to basic forms:

a) Indeterminate suffix -ke, -te, -teke. This ending, which occurs in three equivalent forms, may, in principle, be affixed to all simple basic forms; i.e. 1st group: present-future indicative; 2nd group: 3rd pers. imperative, eventual, preterite. The number of fundamental forms of Basque verbs is thus doubled, theoretically. But in fact, throughout the history of the language, no Basque verb has been known to possess all the basic forms or those with suffix -ke theoretically possible. Thus, the simple eventual is rare; it is absent in most verbs, especially in ‘to be’ and ‘to have’. It is replaced by the eventual with suffix -ke, which is quite common. In contrast, the imperative with the suffix -ke is unknown in most of the dialects.

The suffix -ke signifies an indetermination which may concern the time the action occurred or its degree of completion, a diminution of the force or of the precision of that which is said. Dago signifies ‘he stays’ (now, or habitually, or permanently); dagoke may mean ‘he stays’ but not only in the immediate present (general truth), and also ‘he will stay’ and ‘he may or will be able to stay’. In Souletin, dike can mean ‘he will have it’ or ‘he should have it’ (probability in the present), and zukiian ‘he would have had it’ or ‘he should have had it’ (probability in the past).

The eventual with suffix -ke, legoke, replacing a simple eventual which is not, or at least is no longer, used, signifies ‘he might stay’.
The simple forms with suffix -ke from ekarri 'to bring, to carry' often express the idea of 'to carry' without the idea of completion.

b) Prefixes ai- and albiit- (or albeiiit-). They are affixed solely to the simple forms of the eventual: aihinz 'plût au ciel que tu fusses!' (cf. inzen, hinzan 'tu étais'); albeitiizinekite 'sachez' (cf. zinekiten 'vous le saviez'). They constitute the moods known respectively as votive and prescriptive. The first mood, of which a small number of forms are known from some early texts and a few traces of which remain in Souletin, serves to express a desired eventuality. The second, which was employed more frequently, is not found after the seventeenth century; it served to express prescriptions. Ai- is no doubt identical with the interjection found in Viscayan and Guipuzcoan in syntagms of the type ai baletorl 'ah! s'il venait! plût au ciel qu'il vînt!' Albiit- is none other than the particle albiit used in Viscayan, Guipuzcoan, and upper Navarrese to mean 'so far as is possible, as much as possible'.

6. Morphemes with a syntactic role, affixed to basic forms or forms with the indeterminate suffix.

The subordination of one clause to another is usually marked by a suffix or a prefix which is added to its personal verb form, either unmarked or with the suffix -ke, other than the imperative. There are four markers with a syntactic role: the relative suffix -n, the suffix -la, prefixes ba- and bait-. The prefix ba- 'if' is very rarely affixed to forms with suffix -ke. Morphemes with a syntactic function will be considered below. Other suffixes may be added to the suffixes -n and -la. In the early language, the prefix -albiit- 'if ... possible' was used.

The forms marked syntactically may also be employed in an independent or main clause, with different functions.

7. Tables of moods and tenses.

Language of the sixteenth century: simple forms (Lafon 1943: I.496–9); compound forms (Lafon 1943: II.117–19). For the imperative, see Lafon 1969.

Modern language (literary Labourdin and Souletin): Lafon 1951c and 1952b.

8. Significance of the opposition between the two groups of forms.

The opposition which dominates the system of simple forms of the Basque verb is just as clearly evident in the system of forms with auxiliaries. Its outstanding characteristics are the following:

a) The first group includes those forms which signify a present, habitual or permanent fact, or a future fact, or the result in the present of an event in the past. It also includes those forms of the imperative other than the impersonal; they are most often identical to the corresponding forms of the present indicative. The forms which indicate a past with neither prolongation or repercussion in the present, in other words, a dead past, past event, eventuality or possibility, or a past result of a past event, belong to the second group.
b) Each of the two groups includes forms which express possibility. Those of the first group indicate the possibility which is the object of a confident affirmation ('he can or will be able to...'); those of the second, the possibility of an eventuality, which serves as object of an attenuated affirmation, or a possibility which existed in the past but no longer exists.

c) The first group includes those forms which indicate a hypothesis confidently presented, in keeping with reality, either for the present moment or the future; the second group, those which express a hypothesis proposed on a level other than that of reality, that is to say contingent upon an eventuality, or in the past.

d) The votive, the prescriptive, and the forms of the imperative in the impersonal belong to the second group.

The opposition between the present and the indicative preterite does not have, therefore, a purely temporal significance in Basque. A past event is not on the same level as a present or future event, but rather on the level of an event whose eventual realization one hopes for or foresees. Zen, zan 'he was, who was', which is used as a sort of adjective signifying 'deceased', belongs to the same group of forms as baliz 'if he was', from which is formed balizko 'imaginary, hypothetical': erretor zena 'the late parson'; balizko oleak burdinarik ez, Viscayan proverb of the sixteenth century, a sentence without a verb, 'an imaginary forge (makes) no iron'. What has already happened and what one hopes for or foresees, share the characteristic of unreality. What was is not; the imaginary is not; the eventual is not. According to the Basque system, states and processes belong to two different levels of thought: that of the real and the non-real. The opposition which dominates it is that between being and non-being.

VII. SYNTAX

See the 1931 article by E. Lewy; the fourth part of Lafitte's grammar (1944); chapter III of the 3rd part of Lafon 1943 and Lafon's later articles.

In Basque, sentences may contain only one clause, or two or more clauses either juxtaposed or linked by coordinating conjunctions, or a main clause with one or more subordinate clauses.

The two most important characteristics of Basque syntax are: a) the indication of syntactic relations by markers affixed to personal verbal forms, and not by independent words (pronouns and subordinating conjunctions); and b) the fact that certain rules concerning word order allow no deviations, others define a normal order, and some permit a deviation to emphasize a certain word or clause (Lafitte 1944:§100–20).

Imitations of French, Spanish, and Gascon constructions have been introduced into Basque, but their role is rather restricted. Often the structure of Basque sentences is so different from that of Romance sentences that neither imitation nor combination is possible.

Examples: syntagm 'substantive plus epithetic adjective': see above, p. 1760. Ikusi
dugu etxea; ederra da ‘we have seen the house; it is pretty’; ikusi dugun etxea ederra da ‘the house that we have seen is pretty’; corresponding to the French relative pronoun que is the suffix -n affixed to dugu ‘we see it’. 

Ni¹ baino² zaharrago³ da⁴ gizon⁵ hura⁶ ‘that⁴ man⁶ is³ more-aged⁵ than² I¹’ (-ago is the comparative suffix). Basque bilinguals say, when they compare the word order in Basque and French or Spanish, that in Basque one puts the cart before the horse.

In Basque as elsewhere, a sentence is defined by means of two independent formal criteria: a) it is produced between two pauses; b) it has a specific ‘final’ intonation which varies according to whether it is assertive or, for example, exclamatory, interrogative, suspensive (cf. Benveniste 1967:154, 128–9). On final intonation in Basque, see above, pp. 1755–57.

A sentence may contain only a single word, variable or not. Ona ‘(it’s) good’. Badakit ‘I know it’. Errazu ‘say it’. Emekil! ‘gently!’

Clauses may be classified as follows:

A. Independent and main clauses
   1. without verb
   2. without personal verb form
   3. with personal verb form
      a) without syntactic marker (plain, with suffix -ke, with prefix ai- or albait-)
      b) with a marker which is syntactic in principle

B. Subordinate clauses
   1. with impersonal verb
   2. with personal verb with a syntactic marker

An independent or main clause may lack a verb; a subordinate clause always has one. A personal verb form either unmarked or with only the suffix -ke or prefix ai- or albait- may only occur in an independent or main clause. The same rule applies to allocutive forms; usually only indicative and eventual personal verb forms which are unmarked or which have only the suffix -ke may be allocutive forms.

On clauses with no verb or with an impersonal verb form, see Lafon 1951b and Duny-Pétré 1963.

A1. Verb radical which functions as an imperative: zuhauk ikus ‘see for yourself’, as infinitive of narration: konkorrek kanta, mainguek dantza (Dibarrart), Lat. ‘gibbosi cantare, claudi saltare’ (narration; in another context, this sentence might mean ‘let the hunchbacks sing and the lame dance!’). In norat itzul? ‘which way to turn?’ the radical expresses the verbal idea with no determination.

A2. ellipsis of the auxiliary: jaun aphezek etsortatzen karitate egin dezen (Etchahoun): ‘messieurs les curés exhortent à faire (lit. ‘pour qu’on fasse’) la charité’; the complete form is etsortatzen tie.

Othoitzerik eginen duzuenean, albeitzinarrate hunela (Liç.) ‘when you pray, say this’.

A3b). By a functional evolution which had already begun in the sixteenth century, the personal forms marked syntactically have in certain cases assumed new roles, and have been used in main or independent clauses.

Relative suffix: aizen ‘who is’ (from aiz ‘you (fam.) are’) can signify ‘be (fam. imper.)’: aizén han (Liç.) ‘be there (fam.),’ goazen ‘let’s go’. A subjunctive form like jan dezagun can signify ‘in order that we eat’ or ‘let’s eat!’ Forms with the relative suffix are used in exclamatory clauses: zoin eder den! ‘how beautiful it is!’

Suffix -la. In the sixteenth century, aizela could signify ‘while you are (fam.),’ ‘that you are’ or ‘be (fam. imper.)’; ongi aizela ‘sois bien’. Today an interdiction is indicated by means of compound forms such as eztezazula har ‘don’t take it’, which existed in the sixteenth century.

Prefix ba- ‘if’: the eventual suppositive may be used to express doubts or regrets: a! ethor baledi! ‘ah! if he came’, ‘please God that he come!’, jakin banu! ‘if I had known!’

The prefix bait- indicates that one verbal form is related to another. In the earlier language, however, it was employed in main or independent clauses which were linked to another main or independent clause by the coordinating conjunction eta ‘and’: baina errak solament hitza, eta sendaturen baita ene muthilla (Liç.) ‘but only say the word and my son will be healed’. The addition of the prefix bait- to a verb form introduced by eta indicates not only that what is about to be said occurs after what had been said previously, but also that there is a logical connection between the two (see Lafon 1966:223–5; Lafitte 1944:§774).


See Lafitte 1944:ch. XXII–XXIV and XXXV, in particular §872, for forms of subordinate clauses.

We will mention only a few syntagms. Radical: eztaki norat itzul ‘he does not know in what direction to turn’ (indirect interrogative).

Past participle: eginen duzu nik erran bezala ‘you will do as I said’; the agent is indicated by the pronoun in the ergative nik. To use a personal verb form, it is necessary to add the agent form in the 1st pers. and the relative ending dudan, and then eliminate nik: erran dudan bezala. In clauses which make a comparison, bezala ‘like, as’ is put at the end. Sor lekhua utziz gerōz, Jainko ona urrikaldu da bethi ene nigarrez ‘since I left my birthplace (lit. since the place of birth quitted), the good Lord has always had pity on my tears’: gerōz is an adverb signifying ‘afterwards’; the past participle is in the indefinite instrumental; and the sentence was taken from a song of the poet Elissamburu. This syntagm, however, also belongs to the vernacular: Soul. gu hunätüz géoz, ebría béthi ai diázi ‘depuis (que) nous (sommes) arrivés ici, il pleut sans cesse’: hunätüi is a participle taken from the adverb húna ‘ici’ (with movement).

To indicate that one action takes place before another, the postposition ondoan formed with a relative verbal form, or with a past participle without a case ending, may be used: joan den ondoan, kantatu dugu ‘après qu’il est parti, nous avons chanté’;
Another expression is often used, however; the past participle is followed by the conjunction *eta* 'and', which is pronounced with it and which, in written texts, is often attached by a hyphen: *hura joan-eta, aitak ikhusi-eta.* This construction is very easy to explain. Initially there were sentences such as *edan eta kantatu dugu* 'nous avons bu et chanté'. In order to emphasize the second verb and better mark the chronological order of the actions, *eta* was separated from *kantatu* and linked with *edan*. Thus the change was made from coordination to subordination. This change has already occurred, as the punctuation shows, in this sentence by Liçarrague (Le, 23, 16): *Beraz gaztigatu eta, largaturen dut* 'après l'avoir châtié, je le libérerai'.

**B2. Subordinate clauses with personal verb.**

Personal verb forms in subordinate clauses have syntactic markers which are affixed to basic forms or those with suffix *-ke*, except, of course, those in the imperative. There are four which are mutually exclusive. Both their nature and origin are different. Two, *-n* and *-la*, are suffixes which do not have an independent existence. The other two, which are prefixes, are also employed as affirmative particles. Other suffixes may be added to *-n* and *-la*. In particular, the forms with suffix *-n*, called relatives, can be declined like substantives. Nothing can be added to the prefix *bait-*. Only *al*, which indicates possibility, may be added to *ba*- (hence the prefix *alba-*)

The suffix *-n* (*-en, -an*) originally had — and still has — as its basic function the transformation of an assertive, personal verb form into a determinant of nominal character, placed before a substantive as if it were another substantive or a pronoun in the genitive. In *ikusi dugun etxea ederra da* ‘the house that we have seen is beautiful’, *ikusi dugun* is the determinant of *etxea*, like *aitaren* ‘of the father’ in *aitaren etxea* ‘the house of the father’. This suffix *-n* is often called the relative suffix, because the role it plays in Basque is analogous to that of the relative pronoun in languages where it exists. A relative verb form can be declined, just like a noun in the genitive: *aitarena* ‘celui, celle du père’, *ikusi duguna* ‘celui, celle, ce que nous avons vu’; the instrumental ending being *-az*, one says *mintzo naiz aitarenaz* ‘je parle de celle du père’, *mintzo naiz ikusi dugunaz* ‘je parle de celle que nous avons vue’. Some think that the relative ending is identical with the genitive ending. This is possible, but there are two difficulties. First, the basic form of the relative suffix is *-n*, and that of the genitive of nouns *-en*. Moreover, some pronouns have a genitive in *-e* which is certainly an early form.

As Basque does not allow any double consonants, verb forms ending in the past suffix *-n* also serve as relative forms. The opposition between the relative and other forms is thus neutralized. It is only the context and, in the spoken language, the intonation which make it possible to decide if *ikusi nuen gizona* signifies ‘j'avais vu l'homme’ or ‘l'homme que j'avais vu’ (e.g. in the sentence *ikusi nuen gizona gaztea zen* ‘l'homme que j'avais vu était jeune’.

We cannot here present all the very diverse uses that are made of the relative forms with case endings. One of the most frequent is that of the relative suffix plus the
ending of the singular inessive with the meaning ‘when, since’, lit. ‘dans le (moment) que’: ikusi dugunean, haurrarekin zen ‘quand nous l’avons vu, il était avec l’enfant’. The suffix complex -neko signifies ‘as soon as’: ikusi duguneko, abiatu gare ‘dès que nous l’avons vu, nous sommes partis’. The suffix complex -nez, equivalent to ‘if’ introduces an indirect interrogative: eztaki ikusi dugunez ‘il ne sait pas si nous l’avons vu’. The suffix -n has become a marker for dependency: the verbal form which contains it has often ceased to be a determinant occurring immediately before that which is determined, and has become the verb of a subordinate clause which may be placed after the main verb. The relationship determinant-determined has thus given way to the relationship main clause-subordinate clause.

A simple example shows how it was possible to pass from the ‘determinant-determined’ structure, the former immediately preceding the latter, to the ‘main-subordinate’ structure, with no strict order. In the early language, the simple forms of the present indicative with a relative ending could function either as indicative or subjunctive: den, from da ‘he is’, could signify ‘qui est, qu’il est’ or ‘qui soit, qu’il soit’. In order to say ‘je crois qu’il est là’ it was necessary first to say han den uste dut, lit. ‘j’ai croyance (uste) qu’il est là’, and to say ‘je veux qu’il soit là’, it was necessary to say han den nahi dut, lit. ‘j’ai volonté (nahi) qu’il soit là’. Han den was the determinant of uste and nahi, and den quite naturally took on the function of finality when it was the determinant of nahi. Later, the substantive was joined to the verb, as in the usual verbal locutions uste dut ‘I believe’ and nahi dut ‘I want’. What was originally a determinant was treated as a complement of these verbal locutions and placed after them, without doubt in imitation of the order common to Romance languages. Uste dut han den ‘je crois qu’il est là’ is still used today. The determinant-determined construction has been preserved in the syntagms where ustez (instrumental) or ustean (inessive) is preceded by a participle or a verbal radical: enganatu ustez ‘croyant tromper’, hura bil ustez ‘croyant le gagner, le décider’ (Lafitte 1944:§489d and 875). Nahi dut han den ‘je veux qu’il soit là’ is no longer said, for den is no longer used to convey finality; the subjunctive izan dadin is used in its place. The construction of nahi with an immediately preceding determinant has been preserved in ikusi nahi ‘désireux de voir’: hura ikusi nahi naiz ‘je suis désireux de le voir’.

Today all Basque dialects possess a subjunctive which is distinct from the indicative. All its forms are compound, and the auxiliary always bears the marker -n. They cannot be declined. The only link between them and the relative forms is the final -n. They no longer function as relative forms.

Relative forms are employed with various words which they precede: e.g., artean ‘pendant que’ (lit. ‘dans l’intervalle’), bezala ‘like, as’, nahi ‘although’ (instrumental of nahi ‘volonté’): han agoen artean ‘while you (fam.) are there’, erran dudan bezala ‘as I said’, nahi ez den gaztelua, maite dut nik sor-lekhua (Elissamburu), ‘bien que ce ne soit pas un château, j’aime le lieu de ma naissance’.

The suffix -la. It has two functions. It serves to indicate that an event occurs simul-
taneously with another and constitutes a condition for the latter. It also serves, in indirect speech, to express assertions or commands. This suffix is roughly equivalent as much to Fr. comme, tandis que, as to que introducing a completive clause and used with the indicative or subjunctive. In this second usage, as Schuchardt (1923:§105) states, 'it is interchangeable with -n' and 'their functions cannot easily be distinguished'.

Examples taken from sixteenth century texts (verb ekarri ‘to bring, produce, carry’):

*Eta lurra izigarri oro ikharaturik, Zuhamuyek dakartela odolezko izerdi* (Dech., 1.312–313) ‘et la terre tout entière sera formidablement ébranlée, les arbres produisant une sueur de sang’; *Erioa manatzen du ezein falta gaberik Hilak oro dakazela aitzinera bizirik, Hantik harat eztukela bothererik jagoitik* (Dech., 1.239–241), ‘il ordonne à la Mort d’amener sans faute devant lui, vivants, tous les morts, (disant) qu’à partir de ce moment elle n’aura plus de pouvoir’; *Ilkhi zedin Jesus kampora, elhorrizko koroa zakarkela* (Liç., Jn, 19, 5) ‘Jésus donc sortit, portant la couronne d’épines’ (zakarkela is a preterite with the suffix -ke; see above p. 1771). Today, as before, *erraiten du ongi kantatzen duzula* ‘he says that you sing well’ (assertion) is opposed to *erraiten du ongi kanta dezazula* ‘he says that you are to sing well’ (order).

This same suffix -la serves in the formation of the adverbs nola ‘how?’, hala ‘thus’, bertzela ‘otherwise’, taken from no- ‘who?’, ha-, stem of the 3rd pers. demonstrative, bertze ‘other’. It must have served originally in the formation of a sort of adverbial adjunct of manner from a personal verb form. The original function of this suffix is still felt in this sentence of Liçarrague’s (Jn, 6, 19), *ikhusten dute Jesus itsas gainez dabilala* ‘ils voient Jésus cheminer sur la mer’, ‘vident Iesum ambulantem supra mare’; *dabila* signifies ‘il chemine’, *dabilala* ‘lui cheminant’. The same sentence may be translated in French ‘ils voient que Jésus chemine sur la mer’. The transfer from the first to the second meaning was easily accomplished from a sort of personal gerundive, complement of manner, to a subordinate, completive verb.

The two nominal suffixes -ik and -ko may be added to the ending -la. The first is that of the participle. Today, the definite gerundive above is usually formed with -larik: *abiatu zen khantatzen zuelarik* ‘he left singing’. Dabilalarik rather than dabilala would be used to translate the sentence from the Gospel cited above. The ending -ko became an integral part of the declension, but originally served in the formation of noun complements. It may today be affixed to a verbal form with the suffix -la: which converts it into a noun complement: *guan ninduan etxera gauza hortan akabo zelako esperantzan* (Elissamburu) ‘je m’en allai chez moi avec l’espoir que c’en était fini avec cette affaire’. The complex ending -lakotz, -lakoz signifies ‘because’: *ezta jin, eri delakotz* ‘he did not come, because he is ill’.

Creation of a subjunctive formally distinct from the indicative. In the earlier language, the simple conjugation only formally distinguished as moods the indicative (declarative mode), the suppositive, and the imperative. There was no subjunctive distinct from the indicative. Forms with the suffixes -n and -la were used, sometimes with a declarative function, sometimes to indicate finality. In the compound conjugation, a distinction between the subjunctive and the indicative gradually developed.
It has now become perfectly clear that Basque developed a subjunctive distinct from the indicative by making use of the opposition which existed between the verbs used as auxiliaries. 'To be' and 'to have' do not involve a completion, while *di-* 'to become' and *za-* 'to do, make' (in Visc. *gi-* 'do') do. In the early language, while *sartzen den* could only signify 'who enters, that he enters (indicative)', *sar dadin* could mean not only 'who enters or will happen to enter' (indicative), but also 'pour qu'il entre' (subjunctive). In the first case, *sar dadin* was declinable; in the second, it was not. Sartzen dela could only signify 'as he enters, while he enters, that he enters' (indicative), and *sar dadila* could only express an indirect order, or, in a main or independent clause, a command or a wish. Today the type *sartzen den/dela* is the indicative, *sar dadin/dadila* the subjunctive.

The prefix *ba-* 'if'. Basque has two sorts of verbal forms with prefix *ba-*: The first have an assertive function and participate in main or independent clauses. The others indicate a condition and, in principle, are only involved in subordinate clauses. They are called suppositive forms. There is a *badut* which signifies 'if I have it'. The first *ba-* is an affirmative particle which has, like *bai* 'yes', an independent existence: *jinen da, ba*, 'he will come, yes'. The assertive and suppositive forms are recognized by the following three characteristics. 1. The negation *ez* may be affixed to a suppositive, but not to an assertive form. 2. The suppositive *ba-* may not normally be affixed to allocutive forms. 3. In general, there are no simple forms or forms with affirmative prefix *ba-* which correspond to those of the eventual suppositive. The forms appearing in the table below signify, respectively, 'I have it', 'if I have it', 'if I had it'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>basic form</th>
<th>ba- affirm.</th>
<th>ba- suppos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dut</td>
<td>badut</td>
<td>badut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diat (alloc.)</td>
<td>badiat</td>
<td>does not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not occur</td>
<td>does not occur</td>
<td>banu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ez dut, eztut</td>
<td>ez dut, eztut</td>
<td>ez badut, ezpadut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quite often, the forms of the suppositive are preceded by the particle *badin* or *balin*, sometimes followed by *eta*, the etymology of which is unclear.

Some of the forms of the suppositive belong to the first group, some to the second. The first indicate confident hypotheses, for the present or future. The forms of the suppositive of the second group indicate hypotheses involving eventualities or the past. *Amorosek badagite behin bere nahia, Handiago jiten zale berze nahikaria* (Dech., II.45-46) 'si les amoureux font une fois leur volonté, il leur vient, plus grand, le désir d’autre chose'. *Gizonek utzi balitzate, elaidite faltarik* (Dech., III.2), 'si les hommes les laissaient tranquilles, les femmes ne commettraient pas de fautes'. *Sosa balimbazuen, gastatzen zuen*, 's’il avait de l’argent, il le dépensait'.

The suppositive followed by *ere* 'also, even' is the equivalent of both the Fr. ‘même si’ and ‘quoique, bien que’: *eri bada ere, lan egiten du* may signify ‘even if he is sick, he works’ or ‘quoiqu’il soit malade, il travaille’.
The conditional ba- was originally none other than the affirmative ba-. Certain sentences make it possible to see how the change was made from the categorical affirmation to the hypothetical: Dechepare, thinking about his enemies who have imprisoned him, speaks to God in these terms (XIII.33–34): \textit{Nik eniak badakuskit ene gaitzaz bozturik Zure eskuiaz dakuskidan heiek gaztigaturik}. Badakuskit can mean 'je les vois' or 'si je les vois'. As the original editor does not punctuate within the stanzas, it can be understood to mean: 'Je vois mes ennemis réjouis de mon malheur. Que je les voie châtiés de votre main!', or 'Si je vois mes ennemis réjouis de mon malheur, que je les voie châtiés de votre main!'

The prefix \textit{bait}-, from which, in certain regions, one gets \textit{beit}- and \textit{bit}-, indicates, today, as before, that the verbal form in which it is included is related to another verbal form. It marks a relationship of dependency between propositions (Lafon 1966). \textit{Eria baita, ez da jinen}, 'since he is sick, he will not come'; \textit{aita hil zaio, aspaldi eria baitzen}, 'he lost his father, who was sick for a long time'. The Basque writers who have had to translate Latin, French, or Spanish sentences with relative clauses, have used both forms with a relative suffix and forms with the prefix \textit{bait}-, although they are of a different nature and are characteristic of different sentence structures. The forms with prefix \textit{bait}- are often preceded by the indefinite-interrogatives nor and zer or by adverbs and conjunctions derived from them. Nor, zer are then equal to 'celui qui', 'ce qui'. \textit{Nor baitago nitan, eta ni hartan, hark ekhartan du frutu anhitz} (Liç., Jn. 15, 5), 'qui demeure en moi, et moi en lui, porte beaucoup de fruit'. One could also say \textit{Nitan dagoenak, eta ni hartan, ekhartan du frutu anhitz}. The result was that French and Spanish sentences with relative and noun antecedent were slavishly imitated, using nor, zer, zein 'lequel?' as relative pronouns: \textit{ikusi dut haur bat, zeinek hamar urthe baituke}, ‘j’ai vu un enfant qui doit avoir dix ans’. The correct expression, following the true Basque usage, should be: \textit{ikusi dut hamar urthe dukeen haur bat} or \textit{ikusi dut haur bat, hamar urthe dukeena}, using the relative form dukeen.

In Souletin and Roncalése, the particles \textit{bait}, \textit{bai}, \textit{baiko} are used after a past participle with the signification ‘when, for when, as soon as’: Soul. \textit{zü jin baiit, eginik düket} ‘je l’aurai fait pour votre arrivée’; \textit{Heriuza da laztuko Phizturiik ikhúsi baiko Gizóna jüjamentúko}, a recent translation of the \textit{Dies irae} by Canon G. Eppherre, ‘la Mort s’épouvantera aussitôt qu’elle aura vu l’homme ressuscité pour le jugement’. These particles serve to emphasize the assertion made by the syntagm which precedes them, and at the same time to delimit this syntagm. The first sentence cited above meant originally ‘vous bien arrivé, je l’aurai fait’. Moreover, in a biography in Labourdin of the nineteenth century, \textit{bai} is found preceded by a personal verb form and means ‘as soon as’: \textit{xilinxa tintin, aditzen zen bai, akhabo jostetak}, ‘dès que l’on entendait la clochette tinter, les jeux étaient finis’ (text published by P. Arradoy in \textit{GH}, 1967, p. 145); the main clause, in this instance, has no verb.

Indefinite forms are made by adding -\textit{bait} and its variants to interrogatives: \textit{norbait} ‘quelqu’un’, \textit{zerbait} ‘quelque chose’. These interrogatives, in early Basque, could also
have been used as indefinite forms. The addition of -bait removes any interrogative meaning from them.

This -bait is identical to the verbal prefix bait-. Consider the sentence by Liçarraque cited above (p. 1779), nor baitago nitan, eta ni hartan, hark ekharten du frutu anhitz. It is easy to imagine that nor baitago could have come from an older *nor bait dago, signifying ‘quelqu’un, certes, demeure’. Originally, there must have been two juxtaposed clauses, with only a short pause between them, and without a drop of the voice, after hartan ‘en lui’: ‘quelqu’un certes demeure en moi, et moi en lui, celui-là porte beaucoup de fruit’. Later developments changed it into one sentence with two clauses, of which the first is subordinate to the second. The two syntagms nor bait dago ‘quelqu’un demeure’ and nor baitago ‘(celui) qui demeure’ are two different derivations of an earlier *nor bait dago where bait could be attached to the pronoun or verb indifferently, with an affirmative function in both cases. The use of verbal forms with the prefix bait- in coordinate clauses with eta ‘and’ stems from the period in which bait was still an affirmative particle meant to emphasize the word or the syntagm it accompanied.

Thus, the Basque verbal prefixes with a syntactical role, ba- ‘if’ and bait, a mark of dependency, rest on two affirmative particles the second of which is derived from the first.

Works published in the last twenty-five years have shown that the syntax of Latin and the Romance languages has had only a restricted influence on Basque, due to the profound difference between the structures of the two languages, and to the fact that this influence was stronger on the literary language than on everyday speech, especially on the speech of those who knew or spoke only Basque (see Lafon 1957–58 and 1966).

VIII. LEXICON

The journals have published a large number of articles of varied length and importance on the Basque lexicon. Many are of mainly dialectological interest, but some of them have a greater significance. Some dictionaries have appeared. The Basque-French dictionary of P. Lhande (1938) is very important, although it only deals with dialects in the French region. J. Larrasquet has given in Le Basque de la Basse-Soule orientale (1939) a valuable lexicon of this dialect; he corrects in it some of Lhande’s errors, and, what is most important, he indicates, in addition to the transcription used today, the actual pronunciation, with the position of the accent. The French-Basque lexicon of A. Tournier and P. Lafitte (1954) is useful. The lexicon of the Basque of Eibar, by T. Echebarria (1965–66), adds to our knowledge of this language, which belongs to the Viscayan sub-dialect of Guipuzcoa.

The hand-written dictionary attributed to Landucci (1952), published by L. Miche- lena and M. Agud in 1957, presents a dialect which reveals some affinities with Viscayan, though distinct from it, and which was doubtless spoken in Alava, in the area of Vitoria; the editors call it ‘southern’.
Since the dictionaries of Azkue and Lhande are out of print, it would be advisable to re-edit them, perhaps correcting and supplementing them at the same time, although this would be a long and arduous task. Meanwhile, L. Dassance, J. Haritschelhar, and P. Lafitte have begun preparations for the publication of a Basque-French lexicon which would include the essential parts of the vocabulary. But it is necessary to begin work on a large Basque-French-Spanish dictionary and, eventually, an etymological dictionary of the Basque language.

The only structuralist study which has been done in the Basque vocabulary is the article by Uhlenbeck cited above, p. 1759. It would be very useful to examine from this point of view what has been said of word-formation in the \textit{Morfologia} of Azkue and in the \textit{Grammaire} by Lafitte. There are, for example, in Azkue (1925:§594–8), some interesting observations on words with reduplication, notably on those whose second element has an initial \textit{m}, like \textit{erran-merran} ‘racontar’ from \textit{erran} ‘dit’ (past part.), and \textit{nahas-mahas} ‘pêle-mêle’, from \textit{nahas} ‘together, without order’.

Some words are common to all the Basque dialects; others are only found in some dialects, or in a single dialect, or even in a single local idiom. The etymology of a large number of words is unknown. In our opinion, Basque possesses some words coming from a source common to the Caucasian languages, to which Basque is related. It has borrowed many words from diverse languages: unidentified or little known languages which were formerly spoken in the Pyrenees, the Alps, and in Sardinia; Hamito-Semitic, Germanic, and Celtic languages; and especially Latin. Throughout its history, Basque has drawn largely from the Romance languages with which it has been in contact: Spanish, French, and their neighboring dialects of the Basque country, notably Gascon, finally Provençal (spoken in Navarre, from the second half of the eleventh century to the fourteenth century). We should also cite the works of Bertoldi, Uhlenbeck (\textit{Anthropos} 1940–41), Schuchardt, Gavel and, more recently, of Rohlfs, Michelena, Tovar, Bouda, Hubschmid, and Lafon.

Toponymy and anthroponymy. Basque onomastics includes the study of Vasconian and Aquitanian names. An historical account of research can be found in the article by Lafon in \textit{Onoma} (1954a), and a more recent bibliography at the end of his article in \textit{Rlono} (1965). \textit{Onoma} notes each year, under the rubrics ‘France’ and ‘Spain’, works on Basque onomastics. L. Michelena has published a very important book, \textit{Apellidos vascos} (2nd ed., 1955), with a bibliography and an index; many toponyms can also be found in it. Luis de Eleizalde, who died in 1923, had begun to publish in 1922 the \textit{Listas alfabeticas de voces toponomasticas vascas}, which are incomplete, but very useful. Words up to \textit{Pozuzarreta} have appeared in \textit{RIEB} (last publication in 1936), and the rest in two numbers of \textit{BRSVAP} (XIX.241–73, 1963, and XX.103–59, 1964).

\textbf{IX. DIALECTOLOGY, MAPS, TEXTS}

If one considers the fact that Viscayan occupies a distinct place in the group of Basque
dialects, and that the 'southern' dialect of the sixteenth century, today non-existent, presented some affinities with it, the relationships between the eight dialects may be represented by the diagram below, taking into account their geographical location and indicating their affinities by unbroken lines:

Each French-Basque dialect has a sub-dialect which is spoken south of the Pyrenees. The relationships of these sub-dialects to the northern dialects, among themselves, and to the northern and southern upper Navarrese, are studied in the article by Lafon which appeared in Pirineos (1955).

There exists no structural analysis of a local idiom or a Basque dialect. As descriptions of idioms, we cite the study by Rollo of the Viscayan of Marquina, those by Larraquet on the Basque of Eastern Basse-Soule (his own language), those by Azkue on Roncalese, Michellea on Roncalese and Salazarais (in VD). G. Bähr, Guipuzcoan by birth, who disappeared during World War II, had published lists of verb forms coming from diverse regions where the Guipuzcoan dialect is spoken (RIEB, from vol. XVII on). Lafon has studied, in VD (1959 and 1963), some forms and characteristics of the verb in the Souletin of Larrau.

The publication of a linguistic and ethnographic atlas of the Basque area has been under discussion for many years. Preparations have finally begun (J. Haritschelhar, P. Lafitte, J. Allières, L. Michellea, Mlle A.M. Echaide). J. Allières, a Romance scholar, formerly a specialist for the linguistic and ethnographic investigation of the Gascon region who gradually turned his attention toward Basque, investigated translations of a French text made in 1887 in all the districts of the French region of Basque Country; he transcribed data from these translations onto maps, providing a very important and fruitful study.

Many dialectal texts, songs, tales, and stories have been collected and published, notably by Schuchardt, Azkue, Father Donostia, J. M. de Barandiarán, L. Dassance, P. Duny-Pétré, and J. Haritschelhar. The latter author in 1969 published a critical edition, with translation, of the songs of the Souletin poet Etchahoun.

Some early texts, which are difficult to obtain, have been put at the disposal of philologists and linguists by J. de Urquiyo, who presented, in the RIEB, photographic reproductions of several classic works: the Guero of Axular (minus a hundred pages), the verses of Dechepare, the proverbs and verses of Oihenart. He published in the same journal the Refranes y Sentencias of 1596, with a very useful commentary. He has edited the Basque texts of Garibay, with an important introduction. The BRSVAP has published, thanks to the Seminario de Filología vasca and to its director L. Michellea, a translation into Viscayan of the Doctrina cristiana by Betolaza (1596).
We have thus been able to publish in the BRSVAP a French translation of the verses of Dechepare and Oihenart, and critical and explanatory notes on these two works, as well as a study of the language of Dechepare and some remarks on the verb in Betolaza.

We owe to Michelena the precious collection Textos arcaicos vascos (1964), where some rare texts have been arranged and annotated. He is also responsible for the Anuario del Seminario de Filologia vasca Julio de Urquijo (1st fasc. in 1967).

X. THE PROBLEM OF THE ORIGINS OF BASQUE

The most recent reports are those by Lafon (1951, 1953, 1965).

Since 1918, a very important discovery has been made: Manuel Gómez-Moreno has succeeded in deciphering the Iberian script (first article in 1922). From this discovery it was learned that Basque continues the language of the Aquitanians and the Vasconians and that it does not come from Iberian. In another direction, the comparison of Basque with the Caucasian languages has progressed (especially in the last 25 years). It has been established that Basque was spoken during antiquity in a much more extended area than today. Two cities, at the two ends of the chain of the Pyrenees, each had a Basque name: to the West, close to the Atlantic coast, Gr. Oiásō, gen. Oiasónos, Lat. Oiarso, today Oyarzun, between the French border and San Sebastian; to the East, close to the Mediterranean coast, between Perpignan and the Spanish border, Iliberri, which means in Basque 'new city'. This being so, not only in Aquitania, but even in Aude and Gard, some 300 names of persons, divinities, and populations have been found in Latin inscriptions, names which are neither Latin nor Celtic, and many of which are identical or similar to Basque words. Furthermore, Ausci, the name of a people who lived in the region of Auch, is again found in that of the Basque language, euskara. To the south of the Pyrenees, the Vasconians occupied the territory of present-day Navarre, a strip of land which included Oyarzun and a part of the provinces of Saragossa and Huesca. The documentation for this area is less complete than in the north. However, several names of cities and persons, some of which have been established as early as 90 B.C., have a distinct Basque character. A Latin inscription found in 1960 at Lerga (Navarre), in a region where Basque was still spoken in the sixteenth century, contains the name Sahar, which in Basque signifies 'old'. Finally, much further east, in Catalonia, a stone bearing the name of L. Iunius laurbeles was recently found; this last word is a compound which signifies in Basque 'seigneur noir'.

Aquitanian and Vasconian are thus known to us through documents which stretch from the third century B.C. to the third or fourth centuries A.D. although we do not possess any sentences or syntagms in either of these languages. We are not familiar with any verbal forms; only nouns with the nominative, dative, or less often, the genitive function, uninflected or inflected like Latin nouns. The phonological system, however, of Aquitanian and Vasconian was quite similar to that of the Basque we are
familiar with through history, and it is easy to see how the latter continues the former (cf. above, pp. 1753 and 1757). Furthermore, Aquitanian possessed certain derivational suffixes found in Basque. There is no doubt that Aquitanian and Vasconian, so similar to one another, are an early form of the Basque language.

With the further realization that Basque toponyms have been found to the east of the territory of the Aquitanians and that of the Vasconians, in Cerdagne, Catalonia, and up to the Mediterranean coast (Iliberri), it can be established that, two thousand years ago, Basque was spoken from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean, in the Pyrenees and in the plains below, and even, at least in some scattered places, close to the Rhone valley.

It is no longer possible to say, as Humboldt did, that ‘on trouve des noms de lieux basques dans toute la Péninsule’, yet it is a fact that names of places reminiscent of Basque are found in Andalusia and in the southeast of Spain, some of which were mentioned by early writers, others attested only in the modern era. (Lafon 1955) It is possible that certain coincidences are fortuitous, or that they can be explained by population movements after the reconquest. But the case of Iliberri, a city of Baetica which occupied the present site of Granada, is certain. It remains to be explained historically.

The study of the Iberian language has made great progress since 1918, above all thanks to Spanish scholars. The works of Gómez-Moreno, J. Maluquer de Motes, and in France, of M. Lejeune, which contain references to other works, are cited in the bibliography. New inscriptions are found fairly often, and one or more collections of Iberian inscriptions should be established and the valuable Léxico de las inscripciones ibéricas (1951) by A. Tovar brought up to date. But these tasks, as many others, would necessitate a much larger number of researchers.

Iberian was used in the coastal region, from Ensérune (between Narbonne and Béziers) to Alicante; it also spread towards the interior, along the valley of the Ebro, up to Lérida and Saragossa. It was also spoken in the region which stretches from Alicante to Cordova.

The Iberian inscriptions which we possess belong to the period between the fourth (perhaps the fifth) century B.C. and the beginning of the Christian era (J. Maluquer de Motes). Some of them are in Greek characters, but the majority are in an original script, which is syllabic for the stops (without the distinction between voiced and voiceless). Most of the signs used are of Greek origin, but certain ones may also be of Semitic origin and the origin of some is unknown. This script reads from left to right in the entire coastal region, but in the southeast of Spain, it generally goes from right to left, and includes some special signs.

We know how to read the texts in Iberian, but cannot understand them. None of them are bilingual, and we have not been able to interpret Iberian with the aid of Basque. We possess sentences in Iberian, but not in Aquitanian or Vasconian. Fifteen centuries separate the most recent Iberian texts from the oldest Basque texts, and the morphology and syntax of Basque at the beginning of the Christian era are not known.
Nevertheless, the phonological system of Iberian presents many similarities to that of Aquitanian and Vasconian. Furthermore, certain Iberian words contain morphological elements, _ba-, -ke, -ai_, which are reminiscent of Basque. We cannot, however, identify them with homophonic elements in Basque as long as we do not know their meaning or that of the words they are attached to. Iberian possesses a suffix _-en_ which very probably indicates possession and which is identical in form with the Basque genitive suffix. It also has a suffix _-ar, -tar_, which indicates that someone is originally from a certain city or a country, or a member of a certain family, and which resembles the Aquitanian and Basque ending _-ar, -tar_, with the same function. Finally, approximately forty Iberian words are identical or similar to Basque words: e.g., _bels_, which recalls Aq. _beles, belex_, Bsq. _beltz_ 'black'; _argi_, which recalls Bsq. _argi_ 'light; shining, clear'. It does not seem possible to explain this agreement by chance or borrowing. The conclusion, however, is unwarranted that the Basque known historically is a continuation of Iberian, for if it came from Iberian, that would lead to the conclusion that Aquitanian and Vasconian, early forms of Basque contemporaneous with Iberian, are Iberian. Although we do not possess any sentences in Aquitanian or Vasconian, it is possible to compare the Iberian words with Aquitanian and Vasconian words of the same epoch, second and first centuries B.C. (Iberian words which appear in Maluquer, nos. 180–204 and 324–513). A mixture of similarities and differences is thus observed, the latter more numerous than the former, which leads one to consider them as two languages, not one. For example, _aiunescerat_ (189) contains the suffix _-tar_; _escer_ recalls Bsq. _ezker_ 'left', but _aiunescer_ does not resemble anything in Basque. The final _-wi_ (demonstrative? suffixed article? nominative?), frequent in Iberian, does not resemble anything in Basque. The first part of Iber. _argisabam, argi_, is found in both Basque and Iberian; but words ending in _m_ do not exist either in Aquitanian, Vasconian, or Basque; by contrast, two examples of a final _m_ can be shown to exist in Iberian: _-sabam_ and _bortoloikekobam_ (no. 17; Ullastret, fourth century B.C.), which does not resemble any Basque form. Thus, Aquitanian and Vasconian, early forms of Basque, may not be considered identical with Iberian. In the present state of research, it would appear to be impossible to assume that Basque comes from Iberian; but it seems quite legitimate to suppose that there is a genetic relationship between the two languages, a relationship more indirect and more distant than direct descent. Neither before nor after 1918 has there been any success in attempts to prove regular phonetic correspondences nor precise morphological similarities upon which the common origin of Basque and the Hamito-Semitic languages can be established.

The only languages which lend themselves to comparison with Basque, according to the rules of the comparative method, are the Caucasian languages. The idea of a genetic relationship between Basque and these languages has been defended by Schuchardt, Trombetti, Winkler, Marr, then Uhlenbeck, Dumézil, Bouda, and Lafon. It was above all after 1923 that precise arguments were presented. The Caucasian languages, numbering about forty, and of very diverse structures, can be divided into two large groups. The group of languages on the northern side, the most numerous
and varied, includes the languages of the northwest (Abxaz, Circassian or Adyghe, Ubyx) and the central languages (Chechen or Nax) and the languages of the northeast or from Daghestan (Avar, Lak, Dargwa, etc.). The group of three languages from the southern side, or Kartvelian languages (Georgian, Mingrelian-Laz or Zan, and Svan), present a clear unity. Comparative work has, in the last twenty years, made great progress with these groups and sub-groups. This can be understood by reading Aert H. Kuipers’ chapter on “Caucasian”, in Volume 1 (pp. 315-44) of Current Trends in Linguistics, and the large collective work, Iberijsko-kavkazskie jazyki, by a group of Soviet linguists, under the direction of E.A. Bokarev and Mme K. Lomtaktionze, published in Moscow in 1967. However, a great deal of work remains to be done. We are far from having satisfactory comparative material on the group of Caucasian languages. Moreover, the application of the comparative method to Basque and the Caucasian languages runs into great difficulty, only more so because we have only been familiar with the Caucasian languages since the last century, except for Georgian, for which we possess texts from the sixth century on. These languages have varied phonological systems, which are all much richer in consonants than Basque. On the other hand, none of them show the opposition between a soft and hard r. Among the characteristic traits common to all of the Caucasian languages, one of the most important is the existence of two manners of articulating stops (plosives) and affricates: with complete occlusion of the glottis and without occlusion. These languages possess unvoiced supraglottals (also called glottalized sounds), whose articulation is accompanied by a glottal stop, and infraglottals, some voiceless and aspirated, others voiced. There are triads such as t’/t/d, c’/c/ʒ. Basque has no glottalized sounds, and its voiceless aspirates are only phonetic variants of ordinary voiceless sounds (see above, pp. 1754–55).

In spite of these difficulties, we have been able to establish some phonetic correspondences between Basque and the Caucasian languages. Thus, to the glottalized sibilant or palatal consonant (most often affricate, rarely spirant) of the Caucasian languages corresponds in Basque an alveolar-palatal consonant (s or ts), and to the non-glottalized sibilant or palatal consonant (spirant or affricate, voiceless or voiced) of the Caucasian languages corresponds, in Basque, a pure sibilant (z or tz): Bsq. su ‘fire’ (in Basque, initial ts is reduced to s) ~ Lak c’u, Circassian mas’o e (with prefix ma-) ‘fire’, Georg, c’v- ‘to burn’, with corresponding forms in c’ in almost all the Caucasian languages; Bsq. -(t)zu, earlier plural suffix (see above, p. 1762) ~ Abxaz -c’əa (labialized sibilant), plural suffix, Ubyx -c’əa, suffix marking excess; Bsq. zu ‘you’ (today polite form, but formerly plural) ~ Cauc. of the northeast s’o ‘you’, and forms of the types s’u, s’u, ić’u in the central and northeastern languages; Bsq. -antz ‘until’ ~ Abxaz -nja, Ub. -on’za ‘id.’

Several Basque morphological elements are found in the Caucasian languages: thus the prefix r- which served earlier in Basque in the formation of causative verbs, plays the same role in Abxaz. A significant number of comparisons of vocabulary has been made between Basque and diverse Caucasian languages.
This group of similarities can be explained neither by chance, nor by borrowing; it implies a genetic relationship. Basque, issued from Aquitanian and Vasconian, forms with the Caucasian languages a family which could be called Euscaro-Caucasian. Such is the hypothesis supported by Dumézil, Bouda, and Lafon: Dumézil 1933; 123–49; Bouda 1949, 1951, and articles in BRSVAP since 1954; Lafon, many articles since 1933, esp. 1951–52, 1952, 1968. Uhlenbeck considered it, at the end of his life, as clearly established. Other linguists, notably Deeters, I.M. Echaide (1953), Vogt (1955), and Michelena (1964a) object that the resemblances between Basque and all the Caucasian groups, and not one or the other of them, are too weak and not numerous enough to imply a genetic relationship, even more so since the unity of the Caucasian family itself has not been unanimously accepted; according to some, the resemblances and agreements which have been found between the languages of the northern side and those of the southern can be explained by prolonged contact, and do not imply a common origin. We continue, for our part, to believe that such a body of comparisons, so closely interwoven, can only be explained by a common tradition. But what has been transmitted from generation to generation since the Euskarocaucasian period was certainly not a fixed morphological system, and certain infiltrations must have occurred between diverse groups or speech communities. Moreover, the concepts of a Caucasian family and an Euskarocaucasian family, far from putting an end to research, ought to stimulate new studies which would serve to clarify these hypotheses.

Soviet Caucasian scholars, in particular the Georgians, attach great importance to the problem of the relationships between the Caucasian languages and Basque. I discussed this subject, in 1966, at Tbilisi, with A. Tchikobava (Lafon 1967). He is of the opinion that it is necessary to tackle the problem resolutely and methodically. ‘On sait’, he writes in an article, ‘que les grands problèmes ne peuvent être résolus en un tournemain; on sait aussi qu’ils ne seront jamais résolus si on ne les pose pas’. But, when one is faced with the problem of proving the genetic relationship between a language far removed geographically and a group of languages which are, moreover, quite varied, ‘il est nécessaire’, continues the Georgian linguist, ‘de fouiller leur histoire, de “forer” à une grande profondeur’. It is necessary for the completion of this task to have linguists who are specialists of both Basque and of the Caucasian languages, and hence the necessity of introducing Caucasian scholars, already trained or in training, to Basque linguistics, and vice versa. (See Lafon 1953:333.) To this end, I gave, in 1966, a series of lectures on the Basque language at the University of Tbilisi and at the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the Georgian SSR.

Comparisons have been made between Basque and the Paleosiberian languages: on these languages, see Dean Worth, ‘Paleosiberian’, Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 1, pp. 345–73. Uhlenbeck has pointed out, in 1922, and then in 1925, that a complete ‘parallelism’ exists between the Chukchee verb and the Basque verb. In the two languages, the subject of an intransitive verb, like the complement of the object of a transitive verb, is unmarked, while the subject of a transitive verb bears a
marker (ergative in Basque, instrumental in Chukchee). This ‘parallelism’ is extended to the two languages related to Chukchee, Koryak, and Kamchadal. Bouda has compared the prefix *r(a)*- which serves in the formation of causative verbs in Basque and Abxaz, with the prefix *r-* , which plays the same role in Chukchee: *ilu* ‘to be moved’, *rilu* ‘to move’. In addition, he has pointed out similarities in vocabulary between Chukchee and Basque; e.g. Chuk. *välv* ‘crow’, word with reduplication, resembles Bsq. *bele* (crow), *bel* ‘somber’ (second element of a complex), *beltz* ‘black’ which existed in Aquitanian and Vasconian, and even in Iberian. Uhlenbeck retained some of these correspondences and wrote in 1946: ‘Nous savons encore trop peu de chose sur les relations de parenté extérieure du groupe tchouktche-koriak-kamtchadale. Peut-être apparaîtra-t-il en fin de compte que ce groupe est une ramification du caucasique. Alors, les ressemblances du tchouktche et du basque se laisseraient insérer dans l’étude comparative du basque et du caucasique.’ But one should be very cautious in establishing comparisons of languages as distant geographically from one another as these.

If there exists, as I believe, a genetic relationship between the Basque language and the Caucasian languages, how can it be explained historically? It is unlikely that they belong to a large family of languages which would have extended from the Pyrenees to the Caucasus and which would have been submerged in large part by the advance of Indo-Europeans. For, according to this hypothesis, some traces of it would certainly have persisted in the vast expanse situated between the two extremes. However, until now, no decisive traces have been found. The hypothesis that remains is that of a migration coming from the Caucasus, Asia Minor, or some adjacent region. Since an early form of Basque was in use in the vicinity of Perpignan and Narbonne, and Basque-like place-names can be observed as early as antiquity in the southeast and south of Spain, it is legitimate to think that immigrants, founders of the two *Ilberri*, i.e. of the two Basque ‘Villeneuves’, arrived by sea. But here linguistics offers no help. We can only say that, according to Spanish archeologists, during the Aegean era, the eastern Mediterraneans exerted an influence on the Spanish Levant, and on the southern coast of the Peninsula. There is reason to hope that research of prehistoric and protohistoric archeology and epigraphy which is in full swing in Spain, and the excavations underway in France in the regions of Ensérune, Narbonne, and Perpignan will enable us to see these problems more clearly. But many more researchers are needed.

When trying to discover or to establish a genetic relationship between Basque, isolated in the southwest of Europe, and other distant languages, one must proceed methodically, that is to say, slowly. But if, in the course of study, similarities, either morphological or lexical, are noticed, they should be recorded, so that future study can decide whether they ought to be consolidated or discarded.
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