UMCS WYDAWNICTWO

Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury 36 (2024)
ISSN 0860-8032 ◇ e-ISSN 2449-8335
https://journals.umcs.pl/et

I. Rozprawy i analizy

DOI: 10.17951/et.2024.36.91

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 2: Address Forms and Expressive Speech Act Routines

Eurolingwistyczny kontekst języków polskiego, niemieckiego, czeskiego, węgierskiego, niderlandzkiego, angielskiego, francuskiego, hiszpańskiego i łacińskiego w „Rozmowie" Christopherusa Warmera z końca XVII w. Część 2. Formy adresatywne i utarte zwroty w ekspresywnych aktach mowy

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 the typical European character of address forms and routine formulae in expressive speech acts. All vernacular languages except Dutch are languages with an informal/formal (T/V) address pronoun distinction, with reciprocal V typical among adults, among students, and between adults and young (or inferior) females, and non-reciprocal V typical from (inferior) males to people of a higher generation. Kinship terms are frequent vocatives toward adult relatives. A kinship term for a concrete blood relationship is used to denote a non-first-degree family member in general. The expression "friend" for acquaintances and strangers is often used as well as "sir/lady". Professional titles as vocatives are also frequent, though maidservants can be addressed by guests with intimate address terms. With respect to greetings, all languages use patterns with "God" and the pattern "(Be) welcome" in salutations and "good evening/night" in valedictions. Contrast or complementary response formulae are more common than echo responses. Echo responses

are only found for elliptical patterns. Patterns with an illocutionary-force-indicating device (IFID) are absent in salutations and uncommon in valedictions. In contrast, with respect to thanks, IFIDs are common, potentially followed by echo responses. Of all languages analyzed, Latin shares the smallest number of European and regional features, mostly adhering to classical variants (after the loss of many lingua franca usages).

Keywords: cross-linguistic; spoken language; 17th century; address terms; expressive speech acts; routine formulas

1. Introduction

This article is the installment of a study on the 1691 version of a polyglot manual that ultimately goes back to a Dutch-French phrasebook by Noel van Barlainmont (better known as Noël de Berlaimont, Berlaymont, or Berlemont). The earliest existing version dates from 1527 (Barlainmont 1527), already labeled as a revised version, though. In the second half of the 16th century, his book began to lead to diverse multilingual and enlarged versions (not always with his name as the author or co-author) (cf. Rossebastiano 2000: 693–696, or Bouzouita and Vogl 2019). The most multilingual version is the one of 1691, which was created by Christopherus Warmer (Warmer 1691) and encompasses ten languages (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. Based on the representativity study in Part 1 (Grzega 2023), Warmer's book can be considered a small authentic and representative Eurolinguistic source, with the north 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 considerably shrunk outside the academic and religious contexts).

What kind of conversations do we find in our text? As already mentioned in Part 1 of the study (Grzega 2023), there are three conversations already from 1527, two from 1575, two from 1585. The first and longest conversation (p. 90–157) involves 10 people, for which the English name versions are employed here: It first shows a short talk between two students (John and Hermes) in the street and then one of these (John) goes home where we read the various sections of a dinner-table conversation, with nine interlocutors (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). In the second conversation (pp. 156–179), a saleswoman first talks with a colleague and then with a customer. The third and shortest conversation (pp. 178–189) is between a debtor, a creditor and later a guarantor. The fourth conversation (pp. 188–201) unites two travelers on the road as well as a female shepherd that they ask for the way. 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) is, first, between the two travelers and a young male servant who wakes the travelers in the inn and, thereafter, the chat between the two travelers visiting different spots of the town. The seventh conversation (pp. 234–272) consists of scenes at the market as well as the paying scenes at the inn and involves 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 the innkeeper's maid).

We will inspect the 1691 version for the use of historical pragmalinguistic analysis from a Eurolinguistic perspective in the sense that we are searching for features common to a large number of European languages (see also Section 3.5).

2. Research Questions

As already listed in Grzega (2023), the research questions are these:

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

If yes:

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

RQ2a: ... forms of address?

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

RQ2c: ... the structure of 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 3.5). RQ1 was positively answered in Part 1 of this study. The second part will now deal with the sub-questions of RQ2.

3. Theoretical background

As already said in Grzega (2023), theoretical discussions are not the objective of this study. The goal is predominantly descriptive, or analytical, in

the sense that the study aims at collecting and describing linguistic features typical of a large number of the languages analyzed. Notwithstanding, a number of remarks on theoretical backgrounds and definitions are inevitable.

3.1. Speech acts in general

The term *speech act* goes back to Austin (1962). Each speech act contains a locutionary force (= the bare meaning), an illocutionary force (= the intention) and a perlocutionary force (= the effect). Austin was particularly interested in the phenomenon of performative verbs and performative acts (i.e., acts that change the world). Searle (e.g., 1969 & 1976) refined the system of speech acts and distinguished assertive/representative speech acts (= giving information), directive speech acts (= obliging the interlocutor to perform an act), commissive speech acts (= obliging the speaker to perform an act), expressive speech acts (= giving expression to (intermediate) personal attitudes and feelings, e.g., greeting, thanking, small talk), and declarative speech acts (= changing the world in a culturally determined situation = Austin's performative acts). However, I am inclined to follow Taavitsainen and Jucker (2008: 4), who suggest seeing speech acts as prototypical "fuzzy concepts that show both diachronic and synchronic variation". Searle concentrated keenly on the difference between direct speech acts (with an illocutionary-force-indicating device, or IFID) and indirect speech acts (i.e., acts in which the denotations of the forms say nothing about the speaker's intention). In our analysis we are interested in routine situations of expressive speech acts that aim at establishing a good contact between speaker and hearer. In these routine speech acts we also find cases where the original meaning of a sentence is more and more lost over time. This process has been called *pragmatic inflation* or *discursive inflation* (see Arnovick 1999) or *pragmaticalization* (see Erman and Kotsinas 1993, Claridge and Arnovick 2010).

3.2. Routine formulas, or formulaic expressions

Routines can be seen as parts of interactions where no negotiation is required between individuals (cf. Coulmas 1981a: 3); it could be more bluntly said that they need no semantic negotiation. Routine formulas are prefabricated, repeatable procedures that provide an interlocutor with ready-made problem solutions, to a large degree culture-specifically (cf. Lüger 2007: 445 & 453; cf. also Hyvärinen 2011). Or, as Bardovi-Harlig (2012: 206) puts it: formulas in the pragmalinguistic context are "recurrent strings or expressions used for specific pragmatic purposes. Formulas often succinctly

capture the illocutionary force of a contribution by virtue of the fact that the speech community in which they are used has tacitly agreed on their form, meaning, and use". Routine formulas exhibit varying degrees of variation (and combinability). They can be particularly expected in the reduced set of declarative language acts, such as declaring a couple husband and wife or the buffet open, and in the reduced set of expressive speech acts, such as greetings (*Hi*), farewells (*Goodbye*), thanks (*Thanks*) and, to some extent, small talk (*Nice weather, isn't it? – Yes, it is*, or: *What's new? – Not much*). A greeting is expressive, declaring the buffet open is declarative. Sometimes there is speech-act overlapping. The sentence *I wish you a good night* can be classified, depending on the context, as either expressive or (indirectly) declarative ('I hereby end the conversation').

The second part of a sequence of routine formulas is classified into *complementary formula* vs. *symmetrical formula* (e.g. Radtke 1989: 76). Actually, we could distinguish three types of responses: (a) an exact copy, which Ferguson (1981 [1976]: 27) calls *full echo response*, (b) a modified copy, which Ferguson (1981 [1976]: 27) calls *modified echo response*, (c) a pattern "and you also", which we could call *pseudo-echo response*, (d) a pattern that we could term *complementary reaction* (e.g. "thanks" after a wish) and (e) something we could call a full *contrast formula*, or *converse formula*.

The precise choice of routine formulas may depend on several factors. With respect to greetings and farewell formulas, Laver (1981: 299) illustrates with the help of a flow chart the choice of different forms in British English: type of setting, age (and generation) of interlocutors, age difference of interlocutors, familiarity of interlocutors, social relationship of interlocutors (social ranks), and possibly any kind of convention exemption of the higher or older interlocutor.

For the choice of thanking formulas in a number of European languages, Coulmas (1981b: 74) sees four dimensions regarding whether the object of gratitude is (1) potential ("ex ante") or real ("ex post"), (2) tangible/material or intangible/immaterial, (3) solicited or unsolicited, (4) obligatory/indebting non-obligatory/non-indebting. With respect to thanking in English sources of Early Modern Times, Jacobsson (2002: 74) strangely claims that the first dimension does not suggest itself since thanking "ex ante" is typical of Modern English, although in his own data the "ex ante" subgroup (offer, promise, suggestion, invitation) represents the largest group. Nevertheless, he only resorts to the second dimension, material vs. immaterial, with further sub-categories. The other two dimensions are not taken into account at all. The four dimensions alone cannot be relevant for our analysis, since a thanking formula is more or less required due to the parallel design of

Warmer's book. In other words: it may very well be that a formula was simply used for an object of gratitude because there was one in model texts Warmer used. This holds also true of Jacobsson's type of ironical use of thanks. There may only be some interesting results if we take into account Jacobsson's (2002) additional, formal dimension: (5) short thanking formula vs. thanking with intensifiers, or boosters.

3.3. Terms of address

Terms of address affect the politeness of speech acts. They occur as pronouns and nouns along with the forms of the respective verbs; when employed in the subject plus verb context or the object function, Schubert (1984) termed them *bound address forms*, in the vocative function they are termed *free address forms*. As regards bound forms, many European languages have an informal/formal opposition. They are commonly called *T*-form (from Latin *tu*) and *V*-form (from Latin *vos*) since Brown and Gilman's study (1960). According to Brown and Gilman (1960), the choice is driven by two central motors: power and solidarity. However, other factors may also be vital, depending on the culture (cf. also, e.g., Jucker and Taavitsainen 2003, Mazzon 2010). Braun (1988), after looking at many languages, already draws the conclusion that the address systems are so diversified that it is unlikely that a useful universal theory can ever be formulated: not only can a variable have various numbers of form, but also the parameters that determine the choice of a form vary significantly. Whereas this may be right, rules of thumb may be possible for a group of languages.

3.4. Onomasiological aspects

We will compare the onomasiological background of an expression. This means we will have a look at the (transparent) semantic sources of an expression. In more recent onomasiological theories this is referred to as *designation motives* or *iconemes* (cf. Grzega 2004 & 2007: 23).

3.5. Pragmalinguistic sprachbund phenomena

As said in Part 1 of the study (Grzega 2023), classical definitions of sprachbund refer to the presence of morphosyntactic features, and in more recent approaches a trait can also be considered typical of a sprachbund without being present in all languages of the sprachbund (cf., e.g., Heine and Kuteva 2006, van der Auwera 2011). This differs from the 100% presence that Haarmann (1976) applies to label a feature a europeme. With respect to pragmalinguistic features it was underlined (Grzega 2013: 35) that instead

of a "100%" definition a prototypicality definition is more in line with human thinking; thus, a 66% -level was suggested as appropriate if the number of languages/cultures in the analysis is sufficient. Since we have only 9 vernacular languages (albeit from all directions of Europe), it seems reasonable to define *European* as a minimum 75% occurrence, i.e. in 7 out of 9 languages.

4. Methodology

There are some speech-act analyses for the 17th century for some languages (e.g. Grzega [2005, 2008] on greeting in English, Jacobsson [2002] and El-Mahallawi [2018] on thanking in English, Kremos [1955] on thanking in French, Ghezzi (2015) on thanking in Italian, Braun [1988] on address terms) and prior investigations from non-multilingual sources (only mono- and bilingual) in all languages integrated in Warmer's book on address pronouns and pronoun alternatives.

We will perform a qualitative corpus analysis, although we will point out if something is rare. A quantitative study makes no sense, since our corpus, as already said before, is not a protocol of real language. We will first list the forms found in the corpus, looking for recurrent motives of designation, or iconemes, including the use of elements indicating the intention of the speech act, or – in Searle's terminology (1969, 1976) – the illocutionary-force-indicating device (IFID). Then we will see if there are features for all or a subgroup of these languages.

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./pp.". A Europe-wide observation will be preceded by *#E*, a regional one by *#R* and any other one by *#X*.

5. Free address terms

The first part of this study (Grzega 2023) had already looked at bound address forms (with illustrations entitled Fig. 1 and Fig. 2). The findings will be repeated in the conclusion (under #E1). Here we will deal with free address terms. With respect to vocative functions, we can state the following for all languages with respect to addressing kin and acquaintances.

#E2.1. The use of (first) names is common among the youngsters.

#E2.2. In the adult generation, first names are used if people know each other.

#E2.3. Names are used by an adult when addressing kin from a younger generation, while the reciprocal use is rare (one exception is when Anne asks Roger to give her his knife).

#E3. Kinship terms are frequently used by youngsters when talking to adult relatives, but also among adult relatives.

There are more interesting things to observe for addressing kin.

#X2. David, who must be a second- or third-degree relative of Peter's, is called the same way by Peter, John and Mary, namely by a word that originally means 'cousin' (French, Spanish, Italian), 'cousin + maternal uncle' (German), 'cousin + nephew' (Dutch), 'uncle' (Polish, Czech), or '(sweet) older brother' (Hungarian), 'relative' (Latin). The respective female expression is used by David addressing Mary. It is possible to see in our languages (except Latin) the semantic process of generalization in meaning in the sense of downward movement in a hierarchical taxonomy (cf. Grzega 2007: 24). However, the pragmatic use of the converse kinship was already noted by Renzi (1968) for Rumanian and termed *allocuzione inversa* ("inverse addressing"). Occasionally, the kinship term is preceded by (1) "my", (2) "Sir/Lady", (3) "dear" or (4) "my sweet/good", but not equally in all languages. In Fig. 1 here, we can note that the most frequent attribute is "my", which can be found in 66 percent of the languages. An emotional adjective "dear, sweet, good" is typical of the central-eastern zone: German, Polish, Czech, Hungarian. It is noteworthy that combinations with "Sir . . . " are used in more languages than combinations with "Lady. . . ". Also of note, in Italian, 'sir' has two lexical variants: *signor* and *messer*.

Fig. 1. Kinship vocative modifiers

	en	nl	fr	es	it	de	pl	cs	hu	la
1 "my . . . "	+	+	+	+	+				+	+
2a "Lady . . . "				+		+				
2b "Sir . . . "				+	+	+	+	+		
3 "dear . . . "						+	+	+		
4 "my sweet/good . . . "									+	

There are also some more interesting details that the text reveals about European features when addressing non-relatives of the same or higher hierarchical level.

#E4. A widespread expression is "friend". Occasionally, "friend" is preceded by "my" in all languages but Spanish and Italian.

#E5. We find "sir" and "lady" in all languages. They are sometimes preceded by "my" in all languages but English. Hungarian also has occasional "my sweet/good sir". On two occasions, a traveler addresses an acquainted traveler by "Master + name", but the other only responds with "my sir" (or only "sir" in English and "my dear sir" in Hungarian).

#E6. Professional titles are used. For the innkeeper, there is normally "sir (the) innkeeper" (in Hungarian "innkeeper sir-mine") and female forms for his wife. The drink butler is addressed by his professional title (in Spanish preceded by an expressive *Ola*). A salesman's servant uses "(my) master" to the salesman in all languages except Spanish and Italian.

#E7. Finally, another generalization can be made with respect to the different vocatives (also apparent in Fig. 1: The use of "my" as a vocative modifier is found in all languages albeit not with all vocatives in all languages).

#E8. It is also wide-spread, though not in all zones, that the guest addressing the maidservant five times (pp. 216–223 & 266f.) uses an intimate vocative "(my) love" or "my daughter", although in different concrete combinations as illustrated in Fig. 2 (ordered according to iconemes). Exceptions are the north (English) as well as Latin. The south also uses an intimate "sister". This means that in all languages save English and French, such an intimate address term is used.

Fig. 2. Vocatives for the maid-servant

	en	nl	fr	es	it	de	pl	cs	hu	la
1a "my love"		+			+					
1b "my loves"				+						
1c "my little love"						+	+	+		
2a "daughter"									+	
2b "my pretty daughter"						+	+			
2c "nice daughter"									+	
2d "pretty daughter"		+			+			+		+
3 "sister"				+	+					
4a "she-friend"							+	+		
4b "my she-friend"	+		+			+	+	+		+
5a "(the) pretty girl"	+		+	+	+					
5b "my pretty girl"									+	
6 "my nice (one)"									+	
7 "my good"					+					

#X3. The address term used by the saleswomen reciprocally is usually "lady comrade-woman" (e.g. G. *Frau Gevatterin*, E. *Lady Gossip*, Fr. *madame commere*, Sp. *señora commadre*, It. *senora comare*), but "my comrade lady" in Hungarian, "lady comrade" in Dutch, and "lady" in Polish and Czech.

#X4. When Andrew's servant Lucas addresses Peter on five occasions (pp. 144–147), most versions simply use the name, but the Czech version uses also "Sir Peter" (twice) and "uncle" (twice, Cz. *stryće*); similarly, German uses "Sir cousin" twice (G. *Herr Vetter*).

#X5. In Dialog VII, when the client decides to come back to the original salesman to finally buy the merchandise, hoping that the salesman will nevertheless reduce the price a little bit, the German, Polish and Czech version use the vocative "dear [man]" and the Hungarian version "my dear [man]", while the other versions do not use a vocative at all.

#X6. In addition, the original "your grace" has brought some specific forms to Spanish (*v.m.*, i.e. *vuestra merced* or a slurred phonetic form), Polish *waszmość* (which is the nominative, but in the vocative function) or *waszmości* (vocative), and Hungarian *kegyelmed*.

6. Expressive speech act routines

6.1. Salutations

From the many greeting situations, we can deduce the following observations.

#E9.1. In all languages except Latin we frequently find greetings containing the iconeme "God" (in Polish and Czech even "Sir God, Mister God"), mostly in the pattern "God give you a good . . . " plus the time of the day. In the Latin version the greeting starts with the illocutionary-force-indicating-device (IFID) *precor* 'I ask, I beg', then followed by the time of the day (but maybe this is also to imply 'from God'). Only as a response phrase after the greeting *Salve* does Latin twice show a phrase with *Deus* 'God'. There is also the pattern "(May) God {protect/save/greet/be with/give luck to} you" ('protect' in Czech, French and Spanish, 'save' in English and Italian, 'greet' in German and Dutch); Latin only has *Salve* 'Be healthy'. Another construction is "God give you a long good life" (or just "long life" in Hungarian, just "good life" in Dutch, and "long and happy life" in Italian). In all languages but Hungarian we find "God may-turn

all bad-luck from you", in German and Polish preceded by the wish 'Good-luck' (the Hungarian variant is "God give you good luck"). For mid- to late-17th-c. English, an earlier study (cf. Grzega 2008) claims that phrases with "God wish" plus the time of the day is not the most frequent pattern; more common are "I wish/send" or just the bare term for the time (always after the element "good").

#E9.2. The pattern with an IFID "I wish/send" is completely missing in all vernacular languages of our sample; it only occurs in Latin. This is surprising, viewing Grzega's (2008) observation on English where the iconeme element "I wish/send" is described, as just said, as more frequent than the iconeme element "May God wish".

#E10. Greetings containing the iconeme "God" are answered by a pseudo-echo response "and you also" and/or a modified echo response "a good day may give you God".

#E11. Several times, we read "(Be) welcome" in variants, except for Hungarian. The Hungarian version employs *Isten hozzott (benneteket)* 'God brought (in-you/your inside)' and *Kivánatos jőttél* 'you came (as) desired' and a simple emotional use of the addressee's name *Henrikem* 'Henry mine; my Henry'. A modern variant with the verbal stem *üdvözöl* 'welcome, greet' is not used.

#E12. The pattern "What (good) news do you say?" is also used in all languages once or twice. With respect to the response, these figures are too few to generalize.

One more observation:

#X7. The question about one's well-being (never addressed to inferiors, though) is European, but constructed very individually, the more frequent ones being "How are you? / How do you carry yourself?" (Spanish, Italian, French, Hungarian), "How is it with you?" (German, Czech, Dutch, English), "How are you going?" (German, Spanish), "How is it standing with you?" (German, Italian), "How are you having yourself?" (Polish, Czech), "How are you leading yourself?" (Polish, Czech). This is in line with Radtke's (1994: 85) analysis on French and Italian.

Taking into account previous research, we can also invoke the following remarks: the salutations in French and Italian match with Radtke's (1994: 75–85) findings for the 17th century. For Spanish, instead of "I'm kissing your hands" the pattern "I'm kissing your feet" would also have been possible – and more specific (cf. Radtke 1994: 82).

6.2. Valedictions

There are seven explicit valedictions that end an encounter, two of them at night. The general Latin *vale* is given by various constructions (cf. Fig. 3, ordered by iconemes).

Fig. 3. Valedictions in general

	en	nl	fr	es	it	de	pl	cs	hu	la
1a "May God guide you"	+		+	+	+		+	+		
1b "May God protect you"						+				
2a "May God accompany you"		+				+				
2b "May God be with you"	+									
2c "May God stay with you"									+	
3 "Go in the name of God"									+	
4a "I commend you to God"	+	+	+	+						
4b "May you be commended to God"		+	+	+		+	+		+	
5 "May God commend you"								+		
6 "I commend myself to you"					+					
7 "to God"		+	+	+	+					
8a "Be worth (=well)"										+
8b "Fare well"	+									
8c "Live well"						+				
8d "May you be well"							+	+	+	
9 "Live long"									+	
10 loan from French *Adieu*		+	–			+				
11 "I'm going"	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
12 "I must go"	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

There are also some special patterns for a valediction at night (Fig. 4).

Fig. 4. Valedictions at night

	en	nl	fr	es	it	de	pl	cs	hu	la
1a "May God give you a good night"	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+
1b "May Sir God give you a good night"								+		
2a "good evening"	+	+	+	+	+					
2b "good night"						+	+	+	+	
3a "I wish you a good night"							+	+		
3b "I wish you a restful night"						+			+	
3c "I wish you a happy night"										+

With respect to European features, we can state the following.
#E13.1. As in the salutations, "God" is a central iconeme in the valedic-

tions, too. All language versions except Latin have phrases with "God", among which the pattern "May God protect/guide you" is European.

#E13.2. All language versions display the pattern "May God give you a good night" (even the Latin versions uses this pattern once).

#E14. Furthermore, all languages save Latin use the elliptical pattern "good evening/night".

#E15. When there is a response, "contrast" and "complementary" responses (potentially with a pseudo-echo response of the type "also to you") are typical of European. Instances of these types are found in all languages.

#E16. The pattern "I am going" and "I must go" can be used as part of the leave-taking process in all languages (including Latin).

Other observations:

#R2. The pattern with the IFID "I wish you" is only typical of a central-eastern cluster of German, Polish, Czech and Hungarian, as well as Latin.

#R3. The pattern "I commend you to God" is typical of a western cluster of English, Dutch, French and Spanish. It is noteworthy, though, that it is present in our English language version, as it was analyzed as extinct in English since 1440 in earlier studies (Grzega 2005: 57). Similarly, the pattern "I commend you to God" was not found in the 17th-c. sources investigated by Radtke (1994: 225–231).

#R4. When Lucas is leaving in Dialog I, full echo responses are applied in a north-west-south group of English, Dutch, French, Spanish and Italian ("good evening") and at the end of Dialog III in the Mediterranean group of French, Spanish and Italian (pattern "to God") as well as Dutch (loan *adieu*) and Latin ("be worth").

During the bargaining scenes in Dialog II and Dialog VI there are also instances of pseudo-valediction, that is one of the partners uses a valediction form to motivate the interlocutor to adapt his or her price expectations (cf. Fig. 5, ordered by iconemes).

Fig. 5. Pseudo-valedictions

	en	nl	fr	es	it	de	pl	cs	hu	la
1 "I'm going"	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2 "May God guide you"	+	+					+	+		
3a "go with God"								+		
3b "May God accompany you"			+	+	+	+				
3c "with God"							+			

4 “Stay in health”									+	
5 “I see you go in peace”									+	
6 “so be worth (=well)”										+

6.3. Thanking for something another person has offered or done

There are thirteen cases of explicit thanking. One, however, is a response to a “welcome”, which can thus be considered part of the greeting. Furthermore, at the end of Dialog V we can see the guest’s thank-you to the maid not as a thank-you for her service but as a response to her good-night wish. As mentioned above, we cannot make a cultural comparison with respect to the object. We can only make comparisons with respect to formal aspects. The patterns that we find are displayed in Fig. 6 (structured according to iconemes).

Fig. 6. Thanking formulas

	en	nl	fr	es	it	de	pl	cs	hu	la
1a “I thank you (for it)”	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
1b “I have thanks (for you)”				+						+
1c “I thank nicely”							+	+	+	
1d “I thank you heartily”	+									
1e “I thank you 100,000 times”	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
1f “I have huge thanks for you”										+
2 “(May you) have thank”		+				+				
3a “big thank”		+	+		+	+				
3b “many thanks”				+						
3c “much thank”				+						
3d “nice thank”						+				
3e “thanking to you”									+	
4a “May God give it”								+		
4b “May God reward you”							+			
4c “May God thank you”						+				
5a “God be praised”									+	
5b “God (have) mercy”	+									
6a “Much good may it do you”	+									
6b “You must get something good”		+								
7 “I kiss you the hands”				+						

From a European view, we can state this:

#E17. In all language versions – in contrast to salutations and valedictions – we have patterns with the IFID “I thank”, that is including the 1st-person singular pronoun. In 17th-c. French according to Kremos

(1955), the phrase *je vous remercie* is not addressed to superiors. In our corpus, this is true when the servant thanks the guest for his tip at the end of Dialog VII, but not when the servant Henry in Dialog I thanks Peter for the offer to have a drink (which he declines, though). As to English of the time, the fact that gratitude expressions without the pronoun "I" are absent matches with Jacobsson's (2002: 67) findings that these are rare.

#E18. There are phrases with intensifiers in all languages. They verbalize the iconeme "100,000" except for Latin, which has "huge". It fits Jacobsson's results that expressions of gratitude with intensifiers do exist (they make up about 16 percent of all instances).

#E19. In all languages except Spanish we find a (full) echo response "I/we thank you" plus potentially the object of gratitude in one or both of the following situations. At the end of Dialog I Roger and David thank Peter (and Mary) for the food and drink and Peter thanks them for their presence. Toward the end of Dialog VII the salesman thanks the client for the deal and the client thanks the salesman.

There are two additional remarks we can add if we compare our data to previous research results:

#X8. The phonetically reduced form *God-a-mercy* in our corpus is mentioned by neither Jacobsson (2002) nor El-Mahallawi (2018) for 17th-c. English, but it is well recorded by the OED (s.v. *God-a-mercy*).

#X9. As to Italian, Ghezzi (2015) says that *gran mercé* 'great grace' (together with the long form *mercede*) is very prominent in the 16th century, especially when to express gratitude as a guest. In our corpus, *Gran mercé* is used only once when the servant thanks for the tip.

7. Conclusion

Let us list the answers to our research questions again, concisely.

RQ1: Is the language in the corpus likely to be representative?

Yes, as already shown in Part 1 (but also with aspects noted here), we can determine a mostly representative picture of the period from 1650 to 1680.

RQ2a: Are there any (trans-)European features or regional features with respect to forms of address?

#E1.1. With respect to T or V address forms, in all languages but Hungarian (as well as Dutch and Latin, which do not have T-V distinction), reciprocal V is typical between all adults.

#E1.2. With respect to T or V address forms, in all languages but Hungarian (as well as Dutch and Latin, which do not have T-V distinction), reciprocal V is typical between students.

#E1.3. With respect to T or V address forms, in all languages but Hungarian (as well as Dutch and Latin, which do not have T-V distinction), reciprocal V is typical between adults and young (or inferior) females.

#E1.4. With respect to T or V address forms, in all languages but Hungarian (as well as Dutch and Latin, which do not have T-V distinction), non-reciprocal V is seen from young (inferior) males to people from a higher generation.

#E2. Names are common among youngsters and among adult peers. Names are used by an adult when addressing kin from a younger generation, while the reciprocal use is rare.

#E3. Kinship terms are frequently used by youngsters when talking to adult relatives, but also among adult relatives. A kinship term for a concrete blood relationship is used to denote any family member not of first-degree in general.

#E4. The vocative "friend" is often used for both acquaintances and strangers.

#E5. The vocative "sir/lady" is often used for both acquaintances and strangers.

#E6. Professional titles are used for the innkeeper (from the guests) and for servants. The pattern "(my) master" is given to the salesman by his servant in all languages except Spanish and Italian.

#E7. Before vocatives "my" can be used (though not with all vocatives in all languages).

#E8. A guest addresses the maidservant using an intimate phrase "(my) daughter" or "sister" in all regions except the north (English) or an intimate "(my) love" in all languages except English and French.

#R1. T is used by the parents with the sons and the sons among each other in the east and south (thus not in the north-western group of English and French, and, of course, Dutch as well as Latin).

RQ2b: Are there any (trans-)European features or regional features with respect to the structure of patterns in greeting (and potential echo responses)?

#E9.1. In all languages except Latin we find opening greetings containing the word for "God", mostly in the pattern "God give you a good . . . " plus the time of the day.

#E9.2. The pattern with an IFID is completely missing in all vernacular languages (only Latin uses this pattern).

#E10. Salutations with the iconeme "God" are answered by a pseudo-echo response "and you also" and/or a modified echo response "a good day may give you God". Thus, this occurs in all languages but Latin.
#E11. A variant is "(Be) welcome", except for Hungarian.
#E12. The pattern "What (good) news do you say?" is used.
#E13. In the valedictions, patterns with the iconeme "God" are used.
#E14. In valedictions, all languages save Latin use the elliptical pattern "good evening/night".
#E15. When there is a response in the valedictions, "contrast" responses and "complementary" responses are used (potentially with a pseudo-echo response of the type "also to you").
#E16. The patterns "I am going" and "I must go" can be used as part of the leave-taking process.
#R2. The phrase with the IFID "I wish you" is typical of a central-eastern cluster of German, Polish, Czech and Hungarian, as well as Latin.
#R3. The pattern "I commend you to God" is typical of a western crescent of English, Dutch, French and Spanish.
#R4. Full echo responses in leaving are found in a north-west-south group of English, Dutch, French, Spanish and Italian ("good evening") and in the Mediterranean group of French, Spanish and Italian (pattern "to God") as well as Dutch (loan *adieu*) and Latin ("be worth").

RQ2c: Are there any (trans-)European features or regional features with respect to thanking?

#E17. In thanking – in contrast to salutations and valedictions – we have phrases with the IFID "I thank" in all languages.
#E18. There are phrases of gratitude with intensifiers in all languages.
#E19. In all languages except Spanish we find a (full) echo response "I/we thank you" plus potentially the object of gratitude in one or two situations.

Among the vernacular languages, Hungarian shows most patterns not found elsewhere. Quite frequently, there are particularities where Polish and Czech go together, sometimes Polish, Czech and Hungarian, and sometimes Polish, Czech and German. Equally quite frequent are commonalities between Spanish and Italian.

Fig. 7 shows how many of the 19 European main features, 23 European main and sub-features and the 27 regional and European main and sub-features each language shares. In addition, the results just for the expressive speech-acts are given.

Fig. 7.: Share of European features and sub-features as well as regional features

	en	nl	fr	es	it	de	pl	cs	hu	la
main features (19)	18	18	18	17	18	19	19	19	17	15
main features + sub-features (23)	22	19	22	21	22	23	23	23	18	16
expressive speech-acts: main features (11)	11	11	11	10	11	11	11	11	10	8
expressive speech-acts: main features + sub-features (12)	12	12	12	11	12	12	12	12	11	8
main features + regional features (23)	20	20	20	20	20	21	21	21	19	17
main features + sub-features + regional features (27)	24	21	24	24	24	25	25	25	20	18

The Latin version is the one which displays most unique patterns; obviously, just very classical patterns were used for the variables analyzed in this article. This may be due to the fact that outside religion and academia, Latin had stopped to play a vital role as a lingua franca. The rest of the figures in Fig. 7 can be compared to the quantities of synchronic pragmalinguistic features collected in previous pragmatic Eurolinguistic research, where the lines connecting, on a map, the quantities in descending order are termed the "flight of the Europragmatic bumblebee" (Grzega 2013: 105f.). It may appear astonishing that English shares almost all European features of this study, while it shows only 81 percent in the present-day selection of features. It may also be considered surprising that Czech as well as Polish and French share all historical features, whereas among the present-day features they only showed 86 and 85 percent respectively. All in all, though, there are no real outliers. We see a proximity of quantities in Fig. 7 that do not surprise that much when compared to the said selection of modern pragmalinguistic features. Very interesting for a Eurolinguistic perspective, it can be underlined that Warmer's book then illustrates that routine formulas for expressive speech-acts and addressing forms displayed a common European character in the second half of the 17th century. This is something that adds to Eurolinguistic knowledge.

References

Arnovick, Leslie. 1999. *Diachronic Pragmatics: Seven Case Studies in English Illocutionary Development*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Austin, John. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen. 2012. Formulas, routines, and conventional expressions in pragmatics research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 32: 206–227.

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]

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.

Claridge, Claudia, and Leslie Arnovick. 2010. Pragmaticalization and discursisation. In *Historical Pragmatics*, ed. Andreas Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen. 165–192. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Coulmas, Florian. 1981a. Introduction. In *Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech.* ed. Florian Coulmas. 1–17. The Hague etc.: Mouton.

Coulmas, Florian. 1981b. Poison to your soul: Thanks and apologies contrastively viewed. In *Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech*, ed. Florian Coulmas. 69–91. The Hague etc.: Mouton.

El-Mahallawi, Basma Mahmoud Mohamed. 2018. The use of thanking expressions and their intensifiers from Early Modern to present day English. *Majalat aladab waleulum al'iinsania* 86(4): 903–920. https://journals.ekb.eg/article_174628.html. Accessed 26 February 2023.

Erman, Britt, and Ulla-Britt Kotsinas. 1993. Pragmaticalization: The case of *ba'* and *you know*. *Studies i Modern Sprakvetenskap* 10: 76–93.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1981 [1976]. The structure and use of politeness formulas. In *Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech.* ed. Florian Coulmas. 21–35. The Hague etc.: Mouton.

Ghezzi, Chiara. 2015. Thanking formulae: The role of language contact in the diachrony of Italian. In *Contatto interlinguistico fra presente e passato*, ed. Carlo Consani. 315–343. Milano: LED.

Grzega, Joachim. 2004. *Bezeichnungswandel: Wie, Warum, Wozu? Ein Beitrag zur englischen und allgemeinen Onomasiologie.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Grzega, Joachim. 2005. *Adieu*, *Bye-Bye*, *cheerio*: The ABC of leave-taking terms in English language history. *Onomasiology Online* 6: 54–63. http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/grzega1051.pdf. Accessed 26 February 2023.

Grzega, Joachim. 2007. Summary, Supplement and Index for Grzega, Bezeichnungswandel, 2004. *Onomasiology Online* 8: 18–196. http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/grzega1072.pdf. Accessed 26 February 2023.

Grzega, Joachim. 2008. *Hal, Hail, Hello, Hi*: Greetings in English language history. In *A Speech Act History of English*, ed. Andreas Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen. 165–193. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

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

Grzega, Joachim. 2023. 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. *Etnolingwistyka* 35: 107–125.

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.

Hyvärinen, Irma. 2011. Zur Abgrenzung und Typologie pragmatischer Phraseologismen – Forschungsüberblick und offene Fragen. In *Beiträge zur pragmatischen Phraseologie*, ed. Irma Hyvärinen and Annikki Liimatainen. 9–43. Frankfurt a. M.: Lang.

Jacobsson, Mattias. 2002. *Thank you* and *thanks* in Early Modern English. *ICAME Journal* 26: 63–80. http://http://icame.uib.no/ij26/jacobsson.pdf. Accessed 26 February 2023.

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.

Kremos, Helene. 1955. *Höflichkeitsformeln in der französischen Sprache: Aufforderungs- und Bitteformeln – Dankesbezeugungen*. Zürich: Schippert.

Laver, John. 1981. Linguistic routines and politeness in greeting and parting. In *Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech*. ed. Florian Coulmas. 289–304. The Hague etc.: Mouton.

Lüger, Heinz-Helmut. 2007. Pragmatische Phraseme: Routineformeln. In *Phraseologie/Phraseology: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*, vol. 1, ed. Harald Burger, Dmitrij Dobrovoľskij, Peter Kühn and Neal R. Norrick. 444–459. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

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

OED = *Oxford English Dictionary*, ed. James Murray et al. Oxford: OUP. https://www.oed.com. 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.

Renzi, Lorenzo. 1968. Mamă, tată, nene ecc.: Il sistema delle allocuzioni inverse in rumeno. *Cultura neolatina* 28: 89–99.

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.

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

Searle, John. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. London: Cambridge University.

Searle, John. 1976. A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 5(1): 1–23.

Taavitsainen, Irma, and Andreas Jucker. 2008. Speech acts now and then: Towards a pragmatic history of English. In *Speech Acts in the History of English*,

ed. Andreas Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen. 1–23. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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.

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

Streszczenie: W tej części badania opis i jakościowa analiza pochodzącej z 1691 roku „Rozmowy" Christopherusa Warmera skupiają się na europejskim wymiarze form adresatywnych i utartych zwrotów w ekspresywnych aktach mowy. W „Rozmowie" używa się dziesięciu języków: śląskiej odmiany polskiego, śląskiej odmiany niemieckiego, wschodniej odmiany czeskiego, północnej odmiany węgierskiego, flamandzkiej odmiany niderlandzkiego, północnej odmiany francuskiego oraz włoskiego, hiszpańskiego, angielskiego i łaciny. We wszystkich tych językach oprócz niderlandzkiego odnajdujemy rozróżnienie na formalne i nieformalne zaimki adresatywne; form formalnych używa się dwukierunkowo w gronie osób dorosłych, studentów oraz młodych (lub zajmujących społecznie podrzędną pozycję) osób płci żeńskiej, natomiast jednokierunkowo używane są one przez zajmujących podrzędną pozycję mężczyzn w stosunku do osób starszych. W stosunku do dorosłych krewnych często używa się terminów oznaczających relacje pokrewieństwa – dotyczy to relacji dalszych niż relacje pierwszego stopnia. W odniesieniu do znajomych spoza grona krewnych oraz do nieznajomych często używa się sformułowań oznaczających mniej więcej „przyjacielu" lub „szanowny panie/szanowna pani". W użyciu są także tytuły zawodowe, natomiast goście zwracają się do służby używając również zwrotów bardziej osobistych. Formuły powitalne we wszystkich językach obejmują sformułowania ze słowem „Bóg" lub „witaj(cie)", a formuły pożegnalne – „dobranoc/dobrego wieczoru". Odpowiedzi kontrastujące lub dopełniające ze strony rozmówcy są częstsze niż powtórzenia tego samego sformułowania, które występują tylko w konstrukcjach eliptycznych. Formuły z użyciem elementów wskazujących za siłę illokucyjną aktu mowy (*illocutionary-force-indicating device*, IFID) nie występują w powitaniach, a w pożegnaniach są rzadkie. W podziękowaniach elementy te występują powszechnie i może po nich następować powtórzenie formuły użytej przez rozmówcę. Spośród wszystkich analizowanych języków, najmniej europejskich i regionalnych cech odnajdujemy w łacinie, w której przeważnie występują warianty klasyczne (po tym, jak wypadło z niej wiele użyć typowych dla lingua franca).

Słowa kluczowe: badanie porównawcze; język mówiony; XVII wiek; formy adresatywne; ekspresywne akty mowy; utarte zwroty