

DOI: 10.2478/v10122-012-0014-0

## RESULTATIVES IN BASQUE: A DIACHRONIC STUDY

DOROTA KRAJEWSKA

ABSTRACT: Dorota Krajewska. *Resultatives in Basque: A Diachronic Study*. *Lingua Posnaniensis*, vol. LIV (2)/2012. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences. PL ISSN 0079-4740, ISBN 978-83-7654-252-2, pp. 55–67.

This paper deals with several aspects of the diachrony of Basque resultative constructions. In present day Basque, resultatives can be used with perfect-like meaning. The goal of this paper has been thus to study the development of the non-resultative uses of resultative constructions. To this end, the diathesis types of resultative and the meanings the construction may convey are studied in a corpus of 17th to 20th century texts. It has been found that in the time span covered by the study, new diathesis types are introduced and two new meanings develop: perfect and experiential.

Dorota Krajewska, Department of Linguistics and Basque Studies, University of the Basque Country, Vitoria-Gasteiz, dorota.krajewska@ehu.es

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The diachrony of the resultative constructions has been studied extensively in the context of the grammaticalization process in which resultative evolves into perfect. Resultatives express a state implying a previous event (NEDJALCOV & JAXONTOV 1988: 9). Diachronically, a generalization of meaning often takes place (BYBEE et al. 1994: 69): the state produced by the previous action is reinterpreted as reference to the action itself. This grammaticalization path is a cross-linguistically well attested shift (cf. BYBEE et al. 1994; LINDSTEDT 2000; HEINE & KUTEVA 2006, among others). Such a change happened in old Basque too, as the modern Basque perfect developed from resultative constructions (MOUNOLE 2011). The present study focuses on the newer resultatives, which in the last several centuries have also acquired some properties of perfect. The objective of this paper is to provide a description of the evolution of Basque resultatives between 17th and 20th centuries in three Basque dialects: Bizkaian, Gipuzkoan and Navarrese.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The corpus consists of the following texts:

(1) 17th century. BIZKAIAN: M. Otxoa Kapanaga, *Doctrinea* (1656), N. Zubia, *Doktrina kristiana* (1691); GIPUZKOAN: J. Otxoa Arin, *Doctrina Christianaren explicacioa* (1713); NAVARRESE: J. Beriain, *Tratazen da nola enzun bear den meza* (1621).

(2) 18th century. BIZKAIAN: M. Arzadun, *Doctrina christianeen explicacinoa* (1731), P.I. Barrutia, *Gabonetarako ikuskizuna* (18th century), N.M. de la Quadra, *Exercicio santo de ayudar a bien morir, Doctrina christinaubarena* (1748, Bilbao, 1997, 1998), B. Olaetxea, *Doctrina Kistianeana* (1763); GIPUZKOAN: J. Irazusta,

The paper proceeds as follows: In the remainder of this section, Basque resultative constructions are introduced. Section 2 deals with their diachrony. First (section 2.1), diathesis types of resultative and changes in their use are discussed. In section 2.2, the meanings that the resultative can convey are examined, with focus on perfect and experiential. Section 2.3 summarizes the changes observed.

Basque resultative periphrases consist of a suffixed participle and a copular verb. As for the verb, it can be one of the following: *izan* ‘be’ (and intransitive auxiliary), *egon* ‘be (located), stay’, \**edun* ‘have’ (and transitive auxiliary) and *eduki* ‘have’. The typical resultative construction is exemplified in (1) and (2). In (1) the verb *egon* ‘be’ is used, while (2) is its transitive variant (with *eduki* ‘have’).

- (1) *Dena apurtu-ta zegoen.*  
 everything break-RES be:PST:3SG  
 ‘Everything was broken.’
- (2) *Dena apurtu-ta zeukan.*  
 everything break-RES have:PST:3SG>3SG  
 ‘She had everything broken.’

Resultative constructions allow an optional agent phrase, which bears the ergative case; that is, has the same form as the transitive subject in non-resultative context.

There are three suffixes that mark the resultative. The so-called definite article *-a* (*-ak* in plural) is one of the options. The article makes the participle behave like an adjective, requiring number agreement with the subject. The suffixes *-ta* and *-rik* form adverbial participles (or converbs, cf. HASPELMATH 1995). Both are used in roughly the same contexts, among others, in non-finite adverbial clauses (similar to *ablativus absolutus* construction in Latin), in resultative periphrases and as secondary predicates. In modern Basque, the difference between *-ta* and *-rik* is dialectal: western varieties prefer the former and the eastern the latter, while both are encountered in the central varieties. They also have very different origins. The suffix *-rik* is the partitive case ending (which, as in many other languages, was once ablative). The *-ta* suffix developed through reanalysis from the copulative conjunction *eta* ‘and’ (or, rather, its contracted form *ta*), as illustrated in (3) and (4). The conjunction was

*Doctrina Christiana* (1739), A. Kardaberaz, *Ejertzioak-IV* (1765); NAVARRESE: F. Elizalde, *Apecendaco doctrina cristiana* (1735), J. Mikelestorena, *Zerura nai duenak ar dezaken bide erraza* (1751).

(3) late 18th – early 19th century. BIZKAIAN: J.J. Mogel, *Baserritar nekezaleentzako eskolia* (1816), J.A. Mogel, *Peru Abarka* (1802); GIPUZKOAN: J.I. Gerriko, *Kristau doktriña guztiaren esplikazioaren saiakera* (1805, a fragment), V. Mogel, *Ipui onak* (1804); NAVARRESE: J. Lizarraga, *Sermoiak* (1771–1800, a fragment).

(4) late 19th – early 20th century. GIPUZKOAN: A. Apaolaza, *Patxiko Txerren* (1890); T. Altzaga selected plays (1888–1930), P.M. Urruzuno, *Ur-zale baten ipuiak* (1885–1919); BIZKAIAN: J.M. Etxeita, *Josecho* (1909), D. Agirre, *Auñemendiko lorea* (1898), E. Bustintza, *Abarrak* (1918); NAVARRESE: P.F. Irigarai, *Lekukotasuna* (1916–1936), E. Zubiri selected articles (1928–1936).

(5) 20th century. GIPUZKOAN: A. Anabitarte, *Donostia* (1932), S. Salaberria, *Neronek tirako nizkin* (1964), M. Ugarte, *On Egiñaren Obaria* (1971), BIZKAIAN: E. Erkiaga, *Arranegi* (1958), J.M. Etxaburu, *Neure lau urteko ibillerak* (1963); NAVARRESE: B.M. Garro, *Bertolda eta Bertoldin* (1932), J. Satrustegi, *Ekaitza* (1973), J.M. Estonba, *Izartxo* (1959).

Unless stated otherwise, electronic versions of the texts were used (Klasikoan Gordailua, <http://klasikoak.armiarma.com/> or Euskararen Donostia, <http://www.euskaraz.net/>).

reinterpreted as the last constituent of the first clause that marks subordination (REBUSCHI 1983).

(3)            *hori ikusi ta alde egin dute*  
 this see and leave AUX:3PL>3SG  
 ‘They saw it and left.’

(4)            *hori ikusi-ta, alde egin dute*  
 this see-RES leave AUX:3PL>3SG  
 ‘Having seen this, they left.’

Typically, *-ta* and *-rik* participles combine with the verbs *egon* ‘be’ and *eduki* ‘have’, while the variant with the article is most frequent with the verbs *izan* ‘be’ and *\*edun* ‘have’ (other combinations are attested as well, though). In this paper, however, no distinction is made between the different combinations of resultative participles and verbs and all are referred to as ‘resultative periphrases’.

So far, resultatives in Basque have been treated mostly from a synchronic point of view, with a variety of labels used to describe the relevant phenomena: resultative/experiential (HUALDE et al. 1994), resultative passive (DE RIJK 2008) adjectival or statal passive (HUALDE & ORTIZ DE URBINA 2003), perfect (LAFITTE 1979), antipassive (REBUSCHI 1984). The most important observation relevant to the present paper made in the aforementioned studies is the fact that constructions consisting of a suffixed participle and a copular verb may convey different meanings apart from the typically resultative one. The syntax of resultatives was studied by ORTIZ DE URBINA & URIBE-ETXEBARRIA (1991), ARTIAGOITIA (1995) or DE RIJK (2008) and the principal contribution of these studies is the proposal that Basque resultative constructions should be analyzed as bi-clausal (i.e. they consist of a participial clause, which is combined with a copular verb and its argument or arguments). The diachrony of the resultative constructions was treated in ALDAI (2007) and especially in MOUNOLE (2011) in the context of the changes in the Basque tense-aspect system up to the 18th century. Finally, HAASE (1992a, b) discusses the possibility of Basque resultatives being borrowed from or at least influenced by Romance (Spanish and Gascon) resultative constructions. However, this issue will not be discussed here, as it is necessary to first provide an in-depth analysis of the relevant phenomena language-internally, before considering external influences.

## 2. THE DIACHRONY OF BASQUE RESULTATIVES

### 2.1. DIATHESIS TYPES

NEDJALKOV & JAXONTOV (1988: 9) proposed a classification of resultatives with respect to which argument of the previous action is co-referential with ‘the underlying subject of the state in the resultative’. They distinguished objective, subjective and possessive diatheses (here, they are called P-, S- and A-resultatives, respectively). They further observed that resultatives in which the state is attributed to the patient of the previous action are cross-linguistically more common than other types of resultatives. In other words, they proposed the following implication: if a language allows subjective resultatives, it will also have

objective resultatives and, cross-linguistically, the least frequent type is the possessive resultative. The motivation for studying diathesis types in diachrony is the following: if a resultative construction is moving toward perfect on the grammaticalization path, it is likely that new resultative types appear. In this section the classification of diathesis types is applied to Basque and the question is whether there are indications of an extension of the allowed types or some significant changes in their frequency.

In the S-resultative the subject of the state corresponds to the single argument of an intransitive verb:

- (5) *Naiago nuke Txina-ra joan-da ba-zeunde.*  
 Prefer AUX:PST:POT:1SG>3SG China-ALL go-RES if-be:COND:2SG  
 ‘I would rather you were gone to China.’ [Anabitarte]

In the A-resultative, the subject of the resultative construction corresponds to the agent. In (6) the copular verb is intransitive, but a construction with ‘have’ is also possible, as (7) illustrates.

- (6) *Makina bat kaskarreko artu-ta nago bera-k eman-da.*  
 many one blow take-RES be:1SG he-ERG give-RES  
 ‘I have received many blows given by him.’ [Salaberria]

- (7) *ni-k sarri entzun-a dot*  
 I-ERG many.times hear-DET have:1SG>3SG  
 ‘I have heard it many times.’ [Erkiaga]

The state of the previous action’s patient is referred to in P-resultatives. (8) illustrates an intransitive periphrasis (note also the use of agent modifier in the ergative case, a possibility mentioned in the introduction). Now, transitive periphrases (with ‘have’) can also be P-resultatives. (9) can be seen as derived from another resultative: ‘The number was placed’, from which it is possible to obtain the example in (9) by adding a possessor. Thus, the subject of the state surfaces as the grammatical object of the verb ‘have’, but both (8) and (9) belong to the same diathesis type.

- (8) *Ango su-a ere, Jaungoiko-a-k egiñ-a da.*  
 DEM fire-DET too god-DET-ERG make-DET be:3SG  
 ‘The fire that is there is made by the God too.’ [Gerriko]
- (9) *Plaza Berri-ko balkoi guzti-ek numero bana zuten ipiñi-a gañ-ean.*  
 Plaza Berri-REL balcony all-ERG.PL number one have:PST:3PL>3SG put-DET top-INES  
 ‘All the balconies at Plaza Berri had a number placed above them.’ [Anabitarte]

The last type distinguished here is S/P-resultative, called ‘two diathesis resultative’ in NEDJALKOV & JAXONTOV (1988: 12), which are formed with ambitransitive verbs; i.e. verbs that can be employed transitively and intransitively (e.g. English *John broke the glass* and *The glass broke*). Some examples in Basque are the following: *bete* ‘fill’, *galdu* ‘lose/get lost’, *hil* ‘kill/die’, *harritu* ‘surprise/get surprised’, *itsutu* ‘make/become blind’, *nekatu* ‘make/get tired’, *puskatu* ‘break’. In (10) and (11), which illustrate this diathesis type, the verbs *itxi* ‘close’ and *zauritu* ‘injure, get injured’ are used, respectively. Thus, (10) may cor-

respond to ‘someone closed the door’ or to ‘the door closed’. (11) illustrates the variant with ‘have’ as the copular verb.

- (10) *Ate-a itxi-rik zegoan.*  
 door-DET close-RES be:PST:3SG  
 ‘The door was closed.’ [Gerriko]
- (11) *Zaurittu-rik eukan gorputz guzti-a.*  
 injure-RES have:PST:3SG>3SG body whole-DET  
 ‘He had the whole body injured.’ [Bustintza]

Taking into account the fact that resultatives tend to have restrictions on the verbs that may appear in the construction, it is in order to comment on the range of verbs in each diathesis type. While in P-resultative and S/P-resultative there seem to be no restrictions, there are several issues to consider in the case of A- and S-resultative.

The first issue is whether atelic verbs can be employed in resultative constructions as it might indicate the loosening of lexical restrictions typical of resultative constructions and a move towards the perfect on the diachronic path. In Basque, some verbs that appear in the S-resultative are the following: *eseri* ‘sit down’, *etzan* ‘lay down’, *erori* ‘fall’, *etorri* ‘come’, *joan* ‘go’, *jaio* ‘be born’ (all telic). However, several atelic verbs are also found, e.g. *ibili* ‘walk’, *izan* ‘be’, *egon* ‘be’ (however, Basque has very few atelic verbs, so it is not clear if there ever was a restriction on their use in the resultative). Because of the fact that atelic verbs cannot refer to a state, when used in a resultative constructions, they typically have experiential or perfect meaning (see section 2.2), as in the following example:

- (12) *Aireplan bath-ian ere ibili-a nuk*  
 airplane one-INES even walk-RES be.1SG  
 ‘I have even been on an airplane.’ [Zubiri]

Another issue is the type of verbs that can be used in the A-resultative. The most frequent verbs encountered in the A-resultative are the following: *entzun* ‘hear’, *ikusi* ‘see’, *ikasi* ‘learn’, *esan* ‘say’, *egin* ‘make’, *antzeaman* ‘realize’, *hartu* ‘take’, *igarri* ‘notice’, *eman* ‘give’ (usually in compound verbs such as *eskerrak eman* ‘thank’ or *hitza eman* ‘promise’) and *jakin* ‘learn, know’. They coincide with the types of verbs that NEDJALKOV & JAXONTOV (1988: 23) consider likely to be used in this diathesis, such as mental or perception verbs or verbal collocations; generally speaking, verbs in which the previous action affects primarily the state of the subject. Some examples with prototypical transitive verbs (i.e. affected patient rather than the agent) have been found in the corpus (especially in the 20th century texts). When such a verb is used, the situation is presented from such a point of view that the state of the subject is somehow in focus, or the result of the action is viewed as somehow important for the subject (and the construction often has experiential meaning).

As stated above, what is expected in the diachrony is an extension of the allowed diathesis types. The proportions of diathesis types are listed in table 1. In Basque, in the 17th and 18th century texts studied here, almost all examples are of P- and S/P-type. There are only a few examples of S- and even less A-resultatives. Since the late 18th century, however, A- and S-resultatives have become much more frequent. In the late 18th and early 19th century, S- and A-resultatives account for about 10% of all examples. Their frequency further

Table 1. Diathesis types in the corpus

Period	Total	A	S	P	S/P
17th	121	0.8%	2.5%	70.2%	26.4%
18th	168	1.2%	2.4%	51.8%	44.6%
18th/19th	461	4.6%	5.6%	49.2%	40.6%
19th/20th	657	9.1%	14.3%	25.1%	51.4%
20th	928	12.1%	20.0%	25.0%	42.8%

increases in the late 19th and during the 20th century. In the newest texts, there are 12% and 20% of A- and S-resultatives, respectively. As for P and S/P-resultatives, they outnumber other types in all periods, but in older texts P-resultatives are more frequent, while since the late 19th century S/P-resultatives dominate.

To conclude, the analysis of the diathesis types has shown that in the time span covered by the study, there have been significant changes in the frequencies of the diathesis types, especially with respect to S- and A-resultatives, which once were very scarce, but in modern Basque they are quite common. The appearance of new diathesis types can be taken as a sign of construction grammaticalizing into perfect.

## 2.2. THE MEANING

This section addresses the meaning of the resultative constructions. The four meanings: resultative, passive, perfect and experiential are introduced and the diachronic changes observed in the corpus with regards to the frequencies of occurrence of the four meanings are discussed.

First of all, the periphrases can express the resultative proper as defined by NEDJALOV & JAXONTOV (1988: 6), i.e. “a state implying a previous event”, as in the following example:

- (13) *Plaza Berri-ko denda guzti-ak itxi-ta zeuden.*  
 Plaza Berri-REL shop all-DET:PL close-RES be:PST:3PL  
 ‘All the shops at Plaza Berri were closed.’ [Anabitarte]

Another meaning a resultative periphrasis may convey is passive. What is meant here is actional passive (and not stative passive); put another way, examples incompatible with resultative meaning because they refer to an action are labelled as passive. Some examples are ambiguous between passive and resultative: for instance, in (15) there is no way to determine whether what was intended is passive or resultative (as a consequence, this and similar examples have been labelled as resultative). (14), on the other hand, is unambiguously passive. The verb that is used in the sentence, *hil* ‘die/kill’ would mean ‘was dead’ if read as resultative, but the context makes it clear that the intended reading is ‘got killed’.

- (14) *Kain-en esku-z ill-a izan za-la.*  
 Cain-GEN hand-INS kill-DET be AUX:PST:3SG-COMP  
 ‘[...] that he was killed by the hands of Cain.’ [Gerriko]

- (15) *Ez zara aaztu-ta izan-go aita.*  
 no AUX:2SG forget-RES be-FUT father  
 ‘Father, you will not be forgotten.’ or ‘Father, you will not get forgotten.’  
 [Mogel]

‘Perfect’ is understood here as in COMRIE’S (1976: 52) classical definition: “the perfect indicates the continuing present relevance of a past situation”. The goal is to distinguish cases that are incompatible with resultative meaning. In other words, in the perfect there is a clear reference to a past action relevant at the time of reference, rather than to a state. Since it is impossible to apply e.g. the ‘still’ test to historical data, some other clues are exploited here as a way to distinguish perfect from resultative. Some examples from the corpus are ambiguous in the sense that both perfect and resultative readings are legitimate. However, in other cases, the context or the verb trigger perfect reading. So, in (16) an aspectual verb *hasi* ‘start’ is used. Even though it is possible for a thing to be ‘in the state of having been started’ (i.e. ‘something is started’), it is more difficult to talk about a state that an agent is in after starting an action.

- (16) *Zazpi alegiñ-ak egi-ten asi-a zan.*  
 seven effort-DET:PL make-IPFV start-DET be:PST:3SG  
 ‘He had started making every effort.’ [Erkiaga]

In (17) and (18) the clues for tagging them as perfect are the time modifiers which refer to the time the action took place and not the time frame the state held. In examples (17) and (18) the same verb is employed: *etorri* ‘come’, but (18) is compatible with resultative reading: ‘I had come home’ (action), so ‘I was home’ (result state). But if (17) was understood as resultative, it would mean ‘I was in Pamplona the day before’, namely it would imply that the state of being there held the day before, and we do not know when the action that brought the state about took place. However, the intended meaning (as the context the sentence appears in indicates) was that the action took place the day before and what we do not know is if the state still persists at the time of reference.

- (17) *Bezperan Pamplona-ra etorri-a nintzan.*  
 the.day.before Pamplona-ALL come-DET be:PST:1SG  
 ‘I had come to Pamplona the day before.’ [Salaberria]

- (18) *ni etxe-ra etorri-a nintza-la*  
 I house-ALL come-DET be:PST:1SG-COMP  
 ‘[...] that I had come home.’ [Salaberria]

It could be argued that (19) should be treated as resultative, as it means ‘He’s gone since the day before yesterday’, in other words the state persists at the reference time. The reason for tagging it as perfect lies in the time modifier and, more precisely, in the fact that it does not bear any postposition, which would appear in expressions like ‘since the day before yesterday’. In (20), an example from the same author as (19), a postposition *ezkero* ‘since’ is used (and the example is labelled as resultative).

- (19) *eranegun irten-a da etxe-tik.*  
 the.day.before.yesterday leave-DET be.3SG house-ABL  
 ‘He left home the day before yesterday.’ [Ugarte]

- (20) *Zu-rekin egon ezkeroz-dik irten-a da.*  
 you-COM be since-ABL leave-DET be.3SG  
 ‘He’s gone since he was with you.’ [Ugarte]



Another possible meaning is experiential, which can be understood in a narrow sense, along the lines of the definition by BYBEE et al. (1994: 62): the experiential expresses that “certain qualities or knowledge are attributable to the agent due to past experiences”. In (21) the intended meaning is something more than a mere statement of a fact that the speaker has seen a lot of things. What the sentence implies is that, due to what he has lived, the speaker considers himself an experienced person. Experiential can be also understood in a broader way: “a given situation has held at least once during some time in the past leading up to the present” (COMRIE 1976: 58). In (21) there is a reference to a repeated action too, but the emphasis is on something else, namely on the consequences of the repeated action for the agent. In (22), an example of the experiential in the broader sense, the focus is on the repeated action. It seems that in Basque the former type of experiential is more frequent and most examples can be understood as ascribing some qualities as a result of the previous event or events. Experientials are in many respects similar to perfects: without modifiers such as *askotxo* ‘a lot’ or *makina bat aldiz* ‘many times’, among many others, the experientials would have to be classified under the perfect.

(21) *Ni askotxo ikusi-a nago.*  
 I a.lot see-DET be:1SG  
 ‘I have seen a lot.’ (in my life) [Anabitarte]

(22) *Makina bat aldiz lo egin-a nago bera-rekin.*  
 a.lot one time sleep make-DET be:1SG he-COM  
 ‘I have slept with him a lot of times.’ [Salaberria]

All examples of perfect and experiential given so far are built with an intransitive copula. Transitive variants are also possible, though:

(23) *ni-k sarri entzun-a dot*  
 I-ERG many.times hear-DET have:1SG>3SG  
 ‘I have heard it many times.’ [Erkiaga]

Having introduced the meanings that the resultative construction may convey, we can now to the diachronic changes in their frequency (table 2).

Table 2. Frequencies of perfect, experiential, resultative and passive uses of resultative periphrases

Period	Total	Perfect	Experiential	Resultative	Passive
17th	121	0.0%	0.0%	97.5%	2.5%
18th	168	0.6%	0.6%	91.1%	7.7%
18th/19th	461	1.1%	0.4%	92.4%	6.1%
19th/20th	657	10.0%	4.0%	83.0%	3.0%
20th	928	15.2%	4.2%	79.7%	0.9%

As for the passive, the use of resultatives to convey passive meaning was never very high and has decreased to less than 1% in the 20th century. A likely explanation of this tendency is that more contemporary writers are less likely to imitate Spanish or French constructions and, since Basque lacks passive voice as such, from the first texts on we can find attempts at ‘inventing’ one, using Romance languages as model (and one way of rendering Romance passive voice in Basque are the resultative constructions).



With regard to perfect and experiential, until the 18th century, they are very infrequent and the meaning of the construction is almost always resultative and, less commonly, passive. For instance, in Leizarraga's translation of the Bible (1571, Lapurdian dialect) the construction has resultative or passive meaning. However, there is an exception: (24) is an example of the experiential, which is, as far as I know, the oldest example of this kind.

- (24) *Eta ezagutzen zuten hek Jesus-ekin izan-ak zirad-ela.*  
 and know:IPFV AUX:PST:3PL>3SG they Jesus-COM be-DET:PL be.PST.3PL-COMP  
 'And they knew that they had been with Jesus.' [Leizarraga, 1571]

As for the dialects under study here, the first examples with perfect or experiential meaning appear in the 18th century Bizkaian texts. (25) has clearly experiential meaning and (26) is an example of perfect.

- (25) *Mila golpe artu-ta nago*  
 thousand blow take-RES be.1SG  
 'I have received a lot of blows.' [Barrutia, 18th century]
- (26) *ez guichi-tan icusi-ta daucat*  
 no little-INES see-RES have.1SG>3SG  
 'I have seen it several times' [Quadra, 1748]

Perfects and experientials start to appear with certain frequency in the late 19th century, when 14% of all examples have one of these two meaning. Their frequency continues to increase and reaches 19% in the 20th century, with perfect being more frequent than experiential. However, it must be mentioned that the frequency is not equal in all dialects. Perfects are more frequent in Navarrese than in Gipuzkoan and least frequent in Bizkaian. Experientials, on the other hand, seem to be more typical of Bizkaian and Gipuzkoan than of Navarrese. However, further research is needed to explain these differences.

Thus, the data shows that a new perfect category (with the current relevance and experiential meanings) has emerged in Basque and it has entered the competition with the older perfect construction. The new perfect has two variants, as transitive (with 'have') and intransitive perfects (with 'be') are possible. In fact, most perfects in the corpus are intransitive. Now, an important point is that in the intransitive perfect both intransitive and transitive verbs may be used. For example, in (27) the verb *ikusi* 'see' appears and in (28) *entzun* 'hear'. Both are transitive verbs, which require ergative subject in an unmarked non-resultative sentence. Intransitive perfects from transitive verbs appear in all the three dialects, but are most frequent in Bizkaian and especially in Gipuzkoan (in the latter 40% of all perfects and experientials are of this kind).

- (27) *Komeri ederr-ak ikusi-ak gera gazte-denbora-n.*  
 comedy great-DET:PL see-DET:PL be:1PL young-time-INES  
 'We have seen a lot (lit. great comedies) in our youth.' [Salaberria]
- (28) *Baño joan dan igande-an iru meza bakarrik entzun-da nengoa-la...*  
 but last sunday-INES three mass only hear-RES be:PST:1SG-COMP  
 'But, as I heard only three masses last Sunday...' [Anabitarte]

This pattern is anomalous in an ergative language like Basque, as the agent of the transitive verb is marked with the absolutive case, in the same way that the only argument of an

intransitive verb is marked. For the moment, these constructions are not frequent enough to seriously ‘threaten’ the language’s ergative status, but constitute an interesting example of the kind of changes that result in split ergativity and may eventually produce a change in alignment, as observed by CREISSELS (2008).

### 2.3. FROM RESULTATIVE TO PERFECT

As mentioned in the introduction, according to the most extended analysis of Basque resultatives, these constructions are bi-clausal: they are copular constructions and the participial is predicated of the subject or object of the copulative verb. In the kind of resultative attested already in the oldest Basque texts, the participial clause consists of an optional agent modifier and a suffixed participle. The participial clause is combined with ‘be’ or ‘have’ (and the argument or arguments of the copular verb), as presented schematically in (29) and exemplified in (30) and (31).

- (29) NP<sub>abs</sub> + [participial clause] + be  
 NP<sub>erg</sub> + NP<sub>abs</sub> + [participial clause] + have  
 [participial clause] = [(NP<sub>erg</sub>) participle-RES]

- (30) *Ango su-a ere, [Jaungoiko-ak egiñ-a] da.*  
 DEM fire-DET too god-DET:ERG make-DET be:3SG  
 ‘The fire that is there is made by the God too.’ [Gerriko]

- (31) *esku ta oiñ-ak [otz-a-k gogortu-ta] zituen-etan*  
 hand and foot-DET:PL cold-DET:ERG harden-RES have:PST:3SG>3PL-INES:PL  
 ‘When he had his hands and feet hardened by the cold.’ [Erkiaga]

The construction initially had strictly resultative meaning and the allowed diathesis types were S/P and P-resultative. This situation holds until the late 18th century (around 98% of periphrases have resultative meaning and around 95% are S/P- or P-resultatives). Then, the resultative followed the cross-linguistically well-attested grammaticalization path from resultative to perfect (cf. BYBEE et al. 1994; LINDSTEDT 2000). Perfects with ‘have’ emerged for transitive verbs: the possessor in loose sense was reinterpreted as agent and the reference to the state produced previous action was reinterpreted as reference to the action itself. The resultative meaning has not vanished, though, and thus the following example is ambiguous between perfect and resultative reading:

- (32) *eman-da daukat*  
 give-RES have:1SG>3SG  
 ‘I have something given by somebody’ or ‘I have given’

For intransitive verbs, as the use of the S-resultative increased, the construction acquired a new meaning (just as described above, what happened was a shift from talking about a state resulting from the previous action to talking about the action).

Now, as for the intransitive perfect, it seems that its development followed a path slightly different from the one described for the transitive perfect, even though the two eventually converged. An argument for treating intransitive perfects differently from the resultative in (29) comes from syntax. As suggested by the bi-clausal analysis of the resultative con-

structions, there is a difference between the type of resultative in (29) and the intransitive perfects, which can be represented as in (33). (34) is an example.

- (33) NP<sub>abs</sub> + [participial clause] + be  
[participial clause] = [(adjuncts) (NP<sub>dat</sub>) (NP<sub>abs</sub>) participle-RES]

- (34) *[Len ere zu-ri eskerr-ak eman-ik] nago.*  
Before too you-DAT thank-DET:PL give-RES be:1SG  
'I have thanked you before too.' [Anabitarte]

The difference lies in the structure of the participial clause, which, apart from the resultative participle also contains the arguments and adjuncts of the verb and these have to go before the participle. It is not the case with transitive perfects, which, with respect to the word order of object and subject, behave as non-resultative sentences (they can go after the verb):

- (35) *ikusi-ta daukat ni-k dena*  
see-RES have:1SG>3SG I-ERG everything  
'I have seen everything.'

The restriction on the word order in intransitive perfects applies with no exceptions to direct and indirect objects, while time adverbs and other modifiers do occasionally appear outside of the participial clause, as in (36). It could be the case that they at some point they also had to be placed within the participial clause, but then the restriction was loosened. In any case, the bi-clausal analysis explains why temporal adverbs normally incompatible with present tense verb can appear in resultatives with present tense copula – their scope was the participial clause and not the copula.

- (36) *[Komeri ederr-ak ikusi-ak] gera gazte-denbora-n.*  
comedy great-DET:PL see-DET:PL be:1PL young-time-INES  
'We have seen a lot (lit. great comedies) in our youth.' [Salaberria]

The result of the developments that the resultative constructions have undergone is the competition between perfects from resultatives and the older unmarked perfect (bare participle combined with an auxiliary verb, transitive or intransitive depending on the valency of the main verb). For instance, the experiential-like meaning can be expressed by means of the older perfect (39), which is the unmarked option or by means of the resultative construction, either intransitive (37) or transitive (38).

- (37) *Asko-txo ikusi-a naiz.*  
a.lot-DIM see-DET be:1SG  
'I have seen a lot.'

- (38) *Asko-txo ikusi-ta daukat.*  
a.lot-DIM see-RES have:1SG>3SG  
'I have seen a lot.'

- (39) *Asko-txo ikusi dut.*  
a.lot-DIM see AUX:1SG>3SG  
'I have seen a lot.'

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

The aim of the present study was to describe historical developments that Basque resultative constructions have undergone since the 17th century. The main findings may be summarised as follows: (1) As for the diathesis types, in the oldest texts, virtually all examples of the resultative construction are of P or S/P type and there are very few examples the remaining types. Since the late 18th century, however, a remarkable increase in the frequency of the A- and S-resultatives has taken place. (2) With regards to the meaning, in the 17th century texts, it is resultative in most cases (the rest being passive). First examples of perfect and experiential appear in the 18th century and their frequency has been increasing ever since. (3) The new perfect comes in two variants: transitive (with ‘have’) and intransitive (with ‘be’), even though the variant with ‘be’ is not equally common in all dialects.

### ABBREVIATIONS

ABL – ablative; ALL – allative; AUX – auxiliary; COND – conditional; COM – comitative; COMP – complementation; DET – determiner; DIM – diminutive; ERG – ergative; GEN – genitive; FUT – future; INES – inessive; INS – instrumental; IPFV – imperfective; POT – potential; PST – past; REL – relational marker; RES – resultative.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Research reported here was supported by a predoctoral scholarship from the Vice-Chancellor of Basque and Multilingualism of the University of the Basque Country.

### REFERENCES

- ALDAI Gontzal. 2007. *The Grammaticalization of Present and Past in Basque*. PhD thesis, Universidad del País Vasco.
- ARTIAGOITIA Xabier. 1995. *Verbal Projections in Basque and Minimal Structure*. San Sebastián: Diputación de Gipuzkoa.
- BILBAO Gidor. 1997. “De la Quadrak Bermeon 1784an idatzitako eskuizkribuak: I. dotrina christinaubarena.” *ASJU* 31(1), 247–336.
- BILBAO Gidor. 1998. “De la Quadrak Bermeon 1784an idatzitako eskuizkribuak (II).” *ASJU* 32(1), 165–230.
- BYBEE Joan, PERKINS Rewere, PAGLIUCA William. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- COMRIE Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CREISSELS Denis. 2008. “Direct and Indirect Explanations of Typological Regularities: The Case of Alignment Variations.” *Folia Linguistica* 42, 1–38.
- DAHL Östen (ed.). 2000. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- DE RIJK Rudolf P.G. 2008. *Standard Basque: A Progressive Grammar*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- HAASE Martin. 1992a. “Resultative in Basque.” *ASJU* 26(2), 441–452.
- HAASE Martin. 1992b. *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel im Baskenland: die Einflüsse des Gaskognischen und Französischen auf das Baskische*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- HASPELMATH Martin. 1995. “The Converb as a Cross-linguistically Valid Category.” In: HASPELMATH, KÖNIG 1995: 1–55.

- HASPELMATH Martin, KÖNIG Ekkehard (eds.). 1995. *Converbs in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- HEINE Bernd, KUTEVA Tania. 2006. *The Changing Languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HUALDE José Ignacio, ELORDIETA Gorka, ELORDIETA Arantzazu. 1994. *The Basque dialect of Lekeitio*. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco.
- HUALDE José Ignacio, ORTIZ DE URBINA Jon. 2003. *A Grammar of Basque*. Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- LAFITTE Pierre. 1979. *Grammaire basque (navarro-labourdin littéraire)*. San Sebastián: Elkar.
- LAKARRA Joseba, RUIZ ARZALLUS Iñigo (eds.). 1991. *Memoriae L. Mitxelena magistri sacrum*. San Sebastián: Diputación de Gipuzkoa.
- LINDSTEDT Jouko. 2000. “The Perfect – Aspectual, Temporal and Evidential.” In: DAHL 2000: 365–383.
- MOUNOLE HIRIART-URRUTY Céline. 2011. *Le verbe basque ancien: Étude philologique et diachronique*. PhD thesis, Universidad del País Vasco.
- NEDJALOV Vladimir P. (ed.). 1988. *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- NEDJALOV Vladimir P., JAXONTOV Sergei. 1988. “The Typology of Resultative Constructions.” In: NEDJALOV 1988: 3–62.
- ORTIZ DE URBINA Jon, URIBE-ETXEBARRIA Myriam. 1991. “Participial Predication in Basque.” In: LAKARRA, RUIZ ARZALLUZ 1991: 993–1012.
- REBUSCHI Georges. 1983. “Autour du parfait et du passif basques.” *IKER* 2, 545–558.
- REBUSCHI Georges. 1984. *Structure de l'énoncé en basque*. Paris: SELAF.

*Allatum die 22 mensis Octobris anno 2012*