

Romance contact in the restructuring of the Basque verbal system: Convergent and surprisingly divergent phenomena

José Ignacio Hualde

(University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

Céline Mounole

(Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour)

Romance Linguistics Circle
University of Cambridge (via Zoom)
April 26th, 2022

Two topics

1. Indicative compound forms
2. Forms of address and associated verbal forms

I. TAM morphology in Basque

- Most Basque verbs have only analytical forms:
 Nonfinite form + AUX
- Only a handful of verbs possess synthetic forms in a few tenses.

AUXILIARIES: Indicative

1 sg

HAVE

dut 'I have'

nuen 'I had'

BE

naiz 'I am'

nintzen 'I was'

- The HAVE auxiliary is used with all transitive and some intransitive verbs (with agentive subjects, so-called unergatives)
- The BE auxiliary is used with other intransitive verbs (cf. Italian, French, Gascon, Old Spanish)
- A different pair of auxiliaries is used in the subjunctive, potential and imperative (in combination with the verbal stem)

Main indicative tenses

erosi dut	'I have bought'
erosi nuen	'I bought'
erosten dut	'I buy'
erosten nuen	'I was buying; I used to buy'
erosiko dut	'I will buy'
erosiko nuen	'I would buy'

erori naiz	'I have fallen'
erori nintzen	'I fell'
erortzen naiz	'I fall'
erortzen nintzen	'I was falling; I used to fall'
eroriko naiz	'I will fall'
eroriko nintzen	'I would fall'

- Most of these structures appear to have parallels in Romance
- They all appear to be relatively recent
- How much influence has there been in the development of the Basque conjugation?

ANSWER: less than it seems at first glance.

Clearest parallel: Present Perfect

Past participle + present of HAVE/BE

Eros-i dut 'I have bought'

bought I-have

Erer-i naiz 'I have fallen' Lit. 'I am fallen'

fallen I-have

(Construction found in *Standard Average European* languages, Haspelmath 1998; for Romance, see, e.g. Ledgeway 2011)

Cf. Gascon (V. Lespy 1880: 387)

- En béarnais, tout verbe *transitif* prend l'auxiliaire *habe* avoir: *qu'habem bist*, nous avons vu; les verbes intransitifs se conjuguent, les uns avec l'auxiliaire *habe*, avoir: *qu'han droumit*, ils ont dormi, les autres avec l'auxiliaire *esta*, être: *quand estou cadut*, quant il fut tombé.
- Anciennement, l'auxiliaire ne précédait pas toujours le participe passé: “feyt *ha* so qui deu”, il *a* fait ce qu'il doit; “pagat *ha* los diers”, il *a* payé les deniers;

Northern vs Southern Basque: use of the Present Perfect structure

- Southern Basque
 - *erosi dut* Present Perfect ('I have bought') + Hodiernal Past ('I bought today')
 - vs.
 - *erosi nuen* Non-hodiernal past
 - Cf. e.g. Madrid Spanish *hoy he comprado – ayer compré*
- Northern Basque
 - *erosi dut* ALSO non-hodiernal past
 - Cf. French *j'ai acheté (aujourd'hui / hier)*

Convergence with French in Northern Basque?

erosi dut 'I (have) bought' >

Present Perfect > Hodiernal Past ('I bought today') > also Non-hodiernal Past

Cf. extension of *Passé Composé* in French leading to obsolescence of *Passé Simple*.

- BUT extension of PP to non-hodiernal past contexts took place in Northern Basque in the 17th c., before it did in French.
- Plus, the contact language at the time was Gascon, not French, and Gascon didn't undergo that change (Mounole 2018).
- It is the result of a cross-linguistically common grammaticalization path (Bybee & al. 1994).

Past

Eros-i nuen ‘I bought’ (lit. ‘I had bought’)
bought I-had

Erer-i nintzen ‘I fell’ (lit. ‘I was fallen’)
fallen I-was

- Same structure as Romance pluperfect, but different meaning.

However: in older texts it is also used for ‘I had bought’, ‘I had fallen’. In Modern Basque this use is still common in some subordinate clauses.

- Change from pluperfect to perfective past is recent and does not seem to have been influenced by Romance, but it follows a cross-linguistically common grammaticalization path (Bybee & al. 1994).

cf. the earlier change Lat *amaveram* ‘I had loved’ > Sp *amara* ‘I loved’ (subjunctive)’

Future < Rom INF + HABEO? Sp HAVE+de+INF?

Eros-i-ko dut 'I will buy'

mendi-ko 'of the mountain'

• *erosi-ko dut* ~ *comparāre habeō* > *Sp compraré*

Or: *Sp he de comprar*

Calque? (traditional view, e.g. Michelena 1981)

Future: arguments for and against calquing of Romance structure

- [+] *erosi-ko* ~ *erosi-ren dut* = Sp *he de comprar*

Cf. *alaba-ren etxea* 'the daughter's house' = Sp *la casa de la hija*

- [-] but the suffix *-ko/-ren* is added to the past participle, so a more exact Sp translation would be **he de comprado*

- [-] *eroriko naiz* vs ***cadere sum, **soy de caído*.

- Thus: It is not exactly the same as either Romance construction.

How did the Basque future develop then?

(Mounole 2018)

- Observation: the genitive markers (-ko/ -en) are also used with benefactive and destinative value:

E.g. *bihar-ko* 'for tomorrow', *zu-re* 'for you' (now only genitive, but historically also benefactive)

This use is more common in 15th-16th c. texts

- Possible extension from non-verbal constructions:

Model: *Bihar-ko dut* 'I have (to do) it for tomorrow'

Extension: *erosi-ko dut* 'I have to buy it' → 'I will buy it'

erori-ko naiz 'I am for/about to fall' → 'I will fall'

Future of the past

- *Erosiko nuen* 'I would buy'
- Same structure and evolution as future but the past of BE/HAVE

Present: Present participle + present of BE/HAVE

Erosten dut

Buying I-have.

Eros-te = verbal noun

Eros-te-n = local case, cf. *mendi-a-n* 'in/on the mountain'

- Parallels:

cf. Port. *Estou a comprar*, Eng. *I am a-buying*

Possible Romance source: Gasc. *èste a fer quaucòm* 's/he is doing something' (Haase 1994)

- BUT in Basque we have a BE/HAVE contrast!

Possible development of the Present tense

I. First stage BE auxiliary with all verbs

erortze-n **naiz** lit. 'I am on falling'

*eroste-n **naiz** lit. 'I am on buying' (unattested)

II Second stage: BE/HAVE

erortzen **naiz**

erosten **dut**

- Because of analogy with other tenses (similar auxiliary changes are attested in other periphrastic constructions)

Conclusion- Romance influence in the development of the Basque indicative mood?

- The only identical structure is the Present Perfect.
- The future tense in Basque appears at first glance to be a calque of Rom. INF+HABEO or Sp *haber de*, but upon further inspection the parallelism is less clear: Importantly: In Bq there is a HAVE/BE auxiliary alternation, like in the PP
- The present tense also appears to have parallels in Romance progressive constructions , but again, Basque has a HAVE/BE auxiliary alternation not found in Romance.

- Therefore: there may have been a triggering effect of Romance contact in the origin of these tenses, but whereas in Romance the diachronic evolution has been towards the generalization of HAVE in compound tenses, in Basque there has been a strong drive to strengthen the HAVE/BE alternation throughout the verbal system
- Perhaps because of structural pressure to maintain the ergative alignment in the language, which is manifested also in the case marking of subject NPs.

- >> If this is correct, the generalization of the HAVE/BE alternation has been the opposite direction from what we find in Romance and Germanic, where in the compound perfect forms HAVE /BE > only HAVE

II. 2pl > 2sg

II. 2nd persons and agreement morphology: Rom *tu/vos*– Bq *hi/zu*

- Pre-Historic system (reconstructed)

	BE	HAVE
1sg	ni naiz	nik dut
2sg	hi haiz	hik duk/dun
1pl	gu gara	guk dugu
2pl	zu zara	zuk duzu

- Modern system

1sg	ni naiz	nik dut
2sg familiar	hi haiz	hik duk/dun
2sg polite	zu zara	zuk duzu
2pl	gu gara	guk dugu
2pl	zuek zarete	zuek duzue

Evolution of V̄OS in Romance

From Latin to Romance

- 1st step

vōs: 2pl > 2pl & 2sg formal

French *vous* remains at this step

- 2nd step

vos 2pl & 2sg formal > only 2 sg formal

& a new form is grammaticalized to express 2 pl

(Sp *vosotros/as*)

Evolution of *zu* in Basque

- 1st step: *zu* 2pl > both 2sg & 2pl

Must be assumed, but is unattested (before the first texts)

- 2nd step: *zu* only 2sg & new 2pl form *zuek* is grammaticalized.

Bq *zuek* 'you-pl'

- Through Romance influence?
- Sp *vosotros/as* (Cat *vosaltres*) is a grammaticalization of an expression also found in Fr (*vous autres*), It (*voi altri*), etc.
- Bq *zuek* < *zu* + *(h)ek* 'those' – different morphological structure from Romance (in Western Bq also *zuok* < *zu*+ *(h)au**ek* 'these')

Spanish *vosotros/as* and alternative forms

- The grammaticalization of *vosotros/as* started in the 13th c. and was complete by the 15th c. (de Jonge & Nieuwenhuysen 2012: 250).
- Initially *vos otros* competed with other expressions such as *vos todos* and *vos mismos*.

Bq *zuek*

- The closest parallel of Bq *zuek* 'you-pl' could be Sp *vos mismos*
- In Bq emphatic forms of pronouns are created by adding demonstratives to simple forms

Eg. *ni* 'I' + *hau(r)* 'this' > *ni-hau(r)* 'I, myself' (> *neu*)

- Demonstratives have also become articles:

**Mendi ha* 'that mountain' > *mendia* 'the mountain'

Ni bekatariau 'the sinner that I am'

Cf. IPSA REGINA 'the queen herself/ the same queen' > *essa reina* 'that queen' > *sa reina* 'the queen' in Catalan & Sardinian

Guec ‘we’ in the *Glosas Emilianenses* (10th-11th c.)

- *Guec ajutu ez dugu* ‘We have not V’ed’
we-Erg V-past not we-have

If correctly interpreted as *guek* < *gu* ‘we’+ demonstrative *hek*, grammaticalized emphatic forms with the structure pronoun+demonstrative (*ni-au*, *zu-au*, *gu-ek*, *zu-ek*) in Basque would be older than Sp *nosotros*, *vosotros*.

Romance influence may have led only to the bleaching of the emphatic meaning of a preexisting 2p *zuek*, *zuok* ‘you yourselves’

Only in Bq: development of new verbal forms for 2pl

- In Eastern Bq, from the first texts (16th c.)

Zu zara 'you-sg are' *zuk duzu* 'you-sg have'

Zuek zarete 'you-pl are' *zuek duzue* 'you-pl have'

- In Western Bq both *zu* and *zuek* take the same agreement in 16th c. texts (eg. *zu zara*, *zuek zara*), but the innovative forms for *zuek* with pl *-(t)e* have been spreading since then and are now general.

2pl agreement in Bq

- This development lacks parallels in Romance
- By analogy with 3rd person

3 sg *du*

2sg *duzu*

3pl *du-e ~ du-te*

2pl *x = duzue, duzute*

Divergence in the use of 2sg forms: *zu* in Bq in contact with Spanish

- *Refranes y Sentencias* (1596) [but containing proverbs] and 15th texts.
Perfect equivalence:

Sp *tú* = Bq *hi*;

Sp *vos* = Bq *zu*

- When *vuestra merced* (with 3 sg agreement) develops in Sp, this is calqued in Bq as *zure mesedeori*. We also find *berori* from *bera* 'self' + *hori* 'that' as equivalent to 3rd person pronouns also used as forms of address in 16th c. Spanish (e.g. *Micoleta* 1653)
- BUT, since then, the evolution has been in opposite directions in Peninsular Spanish and Basque.

Loss of *vos* as respectful form of address in Spanish

- In Sp, *vos* underwent pejoration.

Y ansí quien llamase de *vos* a otro, no siendo muy más calificado, le menosprecia y haze ultraje en nombralle, pues se sabe que con semejantes palabras llaman a los peones y trabajadores

(L. Gracián, 1593, apud *CORDE*)

- Result: loss of *vos* in Spain and many Spanish-speaking countries.

Divergence between Bq and Sp

- In Bq *zu*, instead, became more and more common, displacing other forms of address. (Nowadays it is the only 2sg form for many speakers)
- The mismatch in meaning between Bq *zu* and Sp *vos* is noted explicitly in 16th and 17th century court of law proceedings

Examples (apud Reguero 2017)

[...] dixo el quexante: “¿Savéis hijo de quién sois?”. Y que el disculpante le respondió: “Yo soy hijo de D. Miguel Fernández de Garayalde y Lazcano, hijo de padre más honrado que **vuestra merced**”, que en lengua bascongada dixo: Ni naiz **çu** baño guiçon honraduagoren semea. (Altsasu/Burunda, c. 1648)

ZU ≠ VOS

[...] este pleito fue en lengua bascongada y se hablaron en bascuenz y con la palabra *çuc* y no con la de “vos” como está escrita en la quinta pregunta, porque no hablaron en castellano. Y en la dicha palabra *çuc*, en este dicho lugar de Alsasua y valle de Burunda la tienen por palabra cortés y bien recuerda entre [..] “vos”, del qual ussan con amistad, sin que se den por offendidos ni que sea palabra descortés. Si bien para ablar con los sacerdotes y otras perssonas de respecto se le añade el decir *çure mersedea* u *orre mersedea*. Y otras vezes juegan desta palabra: *Çuc, jauna*, que según suena quiere decir “vuestra merced señor”. (Altsasu/Burunda, 1648)

Surprising result: *zu* vs *vos* and language contact

- Even though bilingualism has increased, since the 15th c., the semantic/pragmatic development of Bq *zu* has been diametrically opposed to that of Sp *vos*.

General conclusions

- Both in the development of main periphrases of the indicative mood and in the restructuring of 2nd person pronouns, contact with Romance seems to have been a triggering factor.
- However, more careful analysis reveals important differences in many details.
- Subsequent evolutions have been divergent, in spite of increased bilingualism.

Can we have a predictive theory of language contact and grammaticalization?

- In the case of genetically and typologically distant languages in contact, structural reasons may lead to divergence in evolution
- In the two cases we have studied:
 - 1) A robust ergative alignment in Basque has likely favored the extension of a HAVE/BE morphological alternation throughout the TAM system, even if there was initial calquing of structures.
 - 2) The existence of a clearly segmentable plural marker *-(t)e*, has led to the appearance and extension of innovative 2pl verbal forms.

Contact and divergent evolution of forms of address

- Regarding the evolution of the system of forms of address, systems with two or more 2nd person pronouns are inherently unstable (“power and solidarity”), which makes future development largely unpredictable, cf. German vs English vs Swedish or the different systems found in different Latin American Spanish varieties. It is nevertheless surprising that Bq *zu* and Sp *vos* (initially both 2pl reinterpreted as 2sg of respect) have evolved in such different ways in a situation of language contact.

References

- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In Seheok, T.A (ed). *Style in language*. Cambridge. Mass.: MIT Press. 253–76
- Bybee, J., R. Parkins & W. Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- De Jonge, B.& D, Nieuwenhuijsen. 2014. Forms of address. In J. I. Hualde, A. Olarrea & E. O'Rourke (eds.), *The handbook of Hispanic Linguistics*. Malden, Mass.: Wiley/Blackwell. 247-262.
- Erdozia, J. L. 2005. Zenbait euskal testu Nafarroan XVII. mendean. *Fontes Linguae Vasconum* 99. 307-334.
- Fontanella, M. B. 1999. Sistemas pronominales de tratamiento usados en el mundo hispano. In I. Bosque & V, Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, I. Madrid: Espasa.
- González Ollé, F. 1999. Tuteo y voseo en documentos navarros altomedievales. In P. Gómez Manzano, P. Carbonero Cano & M. Casado Velarde (eds), *Lengua y discurso. Estudios dedicados al Profesor Vidal Lamíquiz*. Madrid: Arco Libros. 435-444.
- Haase, M. 1994. Tense and Aspect in Basque. In R. Thieroff & J. Ballweg (eds), *Tense systems in European Languages*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 279-292.

References (cont.)

- Haspelmath, M., 1999. “How young is standard average European? ”. *Language Sciences* 20: 3. 271-287.
- Hualde, J.I, & Mounole, C. 2019. Tense, aspect and mood. In A. Berro Urrizelki, B. Fernández & J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *Basque and Romance: Aligning grammars*. Leiden: Brill. 59-81.
- Hualde, J.I. & Pérez Saldanya, M. 2020. Convergencia y divergencia vasco-románica en las formas de tratamiento: vasco *zu* y castellano *vos*. In Martínez Alcalde et al. (eds.), *El español y las lenguas peninsulares en su diacronía: miradas sobre una historia compartida. Estudios dedicados a M. Teresa Echenique Elizondo*. Valencia: Tirant humanidades. 305-328.
- Lakarra, Joseba A. 1996. *Refranes y sentencias (1596): Ikerketak eta edizioa*. Bilbo: Real Academia de la Lengua Vasca/Euskaltzaindia.
- Ledgeway, A. 2011. Syntactic and morphosyntactic typology and change. In M. Maiden, J. C. Smith & A. Ledgeway (eds.), *The Romance languages, vol. 1: Structures*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 382–471.

References (cont.)

- Lespy, V. 1880. *Grammaire béarnaise suivie d'un vocabulaire béarnais-français*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Manterola, J. 2009. Erakusleak berreraikitzen: arazoaren beste alderdi bat. *Lapurdum* 13. 261-275.
- Michelena, L. 1981. “Lengua común y dialectos vascos”. *ASJU* XV. 291–303. Repr. in L. Michelena. 2011. *Obras completas* [Supplements of *ASJU* VII]. ed. by Joseba A. Lakarra & I. Ruiz Arzalluz, Donostia-San Sebastián & Vitoria-Gasteiz: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia & UPV/EHU. 517-544.
- Micoleta, R. (1653 [1988]). *Modo breue de aprender la lengua vyzcayna*, ed. by A. Zelaieta, Eusko Ikaskuntza, *Hizkuntza eta Literatura*, Donostia-San Sebastián. 133-215
- Mounole, C. 2018. *Le verbe basque ancien: étude philologique et diachronique*. Bilbao: UPV/EHU.
- Reguero Ugarte, U. 2017. *Goi-nafarrera arkaiko eta zaharra: azterketa eta testuak*. PhD dissertation. UPV/EHU.