

INDEXING RELIGIOUS IDENTITY IN THE FRENCH BASQUE COUNTRY: TOWARD A THEORY OF PRONOMINAL SHIFT

Begoña Echeverría

(University of California, Riverside)

Abstract

This paper argues that the loss of *T* (*hi*) in Basque can be attributed, in part, to the religious identities linked to *T* and *V* between the 16th and 19th centuries. Throughout this period, France—including its Basque-speaking regions—was embroiled in religious conflicts between Catholics and Protestants. Protestants attempted to win converts by translating the New Testament in 1571, and a fragment of the Old Testament around 1700; no Catholic version of the Bible was published until 1865. I show that the Protestant texts used *hi* with single addressees; the Catholic texts used *zu*, using *hi* primarily to show disdain. By the end of the 18th century, however, Catholicism had won out over Protestantism in France, thereby inscribing *hi* with a negative cast that contributed to its loss over time.

Introduction

In their classic study, Brown & Gilman (1960) trace the evolution of pronominal use in European languages. They argue that the development of two second person pronouns can be traced to the Latin of antiquity, in which *tu* was singular and *vos* was plural. In the fourth century, the plural *vos* “as a form of address to one person was first directed to the emperor” (Ibid: 255), perhaps because there actually were two emperors at the time (one in Rome, another in Constantinople), so that addressing one implicitly referred to both. Sometime between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, a non-reciprocal power semantic became the pronominal norm in society; the person with more power (*vis à vis* his or her interlocutor) would use *T*, but receive *V* (Ibid: 256).

Brown & Gilman argue that this non-reciprocal power semantic gave way, in most European languages, to the reciprocal solidarity semantic—i.e. mutual use of *T*—in the 19th century with “the development of open societies [whose] equalitarian ideology acted against the nonreciprocal power semantic and in favor of solidarity ... [T]he larger social changes created a distaste for the face-to-face expression of differential power” (Ibid: 267). Certainly, the ostensible equality

between speakers could have been expressed through reciprocal *V* instead of reciprocal *T*. But Brown & Gilman contend that, because mutual *V* was associated with the upper classes, there was an “animus against the pronoun itself” (Ibid: 265). But in England, it was mutual *V* (“you”) rather than *T* (“thou”) that became the pronominal norm; Brown and Gilman attribute this pattern to “a popular reaction against the radicalism of Quakers” (Ibid: 266) whose speech used *thou* exclusively (cf. Silverstein 1985).

The Basque case is another exception to the rule outlined by Brown & Gilman; it is *V* (*zu*) rather than *T* (*hi*) that is the “pragmatically unmarked” (Errington 1985) form of address. It seems, too, that this preference for *V* might be related to the religious ideology associated with *T* between the 16th and 19th centuries. Throughout this period, France—including the southwestern region where Basque is spoken—was embroiled in fierce religious conflicts between Catholics and Protestants. Like their counterparts elsewhere, Protestants attempted to win converts by making their religious ideology available to the masses by printing religious documents—especially the Bible—in the vernacular, so that believers could read the texts for themselves. The Basque case was no different: it was Protestants who first translated the New Testament in 1571, and a fragment of the Old Testament around 1700. A close examination of the language used in these texts—all, fortunately for comparative purposes, in the Lapurdian dialect—reveals a striking difference in their pronominal usage. In addressing single interlocutors, the unmarked form of address in the Protestant texts is *T* (*hi*); in the Catholic texts, it is *V* (*zu*). In this article, I will argue that the preponderance of *zu* today can be attributed, in part, to the triumph of Catholicism over Protestantism in the French Basque Country by the end of the 17th century.

Second person pronouns in Basque

In addition to its preference for *V* rather than *T* over time, Basque differs from most European languages in other ways. First, there are four second-person singular pronouns in Basque rather than two. The pronoun of greatest deference, *berori*, was used traditionally to address personages such as the village priest. However, this pronoun was only used in the western dialects, not in any of the French Basque dialects of relevance here. In the eastern dialects in France, there is yet another pronoun, *xu*, which is considered more formal than *hi*, but not quite as formal as *zu* (Alberdi 1995). Use of *xu*, however, is even more rare than *hi* and—more to the point being made here—does not appear in the religious texts being discussed. As such, *zu* and *hi* will be the focus of this article.

Second, the semantics of *hi* do not exactly match those of other *T* forms. It is true that, while it is much more uncommon than other *T* forms, *hi* is similar to them in that it is used between close friends, for making jokes or showing anger. It is also often used when addressing persons of similar social rank (siblings and friends one’s own age) and persons of lower social rank (children, younger siblings). In this sense, *hi* is considered primarily a marker of solidarity or familiarity (Urla 1997); however, *hi* also indirectly indexes social meanings not necessarily paralleled by other *T* forms, such as “authentic” Basque identity and masculinity (cf. Echeverria 2003).

Third, unlike the case in several surrounding languages, in Basque asymmetrical *T/V* usage is quite common. Within families where *hi* is used, asymmetrical *zu/hi* use is the norm; when parents use *hi* with their children, they are answered in *zu*. However, reciprocal pronominal usage is more common in other domains (Alberdi 1995: 376). This is true even of employers and employees (de Rijk 1991: 377). Interestingly, spouses usually use *zu* reciprocally with each other, even if they used *hi* before becoming romantically involved, because “the vastly different role patterns assumed in marriage are felt to preclude solidarity between husband and wife” (de Rijk 1991: 377)—however, it is not clear that such has always been the case, since wedding vows written in 1547 also used *hi* (Satrustegui 1977: 110).

Finally, the Basque case is different from surrounding languages in that its *T* form (*hi*) is the only place in the language where gender is marked. While there is no grammatical gender in Basque “the use of the 2nd person singular form, ‘*hi*’ [sometimes] requires a gender marker on its accompanying verb forms” (Aulestia 1989a: 49).

Table 1

Zu and hi

<i>zu</i>	<i>hi</i>
<i>zu z-a-ra</i> you 2sg-Pres-AUX (f/m) 'you are'	<i>hi h-a-iz</i> you 2Sg-Pres-AUX(f/m) 'you are'
<i>lan egin du-zu</i> work do AUX-2SgErg (f/m) 'you have done work'	<i>lan egin du-n</i> work do AUX-2sgFemErg 'you have done work'
	<i>lan egin du-k</i> work do AUX-2sgMascErg 'you have done work'
<i>gertatu o-zai-zu</i> happen 3Abs-AUX-2SgDat (f/m) 'it happened to you'	<i>gertatu o-zai-n</i> happen 3Abs-AUX-2sgFemDat 'it happened to you'
	<i>gertatu o-zai-k</i> happen 3Abs-AUX-2sgMascDat 'it happened to you'

As indicated in Table 1, when the addressee is the subject of an intransitive verb (absolutive case), the verb does not carry a gender marker. However, when the addressee is the subject of a transitive verb (ergative case), or is the indirect object (dative case), then the auxiliary verb marks the addressee's gender (*-n* for female, *-k* for male).

A more unusual property of *hi* is its allocutivity, which means that the inflected verb agrees with the addressee's gender even when the addressee is not an argument

in the sentence (Oyharçabal 1993: 90). This is demonstrated in Table 2. In this example, ‘you’ is not an argument in the sentence. Even so, when using *hi*, the auxiliary verbs mark the addressee’s gender (*-n* for females and *-k* for males).

Table 2

Allocutive forms

<i>zu</i>	<i>laguna-k ikusten n-a-u-ø</i> friend-Erg sees 1SgAbs-pres-root-3SgErg (f/m) ‘a friend sees me’
<i>hi</i>	<i>laguna-k ikusten n-a-i-n-ø</i> friend-Erg sees 1SgAbs-pres-AUX-ALLOCFem-3SgErg ‘a friend sees me’ <i>laguna-k ikusten n-a-i-k-ø</i> friend-Erg sees 1SgAbs-pres-AUX-ALLOCMasc-3SgErg ‘a friend sees me’

(Source: Oyharçabal 1993: 91)

Pronouns in religious discourse

As the pronoun of solidarity and intimacy, it should perhaps not be surprising that *T* has, over time, come to be the pronoun used in private prayer in many languages. But once again, this is not the case in Basque; *zu* is employed in religious documents because, according to a 1820 text cited by Alberdi, the “language of the Pulpit” required a level of “delicacy” and “cultured style” that *hi* lacked (1986: 280). In the next section, however, I will show that *hi* was not considered inappropriate for use in Protestant texts; it is *hi* rather than *zu* that is used in addressing single interlocutors, even when they are deity figures. In contrast, Catholic texts use *hi* very sparingly—and always asymmetrically. In interactions that involve deity figures, *hi* is used to cast out evil spirits, taunt or challenge the damned, or rebuke the devil (cf. Alberdi 1986: 175). The negative connotation associated with *hi* is also reflected in the scarcity of its use in interactions among non-deity figures. Even though *hi* has historically been considered primarily an index of solidarity, it is never used this way in the Catholic texts; rather, it is used almost exclusively to show disdain. It is my contention that the negative social meanings ascribed *hi* in these texts contributed to the loss of *hi* over time among Basque speakers.

Sources and Methods

As mentioned above, Protestants produced the first biblical texts in Basque. In 1564, a Calvinist synod held in Pau decided to introduce Protestantism to the “Basque land” by translating the New Testament into Basque. Under the patronage of Queen Jeanne d’Albret (of Navarre), the Calvinist minister Joannes Leizarraga—a former Catholic priest—was chosen for this task, for which he was given

several assistants (*Diccionario Enciclopédico Vasco* 1988: 233). Around the year 1700, the Huguenot minister Pierre d'Urte —a former Capuchin— produced a fragment of the Old Testament in England, where he had fled as a refugee from religious persecution in France. He apparently had fewer resources at his disposal than did Leizarraga. There is no evidence that his translation was sponsored by an outside agency, and his efforts were carried out during a time of personal hardship; he applied for aid from London's Huguenot Refugee Society twice during this period (Urte 1894: xiii). Nor were his efforts as widely recognized as Leizarraga's; his Old Testament fragment was not published until 1894, when it was discovered in a private collection in Oxford (Ibid: vi-viii).

These Protestant translations of the Bible preceded Catholic efforts by 150-300 years. While Catholics had published a variety of religious documents (prayer books, catechisms) since the 17th century, they did not produce translations of the Bible per se until well into the 19th century. Most of these, produced under the patronage of Prince Lucien Bonaparte, consisted of specific passages of the Bible rendered in various Basque dialects. This article, then, will focus on the Bible produced by Captain J. Duvoisin in 1865; only it contains the entirety of the Old and New Testaments (cf. Ruiz Arzalluz 1987: 720) that can be compared directly against the Leizarraga and d'Urte texts. Given the ostensible inappropriateness of using *T (hi)* for religious discourse, this article examines whether it is used in interactions involving deity figures.

The New Testament

This section examines the way pronouns are used in the New Testament, since it was the first part of the Bible to be published in Basque. Specifically, this section will examine the pronouns used in direct speech to single interlocutors when one of the interlocutors is God the Father or Jesus; speech that is quoted or reported is excluded, as is that used in telling parables. In Table 3 below, "Use by Jesus" includes those chapters in which Jesus speaks to, but is not addressed by, a single addressee. "Use to Jesus" refers to the opposite scenario in any given chapter — when Jesus is addressed by others as a single addressee but does not reciprocate as such. In some cases, this is because Jesus does not respond to his interlocutor(s); in other cases, this is because Jesus is addressed by more than one person whom he would address, if at all, in the second person plural pronoun, "*zuek*." "Mutual" interactions refer to chapters in which Jesus and a single interlocutor address one another.

There are many other "characters" in the New Testament, so to facilitate analysis of the pronouns used by them and Jesus, I have categorized them in the following way:

1. "God" God the Father.
2. "The sick and possessed": lepers, paralytics, the blind, etc.
3. Apostles: Jesus' twelve apostles.
4. Religious and secular authorities: Pharisees, Scribes, "The 70", Jewish leaders, Pontious Pilate, soldiers, centurions.

5. Groups and Individuals: All those not captured in the previous categories. This includes minor, often unnamed individuals (“one of the multitude”, “some”) as well as those of great importance to Jesus (John the Baptist, Mary his mother).

NB: Sometimes Jesus uses one pronoun to address an afflicted individual, but another to address the spirit or demon that supposedly causes the affliction. As such, these addressees are separated into those respective categories.

Table 3 shows the pronouns used in each of the categories discussed above:

	<u>Catholic (Duvoisin)</u>			GOD	<u>Protestant (Leizarraga)</u>		
	<i>By Jesus</i>	<i>To Jesus</i>	<i>Mutual</i>		<i>By Jesus</i>	<i>To Jesus</i>	<i>Mutual</i>
Hi	0	0	—		12	2	—
Zu	12	2	—		0	0	—
Both	0	0	—		0	0	—
DEVILS, DEMONS, UNCLEAN SPIRITS							
Hi	1	0	0		1	3	5
Zu	0	3	0		0	0	0
Both	0	0	5		0	0	0
SICK & POSSESSED							
Hi	0	0	0		17	3	9
Zu	17	3	9		0	0	0
Both	0	0	0		0	0	0
APOSTLES							
Hi	0	0	0		10	36	16
Zu	9	36	16		0	0	0
Both	0	0	1		0	0	0
RELIGIOUS & SECULAR AUTHORITIES							
Hi	0	1	0		3	21	14
Zu	2	19	15		0	0	0
Both	0	0	1		0	0	0
GROUPS & INDIVIDUALS							
Hi	0	5	0		8	39	22
Zu	8	33	22		0	0	0
Both	0	0	0		0	0	0
	49	102	69		51	104	66
	N = 220				N = 221		

The differences in pronominal use here are evident. In dialogue directed to single addressees, the Catholic (Duvoisin) text uses exclusive *zu* 94% of the time

(N=206), exclusive *hi* 3% of the time (N=7), and both *zu* and *hi* 3% of the time (N=7). The pronominal use in the Protestant (Leizarraga) text is quite the opposite: it uses exclusive *hi* 100% of the time. As we will see below, these pronominal patterns are paralleled in the Old Testament texts.

The Old Testament

As indicated above, d'Urte only translated part of the Old Testament (Genesis 1:1 through Exodus 22:11). For comparative purposes, then, this section will examine these portions with their counterparts in the Duvoisin text. More specifically, I will focus on the pronouns used in direct speech to single addressees, when one of the interlocutors is God the Father. For ease of comparison, Table 4 lays out the pronouns used by and to God by the fifteen biblical characters that appear in these portions of the Old Testament. The first section lists those characters who appear in only one chapter of either Genesis or Exodus; the second section list those characters who appear in two chapters or more:

Table 4

Old Testament Pronominal Usage

<u>Catholic (Duvoisin)</u>			<u>Protestant (d'Urte)</u>			
<i>Appearance in single chapter</i>						
<i>By God</i>	<i>To God</i>	<i>Mutual</i>		<i>By God</i>	<i>To God</i>	<i>Mutual</i>
		zu	Eve		hi	
hi			Serpent	hi		
		zu	Cain			hi
zu			Abel	—	—	—
		zu	Sarah			hi
	zu		Hagar	hi		
	zu		Servant		both	
zu			Isaac	hi		
zu			Rebecca	both		
zu			Aaron	both		
<i>Appearance in more than one chapter</i>						
zu (1)		zu (1)	Adam	hi (1)		hi (1)
zu (3)			Noah	hi (3)		
zu (5)		zu (2)	Abraham	hi (5)		hi (1); both (1)
zu (2)		zu (2)	Jacob	hi (2)		hi (2)
zu (10)	zu (1)	zu (5)	Moses	hi (10)	zu (1)	hi (4)
26	3	11		26	3	11
	N=40				N=40	

Once again, *zu* is the pronoun used overwhelmingly in the Catholic (Duvoisin) texts: 39 of the 40 tokens (98%) use *zu*; *hi* is employed only once. In contrast, *hi* is used 95% of the time (N=38) in the Protestant (d'Urte) texts, while both *zu* and *hi* are used only 5% of the time (N=2).¹

Some examples

What accounts for the differences between the Protestant and Catholic texts? Why do the former prefer *T* and the latter, *V*? One way to address these questions is to examine more closely how interlocutors with different social statuses address one another. Status is, after all, one of the social categories that pronouns are meant to index (Brown & Gilman 1960).

As a first step toward that goal, Texts 1 and 2 show the pronouns that are used in the Protestant (Leizarraga, shown at left) and Catholic (Duvoisin, shown at right) texts between God the Father and Jesus Christ (*zu* is *italicized*, **hi** is **bolded**, **allocutive forms are italicized and bolded**):

Text 1: God the Father to Jesus

Eta vozbat cerutic eguin baitzedin, cioela,
Hi aiz ene Seme maitea,
hitan hartzen **diat** neure atseguin ona

And there was a voice from heaven, saying:
Thou art my beloved Son
in thee I take my delight.
(Lk 3: 22)

Eta mintzo bat egin zen zerutik:
Zu zare ene Seme maitea,
Zure baithan baitadukat nik gozoa

And a voice from heaven said:
You are my beloved Son
In you I have my pleasure.
(Lk 3: 22)

Text 2: Jesus to God the Father

Aita, ethorri **duc** orena, glorifica **ecac eure** Semea,
eure Semeac-ere **hi** glorifica eçançat.

Father, the hour has come, glorify thy Son
so that thy Son will glorify thee.
(Jn 17: 1)

Jesus to God the Father

Aita, ethorri *da* ordua; goretzazu *zure* Semea,
goretz *zaitzan zure* Semeak ere.

Father, the hour has come, glorify your Son
so that the Son will glorify you, too.
(Jn 17: 1)

We can see that both texts are characterized by reciprocal pronoun use; but *hi* is used in the Leizarraga text, while *zu* is used in the Duvoisin text. Symmetrical pronoun usage, however, is not reserved for interactions between two deity figures. Text 3 compares the pronoun usage in an interaction between Jesus and Pontius Pilate, a secular figure with high status. In both texts, pronoun use is symmetrical; but in the Duvoisin text uses *zu*, while the Leizarraga text uses *hi*:

¹ Certainly, there could have been important changes in pronominal usage in the intervening centuries between the Leizarraga or d'Urte and Duvoisin texts. But other religious texts suggest that the preference for *zu* in the Catholic texts was established by at least the early 17th century. Many Catholic prayer books and catechisms, in a variety of dialects, were published during this time, and their pronominal usage parallels that in the Duvoisin Bible. The Lord's Prayer, for example, consistently used *zu* (Materre 1623; Etcheberri 1975 [1666]; Haramboure 1635; Bonaparte 1866 [1657]; Harizmendi 1901 [1658]; Tartas 1975 [1666]).

Text 3: Jesus and Pontius Pilate

Orduan interroga ceçan
Hura Pilatec, **Hi aiz** Juduen Reguea?

Eta harc ihardesten çuela erran cieçon: **Hic dioc.**

Then Pilate interrogated him:
Art thou the King of the Jews?
And he answered him, saying: Thou sayest it.
(Mk 15: 2)

Jesus and Pontius Pilat

Pilatok galdatu zioen:
Juduen errege *zare zu?*

Eta ihardestean, Jesusek erran zioen:
Diozu.

Pilate asked him:
Are you the King of the Jews?
And in answer, Jesus said: You say it.
(Mk 15: 2)

We might expect a different pattern in interactions between deity figures and those with low social status, since the non-reciprocal power semantic is often employed in interactions between speakers with different levels of power: the person with higher status uses *T* but receives *V*. In Text 4, Jesus is interacting with a blind man, a person with decidedly lower status than himself:

Text 4: Jesus and a blind man

Sinhesten **duc hic** Jaincoaren Semea baithan?

Ihardets ceçan harc eta erran ceçan,
Eta nor da, Jauna, sinhets deçadan hura baithan?

Eta erran cieçon Jesusec, Eta ikussi **duc** hura,

eta **hirequin** minço dena **duc** hura.
Eta harc dio, Sinhesten **diat**, Jauna.

Dost thou believe in the Son of God?
He answered and he said,
And who is that, Lord, that I should believe?

And Jesus said, The one thou hast seen
the one who is speaking to thee.

And he said, I believe, Lord.
(Jn 9: 35-38)

Jesus and a blind man

Sinhesten *duzu* Jainkoaren Semearen
baithan?

Ihardetsi eta erran zuen:
Zein da hura, Jauna, sinhets dezadan
haren baithan?

Eta Jesusek erran zioen: Ikhusi *duzu*
bada,

eta *zurekin* mintzo dena hura bera da.
Orduan gizonak erran zuen:
Sinhesten *dut*, Jauna.

Do you believe in the Son of God?
He answered and said:
Which is that one, Lord, that I should
believe?

And Jesus said, The one you see, then,
the one who is speaking to you, the
same.

Then the man said: I believe, Lord.
(Jn 9: 35-38)

Here, too, we see that pronominal symmetry is preserved. Thus, we see that even people of low status dare to use *hi* to God in the Protestant text, but not in the Catholic text. We saw in Table 3 above, however, that sometimes *hi* is used in the Duvoisin text. Such deviations from the norm, according to Brown & Gilman, reflect a transient attitude of some kind. Most commonly, switching from *V* to *T* forms indicates contempt or anger; while this switch is usually initiated by a superior to a subordinate, it can be initiated by the subordinate as well (Brown & Gilman 1960: 274). The next section will examine some of the uses of *hi* —either

exclusively or in conjunction with *zu*— in the Duvoisin text, in an attempt to understand what “transient attitudes” are indexed by them.

The Catholic *hi* of contempt: The evidence from Duvoisin

Even though *hi* has historically been considered an index of solidarity and familiarity vis à vis *zu*, I only found one positive use of *hi* in the Duvoisin texts under discussion here. In Text 5, *hi* is used to quote a prophecy regarding the birthplace of Christ:

Text 5: Chiefs priests and scribes to Herod (quoting prophecy)

Eta **hi**, Bethlehem, Judako lurra, ez **haiz** segur chumeena Judako lehembizikoen artean, ezen **hire** baitharik **duk** ilkhiren Israelgo ene populuari hotsemanen dioena.

And thou, Bethlehem, the land of the Jews, thou art not the least among the leaders of the Jews, since from thee will come one who will lead my people Israel.

(Mt 2: 6)

While undoubtedly a positive use of *hi*, it is interesting that it is used to address a city rather than a person; these uses of *hi* are not reflected in Tables 3 and 4 above, as the tables only reflect speech directed to human beings. The positive connotations of *hi* in this context, moreover, are mitigated somewhat by its use under similar circumstances elsewhere. In all, *hi* is used six times to address cities; in every other case, the city is being chastised rather than praised (see Mt. 11: 21-23; Mt. 23: 37; Lk 10: 15; Lk. 13: 34; Lk 19: 42-44). Similarly, Jesus uses *hi* to check forces of nature —i.e. to subdue the wind rocking the boat carrying his disciples and himself (Mk 4: 39), or to command a tree to wither (Mt 21: 19; Mk 11: 14).

The negative cast put on *hi* in the Duvoisin text is also suggested by its uses elsewhere. Indeed, Jesus himself uses *hi* primarily to rebuke the devil —or some manifestation thereof, such as a spirit possessing a person:

Text 6: Jesus casting out demons

Utz gaitzatu; zer da *zure* eta gure arteko,
Jesus Nazaretharra? Gure galtzera ethorria
othe *zare?* Badakit nor *zaren*; Jainkoaren Saindua
zare zu. Eta Jesusek larderiatur erran zioen:
Ago ichilik, eta **hoa** gizon harren ganik.

Leave us; what are you to us,
Jesus of Nazareth? I know who you are;
you are the blessed Lord. And Jesus,
in rebuke, said:

Hold thy peace and leave this man.

(Lk 4: 34-35)

In Text 7 below, we see Jesus using *hi* to reprimand the devil himself:

Text 7: Jesus and the devil

Jainkoaren Semea *balimbazare*,
 jauz *zaitte* hemendik beheiti
 Izkribatua da ezan, *zutaz* dituela bere Aingeruak
zu zaitzazten begira
 Eta beren eskuez idukiko zaituztela,
 beldurrez-eta oinaz behaztopa zadien harrian
 Orduan Jesusek ihardestean erran zioen:
 Errana **duk**: **Hire** Jainko Jauna ez **duk** tentaturen.

If you are the Son of God,
 come down from here
 Since it is written, his angels
 will watch over you
 And they will hold you in their own hands
 lest you strike your foot against a stone
 Then Jesus answered, saying:
 It is written: Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.
 (Lk 4: 10-12)

Thus, both speakers use *zu* with each other for most of the interaction (and the devil continues to do so throughout). But, in quoting the scripture that finally bests his opponent, Jesus uses *hi*; this asymmetrical use of *hi* is also evident in Jesus' other interactions with the devil and demons (cf Mt 3: 3-10; Mk 1: 24-25; Lk 8: 28-30; Mk 9: 24, Lk 8: 28-30—all of which are included in the “both” category in Table 3 above):

Jesus uses *hi* in a similar way in one (and only one) interaction with his disciple Peter. While he normally uses *zu* with him—and his other disciples—we see in Text 8 below that he resorts to *hi* when he gets particularly angry with him—and he calls Peter “Satan” when doing so (see Mt 16: 16-19, 22-23 for another version of this interaction in which Jesus uses *zu*).

Text 8: Jesus to Peter/Satan

Jesusek, itzulirik, eta dizipuluei begiratu,
 larderiatu zuen Piarres erranez:
 Gibelerat **egik**, Satan;
 zeren Jainkoaren gauzez ez **haizen** zale,
 bainan bai gizonenez.

Jesus, turning around, and looking at his disciples
 rebuked Peter, saying:
 Get thee behind me, Satan;
 for thou dost not love the things of God,
 but those of man.
 (Mk 8: 33)

It would seem that, in the Catholic text, *hi* is used primarily to rebuke the kind of behavior that only the devil—or his minions— can muster. This is true in the Old Testament as well. Text 9 shows God rebuking the serpent in the Garden of Eden:

Text 9: God to serpent

Eta Jainko Jaunak erraten dio sugeari:
 Hori egin **duk**alakotz, madarikatua **haiz**
 lurreko azienda eta basabere guzien artean:
 herrestatuko **haiz hire** sabelaren gainean,
 eta lurra janen **duk hire** biziko egun oroz.

And the Lord God says to the serpent:
 Because thou hast done that, thou art cursed
 among the tamed and wild beasts:
 Thou wilt drag on thy belly,
 and thou wilt eat of the dirt thy entire life.
 (Gen 3: 14)

Interestingly, even though God chastises Adam and Eve (the latter of which is shown below) just as harshly, he does not use *hi* in doing so:

Text 10: God rebuking Eve

Usutuko *ditut zure* gaitzak eta *zure* izorrak:
 oinhazetan erdiko *zare*, eta izanen *zare*
 gizonaren eskupeko, eta gizona izanen
da zure nausi.

I will multiply your difficulties and
 your suffering in childbirth
 In pain will you be in childbirth, and you will be
 your husband's handmaiden.
 and your husband will be your master.
 (Gen 3: 16)

That *hi* is too harsh to be used in addressing human beings as a matter of course is also suggested in its use in quoted speech. In Text 11, God is telling Moses what to say to the Pharaoh and to Aaron:

Text 11: God to Moses

Eta erranen *diozu* Faraoni: Hebrearren Jainko Jaunak igorri *nau zugana*, diolarik: **Utzak** ene populua, mortuan niri sakrifizio egitera; eta orai arteo ez **duk** nahi entzun. Jaunak erran ere zioen Moisi: *Errozu* Aaroni: har *zazu zure* zigorra, eta heda *zazu zure* eskua Egiptoko uren gainera...

And you will say to Pharaoh: The Lord God of the Hebrews has sent me to you, saying: Leave my people to make sacrifices to me; and till now thou hast not listened ...God also said to Moses: Tell Aaron: Take your whip, and open your hand over Egypt's waters...
 (Ex 7: 16; 18).

Thus, God uses *zu* when addressing Moses himself (“Eta erranen *diozu* Faraoni” “And you will tell the Pharaoh...”); but he uses *hi* when when “voicing” his message to Pharaoh (“**Utzak** ene populua” “Leave my people...”). That *hi* is not appropriate for dialogue—even when issuing directives—in normal discourse is suggested by the use of *zu* in the rest of the excerpt. God also tells Moses what to say (as Moses)

to Pharaoh, but that directive (as seen above) is rendered in *zu*; similarly, God uses *zu* when telling Moses what to say to his brother, Aaron (“*Errozu Aaroni*, “Tell Aaron”).

But it seems that *hi* is sometimes permissible for directives issued from a superior to a subordinate, among ordinary interlocutors. This is illustrated in Text 12, in which a centurion implores Jesus to heal his servant:

Text 12: Jesus and a centurion

Eta Ehuntariak ihardetsi zuen:

Jauna, *zu* ene etchera sartzeko, *ez naiz* din;

Bainan baxharrik hitz bat *errazu* eta ene

Sehia sendatua daite. Ezen ni ere gizon bat *naiz*

Bertzeen manukoa, soldadoak ene azpiko

Ditudan; eta erraten diot bati: **Habil**, eta badoha

Eta bertze bati: **Haugi**, eta heldu *da*; eta ene

Muthilari: **Egizak** hori, eta egiten *du*

.....

Orduan Jesusek erran zioen Ehuntariari

Zoaz, eta sinhetsi bezala egin *bekizu*.

And the Centurian answered:

Lord, for you to enter my house, I am not worthy;

But just say one word and

my servant will get well. For I too am a man

who is served, I have soldiers under me.

And if I say to one: Go, he goeth

And to another: Come, and he cometh; and to

my servant: Do that, and he doeth it

.....

Then Jesus said to the Centurion

Go, and do as you believe.

(Mt 8: 8-9; 13)

We can see that the centurion uses *hi* when quoting his directives to his servant, a relationship presumably marked by more social inequality than that between Moses and Aaron—which is characterized by mutual *zu* (as is that between the centurion and Jesus).

The above examples suggest that the pronouns *zu* and *hi* index very different social meanings in the Protestant versus Catholic texts. While both religions follow the rule of pronominal symmetry, the pronoun chosen for such symmetry is very different: it is $T(hi)$ in the Protestant case and $V(zu)$ in the Catholic. The use of T forms in the Leizarraga and d’Urte texts parallels its use in Protestant texts in other languages, so it does not seem too far-fetched to suggest that its use in the Basque case is intended to promote a more solidary relationship between God and human beings than had been typical of Catholicism. In fact, the use of reciprocal *zu* in the Duvoisin texts is consistent with the more distant relationship between God and humankind in Catholicism in which, even today, intermediaries (priests, saints, etc.) act as go-betweens in ways that they do not in Protestant denominations.

Further, it seems that the meanings ascribed *hi* are quite different in the Protestant versus Catholic texts. While *hi* indexes familiarity in the Leizarraga and d'Urte texts, *hi* indexes “power over” one’s interlocutor in the Duvoisin text: it is always used asymmetrically and, with one exception, always used to reprimand or condemn.

This is exemplified in Text 13 below, in which Jesus is being crucified alongside two “criminals”:

Text 13: Jesus and two criminals

Hi bahaiz Kristo, salba **zak hire** burua

eta gu ere-bai.

Bertzeak ordean ihardetsiz, gaizkiak erraten

zarozkan, zioelarik:

Hik ez duk Jainkoaren beldurrik ere,

heroni heriotze berera kondenatura **haizelarik**.

....

Eta Jesusi erraten zioen: Jauna, orhoit *zait*e nitaz,

zure erresumara heldu *zaret*ekeenean

Eta Jesusek ihardetsi zioen:

Egiaz *derratzut*, egun parabisuan enekin izanen *zare*.

If thou be the Christ, save thyself

and us, too.

Then the other one rebuked him,

because he spoke wrongly, saying:

Dost thou not even fear God,

even as thou art thyself condemned to death?

....

And to Jesus he said: Lord, remember me,

when you are in your kingdom.

And Jesus answered:

I tell you truly, today you will be in paradise with me.

(Lk 23: 39-41; 43)

The differences in pronominal use here are striking. The first condemned man is clearly mocking Jesus and he uses *hi* (“salba **zak hire** burua”, “Save thyself”) in doing so. Indeed, in Duvoisin’s New Testament, *hi* is used only 7 times in dialogue directed to Jesus; in every case, it is used to taunt him. The condemned man to Jesus’ right, however, believes in Jesus and asks to be remembered by him in paradise (“Jauna, orhoit *zait*e nitaz”, “Lord, remember me”); he uses *zu* in addressing Jesus directly (and is answered in kind). His use of *hi* is reserved for scolding the other man for his lack of respect (“**Hik ez duk** Jainkoaren beldurrik ere?” “Dost thou not even fear God?”).

That *hi* is used primarily to index reproach is corroborated in Duvoisin’s use of it in interactions which do not include divine interlocutors. The majority of such interactions are characterized by mutual *zu*. On the few occasions where *hi* is used, it is used in ways more conducive to social distance than closeness; it is always used asymmetrically —to censure, challenge or accuse.

In Text 14, a young woman approaches Peter soon after Jesus' arrest:

Text 14: Woman to Peter

Bada, Piarres kampoko aldean zagoen, ezkarazean jarria; eta neskatxa bat hurbildu zitzaioen, zerralarik: Jesus Galilearrarekin **hintzen hi** ere. Bainan harek ukhatu zuen guzien aitzinean, zioelarik: *ez dakit zer derratzun.*

Then, when Peter was outside, sitting in the vestibule, a girl came near to him, and said: Thou too wast with Jesus the Galilean. But he denied this in front of everyone, saying: I do not know what you are saying.

(Mt 26: 69-70)

Thus, the woman uses *hi* when issuing her challenge that Peter is one of Jesus' disciples, but Peter uses *zu* in denying her charge. A "crowd" that issues a similar challenge also uses *hi* in doing so (see Mt 26: 73); however, another version of these interactions with Peter uses *zu* throughout (see Mk 14: 68-69).

Text 15, taken from Duvoisin's Old Testament, shows a similar situation in which a "Hebrew" challenges Moses:

Text 15: Moses and a Hebrew

Eta atherarik bertze egunean, ikhushi zituen bi Hebrear liskarrean: eta erran zioen gaizki hari zenari: Zertako jotzen *duzu zure* laguna? Hunek ihardetsi zuen: Nork ezarri **hau** gure gainera buruzagi eta juye? Ala hil nahi **nauk**, Egiptoarra atzo hil **dukan** bezala?

On another day, from the door, he saw two Hebrews arguing: and he said to the one who was doing wrong: Why do you hit your friend? And this one said: Who put thee over us as our master and judge? Or wilt thou kill me, like thou killedst the Egyptian yesterday?

(Ex 2: 13-14)

Thus, even when questioning "the one who was doing wrong", Moses uses *zu*, but the Hebrew challenges the question with *hi*. The association between *hi* and wrongdoing is also suggested in this New Testament passage, in which Judas expresses regret to the high priests:

Text 16: Judas and the High Priests

Zerralarik: Bekhatu egin dut,
hobengabeko odola salduz.
Bainan hekiek ihardetsi zioten:
Guri zer dihoakigu? **Hire**
ikhustekoa **duk**.

He said: I have sinned,
having sold the blood of
the innocent.

But they answered him:

What is that to us?

See thou to that.

(Mt 27: 4-5)

Immediately after being thus dismissed, Judas kills himself. Finally, that *hi* is reserved primarily for negative interactional purposes is suggested by its use in

parables. Jesus uses *hi* in only two parables, and both uses are negative. One parable is that of the talents, shown below:

Text 17: Parable of the Talents: Master to servant

Jauna, *badakit* gizon garratza *zarela*, uztatzen *duzula* erain ez *duzun* tokian, eta biltzen non-ere ez *baituzu* barrayatu. Eta ene beldurrarekin, goan *naiz*, eta luphen gorde dut *zure* talendua; huna non *duzun zurea* dena. Bainan ihardestean erran zioen bere nausiak: Zerbitzari gaichto eta alferra, **bahakien** uztatzen dudala erain ez dudan tokian, eta biltzen non-ere ez baitut barrayatu: Behar **huen** beraz ene dirua eman irabazira; eta nik, ethortzen ninzanean, enea populuarekin alchatuko **nian**.

Lord, I know that you are a bitter man, and that you reap where you do not sow, and gather where you have not scattered. In fear, I went and I put your talent in a cave; here is what is yours. But his master answered him: Lazy and evil servant, thou knewest that I was a bitter man, that I reap where I do not sow, and gather where I do not scatter? Then thou oughtest have made my money grow, so I could keep it for my people when I returned.

(Mt 25: 26-27)

In the speech quoted here, the master uses *hi* when chiding this servant for his wasteful ways; he uses *zu* with the previous two servants, who had done his bidding well (cf. Lk 19: 11-27 for another version of this parable with parallel pronominal use).

In the second parable (Lk 12: 16-21), a rich man switches from *zu* to *hi* when talking to himself about what he shall do with his bounty —“rest, eat, drink, and have thy fill” (“phausa **hadi**, jan **zak**, edan **zak**, **egik** ase onik”). That such is not a good decision is indicated by what follows:

Text 18: Parable of the Rich Man: God to the rich man

Bainan erran zioen Jainkoak:

Zorua, gaurko gauean izanen **duk**

arima galdea: **hik** bilduak beraz,

norentzat izanen dire?

But God said:

Fool, tonight thy soul

will required of thee: for whom, then,

will be the things thou hast gathered?

(Lk 12: 20)

Thus, we see that *hi* usage by an ordinary person (even, as in this case, to himself) does not necessarily index reproval; but its use by a deity figure does. (See Axular 1643: 34 for the same parable with parallel pronominal usage).

Discussion

I have shown that forms of address, especially as they inhere in second person singular pronouns, are used very differently in Protestant versus Catholic biblical

texts produced in Basque between the 16th and 19th centuries. Consistent with Protestant translations in other languages, the Leizarraga and d'Urte texts use "the people's" language not only by using Basque rather than Latin, but also by using familiar forms of address.

One might argue that this pronominal usage has a much more mundane explanation: perhaps Leizarraga and d'Urte merely rendered *hi* directly from the Latin or French *T*. However, at least in d'Urte's case, other evidence shows that the ubiquity of *hi* is not attributable merely to translation. In addition to the Old Testament fragment, he published a Basque grammar in 1712. One section contains nine dialogues—in Basque and French—between single interlocutors (d'Urte 1712: 503-37). While the French translation always uses mutual *T*, only two of the nine dialogues in Basque use *hi*. In one case, a "gentleman" switches from *zu* to *hi* once when speaking to "a student". In the other, *hi* is used exclusively by two "lords speaking *hica* [*hika*] with one another". One of them also uses *hi* with a female servant who is waiting on them—who answers in *zu*. These examples show that *T* could be translated as either *zu* or *hi*; the ubiquity of *hi* in the texts discussed here, then, seems to result from a conscious choice rather than a simple matter of translation.

There is also evidence that both authors were aware of the marked nature of the symmetrical *hi* usage they employed in the biblical texts. For example, d'Urte contributed a Basque version of the Lord's Prayer for a collection published in 1715 (Chamberlayne 1715: 44); he provided a version written in *zu*—although in his grammar of 1712, he had written it in *hi* (d'Urte 1900: 13). Leizarraga, too, seemed to believe that symmetrical *hi* usage was not acceptable in all contexts. In the dedication to Queen Jeanne d'Albret that precedes his New Testament, Leizarraga addresses her in *zu* rather than *hi*. He also published a catechism in which he uses the non-reciprocal power semantic: the priest's part when instructing the child is "voiced" using *hi*, while the child's response is in *zu* (Leizarraga 1990 [1571]). Thus, it seems that both Leizarraga and d'Urte are hesitant to extend symmetrical *hi* usage when it comes to speech among actual interlocutors. Their liberal use of symmetrical *hi* usage in biblical texts, then, suggests that they are attempting to index a particularly solidarity relationship between the (Protestant) believer and God.

This kind of relationship is quite a contrast from that indexed in the Catholic texts. I have shown that the New and Old Testaments produced by Duvoisin use *zu* rather than *hi* as the unmarked form of address. This seems consistent with Catholicism's emphasis on mediation when it comes to the relationship between God and believer. The Catholic Church opposed vernacular translations of the scripture till well into the 19th century, and it was not until Vatican II (1962-1965) that the use of languages other than Latin was allowed in mass. The reluctance to use the vernacular for these purposes mitigates the formation of a deep personal relationship between God and believer in the Catholic tradition, I would argue, so that the use of the "respectful" (but distant) *zu* in the Basque case is perhaps not surprising.

However, I have also argued that the use of *hi* in the Duvoisin text—though infrequent—cast upon it a negative connotation; *hi* is always used (but for one

exception) for negative interational purposes —to reprove, challenge or mock.² That *hi* carries an air of admonishment is also suggested by its use for the Ten Commandments (Exodus 20: 1-17); while Moses normally uses *zu* (or the plural, *zuek*) in communicating with his followers, he uses *hi* when conveying God's commandments to them.

What is missing in the Catholic texts is the use of *hi* to index solidarity or familiarity —which is striking, given that research shows that these are the primary stances indexed by *hi* currently (cf. Echeverria 2003; Urla 1997). But such positive uses of *hi* are not modeled in the Catholic texts. It is my contention that, to use Brown and Gilman's terms, these negative associations ascribed *hi* created an "animus against the pronoun" (1960: 265) which led to its disuse over time. In this sense, the loss of *hi* can be attributed, at least in part, to Catholic theology. By the end of the 17th century, Protestantism had been defeated in France; to the extent that those in its Basque-speaking regions have had access to biblical texts since then, they would be Catholic ones in which *zu* was omnipresent, and *hi* was cast in a negative light —and therefore, to be avoided.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Jose Ignacio Hualde, Pello Salaburu, and Kathryn Woolard for their helpful feedback on various aspects of this paper. Any remaining omissions or errors are my own.

References

- Alberdi, X., 1986, "Euskarazko tratamenduen ikuspegia: I. Historia apur bat", *ASJU* 20, 149-202.
- , 1995, "The development of the Basque system of terms of address and the allocutive conjugation". In J. I. Hualde, J. Lakarra and R. L. Trask (eds.), *Towards a History of the*

² This kind of usage is consistent with another Catholic text of the period, Pedro de Axular's *Gero*, published in 1643. While Axular usually addresses the reader in *zu*, he uses *hi* a few times to admonish the lazy or sinful (1643: 267): "**Hiregatik** gu dilubio handi hartan, Noeren denborako uholdean, hondatu, eta itho **ginituan**" (Because of thee, we were ruined and drowned in the flood during Noah's time). The sun rebukes a man who has stayed too long in bed (Axular 1643: 14): "Nik atzo, **hik** baiño bide gehiago iragan **nian**, inguratu bainuen mundu guztia, eta orai ere, **hi** baiño goizago iaiki **nauk**" (Yesterday, I traveled more than thee, because I circled the entire world. And yet I have gotten up earlier than thee). A soul leaving a sinful body is condemned in (female) *bika* forms (Axular 1643: 263): "Amaren sabeletik iltki **intzen** pontutik, puntu hunetaraino, bethiere iarraiki **natzain**, **eznatzain** behin ere apartatu. Anhitz enseiu egin **dinat**, **hire** horretarik begiratzeko, eta orai daramanan bide gaixtoaren huts eragiteko. Baina alferrik guztiak. Zeren nola baituen libertatea, eta **heure** burua heure eskuko, hala egin **dun heure** plazera eta borondatea: garaitu **naun**, **eztun** nitzaz konturik egin: ez **aiz** nitzaz gobernatu. Galdu **dinat** nik neure trabaillua, eta bai **hik** ere, sekula fingabekotzat **heure** burua". (From the time I left my mother's womb until now, thou hast always followed me, and thou hast never surpassed me. I have tried many tests, so that thou wouldst learn from them, so that by now thou wouldst have left behind the evil ways. But all was naught. Because where there was freedom, to make up thy own mind, thou didst whatever thou wished and whatever pleased thee: thou hadst defeated me, thou didst not pay attention to me: thou art not governed by me. I have lost in my efforts, and thou too, to make thee a disciplined person).

- Basque Language* (Current issues in linguistic theory, 131), 275-93. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Aulestia, G., 1989, *Basque-English dictionary*. Reno and Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press.
- Axular, P. de, 1643, Bordeaux. *Gero*.
- Bonaparte, L. L., 1866 [1651], *Formulaire de Prone Conserve dans l'Eglise d'Arbonne (Pregariac Bayonaco Diocezacoetz)*. Strangeways & Walden: London.
- Brown, R. and A. Gilman, 1960, "The pronouns of power and solidarity". In Th. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*, 253-76.
- Chamberlayne, J., ed., 1715, *Oratio Dominica*. Guilielmi & Davidis Goerei.
- De Rijk, R. P. G., 1991, "Familiarity or solidarity: The pronoun *hi* in Basque". *RIEV* 36: 373-78.
- Diccionario Enciclopédico Vasco*, 1988, San Sebastian: Editorial Auñamendi.
- Duvoisin, J., 1865, *Bible Saindua edo Testament Zahar eta Berria*. London.
- Echeverria, B., 2003, "Language ideologies in (en)gendering the Basque nation", *Language in Society* 32, 3: 383-414.
- Errington, J., 1985, "On the nature of the sociolinguistic sign: Describing the Javanese speech levels". In Mertz and Parmentier (eds.), 287-310.
- Etcheberri, J., 1669, *Manuel Devotionezcoa, edo Ezperen, Oren Oro Escuetan Errabilliceo Liburuchoa. Escarazco Versutan Eguina eta Guztia Bi Partetan Berecia (Bi-garren Liburua. Guiristinoac Erran Behar Litzuzquen Othoitcez)*. Mongiron, Millanges: Bordelen.
- Haramburu, J., 1635, *Debocino Escuarra, Mirailla eta Oracinotegua. Virginaren Debocinoa, Marinelena, eta San Francesen Heren Ordena*. Bordelen.
- Harizmendi, C., 1901 [1658], *L'Office de la Vierge Marie, en Basque Labourdin*. Chalon-sur-Saone.
- Leizarraga, J., 1990 [1571], *Jesus Christ Gure Jaunaren Testamentu Berria Othoitza Ecclesiasticoen Forma Catechismea*. Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia.
- Materre, E., 1623, *Dotrina Christiana*. Bordeaux.
- Mertz, E. and R. J. Parmentier (eds.), 1985, *Semiotic mediation*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Oyharcabal, B., 1993, "Verb agreement with non arguments: On allocutive agreement". In J. I. Hualde and J. Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *Generative Studies in Basque Linguistics (Current issues in Linguistic Theory)*, 105), 189-220. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ruiz Arzalluz, I., 1987, "Notas sobre algunas traducciones vascas del Nuevo Testamento", *ASJU* 22: 3, 709-25.
- Satruestegui, J. M., 1977, "Promesa matrimonial del año 1547 en euskera de Uterga", *FLV* 25, 109-14.
- Silverstein, M., 1985, "Language and the culture of gender: At the intersection of structure, usage and ideology". In Mertz and Parmentier (eds.), 209-59.
- Tartas, J. de, 1975 [1666], *Onsa Hilceco Bidia*. Arantzazu, Oinati: Jakin.
- Urla J., 1997, "Outlaw language: Creating alternative public spheres in Basque free radio". In L. Lowe and D. Lloyd (eds.), *The Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital*. Duke U. P.: Durham and London.
- Urte, P. D', 1900 [1712], *Grammaire Cantabrique Basque*. Bagneres-de-Bigorre: Imprimerie D. Berot.
- , 1894, *The Earliest Translation of the Old Testament into the Basque Language (A fragment)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.