



THE
 VERB IN THE SECOND BOOK
 IN
 GIPUSKOAN BASK.

BY
 E. S. DODGSON.

Tin' a Ya Gyanlan

PRINTED BY
 STEPHEN AUSTIN & SONS, HERTFORD.

February 22, 1901.

4639

et che pher di
1952 pan en urteko
Dagonillan 4
Larotia 'far' han

72 602

THE VERB IN THE SECOND BOOK IN
GIPUSKOAN BASK.

By EDWARD SPENCER DODGSON.

ἔτε γλωσσαί, πύσσονται (1 Cor. xiii, 8), *sive lingua cessabunt.*

WARNED by Saint Paul that languages will pass away, and finding a special though melancholy interest in such which have ceased to be spoken, even as Cornish did in the last century, the Philologist ought to aim at preserving all that may still be found out about any which are in danger. Assyrian and Etruscan are interesting in much the same way as a collection of implements from the age of stone. But a language like Bask is important and instructive in the same way that the machinery of Signor Marconi, and his imitators and rivals, is. It is destined to convey the thoughts of men who will live in the twentieth century. It has some, however little, hope in it. The oldest known book in any of the dialects of a language that is threatened with death, such as Ainu, Finnish, Manx, Maori, Roumansch, or Wendish, deserves especial attention. For such a work shows us how the dialect was written in the most youthful period of its life of which we possess any record. It must be respected as an *incunabulum*. Bask, or *Heuskara*, is in a state of decadence. I recognize it with sorrow. The Basks, or *Heuskara-holders* as they are called in their own speech, *Heuskal-dunak*, are responsible for this themselves, as two of their best writers in the eighteenth century, Cardaberaz and Larregi, boldly told them. The clergy are the chief culprits in the matter. They are now *Heuskara-losers*! If *Heuskara* be spoken and written a hundred years hence, I fear it will be so spoiled by a "corrupt following" of *erdarisms*, that it had better not have lived to be so old, and one might well chant to its memory the lilting lines of "the German Mezzofanti," Dr. G. I. J. Sauerwein, of the University of Goettingen, on *The Death of a Language*.¹ The dialect of the Provincia de Gipuskoa has some

¹ See his brochure entitled "Au dernier moment. Postscriptum du Livre des Salutations," etc. (Leipzig, 1889.)

claim to be considered the best, and may be treated as a standard specimen. It is the most central and the most beautiful, especially as spoken by its oldest and most unlearned owners. It possesses the largest number of printed books. But one wonders what the *Ipuscoani* were about in "the dark backward and abysm of time" that lies behind the production of the oldest¹ of them. The other dialects can boast of firstborns in the sixteenth century, though all were then already sadly mammoocked in the mouth. The booklet

¹ The oldest known book in Gipuskoan Bask is entitled "Doctrina Christianaren Explicacioa Villa Franca Guipuzcoaco onetan eusecaraz itecguitendän moduan *Erri Noble onen instantiaz escrivitu euban beraren Vicario, eta Capellau D. JOSEPH OCHOA de ARINEC: Pueblo onetaco Aurray iracasteco. DEDICATCEN DIO Erri Ilustre oni Cartilla au. ETA Villa Francaico Erriaco consagraten dio bere Patrona Soberana MARIA Santissima Assumpciocuari. Urte IHS 1713. DONOSTIAN: PEDRO de UGARTE, ren Echean."* Of this the British Museum possesses a perfect copy, bought for £3 10s. 0d. on the 29th of December, 1863, at the Standish sale. Its *code* or press-mark is 3506. aa. 28. It is less important than the *Doctrina* of Irazuzta (= *fern-harvest*) inasmuch as, having never been reprinted, it represents only a momentary phase in the life of the language. This copy is not mentioned by Mr. J. Vinson in his *Bibliographie de la Langue Basque* (Paris, 1891 & 98). There, under the number 45, he refers to two others, which lack apparently the three pages, at the end of that in the Museum, containing the "FEE DE ERRATAS, *Que se hallan en esta Cartilla impresa.*" With reference to these twain, M. Vinson wrote to me on the 14th November, 1900: "Les propriétaires des Nos. 42. b. et 45 ne m'ont pas autorisé à vous donner leurs noms; leurs Bibliothèques ne sont pas publiques, et ils ne veulent pas qu'on puisse venir les empuyer. Je ne connais aucun exemplaire du 42. a." The book dated 1691, numbered 42. a. in M. Vinson's catalog, appears to be quite lost. It was the earliest book in Bask, if not the first known book, among those imprinted in San Sebastián, the modern capital of Gipuskoa. Its printer seems to have been the same Pedro de Ugarte, though he then spelt the name Huarte. But, being in Biscayan, it does not concern the present essay. The author, N. de Zubia (= *the bridge*, literally *two-trees*, as bridges in Baskland often are), as Don J. M. Bernaola of Durango told me, "era de esta villa." Now Durango is in the heart of Biscaya. The interesting Biscayan catechism of Zubia is only known by a reprint included in a book by J. de Lezamis, numbered 42. b. by M. Vinson, printed in Mexico in 1699, and dedicated to the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Santiago de Galicia. With reference to this, the keeper of the archives of that church, known to literature as the author of a novel in Gallego, *A Tevedeira de Bonaval*, kindly sent me the following note (received 12th November, 1900): "En la biblioteca de este Cabildo, ni en la de este Seminario no se conserva ningun ejemplar de la obra de Lezamis de que V. habla. Lo que comunico á V. autorizandole para que de ello haga el uso que le parezca. Suyo afmo s.s. q.b.s.m. Antonio Lopez Ferreira." It is not in the British Museum either. One finds there, however, another book by the same writer; his *Breve relacion de la vida y muerte del Señor D. F. de Aguiar y Seyzas*, etc.; Mexico, 1699. (4986. bbb. 8.)

The booklet of Zubia, reproduced from Lezamis, was published in *La Revue de Linguistique* in 1888 (not '87 as M. Vinson says), with too many misprints. The British Museum possesses the *Doctrina* of Astete printed at Burgos in 1766; and the translation of it by Irazuzta published at Tolosa in 1826. As this booklet has the same number of pages as the editions of the eighteenth century, the following index serves in some measure for it also, though it likewise is unpaginated.

of Don Juan de Irazuzta, though in date only the second known, is yet a noteworthy landmark or monument. For it introduces the golden age of Gipuskoan, which may be considered closed with the death of J. I. de Iztueta in the year 1845. It is weighty as belonging to the period that elapsed between the publication by the great Don Manuel de Larramendi of his *El Imposible Vencido* in 1729 and that of his *Diccionario Trilingüe* in 1745. Its title is: "DOCTRINA CRISTIANA EGUINZUANA ERDARAZ. *Aita Gaspar Astete Jesuitac. IPINIDU EUSQUERAZ.* D. Juan de Irazuzta, Erretore Hernaldecoac, ceña dan Provintea Guipuzcoacoan, bere Feligresiaco aurari Doctrina eracusteco, eta añaditeen dio Encarnacioco, eta Eucaristiaco mysterioen explicacioa, baita ere confesio on baten condicioac, eta Acto Fedeco, Esperantzaco, eta Caridadecoac. Imprimitudu Iruñeco Ciudadean. Urte 1742. *Licencia necessarioquin.*" That is to say, "The Christian Doctrine which Father Gaspar Astete made in *Erdara* (i.e. *Romance* or Castilian). Don Juan de Irazuzta,¹ Rector of Hernalde, which is in the Province of Gipuskoa, has put it into *Eusquera* (i.e. Bask) to teach the Catechism to the child (*sio*) of his parish, and adds thereto the explanation of the mysteries of the Incarnation and of the Eucharist, yea, and also the conditions of a good confession, and the Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity. He has printed it in the city of Pamplona, year 1742, with necessary licence." This book was doubtless often reprinted during the next fifty-five years. The only known copy of it is preserved in the Royal Public Library in Berlin, within a stones throw of the statue of Wilhelm von Humboldt. Its press-mark is H 8764. An edition, which we must count as the second, appeared with altered title in 1797 at Tolosa, the capital, till 1866, of Gipuskoa. Of this, the only known copy is to be found in the same collection. It bears the press-mark H 8762, and a printed note to say that it is "*Ex libris a Guilelmo L. B. de Humboldt² legatis.*" The books are numbered 62. a. and 62. b. respectively in the 'Bibliographie' of Mr. J. Vinson; in which it will be seen that the titles are not rightly copied. The original books contain 72 pages each, but

¹ Don Lucas Alvarez, the present Rector of Hernalde [= side (of Mount) Hernio] told me that D. Juan Francisco de Irazuzta ta Urkisu, born at Hernalde on the 5th of May, 1687, was Rector there from 1718 till 1753, when he was promoted to the adjoining living of Alkisa.

² For some account of the visit paid to Baskland by this learned speech-explorer, see "Guillaume de Humboldt et L'Espagne," by Professor Arturo Farinelli, of Innsbruck. (Paris, 1898.)

these are not numbered.¹ Considering the enormous influence which continual reprints of this work have had upon the Gipuskoan language, I now step on to what I feel sure that the patient members of the Philological Society will appreciate and *overstand*, if I may coin the verb; and I ask them to imbook it in their Transactions; namely,

AN INDEX TO THE 207 FORMS OF THE VERB USED IN
THE CATECHISM OF IRAZUZTA IN 1742,

Showing the Alterations observed in the Edition of 1797, the Parsing and Translation of each Form, and the Number of Times, and the Pages on which, it occurs.

EARVM MODVM FORMAMQVE DEMONSTRAT.

(C. Julius Caesar, *De Bello Gallico*, V, Cap. 1.)

BETOR. (Twice) 4, 23. *Let it come.* Imperative sing. 3rd person. From the irregular intransitive verb *etor* or *etorri*. (*El Arte del Bascuenzo* in *El Impossible Vencido*, p. 168.)

BIDI. (4 times) 4, 23, 24 (*bedi* in the second edition). *Let it be.* Imp. sing. 3 pers. intrans. auxiliary. (*El Arte del B.*, p. 159.)

DA. (117 t.) 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68. *It is.* Indic. pres. sing. 3. Verb substantive and auxiliary intransitive. The root of all forms attributed to the verb subs. and aux. intrans. is *izan* = *been*. See the note on *du*.

²DADUCA. 63. *He holds it.* Indic. pres. sing. 3, with accusative sing. Verb possessive irregular *eduki* or *iduki*.

²DADUCAN. 26. (*That*) *he holds it.* I.q. *daduca* with the conjunctive termination *n* superfluously added, introduced by *ceña*.

²DADUCAT. (4 t.) 52, 66, 68. *I hold it.* Indic. pres. sing. 1 pers. with acc. sing. Verb poss. irreg. *eduki*.

¹ For this reason the making of this finding-list has been no easy task; and "the bore of the matter" is that it will not be fully useful till a paginated reprint of the catechism come out. Some of the forms in this list have the prefix *ba* glued on to them in the original. It appears here only with the forms beginning in *l*, where it means *if*. *G*, and *C* before *e* and *i*, and *TZ*, are classed with *Z*, as they would now be written. *X* is put with *I*. *G* is always hard. *U* in *gue*, *gui*, *que*, *qui* is silent, and now left out, *q* becoming *k*.

² In some dialects the third letter in these three words is deducted.

DAGO. (16 t.) 5, 23, 27, 56, 57, 58. *He stays, or is.* Ind. pres. sing. 3. Verb irreg. intrans. *egon*.

DAGOALA. 65. *Staying; while he stays.* I.q. *dago* with a euphonic before *la* as participial ending.

DAGOAN. (7 t.) 21, 40, 49, 57, 68. (*That*) *it stays.* I.q. *dago* with a euph. before *n* conjunctive governed by *becela* or *nola*, or introduced by *cergatio* or *ceña*. After these last two words at least this *n* is superfluous, and would not, I think, be used by modern writers.

DAGOANA. (9 t.) 9, 10, 27, 33, 34, 63, 68. (*The fact*) *that he stays; that man (or woman) who stays.* I.q. *dago* with a euph. before *n* conj. or relative, declined with *a* = *the*. On pp. 9 and 68 the termination *na*, meaning *the fact that*, in which the *n* is the conjunction *that* and the *a* the definite article *the* as acc. sing. has been altered in the second edition into the simple conjunction *la* = *that*, without changing the sense. Such a use of *na* is not uncommon in Spanish Bask. See below *dana*, *zana*, *cituana*, *zuana*. In the other places the *na* is made of *n* the relative pronoun = *who* in the nominative, declined with the definite article or demonstrative pronoun *a* = *that, the*, in the accusative or nom. intrans. sing. This second *na* = *that which, him or he who*. On p. 21 the original has *dagoanae*, rectified in 1797.

DAGOANAREN. 27. *Of the or that (woman) who stays.* I.q. *dago* with a euph. *n* rel. = *who* and *aren* the poss. case sing. of *a* the def. art. or demonstrative. This *naren* means *of her who*. For *aren* as an independent demonstrative see p. 30, *Aren ministroac* = *His ministers*, p. 31, *Aren mandamentuac* = *His commandments*. *Aren* like *illius* is genderless.

DAGOANARI. (2 t.) 34. *To him or her who stays.* I.q. *dago* with a euph. *n* rel. = *who* and *ari* the dative case sing. of *a* def. art. or dem. Thus *nari* = *to him or her who*.

DAGOANAZ. 27. *Of or about her who stays.* I.q. *dago* with a euph. *n* rel. = *who* and *az* the mediative or instrumental case of *a* def. art. or dem. *naz* = *about her who*.

DAQUIZUN. (5 t.) 22, 28, 35. *That thou (= you) knowest it.* Ind. pres. pl. 2 (sing. sense),¹ with acc. sing. Verb irreg. trans. *iakin*. The final *n* is the conj. *that* introduced by *nola* = *how that*.

¹ The 2nd person of respect is plural in form, but used like English *you* in addressing an individual less familiarly than with the thou-and-thee-ing forms. The real 2nd person plural = *ye* differs by its ending.

DALA. (5 t.) 9, 11, 62, 67, 69. *He being; while he is; that (there) is.* I.q. *da*, verb subst. followed, p. 67, by the conj. *la = that*; and in the other places by the participial termination *la* turning *is* into *being* or *while . . . is*.

DAN. (50 t.) 1, 8, 10, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 35, 37, 38, 39, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 61, 62, 69. *Who or which is; (that) . . . is.* I.q. *da* with (a), p. 62, *n* conjunctive ruled by *becin*; (b) *n* conjunctive introduced by *coña*, *cer*, *ceñean*, *cergatic*, and really superfluous, pp. 1, 8, 27, 28, 35, 39, 53, 55, 56, 69; (c) *n* rel. nominative, pp. 8, 17, 18, 20, 37, 38, 51, 54, 55, 56, 61.

DANA. (13 t.) 2, 8, 9, 22, 50, 65, 68, 69. *That which is; the (fact) that he is.* I.q. *da* with (a) *n* rel. nom. decl. nom. intrans. or acc., pp. 2, 50, 65, 69, i.e. *na = that which*; (b) *na* the conj. *n* and the def. art. *a* such as we have seen in *dagoana = the (fact) that*, pp. 8, 9, 22, 68. This *na* has been changed into *la = that* in the second edition except in three places on p. 8. The logical effect of the change is *nil*.

DANAGAN. 37. *In the (person) who is.* I.q. *da* aux. with *n* rel. nom. decl. locative, that is followed by *agan*, the old locative case of the def. art. or dem. *a*. *nagan = in him, or her . . . who.* See *danean*.

DANAREQUIN. 60. *With that in which he is.* I.q. *da* with *n* rel. in the temporal case or locative of time,¹ followed by or declined with *arekin*, the unitive or copulative case of *a = the, that*. Thus *arekin = with that (time)*, *n = during which*, *da = he is*.

DANEAN. (3 t.) 13, 42, 50. *When he is.* I.q. *da* with *n* rel. in time-case¹ and *e* euph. decl. with *an* the locative of the def. art. or dem. *a*. *nean = at the (time) in which, i.e. when.* Cf. *danagan*, the proper locative.

DAUDE. 3. *They stay, or are.* (A contraction of *dagode*.) Ind. pres. pl. 3. Verb irreg. intrans. *egon*, often synonymous with *izan*.

DAUDEN. (Twice) 15, 22. *(That) they stand.* I.q. *daude* with *n* the conjunction ruled by *becela*, postpositively.

DAUDENAC. (Twice) 27, 48. *Those who stand.* I.q. *daude* with *n* rel. nom. pl. declined with *ac*, the nom. pl. intrans. of the article *a*. *nac = those who*.

¹ This case is, of course, peculiar to the declined verb, and illustrates one of the most convenient functions of the wonderful link-letter *n*. See *dezunean*, *dijoanean*, *diradenean*, *duanean*, *geradenean*, *naizanean*, *zanean*.

DAUZCA. 55. *He holds them.* Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. pl. Verb irreg. trans. *iduki*.

DEBAN. 10. *Who has it.* Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. sing. with *n* rel. nom., synonym of *duan*.

DEBELA. 21. *That they have it.* Ind. pres. pl. 3, acc. sing. Verb poss. with the conjunction *la = that*. Synonym of *duela = dutela*.

DEDAN. (Twice) 12, 49. *That I have it, when I have it.* I.q. *det* with the euphonic change of *t* into *da* before (a), p. 12, *n*, the relative in the time-locative, followed by *gustian = every (time)*; (b) p. 49, *n* the conjunction = *that*, ruled by *ceren = that or because*. In the second edition *dedan*, p. 12, was rightly turned into *dan*, making the construction passive and impersonal.

DEDANA. 68. *That which I have.* I.q. *dedan* with *n* rel. acc. decl. acc. *na = that which*.

DEGUIGULA. 25. *That he may have (or do) it to us.* Subjunctive pres. sing. 3, acc. sing. with the dative plural of the 1st person, *to us*. Verb irreg. trans. aux. *egin* used for *ukan*.

DEGUIOZULA. 49. *That thou (= you) mayest do, or have, it to him.* Subj. pres. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. sing. with indirect object in the dative sing. Verb irreg. trans. aux. *egin* for *ukan*. This word was changed into *guiozu* in 1797, i.e. imp. instead of subj., *oratio recta* instead of *obliqua*.

DEGU. 44. *We have it.* Ind. pres. pl. 1 acc. sing. aux. act. This form is introduced by *cergatic*. Yet the author departs from his usual custom and does not put it into the conjunctive form *degun* like *dan*, *dagoan*, *daduean*.

This shows that the conj. *n* ruled by *cergatic* is superfluous. It is like the *that* after *by cause* in Old English.

DEGULA. 40. *While we have it.* I.q. *degu* with *la* participial.

DEGUN. (3 t.) 14, 37, 43. *Which (it) we have, that we have it.* I.q. *degu* poss. and aux. with (a) p. 14, *n* rel. acc. sing.; (b) p. 37, *n* conj. ruled by *becela*; (c) *n* conj. superfluous, introduced by *ceñetatio*.

DEGUNA. 14. *That which we have.* I.q. *degu*, poss. with *n* rel. decl. with the article *a* in the accusative. *na = that which*.

DEITZA & DERITZA. (4 t.) 18, 38, 39, 61. *It is called to him (i.e. his name is).* *Deritza* occurs on pp. 18 and 61; and *deitza* on pp. 38 and 39 became *deritza* in 1797. The same uncertainty in pronouncing this verb still exists in Gipuskoa. Ind. pres. sing. 3, with ind. obj. dat. sing. for the thing named, the subject

being the name; thus, p. 61, *batarri* = *to the one*, *deritza* = *the name is*, *Contricioa* = *contrition (the)*. From the irreg. intrans. verb *eritz*, *eritzi*, a root producing various shoots.

DET. (29 t.) 5, 9, 13, 15, 20, 22, 28, 35, 52, 59, 66, 67, 68, 69. *I have it*. Ind. pres. sing. 1, acc. sing. Verb possessive and aux. act.

DEZADAN. 35. *Let me have it*. Conjunctive, as Optative, pres. sing. 1, acc. sing. aux. act.

DEZAGULA. 24. *That we may have it*. Conj. i.q. *dezagun* with eclipse of *n* before *la* = *that*, or the use of *la* rather than *n*.

DEZAGUN. (4 t.) 6, 27, 28, 45. *That we may have it, let us have it*. Conj. in imp. (p. 27) and final sense, pres. pl. 1, acc. sing. aux. act. On pp. 6, 28, 45, the termination *tsat* = *in order that* is understood with it.

DEZAQUE. (Twice) 65. *Could he?* Potential pres. sing. 3, acc. sing. aux. act.

DEZAQUEDANA. 69. *That which I can*. (accus.) Pot. fut. sing. 1, acc. sing. aux. act. formed from *dezaquet* by changing *t* into euphonic *da* before the rel. *n* acc. decl. acc. *na* = *that which*.

DEZALA. 24. *That he may have it*. Conj. pres. sing. 3, rel. sing. aux. act. formed from *dezan* (or *deza*) by the suffixing of the conj. particle *la* = *that*.

DEZAZUN. 2. *That thou (=you) mayest have it*. Conj. final pres. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. sing. with *tsat* understood after it; aux. act. In 1797 it rightly became *dezagun*.

DECEEN. (Twice) 28. *That they may have it*. Conj. final (as if followed by *tsat*) pl. 3, acc. sing. aux. act. In 1797 it became, l. 6, *dezaen* = *dezaen* and, l. 9, *decén*.

DEZU. (24 t.) 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 40, 47, 63. *Thou (respectfully = you of un-Quakerly English) hast it*. Ind. pres. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. sing. Verb poss. and aux. act.

DEZUENA. (Twice) 15. *That which you have*. Ind. pres. pl. 2 (the real plural), acc. sing. Verb poss. and aux. act., with *n* rel. acc. sing. decl. acc. sing. from *dezu* and *na* = *that which*. The nom. of *dezu* is *zuc*, but that of *dezuena* is *zuc*, *eta Erromako Elizac*, i.e. *thou (=you), and the Church of Rome*.

DEZULA. 3. *While thou (=you) hast it*. I.q. *dezu*, aux. act. with *la* participial.

DEZUN. (7 t.) 22, 26, 28, 35. *Which thou (=you) hast; that thou (=you) hast it*. I.q. *dezu*, aux. act. with (a), p. 26,

n rel. acc. = *which*; (b) *n* conj. introduced by *cer*. This second *n* is a *that* which would be superfluous in English, but not in Bask.

DEZUNEAN. (4 t.) 12, 20, 22, 26. *When thou (=you) hast it*. I.q. *dezu* aux. act. with *n* rel. = *in which*, e euph. and an the locative of time from *a* = *the*. *nean* = *at the time in which*.

ezDIATORDE. 41. *It comes not to them*. Wrongly altered into *dator* in 1797. It is to be noted as not being *eziatorde*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, indirect object dat. pl. Verb irreg. intrans. *etor* or *etorri*. 1766; “y llamarse mortales, no les quadra tan bien”; “eta mortalac deitzea ez dator aĩn ongui,” 1826. *Dator* is not datival.

DIAZADALA. 21. Became *disadala* in 1797 and 1826. *Have thou (=you) it to me!* Imp. sing. 2, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. sing. 1, aux. act. *La* conj. = *that* is not translated when ending the imperative. The Castilian is “Esso no me lo preguntéis a mí.”

DIAZAGULA. (Twice) 24. *That he may have it to us*. It became *dizagula* in 1797 and 1826. Subj. pres. sing. 3, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. pl. 1, aux. act. *la* = *that*. (See the two next forms.)

DIAZAGUN. 40. Became *dizagun* in 1797. (*In order*) *that it may have it to us*. Conj. final, as if ending in *tsat*, pres. sing. acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. pl. 1, aux. act. (See *dizagu-la*.)

DIATZAYZULA. 25. *That he may have them to us*. An evident misprint, altered into *dizagula* in 1797 and 1826; but it should be *diakitzagula* or *dizakizgula*, as the accusative *peatuac* is plural. Subj. pres. sing. 3, acc. pl. ind. obj. dat. pl. 1, aux. act. with *la* = *that*.

DIDALA. 68. Became *dirala* in 1797 (cf. *diustazula*). *That he will have it to me*. Subj. pres. sing. 3, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. sing. 1, aux. act. *la* conj. = *that*. The accusative “bere gracia eta gloria” = his grace and glory, has the appearance of being plural; but, as is common in Bask, the *eta* here is disjunctive. That the accusative is ruled here distributively is made clear in the second edition, where a comma follows *gracia*. The same idiom is found in Old English, which psychologically much resembles Bask.

DIDAN. 67. A misprint, rightly replaced by *diraden* in 1797.

DIDANA. 66. *That which he has to me*. Subj. pr. sing. 3, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. sing. 1. The *n* final is used as *n* the rel. pron. acc. sing. (the two *ens* being, so to speak, melted together), decl. acc. sing. aux. act. *na* = *the* or *that which*.

DIDAZULA. 52. *That thou (=you) hast it to me*. It became *dirazula* in 1797, as did *diustatzula* and *diustazula*. Subj. pres. pl. (sing. sense) 2, acc. pl. ind. obj. dat. sing. 1, aux. act. *la* conj. *that*.

DIDILLA. (Twice) 23, 59. *May it be*. It became *dedilla* in 1797 and 1826. Imp. sing. 3, aux. intrans. *bidi* and *bedi* are simpler synonyms of this word.

DIDIN. 40. (*In order*) *that it may be*. Conj. final, as if ending in *tsat*, sing. 3, aux. intr. Compare *didi-lla*.

DIEGU. 27. *We have it to them*. Ind. pres. pl. 1, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. pl. aux. act.

DIENAC. 31. *He who has it to them*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. pl. with *n*, rel. nom. decl. with *ae* the nom. act. of *a* = *the, that*. aux. act. *nac* = *he who*.

DIET. 41. *I have it to them*. Ind. pres. sing. 1, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. pl. aux. act. In the original phrase *Deitu diet Capitalac* it may seem singular that the accusative is expressed in the plural, i.e. *capitalac* = *the capital (sins)*. But as the sense is "I have called (*deitu*) it to them capital (the capitals)" the implied accusative is *the name, or word, capitalac*. The same remark applies to *Cergatic deitu diezu pecatu Capitalac . . . zatenay*. This is the peculiarity of the verb when used with *deitu* = *called by a name*. (See *deitza*.)

DIEZU. 41. *Thou (= you) hast it to them*. Ind. pres. pl. (sing. sense) 2, acc. sing. (only plural in form) ind. obj. dat. pl. aux. act. See the notes on *zatenay* and *diet*.

DIEZULA. 66. *That thou (= you) hast it to them*. I.q. *diezu* with *la* = *that* and a really singular accusative. Its dative is *onay* = *to the good*; its accusative or direct object *premioa* = *the reward*.

DIGUEN. 12. (*That*) *they have it to us*. It became *gaituen* in 1797, from which *gaituenay* lower down comes. Ind. pres. pl. 3, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. pl. 1, with *n* conj. superfluous, introduced by *cergatic* = *by cause that, literally for what*.

DIGUENAY. 25. *To those who have it to us*. It became *diguenai* in 1797. I.q. *diguen*, but with *n* rel. decl. with *ay* the dat. pl. of *a* = *the, that*. *nay* = *to those who*.

DIGUN. (Twice) 17, 30. *That he has it to us*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. pl. 1, with *n* conj. superfl. = *that*, p. 17, introduced by *cergatic* = *because*; p. 30, followed by *becula* = *as, in the same way that*.

DIJOANA. (Twice) 63. *He who goes*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, *n* rel. nom. decl. nom. sing. int. verb irreg. int. *joan, juan*. *na* = *he who*. We have Larramendis authority, and that of Añibarro, partly his contemporary, for pronouncing the *j* like *y*, as in modern French Bask. The modern Gipuskoans sound it like Castilian *jota* = *khota*, which is ugly.

DIJOANEAN. (Twice) 59, 66. *When one, or he goes*. I.q. *dijoana* decl. temporal case or time-locative. *nean* = *in the time when*.

DIO. (5 t.) 1, 50, 51, 65. *He has it to him*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. sing. aux. act. This form is also used, but not in this book, to mean *he says it*.

DION. (3 t.) 17, 21, 51. *That he has it to him; which (it) he has to him*. I.q. *dio* with (*a*) *n* conj. superfluous introduced by *cergatic* and *cenacgatic*; (*b*) *n* rel. pron. acc. sing.

DIOT. 49. *I have it to him or her*. I.q. *dio*, but with the 1 p. as subject. It also means *I say it*, but not here.

DIRADE. (66 t.) 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, 23, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 55, 59, 60. *They are*. Ind. pres. pl. 3. Verb subst. and aux. intrans. On p. 7, line 22, and p. 38, line 16, it took the shorter form *dira* in 1797.

DIRADELA. 43. *When they are; they being*. I.q. *dirade* aux. intrans. with *la* participial. Really the same as *diradenean*.

DIRADEN. (9 t. counting *didan*) 14, 17, 34, 35, 40, 41, 50, 67. *Which are; that they are*. I.q. *dirade* with (*a*) *n* rel. nom. pl.; (*b*) *n* conj. superfl. introd. by *ceñac, ceñean, cergatic, and nola*.

DIRADENAC. (Thrice) 35, 48. *Those which are*. I.q. *dirade* with *n* rel. nom. pl. decl. nom. pl. intrans. *nac* = *those who, or which*.

DIRADENEAN. 42. *When they are*. I.q. *diraden, n* rel. decl. locative of time. *nean* = *when, quo tempore, alors que*.

DIRADENEN. 41. *Of those which are*. Misprinted *diraden* in 1797 and 1826. I.q. *diraden* with *n* rel. nom. pl. decl. with the genitive or possessive plural of the definite article *a*. *nen* = *of those who*.

DITEQUE. (5 t.) 2, 35, 64. *He might be*. Pot. fut. sing. 3. Verb subst. and aux. intrans.

DITEQUEALA. 63. *When he might be; he being able to be*. I.q. *diteka* with *a* euph. and *la* participial.

DITEQUEAN. 16. *Which might be*. I.q. *diteke* with *a* euph. before *n* rel. nom.

DITECEN. 41. (*In order*) *that they may be*. Conj. final (as if ending in *tsat*) pres. pl. 3. Verb subst. and aux. intrans.

DITU. (13 t.) 13, 21, 30, 35, 38, 50, 51, 54, 55, 61. *He has them*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. pl. aux. act. and verb possessive. From this, with *a* euph. and *la* conj. = *that*, comes the next form.

DITUALA. 51. *That he has them*. I.q. *ditu* aux. act. with *la* = *that*. The second edition replaced it by *dituen*, altering the construction much for the better. In the first, *falla eguin dituala aberiguateen duanena* is clumsy, if not quite ungrammatical. In

the second it runs *eguin dituen falta guztiena*. In this case, however, *dituen* is a misprint for *dituan* with *n* rel. acc. pl. It would be correct in the Labourdin dialect. But in Gipuskoan its place would be between *ditue* and *dituenac*; and that is impossible here because its subject is in the singular. See the note on *duanena*.

DITUAN. 23. (*That*) *it has them*. I.q. *ditu* verb poss. with *a* euph. and *n* conj. superfl. introduced by *cegartio*.

DITUANAC (7 t.) 15, 29, 31, 51, 60. *Those which he or she has; he who has them*. I.q. *dituan*, but with (a) *n* rel. acc. pl. decl. p. 15, nom. pl. pp. 51 and 60, acc. pl.; (b) *n* rel. nom. sing. pp. 29 and 31, nom. sing. act. pp. 31 and 29, it is the subject of *ditu* and *du* respectively; pp. 60 and 51, it is the object of *coartea* and *ditu* respectively; p. 15, it is the subject of *dirade*. *nac* = pp. 29 and 31, *he who* (active); p. 15, *those which*, nominative passive; pp. 51 and 60, *those which*, accusative.

DITUANACGATIC. 50. *For those which he has*. I.q. *dituan*, aux. act. with *n* rel. acc. decl. accusative of respect plural. *nacgatio* means *for*, or *on account of*, *those which*.

DITUANENA. 61. *That of those which he has*. I.q. *dituan*, aux. act. with *n* rel. acc. decl. possessive pl. of the demonstrative, and that itself declined with the accus. sing. demonstr. *nena* = *that of those which*. This reading was rightly abandoned in 1797, as it is not grammatical in its context. It was replaced by *dituanenaz* qualifying *pecatu*, i.e. *about those (sins) which he has (done)*.

DITUE. 36. *They have them*. Ind. pres. pl. 3, acc. pl. aux. act. The accusative is singular in form, *Cer virtute*, literally *what virtue*; but treated as a noun of multitude *what = virtues*. In this respect the interrogative imitates the numerals. It is a synonym of *dituzte*. See *El Impossible Vencido*, p. 87.

DITUENAC. 48. *Those who have them*. I.q. *ditue* with *n* rel. nom. pl. decl. nom. pl. intrans. *nac* = *those who*. It is a synonym of *dituztenak*.

DITUT. 69. *I have them*. Ind. pres. sing. 1, acc. pl. aux. act.

DITUZUNAC. (Twice) 15. *Those which you have*. Ind. pres. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. pl. *n* rel. acc. pl. decl. nom. pl. intrans. Verb poss. and aux. act. *nac* = *those which*.

DITZAEN. 28. (*In order*) *that they may have them*. Conj. final (as if ending in *tzat*), pres. pl. 3, acc. pl. aux. act. = *ditzaten*.

DITZAGUN. 2. *Let us have them*. Imp. pl. 1, acc. pl. aux. act. In 1742 it was misprinted *ditzacun*, unless that was an old form of the word.

DITCEEN. 41. This form occurs in both editions. It must be a mistake for *ditecen* or for *ditzaen*. Its context is *onequin bici ditecen paquean, eta criatu ditecen semeac Ceruraco*. If it be active = *ditzaten*, its accusative is *semeac* = *the children*. If it be passive = *ditecen*, then *semeac* is its nominative. See *El Arte del Bascuense* (Salamanca, 1729), pp. 88 and 160. In 1826 it is *ditzen*, p. 40. The Castilian of 1766 is "con la qual vivan entre si pacificamente, y crien hijos para el Cielo." So it is transitive.

DIUZCA. (Thrice) 50, 51. *He has them to him*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. pl. ind. obj. dat. sing. aux. act. It became *diozca* in 1797, a form used in the Labourdin Catechism of 1733, p. 419.

DIUZCAN. 51. *Which (things) he has to him*. I.q. *diuzca* with *n* rel. pl. acc. It became *diozcan* in 1797.

DIUZCAT. 67. *I have them to him*. Ind. pres. sing. 1, acc. pl. ind. obj. dat. sing. aux. act. The accusative *gracia asco*, though singular in form, is treated as a noun of multitude. It became *diozcat* in 1797.

DIUZCATZU. 26. *You have them to her*. Ind. pres. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. pl. ind. obj. dat. sing. aux. act. It became *diozcatzu* in 1797 and 1826. In the latter edition it is on p. 25.

DIUZCUN. 17. *That he has them to us*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. pl. indirect obj. dat. pl. 1, aux. act. with *n* conj. superfl. introduced by *cegartio*. It became *disquigun* in 1797 and 1826.

DIUZTALA. 68. *That he has them to me*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. pl. ind. obj. dat. sing. 1, aux. act. with *la* = *that*. It became *dirala* in 1797, but wrongly; because if it is an active verb, with *arek* = *he* understood as nominative, it cannot be used with *pecatu guztiao* as its accusative plural. We have seen in discussing *didala* that that form, which occurs in the next line below, also became *dirala* by a well-known phonetic tendency of Gipuskoan. But *dirala* can also be a synonym of *diradela*. It would be very awkward to use *dirala* in the passive sense in the fourth line from the bottom with *pecatu guztiao* as its nominative, and *dirala* in the third line from the bottom as it has been defined under *didala*. But if the editor of 1797 meant *dirala* to be passive in both places why did he put the comma after *gracia*? The passage runs thus in 1742: "Daducat esperantza Jaungoycoagan, bareatuco diuztala nere pecatu guztiao, eta emango didala bere gracia eta Gloria," i.e. *I hold hope in the Lord on high (im hehren Herrn) that He will pardon (them) to me my sins, and that He will give (it) to*

me *His grace and glory*. In 1797 it reads: "Daducat esperanza Jangoycoa-gan, barcatuco dirala nere pecatu guztia, eta emango dirala bere gracia, eta gloria." Of the two difficulties produced by the needless change, the lesser is to consider *dirala* as passive in both places.

DIUZTATZULA. 66. In 1797 *dirazula*. } See *didazula*. *That*
DIUZTAZULA. 52. In 1797 *dirazula*. } *you have them to me*.
Ind. pres. pl. 2 (sing. sense) acc. pl. ind. obj. dat. sing. 1, aux. act. with conj. *la = that*. The accusative plural is *pecatuac* inferred from what precedes. With *dirazula* the accusative must be *it*, understood; and the translation thus becomes "*that thou (= you) will pardon me*" without expressing the fault pardoned.

DIUZTEGUN. (Thrice) 4, 25. *That we have them to them*. Ind. pres. pl. 1, acc. pl. ind. obj. dat. pl. aux. act. with *n* conj. ruled by *becela*, *bezela*. In 1797 it became *diegun* from *diegu* with *n* conj. The alteration proceeded from the same thought as that of the preceding form. Both belong to the word *barcatu = pardon* (from *parcere*). The acc. pl. would be *debts* or *sins*. With *diegun* the thing pardoned is not expressed, the meaning being *pardon (it to) them*.

DIUZTEZUN. 59. (*That*) *you (= thou) have them to them*. Ind. pres. pl. 2 (in sense, singular) acc. pl. ind. obj. dat. pl. with *n* conj. superfl. introduced by *cergalic*; aux. act. The accusative *aimbeste favore*, though sing. in form, is treated as a noun of multitude. In 1797, however, when the form *diozun* was substituted (and *favore* became *mesede*), it is used as a singular object.

DIZUDAN. 52. (*That*) *I have it to thee (= you)*. Ind. pres. sing. 1, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. pl. (sense sing.) 2, aux. act. with euph. *da* for *t* before *n* conj. superfl. introd. by *nola*.

DIZUT. 52. *I have it to thee (= you)*. I.q. *dizudan* without the *n* and its euphonic effect.

DU. (44 t.) 1, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 38, 50, 51, 55, 58, 60, 64, 65. *He has it*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. sing. Verb poss. and aux. act. On p. 12 *du* became *badu* in 1797. The root described as verb poss. and aux. act. throughout this glossary is *ukan = had*.

DUALA. (4 t.) 29, 51, 61. *He having it; while he has it*. I.q. *du* aux. act. with *a* euph. before *la* participial.

DUAN. (22 t.) 13, 14, 15, 17, 36, 38, 50, 51, 59, 61, 62, 65, 68, 69. (*That*) *he has it; which (thing) he has*. I.q. *du* with *a* euph. and (*a*) *n* conj., p. 69, followed by *becela*, and pp. 13,

14, 15, 17, 36, 38, 50, 51, 59, 61, introduced by *cer* and *cergalic*; (*b*) *n* rel. acc. sing. pp. 17, 62, 65, 68. In some places the *an* conjunctive is superfluous, i.e. in oratio recta, as pp. 15, 17, 36, 38, 50. What is right in a dependent clause has been wrongly used in a plain statement.

DUANA. (4 t.) 33 (where it was misprinted *duanac* in 1797), 36, 61, 64. *That which he has*. I.q. *duan* with *n* rel. nom. declined pp. 33, 61, acc. sing., and pp. 36, 64, nom. pass. *na = that which*.

DUANAC. (10 t.) 29, 30, 32, 58, 65. *He who has it*. I.q. *duana*, but nom. act. *nac = he who*.

DUANAREN. 38. *Of him who has it*. I.q. *duan*, rel. nom. decl. poss. sing. *naren = of him who*.

DUANARI. (4 t.) 17, 33, 62. *To him who has it*. I.q. *duan*, rel. nom. decl. dat. sing. *nari = to him who*.

DUANEAN. (Twice) 33, 39. *When he has it*. I.q. *duan*, rel. loc. decl. temporal *nean = when, at the time in which*. Cf. *danean*.

DUANENA. 51. *That of those about which he has*. I.q. *duan* with *n* rel. pl. accusative of respect decl. possessive plural of the demonstrative, which is itself declined in the accusative in apposition to *damutasuna*. *nená = that of those as to which*. This form does not occur in 1797, the whole clause having been altered after *vioteclic*, as we saw in discussing *dituala*. It is perhaps possible to translate it thus, "He will conceive regret from his heart, that (regret) of those (things) about which he verifies that he has committed faults"; but this necessitates taking *falla*, which is singular as the object of *dituala*, a form requiring an accusative in the plural. It may be that *falla-egin* is meant, like *itz-egin*, *gald(e) = egin*, to be a compound word meaning *do faultily*. Then *things*, inferred from *n*, is the accusative of *dituala*.

DUE (for *dute*). (5 t.) 20, 22, 34, 47. *They have it*. Ind. pres. pl. 3, acc. sing. aux. act.

DUEN (for *duten*). (Thrice) 24, 48, 69. (*That*) *they have it; which (thing) they have*. I.q. *due* with (*a*) *n* conj. ruled by *becela*; (*b*) *n* rel. acc. sing.

DUENAC. 14. *Those who have it*. 21, 46, 47, 48, 69 (on this page it became *dutenac* in 1797). I.q. *duen* for *duten*, with *n* rel. nom. pl. decl. p. 69, nom. pl. act., pp. 46, 47, 48, nom. pl. passive, and p. 21, acc. pl.

EGUIDAZU. (Twice) 12, 13. *Have thou (= you) it to me*. Imp. pl. 2 (sing. in sense), acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. sing. 1, aux. act. Verb irreg. *egin* for *ukan*.

EGUIGUZU. (Thrice) 4, 6, 24. *Have thou (= you) it to us.* On pp. 4 and 24, where it follows *eman*, the shortened form *iguzu* without *eman* was substituted in 1797. Imp. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. pl. 1, aux. act. Verb irreg. *egin* for *ukan*.

EGUIOZU. (Twice) 28. *Have thou (= you) it to him.* Imp. pl. 2 (sing. sense) acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. sing. aux. act. Verb irreg. *egin* for *ukan*.

EGUIUZCUTÇU & EGUIUZCUTZU. (Twice) 4, 24. *Have thou (= you) them to us.* Imp. pl. 2 (sing. sense) acc. pl. ind. obj. dat. pl. 1, aux. act. Verb irreg. *egin* for *ukan*. It became in both places *guisquigutzu* in 1797. In 1826 it is *gaizquigutzu* p. 4 and *eguisquiguzu* p. 23.

EGUIZU. 3. *Do it.* Imp. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. sing. Verb irreg. trans. *egin*.

EZAZU & (p. 11) EÇAZU. (8 t.) 2, 4, 6, 11, 22, 26, 29. *Have thou (= you) it.* Imp. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. sing. aux. act.

GAITECELA. 31. *That we be.* Subj. pres. pl. 1, with *la* conj. = *that*. Verb subst.

GAITCEN. 27. (*In order*) *that we be.* Conj. final (as if ending in *tsat*), pres. pl. 1, aux. intrans. It was printed *gaitcen* in 1742.

GAYTUENAY. 25. *To those who have us.* Ind. pres. pl. 3, acc. pl. 1, aux. act. with *n* rel. nom. pl. decl. dat. pl. *nay = to those who*.

GAITZAQUEAN. 62. (*That*) *he might have us.* Potential fut. sing. 3, acc. pl. 1, aux. act. with *a* euph. before *n* conj. superfl. introduced by *cergatic*.

GAITZALA. (Twice) 25, 49. *That he may have us; let him have us.* Imp. and subj. pres. sing. acc. pl. 1, aux. act. with *la* conj. = *that*. This form occurs in the Labourdin Catechism of Bayonne, 1733, which ought to be reprinted.

GAITZATZU. (4 t.) 3, 4, 11, 25. *Have thou (= you) us.* Imp. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. pl. 1, aux. act. It became *gaitzazu* in 1797, but reverted to *gaitzatzu* in 1826 on p. 4.

GAITZATZULA. (Twice) 4, 25. *Have thou (= you) us.* I.q. *gaitzatzu* with *la* conjunctive, which, when suffixed to the imperative, is untranslatable.

GAUDE. 6. *We stay*, used here for *we come!* (a contraction of *gagode*). Ind. pres. pl. 1. Verb irreg. intrans. *agon*.

GAUDEN. 21. (*That*) *we stay.* I.q. *gaude* with *n* conj. superfl. introduced by *ceñari*. It was misprinted *gauden* in 1742.

GAUZCATEN. 2. *Which (things) hold us.* Ind. pres. pl. 3, acc. pl. 1. Verb irreg. trans. *eduli*.

GUENDUAN. 37. *Which (thing) we had.* Ind. imp. pl. 1, acc. sing., the *n* serving as the rel. pron. acc. sing. aux. act.

GUENDUANA. 36. *That which we had.* I.q. *guenduan*, decl. acc. sing. *na = that which*.

GUERADEN. 37. (*That*) *we are.* Ind. pres. pl. 1, aux. intrans. (synonym of *gera*) with *n* conj. superfl. introduced by *ceñarequin*.

GUERADENEAN. 6. *When we are.* I.q. *geraden* with *n* rel. loc. of time, decl. in the same case. *nean = at the (time) in which*, i.e. *when*.

GUERALA. 37. *While we are; we being.* Ind. pres. pl. 1, with *la* participial. Verb subst.

GUACEN. 22. *Let us go.* Imp. pl. 1. Verb irreg. intrans. *juan, joan*. It was printed *goacen* in 1797, but is still sounded *guassen* in all the dialects.

ITZATZU. (4 t.) 6, 32, 33, 35. *Have thou (= you) them.* Imp. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. pl. aux. act.

baLIJOAZ. 62. *If they should go.* Suppositive pl. 3. Verb irreg. intrans. *juan, joan*.

baLIRADE. 63. *If they should be.* Supp. pl. 3, aux. intrans. In 1797 it became *balira*.

baLITU. 64. *If he should have them.* Supp. sing. 3, acc. pl. aux. act. The accusative *penitencia gueyago* is singular in form, but treated as plural, being a noun of multitude.

baLIZ. (Twice) 63, 69. *If he, or it, should be.* Supp. sing. 3. Verb subst. and aux. intrans.

LIZATEQUE. (4 t.) 38, 63. *He, or it, would be, might be.* Conditional pres. sing. 3, aux. intrans.

baLUE. 65. *If they had it.* Supp. pl. 3, acc. sing. aux. act. In 1797 it became *balute*.

NAIZ. 21. *I am.* Ind. pres. sing. 1. Verb subst.

NAIZANEAN. 12. *When I am.* I.q. *naiç*, aux. intrans. with *a* euph. before *n* rel. loc. temp. decl. same case. *nean = when*.

NAITZAYO. 49. *I am to him.* Ind. pres. sing. 1, ind. obj. dat. sing. aux. intrans.

NAZULA. 66. *That you have me.* Ind. pres. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. sing. 1 with *la = that*, aux. act.

NUQUE. (Twice) 69. *I should have it.* Cond. pres. sing. 1, acc. sing. aux. act.

ezTA. (7 t.) 38, 55, 58, 60, 64, 65. *It is not* (French *n'est*, O.E. *nis*, Wendish *ne-jo*). I.q. *da* with the change produced by the negative prefix *ez*. On p. 38, and on its second occurrence, p. 58, it was resolved into *ez da* in 1797. For some years past the Abbé Martin Landerretche, now of Donibane Lohizun = Marshy St. John, i.e. St. Jean de Luz (B.P.), has collaborated with Dom Basilio Joannategi in writing the *Fedacaren Propagationeco Urtecaria* (Annuary of the Propagation of the Faith), which appears every two months in Bayonne. The style of the two writers can be distinguished by their manner of writing the verb with the negative prefix. Landerretche uses *ezda*, *ezdu*, which, though not without venerable precedent, e.g. in the works of S. Mendiburu, is rather pedantic; while Joannategi imitates Dechepare and Leizarraga, the oldest *Heuskaldun* writers, in employing the more euphonic, mutated form. We have seen above in *ezdiatorde* a case of *d* remaining unaffected by *ez*. All forms of the verb beginning in *T* have this initial instead of *D*, because preceded, either by *ez* = *not*, or by *bai*, *pai* = *indeed*, *really*, *because*, *since*, *so that*, or *who* and *which*, according to the context. This *ez* sounds like English *ess*. Some authors have written it *es*.

ezTAGO. (Twice) 56, 58. *He stays not*. I.q. *dago*. In 1797 it became, p. 58, *ez dago*.

ezTAQUIANARI. 33. *To him who knows it not*. I.q. *dakianari*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. sing. with *a* euph. before *n* rel. nom. decl. dat. Verb irreg. trans. *iakin*. *nari* = *to him who*. In 1797 it became *ez daquianari*.

ezTANA. 56. *The (time) in which he is not*. I.q. *dana* with *n* rel. = *in which*, qualifying *Tempora* = *time*, declined nom. intrans. *na* = *that in which*.

ezTANAC. 63. *He who is not*. I.q. *dana*, *n* rel., but decl. nominative active. *nao* = *he who*.

ezTANIC. 56. *Any time in which he is not*. I.q. *danic* Ind. pres. sing. 3, aux. intrans. with *n* rel. time-case, decl. with the indefinite partitive case, in apposition to *Temporario*, which precedes. *nic* = *any (time) in which*, *de (temps) or*.

ezTET. 19. *I have it not*. I.q. *det*; aux. act.

ezTIRADEN. 36. (*That*) *they are not*. I.q. *diraden* with *n* conj. superfl. introduced by *ergatic*. It became *ez diraden* in 1797.

ezTITUANA. 65. *He who has them not*. I.q. *dituana*. Ind. pres. sing. 3, acc. pl., with *a* euph. and *n* rel. nom. decl. nom. intrans. *na* = *he who*.

ezTU. (6 t.) 17, 54, 55, 56. *He has it not*. I.q. *du*. On pp. 17, 55, 56 it became *ez du* in 1797. On p. 54 it became *ez due* (= *dute*); but without any necessity, because the *eta* after *aitac*, its nominative, is disjunctive, as the comma shows.

ezTUANAC. 30. *He who has it not*. I.q. *duanac*, aux. act.

ezTUENAC. (Twice) 47, 48. *Those who have it not*. I.q. *duenac*, for *dutenac*, decl. nom. pass. Verb poss. and aux. act.

ZAYO. (5 t.) 30, 40, 54, 64. *It is to him*. Ind. pres. 3, ind. obj. dat. sing. aux. intrans. On p. 64 *ezpazayo* became *ezpazayo* in 1797. Here *ba* (= *if*) became *pa* after *ez* = *not*.

ZAYOLA. (Twice) 11, 39. *While it is to him*. I.q. *zayo* with *la* participial.

ÇAYONA & ZAYONA. (Twice) 24, 64. *That which is to him*. I.q. *zayo* with *n* rel. nom. decl. acc. *na* = *that which*. *çayona*, p. 24, became *zayona* in 1797.

ZAYTE. 3. *Be ye*. Imp. pl. 2, really plural, aux. act. It became *zaitte* in 1797.

ZAITEZ. 2. I.q. *zayte*.

ZAITECEN. 2. (*In order*) *that ye may be*. Conj. final (as if ending in *tsat*), pres. pl. 2, aux. intrans. It became *gaitecen* in 1797 with a change of person like *dezazun*.

ZAITUDAN. (Twice) 52, 66. (*That*) *I have thee = you*. I.q. *zaitut* with *da* euph. for *t* before *n* conj. superfl. introduced by *ergatic*.

ZAYTUT. 13. *I have thee = you*. Ind. pres. sing. 1, acc. pl. (sing. sense) 2, aux. act.

ZAITZAELA. 60. *Let them have thee = you*. Imp. pl. 3, acc. pl. (sing. sense) 2, aux. act.

ZAITZALA. (Thrice) 4, 5, 6. *Let him have thee = you*. Imp. sing. 3, acc. pl. (sing. sense) 2. On p. 4 it disappeared in 1797.

eTZAIZCA. (4 t.) 6, 7, 62. *They are to him*. Ind. pres. pl. 3, ind. obj. dat. sing. aux. intrans. At the second occurrence, on p. 62, it has the negative prefix *et*, which form is assumed by *ez* when prefixed to a form beginning with *s*. It may be, however, more logical to say that the real negative is *e*, now only used as a prefix to certain forms of the verb, and that, with this *e*, *s* conserves its old sound of *ts*. Cf. *zana*, below. Other writers, e.g. P. d'Urte, have used initial *tz* instead of *s* even when there is no prefix. I suggested some years ago to M. H. de Charencey that Gaulish *ex* might be akin to Bask *ez*.

ZAIZCANAC. (Twice) 8. *Those which are to him.* I.q. *zaizca*, with *n* rel. nom. decl. nom. intrans. *nac* = *those which*. *Zaizca* and *zaizcan* are found in Leizarragas New Testament, A.D. 1571. Of this treasure a reprint was published at Strassburg in December, 1900. In the introduction I am held responsible for some misprints which vexed me much, but which I had no opportunity of correcting. They will occur even in *corrigenda*.

ZALA. (4 t.) 8, 53, 54, 67. *That it was; while she was; she wasing, i.e. being (in illo tempore).* I.q. *zan* with eclipse of *n* before, (a) p. 54, *la* conj. = *that*; (b) *la* participial. Verb subst. and aux. intrans.

ZAN. 24. *He, she, or it was.* 5, 18, 19, 20, 36, 52, 54, 56. Ind. imp. sing. 3, aux. intrans.

ZANA & TZANA. (10 t.) 8, 9, 18, 67, 68. *That which was; the fact that he was.* On pp. 8, 9, 67, 68 (except l. 4, p. 68), it became *zala* in 1797, just as *dana* became *dala*, as explained above. The first edition has *tzana*, e.g. p. 18, *eguintzana*, and p. 68, line 1, *iltzana*. Cf. *etsaizca*, *teigun*, *tzuan*. I.q. *zan*, aux. intrans. with (a) p. 18, *n* rel. nom. included in the usual end, decl. nom. intrans. *na* = *the which*; (b) *n* conj. = *that* decl. acc. *na* = *the (fact) that*.

ZANEAN. 26. *When he was.* I.q. *zan*, aux. intrans., the *n* final serving as rel. pron. in the time-locative, with *e* euph. decl. temporal case. *nean* = *at the (time) in which*.

ZANETIC. 51. *From the (time) in which he was.* The original has the misprint *zanetit*. I.q. *zan*, aux. intrans. with *n* rel. understood, in the time-case, *e* euph. and *tic* the separative or partitive case-ending. *netio* = *from the (time) in which*.

ZATE. (Twice) 34, 48. *It is to them.* Ind. pres. sing. 3, indirect obj. dat. pl. aux. intrans. On p. 48 it became *zaye* in 1797. In both places it is in alliance with *deitcen* = *to be called*, *heissen*, and in both the name is a nominative plural. One may say either that the name, though plural in form, is singular if understood as *the name*, like *Yglesias*, a well-known family name in Castilian, and that this is the nominative of *is called* with a dative plural of the things named and called; or that *deitzen* *zaye* is impersonal, and "Obra misericordiacac" in the first, and "Bienaventurantzac" in the second, place is the predicate of the sentence. Only on p. 48 is the dative expressed, i.e. *oei* = *to these, to them*. Cf. *diezu*, the dative of which is the next form.

ZATENAY. 41. *To those to which it is (called, said as*

a name). Ind. pres. sing. 3, ind. obj. dat. pl. with *n* rel. pron. dat. pl. declined with *ay*, the dat. pl. definite of *a* = *that, tho. nay* = *to those to whom*. This form occurs in the context: *Cergatic deitu diezcu pecatu Capitalac Zazpi, comumente, edo gueyenean mortalcac esaten zatenay?* to be translated "why have you called capital sins to those to whom it is said (i.e. called) mortal (sins) for the most part or commonly?" The root *esan*, *esaten*, properly *said, saying*, is sometimes used of *naming, calling*. Here we see it used like *deitu, deitzen*, with a dative. It became *zatenay* in 1826.

ZAUDEN. 2. (*That*) *thou = you, stayest = art.* Ind. pres. pl. 2 (sing. sense). Verb irreg. intrans. *egon* with *n* conj. superfl. introduced by *ceñean*.

ZAUDENA. (Twice) 4, 26. *O thou = you, who stayest.* I.q. *zaudena*, but with *n* rel. pron. nom. declined in the vocative. *na* = *O you who!* The vocative in Bask is always formed by the definite article.

CEBAN. (Thrice) 10, 53, 54. I.q. *zuan*. In 1797 it became *zuan*, on p. 53.

CEBEN. (Twice) 54. *They had it.* I.q. *zulen*, into which it was altered in line 6 in 1797. Ind. imp. pl. 3, acc. sing. aux. act.

CENDUAN. (4 t.) 10, 13, 15. *Thou = you, hadst it.* Ind. imp. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. sing. aux. act.

CERADE. (Thrice) 4, 9, 11. *Art thou = you?; Thou = you, art.* Ind. pres. pl. 2 (sing. sense). Verb subst. and aux. intrans.

CERADENA. (Twice) 52, 66. *That which you = thou, are.* I.q. *cerade* with *n* rel. nom. decl. nom. pass. *na* = *that which*.

CERANA. 13. *The (fact) that you = thou, are.* I.q. *cerade* in the shortened form, with *n* conj. = *that* decl. with the acc. of the def. article. Cf. *gera* for *gerade*. Verb subst. *na* = *the (fact) that*.

CEUDEN. 9. *Which were staying.* Ind. imp. pl. 3, with *n* rel. pron. nom. Verb irreg. intrans. *egon*.

CEUDENERA. 19. *To that in which they were staying.* I.q. *ceuden* with *n* rel. in the real locative case, declined in the directive case or accusative of motion. It repeats or specifies the sense of *Limborac* = *Limbo*. That might have been better written *Limbo*, when the sense would have been "to (the) Limbo in which, *justuac* = the just, were waiting." The original runs, "baicican Limborac justuac ceudenera." *nera* = *to that in which*.

CIGUN & TCIGUN. (Thrice) 45. *He had it to us.* Ind. imp. sing. 3, acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. pl. 1, aux. act. Though in each place it follows *eman*, only in l. 8 is it *teigun*.

CINDUAN. 59. *She had thee = you.* Ind. imp. sing. 3, acc. pl. (sing. sense), 2, aux. act.

CIRADELA. 20. *While they were; they being, in illo tempore.* Ind. imp. pl. 3. Verb subst. with *la* participial.

CIRAN. 67. (*That*) *thou (= you) hadst it to me.* Ind. imp. pl. 2 (sing. sense), acc. sing. ind. obj. dat. sing. 1, aux. act. introduced by *oergatic*. *n* conj. may be considered included in the common ending of this form.

CITUAN. (Thrice) 17, 28, 53. *He had them.* Ind. imp. sing. 3, acc. pl. aux. act.

CITUANA. (Twice) 9. *The (fact) that he had them.* Ind. imp. sing. 3, acc. pl. aux. act., i.e. *cituan*, with *n* conj. understood in the final *n* (as in *ciran*) and decl. acc. *na = the (fact) that.* In 1797 it became *oituala*. Cf. *dagoana, dana, zana, zuana*.

CITUANAC. 36. *Those which he had.* I.q. *cituan*. Ind. imp. sing. 3, acc. pl. with its *n* final serving as rel. pron. acc. pl. decl. nom. pass. *nac = those which.*

CITUEN. (4 t.) 9, 20, 64. *They had them.* Ind. imp. pl. 3, acc. pl. aux. act. On p. 20 the final *n* is used as the rel. pron. pl. acc., but on p. 64 as the conj. *that* ruled by *baño*. It is a synonym of *oituzen*, and took that form in 1797 on p. 20.

CIUZCUN. 44. *He had them to us.* Ind. imp. sing. 3, acc. pl. ind. obj. dat. pl. 1, aux. act. In 1797 it wrongly became *eigun*.

ZUALA. 19. *While he had it; he having it, in illo tempore.* I.q. *zuan*, aux. act. with eclipse of *n* before *la* participial.

ZUAN & TZUAN. (13 t.) 5, 12, 14, 19, 22, 23, 26, 50, 53. *He had it.* Ind. imp. sing. 3, acc. sing. aux. act. *tzuan* occurs twice on p. 26, in each place following *osan*, but became *zuan* in 1797. Cf. *teigun, zaizoa, zana*.

ZUANA. (Twice) 1, 68. *That which he had; the (fact) that he had it.* I.q. *zuan*; the *n* final serving p. 1 as rel. acc. sing. decl. nom. pass. *na = the which*; and on p. 68 as the conj. *that*, decl. acc. *na = the (fact) that.* On this page it became *zuala* in 1797. Cf. *dana, dagoana, zana, oituaana*.

eTZUEN. 54. *Had they it not?* I.q. *zuten*. Ind. imp. pl. 3, acc. sing. aux. act. with the negative prefix *e*, examined in the note on *zaizoa*. Some writers have used negative verbal forms beginning in *ezz* instead of *etz*. They must have meant to convey the sound of *etz*.

You know! ἐμοὶ δὲ κε ταῦτα μελήσεται, ὄφρου τελέσσω.

(Iliad, i, 523.)

FYLG THU MER EFTER!

Nya Testamente (Kaupmannaháúfn, 1807), p. 381.

It will have been seen that the Bask verb is sufficiently stenographic to be recommended for economy in telegrams. *Ceudenera*, for instance, one single word of nine letters, requires seven words, and twenty-eight letters, to translate it into English; and *didaba*, six letters, needs twenty letters divided between seven words! *Diegu*, five letters, swells to as many words in the language of Chaucer.

It is probable that none of the above forms is obsolete, and that all of them, except those beginning in *dia*, are included in, or are to be inferred from, one or other of the Dictionaries, Grammars, or Paradigms¹ which have been published. These books, however, do not tell the student where he may see any given form at work. They may enable him to take the words on trust, and to commit them to memory. But, just as we understand a person better when we have visited him or her in his or her² workroom and proper sphere of influence; so the Bask verb can only be really assimilated when located (might one say *hered* and *nowed*?) and seen reigning from stop to stop on a printed page, like a *vox humana* in the organ.

Let us look at some of the forms gleaned from Irazuztas teaching. *Da = it is; zayo = it is to him; zate (= zaye) = it is to them; dirade = they are; zaizka = they are to him; det = I have it; diot = I have it to him; diet = I have it to them; ditut = I have them; zaytut = I have you; dizut = I have it to you; degu = we have it; gaitue = they have us.*

THE RELATIVE FORMS IN THIS BOOK

are the most interesting. They are the following sixty-nine:—

dagoana, dagoanaren, dagoanari, dagoanaz, dan, dana, danagan, danarekin, danean, daudenak, deban, dedan, dedana, degun, deguna,

¹ Those of I. de Lardizábal, "Grammatica Vascongada" (San Sebastián, 1856), are the best. This book, however, is responsible (see p. 70, articles 25 and 26) for the blunder of Prince L. L. Bonaparte, which I pointed out in my essay read before this Society in 1898. Lardizábal seems to have had negation upon the brain. On p. 82 he makes it account for *ez* in the double postposition *ez-gero*, the absurdity of which I have explained in a note in my edition of the great book of Sebastián Mendiburu, published at San Sebastián in May, 1900.

² Bask pronouns, being sexless, do not engender any such troublesome red-tapery.

dezakedana, dezuena, dezun, dezumean, didana, dionak, diguenai, dijoana, dijoanean, dion, diraden, diradenak, diradenean, diradenen, ditekean, dituanak, dituanakgatik, dituanona, dituanak, dituzumak, diuzkan, duan, duana, duanak, duanaren, duanari, duanean, duanena, duen, duenak, guituenai, guzkatzen, gonduan, gonduana, geradenean, naizanean, ezana, ezanik, ezakianari, eztituana, eztuanak, zaiona, zaizkanak, zana, zanean, zunotik, zatenai, zaudona, zeradema, zeuden, zeudenera, zituanak, zituen, zuana.

The analysis in the above Index declares the sense which the context imposes on each of the various endings in these relations. I have had, in speaking of the eight forms ending in *nean* in the sense of *when*, to invent a new term, such as *time-case*, *temporal case*, *time-locative*, or *locative of time*, because the same case-ending may also be used as a common locative, though it is not used so in this catechism. Thus *duanean* means not only *when he has it*, but also *in that which he has* with *n* as an accusative, and *in him who has it* with *n* as a nominative. *Danean* is the *time-case* of *dan*. The proper *locative* or *inessive case* of *dan* is *danagan*, the only *real locative* we have among the relative forms in our book, parallel with *Christogan=in Christ*. This *time-case* is, of course, the exclusive prerogative of the *zeit-wort*. It depends on the remarkable casual elasticity of *n*. The use of *n* as the conjunction = *that* does not require so much attention. It will, however, be observed that *aergatic* = *for what*, in the sense of *why*, is followed by the verb in the indicative mood, while *aergatic* = *because* has its verb in the conjunctive, with *n* at the end. This is like the Old English construction "by cause *that*." I call this use of the *n* 'superfluous,' because it would not be translated *that* in modern English, and modern Bask writers seldom use it.

The Relative Pronoun N.

The relative pronoun *N* is common to all the dialects. To my surprise I have found many Basks, who probably would use it quite correctly, ignorant of the rules which I have mined out for the employment of this miraculous letter. Such persons were like M. Jourdain, in Molière, who had been talking prose all his life without knowing it! Some illogicalities and inconsistencies in Bask books, e.g. in the *Refranes* of 1596, have resulted from the incompleteness of the grammars upon this head. This relative is not the only one in the language, and is used exclusively as

a verbal suffix, serving to unite the form which it ends to the words which follow. Probably no other language has such a capacious link-letter. It can translate any of the cases of *qui*, *quae*, *quod*, whether singular or plural, with a preposition into the bargain. By its means any verbal form can become a noun substantive, declinable, and to be used as such.

The Declension of the Verb.

Thus the declension of the verb means the suffixing to it of a case of the definite article or demonstrative pronoun, the two elements being connected, or separated, by means of this protean consonant. By its means an active verb is declined in the passive, or a passive verb in the active; a verb with an accusative is declined in the nominative, or a verb with a nominative is declined in the accusative; a verb in the plural is declined in the singular, or a verb in the singular declined in the plural. The context prevents any possibility of confusion arising in regard to these marvellous products of ancient philosophy.

Its Protean Capacities.

For the verb is in personal and numerical accordance not only with its subject, but with its accusative, if it be an active verb, and with its indirect object or dative if it have one. The subject puts on its active end if it is the nominative of a transitive verb. But the verb is not merely a respecter of persons who are subjects. It is a time-server to all who obey its laws. If it be passive, it tells you by its dress to what class of persons the indirect objects, or outlanders, committed to its care belong. If it be active, it not only does this, but accuses the objects of what they owe to it by a still further change of raiment if they are directed into the first- or second-class carriages in its electric train or *personen-sug*. This many-sided sovran, not content with behaving as any verb does towards its subjects, orders new regimentals at once if he has to tell us that he objects directly or indirectly to one or to more than one thing or person. He not only unifies or counts them, but he pronounizes them as well when pronouncing sentence upon them. He is not merely stenographic, but photographic. The least used part of the verbal machinery seems to be that which shows us the

active rule affecting at the same time *you* as *dative* and *me* as *accusative*, or *vice versa*; I mean, for instance, such forms as would occur in translating "he gives me to you" or "they committed thee to us." But no member of this class has met us in our present object-lesson. *Duana* means both *celui qui l'a* and *celui qu'il a*. In the first case the *n* is nominative, in the second it is accusative = *que*. The context alone can decide whether the *a* final, which makes the word the peer of a substantive, is nominative passive or accusative. *Duana da* is *he who has it is*, or *it is that which he has*; and the logic of the surrounding words must decide whether the *n* in *duana* so placed means nominative or accusative. *Duana du* is *he has him who has it*, or *he has that which he has*. Here also the *n* may be nominative or accusative, but the final *a* can only be the object or accusative under *du*. The word becomes active by changing *a* into *ak*: thus *duanak* = *he who has it* or *that which he has*, *erre du* = *has burned (it)*, *shishidoila*¹ = *the butterfly*. Here, again, *n* is dependent on circumstances to be freed from ambiguity. *Ak* can only be the active or agent case, which, as those who know Bask will admit, ought not to be put on the same level as the passive nominative, the latter serving also as accusative. The oldest French Bask Grammar, that of M. Harriet (Bayonne, 1761), suggests the distinction. It would be much better to call it, as Prince L. L. Bonaparte did, simply *the active case*. It usurps sometimes the functions of the instrumental or mediative case. Thus, on p. 11, Irazuzta has *Libratceagatio Jaungoycoaz pensamentu gaiztoestatic*, where no verb occurs, but the translation is "in order to the delivering (of ourselves) by God (as agent) from the evil thoughts." *Jaungoycoaz*, the instrumental, would be less revealing. Instead of *duanaz ogina da* = *it is made by*, or *through*, *him who has it*, one might say *duanak ogina da* with the same meaning, producing the seeming anomaly of an active nominative in concord with a passive verb, though really qualifying the predicate. From *da* = *he, she, or it is*, we get the relative form *dan*. Articulate or declined passively, this is *dana*, meaning *celui qui l'est* no less than *celui qu'il est*. This serves as nominative to an intransitive verb, as *dana betor* = *let him come who is it*, or as accusative to

¹ A common word at Mugerre (*frontier-town*), about three miles from Bayonne. The butterfly has about as many different names in Baskland as the water-wagtail in all the Spains.

a transitive and active verb, thus *dana ikussi du erleak*¹ = *the bee has seen him who is it*. But in *danak* we see the form ready for use as an active force; thus *danak* = *he who is it* (being nominated to act), *badu* = *really has*, *oizagirrea* = *the hunting-glade*. *Dituanak* may mean *those which he has*, and serve either as accusative plural to an active form like *ditu* = *he has them*, or as nominative passive to an intransitive form like *daude* = *they stay*; and with these meanings its *n* can only be accusative to *ditu*. But *dituanak* can also mean *he who has them*; and in this sense both its *n* and its *ak* are active nominative cases, and the whole word can be nothing else than the subject of a transitive verb in the singular number. So that *dituanak ditu* may also render "he who has them has them." *Degu* is plural, but *degunu* is singular. *Ditu* is singular, but *dituanak* is plural. *Zate* is singular, but *zatenay* is plural. *Dirado* is plural, but *diradenean* is singular.

Dana = *All*.

Dana = *that which is*, is used in the sense of *all (which is)* in the singular. What a man has or is, is his all, all that he can do or be. Some writers have made a plural of it, *danak*. The real plural, however, is *diradenak* = *(all) those which are*. Some others, Cardaberaz for instance, have used the past tense *zena* for the singular, and *ziradenak* for the plural, in the sense of *all*, when referring to time past. Probably no other language makes such a time-comparative of *all* or any adjective!

The Suffix La.

The termination *la* = *that* belongs to the conjunctive mood. When used with the imperative it is not to be translated. It sometimes suffices to turn an indicative form into an imperative, or

¹ *Erle* = *bee* probably comes from *er*, *erre* = *burnt, burn*, which may be a Kabyle word. The bee is *the burner, er-le-a*, when it stings. *Erre* = *burnt* and *erri* = *town* are probably the same word, and have the same sound when articulated, for Bask *e* followed by *a* is often like English *e*. Towns were made when the primitive forest was burnt. See p. 27 of "Life with Trans-Siberian Savages," by B. Douglas Howard, M.A. (London, 1893.) In Navarra there is a village called *errea* = *the burnt*. In Brandenburg there were and are immense pine forests, easily burnt. One of them contains a village called *Brand*. Dr. G. Sauerwein informed me that in Norway many place-names seem to be derived from the word meaning *burn*. *Eire*, the ancient name of Ireland when it had its trees on it, may be Iberian, and mean *burnt land*. *Erri, herri*, generally means *land, contry*. But, like *terra* in Portuguese, or *tierra* in Spanish, or *pays* in French, it is used in the restricted sense of *town, city, village*, instead of *hivi, iri, ili, iri, uli*, and even for *the people, el pueblo*, who live in it. It is *er* in some compound words, e.g. *er-beste, er-dara*.

a conjunctive: thus *dute* = *they have it*; *dutela* = *that they have it*. But frequently it is used with the indicative only to convert the form into a participle. I venture to submit for the approval of grammarians a term invented by myself for describing it shortly and vividly, namely "*la participial*." *La participial* occurs in Irazu'tas book in the following twelve forms: *dagoala*, *dala*, *degula*, *dezula*, *diradela*, *ditekeala*, *duala*, *gerala*, *zayola*, *zala*, *ziradela*, *zuala*. In the other forms it either marks the imperative, or the conjunctive proper, or the indicative introduced by *that* as a conjunction. *La participial* assumes the partitive form *larie* in other books, without enriching its meaning.

Superfluous Conjunctive.

Relative, non-interrogative, independent clauses introduced by *ceña* and its cases, e.g. *ceñac*, *ceñean*, *ceñari*, *ceñarekin*, or by *cer*, *ceren*, also take the conjunctive superfluously. *Nola* used in the same way, meaning *as that*, *just as*, p. 58, or *such as*, p. 40, also has the conjunctive after it, just as *becela* follows the same. On the other hand, after consequential *non* = *that* (*nun* in 1797), originally *no-n* = *in which*, the indicative is used, e.g., p. 58, *alaco moduan non Jesu-Christo gustia dago* = *in such a way in which (= that) the whole Jesus Christ remains*, where *dagoan* would be more elegant and final.

Variations in the Editions.

The two first editions of this book ought to be reprinted in facsimile with the Castilian text of Astete between them, as it was known in 1742. The variations between the two, far from being, as Mr. J. Vinson with his usual slipshoddity asserted, a question of orthography, are really dialectal, at least for certain verbal forms. The first is more Biscayan than the other. This is surprising, because on the frontispice (if I may use the old, correct spelling) one is expressly told that Hernalde, three-quarters of an hour on foot from Tolosa, is in the Province of Gipuskou! But even as lately as 160 years ago the divergence between the dialects was much less marked than now. Leizarraga, however, declared in 1571 that Bask differed almost from house to house; and a few years ago Don Jose Urzelai (= *water-maid*), a priest settled in Abbadiano, said to me: "Los Bascos saben hablar en el hogar, pero no en la plaza!" Indeed, a Bask market witnesses a Turanian

confusion of tongues on the spot. This Euskarian volatility has fatally paved the way for the successful volubility of Castilian as the official language. A house divided against itself cannot stand. The dialect of Eskiula, near Oloron, is almost as unintelligible to the Basks of Orosko as Roumanian to an Algarvean of Silves. Yet some dialects have kept what others have lost.

The Accents.

I do not attempt here to enlist all the differences in wording and spelling, or to illustrate all the grammatical laws observed in the two editions of Irazu'tas translation. The first has no accents. In the second, owing, I think, to the influence of S. Mendiburu, they are very abundant, though no distinction is observable between ` and '. That reactionary tendency is very remarkable, because now, a hundred years later, the Gipuskouan writers have entirely abandoned the armour of the accent!

The Tilde.

In the first the tilde ~ is almost exclusively used to mark the omission of an *en*, as in *sãtuarẽ* for *santuaren*. But in a few places it serves to liquify that letter, e.g., p. 1, *ceña*, p. 2, *baño*, p. 3, *ciñatcera* and *señaleagalic*.

The Aspirate.

The letter *h* is conspicuous by its absence in the second edition, except in words from Latin like *heredero* and *hostia* and in the combination *ch*. It occurs here and there in the first, e.g., p. 30, *honratcea*, p. 31, *ohostatcea*, where it was left out in the second. This letter is no longer used in writing Gipuskouan, though it is found in the editions of J. B. Agirres "Instructions on Confession and Communion," published in 1803 and 1823. It was struck out in the third edition, published at Tolosa in April, 1900.

This study is, I fear, already too long and dreary except for *aficionados*, though it may possibly smooth the road of some future searcher. The revision of the text that had taken place between 1742 and 1797 shows that that purism advised, and rightly too, by Dr. Sauerwein, was already at work. It borders, however, on pedantry, and some of its results were retrograde. Many misprints were cast out, but some new ones put in to lower the scale of gain. The form of the answers (*Erantzulen det*) was modified in some places for the greater glory of the catechist.

Eta = ta.

The conjunction *eta* = *and* occurs, I think, only once in the shortened form *ta* in the first, but *ta* is frequent in the second.

O = U.

That *o* sounds *u* before *a* is clear when we find *guacen* in 1742 replaced by *goacen* in 1797; *juan*, but *dijoanean*.

M for N.

The use of *m* for *n* before *b* is found in Irazuzta as in the earlier writers, e.g., pp. 42 and 43, in *embidia*, from Latin *invidia*; p. 42, in *mandamenturem bat*, changed into *n* in 1797; p. 12, *orrem beste*; p. 20, *aim beste*; p. 33, *urteam bein*, printed *urtean* in 1797; p. 12, *onem bat*, becoming *onen* in 1797; *cem bat*, *passim* but *cenbat* at least twice, pp. 13, 39, though altered into *cenbat* in 1797.

Initial R.

It has been said by some that Bask has no words beginning with *R*. It is true that most of them are of forane origin; but they are abundant, though mostly given a euphonic *er* as a prefix by modern writers. Irazuzta has *Erromara*, pp. 64, 56; *Errequina*, p. 5, but, p. 40, *recibitcen*, *rastrao*, *reliquiac*, and elsewhere *reinua*, etc.

R for D.

The tendency in the Gipuskoan dialect, especially at San Sebastián, is to turn *d* into *r*, producing no little confusion in the verb. We have seen above the change of *didala* into *dirala*, which might be for *diradela*; of *didazula* into *dirazula*. But, on the other hand, *erocein* of the first edition became rightly *edocein* in 1797 (p. 64).

Z = TZ.

Bask *z* never had the lithping sound of Castilian. It is clear that Irazuzta used the letter with the sound of *tz*. We have seen some proofs of this in the verb-list. Others result from comparing the orthography of the two editions. Thus *eloen* in the first is *eltoen* in the second. *Certzaz*, *conciencia*, *dultoza*, *artzaz*, and *erantzuten* in the first became respectively *cérzaz*, *conciencia*, *dulcoza*, *arraz*, and *eranzuten* in the second. He also used *z* for the sound of *ss* in *miss*.

Feminine Words.

Among the many falsehoods that have been printed about Bask two are refuted by a perusal of this book. The first is that the language has no grammatical genders. To say nothing of the common termination in *sa*, *sha*, *cha*, *xa* still in use in Modern French Bask, as it was in the sixteenth century, to mark the femininity of the noun, like *princess* from *prince* in English, and nothing of the forms of the verb used for thee-and-thou-ing female persons, or of words which can only designate females, such as *ama* = *mother*, we have to note, p. 5 in this catechism, "Espiritu santu agan, Eliza santa Catholica," where *santu* represents *sancto* and *santa* = *sanctam*. The same thing may be seen in M. Ochoa de Capánagas Biscayan Catechism of 1656. However, p. 3, we find *Gurutce santuaren*, the masculine agreeing with the Gipuskoan form of *cruce*, which Leizarraga wrote *erutza*. Capánaga and other writers have also used a masculine and a feminine of *bedincatu*, *bedicatu*, and its other varieties, from *benedictus*, but Irazuzta treats it as a sexless word like the common adjectives.

The Numerals.

The numerals in Bask take the noun in the singular, as in Old English (or modern 'five-pound note,' 'a two-year-old heifer') and German, and in some cases in Gaelic, e.g. 3 to 10 inclusively, as I learned in Kerry. The number replaces the plural. In *Iru gauzataraco* = *for three things* the syllable *ta* is merely euphonic and not a plural sign. One sees the same *eta* = *ta*, p. 33, in *Pazcoa Resurrevicioetan* = *on the feast* (not *feasts*) *of the Resurrection*. The Castilian is *por Pasqua Florida*. One may compare the *ta* in *onetan* = *in this (town)* in the title of Arins book quoted above. *Onen* would do as well if it did not produce confusion with *onen*, the genitive, in the same title. On the other hand, p. 61, *eta* is a plural sign in *Mandamentuetatic* and *Santarenetatic*, and definite to boot. When, however, the noun numbered has to be articulate or determined, it assumes the article in the plural. Thus we find here, p. 3, *iru Gurutce* = *three Cross(es)*; p. 13, *lau gauza* = *four thing(s)*; but, p. 10, *Iru Personetatic cein* . . . ? = *of the three Persons which* . . . ?; p. 35, *Leenengo bastao* = *the five first*; *Beste biac* = *the two other(s)*; p. 54, *iru Personaoc* = *the three Persons*; and p. 57, twice, *iru persona Divinoac* = *the three Divine Persons*.

Bi suffixed.

It is to be observed that the number *bi* = *two* is used at least once postpositively, like *bat* = *one*, e.g., p. 62, *persona bi* = *two person(s)*, and this seems to be the right arrangement. But elsewhere we have, p. 50, *bi tempora* = *two time(s)*, and, p. 54, *bi naturala* = *two nature(s)*.

Plural for Singular.

P. 34, *goseao dagoanari*, literally *to him or her who remains the hungries*, i.e. *to him or her who is hungry*; and *egarriao dagoanari*, literally *to him (or her) who stays (or is) the thirsties*, is a curious case of the use of the plural for the singular. It reminds one of *sintzurraekin*, literally *to do the throats*, i.e. *to cut the throat*, in d'Urtes Genesis, c. xxii, v. 10. Can *goseak* and *egarriak* be the active case, ruling *held by* understood? On pp. 47, 48, one has "justiciaren gosea, eta egarria duenac," i.e. "those who have the hunger, and the thirst," where *gosea* and *egarria* are substantives.

Singular for Plural.

The contrary use of the singular for the plural is in the quantitative and interrogative pronouns, e.g., *cer etsay* = *what enemy*, *dirade* are, *orioe* ? these? *Cein dirade* ? = *what are they* ? not *ceinac*. *Cer gauza dirado Articulo Fedecao* ? *The Articles of the Faith, what thing are they* ? i.e. *What thing (not gauzao) are the Articles of the Faith* ? *Cer gauza da Fedea* ? *What thing is the Faith* ? *Cembat gauza* (not *gauzao*) *bear dirado* . . . ? *How many thing(s) are needed* ? This is on the same principle as the use of the numbers. *Cembat temporu bear da* ? = *How much time is necessary* ? *Cembat* ? = *how many, how much* ? is analytically *what one, or a what* ? from *cein* = *what* and *bat* = *one, an, a*. *Ditu* requires its accusative to be plural, yet in *Cembat vorondate ditu Christoc* ? *How many will(s) hath Christ* ? the object is singular in form as much as if it were *bi vorondate* = *two will(s)*. *Cer parte ditu Penitenciao* ? = *What part(s) hath Penance* ? shows a similar idiom with the simple interrogative pronoun.

Latin Loan-words.

It is always interesting to know how Latin words have fared after entering the service of Bask.¹ In Irazuzta we find *Corputz*, from *Corpus*, now written *Gorputz* ;² *Tempora*, from Latin, but used as a singular, now written *dembora*, as it already was in some places in the 1797 edition. *Gauza* had already replaced *causa* in 1742, and is by Irazuzta always written without the loss of its final *a*, e.g. *gauza bat* = *a thing*, *gauza gustiena* = *that of all things*. Yet some foolish writers have lately curtailed it into *gauz*, as if the *a* were the removeable article.

Narru Gorria.

As might be expected in a Catechism, there are few idiomatic expressions to be noted. Yet one might say much about *narru gorrian* on p. 34. It means literally *in the red skin* (*larru* being a variant of *narru*, like *luncheon* for *nuncheon*), i.e. *stark naked, en cueros*. *Gorri* = *red* (or *red-hot*) in Bask is almost as rich in its applications as *blue* in English.

N.B.—The Trinitarian Bible Society, 25, New Oxford Street, London, W.C., will probably publish a correcter and far cheaper reprint of Leizarragas Bask New Testament, for popular use and in pocketable form. That of Doctor H. Schuchardt and Herr T. Linschmann reproduces all the misprints of the original and adds a few others: e.g., Matt. xxvi, 18, *e do-* for *edo-*; Acts, iv, 8, *hetherio*, for *betherio*, and, in the heading of the preparation for Communion, *reeebitu* for *recobitu*.

As a specimen of good modern Biscayan prose, the *Esaldiao* or Sermons, by Andres Iturzaeta, curate of Ochandiano, published in two volumes in 1900 by F. Elosu, at Durango, must be mentioned. They deserve sincere praise.

¹ See a brochure of ten pages by Don Mignel de Unamuno, entitled "Del elemento alienigena en el idioma vasco," where the *etymon* of *ean, chun* from *centum*, which I gave him at Bermeo in 1887, is reproduced as if it were his own. I proposed to him *centum* = *kentum, kendum, kenum, hennum, ennum, emmun, emun, chun, eun*.

² Some busybodies have said that this word is only used of corpses or dead bodies, and is derived from *gorpu* = *body* and *utz* = *empty* ! *Gorpu* is indeed a very empty body, a more ill *ghost-word*, as Professor W. W. Skeat would say.

The Lords Prayer was rendered thus, on p. 1, by Arin in 1713:—

PATER-NOSTERRA.

Math. c. 6, d v. 9, usque ad 13. It. Luc. c. 11, d v. 2, usque ad 5
Aita geurea, Ceruetan zaudena: santificatua izan bidi ceure icena. Betor ceure reinua gugana. Eguin bidi ceure vorondatea, nola Ceruan, à la lurrean. Eman eguiguzu egun gucuren egunoroco oguia. Eta barcatu eguizeutzu gueurē zorrac, gueuc gueren zordunai barcatzen diegun becela. Eta tentacioan erorten eutzi ez gaizatzula. Baicican libra gaitzatzu gaitcetic, Amen.

And by Irazuzta:—

In 1742.

Pater nosterra.

Aita gurea, Ceruetan zaudena: santificatua izambidi zure icena. Betor gugana zurereinua. Eguimbidi zure vorondatea, nola Ceruan, ala lurrean. Eman eguiguzu egun gueren egun eroco oguia. Eta barcatu eguizeutzu gure zorrac, gue gueren zordun ai barcatzen diuztegun bezela. Eta ez gaitzatzula utci tentacioan erorten: baicican libra gaitzatzu gaitcetic. Amen Jesus.

In 1797.

Pater Nosterra.

Aita gurea, Ceruetan zaudena: santificatua izan bidi zure icena: betor gugana zure Reinua: eguin bidi zure vorondatea, nola Ceruan, alá lurrean: egun iguzu gure eguneroco oguia: eta barca guizquigutzu gure zorrac, gue gure zordunai barcatzen diegun becela: eta ez gaitzatzula utci tentacioan erorten: baicican libra gaitzatzu gaitcetic. Amen Jesus.

The hybrid *Pater nosterra*, inherited from Capánaga, was duly altered in 1797 into *Aita gurea* = *the Our Father* on pp. 13, 21, where the Prayer is referred to.

One cannot study a Catechism for linguistic purposes without noticing what is, and what is not, taught therein. In this book, as in all earlier Bask Catechisms, all forbidding of bull-fights, or human fights and wars, and other forms of barbarism and cruelty, or the circulating false coins, is as absent as any mention of the Papal Opinion about the Conception of St. Mary the Virgin. It is true that in the *Maria Santissimaren Letania*, which concludes the book, the invocation "Mater Immaculata, Ora," was inserted in 1797 after "Mater Intemerata." But *immaculata* there may describe merely the post-natal state of the Holy Mother. On p. 10 Irazuzta put the Query and Reply, "*What is the signal of*

the Christian? The Holy Cross." On p. 21 the Basks were taught—" *I ask.* Who is the Holy Father? *I answer.* He is the Supreme Pontiff of Rome, Christs Vicar on earth, to whom these-all (of us) we remain obliged to obeying." The words *Sumo Pontifice Erromacoa* were left out as superfluous in 1797. It would be well if the Pope would add in all catechisms, after the Commandments of the Church, the "New Commandment" of his Lord, *ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους*. It might assume this anagrammatical form in those for English-speakers:—

"In what does *Christianity* consist? '*Tis in Charity!*'"

"What is there in *Christianity*? *Charity's in it!*"

CHRISTIANI † III SINT CARI.

P.S.—In the Index to these "TRANSACTIONS" for the year 1898 the following corrections must be made:—

P. 544, l. 8. For "Eire-land, Basque, its national tongue," read "Eireland, Bask mentioned in a book on its national tongue." I did not say that Bask was, though it may have been, the tongue of Iberian Hibernia or *Eire*.

P. 544, l. 31. For "504" read "505."

P. 545, l. 23. For "Leizarruga's" read "Dodgsons."

P. 545, l. 33. For "Ireland, national tongue of a Basque," which makes no sense at all, read "Eireland, the national tongue of."

P. 546, l. 20. For "504" read "505."

In my article in the same volume I asked, "What is to become of the Prince's Bask books?" I am permitted by their owners, Messrs. Harvey Preen and T. J. Garlick, of 17, Basinghall Street, London, E.C., to state that they do not wish to separate them from the rest of the collection. They desire to sell this as a whole. Their price is £4,500. The Library lies useless in a store-room. Will no wealthy friend of Linguistic Science redeem it from this sad entombment, and present it to the British Museum or some English University? Prince L. L. Bonaparte is meant.

With the change of *Ipuscoa* (as it was written 300 years ago) into *Gipuskoa*, compare *Gurumea*, now *Urumea* the river at Donostia, and *Gibaya* a river in the Province of Santander, evidently an old form of modern Bask *ibaya* = *the river*.

The name of San Sebastián, the modern capital of Gipuskoa, is *Donostia* in modern Bask, from *Dominus* (used in Bask in the sense of *Saint*) and a contraction of Sebastián, the name of the patron. In the "Acts of the Privy Council of England" for 1542-47, the town is called "S. Sebastians," and "Saynt Sebastians." Peter Heylyn, in his ΜΙΚΡΟΚΟΣΜΟΣ (Oxford, 1625), also has, p. 54, "Saint Sebastians." Here the final *s* represents a genitive, and implies *town* to complete the sense. This shows that St. Palais, in French Baskland, took its name from St. Palai = Pelayo, when the English occupied that part of Aquitaine. Heylyn, in his *Cosmographie* (London, 1652), p. 221, has "S. Sebastians (Don Bastia as the vulgar call it)." In *Les Delices de l'Espagne & du Portugal* . . . par Don J. Alvarez de Colmenar (à Leide, 1707), p. 80, there is an engraving of the town, and another in his *Annales* (Amsterdam, 1741). King Charles II of England visited it in 1659. See *Revolutions d'Angleterre*, par M. de Bordeaux (Paris, 1670), p. 190.

Rimes in Labourdin Bask written at Elche on the eve of the total eclipse of the sun, 27th May, 1900 :—

<i>Hilabetez hilla</i>	Monthly to be dead
<i>Oi da Hilargia ;</i>	The Mouth-light is wont ;
<i>Hoztatu duena</i>	The Sun is indeed
<i>Baita Eguskia.</i>	That which hath chilled her !
<i>Ta du Eguskia</i>	And doth Mortification
<i>Hildurak betetzen,</i>	Fill the Sun,
<i>Noizeta, hark duena</i>	Whenever, that which
<i>Argitzen, arkitzen</i>	He doth enlighten, find
<i>Duen Artetkoa</i>	He doth in the Way between
<i>Bere ta Lurraren ;</i>	Himself and the Earth ;
<i>Mariaz Orrilla</i>	The Leaf-Month (<i>May</i>) with Mary
<i>Asi eta askenzen ?</i>	Begun and ending ?
<i>Mariaren gatik</i>	(<i>No ! 't was</i>) for Marys sake
<i>Hil zan Eguskia ;</i>	The Sun did die ;
<i>Hilargia gatik</i>	For the Moons sake
<i>Egin du Corona.</i>	He hath made the Corona !
<i>Cristo Ianna Bera</i>	Christ the Lord Himself
<i>Illun du Mariak !</i>	Hath been darkened by Mary !
<i>Gizonak duena</i>	That which Man hath
<i>Izartu du Iauak !</i>	The Lord hath bestarred !

EDWARD SPENCER DODGSON.

An offprint of 150 copies from the TRANSACTIONS OF THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY, February 22, 1901.

STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, PRINTERS, HERTFORD.

VENOMS ANTIDOTE :

BEING A REPLY TO DOCTOR SCHUCHARDTS CRITICISM ON MY LEIÇARRAGAN STUDIES.

N.B.—In this essay *S.* means Dr. H. Schuchardt of Graz ; *C.* = J. Calvin ; *L.* = J. Leiçarraga.

DR. SCHUCHARDT, in his Introduction to his reprint of Leiçarragas Books, publishes some remarks affecting some little works of my own concerning the Bask New Testament of 1571. They are most *unfair*. They would have been more legitimate if they had been published in some *Revue* or *Zeitschrift*, as my own essays were. But he has placed them where they will meet the eyes of all who read any surviving copy of his edition of that book for centuries to come ; and, though he gives references to the publications in which my real or supposed blunders are to be found, he has not taken the precaution to quote the context in those places where my own interpretation is criticized ; and yet his readers cannot criticize him without referring to such context. Many of them will, no doubt, accept his *dogmata* as infallible, and look no further into the question. In the other places I am referred to as if I were the printer, the actual compositor of my contributions to the four forane reviews which published them for me. The blame which belongs to their printers is thrown upon me as author. S. shudders, I hope, as much as I do at all misprints, especially when they mar his own work. He gives us a list of those which he had detected in his reprint of L.'s books before it came out. But those who compare this with the original edition will enlarge the list. It is a tedious business. But here are the details of my defense against this ungracious attack. The pages in italic are those of S.

On pp. xii and xiii he refers to my work on St. Peters Epistles, written when I was a mere *tiro* in Bask. I much regretted its too hasty publication, and wondered how the Editor of the *Revue de Linguistique*, where it appeared (*Tomes* xxiii and xxiv), allowed so many blunders to pass without warning me or my readers. I had two proofs to correct for the second part of it,

pp. 262-277; but only one for the others. The third part (pp. 43-48 of *Tome xxiv*) was meant to correct some of my own mistakes and those of the printer. But the editor himself states there that he did not publish the whole of it: and a supplementary *corrigenda* which I sent in was altogether rejected. Otherwise S. would have seen that the corrections, which he has correctly made, had been anticipated by myself. If he visits *El Ateneo* in Barcelona, he will find my own copy of those *tomos*, corrected with my own hand in the places which justly excited his sharp dissent.

As for *R. de L.*, t. xxiv, p. 46, the line 10, "pour "emendamentara" lisez "emendamentura," contains a misprint in the final word. It should be "emendamendutara." Anyone knowing the original and turning to t. xxiii, p. 178, can see that what I was trying to correct was the printing of the word in *italic*, which was a caprice of the compositor. I never doubted that "emendamendutara" was the correct form of the word. Dr. S. is disingenuous here, or extraordinarily stupid!

On p. 48 of t. xxiv of *R. de L.* the reader finds "*ohoritzaque*." As for *ohoritzaque* (p. xiii), S. or his printer puts it all in italic. Yet a glance at the place where this correction was meant to be made, shows that what I sent to the printer was *ohoraitzaque*. In jumping from Roman (*steilschrift*) to cursive (*schrägschrift*) the compositor left out the a.

In t. xxv of *R. de L.*, p. 165, the editor took the liberty, without consulting me, of ordering his printer to change my words "as beautiful as can possibly be" into "more beautiful than," etc., completely spoiling the idiomatic force of the Souletin *ecin haboro eger*. He has twice rejected my request that his readers should be told that the disorder of the quotations under *guten* in t. xxxii, pp. 254-257, did not exist in the proof which I corrected. It is an extreme case of the mischievousness of printers devils.

On p. xii we are told "In der 'Euskara' hat auch E. S. Dodgson selbst verschiedene Stücke abgedruckt." I deny that! My share in the publication referred to was to send to the German editor a copy of the text, and to correct in presence of the original the proof which I received from him. I did not *abdrucken* the articles or set up the type of the *Euskara* paper. I never went to Berlin until 1899. I much regret not having learnt the art of typography. The corrections made by S. in this case also are correct. But he would see that I had marked them years ago on my own copy of *Euskara*: and

Herr T. Linschmann, his colleague, who was then the sub-editor thereof, will recollect my sending him a *corrigé* for the *corrigenda* which he never returned or published. Misprints will occur, even in *corrigenda*. They are the painful purgatory of all authors; but are as inevitable as the *purgatorio* which is the plague of travellers in Spain.

S. refers, p. xii, to the misprints with which the *Euskalerrria* review at San Sebastián in Spain disgraced my copy of one of L.'s appendices. The copy when it left my hands was quite correct. I sent a list of corrections to the editor. He did not publish them. Everyone knows that the *Euskalerrria* (= *Bask-land*) is by no means a careful or scientific *Revista*. It has done much harm to Bask by publishing pieces in that tongue ungrammatically written, incorrectly spelt, and devoid of literary merit, to say nothing of imperfect translations and its apparent preference for Castilian. No doubt its Editor, who inhabits the Angels house, thought to do good service to Catholicism by making the work of a Protestant look incorrect. I sent him about the same time a copy of L.'s *Advertimendua*. It was neither published nor returned.

On p. lxxviii, S. asserts that I assume that L. stuck exclusively to the French text of J. Calvin in making his version. I have never said anything more conclusive or exclusive on the point than this, that as a general rule he clings to it most faithfully. He certainly does! and to such an extent that certain misprints and the use of italic are directly transferred from the French to the Bask. But a perusal of my notes to the published and unpublished parts of my long work on the Leizarragan verb will convince any lover of the truth that I have neglected nothing which tends to show that L. was no slavish, blind follower of C., who died seven years before this Bask classic came out. I have in a good many places referred to the Greek and Latin texts which I think he consulted. The Basks are fanatically Catholic, almost disagreeably religious, and detest C. as much as all loyal monarchists hate Oliver Cromwell, but with less cause. For that reason they are inclined to underrate the great literary merit of L. So strong is this feeling that one of the most learned Bask priests, Canon Inchauspe, the well-known author, while most kindly replying to my numerous questions concerning *Testamentu Berrria*, refused to accept the dedication of one of the parts of my work on the verb used therein, because it was Calvinian! It was partly to combat that prejudice, which confounds grammar with religion,

that I have sought to magnify any discrepancies that can be found between the French of C. and the Bask of L.

S. does not seem to have seen this, for he quotes my notes on 1 John, ii, 25; iii, 1; and v, 10, which I inserted on purpose to show L.'s infidelity to or independence of C., as if they were an argument against myself. No! they were put there as exceptions to prove the rule. And S., while seeking to wound me, finds himself caught in my own camp!

Upon my note on 1 John, iii, 1, S. says, "Ebenso verhält es sich Joh. 1, iii, 1 (422¹), wo nach Dodgson a. a. O. S. 24 L. 'infidèle' ist, wegen *ezgaitu*; vgl. *ἡμᾶς, nos: vous* (Luther: *euch*)." It is possible that many readers of the introduction, where these words occur, will find them as unintelligible as they appear here, completely separated from their context; and that someone will doubt if S. knows that *vous* and *euch* do not translate *ἡμᾶς* and *nos*! Here, again, if the readers do not know the difference between *ezgaitu* and *etzaitu*, and do not consult the texts of C. and L., and my brochure on St. Johns Epistles (1893) with quotations therefrom, they will perhaps think I am responsible for the obscurity of S. Let Luther and C. say *euch* and *vous*! L. translated *ἡμᾶς* and *nos*. And that is what my note says clearly. S. has not removed the need of it.

Again, as to my note on p. 6 of my work on the Epistles to St. Timothy (1895), S. by his comment shows that it was quite in its place. On p. 7 of the same I say "(*s'amusans* ne traduit pas *behatzen*)." S. says that this shows that I am not familiar with the French of the sixteenth century. But I put it there to show that I was; and to warn Bask readers that three centuries have made a difference in their language as well as in French. No Bask would now, in the twentieth century, translate modern *s'amusans* by *behatzen*, or modern *behatzen* by *s'amusans*. *Experientia docet!* In view of my remarks on *eztitecen beha*, pp. 39 and 53, S. had no right to accuse me of not knowing that *s'amuser* used to mean the opposite of modern *amusement*.

On p. 14 of the same work I say that Leizarraga does not translate *l'usage* in the summary of 2 Tim. iii. His word is *probetohua*, which, as anyone can see, is Castilian *provecho* with the Bask article *a = the*; just as *ephantohua = the hindrance, the obstacle*, is from Castilian *empacho*. I was not ignorant of the fact that *usage* may bear the usurers sense of *profit*. But that is not its usual sense in C.'s New

Testament. I think the word will be found there in some places where L. has not rendered it by *probetchu*, but by some such word as *ussanza* or *ussaya*, as in modern Bask. A modern Bask would not translate *probetchu* by *usage*, though he might take it to mean *pauvret*. L. did not translate the body or outward form of *l'usage*, but rendered its particular sense in this place more precise by putting *probetohua* for the soul of it. *Ussaya, ussanza*, would have been word for word, but would have deceived the Bask reader. *Usage* may have a bad sense. But *probetchu* to a Bask is good. Moreover, in the verse 16, to which the summary directs attention, C. has *profitable*, and L. has the unprofitable word *probetehable*, which has no need or right to pass into *usage*. L. saw *l'usage* in the summary; but he saw *profitable* in v. 16, and showed good taste in profiting by its presence to justify the rejection of an ambiguous *usage*. I read that part of C.'s text carefully while preparing my Concordance to "Timothy," and that fact alone shows what I meant in saying "L. ne traduit pas *l'usage*." My note was not explicit enough for S.; but he had no right to base on it an accusation that I am unfamiliar with the usages of sixteenth-century French; though I have not studied it, probably, so thoroughly as he has. Here also I was trying to convince Bask readers that they must be prepared to sever L. from their prejudice against C.

On p. lxxix S. says that I misunderstand Bask *akió* because on p. 5 of my book on Timothy, in quoting 1, iv, 13, "*aqiú iracurtzeari*," and its equivalent in the French, "*sois attentif à la lecture*," I say "(on a omis attentif dans le Basque)." S.'s note on this note seems to imply that he thinks I meant to accuse the Bask translator, or his printer, of a fault, of unduly leaving something out; and proceeds to say, what is perfectly obvious, and what was the very point of my note, that "*aqiú* ist so viel wie *sois attentif, attends, πρόσεχε* (vgl. *sei drauf aus*)." One really feels obliged to say, "Go for Dr. S.! be at him! set upon him! but dont pay attention to him!" The two other quotations containing *aqiú* on the same page of my book show clearly that the essential meaning of *aqiú* is "be thou to it," and that it need not, and cannot, always mean that which I meant to point out that it does mean, by an *elleipsis*, in this particular place. Anyone seeing "*aqiú*" translating "*sois attentif à*," and knowing that the proper meaning of it is "*sois à*," can see that the Bask translates *attentif* by dropping

it. My note says that! S's comment thereon says the same! But how many of those who read the latter will see the former? Hence my charge of disingenuousness against S. My reply to him is therefore: "iarreiqui aquió iustitiani = pourchasse justice" (2 Tim. ii, 22). My works on the Epistles of St. John and those of St. Paul to St. Timothy appeared in the *Notes de la Société Philologique* at Paris, *Tomes xxii and xxv*, and in an offprint therefrom of fifty copies; and are to be found in the British Museum. I take this opportunity of requesting that on p. 21 of the work on St. John these words may be added at the bottom: "1, i, 1, . . . , ENÇUN *ghan duguna*, gure beguiez IKUSSI *ghan duguna*, CONTEMPLATU *ghan duguna*, . . . , ce que nous auons ouy, ce que nous auons veu de nos yeux, ce que nous auons contemplé." They are parts, each complete in itself, of a work meant to embrace the whole of the Leizarragan verb, and to enable the beginner, if he can but read French (which I chose as likely to attract a wider range of readers in France and Spain, between which contries the Basks find themselves wedged in and cut in twain, than my native English), to dispense with imperfect grammars and dictionaries such as those of Van Eys, and see for himself why L. translated C. as he did, and what and how many forms of the verb he used in doing so, and where and how many times each of these may be seen at work. The longest part that has appeared is now in very slow course of publication in the *Revue de Linguistique* at Paris. I have unfortunately been allowed only one proof to correct before publication. This has also been read and assailed by S.

He says, p. lxxxiv, that on p. 70 of t. xxxii I gave a false definition of *cituan*. He is right. I am not incapable (surely this is the right, as it was the old spelling, to keep the cap in captivity) of making mistakes any more than S. But, as I distinctly say it is masculine, it is from sheer bad faith that he says I took it for *cituen*! I thought of Gipuskoan *cituan*. I thought of the forms in J. P. Dartayetas useful "Guide ou Manuel" (three editions, at Bayonne), *citizean*, *citian*, *cituoan*, and *cituyan*. No doubt L. used here an old form of *cituyan*, unless his printer erred. The correction shall be made by reading *substantif* for *possessif* in the definition, and the suppression of the note about *ciraden* and *ordara*, which was not the point. I thank S. for that real correction. On p. 29 of *R. de L.*, t. xxxi, I said that in St. Mark, ix, 43, the : before *gehennara* was a mistake on the part of Haultin, or Hautin, who printed L.'s books, and I referred to vv. 47 and

48 of the same chapter and on the same page, to prove my assertion. Anyone can see that my accusation is right; for, if the : were necessary in that place in v. 43, it surely would be equally so in the others where the same phrase is repeated (the intervention of *suco* in v. 47 not affecting the sense). Yet what does S. say on pp. cvi and cvii of his *einleitung*? He wilfully misunderstands me, and speaks as if I were referring to the punctuation between *hura* and *hobe*, which happen to stand next to one another in each of the three verses indicated and justify another note on the printing! I advise no one to send any manuscript to S. without keeping a copy, if he wishes not to be misquoted. He has stated that I have a good knowledge of Bask (it is not perfect, and always slipping back for want of practice and absence from Bask company), and that I might become the *mittelpunkt* for studies which concern it. In 1893 I said in the Introduction to my aforesaid work on St. John, "A new and correcter edition of Leizarraga is absolutely indispensable in order to popularise and elevate Bascollogical studies. Who will pay for it?" In 1895 S. wrote to me to ask if I could myself defray the cost of a new edition of L. The Imperial Academy of Sciences at Vienna deserves the warmest thanks of all scholars for providing the funds needed for that laudable undertaking. Progress in Bask is only possible by going backward. In spite of his crooked method of warfare, I am much bounden to S. for calling the attention of his readers to my essays on Leizarragas Bask. However little they satisfy myself, I meant them to serve to stimulate intelligent examination of so splendid and interesting a model; and scholars like Dr. G. Sauerwein, of Banteln, Hannover, and Professor E. Picot, of Paris, have testified to their usefulness. S. has stated that "it is not to his interest" that I should publish any more of them! For this compliment much thanks!

EDWARD SPENCER DODGSON.

London, Candlemas Day, 1901.

I take this opportunity of thanking Mr. W. J. Van Eys for giving me a copy of his "Bibliographie des Bibles et des Nouveaux Testaments en Langue Francaise des XV^{me} et XVI^{me} Siècles, par W. J. Van Eys" (Genève, 1900). It serves as a guide to some editions on which Leizarraga based his translation. I have also to thank Mrs. Bywater, the wife of the Professor of Greek at Oxford, for a copy of the reprint of Leizarraga; and Dr. E. W. Bullinger, for a copy of Calvin's French Bible printed at Amsterdam in 1635.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY,
146, Queen Victoria Street, London, E. C.

MY DEAR MR. DODGSON,—Lest I should miss you when you call at the Bible Society I write these few lines for you. I am greatly interested in this literary work in connection with the Bible which you have undertaken, but I must at once say that it is the kind of work that the Society would not undertake. Their business is the publication of the Scriptures without note or comment, and anything beyond this would, in accordance with their fundamental laws, be a misappropriation of the funds entrusted to them. It is surely possible, however, to have this most important work published. It is not the kind of work that will pay directly, but in the sum-total of knowledge indirectly. And there is one man on my sub-committee, namely Dr. Cust, who has a great deal of influence with several learned societies in London, and, if you wish, I will support in the strongest manner any proposal you may make for its publication. Dr. Cust is at present at Felixstow, in Suffolk, but I shall be very glad to forward any letter you may address to him, with a covering letter from myself. So very few patient labourers are working out-of-the-way questions like those to which you are devoting so much labour, that it cannot be but some means will be found for the publication of what you have devoted so much labour to produce. Believe me, dear Mr. Dodgson, yours very truly,

W. WRIGHT.

August 20, 1897.

M. E. Picot, the well-known Polyglot, wrote to me with reference to "Le Verbe Basque Trouvé et Défini dans l'Épître de St. Jacques"¹: "J'ai eu le plaisir de recevoir la suite de votre *Verbe Basque*. C'est à vous que je dois maintenant de connaître quelques mots Euscariens."

Dr. Sauerwein wrote to me, November 30, 1899, from Burg in Spreewald, where I had shortly before met him and begun to learn Wendish: "Dear Sir,—I have looked through your interesting little grammatical dictionary, as one might call it. It would almost seem desirable that you should have amplified it, so as not merely to embrace all the verbal forms of one translation, but so far as possible all occurring in the language. Still, even limited as it is, it is a valuable means, to a beginner, of mastering many, at first sight, frightening 'impossibles.' How anyone could purposely refuse acceptance of such an useful 'jauna' (Latin), kindly presented by a learned 'jauna' (Basque), seems inconceivable.² How those dear people disfigure their language with foreign additions! For them a little scion of our purism, growing far too exuberantly in Germany, might be desirable and useful."

¹ Published July 2, 1899. It analyzes 151 forms of the verb. There are 200 copies of it, and some still on sale.

² The Librarian of the University of Göttingen had refused to accept it as a gift to the library under his charge. I have to thank eleven other librarians in Germany for buying it.

150 copies privately printed, February 22, 1901.

STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, PRINTERS, HERTFORD.

