

Célia dos Santos Lopes and Martin Hummel

Introduction

The volume *Address in Portuguese and Spanish: Studies in Diachrony and Diachronic Reconstruction* provides the first systematic contrastive approach to the history of forms of address in Portuguese and Spanish in their European and American varieties. It brings together the most relevant and significant authors on this topic. From a methodological point of view, the volume is innovative as it links historical linguistics with diachronic reconstruction based on synchronic variation. It includes theoretical reflections as well as fine-grained empirical studies. Since nearly all studies on address in Portuguese and Spanish have been published in languages other than English, this collection will allow the international scientific community to become more familiar with the field.

The Portuguese and Spanish languages are intimately related, especially in the case of address. Crucial moments in the diachrony of address are situated in shared political and geographic contexts (e.g., the personal union of Philipp II of Spain and Philipp I of Portugal; the parallel colonization of the Americas by Portugal and Spain; the long-term transformation from a feudal to a democratic system). Consequently, the dialogue between research on Portuguese and on Spanish promises new insights (see also Rebollo Couto & Santos Lopes 2011). To give one example, empirical data show that the puzzling late spread of Sp. *usted* ‘you (formal, polite)’ and Pt. *você* ‘you’ (see below on glossing problems) across America can be explained for both languages by the role of the political and military colonial administration.

It should be added that this volume has its own remarkable history. It is part of a long-term effort designed to stimulate and coordinate research on address in Spanish and Portuguese. It continues and complements the volume *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico* published in 2010 by Hummel, Kluge & Vázquez Laslop, which resulted from the first *Congreso sobre Formas y Fórmulas de Tratamiento en el mundo hispánico* (CFFT1) held at the University of Graz in 2006. The conference was intended to bring together, for the first time, what was then very active but widely dispersed research on address in Spanish in the New and the Old Worlds. The call for papers was received with great enthusiasm, and the 13 reviews of the volume published in journals around the world reflected that the time had come to bring together the diverse strands of research in this field. The volume has become a major reference in studies on address.

However, the success of this first phase could not hide the shortcomings of the state of research at the time. First, the diachronic dimension of research was clearly underrepresented. Second, bringing together Spanish-speaking America

and Europe certainly had merit, but the linguistic, cultural, and above all historical links between Spanish and Portuguese had not been a focus. Consequently, the ambition of CFFT2, held in Graz in 2016, was to create a space for researchers on both languages to meet and exchange. Consequently, Célia dos Santos Lopes was invited to join the organizing team of CFFT2. In the resulting conference, the participants made an impressive effort to provide parallel versions of the handouts in the complementary language (Spanish or Portuguese) or in English. This new approach was very positively received, and had the desired effect of stimulating dialogue among participants. It was repeated at the ALFAL conference in Bogotá in 2017 in a session we organized on *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento del español y del portugués/Formas e fórmulas de tratamento do português e do espanhol*.

The present volume is the fruit of this long-term linguistic effort. It includes studies directly comparing Portuguese and Spanish, or dealing with one of the languages, always from a diachronic perspective, not only in a traditional chronological sense, but also in terms of diachronic reconstruction from synchronic variationist data.

Given the complexity of address in Portuguese, the glosses and translations to English of the different terms used for address can only be tentative. The inventory of the Portuguese and Spanish forms of address is longer than in English, and linguistic variation accounts for different meanings and functions of the same pronoun. Thus Pt. *você* originally was a formal and polite form of address, albeit not as formal as its etymological forerunner *vossa mercê* ‘Your Honor/Grace’. In present-day Portugal, *você* is situated in between formal *o senhor/a senhor* ‘Mr/Mrs.’ and informal *tu*. It may also be negatively connoted by the speakers if used in asymmetrical personal relations, e.g. between employer and employee. By contrast, in Brazil *você* comes close to Engl. *you*, being indifferent regarding (in)formality. In some varieties, Sp. *usted* is used in the same way for both formal and informal contexts, while it is still highly formal in Spain, even more so than in the past. In order to more closely match reality, we use the indices T (informal) and V (formal) with Engl. *you*. Hence, *you_T* refers to informal (close relationship) address, and *you_V* to formal (distant, polite) relations expressed by the Portuguese or Spanish form of address. Since (European) Portuguese and Spanish are *pro-drop* languages (tending to not overtly express the subject pronoun), the personal relationship is usually expressed with the verb only. In such cases, the notations *come_T* or *come_V* may be used. Intermediate terms may also figure, e.g., *you_{VT}*.

Glossing follows the Leipzig Glossing Rules. However, in the running text, outside the glosses, the Leipzig abbreviations “1 = first person”, “2 = second person”, etc. would not be clear (e.g. *“(the verb is used in 1)”). In this case, 1P = first person, 2P = second person, etc. are used. In cases where “person” is followed by

“singular” and “plural” the glossing rules are clear also in the running text, so 1SG = first person singular, 2SG = second person singular, etc. are adopted. In the running text normal capital letters are used, in the glosses small caps.

Discussions with colleagues from the *International Network on Address Research* (INAR) made us aware of the fact that Portuguese and Spanish may well be the best studied languages in the domain of address. This is reflected by the more than 1,500 entries in the newly updated online bibliography created by Mauro Fernández and Katharina Gerhalter (2017). However, almost no bibliographic references are available in English. Consequently, the international reception of these studies is very limited. For this reason, we have chosen English as the sole language of the collection. This will facilitate links between the research presented here and the efforts that have been undertaken in parallel by INAR, especially through its conferences in Berlin 2013, Hildesheim 2014, College Station/Texas 2015, and Helsinki 2017 (see Visman 2015).

Meanwhile, a third conference, the CFFT3, has crossed the Atlantic to Florianópolis, Brazil, where the conference was held in May 2018. The conference links with previous efforts in Brazil to promote research on address, in particular the *I Simpósio do LaborHistórico: História dos Pronomes de tratamento* (Rio de Janeiro 2015) (see Marcotulio et al. 2015).

The volume is structured into three parts that reflect the challenge of bringing together research on Portuguese and Spanish in the Old and New Worlds in the domains of historical linguistics and diachronic reconstruction.

Part I consists of three contributions that directly tackle the comparison of Portuguese and Spanish. **Martin Hummel** provides a critical overview, pointing out the advantages and shortcomings of different approaches to the topic. **Víctor Lara** presents the first empirical study comparing the use of forms of address in European Spanish and Portuguese. The study claims that western Andalusian Spanish and southern Portuguese constitute a *Sprachbund* (linguistic area build by different languages) by sharing a series of salient linguistic features including address. The results are likely to stimulate discussion about the impact of this *Sprachbund* on the general history of Portuguese and Spanish in the Americas. **Célia Regina dos Santos Lopes, Leonardo Lennertz Marcotulio & Thiago Laurentino de Oliveira** outline the major axes of the diachronic development of forms of address in the complex diatopic landscape of Brazil, summing up the results of two decades of empirical research within the framework of the over-arching project *Projeto Para uma História do Português Brasileiro* (PHPB).

Part II comprises four chapters on the historical sociolinguistics of European and Brazilian Portuguese. Combining synchronic and diachronic data displaying linguistic variation, the contribution by **Izete Lehmkuhl Coelho & Christiane Maria Nunes de Souza** provides insights into historical, social and migrational

contexts to explain the specific present-day distribution of *tu* and *você* in the State of Santa Catarina, Brazil. **Vanessa Martins do Monte** examines private letters written in the *Capitania* of São Paulo, Brazil, from 1870 to 1950, the period when *você* started to compete with *tu*. At present, *você* prevails, with some remarkable regional differences, especially in the port town of Santos. She also shows that, while *tu* is generally not overtly expressed in the subject position, following the *pro-drop* tendency, *você* tends to be used overtly, probably inheriting this property from its nominal origin *vossa mercê* ('Your Honor/Grace'). The chapter thus also contributes to the widely discussed *anti-pro-drop* tendency of present-day Brazilian Portuguese. In the same vein, **Márcia Cristina de Brito Rumeu** explores letters written in the Brazilian State of Minas Gerais between 1840 and 1990. She focuses on the repercussions of the changes in the subject position on the syntactic functions that may agree with the subject, such as direct/indirect objects, possessives, and prepositional complements. **Gunther Hammermüller** uncovers and analyzes for the first time the rich dialect archives of Manuel de Paiva Boléo (University of Coimbra, Portugal) who, supported by his students, collected data on rural European Portuguese between the 1940s and 1960s. Data from more than 3,000 interviews provide insights into the synchronic variation during that period, which Hammermüller uses in the diachronic reconstruction of *você*. Each village in Portugal seems to have had a particular and highly differentiated address system and practice.

Part III deals with the diachrony of Spanish, and in particular the related history of European and American Spanish. The first two contributions deal with the neglected history of plural forms. **Virginia Bertolotti** investigates the unknown reasons for the loss of *vosotros* in the Spanishes of the Americas (with the exception of its use in highly ceremonial and formulaic contexts). Criticizing the common bias of considering *Modern* European Spanish as the original variety, she shows that the loss of *vosotros* starts earlier than assumed, in the 18th century, probably as a consequence of the fact that plural distinctions never rooted in American Spanish in the domain of pronominal address. **Philipp Dankel & Miguel Gutiérrez Maté** analyze the particular phenomenon of ongoing usage of the possessive *vuestro* 'your_v (plural, polite)' in the Spanish of Cusco in Peru. While ceremonial *vuestro* may occur in many varieties of American Spanish, the productive and strategic use for marking social identity in the in-group/out-group context created by the heritage of Quechua is unique to this region. The authors explain this specific phenomenon as a consequence of linguistic and cultural contact with Quechua. Using data from 1960 and 2015, **María Marta García Negroni & Silvia Ramírez Gelbes** study the breakdown of prescriptive norms created in order to impose the usage of *tú* and *usted* on the descriptive norm of using simple *vos* in Argentinean Spanish. According to the authors, the values of

social proximity and symbolic identity have guided this process. **María Eugenia Vázquez Laslop** examines two presidential debates in Mexico that took place in 1994 and 2012. The analysis shows a considerable difference between the two debates, with a more informal relationship with the audience in 2012. Address forms play a strategic role in this type of communication which is highly oriented to achieving specific goals. A long-term analysis of future debates will test the hypothesis that this type of variation is a diachronic change, ruling out the specific context of the debate.

Miguel Calderón Campos & M^a Teresa García-Godoy examine new corpora in order to test hypotheses about the diachrony of the alleged Americanism *su merced* ‘his grace’ – a variant of *vuestra merced* which may be used for informal address in some present-day varieties of Spanish. The data provide evidence for the shortcomings of literary corpora that have suggested a diachrony related to the language of African slaves in the Caribbean. The authors show that the first occurrences of *su merced* in America are not restricted to the zones where slavery was common. The data indicate instead that *su merced* originated from European Spanish, where its use was kept to delocutive reference in third person. However, the development of second person address in both formal and informal contexts is indeed a specificity of American Spanish. Finally, **Isabel Molina Martos** explores the sociohistorical background(s) of the well-known expansion of informal *tuteo* (that is, the use of informal *you*) in Spain in the period of drastic political and social changes between 1875 and 1939. Mutual *tuteo* started as a pointed upper-class behavior producing top-down imitation, which ended up joining the parallel and independent development of mutual *tú* among the lower classes. In the first half of the 20th century, not only did progressive intellectuals adopt the popular usage of mutual *tú*, but so did the fascist and communist ideologies trying to mobilize the masses. The author documents the complexity of this process through the analysis of letters written by people belonging to different social classes and ideologies.

It may surprise that the volume does not include a general index of relevant names and topics, but the open access digital version allows free individual parsing in a way that largely exceeds the necessarily limited list of items included in a printed index.

The volume thus provides thorough theoretical, methodological, and empirical insights into the multifaceted aspects of historical linguistics and diachronic reconstruction. Nevertheless, there is clearly scope for further investigation. We want to draw attention to two areas that remain underrepresented in research.

The first area is the lack of investigation into the history of European Portuguese in the research landscape of Portugal. As a probable consequence of the dominance of Generative Linguistics in Portugal over a number of decades, the study of address has been undertaken only by foreign researchers (Sandi

Michele de Oliveira, Gunther Hammermüller, Víctor Lara, Leonardo Lennertz Marcotulio). Whereas in Spanish the investigation of the origins and the history of address has a long tradition culminating in the current systematic corpus-based efforts, in Portuguese the last landmark study on the diachrony of address written by a Portuguese author is almost 50 years old (Cintra 1972). For this reason, the Brazilian PHPB project, which does not tackle data older than the 18th century, lacks a solid historical ground: the European origins of address. These origins and their development during the first century of Portuguese have to be investigated on solid empirical grounds.

Future research should also tackle the Latin–Romance transition, e.g., in translations, as well as the comparative study of address in all Romance languages and varieties. The contributions of this volume provide multiple evidence for the linguistic and cultural relationships that tie the Romance languages together. However, this dimension of address has not been systematically investigated. It would be a good topic for one of the next CFFT conferences.

Finally, we express our gratitude to the organizations that provided the funding for travel costs for colleagues to CFFT1 and CFFT2: the Hugo Schuchardt Foundation, the Styrian Government, and the Arts and Humanities Faculty of the University of Graz. Last but not least, the Austrian Science Fund FWF financed this open access publication. We also feel grateful to the editors of the *Topics in Address Research* series for making helpful comments. The volume could finally not be published in that series. The English version has been carefully revised, first by individual native reviews of each paper, then Jane Warren checked the complete volume.

References

- Cintra, Luís F. Lindley. 1972. *Sobre “formas de tratamento” na língua portuguesa*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.
- Fernández, Mauro & Katharina Gerhalter. 2017. Pronombres de segunda persona y fórmulas de tratamiento en español: Una nueva bibliografía (1867 – 2016). *Linguística en la Red* (25.3.2017). http://www.linred.es/informacion_pdf/LR_informacion20_20170219.pdf.
- Marcotulio, Leonardo Lennertz, Célia Regina dos Santos Lopes & Sílvia Regina de Oliveira Cavalcante (eds.). 2015. *História dos pronomes de tratamento no português brasileiro*, special issue of *LaborHistórico* 1,1.
- Rebollo Couto, Leticia & Célia Regina dos Santos Lopes (eds.). 2011. *As formas de tratamento em português e em espanhol. Variação, mudança e funções conversacionais/Las formas de tratamiento en español y en portugués. Variación, cambio y funciones conversacionales*. Niterói: Editora da UFF.
- Vismans, Roel. 2015. INAR 3. <http://languagesatsheffield.blogspot.co.uk/2015/11/inar-3.html>.