

- Trask, Robert L. 1977. "Historical syntax and Basque verbal morphology: Two hypotheses". *Anglo-American contributions to Basque studies. Essays in honor of Jon Bilbao* ed. by William A. Douglass, Robert Etulain & William H. Jacobsen, 203-217. Reno: Univ. of Nevada.
- , 1981. "Basque verbal morphology". *Euskalarien Nazioarteko Jardunaldiak. Iker-1*, 285-304. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia.
- , 1990. "The -n class of verbs in Basque". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 88.111-128.
- , 1995. "On the history of the non-finite verb forms in Basque". This volume.
- Vance, B. 1993. "Verb-first declaratives introduced by *et* and the position of *pro* in Old and Middle French". *Lingua* 89.281-314.
- Vinson, Julien. 1877. "Avant-propos" and "Notes complémentaires". Included in F. Ribáry, *Essai sur la langue basque*, x-xxv & 99-119. Paris: F. Vieweg.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1963. "Preliminaries to a historical and comparative analysis of the syntax of the Old Irish verb". *Celtica* 6.1-49.

The Development of the Basque System of Terms of Address and the Allocutive Conjugation

Jabier Alberdi
University of the Basque Country

"De ninguna manera se puede decir, por lo tanto, que el vasco carezca de historia: hablando con exactitud, lo más que se puede decir es que esa historia es corta en comparación con la de muchas otras lenguas y también, si se quiere, menos completa dentro del período sobre el cual nos informan los textos a causa de la escasez relativa de éstos.... Decir que los cambios documentados no son esenciales y que la lengua, en sustancia, sigue siendo la misma es otra manera de decir -mucho más expuesta a malentendidos- que esos cambios son pequeños, siendo así que habrían sido mayores de estar fechados los textos más antiguos cinco o diez siglos antes". (Michelena 1986:12).

1. Terms of address in Basque: Present-day situation

Basque possesses only first and second person personal pronouns, which have the forms in the following table (in their absolutive or basic form):

(1)	singular	plural
1	<i>ni</i> "I"	<i>gu</i> "we"
2	<i>hi</i> "thou" (familiar)	<i>zuek</i> "you-pl"
	<i>zu</i> "you" (formal)	

As shown in (1), in the second person singular there is a distinction between a familiar form *hi* "thou" and a form of respect *zu* "you", which formally corresponds to that between *tu* and singular *vous* in French. Whereas this can be considered the general situation in the language, in many dialects we find more complex situations. Firstly, in southern dialects there is an additional form *berori* (*ber* "same" + (*h*)*ori* "that") used to indicate great respect or deference.¹ Secondly, in some eastern varieties there is a form *xu*, which is intermediate between *hi* and *zu*. There are thus systems with three second singular pronouns, *hi/zu/berori*, in southern dialects, and *hi/xu/zu* in some eastern areas. On the other hand, besides the general system with two forms,

¹ *Berori* is the most formal term of address in western dialects. It has the peculiarity that it is normally used asymmetrically. That is, when talking to each other, participants show asymmetrical uses of addressing terms such as *berori* versus *hi*, or *berori* versus *zu*, whereas the symmetrical use of *berori* is hardly ever found.

hi/zu, binary systems of the type *zu/berori* or *xu/zu*, are also found; and there are also many speakers who employ a single form, *zu*.

The distinction between *hi* and *zu* in the singular does not extend to the plural. Corresponding to *berori*, some grammarians list a plural form *bero(r)iek* (*berok*, *eurok*), but these are very rare. The systems with the greatest number of distinctions are organized as in (2):

(2) Second person forms		Some eastern varieties	
Southern dialects		singular	plural
singular	plural	singular	plural
<i>hi</i>		<i>hi</i>	
	<i>zuek</i>	<i>xu</i>	<i>zuek</i>
<i>zu</i>		<i>zu</i>	
<i>berori</i>	<i>beroriek</i>		

Another aspect that must be taken into consideration in describing the second person pronoun system is verb agreement. The second person singular formal pronoun *zu* triggers the appearance of a plural agreement marker on the verb, even though it can only have a singular referent (see Gómez & Sainz 1995 on plural agreement). On the other hand, the form *berori* triggers third person agreement, reflecting the fact that originally it is an emphatic demonstrative. But by far the most complicated agreement facts are those related to the use of the second person familiar pronoun *hi*. To begin with, only in the second person familiar is a masculine/feminine distinction made in the agreement markers (with ergative and dative arguments, provided that they are not encoded as prefixes);² e.g. (*hik*) *dakik/dakin* "thou knowest, masc./fem.", (*hiri*) *datorkik/dakorkin* "s/he is coming to thee masc./fem." No gender distinction is made in any other person, including the third person; e.g. *dakizu* "you know (masc./fem.)", *datorkizu* "s/he is coming to you (masc./fem.)" *daki* "s/he knows", *datorkio* "s/he is coming to him/her". But the truly peculiar property of the second person familiar is that the addressee is encoded in the verb form even when it is not an argument in the sentence. The markers used in this case are those employed to signal agreement with a second person familiar ergative or dative argument: that is, masculine *-k* and feminine *-n*. Thus the form *dago* "s/he/it is, stays" becomes *diagok* (> *zegok*) when the addressee is addressed as *hi* and is male, and *diagon* (> *zegon*), when the addressee is female. Similarly, *nago* "I am, stay" has the forms *niagok* and *niagon* for a male and female addressee respectively in the familiar conjugation.

² The pronoun itself does not vary for gender. Neither does any other pronoun, including third person pronouns, which do not distinguish the gender of the referent.

This phenomenon is known as 'allocutivity' in Basque linguistics, employing a terminology that was introduced by Bonaparte (1862:19). As Oyharçabal (1993:91) puts it, "[i]n allocutive forms, the inflected verb agrees with the addressee (person and gender agreement) when the latter is not an argument selected by the verb". For instance, the two examples in (3) are identical in terms of the number and structure of the arguments that they contain; the difference is that (3b) includes a marker *-k* which corresponds to a male addressee, whereas (3a) lacks such a marker:

- (3) a. *Bihar euria eginen du*
tomorrow rain.A make.FUT 3A.AUX.3E
"Tomorrow it will rain"
- b. *Bihar euria eginen dik*
3A.AUX.3E.ALLOmasc
"Tomorrow it will rain" (Allocutive masculine)

Allocutive agreement is obligatory. That is, if the addressee is addressed as *hi*, allocutive forms must be used (although allocutive agreement is restricted to main clauses). Thus, (4b), where the addressee appears mentioned in the pronoun *hirekin* "with thee", is ungrammatical, since the verb form does not contain allocutive agreement:

- (4) a. **hirekin etorri naiz*
thou.COM come 1SA.AUX
"I have come with thee"
- b. *hirekin etorri nauk/naun*
1SA.AUX.ALLOmasc/1SA.AUX.ALLOfem
"I have come with thee" (Allocutive masculine/feminine)

We can thus distinguish between allocutive and non-allocutive verb forms. We should also notice that verb forms which select the second person as an argument are neutral regarding the allocutive/non-allocutive opposition (Schuchardt 1893). A distinction can thus be made among three types of verb forms (Lafon 1959:106, Oyharçabal 1993): (i) allocutive forms, which show agreement with an allocutive second person (i.e. *nauk/n* "I am, alloc m/f", *duk/n* "s/he/it is, alloc m/f"), (ii) neutral forms, without such an agreement (*naiz* "I am", *da* "s/he/it is", and (iii) those verb forms that agree with an argumental second person (*haiz* "thou art", *zarete* "you-pl are"). In (5) the present indicative of the copular/intransitive auxiliary *izan* "to be" is given together with the corresponding allocutive masculine forms:

(5)	present indic. of <i>izan</i>	alloc. masc.	
	<i>naiz</i>	<i>nauk</i>	"I am"
	<i>haiz</i>		"thou art"
	<i>da</i>	<i>duk</i>	"s/he/it is"
	<i>gara</i>	<i>gaituk</i>	"we are"
	<i>zara</i>		"you are"
	<i>zarete</i>		"you-pl are"
	<i>dira</i>	<i>dituk</i>	"they are"

In western dialects, allocutive forms are used exclusively with the familiar treatment. If the addressee receives a more formal treatment, non-allocutive forms are used. Thus, corresponding to the example above in (4), we find *zurekin etorri naiz* "I have come with you", with non-allocutive *naiz*, when the addressee receives the more formal *zu*. In some eastern dialects, on the other hand, there are also special allocutive forms corresponding to the treatment as *xu* or *zu* of the addressee. Thus, for instance, for *dago* "s/he/it is, stays", besides the familiar allocutive forms *diagok* (masc.) and *diagon* (fem.), there are also *diagozu* and *diagoxu*, used when the addressee receives *zu* and *xu*, respectively (without gender distinction).

2. The development of the system of forms of address

Tracing the evolution of the system of forms of address in Basque is not an easy task, given the nature of the documentation that we have. The first documents that can be used for this purpose are relatively recent, from the 16th century. In addition, given their predominantly religious character, these texts offer us, at best, a very partial glimpse of the sociolinguistic reality of the time. It would not be entirely surprising, therefore, if the discovery of a new text forces us to modify some of the hypotheses that will be advanced in this paper.

2.1 The pronoun *zu*: from plural to singular of respect

There is abundant evidence that the second person singular formal pronoun *zu* was in earlier times a second person plural pronoun, and that the current second person plural form *zuek* is an innovation (see Azkue 1905-06 s.u. *zu*). To begin with, if we consider the phonological shape of the pronouns, we can distinguish a group containing the vowel *-i-*: *ni*, *hi*, from another group which bears the vowel *-u-*: *gu*, *zu*, *zuek*. In addition, the form *zuek* (absolutive/ergative) has as an ending which is obviously related to the plural suffix that nominals take (e.g. *gizona* "the man", *gizonak* "the men"), whereas *gu*, which also has plural reference, does not bear a plural marker. *Zuek* thus appears to have been formed from *zu* by the addition of a plural suffix. Furthermore, if we consider the way pronouns are inflected for case, we notice that *zuek* is

declined like a plural noun, whereas all other pronouns are declined as indefinite nouns. Thus, for instance, in the dative we find *ni-ri* "to me", *gu-ri* "to us" with the same suffix as the indefinite *zenbat katu-ri* "to how many cats"; but *zu-ei* "to you-pl" with the same suffix as the plural *katu-ei* "to the cats". From these facts, it follows that *zuek* must undoubtedly be a more recent formation.

If we look at verb agreement, we find equally strong evidence. That the pronoun *zu* used to have plural reference is indicated by the fact that it triggers the appearance of pluralizers on finite verb forms (on plural agreement, see Gómez & Sainz 1995). Consider, for instance, the distribution of the suffixes *-z* and *-za* in the present-tense paradigms of *joan* "to go" and *ibili* "to go about", respectively:

(6)		<i>joan</i>	<i>ibili</i>
1sg	<i>ni</i>	<i>noa</i>	<i>nabil</i>
2sg.fam	<i>hi</i>	<i>hoa</i>	<i>habil</i>
2sg	<i>zu</i>	<i>zoaz</i>	<i>zabiltza</i>
3sg	<i>hura</i>	<i>doa</i>	<i>dabil</i>
1pl	<i>gu</i>	<i>goaz</i>	<i>gabiltza</i>
2pl	<i>zuek</i>	<i>zoazte</i>	<i>zabiltzate</i>
3pl	<i>haiek</i>	<i>doaz</i>	<i>dabiltza</i>

From the examination of such paradigms (and the facts are consistent throughout the verbal morphology), it is obvious that the current 2sg formal forms belong to the plural paradigm and that the current 2pl forms have been created by adding a second pluralizer (*-te* in the examples above). The pluralizers that are added to the forms for *zu* to create the *zuek* forms are the same that are otherwise used to distinguish the third person plural from the third person singular (cf. *daki* "s/he knows" vs. *dakite* "they know").

Finally, in the works of 19th-century Biscayan authors we find some cases where forms morphologically corresponding to *zu* are used with plural reference; e.g. *zeuek dakizu* "you-pl know" (instead of *dakizue*). Michelena (1964:167) has found similar examples in the writings of the 17th century Gipuzkoan author Juan de Luzuriaga. It thus appears that the obligatory nature of the morphological distinction between verbal forms showing agreement for singular *zu* and for plural *zuek* is a rather recent phenomenon.

Common wisdom is that originally plural *zu* came to have singular reference under the influence of the Romance model (see Fr. *vous*, O.Sp. *vos*). However, we must take into account that the use of plural pronouns as singular of respect is a widespread phenomenon found in many languages and geographical areas (see Head 1978:157-158, Joseph 1987:262). Therefore the

possibility of an independent development in Basque cannot be discarded. It could very well be the case that we are dealing with an independent evolution in Basque which was later reinforced by similar developments in the neighboring Romance languages.

In any case, in Basque, unlike in French, English and many other languages, the assumption by the old second person plural form of a second person singular formal value has not caused syncretism. Basque has gone beyond these other languages in creating a new second person plural pronoun and completely divorcing the form *zu* from its original value as second person plural.

It is impossible to date the proposed evolution for *zu*: 2pl > 2pl & 2sg formal > 2sg formal, since from the first documents *zu* appears exclusively with the value of a second person singular of respect, side by side with the familiar *hi*.

2.2 The pronoun *berori*: from third person singular to second of respect

As mentioned above, the pronoun *berori* corresponds to the most formal level in southern dialects. Morphologically *berori* is an emphatic demonstrative, where the prefix *ber-* "same" is added to (*h*)*ori* "that". It is still used as a member of a demonstrative paradigm that contains the plain/emphatic pairs *hau/berau* "this", *hori/berori* "that", *hura/bera* "that over there", and corresponding plural forms. In some Navarrese valleys (Aezkoa, Salazar, Roncal) the non-emphatic (*h*)*ori* is used with the same function (Azkue 1905-06, 1923-25:2:\$640, Irigoyen 1957:120-121, Beloqui et al. 1953:514, Artola 1991).

The first attestation of *berori* as a pronoun of deference is found in Micoleta (1653). Micoleta, together with *berori*, uses the formula *z(e)ure mesedeori*, calqued from the Spanish *vuestra merced* "your mercy". This situation parallels that found in 16th century Spanish, where together with the familiar *tú* and the initially more formal *vos*, which had lost its formal character, one finds the form of courtesy *vuestra merced* (> *usted*) and the use of third person pronouns as formal forms of address (Pla Cárceles 1923:248).

The use of the demonstrative *berori* as a term of address may be even more recent than that of the forms of courtesy *zure mesede/mesedeori*, lit. "your mercy", *zure senoria* "your lordship", etc. (already documented in several Basque texts from the 16th century) and may have had the same origin as the use of the pronouns *él/ella* as terms of address in 16th century Spanish (cf. also Italian *lei*). In 16th century Spanish, once the addressee was referred to as *vuestra merced*, *vuestra señoría*, etc., to avoid the repetition of these long formulas (which take third person singular agreement), the pronoun *él* or *ella*

was used with the same reference (see Lapesa 1970:158). Exactly the same procedure may have been followed in Basque. The use of the emphatic demonstrative *berori* as a pronoun of deference is documented starting on the first half of the 17th century. Michelena (1988-, under *berori*) offers the following example from Capanaga (1656): *Alan daukat konfiantza zure Illustissima Señoriak faboreziduko dabela bein berorren besoetara egotzi ezker* "I thus have confidence that Your Illustrious Lordship; will favor him once he seeks protection in his; arms". We suspect that the first documentation of *berori* as a form of address in 1653 may actually be very close in time to the beginning of this usage in Basque.

3. The development of the allocutive conjugation

As was mentioned, the familiar treatment carries with it a special conjugation, the allocutive conjugation. We must ask now about the origins of the allocutive conjugation. There is little doubt that allocutivity is an old phenomenon in Basque, since it appears from the very first texts and since such a complex system could not have developed from one day to the next (see Altube 1934:154-185). At the same time, it is clear that the allocutive conjugation must be more recent than the 'plain' or neutral conjugation, since allocutivity adds complexity to 'plain' forms.

In any event, the allocutive conjugation in Basque has some special properties that need to be accounted for (see Oyharçabal 1993). Firstly, allocutive forms present a suffix *-k*, *-ka-*, *-a-* (masc.) or *-n*, *-na-* (fem.) corresponding to a second person which is not an argument of the verb; e.g. *gathoz* "we are coming" -> *gathozik/gathozin*. Secondly, with two auxiliaries there is a change of verb root: *izan* "to be" is replaced by **edun* "to have"; e.g. *naiz* "I am" -> *nauk, naun*; and the root of **edun* (*-u-*) is replaced by *-i-*; e.g. *dut* "I have it" -> *diat, dinat*. Finally, a vowel *-i-* is often inserted before the verb root, giving rise to palatalization in some forms; e.g. *nago* "I am, stay" -> *niagok, ñagok; dago* "s/he/it is, stays" -> *diagok, jagok, zegok*. Of these features the only ones that appear in all dialects are the use of the markers *-k* and *-n* and the replacement of *izan* by **edun*.

3.1 Schuchardt's proposal

The first serious attempt to explain the origin and development of the allocutive forms was undertaken by Schuchardt (1893). Later researchers such as Gavel & Lacombe (1933-36), Lafon (1944), and Altube (1934) express substantial agreement with Schuchardt's theses. Schuchardt proposes to relate allocutivity to the expressive mechanism employed in neighboring languages which is known as 'ethic dative' or 'dative of interest'. The use of the suffixes

-ka-, -a-, -k and -na-, -n in allocutive forms can easily be connected with an 'ethical dative'. Thus, for Schuchardt (1923), the use of forms such as *naiatorrek* "I go, alloc. masc." (from *nator*) would not be very distant from the German usage in *gestern gehe ich dir in der Wald* (Sp. *ayer te me voy por el bosque*). The difference is that, whereas in German (or Spanish) the use of 'ethic' dative clitics is optional and marked, in Basque allocutivity is an obligatory and regular feature of main clauses when the addressee receives the familiar treatment.

3.2 Allocutivity and implicational constructions

As Schuchardt (1923) and many others after him have remarked, the addressee, besides being represented by a dative suffix, can also be encoded by means of ergative markers (Gavel & Lacombe 1933-36:§12, Lafon 1944:§405-10, 1959:108, Altube 1934, Lafitte 1979 [1944]:§541, §690-91). This is what happens in the replacement of *izan* by **edun*, which would involve some sort of 'ethic ergative'. The origin of this phenomenon, as Basque grammarians have frequently remarked, could be the use of constructions in which the addressee is implicated in the action by employing the verb *to have*, as in *you have a beautiful horse* instead of *your horse is beautiful*. There are, however, important differences between such implicational structures and allocutive in modern Basque (see Rebuschi 1984:567-600). To begin with, the allocutive conjugation is restricted to the case where there is a singular addressee, and, in most dialects, to the familiar treatment. Implicational structures, on the other hand, can be used regardless of treatment or number of addressees, as in *gure baserritarra zintzōa duzue* "our farmer is honest (as you-pl can see)" lit. "you-pl have our farmer an honest one". These constructions are not to be identified with the allocutive conjugation since, for one thing, they are not obligatory and are felt as marked. With a plural addressee, a more neutral construction would not include the addressee in the verb: *gure baserritarra zintzoa da* "our farmer is honest". With a singular addressee addressed as *hi*, on the other hand, the use of such neutral construction is impossible, the only possibility being *gure baserritarra zintzoa duk/dun*.

A further reason to distinguish the 'implicational construction' from allocutivity is that both can occur simultaneously, as in *gure baserritarra zintzoa diagu*, lit. "we have our farmer an honest one (alloc. masc.)", where an implicational construction is used involving the first person plural as subject of "to have", but the verb also contains a second person singular familiar allocutive marker (marked as dative).

Thirdly, the 'implicational construction' involves the use of "to have" as a main verb, but in allocutive constructions *izan* "to be" is replaced by **edun* "to have" both when it is the main verb and when it is the auxiliary: *Jon etorriko da* -> *Jon etorriko duk* "John will come".

Finally, the allocutive conjugation is restricted to main clauses, whereas such a restriction does not apply to 'implicational constructions'.

To conclude, whereas the use of formally transitive forms in which the addressee is encoded as ergative in the allocutive conjugation may have its origin in implicational constructions, nowadays the allocutive appears as a clearly distinct phenomenon. Rebuschi (1984) goes further, claiming that the identification between the allocutive forms of the copulative/intransitive auxiliary *izan* and the bivalent forms of **edun* is spurious. He remarks that, whereas these sets of forms are identical in some cases, there are also cases where they differ, for which reason they must be treated as separate. In particular, Rebuschi claims that whereas present-tense allocutive forms of *izan* are identical to those of **edun*, in past and irrealis forms we find a difference:

	<i>izan</i> neutral / alloc	<i>*edun</i>
(7) present	<i>da / duk, dun</i> "s/he/it is"	<i>duk, dun</i> "thou hast it"
past	<i>zen / zuan, zunan</i> "s/he/it was"	<i>huen</i> "thou hadst it"
irrealis	<i>litzateke / lukek, luken</i> "s/he/it would be"	<i>huke</i> "thou wouldst have it"

Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that this distinction is only made in allocutive forms whose subject is a third person. If the subject is a first person, there is complete identity in all tenses/aspects between allocutive forms of *izan* and neutral forms of **edun*:

	<i>izan</i> neutral / <i>izan</i> alloc = <i>*edun</i>
(8) present	<i>naiz / nauk, naun</i> "I am" = "thou hast me" <i>gara / gaituk, gaitun</i> "we are" = "thou hast us"
past	<i>nintzen / nindu(k)an, nindunan</i> "I was" = "thou hadst me" <i>ginen / gintu(k)an, gintunan</i> "we were" = "thou hadst us"
irrealis	<i>nintzateke / nindukek, ninduken</i> "I would be" = "thou wouldst have me" <i>ginateke / gintuzkek, gintuzken</i> "we would be" = "thou wouldst have us"

This identity is the rule in the classical language and in the northern literary dialects (Bonaparte 1869, Ithurry 1979 [1895], Lafitte 1979 [1944]). In addition, the identity extends also to the third person in all tenses/aspects in Gipuzkoan and central dialects. It thus appears that the equation between the

allocutive forms of *izan* and bivalent forms of **edun* can be maintained as a general rule and that the forms *zuan*, *zunan* adduced by Rebuschi must be considered as exceptional, created by analogy or for some other reason. As Schuchardt (1893:235) points out, the original allocutive form **(h)ukan* "s/he/it was, alloc. masc.) may have acquired an initial *z-*, becoming *zuan* by contamination with the non-allocutive *zen* "s/he/it was". Schuchardt (1893) also notices the analogy with present tense forms of **edun* "to have" (i.e. *duk/n*). Lafon (1944) also supports the hypothesis of analogy and claims that a form such as *(h)uen* could not be used as the allocutive form for the past tense of the third person because it lacked the gender distinction which characterizes allocutive verb forms. Thus, the creation of *zuan/zunan* as past allocutive forms appears to be related to gender differentiation.

3.3 Root vowel changes

The apparent change in the shape of the verb root from *-u-* to *-i-* in allocutive forms of **edun* has been related to similar changes in trivalent forms of the verb (Schuchardt 1893:247, 289; 1923, Lafon 1944:1:409-410, 2:35-37). That is, the *-i-* would be an affix connected with dative agreement. For instance, to **da-du* > *du* "s/he has it" there corresponds the allocutive masculine **da-du-ki-k* > *dik*, where the affix *-ki-* is the same affix that appears accompanying the dative agreement marker in **da-du-ki-o-t* > *diot* "s/he has it to him/her" (Lafon 1944, Gómez & Sainz 1995). This would be further indication that allocutivity is in its origin an 'ethic' dative, as Schuchardt claimed.

3.4 The *-i-* vowel in allocutive forms

Schuchardt interprets the vowel *-i-* in allocutive forms such as *nago* "I am, stay" -> *niagok*; *dago* "s/he is, stays" -> *diagok*, as a remnant of the same affix *-ki-* of the dative. As Lafon (1944:420) points out, however, there are some serious problems with this identification. An important difference is that whereas dative *-ki-* is placed after the root and before the dative agreement suffix, as in *d-a-go-ki-o* "s/he/it is, corresponds to him/her", *dator-ki-o* "s/he/it is coming to him/her", the affix *-i-* of the allocutive forms appears before the verb root, as in *d-i-ago-k*.

Recently, Ros (1987) has tried to explain the presence of this *-i-* as resulting from certain phonological processes. Ros proposes that the origin of this vowel could be found in a process of expressive lengthening; e.g. *nago* "I am, stay" -> *naagok*. Such allocutive forms with a long vowel are found in Añibarro's (1969 [1820]) grammar. Those sequences of identical vowels would later be broken with a glide *-j-* to avoid the hiatus or to underline a

functional opposition: *naagok* -> **najagok*, and hence the modern dialectal forms L *niagok*, SHN *negok*, G *natxiok*, B *naižok*, *najak*, Ae *ñagok*, etc., by the application of different phonological rules. The first step, thus, would be a process of lengthening which initially would be of an expressive nature and later would have become morphologized, as a means of strengthening the contrast between neutral and allocutive forms.

This hypothesis, although intriguing and original, presents some weak points which lead us to finally reject it. To begin with, allocutive forms with geminate vowels are found in the writings of 19th century Biscayan authors and grammarians such as Pablo P. Astarloa, Añibarro and J. M. Zabala (see Altzibar 1992:417-54), but not in the writings of earlier Biscayan authors; neither are they found in the works of authors from other regions. Thus, given the absence of these forms in old Biscayan texts and in all texts from other dialects, it is highly unlikely that vowel gemination could have been the source of the multitude of dialectal forms that are found nowadays. A second serious problem is that Añibarro presents third person forms such as *dago* -> *jaagok* "s/he/it stays, alloc. masc." The palatalization of the initial /d/ supposes an earlier glide; but this glide is not found breaking the geminate sequence. Ros tries to account for these facts concerning third person forms by appealing to analogy or morphologization.

Even if we do not agree with the specific proposal in Ros (1987), we find the core of his hypothesis rather reasonable. The presence of *-i-* in allocutive forms can be taken as the morphologization of phonological facts (meaningful palatalization, see Oñederra 1990:59, fn. 3).

As de Rijk (p.c.) has pointed out to us, the *-i-* that appears in some dialects might be the result of historical depalatalization, i.e., L *niagok* < B *ñagok* "I am, stay, alloc. masc.", against the commonly held view involving palatalization, i. e. *n-i-a-go-k* > *ñagok*.

In any case, in order to account for the details of the allocutive conjugation in present-day local varieties, we need to accept the existence of analogical influences and the morphologization of phonological facts.

4. The diachronic sequencing of the various forms of allocutivity

Most vasconists are in agreement regarding the historical ordering in which the various forms of allocutivity found in the eastern dialects arose (see Schuchardt 1893:258, Lafon 1959:124-129, Rebuschi 1984:534-535, Ros 1987:31-33, Alberdi 1986:422-424, among others). The original second person singular was *hi*. The form of treatment required when the addressee is given *hi* combines second person singular forms (of the type *hi haiz* "thou art") with allocutive forms (of the type *hura duk/dun* "s/he/it is, alloc. masc/fem").

This conjugation is found in all dialects. When the form *zu* acquired a singular value, the allocutive system was extended to this form in eastern dialects (Eastern Low Navarrese, Souletin, Salazarese, Roncalese) giving rise to a system of address that combines forms like *zu zara* "you are" with allocutive forms of the type *hura duzu* "s/he/it is, alloc" (instead of the neutral *hura da*). Finally, in some of these eastern dialects (Eastern Low Navarrese and Salazarese) a further step was taken. In these dialects a third type of allocutive treatment was created by the systematic and meaningful palatalization of *zu*-forms: *xu xara* "you are", *hura duxu* "s/he/it is, alloc". The treatment of *xu* implies an intermediate level of formality between *hi* and *zu*. Thus, historically, allocutivity would have originated with *hi*, being later expanded to *zu* by analogy in some dialects, and finally including forms for *xu*, created by a straightforward palatalization of *zu* forms.

There are reasons to believe that the allocutive treatment of *zu* is more recent than the singularization of this pronoun. This can be concluded from the lack of consistency and optionality in the use of allocutive forms for *zu* in old texts. In our first texts (from the 16th century), whereas allocutive forms corresponding to treatment in *hi* are used with complete consistency, the use of allocutivity when the treatment is in *zu* is highly irregular. This would show the more recent character of the allocutive conjugation based on the pronoun *zu*. It seems that the use of allocutivity with *zu* appears linked to register from the earliest documents (Lafon 1959:120). The use of an allocutive with *zu* would convey a certain degree of familiarity. In addition, the fact that this form of treatment is restricted to a specific dialectal area would also show its recent character. As mentioned, allocutivity with *hi*, on the other hand, is found throughout the whole domain of the Basque language.

As for the treatment in *xu*, this results directly from the palatalization of forms for *zu*. Therefore it must be even more recent. Palatalization of coronal segments is a widespread process in Basque to express affection and create diminutive forms (e.g. *zezen* "bull", *xexen* "little bull"). In those areas where both treatments in *zu* and *xu* are preserved we would be in the presence of a true phenomenon of sound symbolism or phonological marking of affectivity (Oñederra 1990:74).

In some areas, such as Saint Jean Pied-de-Port (Donibane Garazi), allocutive forms are used in the treatment in *xu*, but they have disappeared in the treatment in *zu*. In these areas, thus, the expressive value originally associated with the treatment in *xu* is no longer conveyed, since for this value to be present plain forms must exist together with the palatalized ones (Michelena 1977:180). As Rebuschi (1984:520) puts it, the loss of the non-

palatalized forms in this dialect has resulted in the grammaticalization of the palatalization in the allocutive treatment.

Even though 'affective palatalization' is an old process in Basque, we do not think that the allocutive treatment in *xu* is very old. The reasons for this are that geographically it is a very marginal phenomenon, its first attestations are rather recent (from the 19th century), and it is directly based on the allocutive forms for *zu* (which, in turn, are not very old).

To sum up, the oldest type of allocutive treatment by far is that for *hi*, which is obligatory in all dialects from the earliest texts. Much later, an allocutive treatment for *zu* was created in eastern dialects, by analogy. In 16th-century texts this treatment appears as optional and conditioned by register. Finally, the more marked and marginal treatment in *xu* developed in Eastern Low Navarrese and Salazarese, where it is not documented until the 19th century.

5. Hypotheses on the development of the Basque system of forms of address

We can establish the following stages in the development of the Basque system of forms of address, with a certain degree of confidence: (1) In a first stage, *hi*, which requires the use of allocutive forms, was the only second person singular pronoun. (2) The first innovation was the use of *zu* as a singular form of respect. (3) A second innovation was the development of allocutive forms for *zu*, which was limited to the eastern dialects but is found from the earliest texts. (4) More recently, on the model provided by 16th century Spanish, forms of address such as *zure mesedeori* "your mercy", *zure senoria* "your lordship", which require third person agreement, were introduced, apparently not exclusively in the southern dialects. From this formula, the form of respect *berori* developed in the southern dialects around the 16th or 17th century. (5) Finally, perhaps quite recently, the treatment in *xu* arose in Eastern Low Navarrese and Salazarese as an affective palatalization of the forms for *zu*.

The use of *hi*, with or without allocutive verb forms, seems to be the most ancient, and originally the only, term of address. Later, as the pronoun *zu* became singular, the opposition between the 2nd person *hi* with concomitant allocutive agreement and *zu* with neutral forms arose in all Basque varieties. This would be reflected in the situation currently found in Labourdin and Western Low Navarrese. From this point on, Basque dialects would grow apart as the result of different innovations. On the one hand, eastern dialects (i.e. Eastern Low Navarrese, Salazarese, Souletin, and Roncalese) developed an intermediate treatment between *hi* and the neutral forms. As the use of *zu* as

a term of address spread to familiar settings, the door to a threefold system of address opened: allocutive *hi*, allocutive *zu*, and neutral forms with *zu*, although the opposition between formal allocutivity and non-allocutivity with *zu* was always very slippery. In a strict sense, in eastern varieties the true 'terms of address' would be the allocutive second persons *hi* and *zu*, whereas neutral forms would constitute a 'non-treatment' system. This 'non-treatment' system would express lack of closeness and would be used in high registers.

On the other hand, the western varieties developed an additional term of address based on the third person (i.e. the demonstrative pronoun *berori*), which expresses a higher degree of deference than the allocutive second person *hi* and the neutral treatment of *zu* (i.e. allocutive *hi*, neutral *zu*, *berori*). Southeastern varieties (i.e. Salazarese, Roncalese) show both innovations (i.e. the use of both *zu* and *berori* as terms of address). Eastern Low-Navarrese and Salazarese went one step further and developed another allocutive treatment involving the meaningful palatalization of the *zu* forms. Thus, 19th century Salazarese, which incorporated all these innovations, might have distinguished five different treatments: allocutive *hi*, allocutive *xu*, allocutive *zu*, nonallocutive *zu*, and nonallocutive *berori*. In any case, the opposition between allocutive and nonallocutive treatment of *zu* was never clearcut.

There is no question about the antiquity of the allocutive conjugation for the pronoun *hi*. But different proposals have been put forward regarding the ancient situation and its development. For Lafon (1959:124-126), the treatment in *hi*, which was the only second person singular, required the use of allocutive forms from ancient times: *hi haiz* "thou art"; *bero duk* "it is hot, alloc masc". Nonallocutive forms (*bero da* "it is hot") would have been used at that time only when there was a plural addressee. Later, the form *zu* would have acquired its singular value as form of respect, causing a restructuring of the system and giving rise to the new second person plural form *zuek*. Subsequently allocutivity would have been extended to the treatment in *zu* in the eastern dialects. Even later, the allocutive treatment in *xu* would have appeared.

Rebuschi (1984:534-535) proposes a somewhat different evolution. In a first stage there would be no allocutivity (*ni naiz* "I am"; *hi haiz* "thou art"). In a second stage, there would have been two types of treatment: a familiar treatment which involved the use of allocutive forms (*ni nauk* "I am, alloc masc"; *hi haiz* "thou art") and a formal treatment without allocutivity (*ni naiz*; *hi haiz*). In a third stage, the old formal treatment is lost and replaced by the use of the nonallocutive with *zu*, on the model provided by Romance (familiar: *ni nauk* "I am, alloc masc; *hi haiz* "thou art" vs. formal: *ni naiz* "I am"; *zu zara* "you are").

Another proposal, defended in Alberdi (1986:422-424) and in Ros (1987: 31-33), is that originally the only form of treatment would have involved the pronoun *hi* without the use of allocutive forms. The use of allocutive forms such as *ni nauk* would be marked and restricted to constructions where the speaker wanted to implicate the listener in the discourse, as explained above. From optional and expressive, the allocutive conjugation became obligatory when the pronoun *zu* acquired a singular value and *hi* became restricted to the familiar level.

In any event, no hypothesis can be advanced with any certainty of proof, since we are dealing with a time for which we do not have any written testimony.

6. *The use of forms of address in Basque: Past, present, and future*

Regarding the current usage of the various forms of address, we must distinguish two environments: among family members and outside of the family circle. In the first of these two environments, we are far from the generalization of *hi*. Within the family, asymmetric treatment *hi/zu* according to age relations is common (parent/child, uncle or aunt/nephew or niece, grandparent/grandchild, etc). Thus, within the family, the shift towards symmetry in treatment based on the 'solidarity' parameter (Brown & Gilman 1960) appears to be less strong and advanced in Basque than in the neighboring languages. Outside of the family, on the other hand, there is a tendency to replace asymmetric treatment with the same treatment in both directions. In any case, nowadays we do not find any tendency to generalize the use of *hi*.³ The pronoun *hi* (and its associated allocutive conjugation) is the marked treatment and the pronoun *zu* (with neutral verb forms) the unmarked one (de Rijk 1991). The use of *hi* in Basque is much more restricted than French *tutoiement*, not to mention Spanish *tuteo*. This does not seem to be a very recent state of affairs. In fact, as early as the beginning of the 18th century, Larramendi (1728:127-130; 1729:60) remarked on the lack of correspondence between the Basque and the Spanish usage; stating that *zu* is an intermediate treatment between Spanish *usted* and *tú*.

In Gavel & Lacombe's (1933-36) opinion, the current southern system with three forms of address (*hi*, *zu* and *berori*) corresponds to that found in 16th-century Spanish (*tú*, *vos*, *vuestra merced*). As for the usage in northern

³ There are a few towns where the use of the pronoun *hi* seems to be becoming less restricted (Oñati, Aulestia, Barkoxe), but this usage is clearly an exception, limited to some very specific geographic areas, and not the norm.

dialects, for Gavel & Lacombe this corresponds to an intermediate stage between old and modern French practice. Leaving aside the usage of *berori*,⁴ we do not think that the distinction that Gavel & Lacombe make between southern and northern Basque dialects is so clear. For the most part, the usage of the pronouns *hi* and *zu* is the same in southern and northern dialects. In addition, certain usages that Gavel & Lacombe consider recent innovations, such as the use of *hi* with one's children or between siblings, are documented quite early (Michelena 1964:84).

The similarity between 16th century Spanish usage and Basque usage of the same period is actually smaller than one might think. To begin with, in 16th century texts, the formula *zure mesedeori* "your mercy" and the pronoun *zu* appear together and confused. Secondly, whereas the Spanish pronoun *vos* was a familiar form of address (used with an addressee of inferior status or with an equal to show familiarity), the Basque pronoun *zu* was a formal form of address. Finally, unlike in Spanish and French, it does not seem that in the 16th century *hi* was the normal form of address among equals of low status, whereas *zu* was used among equals of high social status.

Perhaps the use of the pronoun *hi* and of the allocutive conjugation was not so different in the 16th century from what we find nowadays. Possibly, at that time the factors that were considered to determine the form of treatment were the same ones that are used nowadays, such as sex, age and relationship. In Etxepare's (1980 [1545]) poems, for instance, lovers use either reciprocal *zu* or non-reciprocal *hi/zu* (the woman addressing the man as *hi* and receiving *zu*), but not reciprocal *hi*. This type of usage is still found nowadays. In fact, in many dialects the feminine allocutive conjugation is very rare and is in danger of being lost.

Our opinion is that in the usage of the forms of address there have not been great changes in the last five hundred years. In any case, we do not find anything comparable to the changes experienced in the neighboring Romance languages. It is sensible to conclude that many peculiarities in the usage of forms of address in Basque have been due to internal developments without necessarily reflecting outside influences. Among the usages that Basque does not share with its neighbors, we could mention the usage of *zu* between husband and wife (already found in 16th-century documents, see Irigaray 1934, Fagoaga 1961) and the use of *zu* to address small children.

⁴ Currently, the use of *berori* to express deference has been almost completely lost. As has happened in Swedish, it might be the case that the asymmetrical use of *berori* worked against its successful survival and expansion.

REFERENCES

- Alberdi, Jabier. 1986. "Alokutibotasuna eta tratamenduak euskaraz: II. Markinaldeko kasua". *Anuario del Seminario 'Julio de Urquijo'* 20.419-486.
- Altube, Sebero. 1934. "Observaciones al tratado de 'Morfología vasca' de Don R. M. Azkue". (Repr. with vol. 3. of Azkue 1969.)
- Altzibar, Xabier. 1992. *Bizkaierazko idazle klasikoak. Mogeldarrak, Astarloatarrak, Frai Bartolome: Nortasuna, idazlanak, grafiak*. Bilbao: Bizkaiko Foru Aldundia.
- Añibarro, Pedro de. 1969 [1820]. *Gramática bascongada* ed. by Luis Villasante. *Anuario del Seminario 'Julio de Urquijo'* 3.
- Artola, Koldo. 1991. "Fidela Bernat anderea, euskal hiztun erronkariarra". *Fontes Linguae Vasconum* 58.247-281.
- Azkue, Resurrección M. 1905-1906. *Diccionario vasco-español-francés*. 2 vol. Tours: Alfred Mame et fils (2nd ed. Bilbao: La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca, 1969.)
- . 1969 [1923-25]. *Morfología vasca (Gramática básica dialectal del euskera)*. Bilbao: La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca.
- Beloqui, Juan José, Jesús Elosegui, Pilar Sansinenea & Luis Michelena. 1953. "Contribución al conocimiento del dialecto roncalés". *Boletín de la Real Sociedad Vascongada de los Amigos del País* 9.499-536.
- Bonaparte, Louis-Lucien. 1862. *Langue basque et langues finnoises*. London: Strangeways & Walden.
- . 1869. *Le verbe basque en tableaux*. London: Strangeways & Walden.
- Brown, Roger & Albert Gilman. 1960. "The pronouns of power and solidarity". *Style in Language*, ed. by T.A. Sebeok, 253-276. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press. (Repr. in Giglioli 1972:252-282.)
- Capanaga, Martin Ochoa. 1656. *Exposición breve de la doctrina christiana*. Bilbao: Juan de Azpiroz.
- Etxepare, Bernard. 1980 [1545]. *Linguae Vasconum Primitiae* ed. by Patxi Altuna. Bilbao: Mensajero.
- Fagoaga, B. 1961. "Algunas frases inéditas del euskera antiguo" *Euskera* 6.27-29.
- Gavel, Henri & Georges Lacombe. 1933-1936. *Grammaire basque. Gure Herria.*
- Giglioli, Pier Paolo (ed.). 1972. *Language and social context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- Gómez, Ricardo & Koldo Sainz. 1995. "On the origin of the finite forms of the Basque verb". This volume.
- Head, Brian F. 1978. "Respect degrees in pronominal reference". *Universals of human language*, 3rd vol., ed. by Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson & Edith A. Moravcsic, 151-211. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- Irigaray, Angel. 1934. "Promesa de matrimonio en euskera". *Yakintza* 81.130.
- Irigoyen, Alfonso. 1957. "Cartas de Mariano Mendigatxa a D. Resurrección M. de Azkue. Escritas en vascuence roncalés y en castellano". *Euskera* 2.119-170.
- Ithurry, Jean. 1979 [1895]. *Grammaire basque*. Donostia-San Sebastián: Ediciones Vascas.
- Joseph, John Earl. 1987. "Subject relevance and deferential address in the Indo-European languages". *Lingua* 73.259-277.
- Lafitte, Pierre. 1979 [1944]. *Grammaire basque*. Donostia: Elkar.
- Lafon, René. 1944. *Le système du verbe basque au XVIe siècle*. 2nd ed. 1980 Zarautz: Elkar.
- . 1959. "Place de la 2e personne du singulier dans la conjugaison basque". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 54.103-129.
- Lapesa, Rafael. 1970. "Personas gramaticales y tratamientos en español". *Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal 4, Revista de la Univ. de Madrid* 19.141-167.
- Larramendi, Manuel. 1728. *De la antigüedad y universalidad del bascuense en España*. Salamanca: Eugenio Garcia de Honorato (Repr. Donostia-San Sebastián: Ediciones Vascas, 1978.)
- . 1729. *El imposible vencido: Arte de la lengua bascongada*. Salamanca: Antonio Joseph Villagordo Alcaraz (Repr. Donostia-San Sebastián: Hordago, 1979.)
- Michelena, Luis. 1964. *Textos arcaicos vascos*. Madrid: Minotauro.
- . 1977. *Fonética histórica vasca*, 2nd. ed. Donostia-San Sebastián: Diputación de Guipúzcoa.
- . 1986. *Lenguas y protolenguas*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- . 1988- . *Diccionario general vasco-Orotariko euskal hiztegia*. Bilbao: Desclée de Brouwer & Ediciones Mensajero.
- Micoleta, Rafael. 1653. *Modo breve de aprender la lengua vizcayna*. 2nd ed. 1897 Sevilla: Francisco de P. Díaz.
- Oñederra, Lourdes. 1990. *Euskal fonologia: Palatalizazioa, asimilazioa eta hots sinbolismoa*. Leioa: Univ. del País Vasco / Euskal Herriko Unibertsitateak.

- Oyharçabal, Beñat. 1993. "Verb agreement with non-arguments: On allocutive agreement". *Generative studies in Basque linguistics* ed. by José I. Hualde & Jon Ortiz de Urbina, 89-114. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Pla Cárceles, J. 1923. "La evolución del tratamiento de *Vuestra Merced*". *Revista de Filología Española* 10.245-280.
- Rebuschi, Georges. 1984. *Structure de l'énoncé en basque*. Paris: SELAF.
- Rijk, Rudolf de. 1991. "Familiarity or solidarity: the pronoun *hi* in Basque". *Revista Internacional de los Estudios Vascos* 36.373-378.
- Ros, Ander. 1987. "Aditz morfologia historikorako ohar kritikoak: alokuzioa". *Enseiucarrean* 2.5-54.
- Schuchardt, Hugo. 1893. *Sobre la formación de las flexiones de relación del verbo vasco*. Sp. ed. by Angel Goenaga, 1947. (Repr. in *Boletín de la Real Sociedad Vascongada de los Amigos del País* 28.217-337).
- . 1923. *Primitiae Linguae Vasconum: Einführung ins Baskische*. Halle: Niemeyer. (2nd. ed. by Antonio Tovar. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1968. Sp. trans. by Angel Yrigaray. Salamanca: Centro Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1947.)