I. Rozprawy i analizy

Joachim Grzega

Universität of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Germany
ORCID: 0000-0001-6562-5456
e-mail: joachim.grzega@ku.de

Eurolinguistic notes on Polish, German, Czech, Hungarian, Dutch, English, French, Italian, Spanish and Latin in Warmer's late-17th-c. colloquy. Part 1: Representativeness and address pronouns

Eurolingwistyczny kontekst języków polskiego, niemieckiego, czeskiego, węgierskiego, niderlandzkiego, angielskiego, francuskiego, hiszpańskiego i łacińskiego w „Rozmowie" Christopherusa Warmera z końca XVII w. Część 1. Reprezentatywność i zaimki adresatywne

Abstract: Warmer's 1691 colloquy including ten languages – (Silesian) Polish, (Silesian) German, (eastern) Czech, (northern) Hungarian, (Flemish) Dutch, (northern) French, Italian, Spanish, English and Latin – is studied qualitatively and descriptively for representativeness and typical European character of address forms and routine formulae in expressive speech acts. Due to Warmer's biography, the content of the book, the comparison to other versions, typographical habits, the uses of address pronouns and their comparison with prior research, the text is considered probably representative of the period from 1650 to 1680. The analysis of address pronouns reveals the following. In all vernacular languages save Dutch, there is a formal/informal address pronoun distinction. Among these languages (except Hungarian), we see the reciprocal use of the formal pronoun between all adults, between students, and between mother and daughter, and non-reciprocal use of the formal pronoun by male non-adults to adults. Based on this, the other pragmalinguistic aspects will be dealt with in the next installment, Part 2 of this study.

Key words: Christopherus Warmer; cross-linguistic; spoken language; 17th century; address pronouns; representativeness

1. Introduction

In early 16ᵗʰ century, Noel van Barlainmont (better known as Noël de Berlaimont, Berlaymont, or Berlemont) wrote a language guide that served as a model for manifold multilingual editions in the centuries afterward. It was originally a Dutch-French phrasebook so that people of (Southern) Dutch mother tongue could learn (Northern) French. The original consisted of three model conversations, several model letters and a dictionary. The oldest existing version is from 1527 (Barlainmont 1527), but the title page already labels it a revised version. Barlainmont died in 1531. In the second half of the 16ᵗʰ c., his book began to serve as a prototype for diverse polyglot and enlarged versions (not always with his name as the author or co-author). A number of studies have been carried out on different versions of this book-type (e.g. Radtke 1989 & 1994, Colombo Timelli 1992, Hüllen 2003, Grzega 2013: 111–122, Villoria-Prieto and Suso Lóez 2018, Mair, Wörz, and Grzega 2021). For an impression of editions in the line of Barlainmont, see Rossebastiano (2000: 693–696) or Bouzouita and Vogl (2019); but the dating of the original is incorrect and the most comprehensive version of 1691 is not mentioned in these articles.

The 1691 version was created by Christopherus Warmer and contains ten languages (Warmer 1691), to wit (in the order of the columns on each double-page): German, Polish, Bohemian (i.e. Czech), Belgian (i.e. Flemish Dutch), English, Latin, French, Spanish, Italian, and Hungarian. Warmer's book can thus be seen as a small truly Eurolinguistic corpus, or sample, with the north being represented by English, the west by Dutch and French, the south by Spanish and Italian, the east by Polish, Czech and Hungarian, a fuzzy center by German plus Latin as the classical European lingua franca (although this role had tremendously diminished outside the academic and religious spheres).

What do the conversations look like? The first, second and third conversation are already present in the version from 1527, the fourth and fifth conversation first occur in a version from 1575 (Anon. 1575), the sixth and seventh conversation first appear in a version from 1585 (Anon. 1585). Again, a double page shows (Silesian) German, (Silesian) Polish, (Bohemian/eastern) Czech, (Belgian/Flemish) Dutch and English on the left, and Latin, (Belgian/northern) French, Spanish, Italian and (northern) Hungarian on the right. Each double page has maximally thirty lines. The first and longest conversation (pp. 90–157) includes ten people, for which the English name versions are used here: it consists first of a brief dialogue between two people (John and Hermes) in the street and then one of these people (John) goes home, where the reader witnesses a conversation at the dinner table, involv-

ing nine people (John, his father Peter and his mother Mary, his brother Francis, his sister Anne, his relative David, a certain Roger, Henry the servant of Peter's uncle, and Luke the servant of another person); the somehow unrelated introductory scene with the youngster bearing the everyday name John leaving his fellow student with the classical name Hermes may reflect a certain sense of humor by Barlainmont to mark that this colloquy is not a classical one preparing students for school-topics, but one that prepares grown-up people for everyday and business dialogs. The second conversation (pp. 156–179) involves a saleswoman, her colleague and a customer. The third and shortest conversation (pp. 178–189) concerns the contract between a debtor, a creditor and later a guarantor. The fourth conversation (pp. 188–201) brings together two travelers on the road (engaging a lot in small talk) as well as a female shepherd that they ask for the way until they have reached an inn. The fifth conversation (pp. 200–223) is in the inn (travelers, the innkeeper, other guests and the innkeeper's young female servant). The sixth conversation (pp. 222–235) takes place in the morning, between the two travelers and a young male servant who wakes the travelers in the inn; thereafter, the two travelers visit different places of the town (one of the travelers showing the other one the things he is already familiar with). The seventh conversation (pp. 234–272) presents scenes at the market as well as paying and tipping at the inn, and includes encounters between a customer and his acquaintance, a salesman, another salesman and his servant, a day laborer, the innkeeper and his wife, as well as the innkeeper's servant (and – without text of her own – the innkeeper's maid).

McLelland (2015) has argued that foreign language teaching manuals sometimes give us a better insight into historical speech acts than grammars for natives (see also Section 3.1). I would therefore like to inspect the 1691 version for the use of historical speech acts from a Eurolinguistic perspective in the sense that we are looking for features common to many European languages.

2. Research questions

The first question of this study is:

RQ1:   Is the language in the corpus likely to be representative (i.e. natural in the situations)?

If this can be answered positively, the next research questions will be:

RQ2:   Are there any European features or regional features with respect to ...

RQ2a: ... forms of address?

RQ2b: ... patterns in greeting (and potential echo responses)?

RQ2c: ... patterns in thanking (and potential echo responses)?

European feature shall be defined as "feature present in 75 percent of the languages investigated" (for the theoretical foundation see Section 3.3). Due to its length, the study will be split up in two parts. RQ1 will be answered in this article, partly with the help of aspects of RQ2a. However, the complete range of the issues in RQ2 will be answered in Part 2 of the study, to be published in the next issue of this journal.

3. Theoretical background

This contribution does not aim at enhancing theoretical discussions but is predominantly descriptive, or analytical, in the sense that it tries to collect and describe linguistic features typical of a large number of the languages analyzed. Nevertheless, some remarks on theoretical backgrounds and definitions are necessary.

3.1. Foreign language manuals in Early Modern Times

As already said in the introduction, McLelland (2015) claims that foreign language teaching manuals can let us gain better insights in speech-act history than grammars for natives. Nonetheless, there are some caveats. Certainly, these texts are not entirely reflexes of natural language; they are model sentences (cf. Radtke 1994: 28). And they are model sentences for the time when they first were created. For example: talking about peace (in the first and fifth text) may be a small talk topic in 1527 and 1575 (in one or more of the language communities), but maybe no longer in 1691 (our present version). Replying that there is so much lying between war opponents that you do not know whom to trust (as in the first dialogue) may be an accepted small-talk phrase in early 16th-c. French and Flemish, but maybe not in the language stages of the late 17th c. Using impoliteness strategies in negotiating prices may have been okay in early 16th-c. Flanders and France, but maybe not in late–17th-c. Hungary. But then, Warmer could have omitted parts if he regarded them as too inappropriate or too artificial. If the language versions for an utterance are structurally not the same, they probably reflect actual language usage; the more differences in usage there are, the more likely it is that the translations are idiomatic (Grzega 2013: 109). In addition, the book is for didactic purposes. We cannot assume that the "script" (in the sense of Schank and Abelson 1977: 41) in terms of structure is natural. There are probably more "slots" than occur in a natural dialogue. In the second and sixth and, to a certain degree, seventh conversation, there are list-like, paradigmatic passages. As the choice and sequence of contents is fixed due to prior versions, only an analysis of concrete forms can teach us

something about late–17th-c. language forms – especially since it is not very likely that the scripts would be typical of all nine modern languages and the cultures behind them.

3.2. Terms of address

Terms of address also contribute to the politeness of speech acts. Terms of address include pronouns and nouns along with the forms of the corresponding verbs; if used in the subject plus verb context or the object function, they are sometimes called *bound address forms*, in the vocative function they are called *free address forms* (cf. Schubert 1984). As to bound forms, in many European languages, there is an informal and a formal address pronoun. They are often called *T*-form (from Latin *tu*) and *V*-form (from Latin *vos*) since the study of Brown and Gilman (1960), although it has never been shown by way of Latin documents that the habit of two address pronouns started in Latin (cf. Helmbrecht 2010: 703). According to Brown and Gilman (1960), the choice is motivated by two central ranges: power and solidarity. However, other factors may also play a role, depending on the culture (cf. also, e.g., Jucker and Taavitsainen 2003, Mazzon 2010). Braun (1988), who deals with various languages, already draws the conclusion that the systems of address forms (including those for pronouns) are so diversified that it is doubtful whether a useful universal theory can ever be established: not only can a variable have a varying amount of forms, but also the parameters that influence the choice of a form vary considerably. While this may be true, rules of thumb may be able to be established for a group of languages. The choice of address names could be illustrated in a type of flow-chart, as was for example done by Ervin-Tripp (1972) for American English.

3.3. Pragmalinguistic sprachbund phenomena

In classical definitions of sprachbund, such as for *Standard Average European*, the presence of morphosyntactic features was investigated, and in more recent approaches a feature can also be called typical of a sprachbund without being necessarily present in all members of the sprachbund (cf., e.g., Heine and Kuteva 2006, van der Auwera 2011). This is different from the 100% presence requisite that Haarmann (1976) uses to call a feature a europeme. Similarly, to consider a pragmalinguistic feature European, it was pointed out (Grzega 2013: 35) that the search for 100% features does not respect the fact that humans think in prototypicalities. Therefore, a 66%-level was proposed as adequate if a sufficient number of languages/cultures was analyzed. Admittedly, we have only nine vernacular languages (although from all cardinal directions of Europe). Therefore, it seems justified to regard

a feature as European if it occurs in at least 75% of the languages, or seven out of nine languages.

4. Methodology

We will discuss the likelihood of the representativeness of the single language versions. To this end, we will check what we know about Warmer's language skills, compare some prior editions that may have served as a basis to the 1691 edition with respect to address pronouns, see what the structure of the edition can tell us, and look for address terms that we can compare to previous research, although we have to keep in mind that the nature of data there is different. We look at address pronouns, or – as Schubert (1984) called them – bound address forms, as this is the only aspect for which we have prior investigations from non-multilingual sources (only mono- and bilingual) in all languages integrated in Warmer's book.

In the tables, Warmer's non-biographical languages are given a gray background; language abbreviations in the tables are according to ISO 639-1; languages are geographically ordered, roughly from west to east, supplemented by Latin. For citations from the corpus the page number is given preceded by "p."; glosses are given according to the Leipzig Glossing Rules. A Europe-wide observation will be preceded by #E, a regional one by #R and any other one by #X.

5. Representative language? Discussion on Warmer's contribution

5.1. Warmer's language skills

With respect to Warmer's life, the biographical information by Klein (1789: 128 & 514f.) seems the only one that we have (cf. also Podhajecka 2014, Núñez 2020: 208). He was born in Bolków, Silesia, in 1644 (today's Poland, but then part of the Habsburg empire). He attended school in nearby Wrocław and in Leipzig, Saxony, before moving to Slovakia, where he finally became pastor in Košice, then part of Hungary. We cannot be precisely sure what his mother tongue was, but during his lifetime he must certainly have come into close contact with German, Polish, Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, and Latin. As for English, though, Podhajecka (2014) assumes that Warmer did not have any command of the language – as opposed to Szili (2013), who thinks that, viewing his education, Warmer must have had knowledge in English and French. Núñez (2020: 225f.), analyzing the manuscript and pointing out the many printing errors, concludes that those involved in the editing and printing process did not know Spanish.

Furthermore, due to these errata, Núñez (2020: 225f.) deduces that Warner was probably a compiler and took each language version from previous editions (except, possibly, for the Hungarian one). But printing errors in general do not seem to be a good indicator. There are all kinds of typographical errors in all language versions. We do not know which ones are Warner's, and which come from the printer or the printer's apprentice. But if typos often concern splitting away morphemes by (additional) spaces, this rather speaks for, and not against, skills in this language. Only if two words are melted together by omitting a space or split up in an awkward way can we say that someone in the printing process did not have enough command of the language. Podhajecka (2014) assumes that Warner created at least the German and Polish versions himself, pointing out, as Zwoliński (1981: 55) already did, the many Silesian influences there.

Let us have a look at the structure of the book. The grammar part presents all ten languages in a parallel way. However, if we take into account the descriptions on the pronunciation of words in the various languages, then Warner must have known French – the description of the letter-sound distributions spans 44 columns, while the Polish, Hungarian, Spanish and Italian descriptions are between 4 and 6 columns each. While we see the detailed phonetic description of French on the one hand, it is surprising that his list of numerals has kept the predominantly northern variants *septante, huitante* and *nonante* (although at least *huitante* and *nonante* were rare variants in the culturally central variety of Paris [cf. FEW s.v. *septuaginta*, s.v. *octoginta*, s.v. *nonaginta*]). The phonetic descriptions are mostly given in German; strangely with the Hungarian section the descriptions are in Latin from the middle of the description for letter C until the end of the section, while the next section (Spanish) is in German again. There are no descriptions for Czech/Bohemian, Latin and English. Obviously, Warner did not think it was necessary to give phonetic explanations for Czech and Latin. That there are no explanations in English could indeed speak for a lack of knowledge of English. Nonetheless, the versions were at least updated in a way that in the section on how to write letters, dates were adapted so that we read the words for the year "1682" written out (even in the English section) (pp. 276f. & 306f.); however, in the French version, the northern French variant *huitante* is surprisingly used instead of the more central and Parisian variant *quatre-vingts*. Moreover, in one of the letters (p. 298f.), the ordinal "83rd [year]" is given only in Roman numbers in the Dutch, English, French, Spanish and Italian version, which may be a hint of a lower command of these languages among the people in the editing process; on the other hand, also the Latin version displays only Roman numbers.

In sum, Warmer could then have mastered all languages to varying degrees, with English maybe the least – but presumably familiar enough with the basic linguistic variables under investigation in this contribution. Nevertheless, the question remains whether Warmer created, adapted or simply copied the single language versions. This shall be answered in the next section.

5.2. Comparison with prior editions

If we look just at the first part of the first dialog, the meeting between Hermes and John, we can already determine quite surely which book Warmer probably had as a basis. For this, we analyze parallelisms investigating:

(a) the structure of Hermes' and John's first utterances;
(b) the structure of Hermes' question about John's parents;
(c) John's and Hermes' last leave-taking turns;
(d) the instances of the use of the ampersand sign instead of the full word for 'and';
(e) the variants used of the proper names of Hermes and John.

We can say that, most probably, Warmer used the 1586 version of the book (Anon.) and simply had the versions of Dutch, English, Latin, French, Spanish and Italian copied. The 1586 edition also included a German version which served as a model, but Warmer made a lot of adaptations, including expressive speech acts and forms of address. Whether Warmer was also familiar with other versions is hard to say. If he was familiar with the 1611 version, which included Czech, he did not use it as a model for his edition; if he was familiar with the 1646 version, which included Polish, he did not use it as a model for his edition either (cf. Anon. 1611, Anon. 1646). In conclusion, Warmer's book most probably offers us representative forms of German, Polish, Czech and Hungarian from the second half of the 17th century. That he adapted the dates in the section on how to write letters to 1682 and 1683 may be a hint that it took about a decade to complete the book and that the stage of Warmer's personal language contribution may be a decade older. The Dutch, English, French, Spanish and Italian versions go back to a linguistic stage from 100 years earlier – not much more as these versions also differ from clearly earlier versions (Barlainmont 1527, Anon. 1551, Anon. 1554, Anon. 1556, Anon. 1575). It should be stressed again that the representativeness issue in this article is directed at the form of single routines. The structure of the conversations themselves may not have reflected all nine cultures involved very well.

6. Representativeness? Discussion on bound address terms

In order to further discuss whether Warmer's book reflects representative language, we will first delve into a corpus analysis of bound address terms and then compare the findings with previous research.

6.1. Corpus analysis

As said above, the classical theory of address pronouns distinguishes between a T-form, indicating low power and/or high solidarity, and a V-form, indicating high power and/or low solidarity. What is the situation in our corpus?

The Latin version consistently uses the second-person singular pronoun *tu*. The Dutch version also only has one form, *ghy* (and its object form *u*), which is originally the 2nd-person plural pronoun.

In English, French, Spanish, Italian, German, Polish and Czech we find 2nd-person plural pronouns to be distinguished from a T-form. The pronouns are *you, vous, vos, voi, ihr, wy, wy*, combined with the 2nd-person plural verb form. In English and French, we also find cases where T and V for the servant co-occur in one dialog (pp. 204–206 [English and French] & p. 268 [English]).

(1) *buy*   *you*   *one* [...]   *Thou*   *sayest*   *well*
    buy-IMP   2PL   one   2SG   say-PRS.2SG   well
    'Buy one [...] You are right.'

(2) *menez*   *le*   *vn petit*
    guide-IMP.2PL   3SG.M.OBJ   a little
    & quand   *il*   *aura*   *mangé*   *quelque*   *peu*
    and when   3SG.M.SBJ   have;3SG.FUT   eat-PST.PTCP   somewhat   little
    tu   *le*   *meneras*   *à*   *l'abbreuuoir.*
    2SG.SBJ   3SG.M.OBJ   lead-2SG.FUT   to   the fountain.
    'Guide it [= the horse] around a little and after it will have eaten a little you will guide it to the fountain.'

Spanish, German, and Polish have an additional third bound address form. In two German instances, we find the 3rd-singular personal pronoun in the object form – in the phrase *(was) beliebet ihm* '(what) pleases him', which can be considered frequent, routine-like formulae (pp. 206, 224).

(3) *beliebet*   *ihme*   *izund*   *zum*   *Abend-Mahlzeit*
    please-3SG.PRS   3SG.M.DAT   now   to-DET.M.DAT   evening-meal
    zu   *kommen?* (p. 206)
    INF   come-INF
    'Does it please him [= you] now to come to dinner?'

In Polish, we find *wy* (combined with the 2nd-person plural verb form because it etymologically is the second-person plural pronoun) and *wászmość*, which is etymologically *Wasza miłość* 'your grace'. However, as a pronoun alternative (not as an address term) it occurs only once in the dative case as a pronominalized address noun (which is also one of instances where the 3rd person is used in German).

(4) *lubi*   *sie*   *wászmośći*   *teraz*   *do wiecžerzy*   *przyść?* (p. 206)
     love-3SG.PRS   REFL   HONORIFIC-DAT   now   to dinner;GEN   come;INF?
     'Does it please the honorable now to come to dinner?'

In Spanish, there are *vos* and *v.m.* The latter is short for *vuestra merced* 'your grace'. It can be used as an address noun in the sense of 'sir'. It is also used in combination with a pronoun such as *à v.m.* 'to you', while *à vos* only occurs in (established) salutations and valedictions, as in the examples.

(5) *Dios*   *os*   *dé*   *buenos*   *dias*   *Iuan. –*
     God   2PL.OBJ   give;SBJV   good-M.PL   day-PL   Iuan
     'May God give you a good day, Juan'
     Y   *à*   *vos*   *tambien*   *Hermes*   (p. 91)
     And   to   2PL-OBJ   also   Hermes
     'And to you also, Hermes.'

However, it cannot be concluded that a preposition binds *v.m.*, as there are equally occurrences of *con vos* 'with you' and *para vos* 'for you' (cf., e.g., pp. 141 & 143). In the last three dialogs, *v.m.* is also in the subject function combined with the 3rd-person singular verb form. Changes between these address terms can occur within a single sentence (pp. 142, 205, 245, 265).

In Hungarian, we find the form *kegyelmed* (etymologically 'your grace'). This V-form is rare, though, and the change can be even within one sentence (cf. p. 269). If used not as a vocative (together with co-occurring 2nd-person singular pronoun), but as a pronominalized noun, *kegyelmed* is combined with the 3rd-person singular verb form in our text.

(6) *akar-é*   *kegyelmed*   *már*   *a'*   Vacsoránac
     wish;[3SG.PRS]-Q   grace-2SG.POSS   yet   the   dinner-DAT
     meg   *ételére*   *eljöni?*   (p. 207)
     still   food-SUBLATIVE   come-INF?
     'Do you want to come to dinner now?'

(7) *Fel-költ*   *kegyelmed*   *Uram?*   (p. 217)
     rise-PST-[3SG]   grace-2SG.POSS   sir-1SG.POSS
     'Have you risen [from bed], sir?'

What can be said about the usage of these pronouns in the eight languages that have more than one address form? Fig. 1 gives an overview (T = informal, V = unmarkedly formal, V* = markedly formal; with forms put in brackets when there is only one instance; contexts where address terms occur only once are omitted).

Fig. 1. T-V distribution

	en	Fr	es	it	de	Pl	cs	hu
1 among adult peers	V	V	V~V*	V	V	V	V	T
2 among strangers (same hierarchy)	V	V	V~V*	V	V	V	V	T
3 among John + Hermes (students)	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	T
4 among brothers	V	V	T	T	T	T	T	T
5 among mother + daughter	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	T
6 among father + daughter	V	V	V	V	V(~T)	V(~T)	V(~T)	T
7 mother to son	V	V	T	T	T	T	T	T
8 father to son	V	V	T	T	T	T	T	T
9 children to parents	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	T
10 youngster Francis to guest Roger	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	T
11 Roger to youngster Francis	V	V	V	V	T	T	T	T
12 guest/ client to male servant	V~T	T(~V)	T~V(*)	V~T	T	T	T	T
13 guest to maidservant	V	V	V	V~T	V	V	V	T
14 male servant to guest/client	V	V	V(*)	V	V~V*	V(*)	V	T~V
15 maidser-vant to guest	V	V	V~V*	V	V	V	V	T~V
16 guests to innkeeper	V	V	V(~T)	V	V	V	V	T
17 salesman to client	V	V	V~V*	V	V	V	V	T

With respect to European features, the picture among the vernacular languages can be summed up as follows:

#E1.   In all vernacular languages except Dutch, there is a T-V distinction.
        (There is also no T-V distinction in Latin). Among the T-V languages,
        we can make the following observations:

#E1.1. In all T-V languages but Hungarian, we see reciprocal V between all
        adult peers (including husband and wife) as well as between adult
        strangers (other guests at the inn, a female shepherd on the road).

#E1.2. In all T-V languages but Hungarian, we see reciprocal V between
        John and his acquaintance Hermes (students).

#E1.3. In all T-V languages but Hungarian, we see reciprocal V between
        Mary and her daughter Anne.

#E1.4. In all T-V languages but Hungarian, there is non-reciprocal V in the
        following cases: Youngster Francis addresses guest Rogier by V. The
        sons use V with their father or mother. In the last three dialogs, the
        male servant is at least once addressed by T, while the maidservant
        gets V. It is noteworthy that in the "guest to male servant" context
        all three forms – 2nd plural, 3rd singular and 2nd singular – are used
        in Spanish:

(8) *yo*   *os*   *bolueré*   *su*   *dinero* [. . .]   (p. 205)
     1SG   2PL.OBJ   turn-1SG.FUT   3SG.POSS   money
     'I will return your money to you.'

(9) *Vete*   (p. 225)
     Go;2SG.IMP-2SG.OBJ
     'Go'

The European flowchart as a rule of thumb for international travelers
that can be drawn for the second half of the 17th century would look like in
Fig. 2:

Fig. 2. T/V flowchart for travelers in the second half of 17th-century Europe

Is the addressee much younger?
1. No.   >   V
2. Yes.   >   Is the addressee female?
                2.1. No.   T or V
                2.2. Yes.   V

#R1.   In 66 percent of the nine vernacular languages, the parents use T
        with the sons and the sons among each other, but the sons give V to
        the father (i.e. not in the north-western group of English and French,
        and, of course, Dutch).

#X1.   In all languages with V and V* (German, Spanish, Polish), V* can
        be an alternative to V, but not vice versa, in other words: there is no
        relation where only V* is found (without V at one slot or another).

6.2. Comparison to previous research on Warmer's first and second languages

We will first take a look at Warmer's first and second languages, although we have to be aware that the basis and kinds of data vary from language to language. Therefore, on the one hand, only general looks are appropriate, but on the other hand, they also seem sufficient to draw interesting conclusions, as the type of our data also aims at language forms that are typical, or general.

The German V-form *ihr* as a frequent form is natural. However, the German of the time is actually characterized, according to Simon (2003: 96), by a threefold system where, in general, the *ihr* (2nd person plural) used in our text is complemented by an *er/sie* (3rd person singular) for addressing inferiors; in this respect, the very rare use of the 3rd person (only twice, addressed even to a superior) is surprising, especially since a superior is addressed; admittedly, though, these two cases occur in the same type of routine question, which may behave differently. Betsch (2003: 2600) claims that even *Sie* (3rd person plural) and *dieselben* 'these very ones, these same ones' were already in use. This is not reflected in the text, but on the other hand, the rule "*er/sie* for inferiors" is not obligatory; the use of T here for the carriers is still natural 17th-century German; and the plural *Sie* had maybe not yet reached all areas of the German-speaking world.

Similarly, the Czech address system of the 17th century was more complex than reflected in the text. There is said to be a five-step formality scale from "distance" to "proximity": *Vaše Milost* 'your grace' (as in Spanish) – *Vašnost* (short form of the former, as in Spanish) – *pán* ('sir') – *vy* – *ty* (Betsch 2003: 137–141). However, in our text we only have *wy* and *ty*; the use of *wy* (just a former scribal variant of *vy*) is common; it is rather the lack of the other forms that is surprising. Of course, though, there may have been regional differences, and we already expected Warmer to be a connoisseur of Czech.

In the Polish version, the frequent choice of *wy* (typical of peasants to elders and superiors, or by superiors to inferiors) and the single application of *waszmość* as a bound form is, on the one hand, surprising, as a natural corpus of 17th-century use would also yield *Wasza miłość mój miłościwy pan* [literally: '2PL.F.POSS love 1SG.POSS lovely sir' (even to non-noble gentlemen), *Mości Panie* (among noblemen), *waszeć, waść, waszmość* (the latter four all shortened, slurred forms of the first long phrase], and *(jaśnie) pan* as deferential address forms, with *wy* on the decline (especially among noble people) (cf. Kiełkiewicz-Janowiak 1992: 61–66, Betsch and Berger 2009: 1021). On the other hand, in the dialect of Silesia a threefold distinction *pan – wy – ty* was continued into modern times (Zaręba 1974, Betsch and Berger 2009: 1021). And remember: Silesia is where Warmer grew up.

With respect to Hungarian we can say that the absence of *maga* as an honorific bound form is not unnatural (it is rare at the time, with the first record from 1668). The phrase *(te) kegyelmed* 'your grace [literally: (2SG) grace-2SG.POSS]', together with the 2nd-person-singular verb form, is also representative, but the lack of phrases with *ő* ('he/she') is surprising, as these are given as frequent forms of politeness elsewhere (cf. Guskova 1978: 19f., Cseresnyési 2004). Again, since we can assume that Warmer knew Hungarian to a sufficient degree, the assumption is that the forms were not equally spread among all parts of the Hungarian-speaking area.

6.3. Comparison to previous research on the other languages

Again, it should be underlined that previous research used other types of data. But they are enough to make generalized contrasts to our data, which is also meant to draw a generalized picture of the languages.

For English and (northern) French, the use of V (E. *you*, Fr. *vous*) conforms with other findings, including the use of T as an option for servants in both speech communities and for intimate relationships in the England – even within one turn or passage (cf. Maley 1972, Radtke 1994: 103, Walker 2003, Nevala 2003); in other words, generally speaking, from the third quarter of the 16th century onward, *you* would serve as a default/neutral/unmarked form, whereas *thou* (2nd-person singular) would be used to mark a discursively important shift, especially with respect to emotionality (cf. the overview article by Busse [2012: 737–739]).

In Italian, the distribution for T and non-T seems in line with earlier research, but it is extraordinary that our Italian version shows entirely *voi* (etymologically 2nd-person plural pronoun) and nowhere the 3rd-person pronoun *Lei*, which shows up as a variant in other 17th-century texts, or the even more frequent *vossignoria* (Guiter 1959: 202; Radtke 1994: 105).

As for Spanish, *usted* and the abbreviation *v.m.* (both *vuestra merced* 'your grace [literally: 2PL.POSS grace]') are fully established at the time. The use of *vos* is also decent, although the intimate *vos* is said to have died out in peninsular Spanish during the 17th century (and then completely in the 18th century); it is unusual at the time, though, that *él/ela* are nowhere used as address pronouns (cf. Bentivoglio 2003, Calderón Campos and Medina Morales 2010: 211).

That Dutch uses solely *ghi* (etymologically '2PL.POSS') is possible, but not for all parts of the Dutch-speaking world. According to van den Toorn (1977: 526), the late 17th-century *jij* and *u* had begun to be used in the subject form as a new pronoun. But this may be true for the Northern-speaking part. In the Flemish region, *ghi* is perfectly common and *jij* and *u* rare (cf. WNT s.v. *gij* and *u[ii]*).

That Latin has only T in these conversations seems okay. There may not have been any conventions as it is doubtful whether Latin would have been much used in non-academic and non-religious situations of the 17th century (cf. also Moran 2019 and Tunberg 2020). Since Latin is no longer a lingua franca in these contexts, editors may have decided to stuck to a more classical form of Latin, waiving expressions that may have been current in the Middle Ages.

7. Conclusion and outlook

In all vernacular languages save Dutch, there is a formal/informal address pronoun distinction. Among these languages (except Hungarian), we see the reciprocal use of the formal pronoun between all adults, between students, and between mother and daughter and non-reciprocal use of the formal pronoun by male non-adults to adults. Taking into account this and the observations from the other previous sections, we can state the following. As for English and French, the versions can be said to be representative for 1691 – at least for parts of the language areas. Spanish, Italian and Dutch seem to be conservative, or old-fashioned for 1691, but not unnatural or unrepresentative. Also for Warmer's biographical contact languages, the forms sound a bit old-fashioned if we do not look at the dialects of the boundary regions, but to more central varieties. It seems as if Warmer's book can be considered to match the situation of the included languages quite comprehensively for a few decades earlier, the 1650s to the 1660s, and for some regions even to 1690.

As already said, on the basis of the first observations on bound address terms, an installment contribution will cover patterns of free address terms as well as patterns of salutation, valediction and thanking and then present an overall picture of the European characteristic features found in our sample.

References

Anon. 1551. *Vocabulaer in vier spraken duytsch, francois, latijn, ende spaensch.* Louvain: Bartholomy de Graue.

Anon. 1554. *A very profitable boke to lerne the maner of redyng, writyng, & speakyng english & Spanish.* s.l.

Anon. 1556. *Dictionarium quatuor linguarum Teuotonicae, Gallicae, Latinae & Hispanicae.* Louvain: Bartholomy de Graue.

Anon. 1575. *[Colloques avec un dictionaire en six langues].* Anvers: Henry Hendrics.

Anon. 1585. *Dictionariolum Hexaglosson.* Basel: Frobenios.

Anon. 1586. *Colloquia et Dictionariolum septem linguarum.* Antwerp: Joachim Trognaesius.

Anon. 1611. *Dictionariolum hexaglosson.* Leipzig: Henning Gros.

Anon. 1646. *Hexaglosson Dictionarium.* Warsaw: Peter Elerts.

Barlainmont, Noel van. 1527. *Vocabulare van nieus geordineert. Een weder omgecorrigeert. Om lichtelijc Fransoys te leere lesen / scriuen ende spreken.* Antwerp: Liesvelt. [ms. Staatsbibliothek München]

Bentivoglio, Paolo. 2003. Spanish forms of address in the sixteenth century. In *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen and Andreas Jucker. 177–192. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Betsch, Michael. 2003. The system of Czech bound address forms until 1700. In *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen and Andreas Jucker. 125–146. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Betsch, Michael, and Tilman Berger. 2009. Anredesysteme. In *Die slavischen Sprachen. Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung*, ed. Sebastian Kempgen, Peter Kosta, Tilman Berger, and Karl Gutschmidt. vol. 1, 1019–1028. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Bouzouita, Miriam, and Ulrike Vogl. 2019. Meertaligheid en onderwijs van moderne talen in de 16de eeuw: Het gebruik van het partikel *hola* als mogelijk voorbeeld voor taalcontact in de *Colloquia, et dictionariolum. Taal en Tongval* 71(2): 105–135. https://www.aup-online.com/content/journals/10.5117/TET2019.2.BOUZ?TRACK=RSS. Accessed 26 February 2023.

Braun, Friederike. 1988. *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures.* Berlin etc.: de Gruyter.

Brown, Roger, and Albert Gilman. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In *Style in Language*, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok. 253–276. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Busse, Ulrich. 2012. Pronouns. In: *English Historical Linguistics. An International Handbook.* ed. Alexander Bergs and Laurel J. Brinton. vol. 1, 731–743. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter Mouton.

Calderón Campos, Miguel, and Francisca Medina Morales. 2010. Historia y situación actual de los pronombres de tratamiento en el español peninsular. In: *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico*, ed. Martin Hummel, Bettina Kluge and Maria Eugenia Vázquez Laslop. 195–222. México: Colegio de México, Centro de Estudios Lingüísticos y Literarios / Graz: Karl-Franzens-Universität.

Colombo Timelli, Maria. 1992. Dictionnaires pour voyageurs, dictionnaires pour marchands ou la polyglossie au quotidien aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles. *Lingvisticæ Investigationes* 16(2): 395–420.

Cseresnyési, László. 2004. *Nyelvek és stratégiák, avagy a nyelv antropológiája.* Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1972. Sociolinguistic rules of address. In *Sociolinguistics*, ed. J.B. Pride and Janet Holmes. 225–239. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

FEW = Wartburg, Walther von, et al. 1922–2003. *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Bern: Francke / Nancy: INaLF. https://apps.atilf.fr/lecteurFEW/index.php/site/index. Accessed 26 February 2023.

Grzega, Joachim. 2013. *Studies in Europragmatics: Some Theoretical Foundations and Practical Implications.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Guiter, Henri. 1959. L'extension successive des formes de politesse. *Boletim de Filologia* 18: 195–202.

Guskova, Antoni. 1978. Syntax der Höflichkeitsformen im Ungarischen aufgrund der Bedeutungsentwicklung der Personalpronomen. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarium* 28: 1–43.

Haarmann, Harald. 1976. *Aspekte der Arealtypologie: Die Problematik der europäischen Sprachbünde.* Tübingen: Narr.

Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. 2006. *The Changing Languages of Europe.* New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Helmbrecht, Johannes. 2010. Höflichkeitspronomina in Europa – Synchronie und Diachronie eines arealtypologischen Merkmals. In *Handbuch der Eurolinguistik,* ed. Uwe Hinrichs. 691–710. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hüllen, Werner. 2003. Textbook-Families for the Learning of Vernaculars between 1450 and 1700. In *History of Linguistics 1999*, ed. Sylvain Auroux. 97–107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jucker, Andreas, and Irma Taavitsainen. 2003. Diachronic perspectives on address term systems: Introduction. In *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen and Andreas Jucker. 1–25. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kiełkiewicz-Janowiak, Agnieszka. 1992. *A Socio-Historical Study in Address: Polish and English.* Frankfurt (Main) etc.: Peter Lang.

Klein, Johann Samuel. 1789. *Nachrichten von den Lebensumständen und Schriften evangelischer Prediger in allen Gemeinden des Königsreichs Ungarn.* Leipzig/Ofen: Diepold und Lindauer.

Mair, Carolin, Caroline Wörz, and Joachim Grzega. 2021. A Colloquy analysis of answers to thanks in English, German, Spanish, and French around 1600 (A seminar project). *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 18: 22–26. http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/ELiX/mairwoerzgrzega-211.pdf. Accessed 26 February 2023.

Maley, Catherina. 1972. Historically speaking, *tu* or *vous*? *The French Review* 45/5: 999–1006.

Mazzon, Gabriella. 2010. Terms of address. In *Historical Pragmatics*, ed. Andreas Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen. 351–376. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

McLelland, Nicola. 2018. Mining foreign language teaching manuals for the history of pragmatics. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 19(1): 28–54.

Moran, Jerome. 2019. Spoken Latin in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance. *Journal of Classics Teaching* 20(40): 20–24. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-classics-teaching/article/spoken-latin-in-the-late-middle-ages-and-renaissance/34844D77157BC8B8C6C5CF4FDD6C8658. Accessed 26 February 2023.

Nevala, Minna. 2003. Family first: Address and subscription formulae in English family correspondence from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. In *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen and Andreas Jucker. 147–176. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Núñez, Luis Pablo. 2020. *Gazophylacium* (1691) de Christoph Warmer. *Boletín de la Real Academica Española* 100(321): 207–226. http://revistas.rae.es/brae/article/view/416. Accessed 26 February 2023.

Podhajecka, Mirosława. 2014. Researching the beginnings of Polish-English/English-Polish lexicography: Polyglot dictionaries (Part 2). *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 131(2): 192–212. https://www.ejournals.eu/Studia-Linguistica/Tom-131/Issue-2/art/3077/. Accessed 26 February 2023.

Radtke, Edgar. 1989. Eine unbekannte Ausgabe der viersprachigen Wörter- und Gesprächsbücher nach Noël de Berlaimont. *Historiographia Linguistica* 16: 205–209.

Radtke, Edgar. 1994. *Gesprochenes Französisch und Sprachgeschichte: Zur Rekonstruktion der Gesprächskonstitution in Dialogen französischer Sprachlehrbücher*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Rossebastiano, Alda. 2000. The teaching of languages in the 15th through the 18th centuries in Europe. In *History of the Language Sciences*, ed. Armin Burkhardt, Hugo Steger, and Herbert Ernst Wiegand. 688–698. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Schank, Roger, and Robert Abelson. 1977. *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schubert, Klaus. 1984. *Tilltal och samhällsstruktur*. Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska sprak vid Uppsala universitetet.

Simon, Horst. 2003. From pragmatics to grammar: Tracing the development of respect in the history of the German pronouns of address. In *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen and Andreas Jucker. 85–124. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Szili, Katalin. 2013. Szívderítő utazás a 17. század végi beszélgetések világába. *Magyar nyelv* 112(3): 325–332. http://dx.doi.org/10.18349/MagyarNyelv.2016.3.325. Accessed 26 February 2023.

Tunberg, Terence. 2020. Spoken Latin in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance Revisited. *Journal of Classics Teaching* 21(42): 66–71. https://www.cambridge.org/core/ journals/journal-of-classics-teaching/article/ spoken-latin-in-the-late-middle-ages-and-renaissance-revisited/ BC94B85F4316E65E5D7419A5F18D49A9. Accessed 26 February 2023.

van den Toorn, M. C. 1977. De problematiek van de Nederlandse aanspreekvormen. *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 70: 520–540. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_taa008197701_ 01/_taa008197701_01_0072.php. Accessed 26 February 2023.

van der Auwera, Johan. 2011. Standard Average European. In *The Languages and Linguistics of Europe: A Comprehensive Guide*, ed. Bernd Kortmann and Johan van der Auwera. 291–306. Berlin etc.: Walter de Gruyter.

Villoria-Prieto, Javier, and Javier Suso Lóez. 2018. The use of dialogues in teaching foreign languages (sixteenth century): Circulations and adaptations of Berlaimont's Dictionarium (1556) in Spain, the Netherlands, and England. In: *The History of Language Learning and Teaching*, vol. I: *16th–18th Century Europe*, ed. Nicola McLelland and Richard Smith. 67–82. Cambridge: Legenda Books.

Walker, Terry. 2003. *You* and *thou* in Early Modern English dialogues: Patterns of usage. In *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*, ed. Irma Taavitsainen and Andreas Jucker. 309–342. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Warmer, Christopherus. 1691. *Gazophylacium Decem Linguarum Europaearum*. Košice: Klein. https://opendata2.uni-halle.de/handle/1516514412012/18453. Accessed 26 February 2023.

WNT = *Wordenboek van der Nederlandsche Taal*, ed. by Jan de Vries et al. Leiden/Antwerpen: Instituut voor de Nederlandse taal. https://wnt.inl.nl. Accessed 26 February 2023.

Zaręba, Alfred. 1974. Czasowniki określające sposób zwracania się do drugiej osoby. *Język Polski* 54: 378–388.

Zwoliński, Przemysław. 1981. Dziesięciojęzyczny podręcznik dialektu śląskiego z końca XVII wieku. *Kwartalnik Opolski* 27: 53–58.

Streszczenie: W artykule poddano jakościowej i opisowej analizie opublikowaną w 1691 roku „Rozmowę" Christopherusa Warmera. Używa się w niej dziesięciu języków: śląskiej odmiany polskiego, śląskiej odmiany niemieckiego, wschodniej odmiany czeskiego, północnej odmiany węgierskiego, flamandzkiej odmiany niderlandzkiego, północnej odmiany francuskiego, włoskiego, hiszpańskiego, angielskiego i łaciny. Analiza dotyczy reprezentatywności i typowości form adresatywnych i utartych formuł zwracania się do kogoś w ekspresywnych aktach mowy. Biorąc pod uwagę biografię Warmera, zawartość książki, jej różne wersje, konwencje typograficzne oraz użycie zaimków adresatywnych (również w świetle wcześniejszych badań), można założyć, iż analizowany tekst jest reprezentatywny dla okresu między rokiem 1650 a 1680. Analiza zaimków adresatywnych prowadzi do następujących spostrzeżeń. We wszystkich językach poza niderlandzkim występuje rozróżnienie na zaimki formalne i nieformalne. W językach tych (z wyjątkiem węgierskiego) obserwujemy wzajemne, dwukierunkowe użycie zaimka formalnego między osobami dorosłymi, w gronie studentów oraz między matką i córką, a także jednokierunkowe użycie tego zaimka przez osoby niepełnoletnie płci żeńskiej w stosunku do dorosłych. Spostrzeżenia te posłużą zbadaniu innych pragmalingwistycznych aspektów tekstu Warmera, które zostaną omówione w odrębnej publikacji – drugiej części niniejszego artykułu.

Słowa kluczowe: Christopherus Warmer; badanie porównawcze; język mówiony; XVII wiek; zaimki adresatywne; reprezentatywność