



On the polysemy of the suffike -ke in the history of Northern Basque

Georges Rebuschi

► To cite this version:

Georges Rebuschi. On the polysemy of the suffike -ke in the history of Northern Basque. Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca "Julio de Urquijo", 2009, 1-2 (XLIII), pp.745-768. artxibo-00494270

HAL Id: artxibo-00494270

<https://artxiker.ccsd.cnrs.fr/artxibo-00494270>

Submitted on 22 Jun 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ON THE POLYSEMY OF THE SUFFIX *-KE* IN THE HISTORY OF NORTHERN BASQUE

Georges Rebuschi

Sorbonne nouvelle & CNRS, UMR 7107)

Abstract

The various semantic values of the suffix -ke in Northern Basque are shown to depend, in the analytic conjugations, (a) on the type of verbal complex - aspectually marked participles plus the auxiliaries izan/°edun vs. aspectually unmarked radicals plus the auxiliaries °edin/°ezan (the synthetic conjugation is ambiguous, since it neutralizes this opposition), and (b) on the “tense” of the inflected auxiliaries (present/past/hypothetical). Depending on the context, three epistemic values can thus be computed: equi-possibility, probability, and prediction - hence a specialized interpretation as an ulteriority marker, i.e. a future tense marker when used with a verb in the present tense. This future value is shown not to have been limited to the Souletin dialect, and to have enabled 16th century Basque to have an analytical “future in the future”. Finally, a pragmatic value, the strong commitment of the speaker, will also be identified.

1. Introduction*

If Azkue's (1923-25: § 762-B) description of the morpheme *-ke* as: “característica del modo potencial” is correct as far as the Southern dialects are concerned, the situation is much more complex in the Northern dialects. To wit:

Il est impossible de faire entrer dans une formule simple et brève toutes les significations que peut avoir le suffixe *-ke*. Elles ne sont d'ailleurs pas les mêmes dans tous les dialectes ni à toutes les époques. Elles relèvent du discours. (Lafon [1970] 1999: 491).

In this paper, I will try to be more systematic, and show that many shades of meaning of this affix can be computed from the verbal morphology it is a part of. But I will also show that other uses can be given a more specific interpretation than Lafon's mere allusion to “speech” or “discourse”.

The first part of the paper consists in an overview of NB (Northern Basque)¹ conjugation, and will progressively introduce the various uses of *-ke*, in particular

* I'm very happy to dedicate this short paper to my friend Beñat, with whom I've exchanged ideas on Basque grammar— and many other topics — for nearly three decades. I am sure that, had he had the necessary space, in Oyharçabal (2003), to deal with the future perfect in *-ke* and the «future in the future» described below, he would have done a far better job than me.

¹ The following abbreviations will be used.

a) Dialects: *B-N*, *behe-nafarrera* (French *bas-navarrais*); *Lap.*, *lapurtera* (French *labourdin*); *NL*, *na-far-lapurtera* (French *navarro-labourdin*); *Zub.*, *zuberera* (French *souletin*).

(i) in some conditional tenses (and sentences), and (ii) in the aoristic conjugations. In the second part (starting with §7), the use of *-ke* as a future morpheme will be examined: contrary to the received view, it will be shown that this value was not limited to the easternmost Souletin dialect (*Zub.*), until at least the middle of the 20th century. Moreover, this futural value of *-ke* in the analytic conjugation (yielding in particular a “past in the future”, and a “double future”) will be described in detail. Finally, a specific pragmatic content will be attributed to Lafon’s intuition that some occurrences of *-ke* really had to do with “discourse”.

2. The synthetic conjugation

As is well-known, only a handful of verbs (Lafitte’s 1962; ‘strong verbs’) can be directly inflected for tense and agreement — the ‘synthetic conjugation’. The basic distinction is between a present tense form which anchors the event referred to in the present time, and another. (Using Reichenbach’s 1947; vocabulary, unfortunately devoid of any aspectual considerations, the present tense corresponds to the identification of S, the *Speech point*, R, the *Reference point*, and E, the *Event point*.) Consider the unaccusative verb *joan* ‘go/gone’.² There are present (continuous) forms like *n.oa* ‘I’m going’ and *h.oa* ‘you’re going’ (where the initial *n-* and *h-* refer to an absolutive argument, 1st and 2nd p. singular, respectively, cf. the personal pronouns *ni* ‘I’ and *hi* ‘thou/you [familiar]’) and another (abstract) type of form, inattested as such if no affix is added: *°n.ind.oa* / *°h.ind.oa*.³ Such forms become “real” once a past tense morpheme *-(e)n* or an epistemic one *-(ke)* is suffixed to them: *nindoa.n* ‘I was going’, *nindoa.ke* ‘I could/would go/be going’ (conditional), *ba.nindoa* ‘if I went/were going’.

Basically, the forms derived from *°nind.oa* and the like therefore denote a break between the world *hic et nunc* in which the speaker and the hearer(s) are located, and the world (or states and processes therein) referred to: this latter world may be either located in the past, or be purely hypothetical, even fictitious or counter-factual. However, when the absolutive argument is 3rd person, there is a subdivision in the morphology of the finite verb. Thus, the prefix is *z-* in the past tense: *z.oa.n* ‘he was going’, but *l-* otherwise: *ba.l.oa* ‘if he went’, *l.oa.ke* ‘he would go’.

Importantly, the suffix *-ke* can also be suffixed to a present tense form: *n.oa.ke* ‘I can go’ in ‘common Basque’, but ‘I will go’ in *Souletin/zuberera* – and, as we shall see, in other northern dialects until a not too forlorn past.

Izan ‘be’ is a strong verb; note, among its many irregularities, that the epistemic suffix mentioned above in fact never occurs as *-ke*: it has two allomorphs uniquely used with this verb – a long one, *-teke*, and its shortened variant *-te*, as illustrated by *n(a).iz* ‘I am’, *n(a).iza.te(ke)* ‘I can be’ / ‘I will be’ (see Lafon 1970, 1972).

b) The references to the Bible will be given as is customary. LV stands for Latin Vulgate, KJV is for the King James Version, and CDR for Chalonner’s revision of the Catholic (hence, translated from the LV) Douay-Rheims translation. Finally, *Imit.* refers to Thomas a Kempis’ *De imitatione Christi* (early 15th century), which has also been translated many times into Basque.

² The perfective participle is also the citation and dictionary form of Basque verbs.

³ The symbol ‘°’ will precede diachronically reconstructed, and synchronically abstract forms, so as to avoid any confusion with ungrammatical forms and expressions.

Turning to transitive verbs, they follow the same distinctions. (i) In the present tense, the active or ergative argument is always cross-referenced by a suffix, e.g. *na₁.kar.(t)zu₂* ‘you₂’re carrying me₁’ (dictionary form: *ekarri*). The same pattern can be observed in the other ‘tenses’, if the absolutive argument is 1 ou 2 p. (sg. or plural): *ninde₁.kar.(t)zu₂.n* ‘you₂ were carrying me₁’, *ninde.kar.ke.zu* ‘you would carry me’. But when the absolutive argument is 3rd p., and the ergative one, 1st or 2nd p., the latter is cross-referenced by a prefix, and no absolutive affix appears:⁴ *ne.karr.en* ‘I₂ was carrying (it)’; *ne.kar.ke* ‘I would/could carry (it)’. This phenomenon, which has come to be known as ‘ergative displacement’, provides additional morphological evidence in favour of a primary split between the present forms on the one hand, and past or fictitious/hypothetical forms on the other (compare the temporal and modal values of the English preterite and the French *imparfait*).

3. The first analytic conjugation: Aspectually specified compound tenses

The strong verbs just mentioned may, and the weak verbs must, have recourse to compound ‘tenses’, also known as ‘analytic tenses’.⁵ The basic facts are these: (a) the lexical verb is realized by a participial form, followed by an inflected auxiliary; (b) there are three aspectual participles: perfective (ending in *-tu*, *-n*, *-i*, \emptyset), imperfective/iterative (*-ten*, *-tzen*), and prospective (derived from the perfective forms by the addition of *-ko* or *-(r)en*); (c) the distinctions described in §2 concerning the synthetic conjugation of the strong verbs carry over to the auxiliaries.

The three participles can be combined with any inflected form of the auxiliaries which they select —or which select them— with only one fundamental constraint: unaccusative verbs are only associated with *izan* ‘be’; as for transitive participles, they are normally associated with *°edun* ‘have’,⁶ unless a valency reduction (yielding a medio-passive meaning) has taken place, in which case the auxiliary is again *izan* ‘be’.⁷

Some of the combinations — typically those with the auxiliary in the present tense *sans plus* need no special comments:

- (1) a imperfective + present
 ja.ten d.u ‘he eats/is eating (it),’ lit. ‘eaing he-has(it)’

⁴ Although absolutive number remains explicitly marked — to wit: *d₁.u.t₂* ‘I₂ have it₁’ / *d₁.it_{pl}.u.t₂* ‘I₂ have them₁’, but *n₂.u.en* ‘I₂ had it’ / *n₂.it_{pl}.u.en* ‘I₂ had them’.

⁵ In order to avoid confusion, I will depart from Lafitte’s expression (*conjugaison périphrastique*) and follow the clearer distinction made by Oyharçabal (2003) and Ortiz de Urbina (2003): some periphrastic expressions proper will illustrated in the Appendix.

⁶ It so happens that the perfective and citation form of Basque ‘have’ is *ukan* in the eastern varieties (*BN* and *Zub.*), but homophonous with the perfective form of ‘be’, *izan*, in the westernmost dialect of Northern Basque (*Lap.*), as well as in the Southern dialects. Using the reconstructed form *°edun* has become the rule.

⁷ De Rijk (1985) is probably the first Bascologist who explicitly noticed that it is impossible to use the synthetic forms of transitive verbs and to simultaneously delete reference to the agent. Thus, *dakar* is necessarily ‘he’s carrying (it)’, with a zero ergative suffix, never ‘he is (being) carried’ whereas *ekar.tzen d₁a* ‘it₁ is carried/brought’ is the natural agentless version of, say, *ekar.tzen d₁.u.te₂* ‘they₂ carry/bring it₁’. Moreover, it is impossible not to make reference to the existence of a (possibly irrelevant or unknown) object or patient, whence the brackets around the *it*’s in the translations of the examples (1a-c) below.

- b perfective + present
ja.n d.u 'he has eaten (it)', lit. 'eaten he-has(it)'
- c prospective + present
ja.nen d.u 'he'll eat (it)', lit. 'to-eat⁸ he-has(it)'⁹

When the auxiliary is [-present], some cases are semantically more delicate.

- (2) a imperfective + past
ja.ten z.u.en 'he ate/was eating (it)', lit. 'eating he-had(it)'
- b perfective + past
ja.n z.u.en 'he ate¹⁰/had eaten', lit. 'eaten he-had(it)'
- c prospective + past
ja.nen z.u.en 'he was about to eat it / he would have eaten it'

Note, on the one hand, the ambiguity (at least from the point of view of the translation) of (2b), which can be rendered either by a purely narrative preterite, or by a pluperfect in English). On the second interpretation of (2c), see the comments that follow (5) below.

4. The suffixes *-ke* and *-ko* in the conditional tenses

In general, no distinction is made between the imperfective and the prospective participles in a suppositive protasis,¹¹ whereas the perfective participle forces a past conditional (hence necessarily counterfactual) interpretation:

- (3) a *ikus.ten / ikus.iko ba.lu* 'if he saw it (now or later)'
- b *ikus.i ba.lu* 'if he had seen it'¹²

In the apodosis, the logical consequent is typically expressed as in (4):

- (4) a *ja.nen/har.tuko lu.ke* 'he would eat/take it' [(a continuation of (3a))]
- b *ja.nen /har.tuko zu.en* 'he would have eaten it' [a continuation of (3b) - recall (2c)]

⁸ «To-eat» is, I must confess, a poor gloss for the prospective participle, but I'm unable to propose anything else. In any case, there is no deontic modality «naturally» associated with this participle. In Rebuschi (1984), I suggested that the *-kol-(r)en* suffix reversed the time relation between the (Reichenbachian) Reference point (R) and the closer boundary of the process: in the case of the perfective aspect, the *right* boundary precedes R, and in the case of the prospective aspect, R precedes the *left* boundary of the process. Today, this still seems to be a reasonable description of the fact, but I'm not sure I would still maintain the sketchy «explanation» I proposed at that time.

⁹ Note, however, the neutralization of the opposition between the imperfective and prospective aspects in adjunct/adverbial clauses, with a possible evolution in the choice of the preferred form. For instance, for Mt 21,40 (Latin Vulgate *Cum ergo venerit dominus vineae*, KJV *When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh*), AnBa 1828, Sal 1856, Irib 1860, Caz 1860, have *etor.tzen* [or: *ji.ten*] *denean*, but Harriet 1855, Dv 1859-65, Léon 1946 and the more recent translations, Ezk 1974, and EdyB, *etorr.iko denean*.

See (6d) for a fourth compound form.

¹⁰ The translation into «ate» in (a) above must be understood as iterative or continuous; in (b), as a pure narrative past.

¹¹ Recall footnote 9 above for adjoined temporal clauses.

¹² The anteriority of the event or state referred to in the protasis (with respect to the contents of the apodosis) can be underlined by the duplication of the auxiliary - see (iii) in footnote (14) for instance: *madarikatu izan banindu*, lit. 'if he had *had* cursed me', *mintzatu izan balitz*, lit. 'if he had *had* spoken'.

In (4a), *-ke* indicates prediction, somehow grammaticalizing the *then* of the *if-then* correlative couple of complex conditional sentences.

Three variants of the past conditional (4b) deserve to be mentioned. Until the 17th century, the epistemic morpheme *-ke* was usually affixed to the auxiliary root, see (5a).¹³ As for (5b), although Lafitte's grammar describes the form as usual, it has fallen out of use (see also Oyharçabal 2003), but it was well-attested until the very end of the 19th century;¹⁴ what is interesting in this particular case is the fact that the morphological quasi-symmetry <perfective *ba+l...*> (in the protasis) / <perfective *l...+ke*> (in the apodosis) has been replaced by a morphologically distinct form in the apodosis, probably owing to the intuitive semantic proximity of the future in the past (recall the first translation of (2c)).

Finally, (5c), which, to my knowledge, is rarely mentioned in Basque descriptions, is attested in (mainly, but not only) in the *Zub.* translations provided in Aurkoetxea & Videgain 2004 (see the Appendix).¹⁵

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| (5) | a | <i>ja.nen / har.tuko zu.ke.en</i> | 'he would have eaten / taken it' |
| | b | <i>jan / hartu l.u.ke</i> | (<i>id.</i>) |
| | c | <i>jan / hartu zu.ke.en</i> | (<i>id.</i>) |

In any case, both (4a) and (5a) point towards two distinct ways of referring to 'ulteriority': the prospective participles *ja.nen* and *har.tuko* indicate temporal poste-

¹³ (5a) is also the standardized construction recommended by the Basque Academy (*Euskaltzaindia*).

¹⁴ To wit, consider the alternation between the *Zub.* and *Lap.* translations of Ps 54/55,12-13: Archü (1862) first uses the structure (4b), and next the one illustrated by (5b), whereas Duvoisin (1859-65) reverses his choices:

- a) LV-54,13 Quoniam si inimicus meus maledixisset mihi, sustinuissem utique. Et si is qui oderat me super me magna locutus fuisset, abscondissem me forsitan ab eo. / CDR-54/55,13 For if my enemy had reviled me, I would verily have borne with it. And if he that hated me had spoken great things against me, I would perhaps have hidden myself from him.
- b) Arch-54,12 Ene etsaiak gaitzetsitü banündü, *enizün* hitzik ere erra.*nen*. 13 Eta hügüntzen nündienak nitzaz gaizki handi erran balü, behar bada *gorde nündükeüzün* harenganik. [*gorde* 'keep, kept' has a phonetically null perfective ending].
- c) Dv-54,13 Ezen baldin ene etsaiak madarikatu izan banindu, *jasan nukeen* segurki. Eta gaitzirizkotan nindaukana, ene kontra goraki mintzatu izan balitz, *gordeko nintzen* eiki haren ganik.

See also the Appendix.

¹⁵ Lafitte (1962: § 720) does not mention the use of this compound tense as a past (counterfactual) conditional, and in the table that follows his § 639, *galdu zateken* is only translated by «il devait s'être perdu» - i.e. it is understood as a past tense associated with the expression of the epistemic modality of (fairly strong) probability. Likewise, Ithurry (1895: 381) only translates *ukhan zukeen* by «il l'avait probablement eu». As for Gèze (1873), a book devoted to *zuberuera*, the combination is not even mentioned. See, however, Bonaparte's ([1869] 1991: 192-196) «Conditionnel passé parfait» (tense No 34), Gavel & Lacombe's (1937: 57) «conditionnel parfait antérieur» and Lafon's ([1951], 1999: 306-307) «conditionnel passé, 2^e forme». In the footnote 7 to his «Septième tableau préliminaire - Temps dits composés», concerning the forms *erori zatekian* (and *ikhusi zükian*), Bonaparte writes: «[...] le futur passé et le futur passé absolu y [i.e. in *Zub.*] sont moins employés que le passé parfait et le passé antérieur absolu du conditionnel: *erori zatekian*, *eroririk izan zatekian* [sont employés] plutôt que *eroriko zen*, *eroririk izanen zen*.»

riority with respect to the reference point R provided implicitly or explicitly by the protasis,¹⁶ whereas *-ke* in the auxiliary marks a special type of assertion, expressing a logical prediction made by the speaker (prediction, and the expression of (high) probability, although intuitively very proximate, are distinct psychological attitudes, even if formal semanticists almost never consider prediction as a special subtype of modality). We shall see another association of the prospective ending on the lexical verb and the affixation of *-ke* on the auxiliary in section 11.

5. The second analytic conjugation and the aoristic (defective) auxiliaries

Let us now consider two defective verbs, which can only be used as (inflected) auxiliaries in certain compound tenses, and whose reconstructed forms are *°edin* (used with unaccusative verbs, root *-a(d)i-*) and *°ezan* (with unergative and transitive verbs, root *-eza-*).¹⁷ They will be noted AUX₂ below. A specific property of these pure auxiliaries is that they do not combine with any of the aspectually marked participles, but with the radical of the lexical verbs.¹⁸

Sticking to the unmarked present tense for the time being, and choosing verbs in which the radical is distinct from the perfective participle, we thus do not only have three distinct analytic combinations (as suggested by (1) above), but four:

- (6) a *ekar.tzen du* 'he brings it', lit. 'carrying he-has-it'
- b *ekarr.i du* 'he has brought it', lit. 'carried he-has-it'
- c *ekarr.iko du* 'he'll bring it', lit. 'to-carry he-has-it'
- d *ekar °deza*¹⁹

Here again appears the symbol '°', and no translation can be directly provided. This is because, like the forms of the *°nindoa* type, but now even in the present tense, an affix is compulsory for an AUX₂ to be licit - and the verb complex to be interpretable.

Until the end of the 17th century,²⁰ at least in the easternmost varieties of Northern Basque, the past suffix *-(e)n* (with *z-* replacing the present tense prefix *d-* of *°deza* above) was sufficient to license the forms, cf.:

¹⁶ Hence a «future tense» when the auxiliary is in the present tense, i.e. when Speech Time and the Reference Point either coincide, or belong to the (subjectively defined) same time interval - but a «future in the past» when it is in the past tense.

¹⁷ Lafitte (1962), who used *ukan* for «have» in his conjugation tables, unfortunately labelled this auxiliary *izan*, although it has nothing to do with «be». There is, by the way, a third defective auxiliary, *iron*, an inherently potential variant of (transitive) *°ezan*, which I'm leaving out here, because the affixation of *-ke* to it seems to have been merely pleonastic.

¹⁸ For the strong verbs, one must distinguish between the radicals, which often have a vowel prefix that drops in inflected forms, and the roots proper, which are devoid of that prefix. Thus *etorri* and *ekarri* are the perfective participles of «come» and «bring», *etor-* and *ekar-* their radicals, and *-tor-* and *-kar-* their roots.

¹⁹ Ithurry (1895: 58) already listed *dadi* and *deza* among a list of strong verbs in the present tense.

²⁰ As is well-known to Bascolologists, Leizarraga's (1571) *New Testament* is replete with such aoristic past forms, which were the unmarked narrative past tense in that text.

- (7) a Aingerua [...] Nazarete hirira *ethor ze.di.n.* (Oy. 1657-64, XX: 25-28)²¹
 angel-SG Nazareth town-to $\sqrt{\text{come AUX}_2\text{-PAST}}$
 'The angel came to the town of Nazareth.'
 b *Inhardets ze.za.n* hitz hotan: ... (*id.*, XX: 43)
 $\sqrt{\text{answer AUX}_2\text{-PAST word these-in}}$
 'She replied with these words: ...'

The affixes that bridge the gap between the speech situation and the event or state referred to (which gap I suggested was conveyed by the °*nindoa* type paradigms), and those that licence the aoristic combinations are partly distinct. Besides the case of the past tense suffix, which has just been dealt with, two more morphemes belong to both lists: hypothetical *ba-* 'if' and its consequent counterpart *-ke* in the two conditional paradigms (*ikus ba.l.eza*, *har l.eza.ke* 'if he saw it, he'd take it').²²

With the prefixes *d-* and *z-*, i.e. when the meaning is really temporal, *-ke* always yields a potential interpretation: *ekar d.eza.ke* 'he can bring it', *eror d.ai.te(ke)* 'he can fall down' (*eror.i*, 'fall(en)'), whereas it does not normally do with the non aoristic forms: *ekarr.i du.ke* and *ekar.tzen du.ke* today have a pure (epistemic) value of probability (superior to equi-possibility): 'he must have brought it', 'he probably brings it' (but see below for another semantic value of *-ke* in non-aoristic conjugations).

Finally, the complementizers *-(e)n* and *-(e)la* help form various subjunctives, see (8b) below for instance for the former one.

6. On the opposition between the synthetic and the analytic conjugations

A quite lucid description is provided by Oyharçabal (2003: 251-2):

For those few verbs which possess synthetic forms, the synthetic present expresses continuous aspect, whereas the analytical present has a habitual meaning; e.g. *nator* 'I'm coming', *nago* 'I am / stay' vs. *etortzen naiz* 'I come', *egoten naiz* 'I usually am/stay'.²³

But the author immediately adds that "this distinction is not always made" in the Eastern [i.e. Northern] dialects, in which "synthetic forms tend to be used only as stylistic variants of the corresponding analytical present forms." The reason seems

²¹ Oyhenart wrote in the Low Navarrese subdialect of the *Pays de Mixe* (*Amikuzera* in Basque), which is very proximate to (northern) Souletin (see Camino 2004); now, as far as the verbal morphology is concerned, these dialects are far more conservative or «archaic» than the western varieties of Northern Basque: for instance, there is no aoristic past in Axular's *Gero* (1643), the great classical Labourdin book.

²² For some speakers, there is an additional potential nuance introduced here - perhaps under the influence of the Southern dialects and the Basque Academy's prescriptions.

²³ Let me add that the *izan* itself could be used in the imperfective aspect with an explicit iterative value when, for instance, used in the periphrastic passive (in which the perfect participle agrees in number with the promoted subject NP/DP in *NL*), as in (a) or as the lexical verb «have», as in (b):

- (a) *Zuek baino altxatuagoak izaten dire zeruko erresuman* (Lar. 1777, ch. 41)
 'They are praised higher than you in the kingdom of heaven.'
 (b) *guziek bardin grazia izaiten dute?* (Dih. 1892, 'Sacramenduak')
 'Do they all have (=get) the same grace?'

clear: given that the synthetic forms are morphologically simpler, they are unmarked - whence also their use in stage directions for example (Rebuschi [1982] 1997).

As for the weak verbs, although there does exist a specific imperfective or continuous periphrasis,²⁴ Oyharçabal (*ibid.*) also notes that (depending on the context or the situation), their participles in *-t(z)en* can be used with an imperfective, rather than iterative, interpretation.

More important is the fact that in some contexts (typically in embedded clauses), the synthetic conjugation is also ambiguous from the point of view of the opposition between the imperfective value and the aoristic one; thus *datorr.en*, in which the *-en* suffix is a complementizer, has two analytic counterparts:²⁵

- (8) a *Ez dakit [nor etortzen d.en].*
 NEG I-know who come-IMP AUX-*en*
 'I wonder who comes.' [embedded question]
- (b) *Nahi dut [etor dadi.(e)n].*
 want AUX √come AUX-*en*
 'I want him to come', lit. '... that he come' [governed subjunctive]

An example that illustrates the long-standing alternation between the synthetic and the analytic conjugations in the subjunctive mood is provided in (9):

- (9) Mk 14,12
 LV - Quo vis eamus et paremus tibi ut manduces pascha?/ KJV - Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the passover?
- a Hnd (1740: *Lap.*) - Norat nahi duzu **goazen** eta prepara diezazugun...
- b Dv (1859-65: *lap.*) - Norat nahi duzu **goan gaitezen** behar denaren zuri aphaintzera...
- c Léon (1946: *B-N*) - Norat nahi duzu **goazen**...²⁶

²⁴ With the adjective *ari* «busy» (Trask 1995). What shows that the lexical verb which precedes *ari*, and ends in *-t(z)en* is not an imperfective participle, but a nominalised form, is the fact that the direct object either must (in Souletin) or may (in the other northern dialects) be in the genitive case, rather than the zero/absolutive (see also Mounole 2008).

A lesser noted explicitly progressive or continuous periphrasis consists in using *izan* 'be' (rather than *egon* 'be/stay') as a main verb, also governing a nominalized form in *-t(z)en*. Here are two examples:

- (i) Egun batez nangoela zuhaintze baten itzalbian neure oren.en_a erraiten nintzala_g...
 'One day as I was [=sat/lay] in the shade of a tree, ([and] as I was) saying_g my prayers_a[GEN]...' (Tartas 1666: *Irakurtzailiari*)
- (ii) Nuiz nizzateke zu.re ikhusten?
 when I-shall-be you-GEN seeing
Quando stabo ad videndum te? 'When shall I stand beholding you?' (Maister 1757: 3,48,3)

²⁵ This was already true in the 16th century: see Lafon (1944: vol. 1, 162-163). The same ambiguity arises with another C° suffix, *-(e)la*, governed by verbs of saying. For instance, *datorrr.ela* corresponds either to (*Erraiten dute*) *etor dadi.la* 'They say [=order] that he (must) come' (subjunctive) or to (*Erraiten dute*) *etor.tzen d.ela* 'They say [=report] that he comes'.

²⁶ In (9a,c), the initial *g-* of *goazen* indicates a 1st p. plural absolutive argument. On the other hand, in (9b), the initial *g-* of *goan* is the radical prefix of the typical *Lap.* form of '(to) go' - in other dialects, the prefix is *j-*. Consequently, the initial *g-* of the AUX₂ *gaitezen* in (9b) is simply (a part of) the absolutive prefix *g(a)-*.

7. The suffix *-ke* as a ‘future’ morpheme in the synthetic conjugation

Up to now, we have already seen that the modal suffix *-ke* has several readings: first, suffixed to the aoristic auxiliaries in the present and past tenses —and consequently also sometimes in the synthetic conjugation— it contributes to a merely potential interpretation of the verb complex; second, when it is attached to any inflected form in *-l-*, it marks the logical consequence expressed by the apodosis in a complex conditional sentence; third, in the other cases, it ‘normally’ expresses probability in today’s *NL*.

It is also well-known that in the Souletin dialect, it can form a ‘synthetic’ (in fact, agglutinative, but definitely not analytic) future tense (Archu 1862, Gèze 1873, Gavel & Lacombe 1937, Coyos 1999: 241) if it is suffixed to an inflected form in a non-aoristic present.

But it is less generally known that the same fact was also true of the other northern dialects, even fairly recently.²⁷

Here are two illustrations with ‘have’ as a lexical verb.²⁸

(10) *Imit* 3,4,1

Non curabis de vanis hominum verbis. ‘You will not care for men’s vain words.’

a Inch (1883: *Zub.*) - *Eztükezü* axolik jenten gaizki erranez.²⁹

b Hst (1896: *Lab.*) - Gizonen elhe hutsalez zer axola *dukezu*?

c Léon (1929: *B-N*) - Jendeen solas alferrez ez *dukezu* axolarik.

(11) *Mt* 6,1

LV - Alioquin mercedem non habetis apud Patrem vestrum...

KJV - Otherwise ye have no reward of your Father... / CDR - Otherwise you shall not have a reward of your Father who is in heaven.

a Dv (1859-65: *Lap.*) - saririk ez *dukezue* zuen Aita zeruetan denaren baita[tik].

b Léon (1946: *B-N*) - saririk ez *dukezue* zuen Aita zerukoaren ganik.

²⁷ Ithurry (1895: 59) only translates *dagoke* and *zegokeen* by «*il peut rester*» and «*il pouvait rester*» respectively. This future was however also acknowledged for the Labourdin dialect in Bonaparte 1869, but was accompanied by the following disputable qualification: «Le futur de l’indicatif, en labourdin, a une signification qui est toujours conjecturale et qui diffère de celle du futur composé.» Oyharçabal (2003) also gives one example from the end of the 19th century in which the value is clearly futural, but does not discuss its use and implications.

²⁸ The possibility of course existed with other transitive verbs. In two distinct translations of the Revelation (Apocalypse), Duvoisin thus offers:

(a) *Rev/Apoc* 3,3

LV - veniam ad te tamquam fur et nescies qua hora veniam ad te.

CDR - and thou shalt not know at what hour I will come to thee.

(i) Dv 1859-65 [*Bible*] - ez *duzu jakinen* zein orduz ethorriko natzaitzun.

(ii) Dv [ms., *Apoc*-1] - ez *dakikezu* zer mugaz ethorriko natzaitzun.

AnBa (1828) also has *ez dakikezu*. Interestingly, none of the earlier translations used this synthetic form.

²⁹ Maister (1757: *Souletin*) has an analytic future here: *Eztüzü gizonen elhe banuetzaz axolik ükhenen*. In fact, in appears that Inchauspé’s more recent text has many more examples of the «futural» *-ke* than Maister’s.

- c Ezk (1974: *N-L*) - Bertzela sarririk ez *dukezue* zuen Aita zerukoaren aintzi-
nean.³⁰

Here are now examples with two unaccusative verbs.

- (12) *Imit* 3,48,9 - Ipsi stabunt foris ejulantes. 'They will stay out lamenting.'
Léon (1929: *B-N*)³¹ Kanpoan *baitagozke* hek orrobiaka.
- (13) Mt 6,23
LV - Si autem oculus tuus nequam fuerit, totum corpus tuum tenebrosum erit.
Si ergo lumen, quod in te est, tenebrae sunt, tenebrae quantaerunt!
CDR - 'But if thy eye be evil thy whole body shall be darksome. If then the
light that is in thee, be darkness: the darkness itself how great shall it be!'
a Lç (1571)³² - Baina baldin hire begia gaixto bada hire gorputz guzia ilhun
da.te.k: beraz baldin hitan den argia ilhunbe bada, ilhunbe hura zein handi
date?³³
b Dv (1859-65: *Lab.*) - Aitzitik zure begia gaitza *badaite*, beltza *daite* zure gor-
putz guzia. Baldin beraz zure baithan den argia ilhunbea [*ba*]*daite*, ilhun-
beak berak *zenbatekoak ez daizte*?³⁴
c Léon (1946: *B-N*) - eri balin *baduzu* aldiz begia, ilhun *dukezu*³⁵ gorputz
guzia. Zutan den argia ilhunbe balin *bada* beraz, nolakoak *ditazke* ilhunbeak
berak?

³⁰ I have even found examples in which only Léon (first half of the 20th century) uses *-ke* with a future value, e.g.:

- (a) Mk 16,(17-)18
LV-17: signa autem eos qui crediderint haec sequentur... 18: serpentes tollent et si mortiferum
quid biberint non eos *nocebit* super aegrotos manus inponent et bene habebunt / KJV - 17: And
these signs shall follow them that believe... 18: They shall take up serpents; and if they drink
any deadly thing, *it shall not hurt them*; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.
Léon (1946)-17: Sinesten dutenek huna zer mirakuluak egingen dituzten: ... 18 sugeak eskuetan
erabiliko, eta phozoinkia iretsirik ere ez *duket* kalterik, eskuak erien gainean emanen dituzte eta
eriak sendatuko dira. [Lit. «they shall have no harm».]

³¹ Here again, all the other translations in Northern Basque I know of have an analytic future here, *egonen dire/dira*: Pouvreau (1669), Arambillaga (1684), Chourio (1720), Haristoy (1896) in the *Labourdin* dialect, and Maister (1757) and Inchauspé (1883) in *Souletin*.

³² It is difficult to classify Leizarraga's language dialectwise; the translation obviously was intended to help build a Northern Basque *koinè*, and displays many Labourdin properties. However, as far as the conjugation is concerned, it definitely displays many eastern features - see the detailed discussion in Lafon (1944: I, 59-65).

³³ Leizarraga never used the familiar or «allocutive» forms (*da.te.k* here) in questions.

³⁴ Note first that the «futural» form *ba.dai.te* is also used in the two protases here — compare Lafon ([1970] 1999: 497): «Aujourd'hui même, [il] s'emploie rarement. Au lieu de dire *badoake* "s'il peut venir", *har badezake* "s'il peut prendre", on ajoute plutôt *ahal* "possible à des suppositifs ordinaires": *Joaiten ahal bada, hartzen ahal badu.*»

Second, note that this sentence also illustrates the (purely morphological) neutralisation between the *izan* «be» and *edin* in some varieties of *lap* and *NL* (as described in Bonaparte (1869) and Lafitte (1962), between others). This is also true of the plural form *daizte* at the end of this example, and of *ditazke* in (10c). But, as shown by ex. (12a) and (c), this was neither the case in Leizarraga's *NT*, nor in late 19th century *Zub*.

³⁵ The copula is twice translated by its bivalent variant «have» here.

Of course, one might argue that a potential “flavour” has been added to the Latin future, but in the following example, two unmarked (prospective) futures, (α) and (β), are explicitly paraphrased by a futural use of *-ke* (γ) and (δ), thereby excluding such a possibility:

- (14) Etcheberry (1875, pp. 212-213: *Lap.*)³⁶

Zer ere neurriz edo izarriz bertzeak izartuko, neur**tuko** baitituzue _{α} , zeroniek neurtuak izan**en** zarete _{β} . Erran nahi baita, zenbatenaz bertzentzat urrikalmendu, miserikordia baitu**kezu** _{γ} , hanbatenaz Jainkoa miserikordiatu **ditakela** _{δ} zuretzat. Lit. ‘By whatever measure you will measure or gauge _{α} the others, you will yourselves be gauged _{β} . Which means that by how much you will have _{γ} mercy or forgiveness for others, by so much will God be _{δ} merciful with you.’

Likewise, in the contexts to be presently examined, this objection does not hold either.

8. The perfective future or future perfect (*-tu + -ke*)

As could be expected, this use of *-ke* is also available with auxiliaries. This most often happens to express a “past in the future”, i.e. an accomplishment in the future, in adverbial clauses. We thus find many passages like the following:

- (15) Rev/Apoc 11,7

LV Et *cum finierint* testimonium suum, bestia... faciet adversum eos bellum / CDR And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast shall make war against them...

- a Lç (1571) - Eta **akabatu dukeitenean** bere testimoniajea, bestiak gerla eginen dik haien kontra.
- b AnBa (1828: *Lap.*) - Eta beren lekhukotasunaren bihurtzen **akabatu duketen** ondoan, ... Abreak gerla eginen diote.
- c Dv (1859-65: *Lap.*) - Eta **akhabatu duketenean** beren lekhukotasuna, basabe-reak gerla emanen diote.
- d Inch (1856: *Zub.*) - Eta **ürhentü dükeienian** bere jakilegoa, saia güdükan ariko da hoien kontre.

- (16) Rev/Apoc 20,7

LV - Et cum *consummati fuerint* mille anni, solvetur Satanas de carcere suo, et exhibit...

CDR - And when the thousand years shall be finished, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison and shall go forth...

- a Lç (1571) - Eta **konplitu diratenean** milla urtheak laxaturen date Satan bere presoindegitik.³⁷
- b Hnd (1740: *Lap.*) - Eta **akhabatu ditezkenen** milla urtheak, lexatua izanen da Satana eta atherako da bere presoindegitik...

³⁶ Etcheberry's book is another translation, but I have not been able to access the original text.

³⁷ On the «double future» *laxa.turen da.te* in the second clause, see §10.

- c Inch (1858: *Zub.*) - Eta *bethe diratekienian* mila urthiak, soltatürrik izanen da Satan bere presuntegitik, eta elkhiren da Satan bere presoindegitik...³⁸
- d Dv (1859-65: *Lap.*) - Eta *bethe ditezkeenean* mila urtheak, presondegiko es-teka hautsiko zaio Satani, eta ilkhiko da...

But the future perfect also appears in the apodosis (or main clause) of a non-fictitious conditional clause; in such cases, *-ke* does double duty, since it also marks the logical consequence that follows from the preceding clause in *ba-* 'if' - note the very late date of ex. (17e).

(17) Mt 18,15

LV - Si te audierit, *lucratus es* fratrem tuum. / KJV - if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. / CDR - If he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother.

- a Hnd (1740) - Aditzen *bazaitu*, *irabazi dukezu* zure anaia.
- b Dv (1859-65) - Entzuten *bazaitu*, *irabazi dukezu* zure anaia.
- c Sal (1856: *B-N*) - behatzen *bazauzu*, *irabazi dukezu* zure anaia.³⁹
- d (Léon 1946: *B-N*) - ontsa hartzen *bazitu*, zure aneia *irabazi dukezu*.
- e (Ezk 1974 *N-L*) - Entzuten *bazaitu*, zure anaia *irabazi dukezu*.

In (18) now, the first occurrence of the future perfect (α), although it appears in an embedded clause (governed by *uste duzue* 'do you think'), functions as if it were in a root clause: *Zenbateg tormenta borthitzagoa merezitu duke?* 'How much harder torment will he have deserved?' More interesting is the duplication of the auxiliary, which marks relative anteriority, in the second occurrence (β), thereby creating a "future pluperfect":

(18) Heb 10,29

LV - quanto magis putatis deteriora mereri supplicia qui Filium Dei conculca-verit...? [Nova Vulgata: quanto deteriora putatis *merebitur* supplicia...] / KJV - Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God...?

Lç (1571) - Zenbateg uste duzue tormenta borthitzagoa merezitu *dukeela* _{α} , Iainkoaren Semea oinen azpian ezarri *ukan dukeenak* _{β} ...?

Lit., 'How much worse torment do you think he will have deserved _{α} , he who will "have had" trodden _{β} upon the Son of God under his feet?'⁴⁰

9. The imperfective future (*-tzen* + *-ke*)

The combination of a *-t(z)en* participle and an auxiliary in *-ke*, on the other hand, is much rarer. Here are some examples— the first one from a translation, the

³⁸ Here in (c), and in (d), *bet(h)e* «fill, fulfill» is a perfective participle with a zero suffix.

³⁹ The other two 19th century *NL* translations available have the same compound form: Sal. (1856), Irib (1860), *idaazi dukezu*; Caz (1860), *iazi dukezu*.

⁴⁰ Just as the duplication of the auxiliary in past /counterfactual conditional protases is natural (recall footnotes 12 and 14), such instances as this one seem to have disappeared in the 17th century. Thus, the purported «modernized translation» of Lç (1571), referred to here under the abbreviation «AnBa (1828)» never uses such complex forms.

second one from a grammar of the same *Zub.* dialect, but the third one is indisputably in the *Lap.* dialect:⁴¹

(19) Mt 21,40

LV - *Cum ergo venerit dominus vineae, quid faciet agricolis illis?* / KJV - When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? / CDR - When therefore the lord of the vineyard shall come...

Inch (1856: *Zub.*) - *Jiten datekienian* mahastiaren nausia zer eginen dü mahastizai haier?

(20) Arch (1868, *Zub.*: 45)⁴²

Egün batez, ikhusten *nükezünian* zure nahiküntienzat ernetürük... kontent *zirate*...

'One day, when you see me anxious to please you, you'll be glad'⁴³

(21) Lk 21,31

LV - Ita et vos, *cum videritis* haec fieri, scitote quoniam prope est regnum Dei.

KJV - So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.

Hnd (1740: *Lap.*) - Hala zuek ere *ikusten dituzketzuenean* gauza horiek gerthazten, jakizue hurbill ditekela⁴⁴ Jainkoaren Erresuma.

(19) cannot be compositionally interpreted, because the act of coming must logically precede the one referred to in the second clause. As for (20) and (21), the case is unclear, since the seeing of the speaker doing this or that need not be over for the addressee to be glad in the first case, and the seeing and the learning in the second one may also be interpreted as simultaneous.

Finally, the next example is clearly compositional (and, here again, induced by the context):

⁴¹ Gèze (1873: 197) does not make any difference between the three forms *eskentüren dü*, *eskentüko dü* and *eskentzen düket* translated by «j'offrirai / je l'offrirai» and labelled «futur présent», i.e. future with respect to the present time. But if the first and second forms are mere free variants, it is difficult to admit that the third one is grammatically on a par with them.

⁴² Archu also used this form at least once (induced by the context - the preceding clause) when translating a text originally in the present tense:

(i) Ps 62/63,10/12

LV - Rex vero lætabitur in Deo; laudabuntur omnes qui *jurant* in eo...

KJV (63,11) - But the king shall rejoice in God; every one that *swaereth* by him shall glory / CDR-62/63,12 ... all they shall be praised that *swear* by him.

Ar (1862: Ps 62,10) - Errege aldiz alegeratüko düzü_α Jinkuan; laidatürük dütükezü_β haren izenian *egiten dütükienak*_γ oro.

Here, there is first an unmarked analytic future: *α*; next, a resultative medio-passive (the perfective participle is followed by the partitive suffix *-(r-)ik*: *β*; finally, the verb complex *γ* is another illustration of the imperfective participle associated with a auxiliary in the future.

⁴³ The author's own translation into French reads: «Un jour, quand vous me verrez docile à vos désirs... vous serez content...».

⁴⁴ On the *-ke* in this verb and the like, see §11 below.

(22) Mt 24,19

LV - Vae ... *nutrientibus* in illis diebus! / KJV - And woe unto them ... that *give suck* in those days!

a Lç (1571) - Dohain-gaitz ... *eredoskiten dukeitenen*⁴⁵ egun hetan!

b Hnd (1740: *Lap.*) - Zorigaitz, ordean, ... haurrak *eredoskiten duketenentzat* egun hetan.⁴⁶

10. The prospective future or “double future” (-*tuko* + -*ke*)

Cross-linguistically, the notion of “future in the future” is an interesting one -see among others the discussions in Jespersen (1924: ch. 19), Gardies (1975: 146-147) on the ‘compound tenses according to meaning’ in the Port-Royal *Grammaire*, and Areces & Blackburn (2005).

In any case, the association of a prospective participle and an auxiliary with -*ke* in a non-conditional sentence was attested from the 16th century till the 18th. However, it is only in Leizarraga (1571) that this compound tense systematically expresses ulteriority with respect to a (preliminary) event which is itself located in the future. Here are a few examples.⁴⁷ In (23), the context is clear: the first conjunct (which contains a relative clause) predicts that a time and event will arrive later, and the second conjunct (introduced by *eta* ‘and’) refers to a posterior event, as also indicated by the adverb *gero* ‘later’:

(23) Mt 9,15

LV - Venient autem dies, cum auferetur ab eis sponsus, et tunc ieiunabunt.

KJV - but the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, AND THEN shall they fast.

⁴⁵ Note yet another allomorph of -*ke*:- *-kei-*, only attested, as far as I know, in Lç (1571) with °*edun*. Besides, re: the ending -*en* here, recall that in early Northern Basque, the genitive could convey a prolativ or destinative meaning (cf. -*ent.tzat* in (21b)).

⁴⁶ See also:

(i) Lk 9,48

LV - Quicumque susceperit puerum istum in nomine meo, me recipit; et, quicumque me receperit, recipit eum, qui me misit. / KJV - Whosoever shall receive this child in my name receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me receiveth him that sent me.

Hnd (1740: *Lap.*) - Nork ere errezibituko *baidu* haur hau ene izenean, ni *nauke errezibitzen*, eta ni errezibitzen *nauenak duke errezibitzen* ni igorri nauena.

The first conjunct is particularly clear: the imperfective participle indicates the simultaneity of the two actions (that of receiving this child, located in the future, and that of receiving the speaker), a clear contribution to the intended identificational meaning of the sentence. But since the participle fulfills this function, the only way to express the future is to have recourse to -*ke*. If, admittedly, the second conjunct is less transparent (owing to the use of the imperfective, rather than prospective, participle in the free relative), both uses of -*ke* are parallel.

⁴⁷ Intriguingly, if Lafon ([1972] 1999: 517) does write: «Tandis que le futur composé [usuel] exprime un fait futur, sans autre précision, le future [«double» - cf. Lafon 1944, II, 69-74] à suffixe -*ke* set à exprimer soit un fait futur de date indéterminée et qui est sujet à se répéter, soit un futur qui s’accomplira intégralement et instantanément (futur non-duratif), soit un fait futur qui s’accomplira après un autre fait futur (futur que l’on pourrait appeler ultérieur)», however, none of the examples that follow in that text (1999: 517-519) illustrate the third case, which is the one on which I naturally wish to concentrate.

Lç (1571) - Baina ethorriren *dirade*⁴⁸ egunac edekiren *baitzaie* ezkondua ETA ORDUAN barur eginen *baitukeite*.

In (24) now, there is a succession of two instances of a perfective future (α, α'), which mark the anteriority of the actions with respect to the unmarked analytic future (β), and finally a prospective future which indicates the fact that yet another action will take place later on (γ):

(24) Rev/Apoc 2,26-27

LV - 26: *Et qui vicerit*, et custodierit usque in finem opera mea, dabo illi potestatem super gentes, 27: et reget eas in virga ferrea... / KJV - 26: And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations. 27: And he shall rule them with a rod of iron...

Lç (1571) - 26: Ezen biktoria *ukan dukaanari*⁴⁹, eta ene obrak finerano begiratu *ditukaanari*_a, emanen *draukat*_b bothere Jentilen gainean. 27: Eta gobernatur *en diture*_c burdinazko zihorrez...

A few examples of a transparent use of the future in the future are attested until the 19th century, see (25), where, now, the imperative clause that precedes the relevant one clearly implies that a future preliminary action will have taken place:

(25) Mt 7,5

LV - (Eice *primum* trabem de oculo tuo,) et *tunc* videbis eicere festucam de oculo fratris tui. / KJV - (*First* cast out the beam out of thine own eye;) and *then* shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

Hrt (1855: *Lap.*) - Khen ezazu *lehenik* eta *orduan* ikhusiko *dukezu* nola khien dezakezun zure anaiaaren begitik phitsa.

Haraneder (1740) also has quite a few prospective participles associated with a future auxiliary. In one case, his use is parallel to Leizarraga's:

(26) Rev/Apoc 10,6-7

LV - 6: et juravit... quia tempus non erit amplius: 7: sed ... cum cœperit tuba canere...

CDR - 6: And he swore ... That time shall be no longer. 7: But... when he shall begin to sound the trumpet...

a Lç - 6: Eta iura zezan ... ezen gehiago denborarik eztela izanen: 7: Baina zazpigarren Aingeruaren bozeko egunetan tronpetaz ioiten hasiren *denean* akabatur *en datela* lainkoaren misterioa

⁴⁸ The reader must carefully distinguish between the present form *dira.de* «they are», 3rd p. pl., and the future form *dira.te* «they will be»: *-de* is a (redundant) pluralizer, whereas *-te* is an allomorph of *-ke* and *-teke*, as mentioned above.

⁴⁹ Interestingly, In Leizarraga's text, because the second form is the unmarked one, the sentences that follow are of the same type β :

(i) LV - ...et tamquam vas figuli confringentur, 28: sicut et ego accepi a Patre meo; et dabo illi stellam matutinam. / KJV - ...as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father. 28: And I will give him the morning star.

Lç (1571) - ...eta xehekatur *en dirade* lurrezko unziak bezala, nik ere Aitaganik rezebitu ukan dudan bezala; ²⁸Eta emanen *draukat* hari artizarra.

- b Hnd (1740: *Lap.*) - 6: juramentu egin zuen ... denborarik ez *zela izanen* gehiago, 7: baiñan ... tronpeta *jonen zukenean*...⁵⁰

But in the overwhelming majority of the cases, there is, as far as I can see, absolutely no possible semantic difference between such forms and the unmarked analytic future.⁵¹

11. Other uses of *-ke* with non-aoristic verb forms

Finally, there remain quite a few (pragmatic) uses of *-ke*, both in the synthetic and the analytic conjugations, which can best be defined as conveying *the speaker's strong commitment* to the content of his speech. Here are three examples, the first two with a *izan* 'be' synthetically conjugated, and the third with *-ke* suffixed to an auxiliary.⁵²

- (27) Mt 13,19

LV - Omnis, qui audit verbum regni et non intellegit, venit Malus et rapit, quod seminatum est in corde eius; hic est, qui secus viam seminatus est.

CDR - When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, there cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart: this is he that received the seed by the way side.

Hnd (1740: *Lap.*) - Nork ere aditzen baidu Erresumako hitza eta ez baidu hartzen ungi, heldu da izpiritu gaixtoa eta arrapatzen du haren bihotzean erein izan dena; hura *diteke* bidearen basterrean erein izan dena.

- (28) Etcheberry (1875, p. 263: *Lap.*) - 'Jauna, zein da beraz salduko zaituena?'

Jesusek ihardetsi zuen: 'Hura *ditake* nik ogia bustirik emanen diodana.'

Lit., "Lord, which is, then, the one who will betray you?' Jesus replied: 'It is/will be the one to whom I shall give the moistened bread.'⁵³

⁵⁰ *Cæpere* «begin» is left untranslated, but this does not affect the point under discussion.

⁵¹ A century later, such vacuous double futures were still to be found:

- (i) Mt 6,6

LV Tu autem cum orabis, intra in cubiculum tuum... / CDR - But thou when thou shalt pray, enter ...

Hrt (1855: *Lap.*) - zure othoitza eginen *dukezunean*...

⁵² In the following translations (with *°edun* used as a lexical verb), it is difficult to know whether *-ke-* marks a situation-induced future, or the speaker's strong commitment:

- (i) Jn 12,48

LV - non accipit verba mea, *habet* qui iudicet eum / KJV & CDR - He that ... receiveth not my words, *hath* one that judgeth him.

a Hnd (1740: *Lap.*) - ene hitzak errezibitzen ez dituenak, *baduke* bere jujea.

b Hrt (1855: *Lap.*) - ene hitzak onhesten eztituenak, *baduke* juierik asko.

c Urr (1873: *Zub.*) - ene elhiak sinhesten ezitituanak, *baduke* nurk jüja.

⁵³ A passage inspired by Jn 13,26. Even Haraneder used the present tense here-but he did use a double future in the (semi-)free relative clause: *Haiña da nik ogia bustirik emanen diokedana*.

(29) Mt 26,25

LV - "Numquid ego sum, Rabbi?". Ait illi: "Tu dixisti". / KJV - Master, is it I?
He said unto him, Thou hast said. / CDR: ... Thou hast said it.

Hnd (1740: *Lap.*) - «Nausia, ni othe naiz?». Ihardetsi izan zioen Jesusek: «Erran *dukezu*».

It should be obvious that the suffix *-(te)ke* in the foregoing examples does not contribute any epistemic value of potentiality, or of probability; neither does it help to refer to ulteriority: its rôle is to highlight the assertion as such.

This pragmatic use of *-ke* is restricted to root clauses - as could be expected, since it is root clauses are the normal locus for the expression of the illocutionary force of an utterance.

The same usage can be found in the 20th century, as in the following excerpt (in the original Latin text, note the ellipsis of 'be', which can only be understood as a generic present):

(30) *Imit* 2,1,1

Frequens illi visitatio cum homine interno, dulcis sermocinatio, grata consolatio, multa pax, familiaritas stupenda nimis. / Benham - 'He often visiteth the inward man and holdeth with him sweet discourse, giving him soothing consolation, much peace, friendship exceeding wonderful.'

Léon (1929: *B-N*) - Gizon bilduak ardura *duke* Jesus ikusliar; ardura *dituzke* haren bake nasai, elhe gozo, kontsolamendu eztiak, eta harekin adiskidetasun bat harritzekoa.

In (31) now, the reference to ulteriority and the speaker's commitment are conflated - in any case, since it is the Lord who is (supposed to be) speaking, neither potentiality nor probability can be involved:

(31) *Imit* 3,43,2

Cui ego loquar, cito sapiens erit... / He to whom I speak will be quickly wise.

Léon (1929: *B-N*) - Nori ere mintzo bainiz eta hura laster *ditake* jakintsu...⁵⁴

A final example from is provided in (32) - again, only Léon's translation displays *-ke*:

(31) Mt 13,12

LV - Qui enim habet, dabitur ei, et abundabit / KJV - For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he *shall have* more abundance.

Léon (1946: *B-N*) - Baduenari emanen izanen zaio, eta hola gaindika *baduke*.

Conclusions

In the aspectually specified analytic conjugation, when the (primary, non-defective) auxiliaries are in the present or past tense, the suffix *-ke* basically indicates prob-

⁵⁴ For this passage, only Léon has *-ke*: all the other translators (see the list in footnote 31) simply use the unmarked prospective future.

ability in *NL* today, but it could also have a future value until at least the middle of the 20th century (just as it has always had in *Zub.*). This latter semantic import is obviously linked to the “prediction” contribution *-ke* has always had in the inflected verb forms used in the apodoses of conditional sentences (referring to either a fictitious or a possible or real world). Thus, in *NL*, the suffix *-ke* is not inherently potential: in these dialects at least, it is only potential when suffixed to the defective, aoristic auxiliaries (AUX_2) in the present and past tenses, associated with the radical of a lexical verb (and the corresponding synthetic forms).

Finally, *-ke* could also indicate the speaker’s strong commitment to what s/he said. This suffix is thus an underspecified modal morpheme, whose more precise interpretation is sometimes, but not always, dictated by its morpho-syntactic environment.

Appendix: the distribution of *-ke* and related conjugated forms in the *Recueil Bourciez*

As the examples in the paper all come from religious sources, and can thus be considered to be stylistically biased, I wish to provide here a description of the 140 over translations into Northern Basque of the five French future tenses, and the one past conditional, found in a text⁵⁵ which was systematically translated into the local subdialects in the very late 19th century (Aurrekoetxea & Videgain eds., 2004).⁵⁶ Here are the main results.

- (a) The “pure” future:⁵⁷ (*Je vais me lever, j’irai trouver mon père*) et [*je*] *lui di-rai*..., ‘I’ll go to my father and *will tell* him...’ (§5) [Lk 15,18]
‘[Je] lui dirai’ is *always* translated by a (morpho-phonological variant of the) basic form of the unmarked type: *joanen naiz*.
- (b) A future passive: *Tu seras puni*, ‘You’ll be punished.’ (§2) [No counterpart in Lk]

This case is more interesting, since the passive is periphrastic:⁵⁸ the perfective participle either agrees in number with the (promoted) subject (*Lap.* & *NL*) or is followed by the partitive suffix *-(r)ik* (*Zub.*). The question is then whether *izan* ‘be’ is itself in the prospective, and followed by an auxiliary (the same ‘be’) in the present

⁵⁵ In spite of its title, it is a secularized —and expanded— version of Lk 15,11-32, translated in almost every local variety of Basque and Gascon in the last decade of the 19th century. Of course, A&V (2004) only provides the Basque versions. For details, see Videgain (2005).

⁵⁶ 150 translations are announced, but some texts are simply distinct transcriptions of the very same translations. Besides, sometimes, the translation is either skipped, or too removed from the original to be considered here.

⁵⁷ The idiomatic use of *aller* is usually translated by a simple prospective future, e.g. *xuti.tuko naiz*, except in a handful of periphrases, namely *xutizera(t) noa* with «to go» and a nominalized verb in the allative case (4 instances in *Lap.*), but also with *nahi izan/°edun* «want» (*BN*, 2 instances, *Zub.*, 3 instances), and with *behar izan/°edun* «must/have to» (*Lap.*, one case). The translation of the second verb (*j’irai*) is often dependent on the translation of the first one, which is the reason why I’m also leaving it out here.

⁵⁸ It is the (proportionately) high frequency of the word order of type III below which I take as a test that the Basque passive is periphrastic rather than analytic. See also ex. (a) in footnote 23 on this matter.

tense, or whether passive ‘be’ is directly inflected, but suffixed with *-ke*. I’ve distinguished three types:

- I: *Punitua/puniturik h(a)izate(ke)* [synthetic conjugation of the passive copula/auxiliary]
- II: *Punitua/puniturik izanen hiz* [analytic conjugation of the passive copula/auxiliary]
- III: *Izanen hiz punitua/puniturik* [analytic, with reversed word order]

In *Lap.* and *BN*, type I is *never* used, not even in the Pays de Cize (*Amikuze*); but there are 10 examples of type I in *Zub.*, as against 21 instances of type II and 8 cases of type III.⁵⁹

- (c) A volitive future: *Comme tu voudras* ‘As you like.’⁶⁰ (§1) [No counterpart in Lk]

We have here another periphrasis, with *nahi* which can be interpreted (here) as an uninflected noun, ‘will’ and a form of *°edun* ‘(to) have’. Four constructions are used:

- I: *Nahi duk(an bezala)*, often contracted into *nahuk(an b.)*, i.e. with no futurity expressed (*duk* is in the present tense).
- II: *Nahiko duk(an bezala)*, with the prospective morpheme directly suffixed to *nahi*.⁶¹
- III: *Nahi dukek(an bezal)a*, where it is *ukan/°edun* which is marked for the future by *-ke*.
- IV: *Nahi izanen/ukanen duk(an bezala)*, with a periphrastic future for ‘to have’ replacing the synthetic form of type III.

In the historical province of Labourd (*Lapurdi*), there are 30 translations of type I, two of type II (in *Urcuit-Urketa* and *Jatxou-Jatsu*), and one of type III (in *Bardos-Bardoze*, the easternmost village of the province). In Low Navarre (*Behe-Nafarroa*), there are 60 translations of type I, only one of type II (in *Aincille-Aintzila*), and 6 of type III (two in the territory of *Arbonel/Arberoa*, 3 in the *Pays de Mixel/Amikuze*, and one in the *Pays de Cize/Garazi*). As we turn to Soule-Zuberoa, the situation is dramatically different: there are 18 translations of type III, almost as many as of type I (21); finally, there is only one instance of type II (in *Haux-Hauze*), and this area is the only one in which an occurrence of type IV can be found (in *Etcharry-Etxarri*).⁶²

⁵⁹ Therefore, there is, in fact, no example of *punitua h(a)izate(ke)*: only *puniturik hizate(ke)* is really attested.

⁶⁰ Context: ‘Donnez-moi ce que je dois avoir.’ [...] ‘Give me what I’m entitled to.’

⁶¹ There does exist a verb *nahitu* ‘to have come to desire’ (*DGV/OEH*, vol. 12), for which both a perfective use (with an inflected auxiliary) and an imperfective use (*nahitzen*) are attested. Therefore, the expected prospective would be *nahituko*; it follows that *nahiko* must be analyzed differently, probably as an elliptical form of *nahi izan/ukan* + the prospective suffix.

⁶² The enormous proportion of type I translations is probably due to the idiomatic character of the future tense in the French expression in the text. It is therefore difficult to draw definite conclusions from the figures obtained, although the contrast between the use of type III (in which *-ke* appears) in *Zub.* vs. the other dialects no doubt reflects the contrasting figures obtained in case (b), the future passive.

- (d) A deontic future: *'Il faudra que tu chantes toi aussi'* 'You will have to sing too' (§ 9) [No counterpart in Lk]

Here again, a periphrasis is used, in which *behar* replaces *nahi* of (c) above, and in which the word order varies: the lexical verb general follows the *behar*+aux. sequence.

The following types are attested:

- I: *Behar dukek kantatu / kantu egin*, with the inflected aux. in the *-ke*.
- I': *Kantatu behar dukek*, id., with the lexical verb preceding the *behar*+aux. sequence.
- II: *Beharko duk kantatu / kantu egin*, where prospective *-ko* is directly suffixed to *behar*.
- II': *Kantatu beharko duk* (same difference with II as in I' vs. I).
- III: *Behar izanen/ukanen duk kantatu*, where the verb *have* is itself submitted to the analytic prospective conjugation.

Here again, there is a strong contrast between the subdialects spoken in Labourd/*Lapurdi* and Low Navarre/*Behe-Nafarroa*, and Soule/*Zuberoa*. Thus, all the direct translations are of type II in the first two groups of dialects, in which neither type I nor type III are used. In the third province, on the contrary, there are only 9 translations of type II, but 18 of type I, and 7 of type III.

- (e) A potential future: *'Vous pourrez aussi prendre des coqs...'* 'You may [FUTURE] also take roosters...' (§ 7) [No counterpart in Lk]

'Be able/allowed to' can be rendered with the word *ahal* associated with either the imperfective, or the prospective, participle of the lexical verb, but also with its radical, associated with a defective auxiliary suffix with *-ke*. What is more, double (morphological) futures are possible. The possibilities are thus much larger than before, but some trends are clear. (Many texts do not use any means of referring to the future).

(i) When only one morpheme is used which can express futurity, it can be: *-ko* on *ahal* (in which case the lexical verb is in the imperfective aspect): *hartzen ahalko d(it)uzue* (type I) or *-kol-ren* as part of the prospective participle (in which case *ahal* remains unaffected): *hartuko ahal d(it)uzue* (type II). Type III has *-ke* suffixed to the inflected verb; in type IV and IV', it is *izan* 'be' which is in the prospective aspect and associated with an inflected form of the same verb *izan* used as an auxiliary.

- I: *Hartzen ahalko d(it)uzue* - Lap.: 7 occurrences; B-N: 11; Zub.: 2
- II: *Hartuko/harturen ahal d(it)uzue* - Lap.: 7; B-N: 20; Zub.: 5
- III: *Hartzen ahal d(it)ukezue* - Lap.: none; B-N: 5; Zub.: 17
- IV: *Hartzen ahal izanen/ukanen d(it)uzue* - Lap.: 1; B-N: none; Zub.: none
- IV': *Hartu ahal izanen/ukanen d(it)uzue* - Lap.: none; B-N: none; Zub.: 2

(ii) There also are three (purely morphological) double futures:

- V: *Hartuko/harturen ahal d(it)ukezue* - Lap.: none; B-N: none; Zub.: 2
- VI: *Hartuko/harturen ahal izanen/ukanen d(it)uzue* - Lap.: none; B-N: none; Zub.: 1 (Musculdy-Muskildi)

- VII: *Hartuko/harturen ahalko d(it)uzue* - Lap.: none; B-N: 1 (Irissarry-Irisarri); Zub.: none

Note that *-ke* on the inflected auxiliary remains typical of the Zub. dialects, and that there are no counterparts to IV/IV' (i.e. neither *hartzen ahalko d(it)ukezue* nor *hartu ahalko d(it)ukezue* are attested in the corpus).

- (f) The past conditional (§3): *Il avait quelquefois si grand faim qu'il aurait bien mangé ces feuilles de choux [...]. Mais personne ne lui donnait rien* 'He would have fain eaten...'. [Lk 15,16]

The various possibilities to express a past, counterfactual conditional were discussed in section, 4. We therefore expect four types to be used:

- I (type) *jan zukeen*, cf. (5c)
 - II (type) *janen zuen*, cf. (4b)
 - III (type) *janen zukeen* cf. (5a)⁶³
 - IV (type) *jan luke*, cf. (5b)
- Interestingly, type IV is *never* used.

In the province of Labourd, type II is the overwhelming winner: 28 instances; type I has 3 occurrences (Lahonce-*Lehuntze*, Halsou-*Haltsu*, Espelette-*Ezpeleta-a*),⁶⁴ and type III only one (Urcuit-*Urketa*). In Low Navarre, if type II is also widely predominant (58 cases); type I has 5, but type III has 8. Again, the province of Soule behaves differently: if type II is still predominant (21 cases), the number of cases of type I is almost as large (16), and there is no occurrence at all of type III.

To conclude, we can note that *-ke* appears five times out of five only in three places in *Haute Soule* - more exactly in the traditional territory called *Basabürüa*: Esquiule-*Ezkiula*, Trois-Villes-*Iruri* and Lagingue-*Liginaga*. On the other hand, the proportion of places in which *-ke* was not used in any of the passages is highest in the Western province of Labourd (31 texts out of 36), the situation of Low Navarre being naturally intermediate.

References

(i) The corpus

Notes. The references followed by a star (*) can be downloaded in r.t.f. (generally with a modernized spelling) at: <http://klasikoak.armiarma.com/alfa.htm>.

Those followed by two stars can be downloaded as photographic documents at: <http://www.euskadi.net/LiburutegiDigitala/>.

[A&V] Aurrekoetxea, G. & Videgain, X. (arg.), 2004, *Haur prodigoaren parabola ipar euskal herriko 150 bertsiotan*, UPV/EHU, Bilbao/Bilbo.*

⁶³ *Hartü zükean* and even *hartzen zükean* are mentioned as possible past conditionals in today's Soule (Arbailles-*Arbaila*) in Coyos (1999: 245).

⁶⁴ The other translation from Espelette has type II.

- [AnBa] (anon.), 1828, *Testamen berria*, Lamaignière, Bayonne.**
- Arambillaga, d'—, 1684, *Jesu Christoren Imitacionea*, Fauvet, Bayonne.*[only books III & IV].
- [Arch] Archü, J.-B., 1862, «Daviden gorantzak edo psalmiak». Ms. ed. by R. M. Pagola *et al.*, *Bonaparte ondareko eskuizkribuak*, Zuberera, Deustuko Unibertsitatea, Bilbao/Bilbo, 1999, vol. I, 114-242.*
- [Caz] Cazenave, A., 1860, «Jesu Khristoin Ebanjelio Seindia San Mathiün aäbera», ms. published by R. M. Pagola *et al.* (arg.) in *Bonaparte Ondareko Eskuizkribuak, Ekialdeko Behe-nafarrera*, I, Deustuko Unibertsitatea, Bilbao/Bilbo, 1999, 17-76.
- [Dih] Diharassarry, L., 1892, *Giristino legea laburzki*. Bayonne: Lasserre.*
- [Dv] Duvoisin, J.-P., 1865, *Bible edo Testament Zahar eta Berria [...]*, London. Facsim., La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca, Bilbao/Bilbo, 1972.*
- [Edy] Etchehandy, M., 1992, *Hebrearrei [...] gutunak; Apokalipsia, grekotik euskararat itzuliak*, Elkar, San Sebastián/Donostia.
- [EdyB] Etchehandy, M., 2007, *Elizen Arteko Biblia [lapurtar-baxenabartarrez]*. Beloc: Biblia Elkartea & Belokeko Fraidetxea.
- [Etch] Etcheberry, J.-B., 1875, *Testament Zaharreko eta Berrico istorioa. Francez liburu aphezpikuek onhetsia den baten gainean hekuaraz eguina*. Lasserre, Bayonne.**
- [Ezk] (anon.), 1974, *Jesu Kristoren Berri Ona*. Ezkila, Bonloc/Lekuine.
- [Hnd] Haraneder, J., 1740, *Jesu Christoren Evangelio Saindua*, Ms., ed. by P. Altuna, Euskaltzaindia, Bilbao/Bilbo, 1990.*
- [Hrt] Harriet, M., 1855, *Jesu-Christo gure Iaunaren Testament Berria [...]*, Lasserre, Bayonne.
- [Hst] Haristoy, P., 1896, *Jesu-Kristoren Imitazionea, P. Haristoy Ziburuko errotaraz argitara emana*, Dufau & Vignancour, Pau.**
- [Inch] Inchauspé, E., 1856, *Le saint Evangile selon saint Mathieu, traduit en basque souletin*, Bayonne, Lamaignière.
- , Inchauspé, E., 1883, *Jesu-Kristen Imitacionia*, Veuve Lamaignière, Bayonne.**
- [Irib] Iribarnegaray, X., 1860, «Yesu Kristoin Ebanjelioa San Mathiain arabera», ms. ed. by R. M. Pagola *et al.*, in *Bonaparte Ondareko Eskuizkribuak, Mendebaldeko behe-nafarrera*, Deustuko Unibertsitatea, Bilbao/Bilbo, 1999, p. 17-81.
- [Lar] Larréguy, B., 1777, *Testamen Berrico Historia*. Bayonne: Fauvet-Duharte.*
- [Lç] Liçarrague/Leičarraga, J., 1571, *Iesus Christ Gure Iaunaren Testamentu Berria [...]*.* Léon, L. 1929, *Jesu-Kristoren Imitazionea*.*
- , 1946, *Jesu-Kristo gure Jaunaren Ebanjelio Saindua*, published by the author, Ustaritz.
- [Mai] Maister, M., 1757, *Jesu-Kristen Imitacionia*. Dugué & Desbaratz, Pau.*[books I & III]/**[the four books]
- [Oy] d'Oyhénart(e), A., 1657-1664, *Proverbes et poésies basques*. Reed. by J.-B. Orpustan, Izpegi, Saint-Etienne-de-Baïgorry/Baigorri, 1992.
- [Sal] Salaberry, M., «d'Ibarrole», 1856, «L'Evangile selon Saint Mathieu, sur la version de M. le Maistre de Sacy [...]». Veuve Lamaignière, Bayonne. Facsim. in L.-L. B., *Opera omnia vasconice*, 1991, Euskaltzaindia, Bilbao-Bilbo, vol. III, 335-420.
- Tartas, I., 1666, *Oña hilceco bidia*, Jacques Rouyer, Orthez. Critical ed. by P. Altuna, Deustuko Unibertsitatea, Bilbao/Bilbo, 1995.*
- [Urr] Urruthy, A., 1873, *Ebanjelio Saintia Jesus-Kristena Jondane Johaneren arabera*, Bayonne, Lasserre.**

Grammar and linguistics

- Archu, J.-B., 1868, *Grammaire bilingue, française et basque / Bi mihiren gramatika, ùskara eta frantsesa*, Lasserre, Bayonne.
- Areces, C., & Blackburn, P., 2005, «Reichenbach, Prior and Montague: A semantic get-together», in S. Artemov *et al.* (arg.), *We Will Show Them! Essays in Honour of Dov Gabbay*, London College Publications, London, vol. I, 77-87.
- Azkue, R. M., 1923-25, *Morfología vasca (Gramática básica dialectal del Euskera)*. Euskera. Facsim. reed. in 3 vols., La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca, Bilbao-Bilbo, 1969.
- Bonaparte, L.-L., 1869, «Le verbe basque en tableaux, accompagnés de notes grammaticales, selon les huit dialectes de l'euskara [...]», Strangeways & Walden, London. Reed facsim., in L.-L. B., *Opera omnia vasconice*, 1991, Euskaltzaindia, Bilbao-Bilbo, vol. I, 174-442.
- Camino, I., 2004, «Nafarroa Behereko euskara», *FLV* 97, 445-486.
- Coyos, J.-B., 1999, *Le parler basque souletin des Arbailles*, L'Harmattan, Paris.
- [DGV/OEH]. *Diccionario General Vasco - Orotariko Euskal Hiztegia*, 16 vols., 1987-2005, Euskaltzaindia, Desclée De Brouwer & Mensajero, Bilbao/Bilbo.
- Gardies, J.-L., 1975, *Esquisse d'une grammaire pure*, Vrin, Paris.
- Gavel, H., & Lacombe, G., 1937, *Grammaire basque*, vol. II, *Le verbe*, Imprimerie du Courrier, Bayonne.
- Gèze, L., 1873, *Éléments de grammaire basque (dialecte souletin)*, Veuve Lamaignière, Bayonne.
- Hualde, J. I., 2003, «Structural analysis of basic verbal paradigms», in J. I. Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina (arg.), *A Grammar of Basque*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 246-249.
- Inchauspé, E., 1858, *Le verbe basque*, Lamaignière & Duprat, Bayonne & Paris.
- Jespersen, O., 1924, *The Philosophy of Grammar*, Allen & Unwin, London. New ed., Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Ithurry, A., 1895, *Grammaire basque. Dialecte labourdin*. Bayonne. Reed., facsim., 1979, San Sebastián/Donostia.
- Lafitte, P., 1962, *Grammaire basque (navarro-labourdin littéraire)*, Editions des Amis du Musée basque & Ikas, Bayonne.
- Lafon, R., 1944, *Le système du verbe basque au XVI^e siècle*, Bordeaux, 2 vols. Reed. facsim. in one vol., Elkar, San Sebastián/Donostia, 1980.
- , 1951, «Indications pour l'étude du verbe basque», *EJ* 5, 93-106. Reed. in *Vasconiana*, Euskaltzaindia, Bilbo/Bilbao 1999, 295-310.
- , 1970, «Le suffixe *-ke*, *-te* dans la conjugaison basque», *BSL* 65:1, 184-212. Reed. in *Vasconiana*, Euskaltzaindia, Bilbo/Bilbao 1999, 479-504.
- , 1972, «Le suffixe *-ke*, *-te* dans la conjugaison basque (suite et fin)», *BSL* 67:1, 239-265. Reed. in *Vasconiana*, Euskaltzaindia, Bilbo/Bilbao 1999, 505-528.
- Mounole, C., 2008, «Sintaxi diakronikoa eta aditz multzoaren garapena: inperfektibozko perifrasiaren sorreraz», in X. Artiagoitia & J. A. Lakarra (arg.), *Gramatika jaietan: Patxi Goenagaren omenez*, UPV/EHU, Bilbao/Bilbo, 585-60.
- Oyharçabal, B., 2003, «Tense, aspect and mood», in J. I. Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina (arg.), *A Grammar of Basque*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 249-284.
- Rebuschi, G., 1980, «The Structure of the Basque Hypothetical System», Ms., Université de Nancy II. [Was to appear in W. H. Jacobsen Jr. (arg.), *Topics in Basque Linguistics*, Associated Faculty Press, Reno (Nevada)].

- , 1984, *Structure de l'énoncé en basque*, SELAF, Paris.
- , 1997 [1982], «Temps, mode et aspect dans les indications scéniques». In *Essais de linguistique basque*, UPV/EHU & DFG/GFA, Bilbao/Bilbo & San Sebastián/Donostia, 154-160.
- Reichenbach, H., 1947, *Elements of Symbolic Logic*, Random House, New York.
- De Rijk, R., 1985, «Un verbe méconnu», in J. L. Melena (arg.), *Symbolae Ludovico Mitxelena Septuagenario Oblatae*, UPV/EHU, Vitoria-Gasteiz, 921-935.
- Videagain, X., 2005, «Présentation du Recueil Bourciez», *Lapurdum* 10, 315-323.
- Zuazo, K., 1989, «Zuberaren sailkapenerako», *ASJU* 23:2, 609-650.