

OLD BASQUE (MEDIO)PASSIVES

Jon Ortiz de Urbina

(University of Deusto)

0. Introduction

In this article, I examine passive and mediopassive constructions in Etxepare's (1545) and Leizarraga's (1571) works, trying to identify some of the morphological/syntactic features which can help us assign specific examples to each of the construction types.¹ The reason why these authors are chosen lies in the fact that they employ a wider range of passive and passive-like constructions than can be found at present. Moreover, their passive and mediopassive types are often quite similar, with an overlapping area which presents interesting analytical problems.

This enterprise may be useful in that there seems to exist considerable vagueness in the way the label 'passive' is assigned to constructions in earlier Basque. Since part of the problem is purely terminological, I will first comment on the labels the constructions in question have been assigned by some analysts, as a preliminary to spelling out the terminology I will be using in the analysis of those texts. Once the terminology is clarified, I will proceed to examine different types of the relevant constructions in these two authors, with some reference to the contemporary Lazarraga.

While what may be called the 'central' or 'standard' passive type is fairly clearly identified, there are other constructions sometimes so labeled which I think might be kept separate. Thus, in Altuna's (1987) classic edition of Etxepare's poetry the label 'passive' is attached to what may be more appropriately analyzed as two distinct constructions, a regular 'passive' (1) and a 'mediopassive' (2):

- (1) Mundu hunec *haraguiac bethi enganatuya*. (1: 404)
world this flesh.E always deceive.PRF.AGR
'always deceived by this world, by the flesh'

¹ The research leading to this article has been funded by a grant from the Department of Research and Universities of the Basque Government to the project HU-2000-13. I am very grateful to Esther Zulaika for discussion of many of the issues below and for her help with examples. All errors are solely my own.

- (2) Ene contra falseria bethi *cinhexi* *çaten*
 my against lies always believe.PRF be.AUX
 Iustician *ençun* *vaninz* sarri ialgui ninçaten (13: 12-13)
 in.justice hear.PRF if.be.AUX im. get.up AUX
 ‘lies against me would have always been believed/
 had I been heard with justice, I would have been released immediately’

At the same time, structures formally identical to those in (2) are sometimes not labeled as passive in this edition:

- (3) Eta noren ycenetan *fundatu* *den* eliça (1: 56)
 and whose name.in found.PRF is church
 ‘and in whose name has the church been founded’
- (4) Gayzqui *eguin* *dadinian* gendec sarri daquite (12:21)
 evil do.PRF AUX.when people im. know
 ‘if evil is done, people immediately know’

It is not clear whether this should be interpreted as a lack of systematicity in the labelling or as a different analysis of these constructions, which I will claim are mediopassives akin to contemporary impersonal constructions. While a common label for (1) and (2) does serve the purpose of highlighting the fact that what looks like the syntactic subject corresponds to a theme argument usually linked with the object position, it also separates the second construction from other mediopassive constructions with which it may belong. The same tendency to collapse what may be different constructions may be observed in an article by Irigoyen (1992) peculiarly entitled “A new note on the passive voice which in the periphrastic verbal system of old Basque literature is opposed to the active voice”, where many examples of the mediopassive type are given and claimed to be ‘passive’ on the basis of their meaning and correspondance with passive translations into Spanish. As we will see, the analysis of all these forms as passive may be based on a morphologically perfectly accurate translation of participle + *be* sequences into the equivalent Romance passive. In fact, in the case of Leizarraga’s Bible translations it is even clear that many of those sequences in Basque directly translate passive examples in the source text, just as they can be translated from Basque into Romance passive structures. However, more than considerations of equivalence with Romance texts, even with those which they translate, language-internal considerations can and should be used to differentiate passive and mediopassive types.

1. Passives and mediopassives

Let us define the terminology I will be using before proceeding any further. I will be following Trask’s practice in identifying some of the examples below as ‘mediopassive’. This term has also been used in the same way in Brettschneider (1979), but has not spread generally among Basque linguists. Like ‘middle’ and even ‘passive’, there is a wide range of constructions, with very different functions and morphological realizations, that have been so labeled (see Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000 for examples). The main thrust of this contribution, however, is to check

whether two distinct constructions can and have to be recognized in what have often been called ‘passive’ constructions in this period of Basque, one of which is a mediopassive in one of the standard uses of this term. A look at Trask’s (1993) dictionary definitions for the entries *passive* and *mediopassive* shows how close the two constructions are in fact. Passives are ‘constructions where an intrinsically transitive verb is construed in such a way that its underlying object appears as its surface subject ... the construction usually being overtly marked in some way to show its passive character’. Mediopassives, on the other hand, would be constructions ‘in which an intrinsically transitive verb is construed intransitively with a patient subject and receives a passive interpretation’. He further points out that this is a fully productive pattern in Basque, since impersonal versions of transitive verbs are typically constructed by means of mediopassive structures. The main goal of this article will be to justify that many of the so-called ‘old passive’ sentences can be analyzed as patterning with the same mediopassive structure used for impersonal constructions. While both passives and mediopassives involve patient subjects in intransitive uses of ‘intrinsically transitive’ verbs, the crucial difference is the usual existence of a special morphology in the case of passives, while mediopassives display a normal intransitive morphology.

The obvious question now is what constitutes ‘passive morphology’ in Basque. For our purposes here, it will suffice to consider ‘passive’ embedded clauses headed by a perfective participial verbal form with an object gap (Ortiz de Urbina & Uribe-Etxebarria 1991). In the most standard cases these participial embedded clauses function as predicative complements of a copulative verb, and the subject of this complex predication structure is interpreted as the antecedent of the object gap in the participial clause (i.e., the ‘passive interpretation’).² This can be represented and illustrated as follows:

(5) Subject_i [... [e]_i ... perf. participle] BE

(6) ene alaba duc deabruaz gaizqui *tormentatua* (Leiz. Mt 15, 22)
 my daughter is devil.INSTR badly torment.PRF.AGR
 ‘my daughter is badly tormented by the devil’

The participle heading the predicative clause can be marked as a normal predicative adjective (almost always, as we will see, with number agreement morphology).³ In other examples/dialects, a perfective participial suffix may be added to the basic participle, *-ta* or *-(r)ik*. Since, with the distribution discussed in Rebuschi (1984), these can occur as predicative complements, they would also qualify as passive. This is specially the case in dialects like Zuberoan, where a participle in *-(r)ik* can occur as predicative complement of the basic copula *izan* (Coyos 2003). However,

² The gap can also correspond to the transitive subject, in a construction Rebuschi (1984), perhaps not very appropriately, labels ‘antipassive’. See de Rijk (2003).

³ In the analysis presented in Ortiz de Urbina & Uribe-Etxebarria (1991), the embedded clause retains its subject, so that the ergative agent phrase is in fact a subject, as opposed to an adjunct. This is based on contemporary standard passives, and would have to be accommodated to account for Leizarraga’s instrumental agent phrases.

quite often, the relationship between the participial clause in *-(r)ik* and the noun it is predicated of is not mediated by a copulative verb. Instead, the embedded clause functions either as a predicative or manner/temporal adjunct marked by the participial ending *-ic*.⁴

- (7) Hire contra heben gutuc ihaurorrec *eguinic* (Etx. 1:282)
 your against here are yourself.ERG do.PRF.ic
 'Here we are against you, having been created by you'

We'll also consider these examples here, although we will cast some doubt on their 'passive' nature in section 3.3.

Mediopassives, as indicated above, use the normal active morphology. Since 'normal morphology' for verbs, even in earlier Basque, was largely periphrastic, and synthetic verbal forms cannot be detransitivized, mediopassive examples will always involve a participle + auxiliary sequence. When the participle is perfective, the two constructions greatly resemble each other, as in (2) and (3) above, repeated here:

- (8) a. Ene contra falseria bethi *cinhexi çaten*
 Iustician *ençun vaninz sarri ialgui ninçaten* (13: 12-13; =(2))
 b. Eta noren ycenetan *fundatu den* eliça (1: 56; =(3))

This could be a standard passive where the embedded participle happens to lack agreement (the standard assumption, it seems), or an intransitive use of a generally transitive verb, i.e., a mediopassive. Given the definitions above, the crucial factor that will help us analyze the preceding example as a mediopassive or as a passive is whether the tensed form of 'be' *den* is a main verb or an auxiliary. If it can be shown to be a main verb, the participle would be heading an embedded participial clause and we would be facing a passive construction. If, on the other hand, *den* is the auxiliary, then we would have a periphrastic form of a basically transitive verb used with an intransitive auxiliary in a simple monoclausal structure, i.e., a mediopassive.⁵ With these categories in mind, let us proceed to an analysis of the constructions we find in Leizarraga and Etxepare, introducing complicating factors as we proceed.

2. Non-perfective participles

It may be advisable to begin with clear examples of either type, turning then to dubious cases. As just mentioned, the problem will largely hinge on whether a

⁴ These are sometimes labeled 'absolute participles'.

⁵ Outside of the fairly restricted middle constructions, English does not employ mediopassives, so Spanish translations might be helpful here: for (8b), the passive construal would be translated as *ha sido fundada* and the mediopassive construal would be *se ha fundado*. The latter is usually called 'reflexive passive' in the Spanish grammatical tradition, 'passive' because of the existence of a derived theme subject, and 'reflexive' because these constructions contain pronouns identical to the reflexive pronouns (here, *se*). Needless to say, this label is quite inappropriate for the Basque constructions, which, from a morphological point of view, resemble more the English 'middle' type.

participle + verb sequence is the monoclausal periphrastic verb of a mediopassive or the biclausal structure of the typical passive. In this section, we will first approach this criterion from the point of view of the type of lexical tenseless form we encounter.

As in other languages, the perfective participle is the ‘adjectival’ verbal form one expects to find in attributive and predicative noun modifying uses. Passives, as defined above for Basque, are structures where an ‘open’ clause headed by the ‘adjectival’ (but still projecting some clausal structure) perfective participle is predicated of a noun which is in turn interpreted as the antecedent of the object gap. The tensed verb, where found, functions as the matrix predicate, in the most standard examples a linking, copulative verb. If we concentrate on the embedded clause, this entails that tenseless verbal forms other than perfect participles would not head predicative embedded clauses, since they do not display adjectival (whether attributive or predicative) behavior. This excludes combinations of bare roots, habitual and future lexical verbs with tensed forms of *be* from the passive group, forcing a mediopassive interpretation.

As a consequence, Oihenart’s purported passive examples mentioned in Irigoyen (1992: 287-88) would be considered mediopassives:

- (9) Hil adi, *alaba aite*
 die be praise be
 ‘Meurs, & apres tu pourras estre louié’ (235)

- (10) Errac eguia, *vrka aite*
 say truth hang be
 ‘Dis la verité, & tu seras pendu’ (148)

Similar remarks apply on the following examples illustrating the different lexical verb shapes, most from Etxepare:

- (11) root
- a. ecin deusere *scriba* dayteyela lengoage hartan (0:14-15)
 can’t anything write be language in.that
 ‘that nothing can be written in that language’
 - b. Amoria ecyn cençuz ecin dayte *goberna* (4:33)
 love cause sense.by can’t be govern
 ‘since love cannot be governed by sense’
 - c. Oray othoy enadila oguen gabe *difama* (9:14)
 now please not.be fault without defame
 ‘now please let me not be defamed without blame’
 - d. Berce gendec vste çuten / Ecin *scriba* çayteyen (14:8-9)
 other people think AUX can’t write be
 ‘the others thought that it could not be written’

- (12) imperfective
- a. Oray *eguiten* diraden gayzqui handiegatic (2:136)
 now do.IMPF be wrongdoing great.because
 ‘because of the great wrongdoing that is made now’

- b. Oray ezta *erideyten* / Heuscararen pareric. (14:37-38)
 now not.is find.IMPF basque.of equal
 'now one can't find an equal to Basque'
- c. Ceren eceyn scripturan *erideiten* ezpaitzen (15:8)
 since any writing.in find.IMPF not.be
 'since it was not found in any writing'

(13) future

- a. Emazteac cerengatic gaiz *erranen* dirate (3:9)
 women why bad say.FUT be
 'why will women be badmouthed?'
- b. Eta vardin *iuyaturen* handia eta chipia⁶ (1:300-301)
 and same judge.FUT big and small
 'and big and small will be judged alike'
- c. Emaçue eta *emanen* çaiçue (Leiz. Lc 6, 38)
 give and give.FUT be
 'Give and you shall be given'

These examples can receive a straightforward analysis as mediopassives, given the terminological premises adopted above. Let us now turn to more dubious examples, where complicating factors introduce new variables.

3. Marked and unmarked participles

Perfect participles in periphrastic verbal forms are always bare in the modern language.⁷ This means participles marked by the agreement *-a(k)* correspond to embedded participial constructions, hence passives. Thus, (6) above, with the form *tormentatua* 'torment.PRF.AGR', is a clear passive clause. The same applies to *eguinic* 'do.PRF.ic' in (7) where the perfective participle had been marked *-ic*. Notice that the latter type of participial clause may be used without object gaps, in 'absolute' constructions without overt subjects:

- (14) Eta Iesusec escua *bedaturic* hunqui ceçan hura (Leiz. Lc V, 13)
 and Jesus hand stretch.PRF.ic touch AUX that
 'and Jesus, stretching his hand, touched him'
- (15) eta *hurbilduric* hamabiéc erran cieçoten (Leiz. Lc IX, 12)
 and approach.PRF.ic twelve say AUX
 'and, having approached, the twelve told him'

It is only the object gap use of this type of clause that we are provisionally considering passive, even though the clause is not a predicative complement.

⁶ If, as is quite likely, the deleted auxiliary is *da* 'is', also present in the preceding verse.

⁷ I am of course analyzing contemporary *etorria da*, *irakurria dut* as complex constructions. See Ortiz de Urbina & Uribe-Etxebarria (1991).

Let's concentrate on the more clearly adjectival perfective participle used as head of a predicative clause. Where the participle bears the agreement marker *-a(k)*, the embedded status of the clause it heads is evident, as discussed.⁸ Most such examples in Leizarraga are stative:

- (16) Eta *cen* Ioannes *veztitua* camelu biloz (Mc I, 6)
 and was clothe.PRF.AGR camel hair.with
 'and John was clothed with camel hair'
- (17) Ecen Maria haren ama Iosephequin *fedatua* *cela* (Mt 1, 18)
 that Mary his mother Joseph betrothe.PRF.AGR was.that
 'that his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph'
- (18) ecen hunela *scribatua* *duc* Prophetáz (Mt 2, 5)
 that this.way write.PRF.AGR is prophet.by
 'since so it is written by the prophet'
- (19) ecen arroca gainean *fundatua* *cen*. (Mt 7, 25)
 since rock above found.PRF.AGR was
 'because it had been founded on the rock'
- (20) *ceren baitziraden errebelatuac* eta *barreyatuac* (Mt 9, 36)
 since were harass.PRF.AGR and disperse.PRF.AGR
 'since they were harassed and dispersed'
- (21) ecen hayen beguiac *sorthatuac* *ciraden*. (Mt 26, 43)
 since their eyes tie.PRF.AGR were
 'for their eyes were heavy'

Eventive cases seem to be less common, although still possible:

- (22) *çuec baino emequiago tractatuac* *içanen diradela*. (Mt 11, 22)
 you than softly.more treat.PRF.AGR be.FUT aux
 'that they will be treated more softly than you'

The most interesting type, however, is the structure with bare, non-agreeing participles. While, given the assumptions above, overt agreement in clausal predicative complements signals a structure which falls squarely into the standard 'passive' type, lack of agreement does not necessarily mean we are facing a monoclausal mediopassive construction. The reason is that predicative adjectives did not obligatorily show agreement morphology in either Leizarraga or Etxepare, as they do not in many eastern dialects at present. Thus, in the Beatitudes paragraph (Mt 5, 2-5), 'blessed be...' is consistently translated as *dohatsu dirade*. As expected, we can also

⁸ Of course, this does not mean that all marked participles head clausal material. It is as expected normal to form deverbal adjectives and, from these, deadjectival nouns like *deithuac* 'the ones called', and *elegituac* 'the ones selected' below, for which, in the absence of any other constituent, clausal structure need not be assumed:

(i) ecen anhitz dirade deithuac, baina guti elegituac. (Mt 20, 16)

find bare participles acting as predicative adjectives, as the following examples from Etxepare:⁹

- (23) *obligatu* guiren guciac (0:29-30)
 oblige.PRF are all
 'we are all obliged'
- (24) Oray dute phorogatu / *enganatu* cirela (14:10-11)
 now aux proved deceive.PRF were
 'now they have proved that they were mistaken'

Here *enganatu* seems to be adjectival 'were mistaken', rather than 'were deceived'. The verb *galdu* 'lose' provides many examples of an adjectival participle, which can be found in the agreeing or in the bare form:¹⁰

- (25) hura gabe oro *galdu* guirade (2:35)
 that without all lose.PRF are
 'without her we are all lost'
- (26) Oren oroz beccatutan nabilena *galduya* (1:402)
 time all.at sin.in walk lose.PRF.AGR
 'me, who am lost in sin all the time'

Galdu guirade in (25) seems to be 'we are lost', rather than inchoative 'we've got lost' or passive 'we have been lost'. Bare forms can also be found as secondary predicates:

- (27) Ordu hartan diacusaçut *galdu* neure buruya. (1:400)
 hour that.in see lose.PRF my head
 'in that hour, I see myself lost'
- (28) othoy *gomendatu* duçun hila eta vicia. (1:450)
 please entrust.PRF have death and life
 'please have his death and life entrusted'

Bare participial adjectives (which we need not assume project the clausal structure associated with more 'verbal' participles) can then be found in the typical predicative positions. The question, then, is whether similar examples with potentially more clearly clausal participial structures can be found as predicative complements, i.e., whether they can be found in clearly 'passive' construction. The types of examples whose interpretation must be discussed are the likes of (2) above, or the following:

- (29) Hala eguin vadaçagu *ohoratu* *guirate*. (2:34)
 so do.PRF if.AUX honor.PRF be
 'if we do so, we'll be honored'

⁹ Of course, the same is true of agreeing participles. *Benedicatu* in many of the examples in Irigoyen (1992) corresponds to adjectival 'blessed', Sp. 'bendita' as opposed to 'benedicida'.

¹⁰ Similarly, verbal periphrases like participle + *joan* 'go' can be found with agreeing (2:67) and non-agreeing participles (1:157; 6:6).

- (30) Ene contra falseria bethi *cinhexi çaten*
Iustician *ençun vaninz sarri ialgui ninçaten* (13: 12-13; =(2))
- (31) Balinetan vide gabe *acusatu baguira* (13:28)
if justice without accuse.PRF if.are
'if we are unfairly accused'
- (32) Heuscaldunac mundu orotan *preciatu ciraden* (15:6)
basques world all.in appreciate.PRF were
'Basques were appreciated throughout the world'

These examples may be translated as passive 'we will be honored', 'would have been believed', '(if I) had been heard', '(if we) are accused' and 'were appreciated'. Altuna (1987: 232, 234) in fact calls them 'passive'. His comments on the following examples make it clear that this label is meant as an identification with standard passive structures, as opposed to a mere indication that the participle is predicated on a noun interpreted as its object, another traditional usage for the label:

- (33) Nola *yçan*¹¹ *redemitu haren odol saynduyaz* (1:42)
how are redeem.PRF his blood holy.by
'how you are redeemed by his holy blood'
- (34) Nola *vaita redemitu çure odol saynduyaz* (1:75)
how is redeem.PRF your blood holy.by
'how it is redeemed by your holy blood'

Altuna (1987: 23) states these are passive, albeit devoid of participial agreement.¹² Similarly, in an excellent and thorough study of Leizarraga's verbs, Zulaika (1998) brings together many such examples occurring in this 1571 text. Continuing with the tradition that recognizes these forms as a variant of more standard passive structures, Zulaika (1998: 779) explicitly analyzes the verbal forms in the following examples as containing a participle used as a 'predicative complement':

- (35) Jesus *eraman cedin desertura eta tenta cedin deabruaz*
Jesus take.PRF was desert.to and tempt.PRF was devil.by
'Jesus was taken to the desert and tempted by the devil'

More recently, Kintana (2004), in his comments on Lazarraga's manuscript (1560s), points out that forms like *dirurren saldu nintzan esklabea* 'I was sold for money as a slave' provide confirmation for the old status of 'this form of passive'. In

¹¹ This is not the participle *izan* 'be' but the present second person informal provided with the interrogative complementizer *-en*.

¹² 'pasivak *-a izan da* edo *-a izan haiz* gabe: "ha sido redimida" eta ez "se ha redimido".' (Passive without *-a izan da* or *-a izan haiz* [predicative forms marked for agreement (*-a*) and perfective participle of auxiliary *izan* 'be']: "has been redeemed" and not "it has become redeemed"). He explicitly rejects (1:42) can be translated as Sp. *se ha redimido*. Since other such cases labeled 'passive' are sometimes glossed with a Spanish *se*-impersonal construction (*acusatu baguira* in (13:28) is translated as '*si se nos acusa*') the construction this translation is intended to reject seems to correspond to an inchoative use of the verb (corresponding also to a *se* construction in Spanish).

this analysis, then, perfective participles unmarked for agreement can also function as heads of clausal predicative complements. If this possibility does exist, we would then face a structural ambiguity: bare participle + tensed *be* could stand for a predicate + main verb (passive) structure as well as for a lexical verb + auxiliary sequence (mediopassive). In the following subsections, I will examine whether the first possibility is actually found. I will first concentrate on properties of the tensed element (3.1), turning in (3.2) to agent phrases. Where available, the evidence shows that the former possibility is not in fact exploited, at least in tensed contexts in Leizarraga. The general point is that these factors must be borne in mind if the label ‘passive’ is to be used in a more than impressionistic way.

3.1. Main vs. auxiliary tensed forms

To check whether uninflected participial heads of predicative clausal complements are actually found, we may take advantage of the existence of verbal forms specialized for ‘main’ and ‘auxiliary’ use. Thus, in the intransitive paradigm, a form like *biz* ‘let it be’ or *bira/bire* ‘let them be’ corresponds to the main verb imperative, while *bedi/bitez* are auxiliary forms. According to the discussion in section 2, we expect to find *bedi/bitez* forms with lexical verbs in non-perfective forms, analysed as mediopassive. This is clearly the case:

- (36) *sanctifica bedi hire icena* (Mt 6, 9)
 sanctify be your name
 ‘hallowed be thy name’
- (37) *Diotsate guciéc, Crucifica bedi.* (Mt. 27, 22)
 say all crucify be
 ‘let him be crucified’
- (38) *Eguin bedi hire vorondatea ceruän beçala lurean-ere* (Mt 6, 10)
 do be your will heaven.in like earth.on-too
 ‘Thy will be done in earth, as in heaven’

The last example contains an *-n* verb which lacks a differentiated root form, and I will consider the occurrence in this context as a ‘root’ instance, rather than a perfective one. At the same time, given the discussion in this section, we expect to find *biz/bira* ‘main’ verbs where the participle is marked for agreement. The only case where a participle combines with the verb *be* in the relevant configuration does show this to be the case:

- (39) *Bira çuen guerrunceac guerricatuac,* (Lc 12, 35)
 be your loins gird.PRF.AGR
 eta çuen candelác *irachequiac.*
 and your candles light.PRF.AGR
 ‘Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning’

There are no examples of bare perfective (predicative) participles with the independent ‘main verb’ forms of *be*, which suggests the bare perfective form is only

used in simple monoclausal mediopassives.¹³ Although, given the scarcity of the data we cannot reach firm conclusions, the evidence available does point in this direction.

There are no relevant examples in Etxepare's text, which makes it impossible to contrast these data for his dialect. However, some other type of evidence to the same effect can be gained from an examination of Etxepare's agent phrases. We turn to this in the next section.

3.2. Agent phrases

In Etxepare's text, agent phrases can also be used as a diagnostic for passive type. There is a clear difference between Etxepare and Leizarraga in the use of overt agent phrases, since the latter employs them both in standard passives and in mediopassives, while in the case of the former, only passives allow for their appearance. Before turning to a consideration of Etxepare's data, though, it is important to comment on agent phrases in Leizarraga.

As can be observed in some of the previous examples, Leizarraga often uses overt instrumental agent phrases in the structures I am analyzing as mediopassives:

(40) *tentatzen cela Satanez* (Mt 1, 13)
 tempt.IMPF be.as Satan.INSTR
 'while he was tempted by Satan'

(41) *eraman baitzedin Aingueruéz Abrahamen bulharrera* (Lc 16, 22)
 take was angels.INSTR Abraham.of bosom.to
 'and he was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom'

It is perhaps worth pointing out that the possibility of overtly expressing the agent by an instrumental phrase, shared by passives and mediopassives in Leizarraga, does not provide an argument to consider both constructions one and the same, or to cast doubt on the mediopassive nature of any construction.¹⁴ It is true that in the modern language, and probably in Leizarraga's own time, passives and mediopassives differ in the availability of an agent phrase, which is optional in the former and ungrammatical in the latter:

(42) *Hitzarmena (*guztiak/*guztiez) sinatu zen.*
 treaty all.ERG/all.INSTR sign.PRF was
 'The treaty was signed (by all).'

¹³ In fact, this can be found in one of the examples listed by Irigoyen: *biz laudatu Iainco Iauna*. The example comes from Harizmendi's 1658 book, which, unless this author uses *biz/bedi* in a different way, indicates bare participles functioned in a way different from Leizarraga's in this dialect.

¹⁴ The occurrence of instrumental for 'demoted' agents does not clash with de Rijk's (2003) claim that earlier forms of Basque possessed fully productive antipassive alternations where the 'demoted' object also occurs in the instrumental case. Instrumental would then have been used as a purely grammatical case for demoted core arguments. In fact, this is typologically attested: Eskimo demoted agents and themes can occur in the instrumental case in passives and antipassives, respectively.

- (43) Hitzarmena *guzतिक* sinatua izan zen.
 treaty all.erg sign.PRF.AUX be was
 ‘The treaty was signed by all.’

Notice that it seems to be the case that a) clear passives in some languages do not allow for overt agent phrases and that b) mediopassives in other languages do allow for agent phrase expression. Even without conducting a wide-ranging typological survey, we can see that the neighboring languages show the latter possibility, if restrictedly. In Spanish, overt agentive phrases in ‘reflexive passives’ and middles are at least marginally possible (Mendikoetxea 1999):

- (44) Se firmó la paz *por los embajadores*.
 ‘The treaty was signed by the ambassadors.’
- (45) Los rumores sobre el nuevo encarcelamiento se divulgaron *por un periodista ajeno a TVE* (from Mendikoetxea 1999: 1683)
 ‘The rumors on the new arrest were spread by a journalist external to TVE’.

As for English, *for*-phrases occasionally found in middles have been claimed to correspond to overt agentive phrases (Rapoport 1999):

- (46) French books read easily *for educated people*

The fact that Etxepare does not display overt agents in mediopassives, coinciding with modern usage, may indicate that Leizarraga was taking full advantage of what may have been only a marginal possibility in his effort to translate staying as close to the original as possible. As is suspected for ‘normal’ passives, these mediopassives may have exploited in new ways existing possibilities.

Returning to Etxepare, the possibility of overt agent expression patterns with the proposed structural distinction between passives and mediopassives. It may not be a coincidence that all overt agents are found in structures that, according to the previous criteria, would qualify as ‘passive’. No bare participial example contains an overt ergative agent phrase, and none of the constructions with overt ergative agent phrases contains a bare participle. The following list shows that to be the case:

- (47) Hanbat gende dacuscula *hunec enganaturic* (1:89)
 many people we.see this.ERG deceive.PRF.ic
 ‘that we see many people deceived by this’
- (48) Gure arimaz cargu dugu *iangoycuac emanic* (1:107)
 our soul.of resp. have god.ERG give.PRF.ic
 ‘we are entrusted by God to the care of our souls’
- (49) Manamenduyac hoyec dira *iangoycuac emanic* (1:224)
 commands those are god.ERG give.PRF.ic
 ‘those commandments are given by God’
- (50) Hire contra heben guituc *ihaurorrec equinic* (1:282)
 your against here are yourself.ERG create.PRF.ic
 ‘here we are, against you [even though] created by you’

- (51) *Mundu oro iarriren da suyac arrasaturic.* (1:316)
 world all end.up be fire.ERG raze.PRF.ic
 ‘the whole world will end up razed by fire’
- (52) *Ieyncoaren ama virgen verac ordenatuya* (1:390)
 god.of mother virgin she.ERG command.PRF.AGR
 ‘God’s virgin mother [as] commanded by him’
- (53) *Mundu hunec haraguiac bethi enganatuya.* (1:404)
 world this.ERG flesh.ERG always deceive.PRF.AGR
 ‘always deceived by this world, by the flesh’
- (54) *Nic eztañcut emaztiac borchaturic guičona*¹⁵ (3:43)
 I not.hear woman.ERG force.PRF.ic man
 ‘I don’t hear [that] man is forced by woman’

As can be observed, these examples only contain marked participles.¹⁶ On top of the positive correlation with passives, helping to define the latter in a sharper way as differing from mediopassives, we find a corroboration of the negative evidence we also found in the preceding section. That is, bare participles, which could in principle serve as heads of clausal predicative complements, do not in fact seem to do so.¹⁷ A quick, and necessarily provisional, look at Lazarraga’s roughly contemporary manuscript, also reveals that overt agent phrases are only found with marked participles. The clearest examples are in fact in the ergative, as in Etxepare, since the instrumental (59) and ablative (60) phrases may well be non-agentive adjuncts:¹⁸

¹⁵ Only in an interpretation where *guičona* is the object of *eztañcut* ‘I don’t hear’, so that [*emaztiac borchaturic*] is an independent passive constituent ‘forced by a woman’. See Altuna (1987: 125) for a (quite likely) different interpretation. The difference between the two interpretations will become irrelevant under the analysis proposed later in this section.

¹⁶ There are no unmarked participle constructions reinforced by the perfective *izan* ‘be’ participle, which, again, could be used as another indication that we are not dealing with standard passive construction. However, this is not meaningful, since there are no clear standard passives with *izan* in Etxepare. The closest is found in the preface:

(i) *eta çure escutic oroc dugun ioya ederra Imprimituric heuscara orano içan eztena* (0:22-23)

if *heuscara orano içan eztena* is an appositive ‘which Basque has not yet been [printed]’. An example like

(ii) *Egun hartan handiena yçanen da erratuya* (1:300)

is irrelevant, since *erratuya* ‘confused’ looks like a participle that is being used in a completely adjectival way.

¹⁷ Notice that Etxepare’s agents occur in the ergative, unlike Leizarraga’s. There is only one possible case of instrumental agent in Etxepare: *çure escuyaz dacusquidan heyec gatzigaturic* ‘let me see them punished by (means of?) your hand’ (13, 35). Altuna (1987: 236) mentions this may be something like ‘castigado por tu mano’. However, the instrumental value is also clearly possible. See also *Nola vaita redemitu çure odol saynduyaz* ‘as it is redeemed by (means of) your holy blood’ (1, 75).

¹⁸ The case in *bildurrac icara nabil* ‘I’m trembling with fear’ is no counterexample; what is exceptional/idiomatic here is the presence of the ergative without a clear verb, rather than whether the latter would have been marked on not.

- (55) *poderioa andia doçu / çeruco jaunac emunic* (20r)
 might great have heave.of lord.ERG give.PRF.*ic*
 ‘you have great power, given by the lord of heaven’
- (56) *lecu onean topadu gara / jaun çerucoac guraric* (21r)
 place good.at meet have lord heave.of.ERG want.*ic*
 ‘we have met in a good place, God wanting’
- (57) *nengoan goseac ylic* (45r,v)
 was hunger.ERG die.*ic*
 ‘I was starving hungry’
- (58) *ecusten / euen guztia galduric/*
 see.IMPF aux all lose.PRF.*ic*
galduric eta / su orrec abrasaduric (48v)
 lose.PRF.*ic* and fire that.erg scorch.PRF.*ic*
 ‘they saw everything lost, lost and scorched by that fire’
- (59) *denbora baten yçan ninçan / amore minez tentadua* (39r)
 time one.of be was love deep.INSTR tempt.PRF.AGR
 ‘at one time I was tempted by a deep love’
- (60) *neure aragui gaxtoaganic / yçan ninçan ni tentadua* (39r)
 my flesh evil be was I tempt. PRF.AGR
 ‘I was tempted by/from my flesh’

I have not been able to locate any agent phrase in a mediopassive, suggesting, with the usual proviso for the limited data available and the lack of a critical edition of this manuscript, that the passive type was indeed a separate type of structure in this dialect as well.

3.3. Passives?

The previous section has tried to use the occurrence of agent phrases as a criterion to differentiate the two types of constructions we are dealing with. Having done that, though, in this section I will cast some doubts on the accuracy of the term ‘passive’ for at least some of the *-ic* examples above. As first discussed in Rebuschi (1984), *-ta* and *-(r)ik* participles can occur as predicative complements of intransitive copulative verbs like *izan* and *egon*. The passive nature of these constructions is similar to that of sentences containing embedded agreeing participles (see Ortiz de Urbina & Uribe-Etxebarria 1991), and I will briefly mention these at the end of this section. However, in all dialects, *-(r)ik* (formally, tenseless counterparts of *-larik*) clauses can be used as disjunct elements. They are typically predicated of a nominal inside the clause without being linked to them in an overt predicative structure:¹⁹

¹⁹ Far less commonly in Leizarraga, the adjunct clause may occur without any gap:

(i) *Eta iaiquiric Iesus synagotic, sar cedin Simonen etchean* (Lc 4, 38)

- (61) eta ametsetan diuinoqui *adwertituric*
 and dreams.in divine.ly warn.PRF.ic
 retira cedin Galileaco bazterretarát (Mt 2, 22)
 retire was Galilee parts.to
 ‘being warned of God in a dream, he turned aside into the parts of Galilee’
- (62) Baina Iesusec hori *eçagaturic* lecu eguin ceçan handic (Mt 12, 15)
 but Jesus that know.PRF.ic place do AUX there.from
 ‘but knowing Jesus that, he withdrew from there’

Notice that ergative subjects in the Lazarraga examples listed above are only found in these participial clauses, just like the majority of such examples in Etxepare’s text, so these structures account for much of the evidence on passives. Quite often, it looks as if the participle were interpreted as ‘passive’ (predicated of their object), and this is the reason why they are often translated as such. Lewy (1934), commenting on the fact that the agent is expressed in the ‘active’ (ergative) case, lists together examples with agreeing and *-(r)ik* participles, giving passive translations. Altuna (1982: 60), however, correctly suggests passive is not correct in his gloss to (51) above. His main objection is that this sentence is eventive, rather than stative, and that therefore it is active. While the actual argument is not very convincing, since passives can also be eventive, he claims *suyac arrasaturic* is to be paraphrased as active *suak arrasatzen duela* ‘as fire razes it’, rather than passive ‘razed by fire’. The intuition is then that these are somehow active, rather than passive, and that does seem to be appropriate. The similarity with passives stems mainly from the fact that they can be translated by passive-like participial constructions with *by/por* agents, but this is a fact about the translation, not about their structure. If we concentrate on the latter, we find a tenseless verb where all its arguments can be overtly expressed in their normal subject/object shapes, and where the object, just like the subject, can be interpreted as coreferential with a nominal in the main clause. There is no structural difference between (51) above and the following sentence, where there is no gap, and no passive paraphrase:

- (63) Hanbat ongui nic eguinic çuyer çuyen mendian (1, 341)
 so.much good I.ERG do.PRF.ic you.to your time.in
 ‘although I did for you so much good in your time’

It looks that perfective paraphrases like ‘X having razed Y’ are closer to the structural characteristics of this construction. Where the verb is transitive, the subject will occur in the ergative, as corresponds a transitive subject. Crucially, the ergative argument would not be a passive agent.²⁰

²⁰ As usual, it is Leizarraga’s examples with the instrumental that represent a departure from this pattern:

(i) Hura bada ethor cedin Spirituaz mouituric templera (Lc 2, 27)

This is the same pattern we find in ‘standard’ agreeing predicative complement passives and mediopassives.

This leaves clausal agreeing participles in predicative position with obligatory gaps as the basic passive type. Even these, however, can be reanalyzed in the light of Rebuschi's (1984) 'antipassive' data and the analysis proposed in Ortiz de Urbina & Uribe-Etxebarria (1991):

- (64) Idazle hori [denek irakurria] zen
 writer that all.ERG read.PRF.AGR was
 'that writer was read by everybody'
- (65) Idazlea [liburu asko irakurria] zen
 write book many read.PRF.AGR was
 'that writer was [in the state of having] read many books'

Since the noun predicated about can be both the subject and the object, it is possible to claim that even in these 'standard' passives, we have an active clausal structure with subject or object gaps. Returning to the main concern in this article, even if this analysis of passive structures is viable, the argument sketched in 3.2 would still be valid in that it shows that we have a type of structure different from the mediopassive.

4. Expletive participles

Let's return now to Leizarraga and to the problem of potentially ambiguous structures with bare participles. One may want to derive an argument for the passive (as opposed to mediopassive) nature of these structures by capitalizing on examples like the following:

- (66) ikussiric nola Çuhurréz enganatu içan cen (Mt 2, 16)
 see.PRF.ic how wise.INSTR deceive.PRF be was
 'seeing how he was mocked of the wise men'
- (67) nola bere obrez manifestatu içan baitzaicu (Cat 1296)
 how his acts.INSTR manifest.PRF be AUX
 'how he has manifested himself to us through his deeds'
- (68) Eztute guciéc ardiesten hitz haur, baina eman içan çayenéc (Mt. 18, 11)
 not.AUX all achieve word this, but give be AUX.ERG
 'not all get this word, but only those to whom it is granted'
- (69) Haur Iaunaz eguin içan da (Mt. 21, 42)
 this lord.INSTR make be is
 'this has been made by the lord'

In all these examples, the tensed verb is preceded by the perfective participle *içan*. Since a periphrastic form like *içan da* is clearly a simple perfective main verb, the preceding participial form might be claimed to correspond necessarily to an embedded verb, as in passives. The embedded predicative clause would be headed by the bare counterpart of the agreeing participle we find in uncontroversial passives like

- (70) vkaturen nauena, ukatua iñanen da (Lc 12, 9)
 deny.FUT AUX.who deny.PRE.AGR be.FUT is
 ‘he who dies me will be denied’
- (71) hiri hura baino emequiago tractatuac iñanen diradela. (Lc 10, 12)
 town that but softly.more treat.PRE.AGR be.FUT are.that
 ‘that they will be treated more softly than that city’
- (72) eta cer-ere lothuren baituc lurrian, lothua iñanen duc ceruètan:
 and whatever tie.FUT AUX earth.on tie.PRE.AGR be.FUT AUX heavens.in
 ..., lachatua iñanen duc ceruètan (Mt 16, 19)
 ... release.PRE.AGR be.FUT AUX heavens.in
 ‘and whatever you will bind on earth will be bound in heaven, ... will be
 loosed in heaven’

If this is so, we would have to conclude that bare participles can also head embedded clausal predicative complements. However, the preceding facts must be examined in the light of Leizarraga’s hyperperiphrastic constructions in general. Leizarraga often includes an ‘expletive’ participle in perfect tenses. Examples follow with both transitive and intransitive verbs, in transparently active constructions:

- (73) Eta erori iñan da vria, eta ethorri iñan dirade vr sobernac, eta eraunsi vkan duté haicéc, eta io vkan duté etchearen contra: eta ezta erori iñan: ecen arroca gainean fundatua cen. (Mt 7 25)
 ‘And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock.’
- (74) Iautsi iñan da iffernuetara: Hereneco egunean resuscitatu iñan da hiletaric: Igan iñan da ceruètara [Cat. 1294-1295]
 ‘he descended to hell: on the third day he resurrected from the dead: he ascended to heaven’

Zulaika (1998: 560) calls these auxiliaries ‘dummy’, adding that they do not contribute any meaning to the basic construction. This is also Lafon’s (1944: II, 119-21) opinion, who shows that in the bilingual dedication of the New Testament, these forms (which he calls *surcomposées* ‘hyperperiphrastic’) translate French simple perfect tenses: *incitatu vkan nautenéc* ‘ceux qui m’ont incité’.

An important characteristic of this dummy participle is that it duplicates the perfective participle preceding it. Impressionistically, we have [*incitatu vkan nautenéc*], rather than *incitatu [vkan nautenéc]*. Thus, dummy participles are not found with lexical verbs in imperfective, future of bare forms (**incitatzen vkan*, **incitaturen vkan*, **incita vkan*). Moreover, the dummy participle is fixed in the perfective form it doubles up: a form like *perfective participle-izanen-aux* must be analyzed as *p.p. [izanen-aux]*, since the lack of aspectual correspondence of the two tenseless forms, i.e., the fact that the verbal form in the middle is in the future, indicates we are dealing with a periphrastic form of the right edge verbal element.

Let’s examine passive/mediopassive examples with expletive participles, that is, cases where transitive verbs are followed by both a participial and a tensed form of

içan. The question is then how to analyze something like *guiçonéz chikiratu içan dirade* ‘have been castrated by men’ in the following versicle:

- (75) Ecen badirade chikiratuac amaren sabeletic hala iayo içan diradenac: eta
 badirade chikiratuac, *guiçonéz* *chikiratu içan diradenac*:
 men.instr castrate.PRF be AUX.who
 eta badirade chikiratuac ceruétaco resumagatic bere buruäc chikiratu vkan
 dituztenac. (Mt 19, 12)
 ‘For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from *their* mother’s
 womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men:
 and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the
 kingdom of heaven’s sake.’

In the light of the preceding discussion, this would be analyzed as [[*chikiratu içan*] *dirade*], i.e., as a single periphrastic verb form whose participle is doubled by expletive *içan*. In particular, we are not dealing with a periphrastic main verb *be* (*içan dirade*) taking a bare participial (clausal) predicative complement. In other words, this is a mediopassive construction, as opposed to a passive one, and so are examples (66) through (69).

In Leizarraga, the correlations of different criteria pattern in the expected way. For instance, where the intervening form of *içan* is in a future form, which, as has been claimed above, necessarily means we are dealing with a passive, the participle always appears in the agreeing form. Some examples can be seen in (70) through (72) above at the beginning of this section. To add another example, we have the following:

- (76) Eta guciéz *gaitzetsiac içanen çarete*, ene icenagatic (Mt 10, 22)
 and all.INSTR despice.PRF.AGR be.FUT AUX my name.for
 ‘And ye shall be hated of all *men* for my name’s sake’

This structure is then clearly passive not only because the participle is marked as a predicative element, but also because of the presence of a main/matrix verb *izan* in a periphrastic form. No bare transitive participle with a future form of *içan* is found in the four gospels, and none is recorded in Zulaika’s (1998) thorough listings. Since, as I am claiming, the presence of *içanen* entails a passive structure, this reinforces the conclusions drawn in the previous section that bare participles, although in principle capable of predicative clausal use, are not in fact found in that function in this dialect.

This correlation, however, is not found in Lazarraga’s text, suggesting that his dialect may have made use of bare participles for embedded predicative contexts. Thus, while the two past forms *yçan ninçan* in (59) and (60) take an agreeing participle, the following two future forms contain bare participles:

- (77) ene parteti *yçango çara / justiçara çitadu* (25r)
 my part.from be.FUT AUX justice.to call.PRF
 ‘you will be called to the court from my part’
 (78) an *yçango da probadu* (25r)
 there be.FUT AUX prove.PRF
 ‘there it will be proved’

As usual, more in-depth studies of each dialect will have to be made to reach firm conclusions.

5. Tenseless forms

For completeness' sake, we should also consider how the criteria spelled out above can fare with cases like the following, where the whole construction is tenseless:

- (79) mundura igorri içanic (Cat. 1295)
 world.to send.PRF be.PRF.*ic*
 'having been sent to the world'
- (80) aitzinetic amáz instruitu içanic (Mt 14, 8)
 earlier.times.from mother.INSTR instruct.PRF be.PRF.*ic*
 'having been instructed by his mother from earlier'
- (81) guiçonéz ohondicatu içateco (Mt 5, 13; Zulaika 1998: 783)
 men.INSTR tread.PRF be.for
 'to be trodden by men'

The first two examples could in principle be analyzed in two ways. One may identify *içanic* as a dummy participle, making *igorri içanic* the equivalent of *igorritic* provided with the expletive. It is true that, in principle, dummy participles always 'double up' the lexical participle; however, there is no morphological mismatch here: the form *içanic* is also a participial form to which the tenseless marker *-ic* has been added. The latter happens to be a bound morpheme, while in forms like *igorri içan da* the tensed auxiliary is an independent word. There is, therefore, no morphological obstacle for the expletive participle analysis. Moreover, as seen in (61) and (62) above, repeated here, the interpretation of *-ic* 'absolute' participles can be passive as in the first example, as well as active as in the second:

- (82) eta ametsetan diuinoqui *aduertituric*
 and dreams.in divine.ly warn.PRF.*ic*
 retira cedin Galileaco bazterretarát (Mt 2, 22)
 retire was Galilee parts.to
 'being warned of God in a dream, he turned aside into the parts of Galilee'
- (83) Baina Iesusec hori *eçagaturic* lecu eguin ceçan handi (Mt 12, 15)
 but Jesus that know.PRF.*ic* place do AUX there.from
 'but Jesus knowing it, he withdrew from there'

So nothing prevents an analysis of these forms as hyperperiphrastic *-ic* forms with a 'passive' interpretation. However, these would not be passive structures, in the sense that the *içanic* form does not correspond to a copulative main verb. Rather they would be 'absolute' constructions with a complex participle. According to our initial assumptions in section 1, both constructions are related in that the latter can also function as an open clause with a gap in the object position, taking as antecedent a nominal in the clause. The difference is that the absolute construction

works as an adjunct while the participle in the passive heads a predicative complement.

Notice that if *içanic* is indeed the doubled up participle to which the Tense mark has been added, and not a main copulative verb taking a clausal participial complement (i.e., a passive), we are also discarding another potential case of passive structures containing unmarked predicative participles. There is however one type of tenseless form where this structure does seem to be used. This is the case of *ohondicatu içateco* in example (81) above. The list below gathers together all the cases I have found in the four gospels of this same type:

- (84) *cebatu içateco* merci duqueen gauçac eguin dituena (Lc 12, 48)
 flog.PRF be.NOM.for worth AUX things make AUX.who
 ‘he who committed things worthy of stripes’
- (85) Ecen guiçonaren Semea-ere ezta ethorri *cerbitzatu içatera*
 since man.GEN son-also not.has come serve.PRF be.NOM.to
 ‘for even the Son of Man did not come to be served’ (Mc 10, 45; 20, 28)
- (86) hura iudicioz *punitu içateco* digne date (Mt 5, 21-22)
 he trial punish.PRF be.NOM.for worthy is
 ‘he will be subject to judgment’

Unlike the *-ic* ending, which is attached to a participle, we are dealing here with a nominalized form of *içan*. It is therefore difficult to propose a hyperperiphrastic analysis for these forms, given the aspectual mismatch with the preceding participle. This would then provide an example of bare predicative complements in passive contexts. The isolated place this possibility displays in the whole system requires more research, and I will not pursue it here. It is not only that this possibility is found here in a clear way. Furthermore, one has to explain why there is no single case of agreeing participle in this same context with nominalized *içan*.

The above cases are different from occasional ‘passive’ interpretations of tenseless verbal forms which do not occur in what we are calling a passive structure. This is the case of ‘passive’ interpretations of participles and nominalized forms, which I will mention for completeness’ sake. Zulaika (1998: 783) registers the following ones, among others:

- (87) Spiritu sainduaz batheyatzea (Act 1, 0)
 spirit holy.INSTR baptize.NOM.ABS
 ‘(to be) baptized by the Holy Spirit’
- (88) Nic behar diat hireganic batheyatu (Mt 3, 13)
 I need AUX you.from baptize.PRF
 ‘I should be baptized by you’

Both of them contain the verb *batheyatu* ‘baptize’, in a nominalized form and, in the second example, in a participial clause complement of *behar* ‘need’. While nominalized clauses can have gaps for subject and object position, it is probably the presence of the instrumental phrase that suggests a ‘passive’ interpretation. As for participial clauses complements to *behar/nahi*, they are also ‘open’ clauses, but the

gap is typically found in the subject position, controlled by the matrix subject. Schuchardt (1900: 89) pointed out this example could be both ‘ich muss getauft werden’, the relevant interpretation in this context, and ‘ich muss ihn taufen’. However, it is not necessary to think of passive interpretations or structures in either case. Notice that the verb *batheyatu* ‘baptize’ seems to enter into the causative/inchoative alternation (89, 90). Moreover, instrumental phrases need not be agentive, as shown in (91, 92):

- (89) ni batheyatzen naicen baptismoaz
 I baptize.IMPF AUX.that baptism.INSTR
 batheya ahal çaitezquete? (Mc 10, 38)
 baptize can be.AUX
 ‘can you be baptized with the baptism I am baptized with?’
- (90) Eta batheyatzen ciraden harenganic Iordanean (Mt 3, 6)
 and baptize.IMPF be.AUX he.from Jordan.in
 ‘and they were baptized by him in the Jordan’
- (91) harc batheyaturen çaituzté Spiritu sainduaz eta suz. (Mt 3, 11)
 he.ERG baptize.FUT have.AUX spirit holy.INSTR and fire.INSTR
 ‘he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire’
- (92) hura duc Spiritu sainduaz batheyatzen duena. (Jn, 1, 33)
 he is spirit holy.INSTR baptize.IMPF have.AUX.who
 ‘he is the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit’

If the intransitive examples above are inchoative, a nominalized form is perfectly possible with a ‘change of state’ monoargumental meaning, so this analysis is plausible for (87), whose instrumental need not correspond to the agent (see again (91) and (92)). As for example (88), given that *behar* could impose a transitive auxiliary over the intransitive one selected by the verb it combines with (see (93) below), one can get a ‘transitive’ version of an inchoative use of a verb. The subject of *behar* will then be interpreted as the theme of transitive *batheyatu*, just like any inchoative subject is thematically related to the object of the causative use of the same verb. This is shown with the verb *hil* (94). Notice also that the animate ablative phrase is perfectly possible in the inchoative intransitive this analysis proposes for (88) above, as (95) shows:

- (93) Eta harc *behar çuen iragan* Samariatic. (Jn 4, 4)
 and he need have.AUX pass Samaria
 ‘and he must needs go through Samaria’
- (94) ecen Iesusec *hil behar luela* nationeagatic. (Jn 11, 51)
 that Jesus.ERG die must have.AUX.that nation.cause
 ‘that Jesus had to die for that nation’
- (95) eta batheyatzen ciraden guciac *harenganic* Iordaneco fluuioan (Mc 1, 5)
 and baptize.IMPF be.AUX all he.from Jordan.of river.in
 ‘and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan’

A better example with *behar* is the following one, also listed by Zulaika:

- (96) *ecen ni behar nicén çueçaz laudatu* (2 Cor 12, 11)
 since I need be.AUX.COMP you.INSTR praise.PRF
 ‘for I ought to have been commended of you’

Since the intransitive auxiliary cannot be ascribed to *behar* and the embedded verb *laudatu* does not have an inchoative use, the passive interpretation can be traced back to a passive/mediopassive structure. Depending on the analysis of *behar* constructions, this sentence could be seen as the mediopassive version of the complex verb *laudatu behar*, or as a mediopassive of *laudatu*, whose derived subject is now controlled by the subject of *behar*.²¹

6. Conclusion

In this article, I have tried to check whether some ‘passive’ patterns in early modern Basque correspond indeed to a distinct ‘old’ passive type, or whether they can be considered as instances of mediopassives, a common structure then and now. To do so, I have identified some criterial differences between the two constructions. To the extent that there exist systematic differences which are not an artifact of the analysis, the distinction is structural and general cover terms like ‘passive’ should be avoided. The analysis has been largely limited to morphosyntactic factors, leaving aside temporal/aspectual issues which may shed some more light on this structural distinction. Even so, some intriguing correlations have surfaced which deserve more explanatory accounts.

References

- Altuna, P., 1987, *Linguae vasconum primitiae*, Bernard Etxepare. Critical edition. Bilbao: Mensajero.
 Bretshneider, G., 1979, “Typological characteristics of Basque”. F. Plank, ed., *Ergativity*, New York: Academic Press, 371-84.
 Coyos, B., 2003, “Antipasiboaren lekua oraiko zubereran”. In Makatzaga & Oyharçabal, eds., 181-93.
 de Rijk, R. P. G., 2003, “Antipasiboak euskaran”. In Makatzaga & Oyharçabal, eds., 385-93.
 Dixon, R. M. W. & A. Aikhenvald, 2000, *Changing Valency*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.

²¹ A cursory examination of the texts has not produced any instance of yet a third type of passive-like structure one can find with *behar*. This type has occasionally surfaced in more modern authors, since it is attested in Axular and in Duvoisin (Ortiz de Urbina 2003: 308):

- (i) Den lurrik hoberenak ere behar du aphaindu, garbitu eta iorratu (Ax. 25)
 (ii) Haritzak ez du hola murriztu behar (Duv., *Laborantzako Liburua*, 189)

Here the main subject is interpreted as the object of the embedded verb, but, unlike the example in (96), the auxiliary is transitive, excluding a regular mediopassive analysis.

- Irigoyen, A., 1992, "Euskal litteratura zaharrari dagokiola verbo-systema periphrastikoan boz aktivoari oposatzen zaion boz pasivoaz ohar gisako elea berriz ere", *De Re Philologica Linguae Uasconicae*, Bilbao, 287-90.
- Kintana, X., 2004, "Sobre el manuscrito de Lazarraga", *Gara*, 05/03/2004 [<http://www.gara.net/orriak/P05032004/art73476.htm>].
- Lafon, R., 1943, *Le système du verbe basque au XVI siècle* Bordeaux: Delmas [Reprinted Zaurutz: Elkar, 1980].
- Lewy, E., 1934, "Zu Dechepare", *RIEVXXV*, 225-39.
- Makatzaga, J. M., & B. Oyharçabal, eds., 2003, *P. Lafitteren sortzearen mendemugako bil-tzarra*. Bilbo: Euskaltzaindia.
- Mendikoetxea, A., 1999, "Construcciones pasivas con *se*". In I. Bosque & V. Demonte, eds., *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, Madrid: Espasa.
- Ortiz de Urbina, J., 2003, "Semiauxiliary verbs", in J. I. Hualde & J. Ortiz de Urbina, eds., *A Grammar of Basque*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 300-16.
- & M. Uribe-Etxebarria 1991, "Participial predication in Basque". In J. A. Lakarra, ed., *Memoriae L. Mitxelena Magistri Sacrum*, Supplements of *ASJU*, Donostia: 993-1012.
- Rapoport, T. R., 1999, "The English Middle and Agentivity", *LI* 31.1, 147-55.
- Rebuschi, G., 1984, *Structure de l'énoncé en basque*. Paris: SELAF.
- Schuchardt H. (& Th. Linschmann), 1900, *I. Leicarraga's Baskische Bücher von 1571*. Strassburg: Verlag von K.J. Trübner [Reprinted Bilbo: Euskaltzaindia 1990].
- Trask, L. R., 1993, *A dictionary of grammatical terms in linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Zulaika, E., 1998, *Ioanes Leizarragaren aditza*. Donostia: Deustuko Unibertsitatea.