

On the reliability of Larramendi's evidence¹

Blanca Urgell*

Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU)

ABSTRACT: In this article, the analysis of the sources of Manuel de Larramendi's (1690-1766) grammar and dictionary reveals the importance of his work and asserts that they are necessary tools to better understand the history of the Basque language.

First, we will offer an overview of the reception of Larramendi's works from the 18th century to the 20th (§ 1), in order to show that from the end of the 19th century onwards bascologists highlighted their apologetic aspect and downplayed their significance as the first printed Basque linguistic tools, just the opposite of what had happened previously.

We will go on to evaluate the reliability and richness of his *Diccionario Trilingüe* (*DT*, 1745) with a sample (§ 2) to show the large number of words from the oral language collected by Larramendi, in what semantic fields they are concentrated and, ultimately, the relevance of his dictionary as a means of attesting words and variants, and dating them.

As this paper presents the results of a first approach to the Basque sources of Larramendi's grammar (1729), we will seek to establish that the Labourdin writers Etxeberri of Ziburu (1627, 1630) and Haranburu (1635) are some of them, and perhaps also Axular (1643), all of them known sources of his dictionary.

Finally, regarding the Biscayan dialect, the data shows that, although some of the verb forms may have been taken from Capanaga's catechism (1656), others are coined by Larramendi analogically from the paradigms of the Guipuzcoan dialect.

KEYWORDS: Larramendi, First Modern Basque, grammar, dictionary, sources, Etxeberri of Ziburu, Haranburu, Axular, Kapanaga.

¹ This work has been done with the help of the following research projects: «*Monumenta Linguae Vasconum* (IV): textos arcaicos vascos y euskeru antiguo» (MINECO, FFI2012-37696), «Historia de la lengua vasca y lingüística histórico-comparada» (Gobierno Vasco, GIC. IT698-13) y «Lingüística teórica y diacrónica: Gramática Universal, lenguas indoeuropeas y lengua vasca» (UPV/EHU, UFI11/14). All the English translations are mine. In order to save space, I have not included the original language of the citations, all of them having been published and easily accessible. I want to thank Paul Wayland and Ricardo Gómez for their patience and painstaking help reading this work.

* **Corresponding author:** Blanca Urgell. Department of Linguistics and Basque Studies. School of Letters, UPV/EHU, Paseo de la Universidad (01006 Vitoria-Gasteiz) – blanca.urgell@ehu.eus – <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4231-2825>

How to cite: Urgell, Blanca (2016 [2021]). «On the reliability of Larramendi's evidence». *ASJU*, 50 (1-2), 121-147. (<https://doi.org/10.1387/asju.22861>).

Received: 2019-10-21; Accepted: 2020-05-21.

ISSN 0582-6152 - eISSN 2444-2992 / © 2021 «Julio Urkijo» Euskal Filología Institutu-Mintegia (UPV/EHU)



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

1. Background

It is hardly an exaggeration to say that Manuel de Larramendi's works are one of the most important stages in the grammaticalization (Auroux 1994) of the Basque language or *Euskara*, insomuch as he published the first grammar (*El imposible vencido. Arte de la lengua bascongada*, 1729) and the first general dictionary (*Diccionario Trilingüe del castellano, bascuence y latín*, 1745). There are previous works, but all of them were still unpublished —and that is why many of them have been lost (cf. Oyharçabal 1989; Lakarra 1992; Urgell 2002; Zulaika 2012).

During the whole First Modern Basque period (1745-1891; Urgell 2018) it was almost impossible to write about the Basque language without making any reference to Larramendi's grammar or his dictionary. He was «the Master of Basques» (Arakastain 1747). Here is what the famous writer Domingo Agirre said a century and a half later: «As long as a patriot lives, as long as a lover of the Basque language lives, while a true Basque speaker lives, the name of Father Larramendi will not be forgotten» (Agirre 1890: 39).

In the Second Modern Basque (1876-1968; Camino 2018) Larramendi's findings were scorned by the new «Masters of Basques», that is, Resurrección María de Azkue (1864-1951) and Sabino Arana Goiri (1865-1903). In general, they disapproved of his generosity in accepting loanwords, and also replaced as many of his common neologisms as they could with their own new words (Pagola 2005: xv).

When the need to create a Unified Basque seriously took root among the Bascophiles in the middle of the 20th century, Koldo Mitxelena (1960) and Luis Villasante (1961), among others, turned to the work of Justo Mari Mocoroa *«Ibar» Genio y lengua* [Character and Language] (1935).² As members of the Royal Academy of the Basque Language, they had the challenge of overcoming the previous purist period, and they found in Mocoroa's book a vision of the history of Basque which help them with this task. Briefly (for a more detailed critique, see Lakarra 1985a and Urgell 1991), according to Mocoroa the writer Axular (1556-1644) was the model for the Northern tendency to write in plain Basque for the Basques and, on the other hand, Larramendi was the perfect example of the Southern Basques being obsessed with writing about their language —but not necessarily *in their language*—, concerned for its honour, prestige and purity, an obsession that produced in Mocoroa's opinion the purist and artificial literary language used by his contemporaries, incomprehensible to the majority of speakers. He proposed adopting what could be called the «Northern Plain Basque» way, i.e., bringing literary language closer to the people's speech, and that is precisely the pathway taken in general by the Basque Academy to this day.

Tovar (1980) used an even more radical dichotomy between the so-called «scientific» approaches from the late 19th century onwards and the «pre-scientific», «non-critical», «naïve» and «apologetic» works. There are some precedents for such a dichotomy: in fact, the breakdown between «scientific» and «fantastical» linguistics happened in the 19th century all over the world, and it supposed the exclusion

² Michelena (1960: 17, note 13) defined it as a «definitive book». Villasante (1961: 116) as a «memorable book».

—and the stigmatization— of previous linguistic concerns, such as the origin of language, the universal language, and so on, from the interests of linguists (Auroux *et al.* 1985). In the wake of this, foreign vascologists such as Achille Luchaire (1846-1908), Julien Vinson (1843-1926) and mainly Willem Jan van Eys (1825-1914)—who influenced in Arana Goiri, etc. (Laka 1987; Sarasola 1989)— rejected all previous works, starting obviously with Larramendi's, because they were, in their opinion, non-scientific, full of errors, and lacking of method (Gómez 2007: 126-132).

Be that as it may, from the middle of the 20th century onwards Larramendi was thought of as an «apologist», a word that has taken on a special meaning in the Basque Country around the same time, a clearly derogatory one which collects in itself concepts such as «pre-scientific», «non-critical», «naïve», etc., though also «well-meaning». For example, in a blog created for students of first year of high school we can read that «apologists» are «those who defended and praised the Basque language, i.e., those that overvalued Euskera».³

Even if it was accepted that Larramendi wrote a «good description» of the Basque grammar and gathered for the first time many words in his huge dictionary (Mitxelena 1959: 430-434 and 438, for example), authors of that time used to emphasize his hundreds of Basque etymologies of Spanish words, mostly nonsensical to 20th century readers, and his hundreds of neologisms, described as incorrect or unintelligible: «Who can say, but a psychoanalyst of wandering souls, where *megopea* ['spirit'] or *txaberama* ['turtle'] come from?» (Mitxelena 1984: 17).⁴ It was assumed that Larramendi wanted to deceive people who did not know Basque, who could hardly refute him, making them believe that it was the first and the only language of the Iberian Peninsula in the Antiquity, and that Basque vocabulary was at least as rich as Spanish. According to these authors, the writers of his time were more than aware he was joking, given the moderate use they made of his neologisms:⁵

When Father Añibarro wrote in Basque, he did not allow himself to be impeded by Larramendian neologisms; he wrote with the expressions and vocabulary of his readers, which he knew by the direct and deep study of the popular language he carried out. Sometimes we have found a Larramendian word in his writings; for example, in *Lora-Sorta Espiritualua* [Spiritual bouquet] there is *obetande* to translate «perfection», but one swallow does not a summer make, as the saying goes (Villasante 1961: 214; see also in the second edn., 1979: 218).

They even suggested that he was not serious about his new words and etymologies:

I do not think it is foolhardy to say that he [i.e. Larramendi] was far from giving blind faith to the products of his fantasy, which were often not more than ways to get

³ «Euskal apologistak», BATX 1. B Euskera. XVI. eta XIX. mende bitarteko euskal idazle adierazgarrienei buruz idazteko sortutako bloga <<https://batx1beuskera.blogspot.com/2011/05/>> [retrieved: 2017-05-26].

⁴ The two words are clearly Larramendi's neologisms. *Megopea* 'spirit' probably comes from *me* 'fine, slender' + *egopea* 'substance', as Novia de Salcedo (1887, s.v. *megopea*) pointed out. As for *txaberama*, I think it is a compound of *etxe* 'house' or perhaps *etxabe* 'oyer' & *eraman* 'to carry', surely following the pattern of surnames like *Txabarri* or *Txazarra* (from *etxe* & *barri* 'new' or *zarra* 'the old').

⁵ In fact, as Sarasola (1986) determined, the use of neologisms depended on the level of the texts: the higher the level, the more neologisms there were, even in different works by the same author.

better or worse out of trouble, nor do I think that we will stray much from the truth if we think that when he wrote some of his amazing etymologies did not lack much to laugh at the credulous readers, present or future. There is at least one very explicit text about his explanation of *España* ‘Spain’ by the Basque *ezpaña* ‘lip’ that confirms it: «I confess that I am laughing, pondering how the Diarists will frown hearing all this [...].» (Mitxelena 1959: 437)⁶

He was made to look ignorant, even ridiculous, a cynic and a liar. We can say, in summary, that the significance of Larramendi’s grammar and dictionary as the first Basque linguistic tools has been downplayed for a long time.

This point of view changed radically with Lakarra’s research (as of 1985a). In short, he proposed looking at the significance of Larramendi’s works on Basque from two vantage points: his own claims about his objectives, and the European context in which he moved. Several academic and/or divulgative articles were published in the wake of Lakarra’s writings, explaining Larramendi’s aims and procedures (Mitxelena 1983; Sarasola 1986; Gómez 1991; Urgell 1991, 1996, etc.). In a whole century (1880-1982) I have collected only eight works that have «Larramendi» in their title, while there are 38 in the later years. Thus, it must be said that, in general, from 1983-1985 onwards Larramendi was, once again, brought back into the fold, often being studied in the academic world.

However, a third of these more recent works are devoted to the dictionary (13; 34 %), and only a few to the grammar (4; 10 %) or to the influence that Larramendi had on the literary language of his time (3; 8 %). This probably evinces that his grammatical work and his influence continue to be belittled among specialists. What is more: in my experience, with few exceptions, out of those works specifically devoted to Larramendi, no one consults or quotes him, except to check if there is any neologism from his dictionary in a text.⁷

On the other hand, the advances made in the last decades have not come out from a small circle of specialists. I find it highly significant that no Basque institution celebrated the 250th anniversary of Larramendi’s death in 2016. It was only commemorated, as far as I know, by the Basque newspaper *Berria*, which published a column with a title that supports my conjecture: «Euskararen apologista sutsua» [A passionate apologist of the Basque language] (Urrutikoetxea 2016).

In this context, the main purpose of this paper is to highlight the importance of Larramendi’s grammaticalization work for the history of Basque, and especially to present Larramendi as the first source of many lexical and grammatical items.

The *Diccionario Trilingüe* (*DT*) will be presented here as one of the most important sources of eighteenth-century Euskera. We will demonstrate that it is abun-

⁶ By «Diarists», Larramendi refers to the authors of the *Diario de los literatos de España* (1737-1742), who gave a lengthy review of one of his books (Larramendi 1736; *Diario...*, vol. II, pag. 1-33, ap. Ruiz Vientemilla 1987: 115).

⁷ There are some exceptions, notably questions of spelling, such as sibilants, from Lakarra’s (1985b: 242-247) and Urgell (1987: 359-363); see, for example, Alzíbar (1992: 505-550) and Ulibarri (2015: 159). One of the few exceptions in grammar issues is that of Alzíbar (1992: 347-348). With respect to non-neological lexicón, see Reguero (2019: 98, 130, 139, etc.).

dant in words of oral origin and illustrate it with a small sample of these. Also, we will emphasize the fact that many of the items are first attestations, seldom-attested words or even hapax legomena.

The same could be true of the grammar *El imposible vencido*, but for that, we would have to know it much better first. Some parts of the grammar will be analyzed here to investigate where its dialectal information comes from and how reliable it is. Evidence will be given, thus, to demonstrate the presence of some of the Basque sources of Larramendi's dictionary already in his grammar, sixteen years before, but also the presence of unattested forms that need further examination.

2. Larramendi's dictionary as a source

Azkue explicitly left Larramendi's *DT* out of the sources of his *Diccionario vasco-español-francés* (1905-1906), and therefore he caused the *DT* to be banished in later lexicography: «With great regret, I have had to put aside the *Diccionario trilingüe* of the great basophile Larramendi, because seeing that there were countless words due to his fecund pen, I did not know which were popular and which were elaborated [i.e., neologisms]» (Azkue 1905-1906: xiii). The following words of Mitxelena are but a paraphrase of those of Azkue:

The data contained [in Larramendi's dictionary] is untrustworthy and has misled many people, because the author included in it, together with the words he heard and read, such a number of words of his own invention, and mixed both elements with such eagerness that even an expert does not often know if they are a neologism or a popular word. (Mitxelena 1959: 434)

It is necessary to say here that the fact that Larramendi did not share objectives with the twentieth-century Bascologists does not invalidate his work, it only makes it more difficult to use as a source without previous philological work. In fact, as indicated above, Mitxelena knew with certainty that there was valuable information in Larramendi's dictionary and, thus, he took it into account in the *Orotariko Euskal Hiztegia* [Basque General Dictionary] (*OEH*; Mitxelena 1987-2005), ordering a reverse version of the *DT*, a Basque-Spanish one, so that Basque data could be more easily consulted. It can be said, thus, that he reintroduced Larramendi's dictionary in Basque lexicography. This way one can verify again and again that the first attestations of many popular words date from the *DT*, sometimes preceding the following one by centuries. For example, in the *Euskal Hiztegia* [Basque Dictionary] (Sarasola 2007; first edn. 1984-1995), a kind of first normative version of the *OEH*, the oldest attestations of 89 words (15 %) from the entries between G-GAR that I have chosen arbitrarily date from 1745, i.e., from the *DT*. Probably there would be many more words, taking into account that Sarasola's dictionary was intended to be *hauta-lanerako* [selection work (of words and variants for Unified Basque)] and thus, several words from the *OEH* were excluded.

In spite of that, it has been proven that in the first version of the *OEH* the testimony of Larramendi's *DT* was often unquoted, even when it is the oldest and indeed the only source of little-attested words (Urgell 2000: § 12.3). The inconsistent use of old dictionaries as a source (Osselton 1989) is a quite general ill in the history of lan-

guages, but it is clearly not the only reason for the neglect of *DT*, because *OEH* often favoured other sources, even secondary ones, over Larramendi's dictionary.

Fortunately, those initial problems have been corrected in the online version of the *OEH*, as can be verified by comparing the entries *alboratu*, *akats* and *andeja* in the two versions, for example. In the printed version of the dictionary the first two were attested in 1934 and 1987, respectively, instead of 1745, and the third one was not collected in it, although there was an entry with very similar forms, with which it is gathered today in the online version (see below for more details on *andeja*).

In addition, to this day it continues to be cited by philologists as a source almost exclusively when they wish to prove the use of Larramendi's neologisms in a text, just as in Mitxelena's times. In other words, he is far from always being consulted and quoted when relevant, as is the case with Nebrija with Spanish, Etienne with French or Johnson with English, an honor in which it has been largely replaced by Azkue's dictionary (1905-1906). One can assume that this is due to the fact that previous beliefs about Larramendi still have some considerable academic weight; his testimonies are considered at the very least doubtful and, therefore, lacking in empirical value.

As suggested above, Mitxelena has some responsibility for this, although it was probably *malgré lui* to some extent. To this very day it remains opportune to read his brilliant passage on the need to check secondary sources (Mitxelena 1970: 26-27). These words are written in a context in which he probably seems to refer first and foremost to Larramendi, but evidently he had a greater goal: to introduce the well-established methods of Philology into the study of the Basque language. What is more, he absolutely was not suggesting that the *DT* should not be consulted, because he himself used it frequently. For example, in his *Fonética Histórica Vasca* (1977), three works of Larramendi appear among the references: the *DT*, the grammar and the *Corografía...* (1882, i.e., 1754). Larramendi is cited over 30 times throughout the book, both in the first edition and in the new chapters of the second, as can now be seen thanks to the index in the new edition of Mitxelena's works (Lakarra & Ruiz Arzalluz 2011). His testimony is used, for example, to date the distinction between *ontza* 'owl' and *untza* 'ivy' in the Guipuzcoan dialect (Mitxelena 1977: 45) and the pronunciation /χ/ in the same dialect (*ib.* 140), to highlight one of the first documented uses of the voiced palatal /ɟ/ (*ib.* 156), to speak about central accentuation (*ib.* 315-317), and so on. But, of course, he felt compelled to justify the use of Larramendi's work:

What value can be attributed to these indications [on the central accentuation]?

We tend to be suspicious, perhaps sometimes excessively, of the fantasy of Fr. Larramendi, but we would be being overly sceptical if we were to believe that all this was born dressed and armed, like Minerva, from the head of the famous Jesuit without any actual foundation. It must also be acknowledged that many details of his exposition do not depart too much from what modern observers have stated. (*ib.* 315-316)⁸

⁸ Hualde (1991: 737) described Larramendi's work as an «accurate description of the fairly complex accentual system of Western Basque».

One of the most effective ways to demonstrate the reliability of the *DT* is to study its sources. Larramendi himself (1745: li-liv) thoroughly described what his main sources were, in a chapter called «On the great difficulty I have had to compile this dictionary». Among others, he explained in detail (1745: lii-liii) the oral origin of a large amount of words and expressions compiled from his surveys, as well as obviously from his own dialect,⁹ and this has been confirmed by later research (Urgell 2000: III, § 12). Larramendi's words are of singular value because they are a detailed description of his survey methods at a time when dialectology was at best in its early stages (Pagola 1991).¹⁰ In addition, he specified the semantic fields —or some of them, at least— in which he actively searched for native Basque words, probably those that would have been prevalent in the every-day life of the Basque Country then: sea or navigation, agriculture, silviculture (including animals and vegetables) and foundry.

In an attempt to illustrate this, a sample of common animal names in the Basque Country were listed and dated (Urgell 2002: 25). 57 % of these words were proven to be first attestations. Now another semantic field, i.e. fish, will be analyzed here, using as a reference the Spanish fish-names quoted in an article on the current situation of fish on the Basque coast (Pérez 2002), to which a few more have been added from memory. This field has been chosen because it belongs to a wider field, that of the sea ports, which Larramendi expressly cited in the passage quoted above as follows: «In the sea ports I took the time to learn the names of fish, waves, storms, navigation, ships and their countless parts, their movements, direction and government» (Larramendi 1745: liii).

In the following table all the Basque equivalents of the *DT* corresponding to those Spanish fish-names are collected. Column by column, this is the data provided: (1) the current form of the word as a lemma, according to the *OEH*; (2) Larramendi's variant in his own spelling; (3) Spanish entry of the *DT* and its English equivalent; (4) first evidence of the variant and/or the word; (5) first use of the word in a text:¹¹

⁹ It perhaps seems obvious today that many words from the dictionary come from Larramendi's own Basque, but it has not been taken into account in the past. For example, Mitxelena (1970: 74) tried to find *bezala* 'as' in Axular's text with the aim of finding the direct source of this word in the supplement of the *DT*, although it was undoubtedly an everyday word in Larramendi's speech. He probably added *bezala* only as a well-known synonym of the Biscayan word *laso* (Urgell 2002: 299). In fact, *bezala* appears repeatedly in his writings (see Altuna & Lakarra 1990, *passim*), not the current Guipuzcoan form *bezela*. Altuna (1992b) even questioned the linguistic competence of Larramendi, harshly examining his Basque writings for errors to the extent that other ancient authors would have also likely been found wanting.

¹⁰ Dialectology has a firm background in works from the end of the 19th century (Pop 1950: xxiii), but there are serious approaches some years before, at least in Spain, such as Sarmiento's surveys on Galician (1730; Rodríguez Alonso 1992; Gimeno 2003), among which Larramendi has never been included. See Desmet, Lauwers & Swiggers (1999) on the state of dialectology in France more than a century later.

¹¹ Note that Basque forms are often determined, such as, for example, *amurraia* (det.) is *amurrai* (indet.) + *-a* (article). Sometimes the final *-a* is a real part of the word, and not the article, as in *andeja* or *kolaka*, and the final *-a* and the *-a* of the article merge into a single *a* in the central and eastern dialects, i.e., *kolaka* + *-a* (art.) > *kolaka*.

Table 1
Basque fish names in the *DT*

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| aingira | ainguira | anguila ‘European eel’ | c. 1600 | 1712 |
| amuarrain | amurraya | trucha ‘trout’ | 1745 | c. 1760 |
| amuarrain | amuarraina | trucha ‘trout’ | 1665 | c. 1802 |
| andeja ¹² | andeja | mero ‘grouper’ | c. 1600 <i>andeza</i> «curvina» | — |
| arrankari | arrancaria | trucha ‘trout’ | 1596 | 1596 |
| bakailao | bacallaoa | abadejo ‘cod’ | 1653 | 1677 |
| burniltxuri | burnil churia | gobio ‘gudgeon’ | 1745 | — |
| arrosel | errosela | besugo ‘bream’ | c. 1600 | 1847 |
| izokin | izoquia | salmón ‘salmon’ | 1745, <i>izokin</i> c. 1600 | 1847 1852 |
| kolaka | colaca | sábalo ‘prochilos’ | c. 1715 | 1853 |
| legatz | lebatza | merluza ‘hake’ | 1745 | 1930 |
| legatz | legatza | merluza ‘hake’ | c. 1600 | c. 1666 |
| mero | meroa | mero ‘grouper’ | 1745 | — |
| sarausle | sarauslea | corvina ‘sea bass’ | 1745 | — |
| txabaloi | chabaloya | caballa ‘mackerel’ | 1745 | <i>xabalua</i> 1826 |
| uerba | überba | caballa ‘mackerel’ | 1745 | — |
| urre-arrain | urre-arraya | dorado ‘gilt-head bream’ | <i>urre-arrain</i> c. 1715 | — |
| urre-arrain | urre-arraña | dorado ‘gilt-head bream’ | c. 1715 | — |

Twelve of the fish-names gathered can be found in the *DT*; it is not surprising that all of them are not there, because almost 100 % of the nomenclature of Larramendi’s dictionary comes from the *Diccionario de Autoridades* (1726-1739), which is the first attempt of the Spanish Royal Academy to make a Spanish general dictionary.¹³ Basque equivalents consist of 18 forms in total, but 15 lemmata, because in three entries there are only phonetic variants: those of *trucha* (*amurraia* & *amuarraina*), *merluza* (*lebatza* & *legatza*) and *dorada* (*urre-arraya* & *urre-arraina*).

As the above table shows, 44 % of the Basque forms are first attestations (8/18). However, in my opinion, there is just one unquestionable neologism among them:

¹² The interpretation of the grapheme <j> is not clear in my opinion. In Larramendi’s spelling it normally represents the sound /x/, as interpreted by the *OEH* (s.v. *andeja*), but the other variants compiled, i.e. *andeza*, *andes* & *antes*, suggest that it might be a sibilant (/sl/, /ʃl/ or /ʃ/). All other attestations of <j> depend directly on Larramendi’s *DT*. It is not impossible, since Larramendi sometimes reproduces the spelling of his sources (Urgell 2001), and <j> was /ʃ/ in some archaic texts (Mounole & Lakarra 2018: § 3.1.3). But, since we are probably dealing with an oral source, perhaps <j> would be instead of <ss> or <zz> because of a bad transcription of what Larramendi heard. The other option is to consider the pair *andega* & *andeka* to propose that <j> is actually /x/, bearing in mind that /x/ and /k/ sounds can be variants (as in the personal name *Koxe Mari*, instead of *Jose Mari*), but, in my opinion, these two forms provided by Lhande seem more likely to depend on Larramendi, at least the surprising *andega*, which would be an error of transcription of <g> instead of <j>. To be sure, a study of Larramendi’s words in Lhande’s dictionary should be carried out.

¹³ Here are the names that do not appear in the *DT*: *alfiler*, *aligote*, *caballito de mar*, *gallerbu*, *lubina*, *morena*, *panchito*, *pargo*, *pez de San Pedro*, *pez ventoso*, *salmonete de fango*, *torillo*, *tripterigon*, *verrugato de fango*.

sarauslea (Sp. *corvina*). One of the Larramendi's more common forms of coining neologisms is to take lexical material from the *Diccionario de Autoridades*.¹⁴ In fact, *sarausle* is a transparent compound of Bq. *sare* 'net' and (*b*)*ausle* 'breaker', elements that are to some degree present in the definition of Sp. *corvina* in the Academia's dictionary: «The teeth are so sharp and strong that it breaks the hooks and cords with them, however thick they may be» (*DAut*, s.v. *corvina*). Just change *hooks and cords* for *sareak* 'nets'.¹⁵

There is only one transparent Romance loanword as well: *meroa* «mero». According to the data given by the *OEH* (s.v. *mero*), nobody has ever used this word in writing.¹⁶ This is not surprising, inasmuch as for a long time there were few opportunities to write about anything other than religion in Basque.¹⁷ However, *mero* has been attested well enough in the spoken Basque of the 20th century —Azkue (1905-1906) found no other name for Sp. *mero*, although he tried to avoid loanwords—,¹⁸ so we can hypothesize that Bq. *mero* was used in the 18th century as well.

Even in that small sample it is possible to find pieces of information that could illustrate some unexplored aspects of the *DT* as a reliable source. For example, the lack of final *n* in both variants *amurrai* and *izoki* (vs Unified Bq. *amuarrain* & *izokin*) would suggest a common dialectal source (cf. Mitxelena 1977: 299-304, especially § 15.4.b). This and other aspects of the oral treasure kept in the *DT* should, of course, be studied more carefully.

The relevance of taking the *DT* into account as a *terminus ante quem* or *post quem* of a linguistic event can also be exemplified by our corpus. It is often assumed that the Western variant *lebatz* of common *legatz* 'hake' has «always» existed (if we can express it in a somewhat informal way). However only *legatz* appears in every attestation before and after the *DT* until Eusebio M. Azcue's *Parnasorako bidea* [The way to Parnaso] (1896), even in the Western texts: the word-list contained in the so-called «Ibarguen-Cachopín chronicle» (c. 1600; Sarasola 1983: 295-307; Arriolabengoa 2008: 131-146);¹⁹ *Bertso bizkaitarrak* [Biscayan verses] (c. 1688; Lakarra 1984) and *Durangoko Plateroak* [The Silversmiths of Durango] (c. 1790-1830; Aldekoat-Otalora 1984). The editor of *Bertso bizkaitarrak* proposed changing *legatz* for *lebatz*, along with other necessary changes according to his convincing hypothesis that it is a copy made by a Guipuzcoan who had changed certain forms from the original Bis-

¹⁴ The theoretical reasons are explained in Urgell (2004: 307-308).

¹⁵ There is another reason to believe that *sarausle* is a neologism: only two other attestations are compiled by the *OEH* (s.v.), both of them list of fishes names and also both belonging to two well-known users of Larramendi's dictionary and his neologisms: Izt C 207 (= Iztueta 1847; the *OEH* says «297» by mistake) and Arzdi *Peces* (= Aranzadi 1933).

¹⁶ Although, according to the corpus of the *OEH*, *mero* has never been used in a text, it appears in some lists of fish names and other later lexicographical works, starting with the aforementioned Iztueta's list (1847: 204 & 206), where it appears twice, first as *meroa* and then as *merua*.

¹⁷ Here Mitxelena's words: «We cannot say that there are too many devotional books in our literature. Let us just say, then, that other types of books are scarce» (Mitxelena 1953: 36).

¹⁸ I use *Azkue biztegiaren aurkibidea* [Azkue's dictionary index] (HAEE 1987) to look for the Basque equivalents of a Spanish word in Azkue.

¹⁹ Although Sarasola (1983: 306) stated emphatically that the dialect of the list is «clearly Guipuzcoan», Arriolabengoa (2004: 145-146) says judiciously that the archaic lexicon is not as well known and that therefore it could also well be Alavese.

cayan text. If he had handled the data we now have thanks to the *OEH* on the history of these forms, perhaps he could have made a stronger case for his choice. In particular, one might think that both variants came from a single form, maybe **leatz*, both having reinforced the hiatus with a different consonant and, consequently, both being equally old. In this case, the editor's choice would have been correct. Nonetheless, if the Western *lebatz* were a secondary variant of *legatz*, his proposal could be brought into question, given that there is no evidence of *lebatz* prior to 1745.

Some words in our list are every-day fish-names in Basque, such as *legatza* 'hake', *amuarraina* 'trout' or *bacallaoa* 'cod', but four of them are not: *andeja* 'grouper', *burnilchuria* 'gudgeon', *chabaloia* & *uerba* 'mackerel'. These four words are first documented in the *DT*, but one can easily verify that they actually exist or existed in Basque, because all four are attested by the *OEH* in other sources, as the following demonstrates:²⁰

- (1) **andeja** (Lar, Sb-Urq, H (+ -ia), Arzdi *Peces*), **andeza** (IC 445r), **andes** (AN-gip ap. A), **andega** (Lh), **anteia** (H), **andeka** (Hb), **antes** (G, L ap. A; vEys (G, L), H, *FauMar* 65).
- (2) **burniltxuri** (Lar), **bumiltxuri** (PMuj, Zubk *Ond* 236).
- (3) **txabaloí** (Lar, H (<ch->), Hb (<ch->), Arzdi *Peces* 384), **xabaloí** (AN-gip ap. Garbiz *Lezo* 51), **xabalu** (G-azp ap. A), **txabalu** (G ap. A), **xabalo** (AN-gip ap. A; Dv (L-côte), Arzdi *Peces* 385), **txabalo** (*FauMar* 100), **xabaro** (Dv (BN-lab)).
- (4) **uerba** (V-m, G-azp; Lar, Hb, H). Ref.: Arzdi *Peces* 376; Zubk *Ond* 238. «*Begi audi* (G-bet), es (*Scomber macrophtalmus*) y (*Sc. colias*), [...] en Getari *uerba»* Arzdi *Peces* 376.

It should be noted, first, that the online version of the *OEH* has always chosen Larramendi's variant as the main form in all the cases, even when he is the only source for that variant, as in *burniltxuri*. If it were possible to draw a safe conclusion from such a small corpus, to be honest it would seem that the *OEH* finally accept Larramendi's forms in this latest version.²¹

Secondly, it should be pointed out that —true to Mitxelena's advice— all of them were gathered at least once from independent sources and/or, preferably, from oral language. As some of them are not attested in the same form and meaning that they had in Larramendi's dictionary, they would probably benefit from deeper analysis than we can carry out here. To take a simple example, *burniltxuri*, a form deemed by *OEH* as a variant of Larramendi's *burnilchuria* (det.), was collected from the speech of Ondarroa (Biscay) by Zubikarai (1981). To this we should add the testimony of *burbiña* (or *burbiñe*) 'sea bass' from the Biscayan villages of Bermeo

²⁰ The heading of the *OEH* entry [retrieved: 2021-07-18] is reproduced here with some minor changes. Main variants are in round letters and the secondary ones in italics. Abbreviations in order of appearance: Lar = *DT* (1745); Sb-Urq = the «Sbarbi-Urquijo» dictionary (post 1826); H = Harriet's dictionary (second half of the 19th century); Arzdi *Peces* = Aranzadi (1933); IC = «Ibarguen-Cachopín» chronicle (1558-1610); AN-gip = High-navarrese dialect of Guipuzcoa; A = Azkue (1905-1906); Lh = Lhande (1926-1938); Hb = Hiribarren's dictionary (s.d., before 1866); G = Guipuzcoan dialect; L = Labourdin dialect; vEys = van Eys (1873); *FauMar* = Laffitte (1935); PMuj = Mujika (1981); Zubk *Ond* = Zubikarai (1981). To know more about these references, see the section «Referencias bibliográficas» in the *OEH*.

²¹ It was not the case in the printed version, as was pointed out above.

and Mundaka (Barrutia 1996), as well as Lekeitio and Ondarroa (Barrutia 2000). It could be related to the first part of *burniltxuri*, where the second part means probably *txuri* or *zuri* ‘white’, as in other fish-names compiled by Barrutia like *txitxarro zuria* (lit. ‘white horse-mackerel’), *arrayn zuria* (lit. ‘white fish’), and so on. Additionally, Azkue’s dictionary (1905-1906) placed the word *burbina* ‘sea bass’ in the Biscayan varieties of Gernika & Markina (ap. *OEH*, s.v. *burbina*). All the aforementioned 20th century forms suggest that the *n* of Larramendi’s *burnilchuria* instead of *burnil-* might be a copy error (probably *burbin-* > *burnil-* due to assimilation and dissimilation), but in any case the *DT* offers the very first documentation—which is older by two and a half centuries—of a seldom attested form.

The fact that these forms were collected in the north-east of Biscay must not be understated, given that Larramendi did not specify where his surveys were done. He lived in the Jesuit College of Loiola (Guipuzcoa; Altuna 1992a; Urgell 2002) for ten or eleven years prior to the publication of the *DT*. Loiola is inland, but only around about 30 kilometers from the seaside village of Mutriku, for example, which is very close to Ondarroa, on the other side of the border between Biscay and Guipuzcoa, so words like *burniltxuri* or *uerba* could naturally proceed from those sea ports near Loiola.

Additionally, it must be said that with some frequency the forms collected by Larramendi are hapax legomena. There are none in the small corpus studied here,²² but some interesting hapax collected in a previous work (Urgell 2000: § 12) can be cited here, i.e., forms that have no independent evidence apart from the *DT*, but which do not have any of the characteristics of Larramendi’s neologisms. For example, among the common animals he quoted, there are some hapax as *chiqueta* and *chirita* ‘butterfly’ (*OEH*, s.v. 1 *txiketa* & *txirita*). There are also unknown variants, such as *sugalinda* ‘lizard’ (*OEH*, s.v. *sugandila*) and *ubagarea* ‘otter’ (*OEH*, s.v. *ugadera*), and unknown meanings, such as *caramarroa* ‘beetle’, instead of the well-known ‘crab’ (*OEH*, s.v. *karramarro* 2).

3. Labourdin sources in Larramendi’s grammar

In the previous section, some conclusions are drawn from a small corpus used as an example of the wealth and reliability of the *DT*. This was relatively easy because its sources have been sufficiently studied. Larramendi’s grammar —*Imposible vencido. Arte de la lengua bascongada* (1729)— is far from being as well analyzed and, as such, it might be advisable to try to find its sources as well.

One of the best known sources of the *DT* is a set of Basque books, almost all of them written by Labourdin authors (Urgell 2005). However, we have to go back 16 years to 1729 or even earlier, when he wrote and published his grammar while teaching at the University of Salamanca and then in Valladolid. Later he lived in Bayonne (Labourd) for about three years (1730-1733), as confessor to the exiled Spanish Queen Mother Maria Anna of Neuburg (1677-1740). That is likely to be the moment in which he accessed many of these books. As mentioned above, there-

²² In the oral version of this paper, I mistakenly cited the hapax *colasa* «sábalo» instead of the non-hapax *colaca* (Modern Basque *kolaka*, *q.v.* in *OEH*, s.v.).

after he retired to Loiola (1734), where he continued to receive such books probably thanks to his correspondents in Bayonne. For example, we can be sure he acquired the rare translation of Leizarraga's New Testament (La Rochelle, 1571) during his stay in Bayonne (Tellechea 1966)²³ and, more relevantly here, he received Martin Harriet's book (Bayonne, 1741), a French grammar with a lot of insights into Basque. Both came into Larramendi's hands just in time to use them as a source in his dictionary (Lakarra 1991; Urgell 2002: 32-33 and 158-170; Urgell 2005: 251-259) but too late, obviously, to include any of Leizarraga's forms and/or Harriet's grammatical suggestions in the *Imposible vencido* (1729).

Larramendi's grammar, although usually classified as belonging to the Guipuzcoan dialect (G), often includes examples of what he considered to be the other two main dialects of Basque: Biscayan (B) and Navarre-Labourdin (NL; Larramendi 1745: xxvii, etc.).²⁴ In his dictionary Larramendi followed a certain order when citing the dialects (Urgell 2001: 131); for example:²⁵

- (5) Clavo, *iltzea* [G], *ultzea* [B], *itzea* [NL].
- (6) Espuma, *aparra* [G], *bitsa* [B], *pitsa* [G], *abuina* [Ax = NL], *haguna* [Leiz = NL].²⁶
- (7) En ningún lugar, *iñon ere* [G], *iñon bere* [B], *nihon ere* [NL] (s.v. *lugar*).
- (8) Es a saber, conviene a saber, *esan nai det* [G], *gura dot* [B], *erran nai du[t]* [NL] (s.v. *saber*).
- (9) Mariposa, *inguma* [G], *chiqueta* [?], *chirita* [?], *micheletea* [B], *ulifarfalla* [Ax = NL].

It should be stated here that he already ordered forms in this way in the grammar, but instead of employing those dialect names, he often referred to Biscayan as «Dialecto 1» and to NL as «Dialecto 2», when specifying the origin of the forms,²⁷ whereas its explanation in general goes in G.²⁸ Our starting hypothesis is that at the

²³ See Urgell (2015) for an assessment of the existence of some copies of Leizarraga's books in Bayonne and other places in the North of the Basque Country in the mid-eighteenth century, although they were thought to have been destroyed during the persecution of Protestants one or two centuries before.

²⁴ Although the name is the same, this «Navarre-Labourdin» which I use to name one of the dialects described by Larramendi, should not be confused with the literary dialect of the same name proposed by Lafitte (1944) nor with the dialect proposed by Zuazo (1998a) in his classification of the current Basque language. Indeed, for historical reasons, Larramendi thought that «in general the dialect of the Basque of France is the Navarrese» (Larramendi 1745: xxvii; cf. Urgell 2018: 703).

²⁵ I have used here the references of the *OEH* where necessary, although in some cases those general dialect marks are obvious even to a native speaker of Basque, as in the case of *iñon ere* / *iñon bere* / *nihon ere*, for example.

²⁶ Ax = Axular, *Guero* (1643), Leiz = Leizarraga, NT (1571).

²⁷ For example, in explaining personal pronouns, after the forms of *ni* 'I' [G, NL] Larramendi presents the forms of *neu* [B] in this way: «Otra 1. persona synonyma» ['another synonymous first person'] (1729: 21). It is therefore important to emphasize that he deliberately left out the dialectal origin of the forms in the grammar, undoubtedly with the intention that they become common to all Basque speakers, as said in the dictionary (1745: xliv-xlv; Urgell 2004).

²⁸ Surely because of this: «What Quintilian says here happens to many Basques, i.e., that they see the dialects of their province as good and elegant, [...] and this is a common illness of the speakers of every language. But it is an illness of passion, which needs to be treated with two ounces of reason and intelligence. I see that the recovery is not easy, because, although it is such a small dose, the medicine is

time of writing his grammar Larramendi did not know the Labourdin dialect at first hand and, consequently, he had to resort to the Labourdin books to find the NL forms cited in the grammar.

At least three of those Labourdin books are explicitly cited by Larramendi in the last chapter of the *Imposible Vencido*, «Apendiz de la poesía bascongada» [Appendix on Basque poetry]: Joanes Etxeberri's *Noelac* [Christmas carols] and *Manual devocionezcoa* [Manual of devotion] (Larramendi 1729: 374-375) and Joanes Haranburu's *Devocino escuarrá* [Devotion manual] (*ib.* 379). Etxeberri and Haranburu are both 17th century writers, belonging to the so-called «classic Labourdin» or «School of Sara», that is to say, to the first well-known literary school or movement in the history of Basque. Larramendi (1745: xxxv) found Etxeberri's *Manual* in the library of the Colegio Mayor of Cuenca in Salamanca, but he failed to mention how he obtained the other two books.²⁹

To verify our hypothesis, we have chosen the chapters on verbs (Larramendi 1729: 42-256), a part of Basque morphology where the differences between dialects are usually abundant and evident. The first mention of forms supposed to be from the NL dialect is found in the description of the future participle, i.e., the unconjugated verbal form that forms part of the future periphrastic in Basque:

El participio futuro se forma así:

Si el infinitivo se acaba en consonante se le añade una destas dos sylabas: *gó, en: emán emangó, egón egongó, egún eguingó*, y también *emánen, egónen, eguínén*.

Si se acaba en vocal, se le añade una destas sylabas: *co, ren*, y con freqüencia y mejor la primera: *artú artucó, izutú izutúco, ibillí ibillíco*, y también *necatú necatúren, alchatú alchatúren* (Larramendi 1729: 54-55).

The NL distinctive forms are the underlined ones, all of them having a suffix -(r)*en*, instead of the suffix -*go/-ko* of the G and B dialects, as in *egonen* vs *egongo* and *ibiliren* vs *ibiliko*; forms like *emanen* 'will give' or *egonen* 'will stay', formed by a participle ending in -*n* (*eman, egon*) and the suffix -*en*, are widespread throughout the eastern half of the country, but those formed by a participle with suffix -*tu* (*necatu, alchatu*) and the allomorph -*ren*, like *necaturen* 'will get tired' and *alchaturen* 'will rise', are today typical of the easternmost part (Camino 2004: 472), but in the ancient texts there is some western evidence, specifically in Etxeberri (*ibid.*; see now Urgell 2015: 658-659).

The *Euskal Klasikoen Corpusa* [Corpus of the Basque Classics] (EKC) reveals that the attestations of the two future participles *necaturen* and *alchaturen* given as examples by Larramendi in his grammar are not invented by him, but extracted from Etxeberri's text: *alchaturen* appears both in Etxeberri and in Leizarraga's translation of the New Testament (1571), but *necaturen* only in Etxeberri. In both cases, there are examples in Etxeberri's two cited books, *Noelak* (= EZ *Noel*) and *Manual* (= EZ *Man*), as shown in (10) and (11) respectively:

both expensive and of great value, and common people do not have enough money for this. I will follow the opinion of Quintilian, who considered the dialects of all the Italian provinces as highly as that of Rome» (Larramendi 1729: 14).

²⁹ As Arcocha (p.c.) reminds me, Etxeberri studied with the Jesuits and they held him in high esteem (cf. Arcocha & Oyharçabal 2009), which would explain why his book was in Salamanca.

- (10) ALCHATUREN: 26 attestations before 1745, 15 from Leizagarra and 11 from Etxeberri (*EKC*)
Ala hic egun baituque / auhena alchaturen, / baldin eçagutçen bahu / cer ethorrico çañen (EZ *Noel*, Vinson 15f: 103)
Hirurgaren egunean bere hobietaric / Altchaturen ditu bieie bicia bihurturic (EZ *Man I*, 72)
- (11) NECATUREN: 3 attestations before 1745, all of them from Etxeberri's (*EKC*)
Peña suerte guztiez / Çaituzte nekhaturen (EZ *Noel*, Vinson 15f: 145)
Milla martyrioz ditu nekhaturen prestuac (EZ *Man I*, 67)
Platonec eçarri çuen liburuan ederqui, / çuhurra versuan cela necaturen alferqui (EZ *Man II*, 3)

As luck would have it, in the case of this sample, by just reading a few pages of the grammar we can confirm one part of the hypothesis being tested, i.e., that Larramendi collected some grammatical forms from Etxeberri's writings in order to give examples of the NL dialect in his grammar.

In Euskera the verb can agree with subject, direct and indirect object at the same time by means of the so-called tripersonal auxiliary verb. In indicative periphrasis, without going into detail, the country is divided into three zones depending on the auxiliary verb: **edutsi* (B), **nin* (G) and **eradun* (NL).³⁰ This is the situation described by Larramendi (1729: 93-94), although for the «second dialect» (= NL) he offers two different paradigms, the «darot» and the «deraut» types (Spanish translations correspond to the periphrasis with the main verb *jaten* 'eating'): ³¹

Table 2

Navarre-Labourdin forms of the auxiliary verb **eradun* in Larramendi's grammar

| | Second dialect forms | Texts | «También assí» [also] | Texts |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 3s-abs 1s-dat 2s-erg ³² | <i>dárotac, -an, -tazu</i> «me lo comes» | <i>darotak</i> (EZ) <i>darotazu</i> (EZ, Harb) | <i>dérautazú</i> | (Mat, Ax) |
| 3s-abs 1s-dat 3s-erg | <i>Dárot</i> «me lo come» | <i>darot</i> (EZ, Harb) | <i>déraut</i> | (Mat, Harb, Ax) |
| 3s-abs 1s-dat 2p-erg | <i>dárotazue</i> «me lo comeis» | — | <i>dérautazue</i> | — |
| 3s-abs 1s-dat 3p-erg | <i>dárotatet</i> «me lo comen» | <i>darotatenak</i> (Harb) | <i>dérau[tal]te</i> | <i>derautate</i> (Harb) |

³⁰ For more details on the current distribution of the variants, see Zuazo (2014: 220-221), who also provides a map.

³¹ In the following, all textual quotes come from the *EKC* and, therefore, are in modernized spelling. I will not pay attention to this, since in no case has it been of interest to determine the source of the verbal forms. On the other hand, I have hyphenated suffixes, presented by Larramendi as independent forms, just for the sake of clarity.

³² The second person singular has three possible forms in Basque: femenine (-*n*) & masculine (-*k*) expressing familiarity, and non-gendered expressing respect (-*zu*).

As is evident in the above table, the «darot» type is used by both writers Etxeberri (EZ) and Haranburu (Harb). As proven above, Etxeberri is a source of the grammar and according to the *EKC* he would also be the source of three of the forms (*darotac*, *darotazu* & *darot*), although Haranburu could also explain two of them (*darotazu* & *darot*). There is no attestation of the forms *dárotan* (3s-abs 1sing-dat 2sing female-erg) and *dárotazue* (3s-abs 1sing-dat 2pl-erg) in the *EKC*, but they can easily be predicted from *darotac* (3s-abs 1sing-dat 2sing male-erg) and *darotazu* (3s-abs 1sing-dat 2sing-erg) respectively.

The last form of Larramendi's paradigm *dárotatet* contains pleonastic dative 'to me', first with the suffix *-ta* in its common position (*dárotatet*), and then with the suffix *-t* after the subject-suffix *-te* (3p-erg; *dárotatet*). It is a really unusual form, and maybe a mistake.³³ On the other hand, as there is *darotatenak* ('that which they X to me', being X a verb; 3s-abs 1s-dat 3p-erg) in Haranburu's text, one might think that Larramendi's form *dárotatet* proceeds from it, but suffered a copy error. Obviously, this is not enough to definitively prove this writer was a source of Larramendi's grammar.

With regard to the forms given in the second paradigm, the «deraut» type, there are no such forms in Etxeberri, but there is one of them in Haranburu, who seems to use either paradigm indistinctively: *deraut* (3s-abs 1s-dat 3s-erg). On the other hand, *deraute* (3s-abs 1s-dat 3p-erg) lacks the dative marker for the first person (suf. *-ta*) and, therefore, needs to be corrected as *derautate*, a form that also appears in Haranburu. Otherwise, the forms *derautazu* (3s-abs 1s-dat 2s-erg, respect) & *deraut* (3s-abs 1s-dat 3s-erg) can be found in two other Labourdin books who are known sources of Larramendi's dictionary: Materra's *Doctrina Christiana* [Christian doctrine] (1617?; Mat)³⁴ and Axular's *Guero* [After] (1643; Ax). *Caeteris paribus*, it is preferable to attribute the variants of the «deraut» type to Haranburu, according to Occam's razor, since on the basis of his examples Larramendi should have no trouble completing the paradigm by analogy. By way of conclusion, it can be said that, although there is still no conclusive evidence to show whether Larramendi took grammatical forms from Haranburu, the second author to be quoted in his grammar, this idea is becoming more and more plausible, even though it needs to be confirmed in a more detailed study.

³³ *Dárotatet* is not impossible, since the well-known Zuberoan pleonasm is the same in form (examples such as *erradaziit* instead of *erradazu* 1s-dat), although this one is very modern: in fact, it does not appear in the texts until the 19th century (Padilla 2017: § 2.3.3). On the other hand, there are some pleonastic forms in *EKC* that follow Larramendi's pattern (*darotatet*, *darotazut*, *darotazuet*), all of them from the Labourdin writer Duvoisin, as Gómez (p.c.) pointed out to me. So, are they verb forms from Duvoisin's own speech, or did he learn the *darotatet* paradigm in Larramendi's grammar? This second option could be the best, at least in the first instance, because now we know that Duvoisin used to use Larramendi's neologisms in his writings (see Urgell 2018: 634). In this regard, it must be taken into account that he has in the same texts another pleonastic dative 'to me' (*darotadazu(e)*, apparently with the old form *-da* after the dialectal *-ta*), mainly in his translation of the Bible, and we can even find it with three marks (*darotadazuet*). These hesitations in the form probably show that he was writing in a kind of standard Labourdin, not in his own speech, just as we would expect from a translator at the orders of Bonaparte (see Camino 2009: 494). Of course, this issue needs more attention than we can devote to it here.

³⁴ When I did my PhD on the sources of the *DT* (Urgell 2000), I was only aware of the second edition (1623). Since the first edition (1617) has only recently appeared (Krajewska *et al.* 2017), it will be necessary to check which one Larramendi used.

Although Haranburu is no doubt the best choice, it is probably too soon to completely rule out Materra and Axular as sources of the grammar. In fact, the analysis of other verbal forms of the NL dialect that Larramendi collected in his grammar gives us a surprise in this regard. When explaining the variants of the transitive auxiliary when the object is plural, Larramendi pointed out that the NL paradigm is the same as that of the Guipuzcoan dialect, but «divided» («...la misma del guipuzcoano dimidiada»; 1729: 89-90): *ditut* (G) vs *tut* (NL), for example. Again, Larramendi includes two distinct types of NL forms, as follows:

Table 3
Navarre-Labourdin forms of the auxiliary **edun* with plural object
in Larramendi's grammar

| Grammar forms | Texts | «También se haze assí» [i.e. another way to say the same] | Texts |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1s-erg 3p-abs | <i>Tut</i> | <i>tut</i> (EZ Man) | <i>jate-intut</i> |
| 2s-erg 3p-abs | <i>tuc, tun, tuzu</i> | <i>tuk</i> (EZ Man) | <i>jate-intuzu</i> |
| 3s-erg 3p-abs | <i>Tu</i> | — | — |
| 1p-erg 3p-abs | <i>tugu</i> | — | <i>-intugu</i> (Ax, 3 ex.) |
| 2p-erg 3p-abs | <i>tuzue</i> | — | — |
| 3p-erg 3p-abs | <i>tuzte</i> | — | <i>-intuzte</i> (Ax, 11 ex.) |

The first, the *tut* type, is undoubtedly taken from Etxeberri once again, but the second could only be from Axular according to the *EKC*.³⁵ Therefore, we can conclude that Larramendi knew Axular's book many years before it was first quoted by him in the prologue of the *DT*. There is a good reason not to mention him together with Etxeberri and Haranburu in the chapter on Basque poetry (§ 3), since *Guero* is a work in prose and not in verse.

4. On the origin of Biscayan forms

Although Larramendi constantly cites Biscayan forms in his linguistic works, very little can be said about their origin. In the chapter «De los libros en Bascuence» [On the books in Basque] (1745: xxxiv-xxxvi), where he presented all the books he knew, he only made a brief and critical reference to Southern printed Catechisms in general: «Apart from these [Labourdin] books, several catechisms have been printed, both in Biscay and Guipuzcoa as well as Navarre; but with little attention to the purity of Basque and its spelling» (Larramendi 1745: xxv).

There are only two Biscayan writings he detailed. The first one is the «booklet of sayings» quoted in a foreword note to the little «Suplemento» [Supplement] of

³⁵ Among the books that Larramendi quotes in the *DT*, Argañaratz (*Devoten Breviariora*, 1665), Gasteluzar (*Eguia catholicac*, 1686) and Xurio (*Jesu-Christoren Imitacionea*, 1720) also have forms of this type, but in this first approach we have used Occam's razor as a criterion.

the *DT*, which has been identified with the anonymous *Refranes y Sentencias* (1596; Vinson 1891-1898: 530-531). He acquired the book «[a]l acabarse la impresión del diccionario» [Once the dictionary was already printed] (1745: A), and as such it obviously cannot be a source of the grammar. The second one, Martin Arzadun's *Doctrina Christianae explicacinoa* [Explanation of Christian Doctrine] (1731), quoted in the *Corografía* (1754), was evidently not in his hands either at the time of writing the grammar.

Larramendi clarified that he knew more than this single Biscayan catechism. For example, in the chapter «Del dialecto de Bizcaya» [On the dialect of Biscay] (1745: xxviii) he said as follows: «...como se puede ver en algunos Cathecismos impressos deste dialecto» [as can be seen in some printed Catechisms of this dialect]; also, in the *Corografía* he put Arzadun's book as an example of «some catechisms» (1754: 298). In any case, at the moment we have no more specific references to them. Of the catechisms that have survived to this day, there are only four dating back to before 1729 that Larramendi would have placed within the Biscayan dialect:³⁶ Juan Pérez de Betolaza's (1596; Arana Martija 1986), the so-called *Viva Jesú* (c. 1640; Ulibarri 2010), Martin Ochoa de Capanaga's (1656) and Nicolas Zubia's (1691). A more extensive presentation of this subject can be consulted in Urgell (2005: 278-282).

On the other hand, Larramendi's response to the letter from his admirer Gandara (1763; Altuna & Lakarra 1990: 38-40) was written in a more than adequate Biscayan. This denotes that at some point in his life he became quite familiar with that dialect, perhaps as a result of his stay in Loiola, from where the Jesuits used to go to preach Christian doctrine in Biscayan-speaking areas, and from where Larramendi himself maybe went to survey Biscayan speakers to compile the *DT*, as suggested above (§ 2). However, this is again too late, more than three years after the publication of the grammar, as we know. Finally, Larramendi could, of course, have learnt some forms from fellow Jesuits or from other Biscayan people residing at that time in Salamanca, probably in quite a large number, but for the moment we can only speculate about this.³⁷

Now that we have clarified these options, we should analyze what the «first dialect» paradigms of Larramendi's grammar tell us about this subject. In the following table the indicative present forms of the transitive bipersonal auxiliary verb **edun* are shown when the direct object is singular (3s-abs; Larramendi 1729: 68), followed by previous attestations from Betolaza's (*Bet*, 1596), *Viva Jesú* (*VJ*, c. 1640), Capanaga's (*Cap*, 1656) or Zubia's (*Zub*, 1699) and the occurrences of these forms in the *DT*:

³⁶ Larramendi would have seen certain texts as Biscayan which we would not see as such. For example, today we know that Betolaza is actually a testimony to the Alavese dialect (Knörr 1986, Zuazo 1998b).

³⁷ On the other hand, at the age of 10 or 11, he went to the Jesuit school in Bilbao, and spent about six years there, as Lakarra (p.c.) reminded me (see Altuna 1992a: 7-8). This would have been his first opportunity to learn some western Basque, of course.

Table 4

Biscayan forms of the auxiliary **edun* with singular object
in Larramendi's grammar

| | Grammar forms | Texts |
|---------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 1s-erg 3s-abs | <i>dot</i> | <i>dot</i> (Bet, <i>VJ</i> , Cap) |
| 2s-erg 3s-abs | <i>doc, don, dózu</i> | <i>dozu</i> (Bet, Cap, Zub) |
| 3s-erg 3s-abs | <i>dou</i> | <i>dau</i> (Bet, <i>VJ</i> , Cap, Zub) |
| 1p-erg 3s-abs | <i>dógu</i> | <i>dogu</i> (Bet, <i>VJ</i> , Cap, Zub) |
| 2p-erg 3s-abs | <i>dózue, dozute</i> | <i>dozue</i> |
| 3p-erg 3s-abs | <i>dóüe, doute, dave</i> | <i>daude</i> (<i>VJ</i>), <i>dabe</i> (Cap) |

The first and second-person forms quoted by Larramendi in the first column (*dot, dozu* & *dogu*) were and are common in Biscayan, as proven by the texts in the second column.³⁸ The same can be said of *dave* (3p-erg; pronounced /b/ and now always spelled *dabe*) for the eastern area of the dialect (*daude* is the western variant, attested in *Viva Jesus*). On the other hand, a contradiction appears between the «o vowel» form of the third-person singular (*dou* 3s-erg) or the first two forms of the plural (*dóüe, doute* 3p-erg) and those attested in the texts (*dau* & *daude/dabe*, respectively). The common «o vowel» forms (*dot, dozu*, etc.) come from **dadu-* > **dau-*, with intervocalic *d* loss and subsequent monoptongation; those changes have taken place only in the first and second person until now. A single *dou* form has been collected in the past century in the village of Arrankudiaga (Yrizar 1992: 212; not in Gaminde 1984), but together with *dau* & *deu* (1s-erg 1s-abs). It is clearly a very late and incomplete change, and surely a circumstantial one, in such a small area of the Biscayan dialect. In fact, *dou* today is the most widespread form of previous *dogu* (3s-abs 1p-erg), while *dau/deu* (3s-abs 3s-erg) are still the most common forms for the third person, according to Gaminde (1984).

These facts can be explained in two ways. On the one hand, perhaps Larramendi did not know enough of the dialect by 1729, but he did know some *dot*-like forms, and would analogically deduce the third person singular and plural from them; on the other hand, Larramendi could purposefully have changed the third-person forms, looking for a regular paradigm. Of course it could well be the result of both of these factors, and this is the hypothesis that will be defended here in what follows.

Firstly, he also presents a regular «o form» paradigm for the verb **edun* when, for example, the direct object is the first-person singular (1s-abs; Larramendi 1729: 141), even though the forms without monophthongization *nau* (1s-abs 3s-erg), *nauzu* (1s-abs 2s-erg) etc. were common then, *nauzu* & *nozu*-like variants appearing together from Lazarraga onwards (c. 1600; Blanco & Krajewska 2020: 373-375):³⁹

³⁸ Surely the same cannot be said of *dozue* (2p-erg), because until the time of Larramendi *dozu* was also plural (Urgell 2018: 620). In fact, the first attestations of *dozue* are from Barrutia (c. 1720 or 1750?; see Lakarra 1996: 174-176), and the first ones provided by the EKC are even later, from Mogel's writings (v.g., *Confesino ona*, 1803).

³⁹ However, Gaminde (1984: I, 255-256) has only found *nausu* in Elgeta, and *nosu* in almost all other towns.

Table 5
 Biscayan forms of **edun*
 for the direct object being the first-person singular

| Grammar forms | |
|---------------|----------------|
| 2s-erg | nóc, nón, nózu |
| 3s-erg | nou |
| 2p-erg | nozue |
| 3p-erg | noüe, naïue |

At the same time, *nou* (1s-abs 3s-erg) & *noüe* (1s-abs 3p-erg) are never attested according to *EKC*, because there was no monophthongation in the third person, as in the case of *dau e* & *dabe* (3s-abs) cited above. It seems that Larramendi completed some Biscayan paradigms in a regular way, and that he put those regular forms first and prioritized them, but without completely rejecting other options, since he also accepted the third-person *dave* from actual speech and/or from the texts, as well as *naüe* (1s-abs 3p-erg).

There is another peculiarity that will help us to understand Larramendi's regular forms and where they came from. Some of the plural forms quoted above have a pluralizer *-e*, which is the common Biscayan one, but sometimes a variant with *-te* also appears, as in *dózue* / *dozute* (3s-abs 2p-erg), *dóüe/doute* (3s-abs 3p-erg) —but not in *nozue* (1ps-abs 2p-erg) or *noüe* (1s-abs 3p-erg), for example. There is no attestation of such *-te* forms, as far as I know; in fact, the pluralizer *-te* is an innovation of the central dialects that has neither reached the Biscayan dialect nor some western and southern Guipuzcoan varieties, including that of Loiola (Azpeitia), where Larramendi lived. In fact, as Mitxelena pointed out,⁴⁰ there are *-te e* & *-e* forms in the Guipuzcoan paradigm of Larramendi's grammar (1729: 66), as shown in the following table:

Table 6
 Biscayan and Guipuzcoan
 forms of **edun* in Larramendi's grammar

| | Biscayan | Guipuzcoan |
|---------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| 1s-erg 3s-abs | dot | det |
| 2s-erg 3s-abs | doc, don, dózu | dec, den, dézu |
| 3s-erg 3s-abs | <i>dou</i> | deu |
| 1p-erg 3s-abs | dógu | dégu |
| 2p-erg 3s-abs | <i>dózue, dozute</i> | <i>dézue, dézute</i> |
| 3p-erg 3s-abs | <i>dóüe, doute</i> , dave | <i>déüe, dute</i> |

⁴⁰ «If measured by territory and by people, it can be said that *due* (*debe*) is the most used verbal form in Guipuzcoa. But this only corresponds to spoken language. In the texts, the main form is *dute*. The roots of this phenomena can be found in Larramendi, if not before. In his grammar, he certainly taught *deü-e* (perhaps to express *deu-e*) and *dute*, but when he wrote in Basque what he used was *dute*» (Mitxelena, ap. Yrizar 1983: 687).

All Guipuzcoan verbal forms in the table above are known (see note 39), whereas all the Biscayan forms in italics are unknown outside this grammar. We can conclude that Larramendi more than likely modelled the Biscayan paradigm on the Gipuscoan one. In fact, there is only one form that does not fit the model: *dave* (3s-abs 3p-erg). Since many of the Biscayan forms are *per se* regular and have their exact counterpart on the Gipuskoan side of the table, these unknown forms *dózute*, *dóüe*, *doute* seem to be analogical creations of Larramendi.

It would not be surprising if Larramendi, as a grammarian, sought to complete regular paradigms which, in his view, would best represent primitive Basque, which having been created perfectly by God was, in his days, a little spoilt or corrupted by the negligence of its speakers (see Urgell 1991: 922). However, in my opinion, he was not completely sure when citing forms of the Biscayan dialect, which may have prompted him to complete paradigms with options derived from the Gipuscoan models. The clearest case of this came sixteen years later, when he probably had the chance to improve his knowledge of Biscayan: none of the aforementioned «analogical creations», such as *dou* & *doue* or *doute*, reappear in his dictionary. In contrast the actual Biscayan forms *dau* (3s-abs 3s-erg) and *daua* (3s-abs 3p-erg) are to be found:

- (12) Se haze tarde, *berantzen*, *berandutzen* *du* [G, NL], *belutzen* *dau* [B] (*DT*, s.v. *tarde*).
- (13) Hasta los enemigos le alaban, *are etsayac*, *etsayac ere*, *arerioac bere alabatzen* *deue* [G], *daua* [B], *dute* [NL] (*DT*, s.v. *hasta*).

On another note, there is an interesting change in the plural form, which was *dave* in the grammar, seemingly with /b/,⁴¹ but *daua* with /w/ in the dictionary; incidentally, without diaeresis (i.e. not **daüe*, as *dóüe*, *deüe*, etc. in the grammar). The same form appears twice to express the relative form of the singular (*dau* → *dauena*):

- (14) Sea lo que fuere, *dána dála*, *déna déla*, *biz nai duena* [G, NL], *izan bidi gura* *dauena* [B] (*DT*, s.v. *ser*).
- (15) Teniente, el que tiene, *deuana* [G], *duena* [G, NL], *dauena* [B] (*DT*, s.v.)

The plural *daua* is an old form, coming from **dadude*, probably not in use in 1745. It can be conjectured once again that Larramendi chose or maybe «reconstructed» it by analogy with the singular *dau*, and the same can be said of the relative *dauena*.⁴² The relative form *dauena* is also mentioned in the Supplement of the *DT* («Obero, overo caballo, saruc. Y el refrán, saruc bat uste, tresnatzzen dauenac bestea»), here in the exact (old) form that Larramendi found in his source, *Refranes y Sentencias* (1596).

⁴¹ The confusion between <u> and <v> had been resolved by the end of the 17th century (Mujika 2002: 160 & 172).

⁴² As far as I know, this *u* > *b* / V — V evolution has not been carefully studied, except in some cases in the Alavese dialect. Thus, Ariztimuño (2015: 58-60) proved the difference between *dabe-* (3s-erg 3s-abs) & *daua-* (3p-erg 3s-abs) in Lazarraga: cf. *dabela* (A29:11) vs *dauela* (A29:107) in the same poem, for example.

In conclusion, it can be said that Larramendi preferred the regular verb forms and sometimes reconstructed them when necessary, but he was able to correct and even eliminate some of them as his knowledge of the dialect improved.

The same conclusion can be reached from other Biscayan verb forms. The following table lists the indicative present forms of the tripersonal auxiliary verb **edutsi* when the indirect object is the first-person singular (1s-dat) and the direct object is the third-person singular (3s-abs; Larramendi 1728: 93):

Table 7
Indicative present forms of **edutsi* in Larramendi's grammar

| | Grammar forms | Texts |
|--------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 2s-erg | déutzac, -an, déutzazu | <i>deustazu</i> (Cap), <i>deusteza</i> (VJ) |
| 3s-erg | déuzt | <i>deustala</i> (Cap) |
| 2p-erg | déutzazue, -zu | |
| 3p-erg | déuztee | <i>deustee</i> (Cap) |

In light of the attestations presented, it is probable that Larramendi knew Capanaga's catechism (1656).⁴³ In any case, the forms given in the grammar were perfectly known and usual at that time, with the exception of the dorsal sibilant *z* rather than the apical *s*. We can assume that the Biscayan speakers who Larramendi met had lost the opposition between both series of sibilants (dorsal and apical merged as an apical), an opposition perfectly conserved in his dialect. Thus, it seems he made a hypercorrection, interpreting as a dorsal what he undoubtedly heard as an apical, perhaps in order to reconstruct the correct or original form. It must be noted that the dorsal sibilant often neutralizes as an apical before occlusive *t* even in other dialects besides Biscayan (Mitxelena 1977: § 14.2). However, all the examples of this paradigm are spelled with apical, fricative (*s*) or affricate (*ts*), in the *DT*, as a sign that later his Biscayan had improved:

- (16) Querer, amar, [...] con los transitivos, *diot, deutsat* (*DT*, s.v.).
- (17) Un tal me ha dicho, [...] *alangoc esan deust* (*DT*, s.v. *tal*).
- (18) Nos ha salido huero, *utsa* [...] *urten deuscu* (*DT*, s.v. *huero*).

5. Conclusion

This paper discusses why evidence compiled by Larramendi in his grammar (1729) and his dictionary (1745) was—and still is—often used with distrust or simply discarded, perhaps unintentionally, by researchers (§ 1), even though from 1985 onwards it is proven that these works were not compiled with a purely apologetic aim. The wealth of lexicon gathered in the dictionary has been shown here by means

⁴³ I could not definitively prove that (see Urgell 2000: III, § 9.3.1.3), but grammar data shows that this possibility should be reexamined. In any case, it would not be surprising, given that his supporter Cardáveraz quotes Capanaga in his Biscayan catechism (1764: 4).

of a sample (§ 2), which provides an idea of the large number of real words and expressions, first attestations and little documented forms collected by Larramendi in his oral surveys. Primarily we can conclude that the *Diccionario Trilingüe* is by far the most complete source for the 18th century lexicon. In light of our example, it seems that many of those lexical forms come particularly from the Guipuzcoan and Biscayan areas close to the Sanctuary of Loyola, or evidently from his own speech.

As far as Larramendi's grammar is concerned, no one has yet done the basic work needed to assess its importance as a prime source of the Basque of his time. Even its Basque sources, if any, have not been determined. Firstly, this work proves that the verbal forms of the Navarre-Labourdin dialect are taken (in whole or in part) from the texts of this dialect (§ 3). Some of them come doubtlessly from Etxeberri of Ziburu (*Manual devotionezcoa* 1627, *Noelac* 1630) and surely also from Haranburu (*Debocino escuarrá*, 1635), the only two authors quoted by Larramendi in his grammar. Unexpectedly, evidence has appeared that Larramendi probably used another book as a source in his grammar, the work of an author cited—and praised—by him only in the prologue to his dictionary, sixteen years later: Axular's *Guero* (1643). In addition, our work has demonstrated that there are some errors in those Navarre-Labourdin verb forms, which is not the case with the forms of Larramendi's dialect, i.e., with the Guipuzcoan ones, for example. As far as I know, generally there are not many errors in Larramendi's printed works. This suggests that perhaps Larramendi was not yet very fluent in the Navarre-Labourdin dialect at the time he wrote his grammar, i.e., some years prior to living in Bayonne (1730-1733).

It also seems clear that the verbal forms of the Biscayan dialect compiled in Larramendi's grammar come partly from texts, perhaps from Capanaga's catechism (1656: § 4). However, some of those Biscayan verb forms are absolutely unattested. Its characteristics indicate that Larramendi completed analogically and sometimes perhaps «reconstructed» the Biscayan verb in his grammar. In our work it has been shown that he «restored» a dorsal sibilant in forms of the auxiliary verb **edutsi* that originally had an apical one. He also regularized Biscayan paradigms of the verb **edun* which have historically acquired an alternation between diphthongated and not-diphthongated forms (such as *dau / dot < *dadu-*). Finally, it has been proven here that Larramendi also created supposedly Biscayan verb forms following the model of the Guipuzcoan paradigm, for example with plural *-te*, instead of the Biscayan plural *-e*.

One might suspect that he tried to reconstruct an ideal verb, just as some grammarians did in Second Modern Basque (1890-1968; Camino 2018). On the other hand, in my opinion, it is clear that, as in the case of the Navarre-Labourdin dialect, in these early years Larramendi did not know Biscayan well. His insecurity led him to create analogical forms, but he had no problem correcting all those «bettered» paradigms in the dictionary (1745), where he only attested actual forms.

By way of a final conclusion, were Larramendi's grammar and dictionary to arouse the interest of researchers, they would recover their position not only as the first Basque linguistic tools, used by all educated Basques who wanted to cultivate their language for a century and a half, but also as an important, and in some senses, prime source of the Basque of his time.

References

- Agirre, Domingo. 1890. *Aita Larramendiren bizitzaren berri laburra*. Donostia: Ignazio Ramon Barojaren semeen moldizkiran.
- Aldekoa-Otalora, Antton Mari. 1984. *Durangoko plateroak*. Durango: Gerediaga elkartea.
- Altuna, Patxi. 1992a. Aita Larramendiren bizitza. In Joseba A. Lakarra (ed.), *Manuel de Larramendi. Hirugarren mendeurrenra (1690-1990)*, 3-26. Donostia: Andoaingo Udala, etc.
- Altuna, Patxi. 1992b. Larramendi euskaldun berritua. In Joseba A. Lakarra (ed.), *Manuel de Larramendi. Hirugarren mendeurrenra (1690-1990)*, 39-48. Donostia: Andoaingo Udala, etc.
- Altuna, Patxi & Joseba A. Lakarra (eds.). 1990. *Manuel Larramendi. Euskal testuak*. Donostia: Andoaingo Udala, etc.
- Altzibar, Xabier. 1992. *Bizkaierazko idazle klasikoak. Mogeldarrak, astarloatarrak, Frai Bartolome. Nortasuna, idazlanak, grafiak*. Bilbao: Bizkaiko Foru Aldundia.
- Arakistain, Jose Maria. 1747. Larramendirentzako gutuna eta hiztegi eranskinak. In Frantzisko Ondarra & Antonio Unzueta (eds.), 1997. *Fr. Migel San Frantziskorena (Zuzeta). Fr. Jose Jesus-Marianera (Arakistain). XVIII-XIX. mendeetako karmeldarrak*. Bilbao: Ediciones El Carmen (KARMEL).
- Arana Martija, Jose Antonio. 1986. Betolazaren *Doctrina Christiana*. Euskera 31. 505-526.
- Arcocha-Scarcia, Aurélie. & Beñat Oyharçabal. 2009. Siglo XVII. Desarrollo y edición de las letras vascas septentrionales. In Mari Jose Olaziregi (ed.), *Historia de la literatura vasca* [online]. <http://www.basqueliterature.com/es/basque/historia/klasikoa/XVII.%20mendea> (2021/01/08).
- Ariztimuño, Borja. 2015. Lazarragaren eskuizkribuko adizki batuez (euskal aditz jokoaren kronologia erlatibo baterantz). In Ricardo Gómez & Maria-Jose Ezeizabarrena (eds.), *Eridenen du zerzaz kontenta: sailkideen omenaldia Henrike Knörr irakasleari (1947-2008)*, 49-70. Vitoria-Gasteiz: UPV/EHU.
- Arriolabengoa, Julen. 2008. *Euskara Ibarguen-Cachopin kronikan. Testu zaharren ediziorako kontribuzioa*. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia & BBK Fundazioa.
- Arzadun, Martín de. 1731. *Doctrina Christianeae explicaciona eiusquera, cein ofrecietandeus ten euscaldun gustiae Don Martin de Arzadun Durangoco Vrico elexetaco beneficiadu, da cureac. Dediquetan deuso Don Nicolas de Echezarreta da Olasari jaunari, Santiacogo Ordeaco Cavalleroari*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Bartholomé Riesgo.
- Auroux, Sylvain. 1994. *La révolution technologique de la grammatisation*. Liège: Mardaga.
- Auroux, Sylvain, Jean-Claude Chevalier, Nicole Jacques-Chauquin & Christiane Marullo-Nizia. 1985. Présentation. In *La linguistique fantastique*, 13-31. Paris: Éditions Denoël.
- Azkue, Resurrección María de. 1905-1906. *Diccionario vasco-español-francés*. Bilbao-Paris: Paul Geuthner (Facsimile edn. Bilbao: La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca, 1969).
- Barrutia, Eneko. 1996. *Bermeo eta Mundakako arrantzaleen hiztegia*. Bilbao: Udal Euskal Unibertsitatea.
- Barrutia, Eneko. 2000. Arrainen izenak mendebaldean. In *Mendebaldeko berbetearen formalizazinoa*. Bilbao: Mendebalde Kultur Elkartea.
- Blanco, Endika & Dorota Krajewska. 2020. Lazarraga eskuizkribuaren hiztegia eta adizkitegia. In Gidor Bilbao, Ricardo Gómez, Joseba A. Lakarra, Julen Manterola, Céline

- Mounole & Blanca Urgell, *Lazarraga Eskuizkribuaren edizioa eta azterketa*, vol. 2, 239-375. Bilbao: UPV/EHU.
- Camino, Iñaki. 2004. Nafarroa Behereko euskara. *FLV* 97. 445-486.
- Camino, Iñaki. 2009. *Dialektologiatik euskalkietara tradizioan gaindi*. Donostia: Elkar.
- Camino, Iñaki. 2018. Bigarren Euskara Modernoa (1876-1968). In Joakin Gorrotxategi, Iván Igartua & Joseba A. Lakarra (eds.), *Euskararen Historia*, 659-735. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Basque Government.
- Cardaveraz, Agustín. 1764. *Jesus, Maria eta Joseren devociñoco libruchoric atalarico devociño batzuc Jesusen Compañíaco Aita Agustin Cardaberaz-ec Bizcaico cristiñau devotoai euren arimen oneraco ofrecetan deutsenac*. Pamplona: Antonio Castilla.
- Desmet, Piet, Peter Lauwers & Pierre Swiggers. 1999. Dialectology, philology and linguistics in the Romance field: methodological developments and interactions. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 13. 177-203.
- EKC = Euskara Institutua (UPV/EHU). 2013. *Euskal Klasikoen Corpusa*. <https://www.ehu.eus/ehg/kcl/> (2019/10/05).
- Etxeberri, Joanes (of Ciboure). 1627. *Manual devotionezcoa*. Bordeaux: I. Mongiron Millanges (Facsimile edn. Donostia: Hordago, 1978).
- Etxeberri, Joanes (of Ciboure). c. 1645. *Noelac eta berce canta espiritual berriac*. Bayonne: P. Fauvet [Vinson 1891-1898: 15f].
- Gaminde, Iñaki. 1984. *Aditza bizkaieraz*, vol. I. s.l.: Udako Euskal Unibertsitatea.
- Gimeno Menéndez, Francisco. 2003. Historia de la dialectología y sociolingüística españolas. In Carmen Alemany Bay et al. (eds.), *Con Alonso Zamora Vicente. Actas del Congreso Internacional «La Lengua, la Academia, lo Popular, los Clásicos, los Contemporáneos»*, 67-84. Alacant: Universitat d'Alacant.
- Gómez, Ricardo. 1991. El legado de Manuel de Larramendi. *Ínsula* 534. 29-30.
- Gómez, Ricardo. 2007. *XIX. mendeko euskal gramatikagintzari buruzko ikerketak*. Bilbao: UPV/EHU.
- HAEE (Herri-Arduralaritzaren Euskal Erakundea). 1987. *Azkue hiztegiaren aurkibidea*. s.l.: HAEE.
- Haranburu, Joanes. 1635. *Devocino escuarrra, mirailla eta oracineteguia*. Bordeaux: P. de la Court.
- Hualde, José Ignacio. 1991. Manuel de Larramendi y el acento vasco. *ASJU* 25(3). 737-749.
- Knörr, Henrike. 1986. Betolazaren zenbait berri. *ASJU* 20(2). 499-508.
- Krajewska, Dorota, Eneko Zuloaga, Ekaitz Santazilia, Borja Ariztimuño, Oxel Uribe-Etxabarria & Urtzi Reguero. 2017. *Esteve Materraren Do(c)trina christiana (1617 & 1623). Edizioa eta azterketa (Monumenta linguae Vasconum: Studia et Instrumenta 7)*. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia & UPV/EHU (= ASJU 51).
- Laka, Itziar. 1987. Sabino Arana Goiri eta Hiperbizkaiera (Hiperbizkaieraren historiaz III). *ASJU* 21(1). 13-40.
- Lakarra, Joseba A. 1984. *Bertso bizkaitarrak* (1688). *ASJU* 18(2). 89-184.
- Lakarra, Joseba A. 1985a. Larramendiren hiztegigintzaren inguruan. *ASJU* 19(1). 9-50.
- Lakarra, Joseba A. 1985b. Literatur gipuzkerarantz: Larramendiren Azkoitiko Sermoia (1737). *ASJU* 19(1). 235-281.
- Lakarra, Joseba A. 1991. Testukritika eta hiztegiak: Harriet eta Larramendi. In Joseba A. Lakarra & Iñigo Ruiz Arzalluz (eds.), *Memoriae L. Mitxelena Magistri Sacrum*, vol. 1, 217-258. Donostia: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia.

- Lakarra, Joseba A. 1992. Larramendirekin aurreko hiztegintzaren historiaz: aztergai eta goeta. In Ricardo Gómez & Joseba A. Lakarra (eds.), *Euskalaritzaren historiaz, I: XVI-XIX. mendeak (ASJUren Gehigarriak 15)*, 275-312. Donostia: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia.
- Lakarra, Joseba A. 1996. *Refranes y Sentencias (1596). Ikerketak eta edizioa*. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia.
- Larramendi, Manuel de. 1729. *El imposible vencido. Arte de la lengua bascongada*. Salamanca: Antonio Joseph Villagordo Alcaraz (Facsimile edn. Donostia: Hordago, 1979).
- Larramendi, Manuel de. 1745. *Diccionario trilingüe del castellano, bascuence y latín*. Donostia: Bartholomé Riesgo y Montero (Facsimile edn. Donostia: Txertoa, 1984).
- Larramendi, Manuel de. 1754. *Corografía o descripción general de la muy noble y muy leal provincia de Guipúzcoa* (ed. by José Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras. Donostia: Sociedad Guipuzcoana de Ediciones y Publicaciones, 1969).
- Mitxelena, Koldo. 1953. Arnaud Oihenart. In Blanca Urgell (ed.), *Euskal idazlan guztiak V. Literaturaren inguruak II*, 35-57. Donostia: Euskal Editoreen Elkartea.
- Mitxelena, Koldo. 1959. *La obra del P. Manuel de Larramendi (1690-1766)*. Oviedo: Cuadernos de la Cátedra Feijoo (Repr. in OC 11, 427-443).
- Mitxelena, Koldo. 1960. *Historia de la literatura vasca*. Madrid: Minotauro.
- Mitxelena, Koldo. 1970. *Estudio sobre las fuentes del Diccionario de Azkue*. Bilbao: Centro de Estudios Históricos de Vizcaya.
- Mitxelena, Koldo. 1977. *Fonética histórica vasca*. (Repr. in OC 6).
- Mitxelena, Koldo. 1983. Mendiburu eta Larramendi. *Euskera* 28(1). 19-23.
- Mitxelena, Koldo. 1984. Aurkezpena. In Ibon Sarasola, *Hauta-lanerako Euskal Hizategia*, 11-23. Donostia: GAK.
- Mitxelena, Koldo. 1987-2005. *Orotariko Euskal Hizategia. Diccionario General Vasco*, 15 vol. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia, etc. <https://www.euskaltzaindia.net/oeh> (2019/10/05).
- Mitxelena, Koldo. 2011. *Obras completas (Supplements of ASJU 54-68)*, 15 vol. Donostia & Vitoria-Gasteiz: «Julio Urkixo» Euskal Filología Mintegia, Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia & UPV/EHU (ed. by Joseba A. Lakarra & Ifíigo Ruiz Arzalluz).
- Mocoroa, Justo Mari. 1935. *Genio y lengua*. Tolosa: Librería de Mocoroa hermanos.
- Mounole, Céline & Joseba A. Lakarra. 2018. Euskara Arkaikoa. In Joakin Gorrotxategi, Iván Igartua & Joseba A. Lakarra (eds.), *Euskararen Historia*, 345-468. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Basque Government.
- Mujika, Jose Antonio. 2002. *Euskal ortografiaren hastapenak Iparraldeko literaturan*. Bilbao: UPV/EHU.
- Novia de Salcedo, Pedro. 1887. *Diccionario etimológico del idioma bascongado*. Tolosa: E. Lopez.
- Ochoa de Capanaga, Martin. 1656. *Exposición breve de la doctrina christiana*. Bilbao: Juan de Azpiroz.
- Osselton, Noel E. 1989. Secondary documentation in historical lexicography. Repr. in *Chosen words. Past and present problems for dictionary makers*, 137-147. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1995.
- Oyharçabal, Befnat. 1989. Les travaux de grammaire basque avant Larramendi (1729). *ASJU* 23(1). 59-73.
- Padilla, Manuel. 2017. *Zuberoako euskararen azterketa diakronikoa: XVI-XIX. mendeak / Analyse diachronique du dialecte souletin : XVIIe-XIXe siècles*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: UPV/EHU doctoral dissertation. <https://addi.ehu.es/handle/10810/26535>.

- Pagola, Inés. 2005. *Neologismos en la obra de Sabino Arana Goiri*. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia.
- Pagola, Rosa Miren. 1991. *Dialektologiaren atarian*. Bilbao: Mensajero-Gero.
- Pérez, Fernando Pedro. 2002. Peces singulares marinos de la costa vasca. *Euskonews* 181. <https://www.euskonews.com/0181zbk/gaia18104es.html> (2019/10/05).
- Pop, Sever. 1950. *La dialectologie. Aperçu historique et méthodes d'enquêtes linguistiques*. Louvain: chez l'autour.
- Reguero, Urtzi. 2019. *Filologiatik dialektologiara Nafarroako euskarazko testu zaharretan berrera (1416-1750) (Supplements of ASJU 71)*. Bilbao: UPV/EHU.
- Rodríguez Alonso, Manuel. 1992. La dialectología gallega. *Revista de lengua y literatura catalana, gallega y vasca* 2. 63-69.
- Ruiz Vientemilla, Jesús M. 1987. Estudio introductorio. Facsimile edn. of the *Diario de los literatos de España*, vol. I. Barcelona: Puvill Libros S.A.
- Sarasola, Ibon. 1983. Contribución al estudio y edición de textos antiguos vascos. *ASJU* 17. 69-212.
- Sarasola, Ibon. 1986. Larramendiren eraginiak eta. *ASJU* 20(1). 203-215.
- Sarasola, Ibon. 1989. Van Eysen gramatika-lanak. *ASJU* 23(1). 87-94.
- Sarasola, Ibon. 2007. *Euskal Hiztegia*. Donostia: Elkar.
- Tellechea Idígoras, José Ignacio. 1966. Nota autógrafa del P. Larramendi a la copia que hizo del Nuevo Testamento de Lizarraga. Advertencia. In *Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de Guipúzcoa*, vol. 7, 175-176. Donostia: Gipuzkoako Foro Aldundia.
- Tovar, Antonio. 1980. *Mitología e ideología sobre la lengua vasca*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Ulibarri, Koldo. 2010. Viva Jesus dotrina: edizioa eta azterketa. *ASJU* 44(2). 41-154.
- Urgell, Blanca. 1987. *Esku-liburuaren grafi aldaketak (1802-1821)*. *ASJU* 21(2). 357-387.
- Urgell, Blanca. 1991. Axular eta Larramendi. *ASJU* 25(3). 901-928.
- Urgell, Blanca. 1996. Larramendi o el despertar de la literatura vasca peninsular. In Gorka Aulestia (ed.), *Los escritores. Hitos de la literatura clásica euskérica*, 263-288. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Fundación Sancho el Sabio.
- Urgell, Blanca. 2000. *Hiztegi Hirukoitzaren osagaiez*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: UPV/EHU doctoral dissertation. https://www.euskara.euskadi.net/appcont/tesisDoctoral/PDFak/Blanca_Urgell_TESIA.pdf.
- Urgell, Blanca. 2001. Euskal formen aurkezpena Larramendiren hiztegian. *ASJU* 35(1). 107-183.
- Urgell, Blanca. 2002. *Hiztegi Hirukoitzaren kanpoko eta barruko historiaz*. In Xabier Arriagoitia, Patxi Goenaga & Joseba A. Lakarra (eds.), *Erramu Boneta. Festschrift for Rudolf P. G. de Rijk (Supplements of ASJU 44)*, 629-649. Bilbao: UPV/EHU.
- Urgell, Blanca. 2004. Etimología eta neología Larramendiren *Hiztegi Hirukoitz-ean* (1745). *Lapurдum* 9. 299-310.
- Urgell, Blanca. 2005. Larramendiren euskal liburuak 1745 arte: testu bibliografiaranzko hurbilketa bat. *Lapurдum* 10. 247-286.
- Urgell, Blanca. 2015. Tartas eta Leizarraga berrikusiak, edo nola aldatzen duen historia ikertzailearen begiradak. In Beatriz Fernández & Pello Salaburu (eds.), *Ibon Sarasola. Gorazarre. Homenaje. Homenaje*, 647-663. Bilbao: UPV/EHU.
- Urgell, Blanca. 2018. Lehen Euskara Modernoa (1745-1891). In Joakin Gorrotxategi, Iván Igartua & Joseba A. Lakarra (eds.), *Euskararen Historia*, 543-657. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Eusko Jaurlaritza.

- Urrutikoetxea, Ane, 2016. Euskararen apologista sutsua. *Berria* 2016/01/29. https://www.berria.eus/paperekoa/1833/030/001/2016-01-29/euskararen_apologista_sutsua.htm (2021/01/08).
- Villasante, Luis. 1961. *Historia de la literatura vasca*. Bilbao: Sendo (Second edn., corrected and augmented, Oñati: Aranzazu, 1979).
- Vinson, Julien. 1891-1898. *Essai d'une bibliographie de la langue basque*. Paris: J. Maisonneuve (Facsimile edn. with J. Urquijo's notes; *Supplements of ASJU* 9. Donostia: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia, 1984).
- Yrizar, Pedro de. 1983. *De(b)e - du(t)e, dai, debie aditz-jokoak gipuzkeraz*. Bizkaieraren eragintza. In *Piarres Lafitteri omenaldia* (IKER 2), 683-688. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia.
- Yrizar, Pedro de. 1992. *Morfología del verbo auxiliar vizcaíno: (estudio dialectológico) / Tomo II, Subdialecto occidental (variedades de Arratia, Orozco, Arrigorriaga y Ochandiano), Subdialecto de Guipúzcoa (variedades de Vergara y Salinas)*. Bilbao: Bilbao Bizaia Kutxa & Euskaltzaindia.
- Zuazo, Koldo. 1998a. Euskalkiak, gaur. *FLV* 30. 191-233.
- Zuazo, Koldo. 1998b. Betolatzaren hizkeraz. In Henrike Knörr & Koldo Zuazo (eds.), *Ara-bako euskararen lekukoak. Ikerketak eta testuak. El euskara alavés. Estudios y textos*, 71-86. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Eusko Legebiltzarra.
- Zuazo, Koldo. 2014. *Euskalkiak*. Donostia: Elkar.
- Zubikarai, Agustin. 1981. R. M. Azkueri jarraitzen. *Euskera* 26. 221-238.
- Zulaika, Josu M. 2012. Breve panorámica de la lexicografía vasca anterior al *Diccionario Trilingüe de Larramendi* (1745). *BSEHL* 8. 43-71.