# Resultative in Basque

MARTIN HAASE

(University of Osnabrück)

This paper will treat the Basque resultative from a primarily typological point of view, following Nedjalkov (1988). Questions of language contact and language change, however, will also be dealt with, especially with regard to how the passive construction developed from one of the resultative constructions.*

Basque is an isolated language, spoken on both sides of the western Pyrenees in South-West France (the so called Northern dialects) and Northern Spain (the so called Southern dialects). Although a Non-Indo-European language, it has been in contact for centuries with Spanish and Aragonese, on the Spanish side of the border, and with Gascon on the French side. In this century French has gradually supplanted Gascon as the second language in the Northern dialect area.

Basque is an ergative language with scrambling word order.[1] For this reason it is not surprising that it originally lacked a passive voice,[2] but we will see in the course of this paper how a passive construction has emerged from one of the resultatives. One of the most peculiar characteristics of Basque is its group inflection, i.e. Basque does not inflect words, but syntagmatic phrases, as can be seen in the following example:

```
(0) Aita Saindu -a      -k     atzo          bi    erresum -eri    aphezpiku bat
    Father Holy -IND -ERG yesterday          two   nation  -DAT   bishop        IDF
    └── NP──-IND -Case                        └──── NP────Case    └───NP────┘

    ararte -     ko     igorri               d        -io    -te.
    mediator -   DEL    send                 ABS      -DAT-  P(ERG)
                        PCP                  3.PRS    3         (3)
    └── NP──-Case └──── Verb Complex──────── -AUX ───────┘
```

(Lafitte 1979: 46)

'Yesterday the Holy Father (has) sent a bishop as mediator to the two nations.'

* *Abbreviations:* ABL, ablative; ABS, absolutive; ADD, additive, ADV, adverb; ART, article; AUX, auxiliary; ENC, enunciative; DAT, dative; DEL, delimitative; ERG, ergative; F, feminine; FAM, familiar (allocutive); FUT, future; GER, gerund; IDF, indefinite (article); IMP, imperative; IN, inessive; IND, individualizer; ITR, intransitive; M, masculine; NEG, negative; NOM, nominalizer; PART, partitive; PCP, participle; P, plural; PRS, present; RFL, reflexive; S, singular; SR, subordinator; TR, transitive.

(1) The typological correlates of ergativity in Basque are described in Brettschneider (1979).
(2) Rebuschi (1983) mentions a few instances of antipassive in Basque. Even if he is right, this category is still rather marginal.

As we can see, flexional morphemes are always added to the last word of the noun phrase, whereas the verb complex is constructed by the non-finite full verb followed by a TAM-auxiliary, the latter containing personal particles for up to three actants.

In order to better understand the formation and function of the Basque resultative, we should take a closer look at the verb complex:

## The verb complex
### Synthetic vs. analytic/periphrastic construction

We can add personal affixes (particles) only to a very small number of verbs (among them the TAM-auxiliaries), as in the following example (from Unified Basque, *euskara batua*, the standard language):

(1)    egon  →  n  -en    -go    -en       'I stayed'
       stay      1S -PAST -ROOT -PAST

This form is called the 'synthetic' verb construction.[3] Verbs are normally constructed periphrastically, by adding a TAM-auxiliary to a non-finite full verb form:

(2)    kanta -tze   -n  d   -u   -t                          'I (am) sing(ing)'
       'sing   -NOM -IN  ABS -TR  -ERG
                        3.PRS 1S ('I have it')

The finite verb *dut* is a form of the transitive auxiliary *\*edun*, which, employed as a full verb, means 'to have'.

Basque possesses a recent perfect, which is constructed in almost the same way and is reminiscent of the corresponding Latin construction:

(3)    kanta -tu    d   -u   -t    - cantatu(m) habeo      'I have sung'
       sing   -PCP   ABS-TR -ERG
                    3. PRS   1S ('I have it')

In the past tense, the distinction between the participle and the nominal verb serves to distinguish perfective and imperfective aspect:

(4)    kanta -tu    n    -u    -en                          'I sang (pfv.)'
       sing   -PCP   ERG   -TR(ABS)[4] -PAST
                    1S            (3S)    ('I had it')

(5)    kanta -tze   -n  nuen                      'I sang (ipfv.) / was singing'
       sing   -NOM -IN  ERG  -TR    (ABS)   -PAST
                        1S            (3S)    ('I had it')

The future and the future of the past are formed by adding the delimitative case suffix to the participle form:

(6)    kanta -tu    -ko    dut/nuen                         'I will/would sing'
       sing   -PCP   -DEL   AUX  (cf. above)

---

(3) Whereas there was still a considerable number of synthetically constructed verbs in the 16 th century (cf. Lafon 1943), they have been gradually disappearing since then.

(4) The absolutive is not marked by a particle in this form. There is no overt marking for the third person absolutive in the past, as there is no overt marking for the third person ergative in the present. Its presence can be deducted from the transitive meaning of the auxiliary. In the same vein, the absence of the plural marker implies singularity.

## Three Resultatives

The participle form is also used for constructing resultatives. There are three ways of forming them in Basque:

  a) with the individualizer added to the participle:

(7) Etxe -a sal -du -a d -a.     'The house is sold'
  house -IND sell -PCP -IND ABS -ITR.PRS
             3.PRS

  b) with the partitive case suffix added to the participle:

(8) Etxe -a sal -du -rik d -a.     'The house is sold'
  house -IND sell -PCP -PART ABS -ITR.PRS
             3.PRS

  c) with the clitic -(e)ta (additive) added to the participle:

(9) Etxe -a sal -du -ta d -a -go. 'The house is sold.'
  house -IND sell -PCP -ADD ABS -PRS -stay
            3.PRS

The difference between the three resultative constructions is mainly a dialectal one. Whereas a) and b) are used in the Northern dialects (in Souletin Basque, b) predominates), c) is typical of the dialects on the Spanish side of the border; it is also promoted by speakers of Unified Basque, which is based on these dialects. The form *dago* is the third person singular of the verb *egon* ('to stay'), which corresponds to the Spanish *estar*; *dago* is used instead of *da* for reasons of language contact in the Basque dialects of Spain.[5]

In Lower Navarra, speakers tend to differentiate between constructions a) and b); the partitive formation of the resultative seems to suggest a more transitory state for those who use both forms.

In addition, it is possible to construct a more personal resultative (involving an actor) by using the transitive auxiliary (e.g. *du* 's/he[6] has', or, in the South, *dauka* 's/he holds'). I will say a few words on these two diathesis types later on in this paper.

## Individualization

In order to understand the formation of the most commonly used resultative, i.e. the one formed with an *-a* or *-ak* (in the plural) we have to consider the overall function of this element, which is often called "definite article" in the literature, although it also functions as a marker of the predicative adjective or noun:

(10) (ni) zaharr -a n -aiz.      'I am old.'
   (I) old -IND ABS -ITR.PRS
         1S

(5) The same distinction is made in transitive sentences between *edun* ('to have', Spanish: *haber*), the third person singular (absolutive and ergative) of which is *du*, and *eduki* ('to hold', Spanish: *tener*) with *dauka* in the third person singular (absolutive and ergative).

(6) Or 'it', there is no gender, sex or animacy distinction for the third person in Basque. Especially when actors are involved, I only note 's/he' in my translation of the examples where it is not clear who/what the third person is.

I have called this element individualizer, following Iturrioz (1982, 1985), who has shown that its main function is individualization.

In the Northern dialects, adding the individualizer to predicative adjectives may sometimes be optional and corresponds to a difference in meaning:[7]

(11)  Arno  =a      on    -a    d      -a.                          'The wine is good.'
      wine  =IND    good  -IND  ABS   -ITR. PRS
                                      3S.PRS

(12)  Arno  =a      on    d      -a.                                 '(The) wine is good.'
      wine  =IND    good  ABS   -ITR.PRS                             [sc. for your health]
                          3S.PRS

Only the adjective *with* the individualizer allows for number agreement:

(13)  Onjo      -a    -k    on    -a    -k    d      -ir    -a.
      mushroom  -IND  -PL   good  -IND  -PL   ABS   -PL    -ITR.PRS
                                                3. PRS

      'The mushrooms are good.'

The individualizer makes the element it is attached to accessible for the category of number, or as Iturrioz puts it (1985: 179):

> [...] la ausencia de -*a* signaliza algo más que falta de referencialidad, signaliza además falta de número, mejor dicho neutralización de la oposición numérica (transnumeralidad), oposición que junto con el género constituye, [...], una de las técnicas de individuación posibles.[8]

The predicate in (11) and (13) consists of the predicative adjective (or noun) in agreement with the head, while the auxiliary functions as the copula; in (12), on the other hand, the adjective without the individualizer, together with the auxiliary, forms the verb complex.[9] This can be illustrated by means of brackets:

(14)  [head]$_i$    [predicative adj/noun]$_i$    [copula/aux]$_i$

(15)  [head]$_i$    [non-individualized element + copula/aux]$_i$
                    └──Verb Complex──── AUX ─────┘

In other words: The individualizer makes the adjective predicative: Only the individualized adjective can attribute an individual quality to a head, whereas the non-individualized element is not related to the head (therefore, it does not agree with it), but, together with the auxiliary, it forms the participation frame of the sentence. Example (12) may be paraphrased in the following way: 'It does good to drink wine.'

In similar fashion, the resultative construction differs from the recent perfect: In the perfect, the participle and the auxiliary form a single whole (cf. (3), (12), and

(7) The, second sentence (12), without the individualizer, is considered obsolete by some speakers (esp. younger ones); in Southern dialects it may even be taken for a mistake.

(8) The absence of -*a* signalizes something more than the lack of referentiality, it also signalizes lack of number, i.e. neutralization of the number opposition (transnumerality), the opposition that constitutes, together with the generical [category], one of the possible techniques of individuation.

(9) The demarcation of noun phrases in the overall system of 'group inflexion' can best be seen as a side effect of individualization.

(15) above), whereas the resultative (e.g. in (7) above) more closely resembles the predicative copular construction in (14), containing the participle, which functions as a kind of predicative adjective, and a copula (cf. (11) and (13) above). This is not surprising, however, since, according to Breu (1988: 55), one of the main function of the resultative is to characterize the head of a construction, i.e. to attribute an individual quality to it.

The perfect, on the other hand, only signalizes that an action has recently occurred and, as Nedjalkov puts it (1988: 15):

The after-effects of the action expressed by the perfect are non-specific, and they are not attributed to any particular participant of the situation.

The resultative formation with the partitive may be explained in a similar way, since one of the functions of the partitive is that of an adverbial marker, i.e. when linked to adjectives:

(16)     isil     -ik     'silently'
         silent   -PART

The common denominator of the different functions of the partitive has to do with individualization: According to Iturrioz (1985: 38f.), the partitive is in fact a generalizer. This is confirmed by its use as an adverbial marker: Whereas an (individualized) adjective attributes a specific quality to a head, the adverb serves to express a general circumstance; when used predicatively, it indicates a transitional or changeable state instead of an individual quality (this is the reason why some speakers prefer *dago* with it, cf. Spanish *está*):

(17)     (i)     Isil-ik da(go). 'S/he is (remains) silent.'

Compare with:

(17)     (ii)    Isil-a da.    'S/he is silent    (of character).'

         (iii)   Isil dago.    'S/he is silent    (= keeps silence).'

Example (17) (i) stands between (ii) and (iii), as it expresses neither a quality (ii) nor a voluntary action (iii)[10] but a transitory state.

The full verb of the resultative thus takes the place of the predicatively used adverb. That is the reason why this resultative has a transitory nuance for some speakers.

The third way of constructing the resultative emphasizes the temporal sequence between an action (change of the situation) and its resultant state. This 'serialization' is expressed by the additive particle -(e)ta:[11]

(18)     Etxe -a       sal     -du   -ta       d     -a    -go.    'The house is sold.'
         house-IND     sell    -PCP  -ADD      ABS   -PRS  -stay
                                               3.PRS

*lit.* 'The house sold and it is.'

(10) The semantic component of voluntary action is very well illustrated in an example from Azkue (1969: I, 433), who cites the following proverb (orthography slightly modernized by me): *Isil hago emaitean, mintza hadi hartzean.* 'Keep silence in giving (*emaitean*), speak (*mintza hadi*, IMP) in taking (*hartze-an*).

(11) When used as a conjunction, it means *and.* Iturrioz has devoted the articles already mentioned (1982, 1985) to a thorough functional analysis of all the usages of -(e)ta.

Some people reject the construction if the action, of which the expressed state is the result, has never really taken place (what Nedjalkov 1988: 14 calls "quasi-resultative").[12]

Additive constructions like (18) are very similar to adverbials, as Iturrioz shows in detail (1982: 28-32) and it is not surprising that we find them in copredication:

(19)   Elhurr-a    izaki  -eta ebas    -ka    aise aberas -tu  d    -a.
       snow  -IND be     -ADD steal  -GER   easy rich   -PCP ABS  -ITR.PRS
                                                                  3.PRS
                                                           (Lafitte 1979: 453)

'As there is snow, he has easily become rich by stealing.'

The construction with the partitive, functioning as an adverbial element, can also be used for copredication:

(20)   Bertz -e    -k    galdegin -ik    kanta -tu   d - u    -t.       (ib.)
       other -IND -ERG ask        -PART sing  -PCP ABS -TR  -ERG
       -P                                       3. PRS      1S
       'The others having asked [me], I have sung.'
       *free:* 'I sang on the others' demand.'

The latter two resultatives are commonly used to connect sentences; as aspect markers, the formatives of the resultative play an important role in the functional domain of sentence connexion.[13]

The three resultatives may be ordered on a scale:[14] Whereas the main function of the -a(k)- resultative is the attribution of a quality, the -ta- resultative mainly insists on the temporal sequentiality of action and result with a slight reminiscence of quality attribution in its proximity to adverbials. The -ik- resultative stands between the two others. In fact, the non-resultative end of the scale would be the perfect, where temporality alone is of interest. This scale is paralleled by that of individualization:[15]

individualized                                    non-individualized/generic

-a                     -ik                    -ta              Ø

resultative                                                    perfect

(12) Txomin Peillen from the Basque Academy ("Euskaltzaindia"), personal communication.
(13) The resultative is located on the overlap of the functional domain of tense-aspect-mood marking and that of sentence connexion (Raible 1988 proposes the term "Junction"). In the course of my article, I will show that the resultative also plays a role in the domain of active/passive diathesis. A universalist model of language (such as the Unityp model, cf. Seiler 1990) must account for tangential points between the domains it establishes. They are perhaps far more numerous as has been assumed: Think of the relation between passive, potential, and honorifics in Japanese (Shibatani 1985), or of honorifics and possession (Haase 1989: 406f.).
(14) It may even constitute a continuum in the strict sense of the Unityp model, as defined in Seiler (1990: 58-60).
(15) The scale of individualization underlies the distinction between, *isila, isilik,* and *isil.* For more evidence on individualization, see Iturrioz (1982, 1985).

## Language contact

The variety of resultative constructions found in Basque and its areal distribution leads us to think that it is not a genuinely Basque pattern. If it is genuinely Basque, the influence of the contact languages might have encouraged the development of different dialectal preferences. The Castilian model for example (9), from the Spanish side of the border, can be easily seen in the following:[16]

(21)  He          vend    -id    -o    la     casa.      'I have sold the house.'
      AUX.TR      sell    -PCP   -M    ART    house                 (perfect)
      1S                         F     (F)

(22)  Tengo vend  -id    -a la          casa   desde hace   mucho tiempo.
      hold: sell  -PCP   -F ART         house  from ago     much time
      1S                 F (F)                              (resultative)
      'I have been holding (lit.: hold) the house sold for a long time.'

Again, the resultative in (22) —having to do with the attribution of a quality— triggers agreement, but the main difference between the perfect and the resultative is the use of the verb *tener* ('to hold', implying a transitory state) in the latter.

This construction has been transferred to Basque:

(23)  Etxe -a     sal    -du    d      -u.                'S/he has sold the house.'
      house-IND   sell   -PCP   ABS    -TR(ERG)                       (perfect)
                                3.PRS         (3)

(24)  Etxe -a     sal    -du    -ta    d      -a     -uka.       resultative)
      house-IND   sell   -PCP   -ADD   ABS    -PRS   -hold
                                       3.PRS
      *lit.:* 'The house (has been) sold and s/he holds it.'

The only difference between the Spanish and Basque example is the use of the additive particle -(e)ta, which underlines the sequence of action (the house is sold first, before the resultant state is reached). As we have seen, the additive is functionally related to adverbials: It functions marginally in the domain of quality attribution, if the quality is considered to be transitory.

As far as the Northern dialects are concerned, French cannot serve as a model for the resultative, which is not grammaticized in this language. But we should remember that the original contact language (following Latin and Proto-Romance) was not French, but Gascon, the southwestern variety of the Occitan language (or language group). In the subdialects of Gascon adjacent to the Basque Country (Bearnese), we find the resultative and, what is more, it strikingly resembles the Basque construction of the Northern dialects (agreement with the head → quality attribution):[17]

(25)  Que  s'    avè        crompat      ua   aulhada.       (past perfect)
      ENC  RFL   AUX. TR    buy:PCP:M    IDF  sheepflock
                 3S.PAST                 F    (F)    (Hourcade 1986: 174)
      'S/he had bought a flock of sheep.'

(16) Similar examples from Spanish and Portuguese are discussed by Breu (1988: 56-59).
(17) The Gascon resultative seems to be of genuine Romance origin, later lost in other dialects due to contact with French, which contains no resultatives.

(26)  Que   s'    avè       crompad-*a*  ua    aulhada.          (resultative)
      ENC  RFL  AUX.TR  buy:PCP-F  IDF  sheepflock      (Camélat: *Vita*
                 3S.PAST              F    (F)                    *vitanta,* cf.
                                                     Hourcade 1986: 173)

'S/he had bought a flock of sheep.'
(*i.e.*: S/he had a bought flock of sheep.)

In (25) the action takes place with reference to another action, i.e. the emphasis lies on the temporal relation. In this case the past perfect is used. In (26), however, the quality of being bought is attributed to the object and the emphasis lies on the result of the action. This interpretation has been confirmed by my Gascon informants.

The parallelism between the Basque and Gascon constructions becomes more obvious in a sentence which I happen to have recorded in both languages:

(27)  (i)   Leiho  -a      zerra-tu     d    -ik.[18]
            window-IND  close-PCP   ABS  -FAM
            /shutters              3.PRS  2S.M

      (ii)  Qu'   a          barrat   lo    -s  contravent  -s.
            ENC  AUX.TR  close    ART  -P  shutter       -P
                  3S          PCP

'S/he has closed the shutters.' (perfect)

(28)  (i)   Leiho  -a     (beti) zerrati -*a* /   zerratu   -*rik* dik.
                    -IND   always        -IND              -PART

      (ii)  Qu'a  /dèisha (tostemps) barrat   -*s*  lo  -s contravent -s.
            let.3S  always                    -P   -P -          P

'S/he has/leaves the shutters (always) closed.' (resultative)

Unfortunately, 'shutters' in Basque is a collective noun,[19] otherwise it would appear in the plural form, with the participle in agreement with the head:

(28)'     leihoak zerrati*ak* ...

In the second example, which shows the resultative, the action of closing the window need not have taken place. Perhaps, they have always been closed ("quasi--resultative", cf. Nedjalkov 1988: 14).

Again, I will try to illustrate the difference between the perfect and the resultative constructions with the help of brackets. The parallelism between Basque and Gascon should thus become clearer:

(29)  Leiho      -a    [zerra -tu    d     -ik].
      window  -IND  close  -PCP  ABS  -FAM
      /shutters                  3.PRS  2S.M

'S/he hs closed the shutters.'

---

(18) *dik* is a 'familiar allocutive', a second person particle is added to the verb, in order to express familiarity; the form is otherwise equivalent to *du*.

(19) *Leiho* in fact means 'the whole window' (with shutters); according to my informants, in this sentence it is the shutters that are meant.

(30)   [Leihoa]ᵢ [zerra-ti  -a]ᵢ   /   [zerra-tu -rik] dik
                           -IND                    PART
       'S/he has/leaves the shutters always closed.'

(31)   [Qu'a                 barrat]   lo     -s contravent -s.     *translation as* (29)
       ENC   AUX.TR          close     ART    -P shutter    -P
             3S              PCP

(32)   Qu'a/dèisha [barrat -s]ᵢ   [lo  -s contravent -s]ᵢ                          *as*  (30)
                   -P              -P              -P

## Diathesis types

The term 'diathesis' does not seem very appropriate for Basque, since this language does not, originally, distinguish active, passive, and other diatheses.[20] Nevertheless, we can distinguish between two types of resultatives, one in which an actor is involved and one in which the actor is not involved (at least to the extent that it does not appear in the auxiliary):[21]

(33)   Etxe  -a    sal -du  -a    d-u.               S/he holds the house sold.'
       house -IND  sell-PCP-IND  ABS-TR(ERG)
                                 3.PRS      (3)

(34)   Etxe  -a    sal -du  -a    d      -a.         ' The house is sold.'
       house -IND  sell-PCP -IND  ABS   -ITR.PRS
                           3.PRS

From a universalist point of view, we may say that the two constructions are differently *oriented*. With the resultative this differentiation is fairly common, even if the construction with the transitive auxiliary seems to be less frequent than that with the intransitive.[22]

It is this second orientation which in language contact gradually develops into a passive construction. Its structural similarity with Romance provides a possible explanation for this process: The Romance passive is always a copular construction containing the participle as predicative element:

(35) [head]ᵢ [predicative participle]ᵢ [copula/aux]ᵢ

This pattern is identical for both the Basque -*a*-resultative and the Romance passive and is recognized as such by bilingual speakers. Since French, the contact language which in this century has gradually supplanted Gascon, makes wide use of the passive voice,[23] speakers of French feel the necessity to imitate its frequent use in

(20) For marginal instances of antipassive, see Rebuschi (1983); he also mentions passive forms, which for me were originally resultatives (cf. below).

(21) In the Southern dialects (in contact with Spanish), *dauka* ('s/he holds', cf. Spanish *tiene*) is used instead of *du*, and *dago* ('s/he stays', cf. Spanish *está*) instead of *da*, both normally with the -*(e)ta*-resultative.

(22) It is also possible to detransitivize present tense forms as in the sentence: *Liburu hau ongi saltzen da.* 'This (*hau*) book sells (*saltzen da*, PRS.ITR) well (*ongi*).'

(23) Here some typological correlates for this fact: passive is used for pragmatic purposes, French is extremely subject prominent (Sasse 1982: 283), and the subject-verb liaison is sentence-constituting (Sasse forthcoming).

Basque, esp. in writting. The following example is taken from a newpaper article (*Herria* 2042: 3):

(36)  Adolfo Villoslada  [...]  libra-tu-a      izan  d    -a   [...]
      proper name              free-PCP-IND    be    ABS  -ITR.PRS
                                                     3.PRS

      'A.V. has been freed.'

(37)  izan da      on    -gi   trata   -tu   -a!  'He has been well treated.'
                   good  -ADV  treat   -PCP  -IND

The participle *izan*, which according to my informants is optional, makes the construction resemble the French formula even more- *il a été ...* ('he has been').

## Adverbials of time

We have seen that the resultative can be combined with the adverbial *beti* 'always'. It can also be combined with adverbials expressing long periods of time between the beginning of the resultant state and the time of reference (normally the time of utterance):

(38)  Etxe -a    saldu  -a    d    -u        aspaldi  -tik.
      house-IND  sell   -IND  ABS  -TR(ERG)  long-ago -ABL
                              3.PRS          (3)

      lit. 'S/he has been for a long time in the situation of having sold the house.'
      more lit.: '... from (ABL) long ago'

Nevertheless, it is surprising to find punctual adverbals as well. The following example is commonly heard:

(39)  Etxe -a    saldu  -a    d    -u        aspaldi  -an.
      house-IND  sell   -IND  ABS  -TR(ERG)  long-ago-IN
                              3.PRS          (3)

      lit.: 'S/he has been in the situation of having sold the house long ago.'
      i.e.: 'S/he sold the house long ago.'

Moreover, when I asked my informants to transform present perfect sentences (e.g.: *Etxea saldu du.*), by adding *aspaldian*, they would regularly put them into the resultative, which serves as a substitute for the simple past tense. This tendency to replace the simple past tense with the original resultative form is typical for elderly informants. Young people follow the general tendency of French to replace the past with the recent perfect (cf. Oyharçabal 1987: 592). The use of the resultative for the past corresponds to the rejection of the recent perfect in such circumstances. Elderly people still seem to be aware of the idea of recentness contained in the Basque perfect, although they have for the most part already forgotten what the resultative is (which coincides with the loss of Gascon). They therefore use this category to imitate the French model of the 'colloquial' past, which uses the original perfect (French 'passé composé') instead of the simple past tense ('passé simple'). As I mentioned above, this situation is transitory: Young people rarely use the resultative with a transitive auxiliary, and tend to

replace the past with perfect forms. On the other hand, they make wide use of the resultative with an intransitive auxiliary to express the passive voice, an obvious calque from the Romance contact languages.

## Conclusions

The dialectal preferences for resultative forms that resemble that of the contact languages and the reanalysis as a passive (or past) after the change of the contact language show that language contact plays an important role in the development of the resultative in Basque. The same certainly holds for other TAM-categories as well. It seems to me that such categories are prone to diffuse through contact.[24] In the Basque example it has once more become clear that the role of transfer is not that important where morphological material is involved; in the first place, it is patterns that are transferred from one language to the other. As for the resultative, the pattern is reinterpreted (reanalysed) as a passive construction (or past tense) in a new contact situation. This is encouraged by the lack of a resultative in the new model language.

Breu (1988) proposes a distinction of perfects, going from a resultative one to the merely 'temporal "perfect"' (the 'passé composé' of modern French). In Basque, the common origin of the perfect and the resultative supports the idea that the latter represents a special kind of the former, perhaps the extreme, i.e. 'prototypical', instance on a scale or continuum, as proposed earlier in this article.[25] In many languages[26] the temporal perfect develops out of more characterizing or resultative instances on the continuum. The most striking point in Basque is however that the resultative has been capable of directly taking over the function of a temporal perfect, as opposed to the (recent) perfect, which, for may speakers, has not lost its semantic component of recentness. This can only be explained by the fact that the idea of recentness is more strongly anchored in Gascon and Spanish than that of resultativeness, so that it is more easily preserved in the contact situation.[27]

## Bibliografía

Azkue, R. M. de, 1969, *Diccionario Vasco-Español-Francés*, 2 vol. Bilbao. La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca.

Brettschneider, G., 1979, 'Typological characteristics of Basque' in: Plank, F. (ed.): *Ergativity: Toward a Theory of Grammatical Relations*. New York etc.: Academic Press: 371-384.

Breu, W., 1989, 'Resultativität, Perfekt und die Gliederung der Aspektdimension' in: Raecke, J. (ed.): *Slavistische Linguistik 1987*: Referate des XIII. Konstanzer Slavistischen

(24) Supplementary to or in support of more general tendencies, such as those described in Bybee/Dahl (1989).

(25) I will not dwell on the general relationship between perfect and resultative. For this point, see Maslov (1988).

(26) Examples are mentioned by Breu (1988: 62f.). Breu does not explicitly subscribe to the idea of a continuum, but his discussion (especially where diachrony is concerned) implies scalarity and fuzzy boundaries between his different kinds of perfect.

(27) In fact the bilingual speakers of French and Basque (esp. when not in contact with the Gascon speech community) tend to give up both the resultative (which is used as a passive surrogate) and the recent perfect (which develops into a simple past). The fact that French has neither, certainly plays a role here.

Arbeitstreffens, Tübingen 22.-25.9.1987 (=Slavistische Beiträge 230) Munich: Sanger: 42-74.

Bybee, J. L. / Dahl, Ö., 1989, 'The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world', *Studies in Langauge* 13, 1: 51-103.

Haase, M., 1989, 'Respekt gegenüber Besprochenem und Gesprächspartner' in: Reiter, N. (ed.): *Sprechen und Hören*. Akten des 23. Linguistischen Kolloquiums, Berlin 1988. Tübingen: Niemeyer: 399-409.

*Herria*. Basque weekly newspaper, Bayonne.

Hourcade, A., 1986, *Grammaire béarnaise*. o.O. (Pau?): Los Caminaires.

Iturrioz Leza, J. L., 1982, 'Apprehension im Baskischen' in: Seiler, H. / Stachowiak, F. J. (eds.) *Apprehension. Das sprachliche von Gegenständen*. Teil II: Die Techniken und ihr Zusammenhang in Einzelsprachen (=*Language Universal Series* 1/II) - Tübingen: Narr: 1-43.

————, 1985, 'La función de *-a* y de *-ta* a la luz de la dimensión de individuación', *Euskera* 30: 175-213.

Lafitte, P., 1979, *Grammaire Basque (Navarro-Labourdin Littéraire)*. 3rd edition - Donostia (San Sebastián): Elkar.

Lafon, R., 1943, *Le système du verbe basque au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. 2 vols., Reprinted in one volume 1980 - Donostia (San Sebastián) / Baiona (Bayonne): Elkar.

Maslov, J. S., 1988, 'Resultative, Perfect, and Aspect' in: Nedjalkov (ed.) 1988: 63-85.

Nedjalkov, V. P. / Jaxontov, S. J., 1988, 'The Typology of Resultative Constructions' in: Nadjalkov (ed.) 1988: 3-62.

————, (ed.), 1988, *Typology of resultative constructions*. New York etc.: Benjamins.

Oyharçabal, B., 1987, *Étude descriptive de constructions complexes en basque: Propositions relatives, temporelles, conditionnelles et concessives*. (Thèse de doctorat d'Etat ès Lettres et Sciences Humaines). Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Raible, 1988, 'Junktion. Eine Dimension der Sprache und ihre Realisieerungsformen zwischen Aggregation und Integration' in: *Jahrbuch der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 1987*. Heidelberg: Winter: 56-58.

Rebuschi, G., 1983, 'Autor du parfait et du passif basque', *Iker* 2: 545-558.

Sasse, H.-J., 1982, 'Subjektprominenz' in: Festschrift Stimm: *Fakten und Theorien*. (eds.: Heinz, S. / Wandruszka, U.). Tübingen: Narr. 267-286.

————, (forthcoming): 'Predication and sentence constitution in universal perspective' (manuscript: Colonge: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft).

Seiler, H., 1990, 'Language Universals and Typology in the Unityp Framework', *akup* (=Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekts) 82 - Cologne: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Shibatani, M., 1985, 'Passives and related constructions', *Lg* 61: 821-848.