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TRANSLATOR’S PREFACE

The article by Luis Michelena (Mitxelena) offered here in English translation was originally published in Basque as «Egunak eta egun izenak» in a Basque journal of anthropology and archeology, Munibe, 23 (1971, p. 583-591) (now available online at http://www.aranzadi.eus/fileadmin/docs/Munibe/1971583591.pdf), in an issue that contains a collection of papers written in honor of the Basque ethnologist J. M. Barandiaran on the occasion of his 80th birthday. The article has been reprinted several times, most recently in 2011, in volume VIII of the compilation of all of Michelena’s work (Luis Michelena, Obras Completas) undertaken by J. A. Lakarra and I. Ruiz Arzalluz. This paper is a classic demonstration of Michelena’s etymological savoir faire. By publishing this English translation now, we hope to make Michelena’s work more accessible to a wider readership.

Although I have tried to be faithful to the original text, I have also felt that my work as a translator included making the text intelligible in a different context, for a very different audience than the originally intended one. Michelena wrote the paper in Basque for a readership of specialists in the Basque language. For his readers, mentioning, for instance, that Father Izagirre recorded a certain form in Altsasu might have been enough to identify the source. Similarly, for this specialized readership, «Cap., Mic., Añib., etc.» and the like might have been meaningful without further details. Some missing details in the references were provided by the editors of the Obras Completas. For the many remaining incomplete references, I have endeavored to find the relevant information to the best of my ability. Following modern practice, all bibliographical references, which Michelena provided in footnotes, often in abbreviated form, have been moved to the end of the paper and are cited in the text of this translation in the name and year (and page) format that will be familiar to readers. In those instances where Michelena gave only the name of the author, without identifying the specific work, I have placed the year (and page numbers if they were missing) in square brackets in the text, e.g. «Izagirre [1967]». If the work was uniquely identified in Michelena’s text, I have not used any special formatting.
to distinguish publication details that were missing and that I have added. Other minor additions that I have made for greater clarity are also enclosed within brackets.

Another liberty that I have taken in this translation has to do with formatting. In the original, Michelena quotes whole sentences in Basque from other sources within the same paragraph. In order to facilitate parsing, and to enable readers who do not know Basque to better appreciate the points that Michelena intended to make, I have added space before and after such examples (with their English gloss) and have highlighted relevant words by bolding or italics, except when such quotes appear in the footnotes, where this would have been impractical.

In addition, I have added clarificatory information in footnotes when it has seemed to me that readers would benefit from some guidance. The text in these added footnotes is preceded by the abbreviation ‘TN’ (Translator’s Note). Some of these footnotes include references to work that appeared after Michelena’s article was published or even after his death. These works are identified in the references at the end by being enclosed within brackets. I want to thank Julen Manterola for his help in tracking down a couple of elusive references and Joseba Lakarra for carefully checking the translation against the original, clarifying for me the meaning of certain sentences within the context in which the original text was written, and answering my questions regarding editions and scholarship. I am also thankful to Begoña Echeverria and Joyce Tolliver for corrections and comments on the translation.

Luis Michelena

DAYS AND NAMES OF DAYS

1. There are some areas of study with which both ethnologists and linguists have been concerned for a long time. Given the fact that every language is the main conveyor and manifestation of a culture, or, in other words, of a people, it provides evidence for its past stages and it is in some ways a mirror, sometimes clear, often blurry, of the culture of the people who speak it. And, because, like an avaricious man or a thieving magpie, it is fiercely attached to the riches that it has gathered here and there, it is oftentimes the only witness to history. Its testimony, however, is not always, perhaps not most of the time, loud and clear; but, rather, something like a barely visible footprint or the sound of a clapperless cowbell. The linguist must thus labor from both sides: on the one hand, from the side of things (and «things» here are not only those that can be seen and touched, but also the collection of all socially created and transmitted traditions); on the other, from the side of the words themselves.

1 TN. The article is signed Luis Mitxelena, which is the spelling the author used when writing in Basque. When he wrote in Spanish or French or his work was published in English translation, however, he signed Michelena.

2 TN. Michelena is making a reference here to the Wörter und Sachen or ‘words and things’ approach to etymology.
A linguist, it should be obvious, cannot leave the «things» aside, being concerned solely with words. Nevertheless, the words themselves are for linguists their special and chosen guide, since that is their profession. A linguist knows that the light that words shed is oftentimes faint and weak, but also that not even the faintest light can be ignored in areas where we walk so much in the dark.

A language’s light scatters more widely when close and distant relatives are found, as happens in some language families. We Basques don’t have anything of the sort, as we are still alone, regarding relatives and family, in spite of many efforts. A long-written history can compensate in part for that lack, but we have had no luck in this regard either. It would appear that, old as we are as a people, we were born yesterday with respect to the history of the language.

2. The issue that I would like to discuss here concerns the Basque word egun ‘day’. Not the word egun itself, which is an orphan with no known parents, but other words that are related to egun ‘day’ in their meaning or in their form.

Etymology, in any language, has clear limits, which define wider or narrower domains. The boundaries of Basque etymology, because of the linguistic isolation we have just mentioned, are even narrower than those of other European languages. Leaving aside «pure Basque words» (that is, those for which nobody has found any other origin yet), we only have two etymological sources: loanwords, especially those that can be explained through Latin and Romance, and those Basque words which Joannes D’Etcheberri of Sara [1712] called moldatuak ['formed or molded'], that is, words created by derivation and compounding from morphemes and other words that can be identified in the Basque language itself.

As I have mentioned elsewhere, the latter class of words are not always obvious to everyone. With the passing of time, they have become opaque. With the years, their original components have merged and there is no clear way to reconstruct the structure that perhaps they once had. We might be able to discover something, to guess what might have happened; hardly, however, will we—or at least I—have the strength to convince someone else beyond all reasonable doubt. In this article, then, I will deal with what might have been, rather than with what necessarily was. And this is so by absolute necessity, not because it is my wish. There may be judges who could decide on these issues; this could happen if older texts are found. However, whether such texts might be found or when they may arrive to us is not something that we can know. The last word, then, must be left to a future time.

3 To find out what one can do in the case of the Indo-European languages, readers may consult Benveniste (1969), which is the most recent book and not the weakest.
4 See Michela (1969). If I mention my own work here, it is not because I am the only iustus iudex, which I am not, but because it would be redundant and tiresome to repeat here what I have explained at length before.
3. Let us start with the word for ‘Thursday’. In Bizkaia, the most widespread word for that meaning is *eguen*. As Barandiaran has pointed out repeatedly, the Bizkaian dialect is quite distinct regarding the names of the days of the week, among other things (Barandiaran, 1934, p. 79, 1953, p. 171, 1960, p. 121).

Nevertheless, *eguen* is not the only form that the word for ‘Thursday’ takes in the western area. There is, in addition, *eguun* (in Mungia) and, notably, *eguaun* in eight villages in Álava/Araba (in the area of Zigoitia and in Nafarrate), as shown in the data from the «Triple Questionnaire» (Erizkizundi Irukoitza) published by the Basque Academy (Euskaltzaindia 1926, p. 52). And this is the problem: one could easily derive *eguen* from *eguauin* by sound change; but it would be much harder to derive *eguaun* from *eguen*. Admittedly, *eguaun* could still have developed, if not by regular sound change, by crossing and confusion with something else. But, for that, it would have to be a recent form; and it is not at all recent. Rather, it is the oldest variant of this word that has arrived to us. As a matter of fact, in Landucci’s dictionary, written in 1562, we find *eguaun* and not *eguen* (Landucci, 1562/1958, p. 43, 138).

For that reason, I thought that *eguaun* could be from something like *egu-egun* ‘day of day(s)’, rather than simply *egu-ren* ‘of day(s)’ (FHV, p. 92). If we take what Barandiaran himself says in different places literally, it would seem that the word could be understood either way.

4. It is a common opinion that the Basque names for the days of the week have been transformed in some measure by the influence of the neighboring languages. The western forms *ilen* ‘Monday’ and *marti(t)zen* ‘Tuesday’, for instance, are generally assumed to correspond to Spanish *lunes* and *martes*, respectively. What we need to examine in more detail is what that relationship is exactly.

In Latin and its descendants, as well as in other languages that have been under their influence in the naming of the days the week, we find three distinct patterns. We may have, for instance, Lat. *veneris* ‘of Venus’ by itself (as in Sp. *viernes*), *veneris dies* (as in Fr. *vendredi*), It. *venerdì* or *dies veneris* (as in Cat. *divendres*) (see Tagliavini, 1963, p. 65, Rohlf’s 1960, p. 49 and map 17). Among these three possible structures, the third one would be the most difficult one in Basque, and it is not surprising that we don’t find any traces of it in this language. But the question I would like to ask is this: Can we be sure that in *il-en* ‘Monday’ the ending -en is what it would seem to be, namely the well-known [genitive] suffix -en? Couldn’t it be, instead, even if it is not so obvious, a contraction of the word *egun* ‘day’?

I see two advantages to this new proposal. First of all, it has the support of the above-mentioned *eguen* ‘Thursday’, since it should be clear that the ending of this form

5 TN. *(h)il* ‘month’ < ‘moon’, cf. *ilargi* ‘moon’ (compound of *hil* + *argi* ‘light’).

6 M. Alvar’s additions to the translation of Rohlf’s book are relevant. In the place that we have indicated he quotes Menéndez Pidal (1950, p. 393): «dillunes vivía en la lengua rústica de Salamanca en el siglo XV». 
is a shortening of *egun* ‘day’ (or at least something other than *-en*). Secondly, it is also supported by the western form *martitzen* or *martizen* ‘Tuesday’. If we start from *marti(t)z egun*, we only need one genitive, the one already present in Latin *martis* ‘of Mars’. Otherwise, we would have two suffixes with the same meaning, Lat. *-is* and Bq. *-en*. And, of course, the most economical hypothesis is best regarding these issues. If what I am proposing is correct, or at least comes close to the truth, the words *ilen* and *marti(t)zen* would be analogous to Fr. *lundi* and *mardi*, respectively, not to Sp. *lunes* and *martes*.

5. If we now consider the day before Sunday, its most widespread name in Basque at present is clearly *larunbat*. However, although that is now the most common form of that word, it is not the only one. One of the oldest variants, which, as it happens, comes from the Bizkaian area, can be read in the book *Refranes y Sentencias* (Anonymous, 1596):

```
1 2 3 4
Eguzqui baco laurenbatic ez
4 3 2 1
No ay sabado sin sol
'There is no Saturday without sun'.
(rs, 1596, proverb 159)
```

Similarly, the [18th century] Gipuzkoan writer Ochoa de Arin, discussing issues pertaining to the diocese or bishopric of Iruña-Pamplona (*Iruñeko Obispadua*):

```
Hostirala egunean, edo Laurembat egunean… Obispaduan jan daique escrupulo vague Laurembat egunean, an permititzen den aragui
‘On the day of Friday, or on the day of Saturday… Those of this diocese can eat without scruple in the diocese of Calahorra the meat that is allowed there on the day of Saturday’.  
(Ochoa de Arin, [1713], p. 53)
```

7 The form that Landucci employs, *martiçena*, is clear regarding pronunciation (that is, it has a fricative; it is what we would now write *martizena*), since he otherwise uses *sç* to represent the affricate that we now write *tz*. On the other hand, neither Micoleta’s [1653] *martizena* nor [Ochoa de] Capanaga’s [1656] *Marticensean* ‘on Tuesday’ are unambiguous, since these authors do not distinguish the fricative *z* from the africate *tz* in writing. Añibarro [Bizkaian, 1748-1830] uses only *martizena*, but nowadays the form *martizena* is still alive, at least around Oñati (see Gandiaga, 1956, p. 212). Regarding the word *ilen* ‘Monday’, Landucci’s dictionary is the oldest testimony (*ylena*). The Bilbaoan Micoleta says *lunes*, *ilen* adding ‘y también astelena’. Añibarro also gives *ilen* as Bizkaian, next to *astelena*. See also Euskaltzaindia (1926, p. 52). Azkue (1923, p. 95, fn.) is undecided regarding the origin of *ilen*; whether it is *il* + *len* «primero de la luna» or *il* + *en* «de la luna».

8 TN. The anonymous book *Refranes y Sentencias* (rs) contains a list of Basque proverbs with word-for-word translations into Spanish. In the book, there are numbers on top of the words in both languages indicating the correspondences between the two. In his article, Michelena omitted those numbers, which may create problems in the printing process. I have restored the numbers, for clarity. The proverbs were studied by Julio de Urquijo in a series of articles published in the *Revista Internacional de los Estudios Vascos* and there is a (partial) 1964 edition by Urquijo for which Michelena wrote a preamble. There is also a more recent critical edition by J. Lakarra (1996). The form for ‘Saturday’ cited in the text, *laurenbatic*, contains the partitive suffix *-ikl*. See also Arcocha-Scarcia & Lakarra (2019).
Ubillos [1785], also a Gipuzkoan, seemingly hesitates between two forms: *laurembata, laurembatean* (26, 177, 188 ff.), but also *larembara* (189), *ostiral-larembaratetan* ‘on Friday and Saturday’ (ibid.).

Among Lapurdian writers, we only find *larumbat*, from the very beginning, as in the following examples:

*Bazcotic Trinitateco igandearen aitcineco Larumbataren Completetetaraino*
‘From Easter to the compline of the Saturday before Trinity Sunday’
(Harizmendi, 1901[1658], p. 1)

*Ezteçquela haragui ian aiphatu muguetan / Ez hain guti Orcirale eta Larumbatetan*
‘Do not eat meat within the mentioned dates / neither on Friday and Saturday’.
(Etcheberry of Ziburu, 1627, I, p. 32)

It appears that the oldest attestation of this word, with a somewhat different shape, is that of Leizarraga (1571). This text has been quoted as often as it deserves, since it provides an exemplary explanation of what a translation must be like, at least a translation of the Holy Scripture:

*Sabbathoa, errañ nahi da reposa, eta berehala (= as is, without changing a thing) hitz bera eduqui vkan dugu, ceren Evangelisté Grecquez scribatzean, langoage hartaco ezpazc-en-ere, ezpaitute cambiatu vkan. Eta hura cen asteco cazpigaren eta azquen eguna, oraín batéz larumbate, bercez eguiacotz eta bercéz nesquen egun deitz egun duguna. ‘Sabbath means rest, and we have left it as such, because the Evangelists, writing in Greek, did not change it, even if it was not [a word] of that language. And that was the seventh and last day of the week, which now some call larumbate, others eguiacotz and others nesquen egun’. (Leizarraga, 1571, Decl. a vi. r)\(^\text{10}\)*

We have thus gathered, next to *larun-*, also *lauren-*, *laren-* and *laran-*. Their common source could hardly be *lauren + -bat(e)*. What is it, then? Something like *laur(en)-egun* [where *laur* ‘four’, *lauren* ‘a fourth’]? In any case, one cannot speak with as much certainty as Vinson did: «on ne saurait le traduire autrement que ‘un quart’, c’est-à-dire ‘un quart de la lunaison’» (Vinson, 1910, p. 37)\(^\text{11}\). For it to be ‘a fourth’ or ‘the fourth (day)’, (see, below, in § 9, *laurdenegur(n)* ‘two days before yesterday, three days ago’, lit. ‘the fourth day’), Wednesday would have to be the first day; and counting from the other end,

\(^9\) Cf. «larumbatha, larugardagur» (Deen, 1937, p. 205).

\(^{10}\) TN. This quote is found in Leizarraga’s addendum to his translation of the New Testament, *Testamentu berriko hitz eta minstatzeko manebra dificil bakoitz batzu bere declarationéquin* ‘Some difficult words and ways of speaking in the New Testament, with their explanation’.

it would be Tuesday. Moreover, if Leizarraga is right, as opposed to everybody else, the last part would be -bate and not -bat ‘one’. Let’s keep in mind that the final -e has often been lost in the last member of a compound (FHV, p. 411)\(^\text{12}\). Thus, perhaps, as happens with the names of other time units, we would have here the suffix -te, as in aste ‘week’, urt(h)e ‘year’, mende ‘century, long time’ (in Zuberoan and Roncalese, mente)\(^\text{13}\) and igande (in Zuberoan and Roncalese, igante)\(^\text{14}\). Possibly, i(n)aute-ak ‘Carnival’ could also be added to this list (the variant i(n)aueriak has been lengthened with another suffix).

From a diachronic point of view, no name for a day of the week is more tempting than that given to ‘Friday’ in the western area: bariku (which is the form found in the writings of Capanaga\(^\text{15}\), Micoleta, Añibarro, etc.), but also bariaku, barieku. The geographical reach of this word also extends to Gipuzkoa, around the town of Mutriku (see Euskaltzaindia, 1927, p. 3-30; Agud, 1968). In those regions, there is only one other word that competes with it for territory, especially in Araba and Gipuzkoa: the very old word egu(b)akotx. This word appears in Leizarraga’s (1571) quote given above in § 5, and still endures, at the other end of the Basque Country, although, as we can read in Leizarraga’s quote, there it means ‘Saturday’, not ‘Friday’.

It is clear what the source of this word’s special attraction is. In everyone’s opinion, it is rather new, since it is used only in the west, and like zapatu ‘Saturday’ and domeka ‘Sunday’, which are also found in that region, would seem to have a Christian flavor. Those who have attempted to find a source for it have mentioned, (Grk.-) Lat. paras - ‘Sunday’, which are also found in that region, would seem to have a Christian flavor.

If this word is related to igan ‘to go up’, as has often been suggested, wouldn’t it be a Christian word? Compare Russian voskresén’te now ‘Sunday’ < ‘Easter Sunday’ < ‘Resurrection’. The Russian word that used to mean ‘Sunday’ is now ‘week’: nedélja, literally something like ‘no-work’. One is reminded of Latin surgo / resurgo. Another Basque word for ‘Sunday’ is domeka(eko), used in Bizkaia and neighboring areas. Rohlf’s (1960, p. 47) observation is relevant, in relation to this form: «El griego eclesiástico designa el ‘día del Señor’ (kuriakè: he:méra) con una palabra que tenía género femenino, de donde puede inferirse que se ha dado preferencia a un dies dominica en aquellas partes del mundo romano donde el influjo del griego eclesiástico fue especialmente intenso». That being the case, the Greek influence prevails in Bizkaia, Araba (domequea, in Landucci’s dictionary) and even in areas of Gipuzkoa and NAVarre, as Gorostiaga has pointed out.

These are the forms of the days of the week that I have found in Capanaga’s work: Aste lenean, Marticene-an, Eguaztenean (with -z, like Añibarro!), Egun ketan, Batiquan [sic], Çapatuan, Domecan (135-).

These are the forms of the days of the week that I have found in Capanaga’s work: Aste lenean, Marticene-an, Eguaztenean (with -z, like Añibarro!), Eguaztenean, Batiquan [sic], Çapatuan, Domecan (135-).


12 Interested readers may see or try to figure out on their own what Garate (1949, p. 360, 1957, p. 50) said or was trying to say.

13 In Larrasquet’s [1939] dictionary: mente ‘século’, mentez ‘de tres longitudes’. For Roncalese, see Mendigacha: Egun ketan nago sentimendu pidkor bateki; oragunam ititzitizidan nore mentian adesskiderik andien ekunduana, irian; laundegenen gossan onrzizein ‘These days I am deeply saddened. The best friend I ever had has recently died, in this town; he was buried three days before yesterday in the morning’ (letter of 1903, published in Irigoyen, 1957, p. 127).

14 If this word is related to igan ‘to go up’, as has often been suggested, wouldn’t it be a Christian word? Compare Russian voskresén’tet now ‘Sunday’ < ‘Easter Sunday’ < ‘Resurrection’. The Russian word that used to mean ‘Sunday’ is now ‘week’: nedélja, literally something like ‘no-work’. One is reminded of Latin surgo / resurgo. Another Basque word for ‘Sunday’ is domeka(eko), used in Bizkaia and neighboring areas. Rohlf’s (1960, p. 47) observation is relevant, in relation to this form: «El griego eclesiástico designa el ‘día del Señor’ (kuriakè: he:méra) con una palabra que tenía género femenino, de donde puede inferirse que se ha dado preferencia a un dies dominica en aquellas partes del mundo romano donde el influjo del griego eclesiástico fue especialmente intenso». That being the case, the Greek influence prevails in Bizkaia, Araba (domequea, in Landucci’s dictionary) and even in areas of Gipuzkoa and NAVarre, as Gorostiaga has pointed out.

15 Interested readers may see or try to figure out on their own what Garate (1949, p. 360, 1957, p. 50) said or was trying to say.

16 In Larrasquet’s [1939] dictionary: mente ‘século’, mentez ‘de tres longitudes’. For Roncalese, see Mendigacha: Egun ketan nago sentimendu pidkor bateki; oragunam ititzitizidan nore mentian adesskiderik andien ekunduana, irian; laundegenen gossan onrzizein ‘These days I am deeply saddened. The best friend I ever had has recently died, in this town; he was buried three days before yesterday in the morning’ (letter of 1903, published in Irigoyen, 1957, p. 127).

17 Among others, Vinson (1910, p. 37): «<domeka, etc.... sono des emprunts récents, ainsi que barriaku [sic], qui paraît signifier ‘jour de jeûne, d’abstinence’ et serai ainsi de formation récente».

I will not go into the weaknesses of the various etymologies that have been proposed for this word. It should suffice to consider the form, since a word's sound form is the only way that may lead to the hidden substance it carries. And the proposals that have been made so far explain at most the first part of the word, leaving the ending unexplained. As far as can be ascertained, lat. *Venus, Vener-* has never had a related adjective with an ending -iacus. And, since we are talking about the form, it is clear that we must start from *bariaku*, which is the lectio difficilior, not from *bariku*.

Now, among the names for ‘Friday’ there is one in the Romance area, which is not too widespread, but still sufficiently known, not borrowed, but calqued from Greek: *cena pura* ‘clean, pure supper’ (See Rohlfs, 1960, p. 49; Tagliavini, 1963, p. 106; Wagner, 1957, p. 328). Wouldn’t we be on a better path than those we have been following so far if we started by looking for traces of *afari* ‘supper’ in *bariaku* ‘Friday’ as well?

Even better, we could start from *abari*, which is older than *afari*. The form *abari*, which is still used in Navarre, has been documented at least since the 13th century. In that form, it appears in the [old Navarrese law known as] *Fuero General de Navarra* (see Michelená, 1964). In that form as well, it is found in some lines of text that were written in Pamplona-Iruña around the year 1400 and have been published by Florencio Idoate: *jaunaticula abarion* ‘que Dios os conceda buena cena’ [‘May God grant you a good supper’] (Idoate, 1969).

Let us assume that we have *abari*, the Basque counterpart of lat. *cena*, as a component of *bariaku*. What follows next could hardly be a translation of *pura* or anything of the sort. Even if it requires strong, perhaps too strong, contractions, this is what I would like to propose: *(a)bari ba(ga)ko egun* lat. ‘*dies sine cena*’, that is, ‘day without supper’. From a semantic point of view, there is no difficulty. Most, if not all, researchers who have dealt with this issue have observed that *bariaku* ‘Friday’ is a day of fasting (*barau*).

And this is how Oihenart ([1657], proverb 67) explains what that fasting might have been: *Barurac birur asse* ‘Le ieuze a trois saoulés [Fasting (has) three fillings]’. And as an addendum, he gives the origin of the proverb:

*Hirur asse hauc aditzen dira, barureguneco barascarias, aizineguneco auharias, eta bi-haramuneco ascarias.*

‘c’est à savoir le diner du jour auquel on ieusne; le souper du soir precedent, & le desiuner du lendemain’

19 «originalmente termine del rituale pagano, adottato degli Ebrei per designare la vigilia della Pasqua, come traduzione del greco *deipnon katharón*, e introdotto in Sardegna dagli Ebrei venuti dall’Africa» (Wagner, 1957, p. 328) Additional references can be found there.

20 *TN. jaunak* ‘the Lord-ERG’ *dzula* ‘that 3sg may give’ *abari* ‘supper’ on ‘good’.

21 It is true that later on things have been softened, even if the name and appearances have been preserved. As Capanaga ([1656], p. 58) puts it: *Barauen ganeco agindua... obligazen gaitu... ez iaateco iaagi veledauturic eta egumean bein baxen ian eztira* ‘The command regarding fasting... obliges us... not to eat forbidden foods and not to eat more than once a day’. There is also a question for hungry people: *Zenbait bearlizate gabeco colazioa?* ‘How large should the evening light meal be?’
'That is to say, the midday meal of the day when one fasts; the supper of the preceding evening and the breakfast of the following day'
(Oihenart, 1657, proverb 67)

It is not easy to establish the so-called filière of forms, but we may hypothesize something like this: *(a)baribakoeun* \( ^{22} \) > *(bari)akoun* > *bariakun* > *bariaku* > *bariku*. I will come back to the loss of the final -n, since it is not as surprising as it seems, given the fact that it is not an isolated case. The most difficult point is the lack of the initial a-. In some other languages, word-initial vowels have often been lost when they did not have any support. This is what we find in Albanian (*mik* ‘friend’ < Lat. *amicus*, *mbret* ‘king’ < Lat. *imperator*) and Greek (*máti* ‘eye’, etc.). In other languages, such as Spanish, the loss is more sporadic (*mellizo* ‘twin’ [<*gemellicius*]). In Basque, examples are not rare (dialectal *mazte* < *emazte* ‘woman, wife’, *zaumentu* ‘knowledge’ < *ezagu* ‘to know’, etc.), but are mostly found far from Bizkaia.

7. I once wrote (FHV, p. 355) that, in my opinion, the word *biharamun* ‘the next day’, which appears in the quote from Oihenart mentioned in the previous section, is nothing more than *bihar* ‘tomorrow’ + *egun* ‘day’ in its origin, via something like *-ebun*\(^ {23} \). It is evident that *bihar* ‘tomorrow’ and *biharamun* ‘the next day’ are closely related both in form and in meaning, just like French *demain* and *lendemain*, to mention just one parallel. If that were not enough, here are some examples from Leizarraga’s translation of the New Testament:

\[
\text{Etxaretela bada arthatsu biharamunaz: ecen biharamunac beretaco artha vkanen du.}
\]

\[
\text{Nolite enim solliciti esse in crastinum. Crastinum enim dies sollicitus erit sibi ipsi (Grk. eis tè:n aúrion, he: gár aúrion)}
\]

\[
\text{[Ne soyez donc point en souci du lendemain: car le lendemain se souciera de ce qui le concerne]}
\]

\[
\text{‘Therefore do not worry about tomorrow, for tomorrow will worry about its own things’ (Matthew 6:34)}
\]

\[
\text{\emph{Egun edo bihar ioean gara hiri batetara... Estaquiçueilaric biharamunean cer içanen den}}
\]

\[
\text{Hodie aut crastino (Grk. sé: meron è: aúrion) ibimus in illam ciuitatem... qui ignoratis quid erit in crastino (Grk. tò tè:s aúrion)}
\]

\[\text{22 Of course, even if *baga* ‘without’ was still found in its complete form, *baga* ‘without’ + *ko* ‘of’ had already become *bako* in Bizkaia. See RS: Odol bearbaguea ‘Sangre sin ser necessaria’(208), but \textit{Su baco esea ‘Casa sin fuego’ next to gorpus odol baguea ‘cuerpo sin sangre’} (237), \textit{Gurenda andia odol bacoa ‘Gran vitoria la de sin sangre’} (308), etc.}
\]

\[\text{23 Oihenart ([1847], p. 222) uses the verb *biharamun(du)* ‘to become the following day’, which is not included in either Azkue’s [1905] or Lhande’s [1926] \textit{dictionaries}: \textit{Gaia goisac ordaritan biharamun deçano} ‘jusqu’à ce que le matin, en échange, transforme la nuit en lendemain’ (Lafon’s [1955] French translation).}\]
[allons aujourd’hui et demain en une telle ville,… Qui toutefois ne savez pas ce qui adviendra le lendemain]

‘Today or tomorrow we will go to such and such a city… whereas you do not know what will happen tomorrow’

(James 4:13-14).

The Basque translator, perhaps following the French, had to choose between options that were not differentiated in Latin24.

Just a few years ago, Benveniste [1966] investigated and explained better than anyone else how language deals with time. Language considers two main points in the time axis, which it treats as related to place. One is the moment of speech itself. Exemplifying with the forms in Landucci’s dictionary: orain ‘now’, egun (gaur) ‘today’, aurten ‘this year’ just like euen, ni naguan lequan ‘here, in the place where I am’ vs. orr, y aguan lequan ‘there, in the place where you are’. The second one is the point in time that the speaker chooses as reference in order to narrate something: ‘then’, ‘at that time’, ‘on that day’, ‘in that year’, etc. To see the difference between the two, it is enough for me to remember a difference that is made in the language I learned in childhood. We say datorren urtean or heldu den urtean ‘next year’ [lit. ‘the day that is coming’] if our anchoring point is aurten ‘this year’. But, we say hurrengo urtean ‘the following year’ if we have urte hartan ‘in that year’ as our point of reference in the narrative25. Here are two more contrasting sentences from Leizarraga’s translation of the Gospels:

\[
\text{Baina bide egin behar diat egun eta bihar eta etzi} \\
\text{Veruntatem oportet me hodie, cras et sequenti die ambulare} \\
\text{‘Nevertheless I must journey today, tomorrow, and the day after’} \\
\text{(Luke 13:33)}
\]

\[
\text{sendatzea acabatzen diat egun eta bihar, eta hereneco egunean fin hartzen diat} \\
\text{sanitates perficio hodie, et cras, et tertia dia consumor} \\
\text{‘I cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I shall be perfected’ (Luke 13:32)}
\]

24 TN. Joannes Leizarraga had converted to John Calvin’s Reformed Christianity and had been charged by the Queen of Navarre with translating the New Testament into Basque. It is now clear that, in producing his Basque translation of the Gospels, Leizarraga closely followed Calvin’s French text; see Mounole & Lakarra (2018, p. 426), Arcocha-Scarcia & Lakarra (2019). In the examples above, after the Latin and Greek versions that Michelena gives, we have added a French translation, based on the Bible of Geneva (from 1669), so that the point that Michelena is making here regarding Bq. bihar = Fr. demain and Bq. biharamun = Fr. lendemain can be directly appreciated.

25 In relation to Benveniste’s distinction between instance du discours and instance du récit, I would like to say something regarding Leizarraga’s use of verb tenses, although this matter deserves a more detailed study. In main clauses with past time reference, Leizarraga uses two tenses, e.g., ikhus zezan / ikhusi ukhan du ‘s/he saw’, when in modern Basque we would use ikusi zuen. To tell a story, as temps de narration (cf. Cat. va anar ‘s/he went’, etc.), what he uses is ikhus zezan (mostly in the Gospels and Revelation). On the other hand, when the writer speaks his own words or quotes those of others (thus, mostly in the Epistles), he employs ikhusi ukban du [TN. See also Mounole 2014/2018].
It is obvious that the point of reference changes from *etzi* ‘the day after tomorrow’ to *hereneco egunean* ‘on the third day’. It switches from ‘today’ to ‘on that day’.

And since we are discussing days, one thing is *bezperan* ‘in the eve’ (or, if you prefer, *aitzin-egunean*, in Oihenart’s words), *egun hartan* ‘on that day’, *biharamunean* ‘the next morning’\(^{26}\), and a different, very different one, *atzo* ‘yesterday’, *bart* ‘last night’, *egun* or *gaur* ‘today’, *bihar* ‘tomorrow’ or, when we speak about years, *igaz* ‘last year’, *aurten* ‘this year’, archaic *geurz* ‘next year’\(^{27}\). The latter series is the one that we are going to be concerned with, especially the names of the days that come after *etzi* ‘the day after tomorrow’. Consider the following proverb in RS:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Beyçut nay baoçu / gaur, biar, ezi, eziluma, ezicaramu

1 2 3 4 5

Hareoslo si quereys,/ hoy, mañana, después de mañana

‘I will do it for you, if you want, today, tomorrow, the day after’

(RS, 410)\(^{28}\)

There is a strange detail here. As always in this collection of proverbs, the Basque and Spanish words carry numbers to indicate the correspondences between the two; but the numbers on the Spanish words end with 5, even though those on the Basque ones go up to 7. In my opinion, the missing numbers in the Spanish are due to the lack of Spanish words for those meanings. It seems reasonable to conclude that *eziluma* is, just like in present-day Basque, the day after *etzi*, that is, ‘two days after tomorrow, in three days’, and that *ezicaramu* is the day after *eziluma*, or, in other words, two days after *etzi*.

It is true that nowadays that distinction is not at all clear, even in Bizkaia, but the text of this proverb seems too transparent for us to harbor any doubts. In any event, the forms without -*k*- are the following, as far as I know (see Azkue, 1923, p. 459): the already-mentioned form *etzilume*, which is now used around Plentzia and in Zigoitia (*etzilume*, with -a > -e after u); *etzirimu* in Landucci’s dictionary (written esçirimu and wrongly given as a translation of «oy ha tres dias» ‘three days ago’, even if someone else later added *erenegun*); the Bizkaian variant *etzilimo* (in Bera, it seems, *etzimo*); *etzidamu*, which is perhaps the most widespread form nowadays and also the one that is found in Pouvreau [c. 1665]: «*etcidamu edo itciridamu*\(^{29}\). O[ihenart]. *Le jour depuis*

---

\(^{26}\) See Azkue (1923, p. 459, *biharamun*): «Es más nombre adverbial, pues recibe articulo». Compare *ordu-a-n* ‘then’ [lit. ‘on the hour’], formed in the same way as Old Sp. *a la hora*, It. *allora*, Fr. *alors*, etc. (see Corominas, 1954-1957, vol. ii, p. 942b), as Azkue saw, and, like similar words, always with the article, whereas the other words in this group can appear without the article.

\(^{27}\) Cf. Etcheberri of Ziburu (1627): «*Iragan orthea deitzen da, iaz, onaingoa aurthen, eta baldu dena geurzk*». ‘Last year is called iaz, the present one aurthen, and the next one geurzk’. That is the way it appears, with -*k*.

\(^{28}\) Urquijo (1932, p. 270) does not shed much light on this saying. It seems, nevertheless, that it refers to promises that are postponed without ever being fulfilled.

\(^{29}\) Or *itziri*-? I cannot read the first letter well.
demain"\textsuperscript{30} and the very similar forms etziramu, etziamu and Bizkaian etziaramu. In addition, the form etziago, found in Baztan, may be the result of a confusion with the suffix -ago\textsuperscript{31}.

The forms with -k- are the following: etzikaramu, which we have already seen, and which Añibarro also uses, and its variant etzikaramon in Lekeitio\textsuperscript{32}.

8. Even if the only sound basis for it that we have is the above-mentioned proverb in RS, I will assume that etziluma and etzikaramu are not synonyms, but, rather that each of them refers to a different day. That is the way Larramendi [1745] understood it too [in his dictionary]: etziluma ‘dos días después’, etzikaramu ‘tres días después’.

Thus, in my opinion, etzidamu, etzilimo, etziluma and the rest are, in their root and origin, only variants of a single older word: a compound word that combined etzi ‘the day after tomorrow’ and biharamun ‘the next day’ (as we have already seen, the latter is itself a compound of bihar ‘tomorrow’ + egun ‘day’). At one time, this structure was commonly used in the entire Basque Country. Its meaning is rather obvious. In French, it could be translated as (le) lendemain d’après-demain. I will not discuss how the phonetic form changed, contracted and diversified from one place to another, since that is an issue that cannot be decided without more light than we now have. Leaving other aspects aside, I will simply note here the same lack of final -n that we saw above in § 6, with the intention of pursuing this matter in more detail later\textsuperscript{33}.

The other word, that is, etzikaramu, would be etzikirik ‘from the day after tomorrow’ (or etzioko ‘of the day after tomorrow’) + herenegun ‘third day’; that is, ‘the third day starting from the day after tomorrow’, counting both etzi and the third day itself (cf. lat. nudius tertius).

\textsuperscript{30} TN. Two copies of Pouvreau’s manuscript Basque-French dictionary are available online on the website of the Bibliothèque nationale de France. The entry that Michelena cites here is found on p. 93v of the second copy. I read «itcidamu edo itciridamu». The date of composition that I have added for the ms. is that established in Kerejeta (1991).

\textsuperscript{31} Azkue also added by hand the form etzirune found in Zigoitia [Araba]. The form etzinburu ‘tras pasado mañana’, ‘two days after tomorrow’, which was gathered in Etxalar [Navarre] looks like it could be ‘etziren buru’ [lit. ‘head or end of etzi’]. Other forms found in Gipuzkoa and other places, such as etzidamu-atzetik, seem to have replaced the ending -aitzetik ‘from the front of’ with -atzetik ‘from behind’. Regarding time measurements, there is widespread confusion between ‘front’ and ‘back’ in Basque. Are they in the past or in the future? Or, in other words, it seems that some forms have been altered under the influence of the neighboring languages. I wonder if the suffix -aste or -azte used in Roncalese has anything to do with this (etziate ‘etzidamu, two days after tomorrow’). [TN. Cf. Sp. traspasado mañana ‘two days after tomorrow’, lit. ‘beyond or behind the day after tomorrow’, Sp. anteayer ‘the day before yesterday’, lit. ‘before or in front of yesterday’].

\textsuperscript{32} I don’t think etzikaramu is a jocular formation, created to prolong the series, even if that has happened sometimes in other cases, cf. Spitzer (1955, p. 45), discussing Pulci’s Morgante Maggiore: «...las voces cra y poscura son auténticos reflejos italianos de las voces latinas cras y postcras; en cambio, poscrilla y posquacchera son términos creados por la fantasía popular».

\textsuperscript{33} It seems that later -damu was analyzed as a suffix with the meaning of ‘the following day’, as in biardamu and erenegundamu used in the Baztan area.
The second part of the compound does not need an explanation: the word heren (Old Bizkaian aren) is well known with the meanings of ‘third’ and ‘a third’, even if nowadays it is rarely used. It has the suffix *-a-en ‘genitive plural’; her-, ar- and hirur ‘three’ are seemingly related to each other, even if the link among the phonological forms is rather loose.\(^{34}\)

Pouvreau [c. 1665] has herenegun ‘uant hier’ and also hereneco egun (from Leizarraga, as we saw in § 7). In Landucci (1562) there is arayn egun ‘antiyer’ and Micoleta [1653] has arenegun ‘antayer’. Añibarro [1963 [c. 1820]] says the following, among other things «día tercero, antayer: b. araneun, g. erenegun», and Father Izagirre [1967] recorded arainun in Altsasu\(^{35}\). To partially complete the list, let me add that in Zaraitzu [Navarre] the form is erenegun, with the typical syncope of that dialect, and in [the Navarrese Valleys of] Aezkoa and Uztzama, erenegu, again without final -n.\(^{36}\)

9. Once (in FHV, 1977, p. 137-138, [2011, p. 113-114]), I listed the Basque words that clearly show a sound change -n > 0. I listed them and stopped there, since I could not provide an explanation. I left two cases aside, which are essentially the same one: the inflectional (genitive) suffix -ren / -re and its verbal past tense counterpart -en / -e.

The remaining instances, if I am not mistaken, are the following: the [comitative] suffix -ki(e)n / -ki; the Aezkoan adverbial form egu ‘today’ (not the noun, egun ‘day’, which has -n there too) vs. egun ‘today’ which was once general to the entire Basque Country\(^{37}\); and the eastern form orai ‘now’ (also in Leizarraga) vs. orain. The additional examples of -n > 0 that we have considered here are mostly hypothetical. They include bariaku ‘Friday’, etzidamu ‘two days after tomorrow’ and etzikaramu ‘three days after tomorrow’, the last one of these with a variant etzikaramon.

But as certain as the fact that the Aezkoan form egu ‘today’ is missing something is the fact that the same thing happens to Aezkoan and High Navarrese erenegu ‘day before yesterday’, which undeniably is egun’s child. And this is equally clear regarding the

---

\(^{34}\) Are there any other ordinals with this type of irregularity? Azkue (1905) includes serren ‘octavo, octava parte’, as being used in some areas of Bizkaia. He gives an example from Mondragón/Arazasate: kana-serren ‘octavo de vara’. But zerren is also rather opaque in its meaning: ‘tercera parte de la vara. Algunos (B-otx) tienen por cuarto, otros (B-mu) por octavo de vara’. It is thus not clear that zerren derives from zortzi ‘eight’, especially if we take zerrenda into account, cf. Añibarro [1963, c. 1820]: ‘retal, pedazo de tela que queda o sobra: c. erretala, emparaüa, cerrena, cerrenda’.

\(^{35}\) It is enough to compare the Altsasu forms arainun and arainaun-etxiri with the corresponding Txorierri forms erenegun and erenegun-etxeki to see what I said before, in fn. 31; namely, that there is a connection with atzi-tik ‘from the front’ (Bizkaian atxi-ti(k)). The Gipuzkoan word antziña ‘a long time ago,’ and similar forms, from the same root, are oriented towards past times, not those that are still to come.

\(^{36}\) I don’t know what to think about etzidazu. From Larramendi’s dictionary it spread to Humboldt, Añibarro (=aun otro día después [de pasado mañana] =) and others (maybe even to Bonaparte?). Azkue, on the other hand, has the following, added by hand: «etzidaso (B-mo) etzikaramu-ostean» ‘after etzikaramu’. In Bizkaian there is generalized confusion between s and z, as is well known.

\(^{37}\) TN. In modern times, the word for ‘today’ in western and central dialects is gaur (< gau haur lit. ‘night + this’).
form laurdenegu ‘trasantayer’, ‘two days before yesterday’ that Father Izagirre [1966] recorded in Ultzama: laur(d)en ‘fourth’ derives from laur ‘four’ as straightforwardly as heren ‘third’ comes from hirur ‘three’; and in Roncal/Erronkari we find the full form laurdenegun, see fn. 13.

I will add now to this list a less obvious example. According to Karl Bouda, the Bizkaian word eztegu(ak) ‘wedding’ is a compound word whose second member is egun [Bouda, 1952, p. 12]. I would propose that, in the word eztegu and in its synonym eztei found elsewhere, the first element is shared (ezti ‘honey, sweet’ in Bouda’s opinion)\(^3\). The second element in eztei would be jei, jai ‘feast, holiday’ (it is well-known that ezteiak alternates with eztaia). Instead, in the Bizkaian form eztegu, the second element would be again egun ‘day’\(^3\).

I will now explain where I am going with this. If, for the moment, we leave aside the comitative suffix -ki(e)n / -ki, all other examples of this alternation (-n ~ 0) are found in time words, in the expression of temporal relations. To be more precise, in words that have as point of reference «now», but the speaker’s «now»: egu ‘today’, erenegu ‘three days ago’, laurdenegu ‘four days ago’, etc., and not, on the other hand, biharamun ‘the next day’. Now, to return to -ki(e)n ‘with’, keeping in mind that we express time and place in similar ways, we may be guided by Schuchardt [1923, p. 17-18, § 57 & 32-33, § 172], who proposed that -ki(e)n ‘with’ < kide ‘companion’ + -n, and that the suffix expresses where something is located in place and time and, therefore, when it happens.

10. I will now express very briefly what remains to be said in order to complete the task at hand, necessarily leaving the details for another occasion.

Linguistics has blazed rather new trails in the last ten years or so, mostly thanks to Chomsky. And, as often happens, old things have become new here too. He has rediscovered the people of Port-Royale, who had been so scorned and despised by other linguists. He has also claimed as his intellectual predecessors 17th and 18th century writers like Humboldt (fortunately or unfortunately, he still does not know Astarloa)\(^4\), and even older writers.

---

\(^3\) TN. Here Michelena mentions Karl Bouda’s name without providing a more specific reference. Bouda (1952, p. 12) analyzes eztegu as a compound whose second member is egun ‘day’. For the first component, he proposes a root *zte, which he relates to a Circassian word meaning ‘to take’: e-zte-gu B “Hochzeit”, Wurzel ‘zte: tscherkess. šte “nehmen”. Das zweite Glied des Kompositum eztegu ist bask. e-gu-n “Tag”». The proposal mentioned by Michelena that this word is related to ezti ‘honey’ must be found elsewhere in Bouda’s work.

\(^4\) TN. Manterola (2015) has proposed that eztei ‘wedding’ is a loanword from Gascon bestejar ‘to celebrate’ (< Lat festa). See also Lakarra, Manterola & Segurola (2019). This would not invalidate Michelena’s (and Bouda’s) proposal regarding the ending of Bizkaian eztegu.

\(^4\) TN. Pablo Pedro de Astarloa (1752-1896) wrote about the Basque language and interacted with Wilhem von Humboldt. He had some rather unconventional ideas regarding etymology.
If our classical grammarians had spoken in today’s language or metalanguage, they
would have said that the genitive suffixes -(r)en and -(e)ko are the result of a transfor-
mation. This is what Azkue says in his dictionary, under -ko:

sufijo casual, calificado de ‘genitivo relativo’ por el príncipe Bonaparte […] -(e)n es geni-
tivo que indica posesión; el genitivo -ko indica lugar o tiempo en que se contiene o pasa
algo: gizonaren etxea ‘la casa (que es posesión) del hombre’; etxeko gizona ‘el hombre de
(que está contenido en) la casa’; atzoko euriak ‘las lluvias de ayer’. (Azkue, 1905, s.v. -ko)

case suffix, which Prince Bonaparte called «relative genitive» […] -(e)n is a genitive
that indicates possession; the genitive -ko indicates the place or time in which some-
thing is contained or happens: gizonaren etxea ‘the man’s house; the house that be-
longs to the man’; etxeko gizona ‘the man of the house; who is (contained) in the house’;
atzoko euriak ‘yesterday’s rains’.

In today’s language: gizonaren etxea ‘the man’s house’ is generated from gizonak
etxea du ‘the man has the house’ by means of a transformation, and etxeko gizona ‘the
man of the house’ likewise from gizona etxean da ‘the man is in the house’.

Azkue clearly identified the gaps in the paradigm of -ko:

Este sufijo se agrega a la mayor parte de los sufijos casuales y aun a frases, formando
en uno y otro caso elegantes locuciones. Los únicos sufijos casuales que no reciben el
sufijo -ko son el activo -k, el dativo -i, y el inesivo -n (Azkue, 1905, s.v. -ko).

This suffix is added to most case suffixes and even to phrases, forming in both cases
elegant expressions. The only case suffixes that do not receive the suffix -ko are active
[ergative] -k, dative -i and inesive -n.

He adds, furthermore: «El posesivo no lo puede recibir directamente, sino, como reci-
be los demás, mediante el artículo -a tácito», ‘it cannot take the possessive directly, but
only in the same way that it takes the rest [of the suffixes], by means of the unexpressed
article -a’. Using an example from Rś:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neure eshseco quea / laguneneco sua bano obeda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humo de mi casa / mejor quel fuego de la del ageno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘My home’s smoke is better than the neighbor’s fire’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rś, 473)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The determiner article, thus, does not appear in the «surface» structure (it is silent),
but it does in the underlying structure, since mendí-ko means ‘de + el + monte’, ‘of + the
+ mountain’. The locative mark, -(e)n, is not visible on the surface, but the force of its
meaning is carried by the suffix -ko, as Azkue himself says. I am not skilled in matters
of formalism and I will not get involved in these issues now, but I think that what I am
suggested is clear. In the so-called «deep structure» we have *mendi* ‘mountain’ + -a ‘the’ + -n ‘on/in’ + -ko ‘of’ (that is, *mendiango*)\(^{41}\). We would, thus, need a rather late rule in order to erase -a and -n to the left of -ko (a deletion rule) in order to obtain the surface form *mendiko* that we actually pronounce\(^{42}\).

11. In Linguistics as well, there are thus innovations, or new fashions, and, even if I adapt only with difficulty to new ways, I do not think that all, or even most, of the opinions of younger people are necessarily wrong, as some of our honest countrymen are trying to proclaim to us, loudly and vehemently, but completely in vain. Somehow, those younger scholars do not separate diachrony from synchrony as strictly as did those who were young and innovative some years ago (and now, sadly, are old and attached to old opinions). Since I have always been one of those unrepentant diachronists, I would like to explain the consequences for diachrony of the idea I have presented in synchronic terms.

In Basque diachrony, thus, I see two main tendencies. Sometimes one of them applies and sometimes the other. One tendency is to spread the suffix -(e)n to all locative inflection: *non* ‘where’, *nondik* ‘whence’ (vs. Old Bizkaian *norik* ‘whence’ and common *nora* ‘whither’), *ban* ‘there’, *bandik* ‘thence’ (vs. common archaic *barik* ‘thence’, *Old Bizkaian *arean* ‘thence’ and now everywhere *bara* ‘thither’,etc.; except for Aezkoan, as Azkue (1905) tells us: *gena*, *genara* ‘thither’); especially, -*gan* ‘in/on, with animates’, if it is from -*gan* and the related forms used with animates -*gan(d)ik* ‘from’, -*gana* ‘to’\(^{43}\).

The other is to take -(e)n away: *hemendik* ‘hence, from here’ is formed on *bemen* ‘here’. It is thus a new form. Nevertheless, in different areas of the Basque Country it shows up without -n: Bizkaian *emetik*, Zuberoan *bebeti*. The phrase *Oñeztar*

\(^{41}\) TN. The initial stop of the suffixes -ko and -tik systematically voices after a nasal, except in Zuberoan and Roncalese.

\(^{42}\) The seed of these thoughts was sown by someone else, see Ruwet (1969, p. 115-135). But it would be excessive to impute the responsibility for the fruit, if it is rotten, to Ruwet.

\(^{43}\) Azkue is not quite correct when he says this, in the same place [Azkue, 1905, under -ko]: s... el inesivo -n... conviene advertir que cuando se usa repetido formando modismo, en tal caso recibe el sujeto -ko: *egunean eguneango gure ogia* [‘today our daily bread’]... *orrako berban berbanga gezurtegiori* ‘ese mentir de cada palabra’ [‘that lying in every word’]. His third example, from Leizarraga, is rather different: *Eta baren icena baithango fedez* ‘Et in fide nominis eius’ (Acts 3:16). With nouns referring to animates it is easier for the -n to remain, as in *ta neurregango dator au, sugutegu icatz ondo erriaz gar baga iraquieten dabelaco emengo lapicuac gueldi gueldi gañetic eguin baga* (Moguel, Peru Abarca, p. 131) ‘and in my opinion this (the tastiness of the blacksmiths’ food) comes from the fact that the pots simmer over embers, without flames, very slowly and without boiling’. Some further examples: *eta birietan iraquieten iradela iraasten bizetangoa* (Leizarraga, Acts 16:4) ‘And as they went through the cities, they taught the people in those’ (although here *betangoa* ‘those [people] in those’ are *birietakoak* ‘those in the towns’!); *elcarrengoa amorioa* (Lizarraza of Elkano, 1868, *copla* 434) ‘mutual love’; *mi gango uste ona* (Mendiburu, 1760, IX, p. 173 [LXX,garren ootitza-gaija]) ‘the good opinion towards me’, etc. For -*ekin* ‘with’, *aitarrequioa egin* (Lardizabal, 1855, p. 34) ‘do that of [with] the father’, without -n. In Zuberoa and neighboring areas, as is well known, a distinction is still made between locative forms with and without the article: *etxen* ‘at home’ and *etxin* *< etxian* < *etxeain* ‘in the house’; *etxela*, *etxeait* ‘(to) home’ and *etxila*, *etxilai* ‘to the house’; and there is also *etxenk0* ‘of home’.
barrungoan ‘the followers of Oñaz who were inside’ that we find in an old ballad [see Michelena, 1964, p. 83] would be barrukoak ‘of inside’ in present-day Basque.

12. The confusion that could arise from that can be seen in Old Bizkaian itself, in the words that express quality or manner (in other dialects too, compare nolatan? ‘how’, next to nola? ‘how’). The following examples are from RS:

\[\text{Celangoa baista anea / alangoa oycla alabea} \]
Qual suele ser la madre / tal suele ser la hija
‘As the mother is, so is usually the daughter’
(rs, 35)

Like: \[\text{Celangoa da Butroe} \]
Qué tal es Butron
‘How is Butron’
(rs, 92)

But: \[\text{Celan vaysta ojala / alacoa mendela} \]
Qual es el paño / tal es el orillo
‘As is the cloth, so is the hem’
(rs, 20)

In accordance with what I have been saying, the -n of some time words has been lost mostly before the suffix -ko ‘of’, but also before -tik ‘from; through’ and some others suffixes: orainko ‘of now’ → oraiko (the Low Navarrese author Salaberry [1856, p. 138] called the suffix -ko ‘locatif’); from egun ‘today’ + -tik, -danik, in Aezkoa andErro (as Azkue has shown) → egutik, egudanik. In the same way, erengun ‘three days from today’, laurdenegun ‘four days from today’ → erenegu, laurdenegu, with the help of suffixes.

One could reply that the deletion of -n could happen at most in indefinite words, not in definite ones. Thus bariaku ‘Friday’ and eztegu ‘wedding’ would fall outside of its domain. But, demonstrably, the definite article was used less frequently before than it is nowadays; cf. Osaylgo euria ‘Pluuias de Hebrero’, ‘February rain’ (RS, 89), where otsail ‘February’ is treated as a proper name.

\[\text{44 The Bizkaian evidence shows undoubtably that the ending of orain ‘now’ does not come from an older *-ain, but from something like *-aen. Its source is obviously Lat. bora, followed by a Basque demonstrative (cf. Sp. abora, older agora, Russian sejčás, etc.). Similarly, egun ‘day’ and egun ‘today’ may not have been once completely identical. It would seem that the latter would have required, besides egun, a demonstrative or similar element; just like aurt(h)en ‘this year’ [cf. urte ‘year’] has it at the beginning [cf. Lat. bodie, Grk. s- témeron, Class. Arm. aysiaur, Grm. Heute, Rus. segódnja and so on and so forth] [TN. See Lakarra, Manterola & Segurola, 2019 under orain and aurt(h)en].} \]

\[\text{45 TN. Compare azal-eko ‘of the skin’ (common noun) with Usurbil-go ‘of Usurbil’ (proper name). In modern Basque, the usual form is otsail-eko ‘of February’, not otsail-go (Osaylgo).} \]
13. The suggestion that I made before (in § 10) has an undeniable weakness, which I will only briefly mention here. Benveniste derived all usages of the Latin genitive from a génitif de transposition (Benveniste, 1962; see also Ruwet, 1968, p. 82, 231). In Basque, however, we have a tougher job, because, as we have seen, we need to explain not one, but two genitives -{r}en and -(e)ko. The task, in addition to being harder, brings from darkness to light what Benveniste’s article, as if it were passing through a field of ferns, leaves untouched.

This is Benveniste’s method: ludus pueri ‘the boy’s game’ ← puer ludit ‘the boy plays’, risus pueri ‘the boy’s laughter’ ← puer ridet ‘the boy laughs’, and from there, first, somnus pueri ‘the boy’s dream’, then, mos pueri ‘the boy’s habit’ and then liber pueri ‘the boy’s book’ (in Basque it would be baurraren ‘of the boy’ in every case). But consider Bq. hospe gaiztoko ‘of bad reputation’:

```
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Aldi guextoan jai doa hospe guexto coa
2 1 3 4 7 6 5
En mal punto nacer suele el de mala fama
The one who has a bad reputation was usually born at a bad time
(185, 107)
```

From what could this phrase derive? Certainly not from hospe gaiztoan da ‘he/she is in bad reputation’ or anything of the sort. Similarly, in Latin, eloquentia hominis ‘the eloquence of the person’ is fairly clear; but not, on the other hand, homo magnae eloquentiae ‘a person of great eloquence’\(^46\). In one case, the person has eloquence, but in the other, the person is of great eloquence. To compare Latin and Basque, we may consider, for instance, the well-known et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis ‘and on Earth, peace to people of good will’ [Luke 2:14]\(^47\). In Harriet-Haraneder’s Basque translation, we have eta lurrean baquea dutela gizcune bihotz çucenecoec [Harriet, 1855, p. 219]. So, bihotz zuzena gizonek dute ‘the people have a righteous heart’ and, from there, gizonen bihotz zuzena ‘the people’s righteous heart’. But to arrive at bihotz zuzeneko gizonak ‘people of righteous heart’ we must not focus on the people who have, but on what those people have. In other words, the people are the possessors; a righteous heart is what is possessed by them.

14. I would have preferred to have been able to offer to our teacher Barandiaran something richer and more pleasant instead of what I have offered him. A linguist, however, does not have much to give to an ethnologist—in any case, much less than what he takes from him—; so my offering will be even more insignificant, I being who I am and he being who he is. In this sorry world, however, there is nothing good except for good

---

\(^{46}\) This usage, unlike the others, had clear limitations: it was in competition with the ablative, and besides, it could not be used with an unmodified noun; it required an accompanying adjective. Thus, one could have hominis bonae voluntatis ‘a person of good will’, but not hominis voluntatis ‘a person of will’.

\(^{47}\) TN. This verse also appears in the Christian hymn *Gloria in excelsis Deo* ‘Glory to God in the highest’.
will—as I think Kant said—and I don’t think Barandiaran will find this meager show of gratitude lacking in that respect at least.
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