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ABSTRACT

This study is a synchronic investigation of a pragmatic aspect of the normative language behavior in eighteenth-century Russia. Although it draws on the discipline of historical pragmatics it does not attempt to draw conclusions about the evolution of the language; rather, its goal is to examine the state of the language at a given point of time, the second-half of the eighteenth century. The study is an analysis of eighteenth-century Russian language behavior and writes a chapter in the social history of the Russian language through an investigation of a little-studied genre, the conversation book. In addition to a purely linguistic analysis of the texts, the dissertation also investigates the social and educational environment that produced the conversation books. This examination includes an overview of areas affected by the use and production of the new genre of conversation books - contemporary pedagogical ideology and goals, especially in the matter of language acquisition as well as publishing in the context of the Imperial Academy of Sciences. The work draws on Brown and Levinson’s theory of linguistic politeness (1987), which claims universality in the strategies that speakers use in their interactions; this dissertation tests the validity of the theory by applying it to eighteenth-century Russian texts. The data analysis demonstrates some problems with Brown and Levinson’s theory of linguistic politeness, specifically in regard to the claimed universality of the strategies, the sentence-level approach to data, and the lack of a neutral baseline against which to measure imposition levels. The use of address terms within the conversation books is evaluated as a potential signal of face-threatening acts.
A maxim of duty is proposed as a criterion in behavior guidance as reflected in the conversation books.
For Al and Oscar
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preliminary Remarks.

This study is a synchronic investigation of a pragmatic aspect of the normative language behavior in eighteenth-century Russia. It is intended to add a chapter to the social history of the Russian language by investigating a little-studied genre - eighteenth-century conversation books. In addition to the linguistic analysis of the texts, the dissertation investigates the social and educational environment that produced conversation books, which are part of a little studied genre that deserves consideration in a thorough assessment of the state of eighteenth-century Russian and the development of the Russian literary language. The work draws on a theory of linguistic politeness which claims universality in the strategies that speakers use in their interactions; this dissertation explores the theory, attempts to apply it to eighteenth-century Russian texts and tests its validity. The work also incorporates Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of speech genres in the linguistic analysis. The dissertation uses these various foundations to draw a picture of an aspect of the language in eighteenth-century Russia, a time of great significance in the development of the Russian literary language. It draws on the programmatic ideals of Dean Worth as set out in the essay “Towards a Social History of Russian” and it recognizes the complementary role that the disciplines of linguistics and history have in such investigations.
Although the study draws on the discipline of historical pragmatics, it does not attempt to draw conclusions about the evolution of the language; rather, its goal is to examine the state of the language at a given point of time, the second-half of the eighteenth century in Russia. It includes an overview of certain social phenomena of the time, such as the contemporary pedagogical ideology and goals, especially in the matter of language acquisition as well as publishing in the context of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.

In the remaining sections of Chapter One, I define some concepts relevant to the methodology of the work. In Chapter Two, I discuss the aspects of the social and cultural atmosphere of eighteenth-century Russia that demand new genres and two of the new genres that resulted: the conversation book and the behavior guide. In Chapter Three, I examine the linguistic theory of politeness that is the basis of my analysis of the texts. In Chapter Four I present a close pragmatic analysis of one representative of one of the new genres discussed in Chapter Two, the conversation book, *Domashnie Razgovory*. The analysis also draws on other works on politeness which relate to the context in which the conversation books existed and were used. In Chapter Five I make concluding remarks and discuss possible lines of future research.

1.2 A Social History of Russian.

The concept of the “social history of Russian” is, according to Worth, a framework which “emphasizes the social role of linguistic forms, and that it differs from the *istorija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka* in that it is not restricted to those developments that eventually resulted in a standard national language” (234). He adds further that a social history of a language is based on the implied existence of 1) a social structure, such as economic and intellectual history, 2) linguistic structure, and 3) a system of
genres. Both social and linguistic structures develop over time and each may, but does not have to, impinge on the other. A system of genres is the factor that mediates between the two structures; it is how society uses the linguistic structures - “it is what enables language to serve social needs” (234). A genre is a part of social history because it fulfills a social function, and it is a part of linguistic history because it has its own particular linguistic form. It is at this juncture of form and function that the two structures interact, where “history and language impinge on each other, and the history of these impingements is, precisely, the social history of the language” (234).

Not all elements of social and linguistic history must be considered in the social history of language, only those that affect the nature of genres and the ability of the language to fulfill its social roles. The form/function relationship of the genre system tends towards equilibrium which may be disrupted, for example by external factors, and create new needs for the language to fill or by internal changes that leave the language unable to fulfill adequately its functional role. Thus, the system is not static, but rather, in a constant state of self-generation and self-renewal (Worth, 234-35).

Worth notes that disruptions which affected Russian have come more frequently from “external historical events” than “internal linguistic developments” (236). He cites three major developments in the history that have had lasting significance on the Russian language: the Christianization or Byzantinization of East Slavic culture (10th century and later), the secularization and Europeanization (or de-Byzantinization as Worth calls it) of Russian culture (17th and 18th centuries), and the current (at the time of publication, 1984) “technicalization” and internationalization of then Soviet culture (238). I propose that the process that Worth saw occurring in the 1980s is continuing in Russian today, with perhaps even greater speed and pervasiveness than he anticipated. It is in the newer, less fixed genres, regardless of the period, that new elements are most easily
incorporated into the language. This dissertation examines a new literary genre for eighteenth-century Russian in order to see how it deals with the demands of new social functions.

1.3 The Literary Language.

Worth's search for an approach to the social history of the language is motivated by an uneasiness with the term 'literary language.' He feels that the term is inadequately defined and without a definition, any discussion about the nature of the development of the Russian literary language cannot be fully productive since the very object of discussion is unclear. The problems begin with a lack of a clear antecedent to Contemporary Standard Russian (an Old or Ancient Literary Russian language) and with the dichotomy between Church Slavonic and East Slavic.

The question of the "Russian literary language" has been the topic of countless articles and books.\(^1\) An initial problem is a lack of consensus on what the term literary language itself means.\(^2\) The use of the term literary language is infelicitous as it does not satisfactorily describe the subject. Worth equates the item under discussion to the German term Hochsprache; it is not limited to the language of literature, but it is rather the standard language of a nation, shared by all of its people and able to fulfill all functions required by these people in written or oral form (Worth 1985, 260). It should be noted that the focus on "literary" language by scholars is due to the greater accessibility of the written language for study.

---

\(^1\) Some of the most prominent Russian scholars in the last few decades to weigh in on the issue include: Alexander Issatchenko, Boris Uspenskii, and Viktor Zhivov.

\(^2\) See Auty 1958 for a discussion of the problem of the use of the term 'literary language.' also Lencek 1985.
Issatchenko enumerated four characteristics that a "literary language" should have: 1) polyvalence, meaning that it is suited for "all spheres of national life"; 2) codification, meaning that it is governed by norms regarding its orthography, pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary; 3) obligatoriness for all members of the nation or community and does not allow dialectal variation; and 4) stylistic differentiation, meaning that it is capable of fulfilling many needs and purposes for the community (Issatchenko 1958, 24 and 1975, 5). It is generally agreed that prior to the eighteenth century Russian did not have all of these elements; a dichotomy existed between Church Slavonic which was the language of the church and scholarship and the Russian spoken language which was used in almost every other sphere. Opinions vary about the exact nature of the relationship between the two, but they were not completely isolated from one another. By the eighteenth century, however, the gulf between the two was wide, and neither language was able to fulfill all the needs of the community; neither was polyvalent. At the same time Russia was experiencing a vast influx of new sciences, technologies, and educational and other cultural resources which required new vocabulary and new genres for communicating and dispensing the information. Church Slavonic was perceived by the Russians creating the new genres as being too archaic to meet the new demands, while spoken Russian was seen as lacking in tools for meeting the growing requirements that it faced. The process that married elements from both languages and which drew on models from foreign languages has been recorded many times, though most studies focus on the expansion of the vocabulary (see for example Hüttl-Worth 1956 and 1963) and the language of literature (see for example Unbegaun 1965 and 1968).

It is not the purpose of the present work to present a complete investigation of the nature of the literary language; rather, it will investigate one genre from several
perspectives in order to deepen the understanding of the elements which comprise the literary language. In this work the concept of the literary language is modeled on that of Bakhtin in his essay “The Problem of Speech Genres” where he writes that literary language “also includes nonliterary styles” and “is a complex, dynamic system of linguistic styles” (1986, 65). Thus Bakhtin uses the term to cover a much wider range of human expression than simply the language of literature.

The breadth of Bakhtin’s definition is echoed by Keipert when he calls for a new approach to linguistic history. Keipert proposes that scholars turn from chronologically-oriented studies to a “problem-orientated structure” (217). He lists seven functional spheres of language which could serve as a basis for investigation — church and religion; administration, military, diplomacy; learning technical sciences, crafts; belles-lettres, including the theatre and recitation; journalistic writing, public speaking; private notes; and oral usage (219-220).

Significantly, Keipert further emphasizes the importance “of a better understanding of the teaching and learning of foreign languages in Russia” (221) in order to learn how Russian responded to the challenge of competition from other languages and how the teaching of foreign languages affected the teaching of Russian. Moreover, the role of foreign languages and translating also affected the development of Russian, but it is also an understudied area (Keipert, 218). This call for the study of translation in Russia in the eighteenth century is also made by Hüttl-Folter, who agrees with Keipert that too much attention has been focused on belles-lettres and not enough has been given to other genres of writing (1985, 192).

---

3 Keipert’s ideas about approaches to study of the literary language are very close to Bakhtin’s suggestions, though he may not have been aware of Bakhtin’s thoughts on the subject. Bakhtin’s essay, “The Problem of Speech Genres” was written in 1952-53, however it was only published in 1979 (Bakhtin 1986, xv, Emerson, 1997, 120 n. 58)
Thus it is clear that a new approach to the study of the language and the types of works investigated is due. This dissertation seeks, in part, to address the topic of language teaching in Russia in the eighteenth century.

1.4 Historical Pragmatics as a Methodological Framework.

The current work falls into the framework of historical pragmatics, investigating language use and using a specific theory (see Chapter Three) as the investigative means for examining linguistic devices that came into usage due to changes in the communicative needs in eighteenth-century Russia.

The disciplines of history and linguistics have long co-existed, but neither discipline has undertaken to make the other a key part of the investigative process. As the historian Michael Richter notes “...Few histories of the Middle Ages have shown an awareness of the potential of language as an important factor in the evaluation of the past although virtually all of them study the past on the basis of written material (133)”. In recent years, however, there has been a movement toward collaboration. Richter points out some of the pitfalls that the researcher must contend with, notably the need “to place material in its wider context” and to recognize that the researcher as well as the information provider each brings his/her own subjectivity to the topic (Richter, 134-5).

An understanding of the society and context from which material is drawn is crucial for historians and linguists alike, according to Richter:

In order to work out fully the place of language in relation to society the researcher has to have as full as grasp of that society as can be obtained just as is expected in synchronic sociolinguistics. In this way it appears to me that historians have much to contribute to historical sociolinguists (145).

Richter considers history and historical sociolinguistics ancillary disciplines for one another. He is careful to note that the study of literary texts for historical purposes
has its own special requirements, but that no clear line exists between historical and literary texts (Richter, 145).

Just as Richter points out the failing of historians to consider language data, so the sociolinguist Dell Hymes notes the converse failing among linguists. In his programmatic article “Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life,” Hymes writes

A general theory of the interaction of language and social life must encompass the multiple relations between linguistic means and social meaning. The relations within a particular community or personal repertoire are an empirical problem, calling for a mode of description that is jointly ethnographic and linguistic (Hymes 1972, 39).

Hymes’ goal is not just that the different disciplines (linguistics, history, anthropology, etc.) recognize each other nominally, but that our understanding of each discipline should be changed and broadened to encompass the interactions between disciplines. For the field of sociolinguistics, the goal is “the meaning of language in human life ... in the concrete, in actual human lives” (Hymes 1972, 41).

While sociolinguists, by the very nature of their investigations, use social factors in their studies of language, historical linguists have been less interested in doing so. James Milroy explains that

Historical linguists have generally reflected a predominantly social approach to change. There have been many reasons for this, but ... historical linguists can certainly justify a mainly language-internal approach by various arguments, especially as such approaches have led to so many advances (75).

In fact, internal (as opposed to external) descriptions of language change have been the most highly valued. Reference to external, that is social, factors has often been minimal. Milroy acknowledges that language-internal analyses do allow for very sophisticated theories of change, but the more basic question regarding why some forms change and others are maintained requires reference to society (Milroy, 75-76). He proposes a theory of language innovation by individual speakers, which may in turn
become language change as it is acquired and practiced by the larger group of speakers. This means language change that is observable historically is at the end of a process, much of which may be unobservable since innovation and its origins are unobservable. Thus, linguists need more complete and sophisticated models for tracking language innovation and change from both social and linguistic standpoints. “In order to reach a fuller understanding of social aspects of language change, therefore, linguists need to move towards a more sophisticated understanding of society, and this will be particularly relevant to the extent that linguistic change is itself a social phenomenon” (Milroy, 88).

The field of historical pragmatics has been working to counter these previous trends in the two fields of history and linguistics. Historical pragmatics is a relatively new field or perhaps, more appropriately, it is a relatively new branch of the existing fields of pragmatics and historical linguistics. This line of inquiry had been hampered by the basic problem of data. Pragmatics has generally had spoken data as its focus while historical (diachronic) studies have generally been dependent on written data. However, both fields have made progress in reaching out towards the other.4 As Andreas Jacobs and Andreas H. Jucker note, tools of description of current pragmatic phenomena can also be applied to descriptions of similar phenomena of earlier eras, e.g., speech acts, politeness phenomena, etc. It is within this new discipline that the current study falls, as it uses a pragmatic approach to texts in combination with an historical perspective of the role of such texts in linguistic and social history.

Jacobs and Jucker outline approaches to integrating historical and pragmatic studies of language. They offer two basic perspectives: the first applies pragmatic

---

4 Jacobs and Jucker, 3. Their introduction to Historical Pragmatics provides a useful overview of studies and approaches in historical pragmatics.
perspectives to historical linguistics in order to investigate language change (pragmaphilology), the second applies a historical dimension to pragmatics in order to examine language use over time (diachronic pragmatics). They note that the latter seems to be the more general approach, while the former may provide useful data for the investigation of language change.

In an earlier survey of work in historical pragmatics, Dieter Stein notes the "general interdependence" of linguistic and social structures; the linguistic structure responds to changes in communicative needs, which in turn change as the social structure changes (Stein, 348). Stein sees the field of historical pragmatics as a fruitful one trying "to relate changes in the inventory [of speech acts and speech act types] and in other analytical strata (obligations, syntax) to changes in society" (Stein, 350) and also trying to relate the history of genres to social, intellectual, and literary history (as literary studies has long done).

The problem of data for historical pragmatics has been discussed, not only by Jacobs and Jucker (Jacobs and Jucker, 6-10), but also by Helmut Henne (1980) and Richter (Richter, 132-47). These discussions remind us of the obvious, that we lack the recordings of spoken language from earlier periods that can be made today, but also of the problems of texts that do report spoken language. As both Jacobs and Jucker (7) and Richter (134-36) note, such texts often lack any information about their situational context. While some texts allow assumptions to be made about the context, caution must be exercised to prevent twentieth-century (Jacobs and Jucker, 7) interpretations of earlier contexts.

Richter uses a historical account written in Latin in the twelfth century to make some observations about language usage in England at the time (132-147). He correctly
points out the need to evaluate the source of the information in order to have some idea of the reliability of the information provided (133-135). The example that Richter cites is not totally factual regarding all events, and he adds that the subjectiveness of the source as well as of the researcher must always be recognized as a factor in data analysis and the conclusions that the researcher comes to.

A number of other genres can also provide rich sources of data for the historical pragmatist - including court proceedings, sermons, letters, and wills. In addition to historical, non-fictional genres, literary texts may also be useful sources. Richter remarks that there is no clear line separating literary and historical texts. Several studies exist of pragmatic strategies in plays (145). Thus, while historical pragmatics faces many challenges, it also has been able to find solutions to meet them.

1.5 Background of the Texts Used in the Study.

This study focuses on the analysis of eighteenth-century Russian conversation books which contained dialogues and phrases for students learning foreign languages to memorize. The texts that I examine are the conversation books which were the most popular in terms of their print runs and number of editions. The earliest text that I examine is the Domashnie Razgovory (Dialogues Domestiques, Gesprächen von Haussachen, Colloquia Domestica) [Domestic Dialogues] first published in 1749 by the Academy of Sciences Press and subsequently reprinted seven more times before 1800. A second source is the Novye Razgovory [New Dialogues] by Jean-Phillip Weguelin, which were published in bilingual (German-Russian and French-Russian) editions between 1789 and 1799. The Russian texts of the two versions are virtually identical. The last title is the Novye Frantsuzskie, Rossiiskie, Nemetskie Razgovory, kupno s

\[5\] See, for example, Kopytko, Brown and Gilman.

11
sobraniem upotrebitel' neishikh slov, v pol'zu nachinatelei [New French, Russian, German Dialogues, purchased with a collection of the most useful vocabulary for the use of beginners] by Feodor Karzhavin (1745-1812), originally published in 1791 and again in 21 subsequent editions by 1840. Karzhavin's books appear to have enjoyed the greatest success, with many printings well into the nineteenth century.

1.5.1 The *Domashnie Razgovory*.

The dialogues in the *Domashnie Razgovory* are printed in parallel columns of French, German, Russian, and Latin across two pages. There are 96 dialogues, with no vocabulary or pronunciation guides. The dialogues are each listed as either *Razgovor* or *Komplimenty*; the content of the dialogues do not indicate a reason for the different terms as either one may cover the same topic.

The history behind the printing of the *Domashnie Razgovory* provides some insight into the inner workings of the Academy of Sciences and how books came to press within the Academy. The role of the Academy of Sciences Press in the Russian book trade is discussed below in 2.3.1. The printing history of the *Domashnie Razgovory* involves the first Russian member of the Academy of Sciences, Vasilii Trediakovskii and reveals the tension that existed between Trediakovskii and some of his fellow academicians.

Trediakovskii's initial role with the Academy came when he was hired as a translator in 1732. A year later he became acting secretary of the Academy; his duties included "perfecting" the Russian language, finishing the Russian grammar that he had already begun, working with others on a Russian dictionary, and translating into Russian items from French and Latin as assigned by the Academy (Reyfman, 27). In 1745 Trediakovskii was made a member of the Academy of Sciences; his title was
Professor of Latin and Russian Eloquence. The tension between the Russian
(Lomonosov became a member the same year as Trediakovskii) and non-Russian
academy members is well-known (see, for example, Reyfman and Pekarskii). The
Russians obtained their professorships after considerable struggle, and Trediakovskii
soon faced more difficulties as he, Lomonsov, and Alexander Sumarokov became
embroiled in bickering and disputes, especially about versification. Trediakovskii’s
ability to function as a scholar was compromised, and his reputation suffered and
remained damaged even after his death. Recent works have rehabilitated Trediakovskii’s
image and the significance of his contributions (Hüttl-Worth 1970 and Reyfman).

In 1746 Trediakovskii was asked to revise the Russian text of a *colloquia
scholastica*, a dialogue book for young students written in Latin, Russian, German, and
French, which was being revised for republication by the Academy (*Protokoly*, 2: 110).
It was first published by the Academy in 1738 (twice) and was used in the Academy’s
gimnaziia. The various language texts (French, German, and Russian) were corrected
by members of the Academy who were native speakers of the respective languages, and
Trediakovskii was chosen for the Russian text. Trediakovskii made corrections to the
text and wrote a *dissertatio* about the masculine plural adjective endings in which he
disagreed with the standard for these endings adopted by the Academy in 1733
(Rosenberg, 65-6; *Protokoly* 2: 113). He wanted his changes to be incorporated into the
reprint. This stance on the adjectival endings lead to a dispute with Lomonosov, and
Trediakovskii’s recommendations were not followed (Rosenberg, 66).  

---

6 Although Academy records chronicle preparations made for the reissue of the text, no
publication record exists for the *Shkolny razgovory* between the first edition and second edition in 1738
and an edition printed by the Academy of Sciences Press in 1763. Other printings and editions followed.
See *Svodnyi Katalog russkoi knigi grazhdanskoj pechati XVIII veka 1725-1800* (SK) #3443-3449.
In the same year a second colloquia was being prepared for publication. In June the text, already in Russian, French and German, was presented to a meeting of the Academy with the suggestion that it be translated into Latin (Protokoly 2: 151). Trediakovskii prepared a translation of the Colloquia Gallico-Germanica by Georg Phillip Plats a few weeks later (Protokoly 2: 152). At the time of the original presentation to the Academy, the President Schumacher declared the text to be more suitable for future courtiers than the previous text, the Colloquia scholastica by Joachim Lange, which has a decidedly moral tone.

In July Trediakovskii presented samples of the Latin translation to the Academy conference (Protokoly 2: 154), then in October Trediakovskii’s translation was given to a committee for review (Protokoly 2: 159). In February 1747 Christian Crusius, a German member of the Academy, reported that the translation was too marred to be corrected and that he had begun a new translation himself. His judgment of Trediakovskii’s work was very harsh; he stated that the most basic grammar rules had been broken and that the translation was not worth correcting since “no line does not give offense” [translation mine] (Materialy 8: 378). The strong anti-Russian bias among the foreign professors (Reyfman, 53) could have been a motivating factor behind Crusius’ attack on Trediakovskii’s Latin translation. The translation was turned over to Crusius to be done with all speed (383), however, the work may have been turned over to an Academy translator, Vasilii Lebedev. In November the President of the Academy ordered the printing of 2400 copies of “Smieszannye razgovory s obykovennymi komplimentami o domovykh veshchakh” (in Russian, French, German, and Latin) in order for the Russian text to be approved as recommended by the translator Lebedev (Materialy 8: 594).
Lebedev was a former student of the Slavonic-Greek-Latin Academy and the Academy of Sciences University. He had worked as a translator for the Academy since 1740, translating internal communications and later also works for publication (Slovar' russkikh pisatelei XVIII veka (SRP) 2: 190). Lebedev was an experienced Latin translator, and his first book published by the Academy was a translation of a Latin grammar (Svodnyi Katalog russkoi knigi grazhdanskoj pechati XVIII veka 1725-1800 (SK) #6683 and #3213-18) which was in print into the nineteenth century (SRP 2: 190). The actual translator of the Latin text remains unclear; in September 1748 a request was made to the Academy to either reprint the Colloquia scholastica or to print the "razgovory, kotorye gospodin professor Kruzius na latinskii iazyk perevel" because the Colloquia scholastica were no longer available in the bookstore (presumably, the Academy's bookstore) (Materialy 9: 404).

The translation of the Russian text excited no controversy within the Academy of Sciences, but the history of the Russian translation does raise some questions. The first mention of the text in June 1746 is of "Colloquia in usum Gymnasii versa Russice, Gallice, Germanice" and a Latin translation is to be made by either Professor Staehlin or Professor Trediakovskii (Protokoly 2: 151). Thus a Russian text seemed to already exist; however, in July the next note about the book in the Academy of Sciences records calls it "Colloquia Gallico-Germanica autore Georgio Philippo Platz" with no mention of a Russian text (Protokoly 2: 152). But in September Academy records report that Trediakovskii translated "Platzii colloquia domestica" from French into Russian (Protokoly 2: 157). The subsequent controversy over the Latin translation is all that appears in the Academy of Sciences records. Trediakovskii's Latin translation appears to have caused more discussion than his Russian text, but only one other Academy member would have been qualified to judge it, namely Lomonosov, who had become a
member of the Academy shortly after Trediakovskii in 1745. Lomonosov was present at
the meeting at which the translation was announced (Protokoly 2: 156); moreover, he
know the book in question as he had acquired a copy of the original German printing
while a student in Marburg.

Lomonosov listed the 1724 edition of “Plats dialogues domestique[s] François-
Allemands” in his 1738 list of books acquired in Marburg (Korovin, 410). He had been
sent to Marburg by the Academy of Sciences as part of a small group of Russians to
study with Christian Wolff, a mathematician, physicist, and philosopher. The Dialogues
domestiques was also published in 1738 and 1743; its complete title is Dialogues
domestiques françois-allemands avec des complimens familiers. Französisch-teutsche
mit gemeinen Complimenten vermischte Gespräche von Haus-Sachen. An das Licht
gestellt von Georgio Philippo Plats (Korovin, 301). A catalogue of European books
from a Leipzig bookseller lists the 1743 edition of the Dialogues domestiques, en
François & Allemand by Georg-Philip Plats along with several other titles by the same
author, including another dialogue book, Dialogues nouveaux François-Allemands
(Georgi, 311). Virtually nothing appears to be known about Plats’ biography.

Lomonosov is not mentioned in connection with the Plats book in the Academy
records, but the fact that he owned the book is significant. It is possible that he supplied
it to the Academy of Sciences for translation, indicating that he found it a model worthy
of dissemination to Russian students. In 1746 Lomonosov and Trediakovskii still had
an amicable relationship and thus, it is conceivable that they at least consulted on the
translation.7 Lomonosov wrote the most important Russian grammar of the eighteenth
century (Rossiiskaia grammatika 1755-57) as well as significant works on stylistics.

7 See Reyfman, 57-69 for a discussion of the polemics which later divided Lomonosov,
Trediakovskii, and Sumarokov.
Any work that could have been the result of a collaboration between Trediakovskii and Lomonosov, the two leading Russian language and literary scholars of their day, would be of considerable interest, and such a collaboration, even if informal, cannot be entirely discounted.

No further discussion of the *Domashnie Razgovory* is found in the Academy records. It was printed by the Academy Press for the first time in 1749 as the *Domashnie Razgovory*. It was reprinted by the Academy in 1756, 1788, and 1793 (SK #1969-72). It was also printed in Leipzig by Breitkopf and Sohn in 1773 for sale in Riga; this edition and others printed in Riga by Johann Friedrich Hartknoch in 1778, 1784, and 1789 were in Russian and German only (SK #1973-76). They were clearly intended for the Baltic German population. A contemporary catalogue of Russian books notes that these bilingual editions retained the Russian text of the Academy editions but that the German texts were completely altered (Bacmeister 4(1-2): 66).

1.5.2 Weguelin and the *Novye Razgovory*.

Jean-Philippe Weguelin had several titles to his credit in the Russian book market. They were all pedagogical texts, mostly language texts, but also titles on geography and history. According to the title page of a history text, Weguelin was a professor for the Engineer Corps and former director of the École Militaire de Colmar in Alsace.

Weguelin’s conversation books are of particular interest to the present study because they were reprinted several times. There were French-Russian and German-Russian versions of the books; each edition was printed a total of three times. The texts of the French and German versions are virtually identical with only some minor variations, often simply alternative phrases in addition to the primary translation of a line.
or phrase. Like the *Domashnie Razgovory*, the books have parallel columns of text. They are divided by lessons, 130 in all. In contrast to the *Domashnie Razgovory*, the Weguelin books have tables of contents which list the lessons by topic such as *How to ask*, *Questions with answers*, *About the Weather*; a single topic may include multiple lessons. Another difference from the *Domashnie Razgovory* is that Weguelin’s texts are not exclusively dialogues, but contain many phrases appropriate to the topic. For example, the lessons for *Privietstvovat' i sprashivat' o zdorov’ie* includes phrases of greeting (*dobrii den’ gosudar’ moi. (zdravstvuite)*). Often a brief dialogue of two to four turns is included in the lists of phrases; other dialogues are more extensive.

Each lesson in the French version of 1793 ends with a brief list of vocabulary, French, Russian. The German edition of 1789 does not have any vocabulary listings. Although they claim to be aimed at beginners of the languages, the books do not give any grammatical information or guides to pronunciation, so presumably the books were intended for students who had covered these preliminaries.

The initial editions of both the French and German versions were printed in 1789 by the Typographical Company owned by Nikolai Novikov. The subsequent French editions were published in Moscow by Selivanovskii, a private press operator, in 1792 and 1794. The German edition of 1793 was printed in Moscow by the Typography at the Theatre of Christopher Claudia at the expense of Jacob Bieber. Claudia was one of the group of private publishers who were either foreign born (mostly in Germany) or born in the foreign neighborhoods of the Russian capitals (Marker, 109-110). He had a long-standing association with the Academy of Sciences and thus had contact with authors (112); he also accepted a number of private orders for printing books (118). Bieber was a successful book merchant in Moscow who stocked many imported books (174). The 1799 German edition was published in Moscow by Andrei Reshetnikov,
who operated a private press from 1786-97 and later rented the Moscow province press until 1805 (262). Reshetnikov was one of what Marker calls the “intellectual” publishers. As a group these printers had different motivations and backgrounds from the foreign and Russian tradespeople who became publishers; they were from the educated gentry and tended to have shorter, but very active careers as publishers compared to the tradesmen (111-12). See also 2.3.2 below.

1.5.3 Karzhavin and the *Novye Frantsuzskie, Rossiiskie i Niemetskie Razgovory.*

Feodor Karzhavin (1745-1812), the son of a rich merchant and Old Believer, had a French education. His father illegally took him abroad as a boy. Karzhavin lived and was educated in Paris from 1753 until 1765 (*SRP* 2: 46). He attended lectures at the Sorbonne at the same time as attending a *pension*. At the Sorbonne he studied, among other subjects, French, Italian, Greek, and Latin. He is reported to have had natural linguistic ability and his first translations were done as a boy. After returning to Russia in 1765, he taught French at the Trinity-Sergius Seminary and later at Moscow University. He began publishing his own writings with Novikov in the 1770s. He returned to Western Europe and studied medicine and the natural sciences and began his own publishing career in France. In 1777 Karzhavin was one of the few Russians at the time to travel to America. Arriving in the middle of the Revolutionary War, his time in America shaped his democratic views. He worked in the United States, practicing medicine, teaching, and translating. He returned to France and then Russia in 1788. In the 1790s he renewed his literary ties and activities in Russia. He moved in progressive intellectual circles that included Radishchev. He eventually secured a position with the Admiralty producing translations on marine topics.
Karzhavin’s interests were wide-ranging, from language and linguistics to archeology to medicine to political philosophy to the problems of colonization and the treatment of indigenous populations. Many of Karzhavin’s works were published without his name. This is also true of his language teaching texts, which besides the Razgovory included Remarques sur la langue Russiène et sur son alphabet and Vozhak: pokazyvaiushchii put’ k luchshemu vygovoru bukv i rechenii Frantsuskikh (1794, published under his name). His dialogues appeared under two titles: Novye Frantsuzskie, Rossiiskie i Nemetskie razgovory, kupno s sobraniem upotrebiteln'neishikh slov, v pol’su nachinatelei and Frantsuzskie, Rossiiskie i Nemetskie razgovory v pol’su nachinatelei. Editions under each title, with some minor variations, on these appeared from 1784 until 1840 (Rabinovich, 216-22). This enduring publication record suggests that the texts must have been popular; they were published by several different publishers over the years, including the Academy of Sciences Press.

The book (1784 edition) is printed in parallel columns of text (French, Russian, German); a fourth column has vocabulary in all three languages (Russian, French, German). The Karzhavin dialogues, like the Weguelin dialogues, mix phrases with intermittent sections of dialogues. The first part of the book is dialogues on the typical topics (greetings, questions, invitations, responses, visiting, meals, shopping). The divisions are called razgovor; they are much longer than those of either of the other books discussed. There is no table of contents and the dialogues do not have descriptive titles as in the Domashnie Razgovory or the Weguelin books. The second part of the book is also in dialogue form between father and son, but covers a different range of subjects such as geography, natural history, the population of the earth after the Flood, and the elements of civilization and its spread. It has an oblique reference to Catherine II.
at the end as the father tells the son that they should be thankful that they live under a (female) monarch who rules so well and wisely and in whose reign the arts and sciences are flourishing.
CHAPTER 2

THE GENRE OF CONVERSATION BOOKS AND THEIR ROLE IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN BEHAVIOR

2.1 Preliminary Remarks

This chapter establishes the cultural and educational context of the society that demanded and created the conversation book genre. Why were these books produced when they were, and what new need were they filling? In Chapter Four one of these texts, the *Domashnie Razgovory*, is analyzed using the theory of linguistic politeness discussed in Chapter Three.

2.2 Behavior in Eighteenth-century Russia.

The evolving social and cultural reality in eighteenth-century Russia had effects on many facets of life in Russia. Peter I took a society which had been governed in its patterns of behavior largely by the Church and, through his edicts and example, made the state the controlling force in the lives of the people; in this way he formed a secular society from a religious one. While Peter I could force outward changes such as the

---

8 For more complete accounts of this view of the change to a secular culture, see Hughes' book and Billington's *The Icon and the Axe*. Not all scholars agree with this assessment of the broad effects of Peter I's reign, notably Edward Keenan, see his book *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha* (1971). Even among scholars who believe religious culture was still dominant, there is recognition of significant changes in the religious culture in the seventeenth century that left Russia more receptive and prepared for the increased secularization under Peter I; see Paul Bushkovitch, *Religion and Society in Russia* (1992). Some scholars view the secularization and Westernization of the eighteenth century as having
adoption of modern Western clothing and hairstyles, effecting change in manners and behavior took more time. Foreign visitors to Russia often commented on what they viewed as the poor manners of the Russians. The reports of Western travellers to Russia seem to unanimously confirm that Russian manners differed greatly from the West. F. C. Weber, a native of Hannover who worked in the English Embassy in St. Petersburg for several years during Peter's reign, recounts how he was forced to wait in the courtyard in the cold in order to see someone because the servants refused to inform their master of the visitor's arrival; when the nobleman he had come to see did emerge from the house, Weber did not receive the polite treatment he expected. (Cross, 157). Weber was not alone in his experiences; even as late as 1839 the Marquis de Custine included in his frank and blunt assessments of his travels in Russia harsh remarks on Russian manners.

Western Europe had gradually undergone the shifts in accepted behavior from the medieval standards rejected by Erasmus to the highly cultivated civility of the eighteenth century which Kant felt led to society being “overburdened with all sorts of social propriety and decency…” (Elias 1978, 8). Peter's actions forced a much more rapid transformation in Russia. Stories about the forced change in attire from traditional Russian long robes and beards to short Western coats and beardless faces are well known. Peter was aware “that he faced a stiff challenge in attempting to make Russians into Europeans” (Hughes, 295). He took a number of steps to bring about this conversion, including sending students abroad (with the intention of having the students occurred on a lesser scale; see Okenfuss, The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism in Early-Modern Russia (1995).

9 See A. G. Cross's Russia under Western Eyes: 1517-1825 for a compilation of foreigners' impressions of travel to Russia.

10 Norbert Elias chronicles the transformation of Western European manners in his groundbreaking work The Civilizing Process.
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return to Russia with new technical knowledge and skills), bringing women into the social life of the court, and building a new European-style capital. The changed social demands created a need for some kind of guide to social behavior for Russians such as the behavior manuals that had developed in Western Europe in previous centuries.

2.2.1 European Models.

Since behavior had long been a topic of attention in Western Europe, books on proper behavior were common and popular, from the early classics such as Erasmus’ *De cælicitate morum puerilium* (1530) and Castiglione’s *Il Cortegiano* (1528) to Jean-Baptiste Morvan de Bellegarde’s books, including *Modèles de conversations pour les personnes polies* (1697), and Lord Chesterfield’s letters to his son (1774). A number of these books focused on conversation since it played such a large role in contemporary social life. In Western Europe, the courts became “the actual model and style-setting centres” (Elias 1982, 5) during the Renaissance. By the seventeenth century in France the *salon* was taking on a larger role as the “style-setting centre” where social norms and the rules of good and proper conversation were established (Goldsmith, 7).

Few such works focusing on behavior were written in Russian in the eighteenth century. In fact, the titles published in Russia in this area appear to be largely anonymous translations of Western European originals. They frequently were published in bi- or multilingual editions; thus they served a dual purpose – they provided the Russian audience with Western behavior models and they taught the languages of Western European society, especially French and German (see Ariès, 383). The only

---

11 See P. Burke’s *The Art of Conversation* for a detailed examination of the genre in Western European culture.

12 See Iu. Lotman’s essay “On the Poetics of Everyday Behavior in Eighteenth-Century Russian Culture” for an interesting discussion of the place of European-influenced behavior in Russian culture.
"native" Russian book that discussed behavior was the *Domostroi*, a sixteenth-century guide to household management. Needless to say, it offered a different view of accepted behavior than the Western European guides; nevertheless, it was used by the Russian provincial gentry well into the eighteenth century (Pouncy, 46).

2.2.2 Russian Practices.

The change in Russian behavior from Peter's time onwards may be seen in the production of a new book genre, the behavior guide, as well as in the deportment portrayed on the stage in eighteenth-century Russian comedies. One step that Peter I made to attempt to promote the practice of Western behavior was to order the compilation and publication of the etiquette guide *Iunosti chesthoe zertsalo* [The Honorable Mirror of Youth], which first appeared in 1717.\(^{13}\) This guide to behavior served as a kind of all-purpose textbook; it included a primer, a guide to numbers, and alphabetically arranged moral lectures precede the etiquette sections. In this respect it was embellishing on Western European tradition; the etiquette manuals of Western Europe served as children's texts for learning to read and write (Ariès, 383). They were printed with different types of characters; the first pages of *Iunosti* are tables of the new civil script (but see Marker 1994 for a discussion of the problem of literacy and the old and new alphabets). Although the main text of the book is addressed to boys and is similar in spirit to Erasmus' book, *De civilitate morum puerilium*, it also contains a section for girls. *Iunosti chesthoe zertsalo* was but the first of a series of such books translated from French or German and intended to bring some sense of etiquette to

\(^{13}\) See Black 1979, 185-86, n. 46. The source(s) of the book are not clear. It appears to be a compilation of guidance from various sources though neither a compiler nor any sources are identified. Some scholars (such as Hughes, 289, Okenfuss, 309) consider Erasmus' book as a source, while others (such as Anisimov, 221) disagree. Comenius has also been suggested as a source (See Black 1979, 186, n. 46). It was printed 3-4 times during Peter I's reign, three times in the 1740s and again in 1767.
Russian society. Although, unlike many of its successors, it was not printed in a multilingual edition in following with the dual goals of teaching language and behavior, the book did advise young readers to speak among themselves in foreign languages so that discussions of private matters would not be understood by servants (lunosti, 18-19). Other behavior guides are discussed below in 2.5.

By Peter I’s death, various resources had broadened the Russians exposure to Western European ways, including foreign and foreign-influenced books, greater access to travel and the subsequent contact with Westerners. The great influence of foreign elements on Russian society and culture in the eighteenth century has been widely discussed. Although German culture had dominated during Anna’s reign (1730-40), French social mores and manners became increasingly influential form the reign of Elizabeth (1741-62) onwards.

The Gallomania which swept the aristocracy was frequently satirized in contemporary plays, most notably in Fonvizin’s Brigadir.\textsuperscript{14} and the Frenchified “fop” and “petit-maitre” (shchegol and petimetr in Russian) were common objects of this satire. “Gallomania was so widespread in Russian that there is hardly a comedy between 1765 and 1823 which does not contain satirical references to it” (Welsh, 49). The growth in prestige by French culture and language led to many Russians enthusiastically immersing themselves in all things French even in their native Russia, sometimes to an extreme degree. The resulting Gallomania was the object of ridicule by writers such as Fonvizin and Novikov and scorn by Countess E. Dashkova (who nevertheless wrote her memoirs in French, as did Catherine II herself).\textsuperscript{15} In Sumarokov’s 1750 play Chudovishchi, a young Russian cries “Oh, why was I born a Russian? Oh, Nature! Art

\textsuperscript{14} Also Rogger, chapter 2, esp. 55-56.

\textsuperscript{15} Black 1979, 114, Rogger, 69, and Raeff 1962, 303-4.
thou not ashamed of giving me a Russian father?" (quoted in Welsh, 49). Similarly, in Fonvizin’s Brigadir, the petit-maître Ivan explains that he wants a wife with whom he can speak only French so that his life will be much happier.

In the eighteenth century foreign travel by Russians also grew less restricted than before, and in the second half of the century the concept of “the Grand Tour” was embraced by the Russian aristocracy. Naturally, the itinerary included France and Paris and knowledge of French was necessary in order to enjoy and participate in the cultural life of France as well as in other European nations.

The knowledge of foreign (particularly French and German) culture became both desirable and prestigious thanks to their popularity at court (Rogger, 46-47). Clearly, proficiency in French in particular, offered an individual great social and intellectual advantage. French language and culture occupied the dominant position in the Russian court and society and French served as an international lingua franca for European intellectuals. Catherine II corresponded with the French philosophes in their language. French remained an important second (or sometimes first) language for the Russian aristocracy through the nineteenth century. As Chatskii notes in Act Three of Griboedov’s Gore ot uma (1824), a French visitor to Moscow feels at home: “Ni zvuka russkogo, ni russkogo litsa/ne vstretil: budto by v otechestve, s druz’iami.”

One important consequence of the increased awareness of foreign culture was a growing concern with Western-style politeness. This is likewise reflected in the plays, which, for all that they satirized the rampant Gallomania affecting Russia, also attempted to inculcate Western-style bon ton. According to Lukin, who translated many Western

---

16 See Berelowitch’s article for a discussion of the role of the “Grand Tour” for the Russian nobility.

European plays, "It is more important to correct manners than to display the beauties and power of the foreign author" (quoted in Welsh, 18). Another sphere in which this preoccupation with Western manners is reflected is in the production of guides to etiquette. These successors to *lunosti* are discussed below.

One manifestation of the desire to flaunt this newly acquired *bon ton* was the intense interest in learning foreign languages. Foreign language acquisition was a cornerstone of children's education (Lotman 1983, 42 & 54). Paradoxically, this concern for manners and foreign languages could lead to an increased sense of national pride and cultivation of 'polite' Russian. Although the playwrights depicted many negative Russian characters who are unable to speak Russian or French well, the positive characters and heroes are invariably patriotic Russians who know how to speak their native language properly. These characters also had a basis in reality. N. Khovenom, a Danish traveller to Russia in the 1730s, encountered both the Gallomane Princess Kurakina, a stereotype fit for any satire with her mixed Russian and French speech and her extravagant behavior, and the "willed and conscious Russianness" of Prince Cherkasski and his wife, who preferred speaking Russian to French, expected foreign visitors to be able to do the same, and used the simple device of a domestically produced, yet fashionable straw hat to demonstrate that Russians had no need for foreign imports (Rogger, 50-1; Miliukov 3: 361-62).

During Catherine II's reign (1762-96), the Russian nobility began to link its identity as the class with the use of the Russian literary language (Jones, 293-8). The use of language as a marker of class was not unique to Russia; Jones cites several English sources from the eighteenth century which also relate proper and refined

---

18 See Welsh, 95 and 104 and Jones, 296-97.
language with the ruling class. The nobility’s identification with the Russian language
was just one manifestation of a growing sense of Russian nationalism and patriotism
which signalled the decline of French influence in Russian society and a renewed sense
of national pride in Russian institutions and ways. A growing sense of self-confidence
of the Russian elite may have also allowed them to identify with the use of the
vernacular just as the French elite communicated in their own vernacular, thus the
increased use of Russian may have also been another way of imitating the French elite.

Dramatists were also active in promoting the use of Russian, again painting
those characters who spoke Russian as patriots and those who preferred French as
defective (Welsh, 51). Fonvizin’s plays are prime examples of this tendency, with the
patriotic Starodum of Nedorosl’ and the French-infatuated Ivan of Brigadir. Characters
could be clearly identified by the type of language that they spoke; heroes spoke with
elevated, sometimes stilted Russian, and the Francophiles by their “affected Franco-
Russian jargon” (95). Lukin, an important translator and transformer of French plays
for the Russian stage, made the most adjustments in his translations, going further than
most of his contemporaries, not only translating the words into Russian, but also
placing the plays in Russian settings and using Russian realia (15-16, 95).

2.2.3 New Behavioral Patterns.

A different model of Western behavior was available in the new genre of
etiquette manuals. They became increasingly available in the course of the eighteenth
century. These behavior guides played a particularly important role because the social
changes, such as the new socialization styles, were not organic; i.e. they were the result
of reforms and external influence rather than a gradual evolution. The changes embraced

---

19 See also Wachtel 1990, 126-27.
not only (1) "ordinary, everyday, customary social behavior which members consider ‘natural’; the only possible, normal behavior;” but also (2) “All types of ceremonial, ritual, nonpragmatic behavior. This category includes state ceremonies, religious cults and rites, and all those activities that ‘native speakers’ of a culture perceive as having an independent meaning” (Lotman 1985, 68). Whereas the first type of behavior is learned unconsciously and by everyday contact and observation much as people learn their native language, the second type of behavior is learned much as people learn a foreign language “with rules and grammar books”– hence the etiquette manual; this second type of behavior requires conscious effort and a teacher. Lotman argues that these two categories were enmeshed in the eighteenth century:

Starting with the reign of Peter the Great, the Russian nobility underwent a change far more profound than a simple shift in the customary social order. The area of subconscious, “natural” behavior became a sphere in which teaching was needed. Instructions were issued regarding the norms of social behavior, since the entire previously existing structure had been rejected as incorrect and replaced by “correct” European rules (Lotman 1985, 68-9).

Lotman notes that the changes in cultural life for the Russian nobility in the eighteenth century were so great that the transformation did not follow the normal rules of cultural change. The result according to Lotman, was that Russians felt like strangers in their own land and had to learn foreign ways to deal with everyday Russian situations. Unlike many observers of eighteenth-century Russian life, Lotman does not see this situation as a Europeanization; rather, he suggests that in the transplanting of European norms of behavior and making them the “normal means of social interaction” for Russians there was a change of function. The patterns of behavior that were normal and not regarded as anything valuable in themselves in Western Europe achieved an elevated status when acquired in Russia by Russians. For example knowledge of French raised one’s social status in Russia though knowledge of French in France, naturally, was perfectly normal and common. The French that Russians should learn was the
language of the French elite, and it was only the Russian elite who were learning it. However, Lotman fails to examine the situations of the elite in other societies which borrowed from the French, such as in Germany and England in order to establish the uniqueness of the Russian situation.

Already in 1717 the etiquette guide *Lunosti chestnoe zertsalo* emphasizes this idea, by saying that those who have not been abroad should be very circumspect in their behavior and try to learn from those who have been abroad; the latter are advised to keep up what they learned and try to act like foreigners. The foreign, learned behaviors were played out against a background of "natural", Russian behaviors. A behavior style was created that resulted from a mix of behavioral codes and there was a "the creation of styles within the framework of everyday norms. This process was expressed in part as the development of behavioral styles appropriate to specific geographical locations" (Lotman, 74). So behavior that was appropriate to the salons of St. Petersburg could differ from behavior on the estate or while touring Western Europe. The behavior was geared towards social as well as geographical criteria. These behavioral styles eventually resulted in a system of behavioral genres which characterized the behavior of the Russian nobility.

2.3 Education in Russia.

As noted above, the changes in Russian social behavior were part of a larger process of social and cultural change. Increased access to education and greater demands for improved and appropriate curricula occurred throughout the eighteenth century. The Russian educational program expanded considerably, from very limited offerings to a much broader system at century's end (though it continued to fall far short of a
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20 Wachtel also notes that even in the nineteenth century having foreign tutors to teach the young children languages assured that only the elite spoke French with French accents (127).
Language learning remained a central part of the curriculum, for the elite social classes. The books on proper deportment were linked with language study. Other texts were developed for use in the schools. In this section I wish to examine the educational system in Russia and how language-learning needs were met and where the conversation books were used.

2.3.1 A Brief History.

Before the eighteenth century, Russia had no systematized school programs. The little formal schooling that was available was either through the church (and often on a very low level) or from private tutors, who were usually beyond the means of all but the wealthy. The seventeenth century saw the establishment of two institutions which influenced or served as the first state supported educational centers of any significance. The Kiev Academy was founded by Peter Mogila (Mohyla) as the Lavra School in 1631, for the instruction of Greek, Latin, and Slavonic and for the defense of Eastern Orthodoxy, “to combat the increasing influence of the Jesuits” (Johnson, 21). Ukraine was not under part of Russia at the time (it was part of the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth), but it was an important source of scholars, influence, and inspiration for the coming educational “boom” in Russia. At the time the school was founded, the “Orthodox Poles were coming under ever greater pressure to convert to Catholicism or the Uniate faith. They competed by imitating. The curriculum, administrative procedures, and rules for Ukrainian schools” both Orthodox and Jesuit were almost indistinguishable (Hughes, 300). Latin was the language of instruction and conversation among the pupils. In its heyday the school had an average of 200 pupils and four to eight teachers each year (Johnson, 21).
The second educational institution, the Slavonic-Greek Academy, was founded in Moscow in 1687 by Simeon Polotskii, who had been the tutor to Tsar Alexis' two oldest sons and his daughter, the future regent Sofia. Although Patriarch Joachim had originally drawn up guidelines for the Academy in 1682 which included prohibitions on foreign-language instruction (with Greek exempted, presumably because it was Orthodox) and on the possession of foreign books, Peter changed the focus of the school when he took it over in 1700 or 1701 and converted it to a Latin school modeled after the Kiev Academy (Johnson, 23-5, Hughes, 300). The school eventually had enrollments rivaling the Kiev Academy, but it could not compete with the resources of the older institution.

The opening of these two academies represented the first efforts to introduce Western educational values into East Slavic lands. Peter I continued the process with the establishment of a number of institutions, many of which were designed to train students in the technical and scientific skills required by the new technologies that were being imported from the West.

While Peter is generally credited with promoting only technical and vocational training, his reforms in education were not in fact one-sided as is evidenced by the reform of the clerical educational institutions (Hans, 7-8 and Hughes, 308). Peter (like Catherine II later in the century) recognized “that education was a key that could unlock Russian potential, and that there was no place for wounded national pride” (Hughes, 299), as may be seen from his establishment of the Academy of Sciences with its academicians imported from Western Europe.

Education in Peter’s time was not completely secularly run; the church served as a partner in education, running grammar schools. Peter found an able aide in Feofan
Prokopovich, a graduate of the Kiev Academy who, among a number of other roles was charged with the education of new clergy.

The period between Peter I's and Catherine II's reigns was a time of mixed progress on the educational front. On the one hand neither Anna or Elizabeth had any systematized programs for education; but on the other hand some important advances were made such as the establishment of the Russian Cadet Corps in 1731 and most importantly the founding of Moscow University in 1755. The academy offered a secular course of study to prepare its pupils for military and civil service. These pupils were the sons of the nobility. The school's curriculum offered a contrast to the traditional classical model of the Kiev and Moscow Academies; in addition to modern languages (rather than Latin) and mathematics and science (instead of philosophical and philological sciences), the curriculum included a social program – dancing, music, riding, and fencing. Notable graduates included the writers Aleksandr Sumarokov, Mikhail Kheraskov, and Ivan Elagin.  

Moscow University was founded by Lomonosov in 1755 during Elizabeth's reign. But it was only in 1760 that there were Russians (graduates of the Academy gymnasium) who were adequately prepared to enter the university, mainly due to the Latin requirement (Black 1977, 45). Latin, French, and German were the languages of instruction at the university (Johnson, 41). Thus in the University, as in the Cadet Corps, knowledge of foreign languages formed a central part of the educational programs.

---

21 See Hans, ch. 1 and Johnson, ch. 3 for more detailed discussions.

22 Okenfuss (1995) argues that Latin literacy was more widespread (116, 166-67).
2.3.2 Policy and Practice under Catherine II.

Catherine II, as the first Russian ruler after Peter I with an educational agenda, attempted to establish and implement a centralized national policy. Catherine's interests are reflected in her textbook *(On the Duties of Man and Citizen)* and her instructions for the education and upbringing of her grandsons.\(^{23}\) Her program was not limited to the nobility, but was intended to reach various levels of society in all parts of Russia. Nevertheless, the social classes were separated and had different curricula; each class was to receive an education considered appropriate for its station and needs. Thus foreign language training was part of the curriculum of the nobility and the clergy, but not for other classes.\(^{24}\)

Like Peter, Catherine consulted with Westerners on education, though she did not always take their advice. The French *philosophe* Denis Diderot came to Russia in 1773 and drafted a plan *(Plan d'une universite pour la Russie)*; however, Catherine ignored much of his advice and continued on her own (Johnson, 46-7). Catherine also received advice from the Austrian Emperor Joseph II through Theodor Jankovich de Mirievo, a Serb who had experience in school systems of the Hapsburg empire, but first she turned to a Russian advisor, Ivan Betskoi.

2.3.2.1 Betskoi.

Catherine's first aide for educational policy and practice was the Russian Ivan Ivanovich Betskoi, who shared many of her ideas regarding education in which the teaching of virtue was the primary goal. Both had been influenced in their thoughts on

\(^{23}\) *On the Duties of Man and Citizen* in Black, 1979 and *Sobstvennоручны inменноi ukaz I nastavljenie Imperatrity Ekateriny II, Generalu-Anshefu Nikolaui Ivanovichu Saltykovu o vospitanii velikih kniaziei Aleskandra I Konstantina Pavlovichei*, excerpts in Epp, 199-202. The latter document was clearly influenced by Locke's *Some Thoughts concerning Education* (1693).

\(^{24}\) See Freeze 1977 for a description of the new seminaries in the eighteenth century.
education by figures such as Montaigne, Comenius, Locke, Fenelon, and Voltaire. Having spent much time abroad, particularly in Paris, Betskoi was imbued with the progressive spirit of the Enlightenment and, together with Catherine, "shared...[a] faith in the power of education to mold a new humanity" (Ransel, 329). In this vision, education was not limited to academics, but also included physical and moral training. By acquiring a firm moral grounding, young people would grow into model citizens of the state and therefore be best able to serve the state in a variety of capacities. Rote learning and memorization were dispensed with in Catherine's and Betskoi's program in favor of engaging the students with real objects (a very current approach today as well). Corporal punishment was prohibited in the schools.

The moral training that Betskoi emphasized fit in well with Catherine's own ideas and goals for the nation and the role of education. Together they founded several schools in the early years of Catherine's reign, all located in St. Petersburg: the School of Arts and Science at the Artillery and Engineering Corps (1762), the Imperial Educational Institution and Hospital for Orphans (1764), and the Boarding School at the Academy of Arts (1764). Betskoi advocated education for girls; hence he was instrumental in the establishing of the School for Noble Girls, better known as Smolny (1764), and the School for Common Girls (1765) (Epp, 164). Betskoi was also responsible for overhauling the program at the Cadet Corps in 1766. He later founded a second educational orphanage in Moscow. The foundling homes were designed to educate these orphan children, unwanted and abandoned, in order to prepare them for life as free citizens. He was also involved in the establishment of a school for the merchant class in the 1770's.

---

25 See Black 1979, Epp, Tolstoy, 1, Raeff 73, 42-3
The result of Betskoi's program was a very structured curriculum. This might seem contradictory to the teaching philosophy he favored, but was necessary in an institutional setting with many students such as Smolny or the Cadet Corps. The program began with the early removal of the child from the home to school at age 5 or 6. Girls remained at Smolny to the age of 18, and boys at the Cadet Corps until age 21.

Betskoi felt it necessary to isolate the children from the ignorant and corrupting influence of parents, uneducated tutors, and serfs. While Betskoi sought to create a new man of the Enlightenment era, he did so within the existing class system.

The educational structure he erected conformed to the established estate division, with separate schools for noble boys and girls, merchants, commoners, and foundlings, each designed with the expressed objective of filling out the given social hierarchy. (Ransel, 338)

Catherine and Betskoi had planned the establishment of primary schools throughout the empire to begin teaching children at a young age so that they could be properly shaped for future service and citizenship. However, even though many schools were established, Catherine and Betskoi fell short of their goals. The populace at all levels was resistant to sending their children to the schools (Hughes, 303-5); even among the nobility, the usefulness of education was slow to be valued (Black 1979, 103 & 166). The lack of students and qualified teachers severely hampered the implementation of any plan. Moreover, the programs proposed typically suffered from the absence of financial support. The Smolny Institute was fully supported (Epp, 51 & 55), and the orphanages were financially independent of the government, with their income produced by several commercial ventures which they were licensed to operate. (Epp 46). However, most public schools received little from the state, and local communities were uneven in the support they provided the schools. The situation did not improve under Catherine; the public schools for commoners received only a fraction of what the schools for the nobility received (Black 1979, 145-6). Betskoi worked with
Catherine on meeting the educational needs of the nation during the first years of her reign; but she continued to look for assistance, particularly from Westerners, to expand the system, and eventually Betskoi retired from the scene.

2.3.2.2 Jankovich de Mirievo.

For the task of expanding the public schools, Catherine turned to her new associate, Jankovich de Mirievo, who had the experience from his Austrian career to create a plan for a system of state schools. In 1782 Catherine made Jankovich the Director of Russian Schools and a member of the Commission for the Establishment of Public Schools (Black 1979, 132). The Commission conducted studies of Smolny and the Cadet Corps in 1783 and, based on their findings, recommended a number of improvements. Jankovich quickly drafted a plan for the improvement of the existing schools.

Jankovich’s contributions to the Russian educational systems included the commissioning of translations of Western, particularly Austrian, textbooks and teaching guides. Previous efforts to offer schooling to a broader population had continually been hampered by the lack of qualified Russian-speaking teachers. In addition, Jankovich introduced a new concept of methodology, which largely undid Betskoi’s educational philosophy. Where Betskoi sought to have children learn by individually exploring, Jankovich strove to provide a uniform learning experience for all students. He advocated the teaching approach developed by Augustinian abbot Johann Ignaz von Gelbiger for the Austrian school system, which included uniform textbooks, teaching the same subject to a large number of students at one time, students reading aloud in choruses, memorization, and mnemonic devices (de Madariaga, 383).
Jankovich was charged by Catherine with creating a public system for the common population. He adapted the Austrian plan and developed a system for Russia calling for Major and Minor schools to be established throughout the empire. The Major schools were to be established in cities and large towns, the Minor schools in smaller towns and villages. The Major schools were designed to train teachers for the Minor schools. The curriculum at these schools was limited to basic skills: reading, writing, arithmetic, some Russian grammar, and some religious training. The schools were open to anyone who could reach a school regardless of social class. There was no charge for tuition, and books were to be provided at no cost to poor families. While many of these schools were established, they remained underfunded and often underused. The schools were under the control of local boards and their success or failure was often dependent upon the interest of the local administrators.

2.3.3 Language Instruction and Methodology.

Having acquired the desire to learn foreign languages, Russians now had to learn them. Foreign-language acquisition was generally limited to the nobility. Both boys and girls were taught; it was thought that both genders could benefit from the social advantages that foreign-language proficiency could bring – the boys to aid their careers at court and abroad, and the girls because as future mothers they would be the first educators of their sons. Some women also had official positions at court and needed foreign language skills.

The actual learning of foreign languages could be more difficult than simply the learning the mechanics of grammar or practicing conversation. The private tutors who

26 See Black 1979, 146-151 for the more detailed discussion which informs this section. Also Epp, Ch. IV.

were frequently the first instructors that a child would have besides the mother were often incompetent. While they advertised themselves as language tutors in Russia, many came from undesirable backgrounds with no training or experience in pedagogy; some were not even the native French speakers that they claimed to be. In his *Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow*, Radishchev includes a story about an illiterate Frenchman who succeeded in masquerading as a tutor for a year before his discovery. Likewise, Fonvizin has a similar character in his play, *Nedorosl'*, and Pushkin included a similar character in the opening chapter of *Kapitanskaia Dochka*, perhaps in a veiled tribute to Radishchev's work (Thaler, 211).28

However, poor teaching was not limited to private tutoring. Records of the Imperial Academy of Sciences from 1739 note the dearth of Russian books, inadequate knowledge of Russian, and the problem of students needing to learn Latin before being able to progress on to other subjects29 Paradoxically, the interest in foreign language acquisition also adversely affected the instruction of Russian and other subjects; low enrollments in Russian-language classes only aggravated the shortage of qualified Russians to serve as teachers and to continue their studies at the university. In 1733 only 18 of 245 cadets at the Cadet Corps were enrolled in Russian classes, while 51 were enrolled in French and 237 in German (D. Tolstoy, 37). Fifty years later, in 1783, Jankovich reported that at the Smolny Institute all language instruction was poor, even in Russian; in addition, there was still a deficit of reading materials and textbooks, especially in Russian (Maikov, 288). Jankovich also noted that much instruction there was done in French even though most students did not sufficiently understand it, and

28 See also Lotman, 1983, 44.

29 "Weil die meisten von den russischen scholaren entweder gar nichts, oder sehr schlecht russisch schreiben..." *Materialy dlja istorii Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk*. vol. 4 (1739-1741), 19. See also C. D. Buck esp. 198-204.
that French and German were taught by the same teachers, who did not even know them well (288). Among his recommendations for improving teaching was that a teacher who knew Russian well should be hired to converse with the students and correct them (289).

This deplorable situation also existed at the university level. Lectures at Moscow University were delivered in Latin or, to a lesser extent, French (D. Tolstoy, 47). Most professors were foreign and did not learn Russian, thus they lectured in Latin, the language of scholarship in Western Europe or their native language. Special provisions had to be made for students who were not skilled enough in Latin to follow the lectures. French was used for other official university functions such as conference protocols and official speeches.

Among the critics of the use of foreign languages in instruction was the poet Aleksandr Sumarokov, a graduate of the Cadet Corps and founder of the Society of Lovers of Russian Literature, which influenced many future literary figures who passed through the Cadet Corps (Black 1979, 47-48). Sumarokov wished to introduce into Russian letters the European traditions and genres of literature to which he had been exposed as a student at the Cadet Corps with its Western-oriented curriculum. He saw the western literary tradition as a source of inspiration for the creation of a new Russian literature. Thus, his criticism can be seen as part of the general movement of the time to develop the potentials of the Russian literary language in the face of encroaching Gallomania.

Records from the Academy of Sciences in the 1740s document the efforts to use Russian as a language of teaching and scholarship within the Academy and its gimnaziia. The main function of the gimnaziia eventually became language study (C.
Locating qualified Slavic speakers with training in the sciences proved difficult, as the Slavic languages were not yet established in the worlds of science and scholarship. Nonetheless, the Academy continued in its efforts to promote Russian, banning the use of French and German for instruction, and allowing only Russian and Latin (202). The path to an institution-wide use of Russian was a difficult one, and in 1749 Razumovskii, president of the Academy of Sciences was petitioned to allow instruction of Latin “as in the past” (presumably meaning with instruction in German by a German teacher) since there was no Russian-speaking teacher available (203).

Even though the institutional foundation for Russian teaching was shaky, both Betskoi and Jankovich valued the students' knowledge of Russian. In *Les Plans and les statuts, des différents établissements ordonnés par speech sa M. I. Catherine II: pour l'éducation de la jeunesse et l'utilite générale de son empire* (Les Plans), Betskoi wrote that Russian was “la premier des langues que les Eleves Russes doivent parler & ecrire correctement” (2: Table One). Yet while Betskoi called Russian the most important language, his curriculum for the Cadet Corps devotes almost four times as much class time to French language instruction in the first year as it does to Russian (2: Table One). As already noted, instruction was conducted in French until the mid 1780's; as a result, students still had to learn a foreign language before being able to tackle other subjects effectively. Betskoi did not appear to have planned that French be the main language of instruction; rather it seems to have evolved out of necessity due to the shortage of qualified teachers. In *Les Plans*, he writes as if Russian is the language of instruction and makes the following recommendation on the practice of foreign languages:

*Comme la langue Françoise est après la Russe celle qu'il importe le plus aux Eleves de savoir à fond, on ne sauroit trop la leur rendre familiere; & comme*

---

30 French translation of some of Betskoi’s works that was printed in Amsterdam in 1775 to advertise Catherine’s policies to the West.
As noted above, Jankovich, Betskoi's successor, was disturbed by the low level of Russian among the students and made recommendations to improve it. In the curriculum of the Major and Minor schools which he developed, Russian was taught, but French was dropped, evidently because it was thought that those who needed French lessons could afford independent tutorials (de Madariaga, 385). However, the absence of French made the national schools less attractive to the provincial nobility, who preferred to send their children to the prestigious Cadet Corps or to private boarding schools.31

The language curriculum and program goals of the Lycée at Tsarskoe Selo, established in 1811 for the sons of the nobility, were similar to the earlier programs discussed above. Language study was highly valued at the Lycée; students had lessons in Latin and Russian from an early age as the basis of philological study. German and French were also important subjects, particularly for the academic study of ethics (нравственности), government, and "good order" (благоустройство) (Kobeko, 97). Oral proficiency was not forgotten, and many students reached high levels. The study of Slavonic was considered important for philological, patriotic, and religious reasons. Betskoi made a similar observation in Les Plans (2: 137).

2.4 Book Publishing in Eighteenth-Century Russia.

An essential ingredient of any educational program is textbooks. Meeting the need for Russian-language books was one of the primary missions of the Academy of

---

31 This situation was part of the larger problem that the national schools faced. The merchant class also failed to attend the schools in the numbers hoped for; the utility of the education provided was not recognized, since it was felt that government employment only required legible handwriting (De Madariaga, 392). The merchant class, like the nobility, rejected the schools for what they taught or failed to teach, not necessarily for the institutions in themselves (393).
Sciences. Other presses also produced books for the educational market. The growth of the book trade was tied to the general expansion of Russian intellectual life.

The publishing field was yet one more facet of Russian life that changed profoundly in the course of the eighteenth century. Up until Peter I's reign the few existing presses were controlled by the church. The total number of works published in Russia up to Peter's time was very small, and the overwhelming majority of titles were religious in nature. Peter changed the situation initially by contracting for the production of Russian books in Amsterdam, and then by founding several institutional presses, such as the Senate presses in Moscow and St. Petersburg and the St. Petersburg press, which served as a government organ (Marker 1985, 21). He established a Department of Printing to control all presses. Peter used the presses to circulate whatever information he felt was important to whichever audience he felt should read it (23). As a result, legal and official documents account for the majority of publications during his reign. Academic and literary titles formed only small portions of the published works during this period. After Peter's death the situation was reversed for some time, as his successors limited the number of the presses. Government support for printing, both financial and moral, was reduced drastically.

2.4.1 The Academy of Sciences and its Press.

The Academy of Sciences Press was able to survive and become the single most important press for the period prior to Catherine II. It achieved this position by virtue of being allowed to operate with little editorial interference and due to the support that several key figures at court gave to the continued existence of the Academy, despite the

32 "...these presses printed collectively fewer than 500 titles during the entire seventeenth century...", Marker 1985, 19. For a complete discussion of publishing and books in eighteenth century Russia see Gary Marker's book, Publishing, Printing and the Origins of Intellectual Life in Russia which informs this discussion.
financial burden it placed on the state (47). The Press recognized its ability to mold the Russian literary market (58). By the 1750s it was focusing on producing Russian texts that would be financially successful; this strategy meant primarily translations of Western Europe works.

The Imperial Academy of Sciences was one of Peter I's final accomplishments. He corresponded with the German philosophers Gottfried von Leibniz and Christian Wolff regarding its formation and its importance for the arts and sciences in Russia. Peter envisioned the Academy as a means to both spread the arts and sciences among Russians and also as a way to develop the potential of Russia in these areas so that it could assume its rightful place among nations (Hughes, 307-8, also C. Buck, 188). However, Peter did not survive to see the Academy of Sciences inaugurated. After his death his widow and successor, Catherine I saw to its opening in 1726.

The first academicians were all foreigners; most were German. These scholars, assembled from abroad, were to continue their own scholarly work in Russia as well as train the first Russian scholars (C. Buck, 188). The men involved were more enthusiastic about the former assignment than the latter. Few took the trouble to learn Russian, and Latin and German were the most common languages in use at the Academy.33

The Academy of Sciences press played a key role in intellectual life in Russian at the time. The primary outlet for the Academy’s work, scientific and linguistic, was the Academy of Sciences press which began printing in 1727 (Marker, 44). “For long periods in the eighteenth century its publications were the most important vehicle for the wide dissemination of general knowledge and cultural interest” (Raeff 1973, 31-32).

33 See C. Buck for a detailed discussion of the languages used at the Academy as well as how the Russian language question was treated at the Academy of Sciences during the eighteenth century.
Marker makes the same point and relates the Academy's success with the success of the Academy of Sciences press (45). The Academy's scholars were able to publish relatively freely, with any obstacles to printing being internal to the Academy rather than any external censorship.

2.4.1.1 Translators at the Academy of Sciences.

The language barrier that existed between the Academy and the Russian public (i.e. Russian was not the primary language in which Academy affairs were conducted) made the Academy seem remote from Russian life early in its existence, but eventually it did take on a leading role (47). Although Russian was not used in any official capacity at the Academy of Sciences, the development of the Russian national language to a level where it could function for such purposes was an undertaking that occupied the Academy and many connected with it for much of the eighteenth century (C. Buck, 187-88). The gap between the Academy of Sciences and the nation was bridged by the Academy's translators, who were the link between Western literature and the Russian reading public.\(^{34}\) In the time before Russians played a larger role in the scientific endeavors of the Academy, the translators were important contributors to the inventory of the Academy of Sciences Press. While some translators such Vasilii Adodurov and Vasilii Trediakovskii are familiar names in Russian literary history, many translators were otherwise unknown figures. The translators were aware of the significance of their work, and in 1735 they formed the Russian Conference (Rossiiskoe Sobranie), which meet regularly to discuss translations. They were to “strive for the perfection of the Russian language in the translation encountered” (Suxomlinov, II: 633 quoted in C. Buck, 212). In 1736, Sergei Volchkov, an Academy translator named as secretary to the

\(^{34}\) See Marker, ch. 2, esp. 50-58 and C. Buck for discussions of the role of translators within the Academy.
Russian Conference, was told “to make every possible effort for the improvement of the Russian vocabulary and for the perfection [of translations]” (Suxomlinov, III: 34 quoted in C. Buck, 212)

The Russian Conference was only active until 1743; Lomonosov felt in 1747 that it should be reinstated as the demand for books grew. It had a successor organ in the Historical Conference (Istoricheskoe Sobranie), which began reviewing translations that were submitted to the Academy for publication in 1747. The task of the Historical Conference differed somewhat from that of the Russian Conference. It was no longer a group of translators discussing their work, but rather they were “applying established standards to works coming to the Academy from outside” (C. Buck, 214). In 1767, a similar arrangement had to be resumed when some former translators were recalled for such work (C. Buck, 214). In directions to the same Volchkov regarding one of his translations, the Academy writes that it “makes particular efforts in this area when books are printed in its name” (Suxomlinov, X: 484 quoted in C. Buck, 214). The Academy had come to see that it had a role as shaper of the language and a responsibility as keeper of the language for setting and maintaining standards (C. Buck, 215).

Translators had an important role in the decisions about style and usage. The standards of what should constitute proper literary Russian were still being debated and worked out by both translators and writers composing in Russian. While the literary figures of the time such as Trediakovsky and Lomonosov were chiefly concerned with matters of lexicon, syntax, and morphology, the pragmatics of the language were also being decided upon, albeit unconsciously, as literary and linguistic choices were made. The debates about language and translation and the place of Russian among Latin and modern Western European languages were part of the larger discovery and discussion of the emerging sense of the Russian national consciousness.
Translators also influenced the output of the press in a different way. They sought out books to translate which would sell well and then demand commensurate compensation from it for providing financially successful books for the Press to market. It follows that the books chosen for translation were then expected to be strong sellers.

2.4.2 Other Presses: Academic and Private.

The Academy of Sciences press was joined over the next twenty years by several other presses with academic connections. Several of the elite schools, including the Naval Corps, Moscow University, the Cadet Corps, and the Artillery and Engineering Corps opened presses. “In the period between 1755 and 1775 these scholastic presses, along with the Academy of Sciences Press, dominated Russian publishing, accounting for about three-quarters of all published books” (Marker 1985, 76-77). Like the Academy of Sciences Press, these presses originally functioned to serve the needs of their parent institutions, but over time they sought patronage and took on other sources for publications, many of which were aimed at the popular book trade (77-78). As a result these presses turned out a wide variety of titles.

The academic presses soon had to share the market with private presses. In the 1770s private presses were allowed to print books for the first time since 1708. After Catherine II allowed private individuals the right to own and operate presses without special governmental permission in 1783, the number of presses and publications grew rapidly (Marker 1985, 105).

The most prominent figure in publishing during the 1770s and 1780s was Nikolai Novikov. He published several journals, leased the Moscow University press (1779), and owned a second press, the Typographical Company (1785). He pioneered the sales, promotion, and distribution of books to the broadest possible market in
Russia. At one point of his publishing career he was behind the publication of more than one third of all Russian language books (Marker 1985, 106). Novikov promoted Russian education in his publications and in his other activities. He helped open two charitable schools for the poor in Moscow and subsidized them through his publishing income. As a Mason, he advocated early moral education; however, his Masonic connections eventually led to his falling into disfavor with Catherine II, and he was arrested in 1792. Nevertheless, while he was publishing he was the single largest presence in Russian publishing.

Novikov used publishing as a means to promote his own social agenda, and he was joined by other intellectuals including Andrei Reshetnikov and Semen Selianovskii who shared his vision of using the press to educate and develop the Russian populace. Most Russian presses, though, were operated by men who had training and experience in printing and the book trade. Many of these men were the foreigners, mostly Germans by birth or ancestry, who came to Russia to have successful careers in the new book market. Only one, Bernhard Breitkopf had a meaningful career in Germany; others such as Johann Schnoor, Christopher Claudia, and Johann Weitbrecht came from more modest beginnings (Marker 1985, 110). Many press owners engaged in the book trade, and the number of booksellers in the two capitals also grew rapidly in this period, from about a dozen or so in the mid-1770s to more than fifty in the 1790s (164).

2.5 Conversation Books.

The books that are the focus of the current study, conversation books, fall into two parts of the new book market. They were language textbooks, but (like the related genre of behavior guides) they were also handbooks on social behavior. The
conversation books, however, were most explicitly language textbooks, and it is this aspect which is examined below.

Substantial numbers of textbooks were printed and circulated in the last decades of the eighteenth century. Each student was supposed to have his own textbooks, so with the expansion of education came the expansion of book consumption, at least of textbooks (Marker 1985, 193-94). Language books, especially Russian books, were popular and the most important ones went through many editions with large print runs; for example Lomonosov’s Russian Grammar (1755) was published by the Academy of Sciences Press seven times with print runs of up to 2500 by the end of the century (195). Demand for these books extended beyond the schools into the public market. A number of booksellers stocked and advertised language books (196). While exact figures are unavailable, the numbers of editions indicates a sizable market.

The market for foreign language texts also grew, but it remained limited (Marker 1985, 196). Nevertheless, the Academy of Sciences Press had large print runs (1000-1800 copies) of foreign language grammars, and many different French language textbooks were printed during Catherine’s reign (196). Interest in German textbooks also remained high during Catherine’s reign (197). Still Russian language books outsold all foreign language titles.

2.5.1 A Brief History of the Genre.

The texts examined in this dissertation are called razgovory in Russian, and which I am translating into English as ‘conversation books.’ The Slovar’ Sovremennogo Russkogo Literarurnogo Jazyka (Dictionary of the Modern Russian Literary Language) published by the Academy of Sciences includes the following in the definition for razgovor - “3. plural only, archaic, the same as razgovornik” (12: 237,
translated mine). *Razgovornik* is defined as “textbook for the study of a foreign
language, containing models of conversations on various everyday topics” (12: 237,
translated mine). *Razgovory* are rendered as *dialogues* in French and *Gespräche* or
*Gesprächsbuch* in German.

The conversation books examined in this study are generally structured as
dialogues, often brief – from one to three pages, of two or more speakers. The books
were printed in parallel columns (up to four) of Russian and the other language or
languages, usually French, German, and Latin. These books were intended for
Russians studying foreign languages. The books discussed in this work are all for
advanced learners; they do not provide any information on grammar or pronunciation.

2.5.2 The Dialogue as Pedagogical Tool.

The dialogue form has been used as an pedagogical tool since the ancient
Greeks, Plato being the most famous early composer of dialogues in his writings. The
Greeks used dialogues to make philosophical arguments easier for the reader to
comprehend. The inductive method of teaching used by Socrates was also adopted by
the Romans. “St. Augustine popularized dialogue methods of teaching, making the
pupil’s role in the dialogue part of the act of discovery” (Kelly, 35).

Dialogues have served multiple purposes since the Middle Ages. The term
‘dialogue’ carries a broad array of meanings; Virginia Cox in her book on the
Renaissance dialogue in Italy states that

a dialogue may be anything from a language-teaching primer to a comic verse
exchange between animals; anything from a primitive catechism to a Ciceronian
debate on the immortality of the soul. It may be safe to venture a definition of the
dialogue as an exchange between two or more voices, but, beyond this
unhelpfully low common denominator, even the most cautious generalizations
are doomed to founder under the weight of the exceptions they create. (2)
In the language-teaching applications, dialogues were known as *colloquia* prior to the eighteenth century. (Kelly, 120). In foreign-language-learning texts, a dialogue generally has the format of interactions between two or more interlocutors. They may consist of running story lines, or they may have many short dialogues where the identity and personality of the speakers is not revealed or developed. Dialogues are used to practice conversational ability and to internalize grammatical knowledge through the active exercise of language skills. The best dialogues and conversation books provide more than just linguistic models; they give a social and cultural context for the exchange. The teacher or author knows that the student must learn “how to express oneself in the manner befitting the circumstances, in a socially and culturally appropriate fashion” (Bonin and Wilburn, 189).

According to Kelly, “the dialogue was in constant use in the language classroom right through the history of language teaching” (120). Several medieval examples of the genre are worth mentioning. Two famous *colloquia* of the Middle Ages were by Aelfric and Alexander of Neckham. Both cover the contemporary life of their historical periods. Dialogue plays a secondary role to exposition in the form of a few questions on a specific topic. The glosses that accompany these texts were probably added by students and not the authors (120).

Dialogues appeared in both single language and bi- or multilingual formats. Kelly notes that dialogues produced for travellers usually had a parallel translation, but the fourteenth-century French language conversation book, *La Manière de langage qui enseigne à parler et à écrire le français*, which is aimed at its century’s version of the English “Grand Tour” market, is entirely in French (Bonin and Wilburn, 189). The intent of this book was to give the prospective traveller models of conversations and situations that he would likely encounter during a trip to France. While the focus was on
language, the nature of the situational dialogues gave the student valuable pragmatic and cultural lessons as well. The language presented was true to the contemporary spoken language and not the preferred literary norm for French (Bonin and Wilburn, 190). The author demonstrates a sophisticated awareness and understanding of pragmatic and sociolinguistic factors, including the role of class in communication and the need to express emotions in the dialogues and situations presented.

The dialogues represented by texts such as La Manière clearly have language learning as the main goal. Another type of dialogue is seen in the Colloquia of Erasmus, the first sanctioned publication of which was in 1522. Erasmus used the dialogue form to prescribe behavior. His first dialogues or colloquia were the Familiarum colloquiorum formulae, which told how to make greetings, express thanks, etc. In 1526, Erasmus published a guide to using the colloquies. The dialogues were written in Latin with clear didactic intentions and often had classical settings. They tended to have a humorous rather than harsh attitude toward the characters. The dialogues were, however, not always very natural in their language, and the behavior shown was not always polite; Erasmus seemed to understand the value of comic relief even in the teaching of proper behavior. Other dialogues attempted to cover language and behavior, such as John Florio’s First Fruits (1578) and Second Fruits (1591), which “tried to school the pupils in social behavior and in graceful conformity to the genius of the language” (Kelly, 121).

The dialogues of sixteenth-century Italy were works of considerable social significance. These books were written in Italian and served as guides to conversation in the social sense rather than strictly language guides. The models of attitude and behavior in these books were more important than the models of speech. Books like Baldassare Castiglione’s Cortegiano (1528) and Stefano Guazzo’s Civil conversazione (1574)
became such influential textbooks of European manners because they answered a social need, a need felt earlier and more keenly in Italy than elsewhere. As Christoph Strosetzki has observed about seventeenth century France, the art of ‘civil conversation’ codified in such books was not simply a ‘jeu de l’esprit’: ‘la théorie de la conversation représente le savior professionnel d’une classe noble qui ... a perdu son pouvoir politique et dès lors ... n’a plus qu’une fonction purement représentative’ (Cox, 24).

These books were particularly important in France, a country whose culture and society subsequently had great influence on European culture and behavior in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These texts prescribed the kind of behavior and, consequently, the kind of speech that were suitable for a member of ‘polite’ society.

A related type of dialogue are the seventeenth-century French books such as Jean Baptiste Morvan de Bellegarde’s *Modèles de conversations pour les personnes polies* (1697) and Madeleine de Scudéry’s books of conversations (1680-92), which are representatives of what cultural historian Peter Burke describes as “a new genre, the treatise or dialogue devoted completely to conversation in the precise sense of the word “ (104). The books recommended topics and behavior to avoid in discussions such as politics and religion. Topics were light; Scudéry recommended “de choses ordinaires et galantes.” Little of import remained acceptable for conversation. Style of speech was as important as topic; direct forms of speech were rejected in favor of circumlocution and euphemism (108). Clearly content had become secondary to the act of conversation itself. What is important in conversation is that all participants allow the form and flow of talk to continue without paying too much attention what is being said or weighing too carefully the value of each contribution (Goldsmith, 12).

Dialogues in all of their forms were frequently published in the West from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries. Many of the texts themselves changed little if
at all. The *Colloquia* of Erasmus and the *Colloquia* of Maturinus Cordierus (1556) continued to be published until the late eighteenth century.

Corderius seems to have been the first author to include vernacular translations in parallel columns. While his Latin textbook included French translations, later pirated versions simply changed the vernacular versions as needed to the appropriate language for a given market (Kelly, 121). This format was very popular and by the eighteenth century had become standard (122). Teachers and authors saw the utility of the parallel texts for the foreign language student.

As they learne these dialogues, when they have construed and parsed, cause them to talk together; uttering every sentence pathetically...and first to utter every sentence in English, as neede is, then in Latin.


In the preface of a 1704 edition of Corderius' *School-Colloquies* in English and Latin, the schoolmaster Charles Hoole writes in a letter to the father of a pupil,

For I remember, your care was to see them over-night to perform their tasks imposed; and amongst other things this was usually enjoyned him, to write out a certain number of the choicest phrases in his Book, and to say them by heart the next day. By which he received a double benefit; first, to be able readily to read and truly to write out our English, and withal to be well acquainted with some elegant and pure Expressions in the Latin tongue.... [A]nd be sure in reading them to make those Expressions their own, both for writing and speaking; because in them they should find Terence and Tullies Elegancies applied to their common talk.... [A]nd teach them how to imitate them; and partly to discover that rich Treasure of Elegancies, which are sometimes involved in particles and single words, as well as gloriously exposed in larger phrases (A 3-A 4).

The use of parallel texts has been the object of some study in modern language pedagogy. Michael Barlow (1996) writes that parallel texts provide "an online contextualised dictionary" which the student can utilize. Barlow adds that what advanced students need more than the mastery of obscure grammatical points is
to deepen their knowledge of words and phrases: to understand not just the main meaning or most common meaning of a word, but to understand a range of meanings and to know how context in terms of discourse and genre provide clues to the appropriate meaning (54).

Parallel texts provide a clear view for the student of the correlations, correspondences and non-correspondences of translations of words and meanings. The student can see which schema can be successfully transferred from the native to the target language in determining correspondences, and he may (create or recognize) the schema in the target language.

Corderius’ *Colloquia* provide models of a well-developed and cultivated level of language that is being translated or transferred from the target language into the native language. This situation speaks to the potential dual nature of conversation books; they could be used to teach a new and foreign language, such as Latin or French, and they could function simultaneously as guides to improving and expanding a student’s command of his native language. Most conversation books were probably written with the more limited goal of teaching a foreign language, but the more ambitious goal of improving the native language could also be exploited.

The conversation books published in Russia in the eighteenth century shared the structure of the *colloquia* of Corderius in that they were short interactions between two or more speakers printed in parallel columns of two or more languages. Since Corderius’ texts were schoolbooks, their content was clearly didactic, not just for language, but for morals and conduct. The Russian texts examined in this study are suitable for a broader audience than schoolchildren; the dialogues deal with everyday matters, social topics and situations.

The works discussed in this study were translations of or imitations of a particular type of dialogue book popular in Western Europe, but the dialogue genre was
not new to Russia. It had been transplanted from Greece centuries earlier as seen in the *Izbornik of 1076*, which contains sections of erotapocritical (question and answer) text. The goal of the *Izbornik* and other texts of early provenance such as the *Beseda trex sviatelei* and *Voproshanie Kirika* was religious edification in an accessible way.

2.5.3 Contemporary Usage of Conversation Books in Eighteenth-century Russia.

The fact that the conversation books were written for Russians to use as textbooks for learning foreign languages has already been noted, as well as the way that patterns of usage from the target language would quite naturally have been transferred to the student’s native language. The parallel columns of texts in the books used in this study are generally very close translations and show relatively little variation between the individual languages. The closeness of the translations reflects the cultural unity portrayed in the dialogues. As Niels Haastrup has noted in his discussion of Western European conversation books (which Haastrup refers to as phrasebooks), although the phrasebooks are designed to prepare young travellers for foreign travel, little, if any, reference is made “to differences of manners among western nations. The fictitious interlocutors often seem to belong to the same speech community” (68). While this pan-European speech community holds in general for the conversation books examined, the Russian books do have some cultural specifics such as the mention of Russian poets and plays, dialogues about the Russian language, and some consideration for the Slavic hosting style (see 4.2.4.4). The conversation books produced in Russia appear to have been mostly translations of books from Western Europe, although tracing their provenance has proved to be difficult. Russians generally are not credited as authors; one Russian author who is credited is Fedor Karzhavin, who wrote several other pedagogical titles. Karzhavin, who was active as a translator in Saint Petersburg,
studied in Paris for many years, travelled to America at the time of the Revolutionary War, and moved in liberal circles in Saint Petersburg.

The value placed on language proficiency by the leading pedagogues in Russia in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries has already been shown. Of the language learning materials available, the conversation books were the most likely to promote oral proficiency. Grammars and lexicons provided some of the basic information needed for learning a language, and the conversation books provided the linguistic and pragmatic models needed to adequately master the language. It is true that some grammars and lexicons sometimes included dialogues, but they were not as extensive as the separate books. Conversation books could be attractive to both student and teacher as textbooks since they tended to reflect actual language usage of the target language. This trait would be particularly valued by learners planning travel abroad. These books could provide the learner with a preview of situations to expect in daily life at their destination.

The phrases are those of the most common occurrence and indispensable use in conversation; and the dialogues represent the various occasions of social intercourse, and the ordinary proceedings of a day from its beginning to its close; particular reference being had to the customs and the manners of Italy.

Kelly, 196 citing Bachi, P. Conversazione italiana, Cambridge, 1835. 67: viii

A passage from Lev Tolstoy’s Detstvo (Childhood) illustrates how conversation books were used as texts for memorization. Tolstoy describes a lesson with the German tutor, Karl Ivanych, for which the boy was to have memorized parts of a “book of dialogues” (po knige dialogov), and he even includes a few lines from a dialogue.35 (Tolstoy’s foreign tutor seems capable in contrast with those depicted by Radishchev and Pushkin.) The scene shows the important role that memorization had in education.

35 The scene is at the beginning of chapter 4, Klasy.
particularly the use of dialogues in second language acquisition. In Russia, memorization has remained a key educational technique into the present era.

2.6 Behavior Guides.

I am using the term ‘behavior guide’ to refer to a genre that is separate from, but related to, the conversation books. Behavior guides tell the reader what is acceptable deportment and generally address a number of topics including society, friendship, marriage, reading, and conversation. Behavior guides sometimes overlap with moral treatises, a quite large genre, which do not limit themselves to social behavior, though this can sometimes be a hazy distinction.

The behavior guides available in Russia at this time tended to make broad statements about proper behavior rather than provide the kind of specific situations seen in the conversation books. In fact, the behavior guides and conversation books have little or no overlap in content. While a typical behavior guide may offer the reader advice such as not to argue about religion, only one of the behavior guides examined offered any concrete examples of turns of speech to use or to avoid (see Chapter 4). Conversation books, on the other hand, are consciously presenting vocabulary and behavior in context.

2.6.1 Western Models and Translations.

As with the conversation books, the behavior guides available in Russia in the eighteenth century were almost universally translations from German or French. In this section I will discuss some of the most important books available in Russia. Importance in this context is based on size and frequency of print runs or on the significance of the author or the press.
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As mentioned earlier, the first book of this genre to appear in Russia in the eighteenth century was the *lunosti chestnoe zertsalo*. It is a compilation from various uncredited authors, possibly including Erasmus. The lack of attribution is a common characteristic of many Russian books published in the eighteenth century, including behavior guides and conversation books.

The Western European preoccupation with behavior from medieval times on has already been discussed (see 2.2.1). Interestingly, the first books which were so influential in shaping Western European manners – those by the Renaissance Italian authors Castiglione, Guazzo, and Della Casa – were not translated into Russian in the eighteenth century, though they continued to be read in Western Europe. There were translations of several books on conduct and social life, some with a clear moral bent, by the seventeenth century French author Bellegarde; however, his conversation guide was not translated. John Locke’s *Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693) was published in 1759 and 1760 in a translation into Russian from French by the Moscow University Press and again in 1788 by Novikov’s Typographical Company (*O Vospitanii Detei*). While these books represented significant, if not groundbreaking contributions to the genre, more commonly the behavior guides sold in Russia were unattributed books that appear to be translations from French or German.

One author who can be identified is August Witzman (Vitsman), who worked in Russia as a pedagogue and publisher after being forced from Leipzig for his involvement in the “revolt” of the Russian students there against their supervisor, Georg von Altenbokum, also known as Major Bokum (*SRP I*: 158-59; Terras, 361). One of the Russian students was Radishchev, who, at the time of his exile, sent his children to attend Witzman’s pension in St. Petersburg (159). Witzman was a prolific author with over 40 titles to his credit. A number of his works were published without any author
listing; many were compilations from German materials, sometimes prepared with the help of a Russian translator (160). They cover a wide range of topics, from a satire of the life of the upper classes to educational titles and moral and behavior guides. The latter include *Obshchiia Pravila Zhizni Blagocestivoi Podarok dla Detei* (*General rules of Honorable Life. A Gift for Children*) (1798), which is printed in parallel columns of French, German, and Russian for language learning and translation study, and *Nastavleniia Poleznyia dlia Slug, kotoryia tak zhe ne budut bezpolezny i dlia samikh khoziaev* (*Useful Instructions for Servants, Which Will Also Not Be without Use for the Masters*) (1799). The latter book, clearly not meant for the servants, few of whom would have been literate, was a product of Witzman's egalitarian and satirical tendencies.

Some books were written specifically for women, such as *Dolzhnosti Zhenskago Polu* (*The Responsibilities of the Female Sex*) (1760 and 1765). This unattributed work was translated from German and printed by the Moscow University Press. Like other behavior guides, this book emphasizes modest and moral behavior. The reader is encouraged not to talk too much, to seek out good company and shun bad company, and to deal with servants firmly but fairly.\(^\text{35}\)

One of the most frequently printed books of this genre was *Druzheskie Soviety molodomu cheloveku nachinaiushchemu zhit' v svietie* (*Friendly Advice to a Young Man Beginning to Live in Society*). It was initially published in 1762 and again in 1770 by the Moscow University Press in a multilingual (French, German, and Russian) edition. It was also published in Russian only in 1765 and 1774. Each of these editions

\(^{35}\) Other titles for women include: *Opyt o vospitanii blagorodnykh devits* (1778), a translation from French by Mikhail Semechevskii, and *Soviety neshchastnyia materi eia docheriam, poleznye dla molodykh devits, vstynaiushchikh v svet: sprisovokupleniem dla zhenskago pola nравочител'nykh basenl* (1788) by Sarah Pennington, translated from English to French and from French to Russian.
was published by the Moscow University Press. In 1781 a fourth edition was published by the Senate Press. It was published in what appears to be a sixth edition in Russian only by Reshetnikov in 1794. A successor title, *Druzheskie Soviety molodomu cheloveku vstupaiushchemu v sviet* (Friendly Advice to A Young Man Entering Society), was published in two bilingual editions in 1788. One was a German-Russian version, the other was a French-Russian version. They appear to be the third edition of *Druzheskie Soviety molodomu cheloveku nachinaiushchemu zhit' v svietie*. The content of this book is broken down into chapters on such topics as religion, career, society, friendship, conversation, solitude, and marriage. The opening section is a personal note from the author relating his hopes and concerns for the reader's future and prospects. Multilingual editions were created for language teaching purposes, not for any marketing reasons; there was virtually no market abroad for Russian-language books (Marker 1985, 176).

*Iskusstvo iavit'sia v sviet s uspekham, pripisannoe Gospodinam Kadetam V. vozrasti* (The Art of being Successful in Society, written for the Gentlemen Cadets of the V. class) (1774) by Nicolas Le Clerc is of interest because of the author and the publisher. The book was published by the Cadet Corps in a French-Russian version and a second edition appeared in 1790. Le Clerc was a professor and member of the Academy of Sciences. The book was written for students at the Cadet Corps, the sons of well-to-do families who would become leaders in government service and the arts. Le Clerc's book is one continuous treatise on behavior, in contrast to the chapter divisions used in *Friendly Advice*.

---

37 Twenty four copies of this edition were confiscated in a Moscow book store in 1787 (*Svodnyi Katalog*, I: 317). According to Marker, the book raids of 1787 by church and police officials were the slightly panicked reaction of Catherine II to the realization of the freedom that the private presses had come to enjoy (225).
The behavior guide that is most interesting for this study is *Nauka byt' uchtivym* (The Science of being Polite), because it offers the reader specific advice on speech behavior. The book was published anonymously in 1774 and 1780 by the Academy of Sciences and again in 1787 by Novikov’s Typographical Company. *Nauka* was published by the Academy of Sciences Press for the Society Striving for the Publication of Books (*Obshchestvo staraiushcheesia o napechtanii kníg*), which was founded by Novikov and the St. Petersburg bookseller, Karl Müller (Marker 1985, 93). It was translated from an anonymous French original by Ivan Kriukov, who translated a number of works for the Society (*Slovar’,* 158; *SK* 2: 285). The first printing had a print run of 600 copies. *Nauka* is written in 52 brief, untitled sections giving advice on behavior. It emphasizes honorable behavior and the importance of social class and knowing how to behave with one’s betters and one’s inferiors. Unlike the other guides, it offers some concrete examples of language to use, mostly for addressing others and how to agree or disagree with someone. For example, rather than saying отец мой or мама моя, one should say батьшка or матушка (19). If agreeing or disagreeing, rather than simply saying так or нет, one should add милостивый государь or милостивая государыня. If one finds that one must contradict someone important, one should exercise some circumlocution: Вы меня извините милостивый государь or Я прошу извинить меня милостивая государыня (15). *Nauka* also offers advice on how to get someone’s attention (don’t pull on the coatsleeve), and where to sit while waiting to speak to someone (not in the best chair).

---

38 Little is known about the origins of the society, Catherine II may have been an interested party in its foundation (93). The Society was active for a few years in the 1770s. Its existence seems to have been related to the Translation Society sponsored by Catherine, which saw to the translation and publication of over 100 titles (91).
2.7 Significance of the Conversation Books and Behavior Guides.

The essential changes in Russian social behavior in the eighteenth century and the ways in which such change was propagated have been shown. An educational system was in development and the importance of language training was recognized and supported through the schools and the publication of language texts. The conversation books served the dual purpose of modeling new behavior and new speech patterns – in the foreign languages and in Russian. The specific behavioral patterns modeled in the conversation books complemented the general recommendations for deportment in the behavior guides.
CHAPTER 3

LINGUISTIC POLITENESS THEORY: AN APPROACH AND CRITICISMS

3.1 Theoretical Basis.

The theoretical basis for my analysis of the conversation books draws on different disciplines. Though my analysis is primarily linguistic, it is informed by social and historical considerations that permit a more complete understanding of the texts and the context in which they were created and used. The goal is to conduct an analysis that combines linguistic and socio-historical views. I believe that the tools for doing so exist; they have simply not yet been joined together for such a purpose. In Chapter One I discussed the new field of historical pragmatics which is a basis for the analysis. In this chapter I will discuss some aspects of linguistic pragmatics and more specifically linguistic politeness, which I use in the analysis of the data in Chapter Four, followed by a look at the critical response to these theories. In particular, in this chapter I will discuss how the main linguistic theory on which I draw – the linguistic politeness theory of Brown and Levinson – can be integrated with the ideas of Bakhtin on language and the relationship between language, history, and society in order to create a single framework for viewing a text.

In the following chapter I use Brown and Levinson’s theory to examine data from the eighteenth-century conversation books. I examine whether the theory fits the data and whether or not Brown and Levinson’s predictions about the distribution of
strategies are correct. I discuss problems with strategy assignments from Brown and Levinson's categories to the Russian data. I look at the FTAs in the broader context of the cultural and social context for clues as to how these factors affect strategy choice and therefore language use, and what kind of restrictions on behavior and/or language may result.

3.2 Speech Acts and Grice's Maxims of Conversation.

The concept of speech acts has its origins in the work of philosopher J. L. Austin. His theory is outlined in a series of lectures which were published posthumously in 1962 (How to Do Things with Words). Austin introduced the term 'performative' to describe a kind of sentence that does not just relay information, but one for which speaking it is a performance of the act itself. Austin gives the following examples to illustrate his point: 1) "I do" (in a wedding ceremony), 2) "I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth' – as uttered when smashing the bottle against the stem." 3) "I give and bequeath my watch to my brother' – as occurring in a will." 4) "I bet you sixpence it will rain tomorrow." (Austin, 5) Performatives cannot be true or false, in contrast to statements, assertions, etc., which he called constatives. However, performatives are subject to felicity conditions which, if not upheld, could lead to a performative being invalid. Austin eventually rejects the performative-constative dichotomy and treats those utterances previously regarded as constatives as special cases of performatives. Thus all utterances 'do things', i.e. perform specific actions via their specific forces (whether or not the utterance was given as an order, request, or some other type of utterance).

Austin describes three basic ways in which an utterance may be performing an action.

---

39 This discussion is based on the description of speech act theory in Levinson, Ch. 5.
1) **locutionary act**: the utterance of a sentence with determinate sense and reference;

2) **illocutionary act**: the making of a statement, offer, promise, etc. in uttering a sentence, by virtue of the conventional force associated with it (or with its explicit performative paraphrase);

3) **perlocutionary act**: the bringing about of effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence, such effects being special to the circumstances of the utterance (Levinson, 236).

The second of these acts is the most interesting to Austin, and it is this act which is now generally referred to by the term ‘speech act.’ While Austin’s ideas have been taken up by others, not all aspects of his ideas have been followed through, notably, the interactional emphasis between the speaker and the addressee.

John Searle “systematized, in part rigidified” (Levinson, 238) Austin’s theory, and connected it with the general theory of meaning and other philosophical issues. Searle limits the kinds of actions that can be performed by speaking to five types of utterances. Levinson notes that this classification improves on Austin’s but is still lacking in “a principled basis.” (240)

Some problems that have been raised in connection with speech act theory include the basic absence of a one-to-one correspondence between form and force of an utterance - that is the ‘literal’ meaning and the ‘actual’ meaning of an utterance may not coincide (Levinson, 241). While speech act theory has sparked significant work in the study of language usage, it may well be overtaken by other, still more complex and versatile pragmatic approaches to language function. “Speech act theory is being currently undermined from the outside by the growth of disciplines concerned with the
empirical study of natural language use (as Austin indeed foresaw)” (Levinson, 279). These areas include conversation analysis, the ethnography of speaking, and language acquisition. The speech act concept does not play a significant role in these areas. In regards to conversation analysis, speech acts are problematic in that they are inadequate for describing sequencing constraints in conversation (re: turn-taking) (Levinson, 293).

The work of the philosopher H. P. Grice provides some additional concepts critical to linguistic pragmatics and linguistic politeness. Grice’s theory of implicature is concerned with “how people use language.” Grice proposes that there are some fundamental assumptions about how conversation is conducted. These assumptions have a rational basis and Grice formulates them “as guidelines for the efficient and effective use of language in conversation to further co-operative ends” (Levinson, 101). Grice calls them Maxims of Conversation and notes that together they “express a general co-operative principle.”

The cooperative principle states that one should make one’s contribution appropriate to the course of the conversation at the time that it is made. The four maxims are:

a) **The Maxim of Quality** - try to make your contribution truthful; do not say what you believe to be false; do not say things that you lack evidence for.

b) **The Maxim of Quantity** - your contribution should be as informative as requested, but it should not be more informative than is required.

c) **The Maxim of Relevance** - your contribution should be relevant

---

40 This discussion of Grice’s theory is based on Levinson, Ch. 3.
d) *The Maxim of Manner* - be perspicuous, avoid ambiguity and obscurity, be brief and orderly. ⁴¹

These maxims are guidelines for “maximally efficient rational, cooperative” conversation in which speakers are truthful, relevant, and clear. As Levinson points out, the problem with this concept is that people do not really talk this way. Rather they aim for these guidelines, which are being followed at a deeper level, even if surface appearances may seem to indicate otherwise. The question of cultural specificity has also been inadequately addressed in this context. The cultural bias of a given idea or theory is a shortcoming that has only recently begun to be addressed in pragmatic scholarship.

3.3 Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory.

Although earlier studies in politeness exist⁴², it was the publication in 1978 of the work by Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* (reissued in 1987) that has led to the burgeoning of linguistic interest in the phenomenon. While many criticisms have been made about the theory, particularly in regards to Brown and Levinson’s claims of universality, it remains the most comprehensive and thoroughly developed framework for politeness research.

3.3.1 Face and Face-Threatening-Acts.

Brown and Levinson base their theory on the assumption that “all competent adult members of a society have (and know each other to have) ‘face’, the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself” (61). Brown and Levinson draw on the work of Goffman (1967) in their concept of face. Face has two aspects – positive and negative, which Brown and Levinson define as follows:

---

⁴¹ Based on Levinson, 101-02.
negative face: the want of every ‘competent adult member’ that his actions be unimpeded by others.

positive face: the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others (62).

While they acknowledge that face content (limits of personal territories and “what the publicly relevant content of personality consists in”) may vary from culture to culture, they assume that the mutual understanding of the public self-image (face) between speech partners and the social need to redress it are universal (61-62).

Although speakers will generally want to maintain the addressee’s face (just as they wish their own face respected and maintained) there are some acts which intrinsically threaten face. These acts are known as face-threatening acts (FTAs) (60).

Given that both the speaker (S) and the hearer (H) want and expect their face wants to be redressed, S will have to keep in mind certain factors when deciding how to minimize the threat of a FTA. At least three factors will play a role: “(a) the want to communicate the content of the FTA x, (b) the want to be efficient or urgent, and (c) the want to maintain H’s face to any degree” (68). Only if (b) outweighs (c) will S choose not to minimize the threat of the FTA.

S then has several options for carrying out the FTA. S may go on record in doing an act, meaning that S states his intentions unambiguously, ‘I promise to come tomorrow.’ S may go off record in doing an act, in a way that permits more than one interpretation of the statement. This ambiguity allows S to not be viewed as committed to a particular intent, e.g. ‘I’m out of money, I forgot to go to the bank today’ may be S’s way of asking H to lend him some money, but if H challenges S (having already heard this and other similar excuses many times), S can say that borrowing money was
not his intent, that he was merely making an observation. A number of linguistic phenomena fall into the off-record class, including irony, metaphor, understatement, and rhetorical questions, which allow S to provide hints about his message, but without doing so directly, thereby leaving some room for negotiation. However, when S needs to do an act in the most efficient or urgent manner possible, then he may do so baldly without redress. This means is the most clear and unambiguous and it is a clearly on record method of communication. This choice is generally reserved for occasions when S need not worry about H’s reaction to the apparent absence of concern for face considerations. This may be in cases where both interlocutors agree that efficiency or urgency outweigh any face considerations, where the danger to H’s face is minimal (offers, suggestions, etc., to H’s clear benefit), or where the power differential is greatly weighted toward S, so that, S has no need to be concerned with H’s face wants. Conversely, S may wish to do an act in such a way that he minimizes possible face damage caused by the FTA; he does so by redressing or ‘giving face’ to H so that H knows that S does not desire to threaten H’s face, but rather recognizes and wants H’s face wants. A speaker has two options for conducting redressive action - via positive politeness or negative politeness.

3.3.2 Speaker Strategy Choices.

According to Brown and Levinson, “Positive politeness is oriented toward the positive face of H, the positive self-image that he claims for himself” (70). It lets H know that S wants H’s wants, which may be done by indicating that S and H are ‘the same’, from the same in-group, that H is S’s friend.

Negative politeness seeks to redress, at least partially, H’s negative face, “his basic want to maintain claims of territory and self-determination” (70). Negative
politeness is "avoidance-based" and consists of S assuring that H's negative-face wants will not be (or only minimally) impinged on, and that H will retain freedom of action. Negative politeness emphasizes "self-effacement, formality, and restraint" (70); it is aimed at letting H know that he is free to act unimpeded. H is given an 'out' so that he won't feel forced into an unwilling response.

Conventionalized indirectness is a result of the tension between the desire to be seen redressing face on record and the desire to go off record so as not to impose. When an indirect method of doing an FTA becomes conventionalized, it is once again on record. Many indirect requests in English are conventionalized; 'Can you pass the salt?' is understood (except in humorous usage) as a request and not as an inquiry about H’s ability to pass the salt. But even such conventionalized indirectness suffices as an 'out' for S. By using such a formulation S indicates to H that he is honoring his negative face wants.

Brown and Levinson also describe several variables that affect the seriousness of the FTA and which affect the choice of strategy that S uses in order to do an FTA. The factors are a) 'social distance' (D) of S and H, b) 'relative power' (P) of S and H, and c) absolute ranking (R) of impositions in a given culture. (74) These factors are clearly context-related. Someone who might normally have a high P rating could find the P rating lowered in some situations; for example, the president of the United States would generally have a high P rating, but he might find it lowered while testifying to a grand jury. D ratings may have strong situational relevance: two acquaintances might treat each other formally in their home setting, but in a foreign or strange location, they may treat each other with much less circumspection.
Brown and Levinson offer a formula for determining the weightiness of an FTA (W_j) based on the relationship of several variable factors. The social distance between S and H is represented by D. The relative power of S and H is represented by P. This relationship may be asymmetric (unlike social distance), as either S or H may hold considerable power over the other. Brown and Levinson attempt to address cultural concerns with the factor of absolute ranking of impositions (R) in a particular culture. These factors are relevant to the interlocutors’ perception of the weightiness of the FTA, rather than any objective ratings of relative power etc. Thus, \( W_j = D(S, H) + P(S, H) = R_j \). \( W_j \) is, essentially, an estimation of risk. S must consider the payoff of a strategy in the particular circumstances of the FTA. As the FTA increases in weight, the greater the likelihood that S will choose a strategy that most satisfies H’s negative face. Brown and Levinson rank the possible strategies in terms of estimation of risk of face loss from low to high with the higher-numbered strategies for situations with the greatest risk. The on-record strategies are the lowest: from without redressive action, baldly, to with redressive action – positive politeness and with redressive action – negative politeness. The off-record strategies are ranked highest: off-record and, in cases of the greatest risk, don’t do the FTA. S must balance the \( W_j \) of the FTA with the amount of clarity and face redress, etc. he wishes to have in the FTA. Using a high-numbered strategy for a low-level FTA may cause H to think that the FTA is more threatening than it really is, so S must balance his need for success, his need for clarity, and H’s face want needs when selecting a strategy. (While redressive action may not always be verbal e.g., it may involve a gift, a bow, etc., in the texts that I examine only verbal clues are given, so I will ignore other types of redress.)

A speaker’s choice of bald on record is generally linked to urgency (Fire!) or significant power differential (military commands) where efficiency is essential or where
S does not have to consider face wants. Brown and Levinson note another group of bald on record usages which are oriented to face wants - firm invitations - often seen in welcomings (*Come in*!). S may use such a device to indicate to H that H may impose on S’s negative (or positive) face. Such forms will only be used when S is relatively secure that H will accept the invitation, i.e., when S and H have relatively equal stature (P and D). As Brown and Levinson note, the firmer the invitation, the less reluctant H will be, therefore, “provided that no other face wants are infringed, the firmer the invitation, the more polite it is” (99). Positive politeness hedges may also be added for a sense of urgency (*Do come in, I insist, really!* (101) or a negative politeness phrase may act as a softener (respect term or *please*) (*Please come in, sir*). The role of the imperative in invitations in Slavic is somewhat different than its role in English; see examples in Chapter Four and Wierzbicka (1985a).

3.3.3 Positive Politeness Strategies.

In the sections below I will describe the strategies that Brown and Levinson enumerate in their model. I will generally limit my discussion to strategies that occur in the texts that I examined. This will include all fifteen of the positive politeness strategies, most of the ten negative politeness strategies, bald on record, and two of the fifteen off-record strategies.

Positive politeness seeks to redress the addressee’s positive face by indicating to him that his wants are desirable. This redress generally lets H know that S has similar wants. Positive politeness tends to address itself to H's general desires and wants, not just those implied and infringed on by the FTA itself. It is like the “normal linguistic behavior between intimates” (101) who know each other and each other’s wants well. It is generally marked by exaggeration that lets H know that, even if S can’t say ‘I want
your wants,' he can say 'I want your positive face to be satisfied' (101). This shared desire for face redress, which marks common ground between S and H, gives positive politeness its redressive force. It also makes positive politeness techniques useful not just for redressing FTAs, but also as social lubricants which allow S to become closer to H (103).

All examples given below are from Brown and Levinson. While Brown and Levinson give their primary examples from English, Tamil, and Tzeltal, I will use only Brown and Levinson's examples from English.

3.3.3.1 Claim Common Ground

The following strategies operate under the maxim *Claim common ground* with H because S and H share wants, goals, etc. This group of strategies, particularly the first four are well-represented in the conversation books.

Strategy 1: *Notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods).* With this strategy S should pay attention to anything of or about H that H would want noticed (appearance, possessions, etc.).

(1) You must be hungry, it’s a long time since breakfast. How about some lunch?

(2) What a beautiful vase this is! Where did it come from?

Strategy 2: *Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H).* This strategy may be accomplished via prosodic features (stress, intonation) or with intensifying modifiers.

(3) What a fantastic garden you have!

(4) How absolutely marvellous!
Strategy 3: *Intensify interest to H*. Brown and Levinson describe this strategy as a way for “S to communicate to H that he shares some of his wants …[and] to intensify the interest of his own (S’s) contributions to the conversation, by ‘making a good story’” (106). This technique pulls H into the middle of the story as a way of increasing his interest. The exaggeration of facts (overstatement) is also included in this strategy.

(5) There were a million people in the Co-op tonight!

(6) You *always* do the dishes! I’ll do them this time.

The dramatic exaggeration is a way of increasing H’s interest in the conversation.

Strategy 4: *Use in-group identity markers*. There are several subsets of this strategy which operates on the principle of conveying “in-group membership,” thereby allowing S to claim common ground with H. This may be accomplished by address forms, language or dialect, jargon or slang, and ellipsis. The address forms may include the use of a T-form pronoun versus a V-form in languages which make such distinctions (as Russian does).[^43] The T-form is a familiar, intimate form versus the V-form, which in Russian (as in other languages) has a dual role as the second-person plural pronoun and as a formal, honorific second-person pronoun used to indicate respect and social distance. The T/V distinction is, of course, also evident in verb forms, and imperatives are especially relevant here. Other terms of address may include terms of address like *buddy, pal*, etc. or diminutives. The use of such address forms has a softening effect on FTAs (108).

(7) Bring me your dirty clothes to wash, honey.

[^43]: See Brown and Gilman 1960.
Jargon or slang usage also draws on the associations and attitudes that the interlocutors may share and which are encoded in the jargon or slang similarly to the associations that a language or dialect might have.

(8) Lend us two bucks then, wouldja Mac?

Contraction or ellipsis functions as a signal of in-group status by indicating shared context, as in Brown and Levinson's example of the utterance 'Nails’ as interpretable for S and H since they are involved in a construction project together.

Strategy 5: Seek agreement. This strategy relies on two basic approaches - safe topics and repetition. Safe topics (such as the weather) allow S to claim common ground with H by discussing something that they can agree on, thus S can underscore his desire to agree with H and redress H’s positive face wants for likeability and acceptability. This technique is also applicable when a speaker must 'dig’ to find something positive to say about something he dislikes, by focusing on one aspect - such as praising your neighbors’ new car, which you actually find an abomination, by praising the car’s color (112).

Repetition is simply agreement by repeating all or part of the preceding speaker’s utterance in the conversation, thus showing that the present speaker is listening attentively and agrees ‘emotionally’ with the previous speaker

(9) A: I had a flat tyre on the way home.

B: Oh god, a flat tyre!

Such repetition is highly conventionalized in some languages (including Russian, where repetition is favored over da/net in answers to yes/no questions: Vam nravitsia novaia kvartira? Ochen’ nravitsia.).
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Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement. Closely related to the previous strategy, S wants to agree or at least appear to agree with H. This may be done with ‘token’ agreement in which a speaker twists his utterance to hide disagreement. (Examples in Brown and Levinson from Sacks, 1973)

(10) A: That’s where you live, Florida?
    B: That’s where I was born.

(11) A: Have you got friends?
    B: I have friends. So-called friends. I had friends. Let me put it that way.

The ‘white lie’ provides a socially acceptable out for a speaker seeking to avoid disagreement. Even when H knows that it is a lie, both S and H can pretend otherwise.

(14) Yes, I do like your new hat.

Hedging opinions by limiting or qualifying an utterance is another means of avoiding disagreement. This choice is related to positive politeness strategy 2 - Exaggeration. While hedges are usually a feature of negative politeness (see below), some hedges have positive politeness functions by hedging the extremes used in a strategy such as exaggeration. The hedges make the opinion voiced more vague and less personal.

(15) It’s really beautiful, in a way.

(16) I don’t know, like I think people have a right to their own opinions.

The now ubiquitous ‘like’ is a commonly occurring hedging of opinion in contemporary colloquial English.
Strategy 7: *Presuppose/raise/assert common ground*. This strategy may be realized in several different ways. A speaker may use gossip or small talk as a precursor to the actual FTA to underscore his interest in H and his face wants. A speaker may also perform a point of view switch, either of person, from S to H in which S speaks as if H were S or as if H and S have equal knowledge of a situation.

(17) I had a really hard time learning to drive, didn’t I.

Time or place switch can also be used “to increase the immediacy and therefore the interest of a story” (121).

More relevant for this study are the presuppositions by the speaker of the addressee’s wants and values of presupposing familiarity in the relationship with the addressee.

(18) Don’t you want some dinner now?

(19) Isn’t it a beautiful day!

(20) Look, you’re a pal of mine, so how about…

Strategy 8: *Joke*. Jokes obviously draw on shared background or cultural knowledge and values, so they can be used to emphasize their shared features. They function by helping to soften an FTA or for putting the addressee ‘at ease.’

3.3.3.2 Convey that S and H are Cooperators, and therefore, They Share Goals

Another group of positive politeness strategies operates under the maxim *Convey that S and H are cooperators*, and therefore, they share goals. This sense of cooperation can redress H’s positive-face wants.
Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose S’s knowledge of and concern for H’s wants. S can use this strategy to communicate to H that he is aware of and sensitive to H’s wants. By reminding H that they are cooperators, S can cause H to cooperate with S.

(21) Look, I know that you want the car by 5.0, so should(n’t) I go to town now? (request)

Strategy 10: Offer, promise. This strategy (as well as the following three strategies) operates by playing with the idea of cooperation and reflexivity, meaning that S wants for H what H wants. This strategy emphasizes S’s willingness to cooperate with H. In this strategy, S can let H know that S wants for H what H wants and will help it to happen. This approach leads to offers and promises, which may be false or insincere, but show S’s good will towards H’s positive-face wants. This strategy is hearer-oriented.

Strategy 11: Be optimistic. This strategy is the reverse of the previous strategy - it consists of S assuming that H wants S’s wants for S and will help to make them happen. It implies cooperation by H with S and vice versa - because they have a mutual interest in a positive outcome. While Strategy 10: offer, promise relies on H’s desire to cooperate, the strategy of optimism is based on S’s assumption that H will share S’s wants and will help to realize them. This strategy is speaker-oriented.

(22) Look, I’m sure you won’t mind if I remind you to do the dishes tonight.

(23) You don’t have any objection to me helping myself to a bit of cake, do you?

Strategy 12: Include both S and H in the activity. This strategy uses the inclusive ‘we’ form even when S is really saying ‘you’ or ‘me’ (127). In this way cooperation
issues are addressed and FTAs are redressed. This strategy is frequently found in the conversation books.

(24) Let’s have a cookie, then. (i.e. me)

(25) Let’s get on with dinner, eh? (i.e. you)

Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) reasons. Giving H reasons for S’s desires is another way of including H in the activity and may help H to see that the FTA is reasonable. There is the pressure to go off-record and test H’s willingness to cooperate and if he is willing then to make an on-record request or offer. Such forms can become conventionalized positive politeness forms (at least in English).

(26) Why don’t we go to the seashore!

(27) Why don’t I help you with that suitcase.

Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity. Reciprocity is an obvious feature of mutual cooperation, and by reminding H of this past or future reciprocity, S can soften the FTA by reducing the threat.

3.3.3.3 Fulfill H’s Wants for Some X

This final positive politeness strategy operates under the maxim Fulfill H’s wants for some X.

Strategy 15: Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation). The final positive politeness strategy works by having S directly fulfill some want of H. The gift may be tangible, or just as likely, it may address some want to be liked, respected, understood, etc. The good frequently dispersed in the conversation books is flattery, a category that Brown and Levinson do not address directly, though it certainly
has a role in easing social interactions, which Brown and Levinson state as a primary motivation for using positive politeness.

3.3.4 Negative Politeness.

Negative politeness is redressive action oriented to the addressee's negative face, i.e., his want to act unimpeded. As Brown and Levinson state, “It is the heart of respect behavior, just as positive politeness is the kernel of 'familiar' and 'joking' behavior” (129). Negative politeness is more focused on redressing the FTA than positive politeness. It is the core of Western culture’s ‘polite’ behavior and etiquette. Just as positive politeness can be used to draw interlocutors closer, negative politeness can be employed to create or emphasize existing social distance.

3.3.4.1 Conventional Indirectness.

Brown and Levinson include 'Be direct' as a negative politeness strategy performed on record and without redress. They include it in negative politeness because it is the simplest way to deliver a message; it minimizes imposition by quickly getting to the point (the element of politeness that R. Lakoff (1973) finds crucial, though Brown and Levinson disagree), but such bald-on-record usage conflicts with the negative-face want of freedom of action and does not redress H's negative face. Brown and Levinson identify the compromise that occurs from this conflict as the use of conventional indirectness which includes negative-face redress and the use of conventionalized means of expression.

Strategy 1: Be conventionally indirect. This strategy is marked by the opposition of giving H an 'out' through indirectness and the wish to go on record.". Conventional

---

44 For detailed discussions of indirect speech acts and politeness in Contemporary Russian, see Mills 1991 and 1992.
indirectness presents an acceptable compromise, thanks to the use of linguistic means with “contextually unambiguous meanings (by virtue of conventionalization) which are different from their literal meanings.” (132) Brown and Levinson note that there are degrees of conventionalization and that some expressions are conventionalized to such a degree that they are on-record and can no longer have their literal meanings (132-33). Such utterances allow S to go on record while at the same time showing the desire to go off record. “Conventional indirectness encodes the clash of wants, and so partially achieves them both.  Conventional indirectness functions as a negative politeness strategy when the context is “unambiguously on record.” Brown and Levinson hold that their model predicts that the speech act which employs the strategy that most satisfies the end of the FTA will be ranked as the most polite. They also contend that the degree of politeness can also be measured by the amount of effort (usually equated with the amount of verbalization) that a speaker puts into maintaining face (of S and H). Therefore, Brown and Levinson rank the following sentences in descending degree of politeness with (28) as the most polite and (33) as the least polite request form.

(28) There wouldn’t I suppose be any chance of your being able to lend me your car for just a few minutes, would there?

(29) Could you possibly by any chance lend me your car for just a few minutes?

(30) Would you have any objections to my borrowing your car for a while?

(31) I’d like to borrow you car, if you wouldn’t mind.

---

45 Brown and Levinson provide a detailed discussion (132-144) of indirect speech acts, what they are, their universality, and their complete role in Brown and Levinson’s theory, what is included in this work is only an outline of that discussion. For purposes of the present discussion I will define indirect speech acts as “an utterance whose linguistic form does not directly reflect its communicative purpose, as when I’m feeling cold functions as a request for someone to close a door.” (Crystal, 175)
(32) May I borrow your car please? (142)

(33) Lend me your car.

The universality of Brown and Levinson's notions of conventionalized indirectness are called into question by Margaret Mills' examination of requests in Russian (1991 and 1992). She finds that in Russian the use of indirect speech acts does not necessarily produce the most positive results (1991, 565). Her investigations also reveal that Contemporary Russian uses considerably different strategies than English in formulating conventionalized indirect requests and that perceptions about levels of politeness are both culture- and language-specific (1992, 76).

3.3.4.2 Don't Presume/Assume.

Strategy 2 represents the maxim Don't presume/assume.

Strategy 2: Question, hedge. This and the remaining negative politeness strategies are based on the principle of redress to H's negative face. This strategy redresses H's want not to be forced into anything and provides him with an out by avoiding any presumptions or assumptions about H's willingness to carry out the FTA. "A 'hedge' is a particle, word, or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set" (145). Such membership is limited; it may be less or more true than might be expected.

Brown and Levinson identify several types of hedges: 1) those addressed to illocutionary force, especially hedges in particles, 2) hedges addressed to Grice's maxims and hedges addressed to politeness strategies, 3) prosodic and kinesic hedges.
Since the example in the analyzed texts are all particles I will include only these in the discussion here.\textsuperscript{46}

3.3.4.3 Don’t Coerce H.

This group of strategies fulfill the maxim \textit{Don't coerce H}. This group of strategies is popular in the conversation books, especially the use of deference. They characterize the strong desire of speakers not to impose on the hearer.

Strategy 3: \textit{Be pessimistic}. As stated above, this strategy operates by redressing H’s negative face by not expecting that H will do the act or that it is even appropriate. This strategy seems to have three realizations - “the use of the negative \textsuperscript{(34)} (with a tag), the use of the subjunctive \textsuperscript{(35)}, and the use of remote-possibility markers” [through use of a future form] (175).

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(34)] You don’t have any manila envelopes, do you, by any chance?
\item[(35)] Could/would/might you do x?
\end{enumerate}

Strategy 4: \textit{Minimize the imposition, Rx}. This strategy seeks to let H know that the imposition encoded in the FTA is small. Out of the equation for determining the weightiness of the FTA (\(W_x\)), the minimizing of Rx leaves only D and P (distance and power) as significant factors. Thus this strategy is also an indirect form of deference to H. In English this task can be performed in various ways.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(36)] I just want to ask you if I can \textit{borrow a little} paper.
\end{enumerate}

The \textit{just} and \textit{little} imply ‘merely’, downplaying the imposition and scope of the FTA, and \textit{borrow} is a euphemistic way of saying ‘take and consume’ (177).

\textsuperscript{46} See Brown and Levinson for an extensive discussion about all the types of hedges.
Strategy 5: Give deference. This strategy can be performed in one of two ways: by S humbling and abasing himself; or by S raising H and, by so doing, offering a special kind of positive face redress in which H is treated as superior. Both give H higher social status than S. The difference in the P status between S and H allows H to communicate to H that H cannot be imposed on and that S is in no position to coerce H, thus lowering the threat level of the FTA. For Brown and Levinson reciprocal deference is a sign of mutual respect, but it is based on a high D value and so the relationship is asymmetrical in terms of deference use and social ranking.

The term ‘deference’ deserves some consideration. Like the term ‘politeness,’ it lacks a clear and universally accepted definition. Discussion of deference is often limited to the use of honorifics and address terms. Brown and Levinson point out that it can also include self-humbling behavior intentionally done to make oneself look foolish and therefore lower than one’s speech partner.

Fraser and Nolen attempt to distinguish deference from politeness. They cite Goffman, who writes that “Deference...is that component of activity which functions as a symbolic means by which appreciation is regularly conveyed” (1971, 56). The idea that deference is a component of activity is important for this work; it may include such non-verbal demonstrations as opening a door for someone or giving a gift. It could be reflected verbally in the selection of strategy for carrying out a speech act or FTA.

Goffman's and Brown and Levinson's notions of deference share the concept of 'appreciation,' i.e. giving value or status to H. This appreciation creates or maintains a "relative symbolic distance between the speaker and the hearer" (Fraser and Nolen, 97). For the examples from the conversation books the term deference will be considered to embrace the verbal and non-verbal manifestations discussed here.
Deferece can be encoded linguistically in a number of ways. The wide-spread use of plural pronouns as honorifics to singular addressees is treated as a different strategy by Brown and Levinson (see Strategy 7 below). Brown and Levinson see honorifics as "derived from frozen outputs of politeness strategies ... where these directly or indirectly convey a status differential between speaker and addressee and referent" (179). T/V pronouns are an indirect means of conveying this status differential by pluralizing in order to impersonalize. In reference to pronoun switching between T and V as a deference device, Brown and Levinson cite Friedrich’s (1972) article on pronoun usage in Russian. They note that his data indicate that a switch from V to T indicates sympathy and that such switches are FTA-sensitive.

The plural 'you' pronoun is used in a variety of languages to refer to a single addressee and it is seen as a sign of deference or distance. R. Lakoff sees this pluralization as an 'out' for H. Since a plural, rather than a single pronoun is used, H can pretend that the utterance does not apply to him. Conventionalization has not completely eliminated the effect as it shows S's wish to show respect to H. In this way, it parallels the wants which motivate the use of conventional indirectness.

Brown and Levinson use Comrie's categories of honorifics, which are based on the relational axis. The speaker-address axis encodes the relation of speaker to hearer (addressee honorifics), as in Japanese and Javanese. The speaker-referent axis encodes the relation of speaker to things or persons referred to (referent honorifics) as in European languages with T/V usage. The speaker-bystander axis encodes the relation of speaker (or hearer) to 'bystanders' or overhearers (bystander honorifics) as in Dyirbal.

---

47 Deferece mechanisms have been frequently described for Asian languages, in particular.

To these axes Brown and Levinson add the speaker-setting axis (180) in reference to diglossic situations, as described by Ferguson (1964).

Referent honorifics are the most relevant for the current study. Just as T/V pronoun and verb usage pay deference to H directly, indirect means can also be employed – for example, what I call “semantic honorifics.” Brown and Levinson offer examples from English of doublets in which the second word shows a higher level of respect to the object, e.g. man/gentleman, give/bestow, book/volume. In addition, terms of address (sir, madam, etc.) may encode deference. According to Brown and Levinson, they can be used “strategically...to soften FTAs, by indicating the absence of risk to the addressee.” (182)

Another means of showing deference is usage that reflects a low evaluation of one’s own abilities or possessions.

(37) It’s not much, it’s just a little thing I picked up for a song in a bargain basement sale in Macy’s last week, I thought maybe you could use it.

The final form of showing deference that is relevant for this study is conveying that the wants of H are more important than those of S.

(38) Just as you like.

3.3.4.4 Communicate S’s Want to Not Impinge on H

The maxim Communicate S’s want to not impinge on H, guides the function of these strategies.

S lets H know that he is aware of H’s negative-face wants and is trying to honor them in informing him of the FTA. H should then understand that S recognizes the infringement and does not take it lightly. Of the following strategies, only the first two
are significant for the present work; Strategy 9: Nominalize is omitted from the discussion.

Strategy 6: Apologize. This strategy tells H that S recognizes the imposition and seeks to offer redress by making amends for the FTA. Brown and Levinson outline four substrategies under this strategy. Apology, especially through the listing of overwhelming reasons is often seen in the conversation books.

— Admit the impingement

(39) I’m sure you must be very busy, but ...

— Indicate reluctance - via hedges or other expressions

(40) I normally wouldn’t ask you this, but ...

— Give overwhelming reasons - telling H that S seeks his help and thus imposes only due to extreme circumstances

(41) I can think of nobody else who could ...

— Beg forgiveness - S hopes that H will forgive the FTA and the debt that it carries.

(42) Excuse me, but ...

Strategy 7: Impersonalize S and H allows S to escape some responsibility and act as if someone other than S is behind the FTA and therefore it is not S who wants to impose on H and H may not be the only addressee. Although Brown and Levinson discuss various means of carrying out this strategy, I will concentrate here only on those means found in the relevant texts. Brown and Levinson say that avoiding first- and second-person pronoun usage is one technique in this strategy, but they also noted that

---

49 For a more complete discussion see Brown and Levinson 190-206.
pluralization of 'you', which functions as a form of deference, is in its origins a type of impersonalization.

Imperatives are the most common means of carrying out the most threatening of FTAs - commands. Many languages omit the pronoun in order to lower the level of threat and the use of the pronoun may actually make the utterance (more) rude, e.g. *You take that out!* would occur only in very limited circumstances. Omission of the pronoun allows S to distance himself from the utterance.

(43) Take that out!

Strategy 8: *State the FTA as a general rule.* This strategy is generally seen in rules and regulations.

(44) Passengers will please refrain from flushing toilets on the train.

The final negative politeness strategy falls under the maxim *Redress other wants of H's.* It does do as a way of making up for the threat of the FTA itself. This motivation also applies to the use of deference, Strategy 5.

Strategy 10: *Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H.* In this strategy, S acknowledges that the FTA is imposing on H and S openly acknowledges and takes on this debt. Such debt acknowledgment may be marked in English by such phrases as:

(46) I'd be eternally grateful if you would ... (request)

(47) It wouldn't be any trouble; I have to go right by there anyway. (offer)

This strategy is a favorite means of redress in the conversation books.
3.3.5 Off-Record Strategies.

The strategies described above have all been on record. Brown and Levinson also describe fifteen different off-record strategies. They note that these speech acts are marked by a 'trigger' which is a flag to the addressee that an inference must be made and that a "mode of inference" is necessary for distinguishing what is meant from what is said. The trigger may be a violation of one of Grice’s Maxims and Brown and Levinson organize the off-record strategies accordingly. The type of inference needed is still an open question; the authors rely on “practical reasoning.”

Brown and Levinson note that many “off-record” strategies are actually used on record (irony, understatement, etc.) because they are used in a context that allows only one interpretation. The test for the “off-recordness” of an utterance is how a challenge could be responded to. If S can avoid responsibility for an FTA, then it is off record. The more off record an utterance is, the more viable alternative interpretations may be. It is this availability of alternative interpretations that distinguishes off-record strategies from on-record indirectness, Strategy 1. Indirect speech acts that have become conventionalized allow only one interpretation in the given context.

Although Brown and Levinson discuss fifteen off-record strategies, I will only discuss the two that are relevant for the present study. Both strategies are triggered by violations of Grice’s Maxim of Relevance. They operate under the maxim: Invite conversational implicature.

Strategy 1: Give hints. Instead of making an on-record request for H to do something, S may “raise the issue of” the desired act.

(48) It’s cold in here (implying the H should shut the window).
Strategy 2: *Give association hints.* The association hints that Brown and Levinson describe here are probably only clear to the interlocutors and do not likely have any cross-cultural applicability. S can only make the hint, whether or not to react with an offer, or other response is up to H.

(49) Are you going to market tomorrow? ... There’s a market tomorrow, I suppose. (implying - Give me a ride there.)

3.4 Additional Comments on Brown and Levinson’s Theory.

In their comments which accompany the reissue of their work in 1987, Brown and Levinson concede that their reliance on speech act theory in the construction/formation of their model was probably too great, though at the same time they add that it would have been difficult to avoid the speech act categories and “shorthand” that they used (11). Although Brown and Levinson acknowledge in the 1978 version of the model that FTAs do not necessarily occur in single speech acts, they do not adequately address the place of FTAs in conversational structure and do not demonstrate how FTAs and politeness strategy choices affect conversation structure.

Two other points regarding FTAs are worth noting at this time. Although their discussion of the realizations of positive and negative politeness are focused on one given strategy at a time, Brown and Levinson do admit the possibility of strategy mixing. They refer to this mixture of elements from both types of strategies in an utterance as a “hybrid strategy.” For example, the use of hedges (a negative politeness device) in a positive politeness statement will still yield a positive politeness strategy, even though a negative politeness device softens the blow. A speaker may use multiple strategies to address more than one aspect of an FTA with a particular strategy which may also cross categories (Brown and Levinson 286, Footnote 14). Not all strategies
can form such hybrids, but Brown and Levinson claim that by moving from one strategy to the another and back again the resulting interaction may be awkward or painful, however, they also claim that the skillful speaker can use multiple strategies to maintain a balanced relationship in his interactions with the hearer (230-231). Examples in the following chapter demonstrate that Brown and Levinson's ideas regarding strategy mixing, i.e. that it is generally not a common or usually successful situation, are not reflective of actual speech circumstances.

Interlocutors can use the strategies to their advantage to create or diminish social distance - and they may do so within a conversation if they feel a need to change the way that an interaction is proceeding. Brown and Levinson see the use of strategies as an "index of the quality of social relationships and the course of their development." (231) Brown and Levinson make some observations about strategy distribution and P and D relations: where P is great and D is low (H has power over S), H will use more bald on record and S will use more negative politeness and off record strategies; where D and P are low and H has little or no power over S and there is a high D for S and H, then both S and H will use positive politeness and bald on record strategies; where D is high and P is low and H and S are more or less equal, there will be more or less symmetrical use of negative politeness and off-record strategies (250-51). It is clear that strategy choice will also be tied to the level of threat of the FTA. Evidence presented in Chapter Four also shows that cultural factors play a role in strategy choice.

Brown and Levinson point out that English requests are frequently done via conventional indirectness and this conventionalization implies respect of the addressee's negative face. This tendency towards particular strategies for particular FTAs in one language or culture limits the cross-cultural conclusions that can be drawn, and
emphasizes the necessity of clear contextual understanding when analyzing data. Relationships between speakers may also be very culturally specific (245).

3.5 Criticisms of Brown and Levinson.

Above I have given a description of the theory proposed by Brown and Levinson. Since its publication, a number of researchers have disputed a number of Brown and Levinson's claims, particularly in regard to the idea of universality. I will now examine some of those counterarguments which are especially relevant to my own research.

Numerous articles from the last ten years have tested Brown and Levinson's theory in light of research in linguistic politeness. Brown and Levinson include a survey of such work in the introduction to the 1987 reissue of their book, and they address some of the criticisms. Buck (1993) provides a very clear and succinct summary of the theory and a summary of the seven most important criticisms of Brown and Levinson's work. As mentioned above, Brown and Levinson's claims of universality for their concept of face and its positive and negative aspects has faced considerable attack, especially with respect to the Western-centric ideas of face that it supposes. As Buck points out, although the specifics of face wants have been controversial, "the underlying notion of face — and individual's positive social self-worth — as a central dynamic in interactional discourse has not been contested" (4). Kasper (1997) also points out difficulties in how Brown and Levinson define face versus Goffman's definition of face, which Brown and Levinson claim as the model for their own work.

See Kasper 1990:194-196 for specific authors and their criticisms, particularly in regard to Asian notions of face.
Another criticism of Brown and Levinson that Buck notes is their ranking of politeness strategies. They rank negative politeness over off-record strategies in politeness, but research seems to show otherwise. Brown and Levinson have also been criticized for the idea that an FTA is redressed by only one type of strategy (Buck 4). In fact, Brown and Levinson do admit this possibility, but they devote very little space to it and do not really integrate such strategy mixing into their model.

The third major criticism Buck notes is the predictability of the model. There seem to be more factors and variables involved in determining the correct strategy to employ than just P, D, and R. Gender and speech context are just two additional factors that affect strategy choice. The cultural valuation of R has also been a difficulty.

A fourth problem that others have found with the Brown and Levinson model is that it is not always easy to distinguish the FTA within a given discourse. Again this criticism is linked to the concept that an act may contain only one FTA which may only threaten one aspect of face. Yet Brown and Levinson say themselves that an FTA may threaten both face aspects (see above). Threats to positive and negative face may vary in weight and seriousness.

The fifth criticism listed by Buck is a lack of clarity of the varieties of politeness. Buck cites Kasper's (1990, 194) terminology for Brown and Levinson's view of linguistic politeness as "strategic conflict avoidance". But this view is only one part of the larger "concept of politeness." Buck notes that their model of linguistic politeness and "FTA strategic management" is not adequate for explaining other acts of face saving and face maintenance in discourse.

---

The absence of a clear definition of politeness plagues all discussions about linguistic politeness. Without a functional definition of the term, how can we determine what separates linguistic politeness from first-order politeness? Does linguistic politeness refer simply to language or does it also include behavior which may in turn affect linguistic choice? While Brown and Levinson never explicitly define the term politeness themselves, they claim to recognize the broader social and sociological effects of politeness. However, they limit the types of linguistic manifestations of it to a fairly narrow view of politeness; they fail to include paralinguistic and nonverbal behavior in their considerations of FTAs and strategy selection. Just as speech act theory requires greater attention to context, I think that politeness phenomena should be viewed not just as a linguistic means or phenomenon, but it must recognize linguistic politeness as part of the larger context of human, social interaction which influences our linguistic choices and behavior. These choices are reflected in the "speech genres" that we choose for expressing ourselves (see 3.6 below).^52

The final, and to Buck's (and my) thinking, the most severe shortcoming of the model is Brown and Levinson's failure to account for how FTAs and politeness strategies function as part of the larger category of extended discourse. As Brown and Levinson themselves have admitted (see above), their reliance on speech act theory was misguided, as FTAs can certainly occur above the sentence level. As Buck notes, "a significant weakness of the model is that sentences in which no FTAs are found are discarded from the analysis."^53

---


Given that Brown and Levinson were trying to make their case for universals in language, meaning that it was accurate for all languages and independent of cultural considerations, I find it noteworthy that the main criticisms of the model, as outlined by Buck, all critique the absence of cultural considerations in the original theory – i.e., cultural notions regarding face and the image of self, cultural grounds for strategy choice and preference, cultural interpretations of what constitutes an FTA, paralinguistic and non-verbal behavior that may affect interpretation of an act as an FTA or not within a particular culture, and cultural ideas about discourse, which would affect whether an act is seen as an FTA or not. It is these shortcomings which must be addressed in order for a more complete accounting of the viability of the theory to be determined. The present work attempts to address some of these issues.

The criticisms of Brown and Levinson’s model are the same criticisms that were emerging in the field of sociolinguistics and speech act theory in general at the time of their book’s publication. A number of researchers were questioning the cultural specificity or ethnocentric bases of the theoretical models. There was a movement to attend to cultural (and social) norms in the evaluation of language usage and the linguistic devices used by particular cultures, and a concomitant tendency to reject or de-emphasize universals. Complementing this trend, there was a desire to compare linguistic phenomena across languages and cultures. This desire to seek universals lead to work such as Wierzbicka’s metalanguage (for cross-cultural semantic comparison) and the cross-cultural work of Shoshana Blum-Kulka.

---

54 For such criticisms relating to Slavic languages see Wierzbicka 1985 and Mills 1991 and 1992.

I also have my own reservations about Brown and Levinson's claims of universality, which I elaborate on in the following chapter as I discuss the findings of my own analysis. My findings undercut the claims of universality of the specific strategies, but a broader consideration of strategies could eventually lead to a universal framework – one that allowed for cultural conventions and norms and that considered para- and extralinguistic factors as well as linguistic devices. Most importantly, such a framework would examine FTAs (or speech acts) in the full context of discourse — not in segregation. As Sell points out, "can one really isolate FTAs and politeness from everything else" (1991, 213)?

3.6 Integrating Pragmatics and Bakhtin's Speech Genres.

The fields of pragmatics and politeness theory may be used in conjunction with the ideas of Bakhtin for a more encompassing view of language phenomena than linguistics alone can offer. Bakhtin wrote extensively on language, but linguists have been slow to incorporate his ideas into linguistic thought and research. This neglect is all the more surprising given the focus of his writing on language and the related directions that linguistic research has taken in the last 30 years or so, notably in such fields as discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, and pragmatics. Researchers in reported speech have made some reference to Bakhtin's work, but in the West, at least, there has been little discussion in the linguistic literature about his concept of speech genres - and this at a time when speech act theory and discourse analysis have been emerging issues in linguistics.

For the purposes of this dissertation, I am particularly interested in the concepts Bakhtin discusses in his essay "The Problem of Speech Genres" (written 1952-53). I wish to suggest that Bakhtin's notion of speech genres provides a necessary and
missing complement to linguistic theories of pragmatics and sociolinguistics. These fields have often not adequately taken into account the relevant historical and social factors that are necessary to understand properly the causes of language change and development. While this criticism may be a bit premature for the relatively young field of historical pragmatics, it is a valid point in regard to sociolinguistics.

In his essay, Bakhtin describes speech genres as a joining of history and language as he discusses the historical processes that effect style in language. He writes of the need for a "history of speech genres" to reflect changes occurring in social life.\(^\text{56}\) The issue of language was not just one of language as an entity or speech as a means of communication, but as a measure of history and society. Bakhtin calls speech genres "the drive belts from the history of society to the history of language" (1986, 65).

In "Discourse in the Novel", Bakhtin writes about the problem of relying on the current living language for understanding works from earlier eras and foreign languages and cultures. Our lack of knowledge of the corresponding systems prevents us from sensing "any distinction...between levels and distances" (1981, 417). Bakhtin notes that "historico-linguistic research into language systems and styles available to a given era...will help us to differentiate and find the proper distances within that language" (1981, 417). I think that the combination of Bakhtin's perception of what is needed for a true understanding of the processes affecting language change and the tools developed by contemporary linguistic theory can lead us to a greater understanding of the path that these processes take.

Bakhtin's work has not been completely ignored by linguists, but his ideas deserve more attention than they have received to date. Although linguists in the West

---

\(^\text{56}\) This call is paralleled by Dean Worth's 1984 article which calls for a social history of language which includes three components: social history, linguistic history, and a system of genres.
may have made little note of Bakhtin's concept of speech genres, linguists in his native Russian have taken more notice, but they seem to feel, for the most part, that the concept described by Bakhtin finds a more or less equal, though more fully developed description in speech act theory as described by Austin and Searle. Meanwhile, in the West, one paper that does discuss the relationship between speech acts and Bakhtin's speech genres finds more differences than similarities between the two theories (Stewart, 1976). The Russians seem to embrace the systemization that speech act theory provides for describing speech, yet Stewart notes that Bakhtin rejected systematization because it meant a rejection of history and creativity, and these are two of the factors that make speech what it is - individuals using language in a dialogue.

Speech act theory ignores history and the place of language and speech in social life. It is oriented to small chunks of speech with little attention to the larger context in which it belongs; however, like Bakhtin's speech genres, speech acts are concerned with speaker intent (Bakhtin uses the terms "speech plan" or "speech will"). As Hymes has noted, the future of speech act theory can only achieve lasting success if it "depends on the integration of attention to types of single act into this larger context, the context of speaking (and writing) itself" (1990, 425).

Wierzbicka has voiced a slightly different view of the relationship between speech act theory and speech genres. She sees the need for a basic unit to describe speech (something smaller than the speech act) and for a larger unit (the speech genre). I agree with Wierzbicka that the two theories overlap but do not coincide fully. The speech genre is indeed something larger and more encompassing than the speech act, though speech acts and speech genres do sometimes correspond, as in the military

\footnote{This issue has been discussed in two recent survey articles about the work of Russian linguists in speech genres – FedosiuK and Dement'ev, both 1997.}
command which is both a speech act and a speech genre. Bakhtin addresses the heterogeneous nature of speech genres in his essay; he makes a distinction between two types of speech genres, primary and secondary. Bakhtin considers some types of oral language such as “of the salon, of one’s own circle, and other types as well, such as familiar, familiar-everyday, sociopolitical, philosophical, and so on” (1986, 65) as primary (simple) genres and more developed, complex, and organized genres such as novels, dramas, major genres of commentary as secondary (complex) speech genres. Secondary speech genres “absorb and digest various primary (simple) genres that have taken form in unmediated speech communion. These primary genres are altered and assume a special character when they enter into complex ones” (1986, 62).

To date no work has attempted to integrate Bakhtin’s speech genres with Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory. While it is not possible to speak of a single speech genre of politeness, it is possible to list speech genres such as invitations, social calls, or chance encounters on the street which contain FTAs and politeness strategies. What is missing in Brown and Levinson’s account is the context for politeness; this absence could not occur in Bakhtin’s account of speech genres. It is an integral part of the account that he suggests.

In the following chapter I will examine a genre — conversation books — that is clearly based on primary genres, everyday speech acts, but which, by virtue of its developed and organized character, is itself a secondary (complex) genre. In doing so I wish to show how the “primary” genres used here are more that just speech acts, and that linguistic politeness theory reveals more about them than speech act theory and that this theory, in turn, benefits from contact with Bakhtin’s theory of speech genres.
The genre that I will discuss is particularly interesting because it serves as an example of the change that Bakhtin describes from primary to secondary speech genres. The books use primary speech genres, the everyday speech acts, and very consciously create another genre, a secondary speech genre, the conversation book, a model of language behavior. Speech genres accumulate meaning over time, and the evolution from primary to secondary speech genre could also contribute to the accumulated meaning of a genre.

I think that the conversation books provide a clear illustration of speech genres as “drive belts from the history of society to the history of language.” This genre played a role in the development of the literary language that has been overlooked up to this point. I use the term ‘literary language’ in the broadest, Bakhtinian sense. Bakhtin notes that literary language includes nonliterary styles and that “any expansion of the literary language that results from drawing on various extraliterary strata of the national language inevitably entails some degree of penetration into all genres of written language (literary, scientific, commentarial, conversational, and so forth) to a greater or lesser degree, and entails new generic devices for the construction of the speech whole, its finalization, the accommodation of the listener or partner, and so forth” (1986, 65-66). The genre of the conversation books is one that draws on the “extraliterary strata” and brings the speech genres that it finds in conversation into a literary genre.
CHAPTER 4

LINGUISTIC POLITENESS IN DOMASHNIE RAZGOVORY

Preliminary Remarks.

In the previous chapters I established the social and educational context in which the texts were written, examined the history of the texts themselves and discussed the theoretical background of the analysis. This chapter will examine the language that was actually recommended in the books. What models of spoken Russian were being offered to the readers of conversation books in eighteenth-century Russia? While I examined several conversation books for the study, the focus in this chapter will be on one book, the Domashnie Razgovory, the only conversation book that consists exclusively of dialogues. The Domashnie Razgovory offers the best source of dialogues that exemplify the politeness issues discussed in Chapter Three, since it has the most dialogues in which there are face conflicts. The other sources function, in effect, as phrase books as much as conversation books; that is they teach the reader phrases and opinions to be repeated in the appropriate context. The dialogues that do exist in these works tend to be expository and are often lengthy as they wander from topic to topic. In this respect they are often more like real conversation, but they are short on the face conflicts evaluated in this study.

I grouped the dialogues into groups by level of imposition, which I discuss in 4.2. These groupings allows for an organized evaluation of how communication and
face redress, with varying levels of effort and success, occur in the dialogues. In addition, I discuss the use of address terms in the dialogues as well as the prevailing social maxim that emerges from the dialogues – duty and its expressions in the *Domashnie Razgovory*.

Many of the dialogues in *Domashnie Razgovory* deliver information that may have been new to some Russian readers, such as the qualities to look for in Brazilian coffee (#R 24), or this dialogue on the history of the use of tobacco (#R 22).

(1)

**Разговоръ 22 О Употреблении табаку**

A 58  

**T**  

Желалъ бы я знать, мон господь, давно ли уже въ Европѣ табакъ извѣстенъ.

B  

**T**  

Во извѣстіе вамъ, государь мой, доношу сие, онъ знакомь сталъ по сысканіи Америки. Гибшанцы назвали его такъ, по имени Табако, провинцій королевствъ Юкотанскому, где его сперва нашли, и употребленіе сей нынѣ столь общей травы ввели.

C  

**T**  

Вы правдиво сказали, столь общей травы, а я почитаю се за всеобщую.

A  

**T**  

Я считаюсь между тѣмъ (въ числѣ тѣхъ находуся,) которые ево очень много употребляютъ, ибо я ево курю и нюхаю: но сие обыкновеніе весьма худо, отъ котораго отстать надлежалобъ.

C  

**T**  

Правда я табаку не курю, но токмо много нюхаю.

C [B]  

**T**  

Въ прочемъ великиѣ торгъ имъ отправляются во всѣхъ Европейскихъ государствахъ, хотя онъ дешевою цѣною покупается.

C  

**T**  

Какой вы, государь мой, нюхаете табакъ?

A  

**T**  

Бразильской.

---

58 The speakers are not generally marked in the dialogues. The speaker identifications in the examples are my own, unless otherwise noted. In dialogue 22, however, the speakers are marked, though the letters in the Russian column contain errors, the identification from the French and German columns are shown in the brackets.
The dialogues in the conversation books were presenting models of Western behavior and in doing so they were implying that such behavior was acceptable and desirable. This behavior could sometimes be in conflict with the traditional Russian norms. The use of tobacco is one example. Its use was forbidden in seventeenth-century Russia and it was described as the “Devil’s herb.” Old Believers continued to ban it, seeing it as emblematic of corrupting Western influence, but, for those Russians eager to embrace the new ways, tobacco use was a way of demonstrating adherence to the new cultural standards advanced by Peter the Great and his social reformers.59

These “informational” dialogues often do not contain FTAs which are useful for the purposes of this study. I chose dialogues in which there is a face conflict to be resolved, for example, two men trying to get through a doorway, unexpected (and unwelcome) encounters on the street, repaying a debt, and extending and receiving invitations. While I do not agree with Brown and Levinson that politeness only exists when there are face needs to be redressed, such cases are the clearest instances of

59 Thanks to Eve Levin for this information on the cultural significance of tobacco use.
politeness in action. Since they only expect to find "politeness" strategies in action where face is clearly under threat, it follows that only in dialogues with such situations could Brown and Levinson's strategies find any application (see Kasper, 1997, and Brown and Levinson, 5-6). I chose FTAs with some discreet level of imposition in situations where politeness issues could be most clearly examined. The dialogues in this study contain FTAs which generally are conflicts over controlling someone's actions, i.e. getting someone to agree to come to dinner or go for a walk. One notable exception involves settling a debt. This dialogue is also the only one in the group in which the speakers appear to be from different social groups.

After selecting the dialogues that fit the criteria, I look at each dialogue and attempt to assign strategies from Brown and Levinson to each utterance or turn of a speaker. Since not all utterances are FTAs, not all utterances receive strategy assignments. Brown and Levinson examine speech acts and assign strategies to individual utterances; they do not examine the speech acts within the context of an extended dialogue as I do. Although I also assign strategies to individual utterances or turns, I examine each one within the context of the given dialogue, since I view the act of conversation itself (and the need for proper behavior of which it was an integral part) as an FTA. This fact that conversation itself is a larger FTA influences the strategies that appear in various utterances.

While examining the Russian text, I follow the French and German texts for places where the various texts deviated in meaning or politeness strategies. The three languages coincide in meaning and strategy (at least superficially) in the vast majority of cases. Noteworthy exceptions are discussed with the examples below.

---

See Chapter Three for discussion of problems with the definition of politeness.
Similarities in strategy and word choice are not surprising, given that the book is a translation, and also given that (as is well known) Russians were actively imitating and assimilating Western forms of behavior, both verbal and nonverbal. Thus, the question of Western influence or borrowing is a valid one. But one must first consider what is meant by 'borrowing.' The term may be defined as a form "taken over by one language or dialect from another" (Crystal, 41), and it may refer to a lexical item, sound, or grammatical structure. But at what point is a 'borrowing' to be considered a nativized element of the language? While this question is a complex one and a full answer is beyond the bounds of the present work, the fact that the dialogues survived a lengthy editorial process within the Academy of Sciences suggests a certain degree of acceptance and normativity as valid models of speech behavior to be disseminated in educational materials.

4.2 Imposition Levels.

Speakers may use several means in their attempts to achieve their goals. These tools include the decision whether or not to do the FTA; a choice of politeness strategies for carrying out any FTA; adjusting the amount of compulsion to place on the speech partner; and deciding about the relative importance of the face conflict in regard to each participant's self-interests.

I group the dialogues by level of imposition, which I determine by establishing what sort of obligation is being placed on a speaker by the speech partner. These groupings range from low through mid to high. Measuring imposition level is not just a question of enumerating the number of steps necessary to achieve the desired effect, but of examining what occurs within each of those steps (here in turns of speech), the
presence or absence of FTAs, the type of strategy, and the level of compulsion laid on the speech partner. The following discussion will show what is meant by these ratings.

A note about the texts; this study looks at language and speech on a pragmatic level. The texts are eighteenth-century Russian and reflect the grammatical, morphological, and orthographic norms of that time. While these texts do present forms of interest it is not the purpose of the current work to examine them.

4.2.1 Low-Level Imposition.

The low level of imposition is seen in dialogues where the parties are, not surprisingly, basically well-disposed to each other. The exchanges are marked by an absence of or very low level of conflict, such as greetings and exchanges of compliments, and the expression of positive, friendly feelings for the other. In some situations, the only FTA is the conversation itself. Also typical of low-level dialogues is a reluctance to impose, either on the host or the guest. Such reluctance is seen in dialogues of all levels, but in the low-level dialogues it is generally respected, either by the initiator of the FTA not pressing his request or by the other party agreeing to what is requested without excessive delay. FTAs in these dialogues are generally handled quickly; any potential conflict is cut off before it can become a problem. The initial reluctance is usually dropped after one “requisite” display, which social protocol (as described in the behavior guides) demanded. The behavior guides recommended some reluctance in accepting various manifestations of hospitality, but also warn against excessive refusal.

The low-level dialogues fall into several subgroupings. The first is invitations. Invitations (to dine, to go for a walk, etc.) are usually refused initially, or else some reluctance to impinge is shown by the invited party, as in #R 47:
(2)
Разговор 47  О том же.

A  Т₁  Жела́ть бы́ я вась, государь мой, удержать у себя обедать, ежели бы́ я то имел, что вамъ бы́ приятно было.

B  Т₂  У вась всегда богатой бываетъ столъ; только я вась теперь обеспечоить не хочу.

A  Т₃  Ежели вы симъ малымъ общдомъ довольны будете, то я сие почти себѣ за великую честь и угождение.

B  Т₄  Наипаче я приму то за честь и удовольствие.

The exchange in #R 47 demonstrates how the speakers respond to the imposition level signalled in each speaker's turn. Here the level stays low. In T₁, speaker A tries to maintain a balance of seeming to wish not to impose with the act of making an offer; the host is downplaying his potential offerings, as if he does not want to offer his guest something unenjoyable. Ostensibly he is thus supplying an out for B, but in fact this strategy has the opposite effect; B must reply with a positive statement, complimenting A's food (T₂), though he includes a clause in which he seems to be trying to avoid imposing on his host. A reiterates his desire for B to accept the invitation in T₃. He continues to downplay what he has to offer B, but he uses this chance to tell his guest what honor and pleasure it will bring him to be his host. Having dispensed with the requisite first refusal, B can now accept with equal enthusiasm (T₄).

A similar situation can be found in #R 30, in which one man meets another on the street and wishes to join him on his walk. Speaker A uses this technique to "test the waters" and see if his self-invitation to join B will be welcome or not (T₂).

(3)
Разговор 30  О прогуливанье

A  Т₁  Куда вы изволите ити?
In T₃, A appears to be reluctant to impose his company on B; consequently, in T₄, B must indicate what pleasure A’s company would be.

In # R 3 (4), the guests are very aware that they are imposing on the host and remind him so in T₃.

(4)

Разговоръ 3 Комплименты при визитѣ

A  T₁  Вы намъ позволил, государь мой, пріѣхать къ вамъ, мы пріѣхали отдать вамъ долгъ нашъ, и провѣдать о здоровѣ вашемъ.

B  T₂  Я вамъ, государы мои, покорно благодарную за честь, которую вы мнѣ здѣлалы. Моя бы должность была, пріѣхать къ вамъ: меня это очень безпокойитъ, что вы своимъ учтивствомъ предскуроли мою должность.

A  T₃  Вы такъ говорить изволите, и вы не поставите того въ вину, что мы пріѣхали отнять у васъ четверть часа отъ вашего времени, которое вамъ очень дорого.

B  T₄  Мнѣ нѣть пріятнѣе времени какъ то, которое я препровожу въ вашей пріятной компаній.

This brief dialogue provides examples of how many different strategies can occur in a single sentence. In T₁ speaker(s) A use the negative politeness strategy - apologize, admit the impingement when they say, Vy nam pozvolil; thus they immediately move to let B know that they are impinging. This move is directly followed
by *gosudar' moi* which serves as a display of the negative politeness strategy -
deference, by using a term of respect when addressing B. Speakers A refer to the debt
that they are repaying; a sense of duty recurs throughout the text as an overriding
concern. This preoccupation is examined more below in 4.4. As a politeness strategy it
is difficult to categorize; it does not fit the negative politeness criteria of not impinging
on H’s freedom, but it does not reflect the positive politeness sense of wanting what H
wants. It is a way of showing respect to H which would seem to be oriented towards
H’s negative face, but it does not fit well into any negative politeness strategy described
by Brown and Levinson. The turn ends with a positive politeness phrase, *proviedat o
zdrowie vashem*; the previous displays of deference and respect lead up to a positive
politeness strategy - notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods). Here the
“goods” are B’s health.

In T₂, several strategies appear. B also uses the polite term of address, *gosudar' moi*
which serves as a display of deference (negative politeness). The work *pokorno* is
also a marker of deference. Giving thanks for the honor received, *blagodarstvuiu za
chest’* fits into the negative politeness strategy - go on record as incurring a debt, or as
not indebting H. B also mentions the call of duty, *moia by dolzhnost' byla*. B is also
disturbed that A in their courtesy anticipated B’s duty. This discomfort at being shown
up by someone else fuels a rival spirit in the dialogues that occurs again and again.
Courtesy and politeness seem motivated by a sense of competition more than by respect
and friendship.

The speakers (A) in T₃ pay redress to B by downplaying his sense of having
been anticipated in courtesy, *Vy tak govorit' izvolite*. This move seems to function as a
kind of positive politeness - notice, attend to H (his interests, needs, wants, goods) yet
it also has a negative-politeness sense of A minimizing the importance that B attributes to
A’s visit and its timing. The speakers (A) return to negative politeness strategies to reiterate their recognition that they are imposing on B; they make a clear statement that they are imposing on B, taking up his valuable time (my priekhali toniat u vas…ot vashego vremen, kotoroe vam ochen’ dorogo) using the negative politeness strategy - go on record as incurring a debt, or not indebting H.

In the final turn, T₄, B counters A’s negative politeness strategies with a positive politeness strategy - give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation) that emphasizes how pleasant the time spent in their company is (priiatniee vremeni, priiatnoi kompanii). The “gift” that B offers is compliments, not a gift listed by Brown and Levinson.

In the dialogue below, #R 31, it is the guest (A) who is inviting the host for a walk. In the first turn he gives the host (B) a reason to accept or refuse the invitation - either by welcoming a break or by citing the need to work.

(5)
Разговор 31 Звать кого съ собою прогуливаться

A  T₁ Мой государь вы всегда въ трудахъ упражняетесь.
B  T₂ Не очень много, мой государь, я дѣлаю только, для пропганія своей скуки.
A  T₃ Я не хочу вамъ дѣлать мѣшать.
B  T₄ Мой дѣла не весьма нужны: я чрезъ три дни изъ дому не выходилъ, и я весьма радъ, что вы ко мнѣ пожаловали.
A  T₅ Мой государь, понеже я увидѣлъ, что воздухъ столь пріятень и ясенъ (на дворѣ столь пріятно и ясно), то пришолъ я къ вамъ спросить, не поволите ли прогуляться.
B  T₆ Мой государь, вы великое угощеніе мнѣ дѣлаете; ибо мнѣ сидѣть дома одному скушно, да и дѣла мои не таковы, чтобъ ими весьма спѣшить, (не къ спѣху).
A/B? T2 Дело делать мне всегда время, а прогуливаться с вами не всегда случай имью.

T1 functions as a kind of pre-sequence (to borrow a term from Conversation Analysis) to the invitation that follows in T3. Although A’s uninvited appearance at B’s home may be considered an FTA, T1 does not fit any category described by Brown and Levinson; nevertheless, it has an integral role in the conduct of the interaction. B’s response in T2 indicates receptiveness to a break in his work routine. The guest voices his wish not to impinge on B in T3, offering a second chance at an out (going beyond the “requisite” one showing, perhaps because the FTA is still implicit). The host’s response in T4 tells the guest that his visit is welcome and A can infer that his invitation to go for a walk (T5) will be well received. The final two turns, as listed here, T6 and T7, present a problem. The paragraph marking in the original for all four languages indicates a change of speaker (to A for T7 as marked above, my speaker assignments). The context of the conversation would suggest, however, that it is a continuation of B’s turn in T6. B has already stated that he is bored at home alone and his business is not urgent, therefore, the statement in T7 could logically be attributed to him as he accepts A’s invitation to get some fresh air.

The dialogue in (5) demonstrates a problem with strategy assignments following the Brown and Levinson schema. T1 is neither an on-record FTA nor an off-record FTA. Brown and Levinson group the off-record strategies that they list by the Gricean maxims that they violate, e.g. the maxims of Relevance, Quantity, Quality, or Manner. This qualification of off-record statements as violations shows that T1 does not fit the criteria for off-record statements. T1 functions to assess B’s receptiveness to an invitation, which comes later (T3). The potential for face threat to A exists if B’s response indicates that his work is more important than A’s company. However, any
out that A may be providing is only an “ostensible” out. At any rate, B would have to offer a strong justification for refusing to go on a walk. (Compare discussion of (2).

Another subgroup of the low-imposition-level dialogues are those in which the speakers simply express positive, friendly feelings towards one another. The speakers are maintaining and furthering amicable emotions by communicating good will towards the speech partner. This type of exchange is missing in Brown and Levinson’s discussions of politeness but certainly must be seen as part of the fabric of polite behavior. There is contemporary evidence that they were normative: eighteenth century behavior guides direct readers to say pleasant things: “Accustom yourself to saying something courteous to all; it is the secret means to gain love from all. But do so without showing that you are striving, and without flattery” (Druzheskie Soviety, 50).

Here is a response to someone inviting himself along on a walk (#R30); see (3), above.

(6)
B T₄ Мой государь, съ вами вместе прохаживаться мнѣ весьма приятно будет.

or in T₄-T₆ (T₇) in #R 31 see (5) above.

B T₄ Мой дѣла не весьма нужны: я чрезъ три дни изъ дому не выходилъ, и я весьма радъ, что вы ко мнѣ пожаловали.

A T₅ Мой государь, понеже я увидѣлъ, что воздухъ столь приятен и ясенъ (на дворѣ столь приятно и ясно), то пришелъ я къ вамъ спросить, не поволите ли прогуляться.

B T₆ Мой государь, вы великое уважение мнѣ дѣлаете; ибо мнѣ сидѣть дома одному скучно, да и дѣла мнѣ не таковы, чтобъ имѣ весьма спѣшить, (не къ спѣху).

A/B? T₇ Дѣло дѣлать мнѣ всегда время, а прогуливаться съ вами не всегда случай имѣю.
Low-imposition-level dialogues often contain exchanges of compliments, as in $T_4$ and $T_5$ in #R 8 (7). Similar to $T_1$ in #R 31 (5), the face threat only exists if an inappropriate response occurs. By making a compliment in return, remarking on C’s good manners ($T_2$), A avoids any face damage. The italicized portions of the dialogue are characteristic of the speech behavior of low-imposition-level interactions in the emphasis on positive topics: ‘I’m very glad…’, ‘You do me a great honor…’, etc.

(7)

Разговор 8  Приходить к стати.

A $T_1$  Давно уже я не имел чести видеть г. Сазе, где бы он был? надобно послать проводить объ нем.

Слушать никто, кажется, будто кто у дверей.

B $T_2$  Это г. Сазе.

A $T_3$  Вы пожаловали, государь мой, очень к стати, я объ вас думал; и ежели бы вы не пришли, я бы послал вас искать.

C $T_4$  Это знак, государь мой, что вы меня любите, по тому что вы обо мн я думаете, и что вы хотели бы меня посылать. Я вам покорно благодарствую, за ваше напоминание, прося вас, чтоб меня всегда в вашей памяти сохранить. Я бы желал быть столько щастлив, чтоб иметь случай вам услугу показать.

A $T_5$  Вы очень учтивы, государь мой. А я приму всегда ваше намерение за самое дело.

In (8) the guest turns the host’s disappointment that he is not drinking into a chance to compliment his wine choice ($T_4$ and $T_5$). In this way, he heads off further attempts by the host to push wine on him and maintains a low imposition level.

(8)

Комплименты 54  Просить хозяинъ гостей, чтобъ пили и прохлажались (вселились).

A $T_1$  Господя, что пить не изволите? пожалуйте кушайте буде не противно: разве вино вамъ не нравится?
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This dialogue evolves into a lengthy exchange of toasts among the guests and hosts, continuing the show of good will and cordiality inherent to low-imposition-level dialogues.

In #R 40 (9), a foreigner is searching for someone’s apartment, but cannot find it since the person he is seeking has moved; he is aided by a local and his servant. (The italics in the dialogue are mine.)

(9)

Разговор 40  Пріїжжему указываютъ, кого ищеть.

A  Т1  Говорите ли вы, государь мой, по Французски?
B  Т2  Говорю, да не много, однако столько что вамъ услужить могу.
A  Т3  Пожалуйте, государь мой, скажите мнѣ гдѣ живетъ господинъ Н.
B  Т4  Онъ живеть здѣсь блиско, (въ сосѣдствѣ).
A  Т5  Я очень долго искалъ ево квартиры.
B  Т6  Не дивно, ибо онъ переѣхалъ. Онъ недалеко отсюда живеть, вы тотчасъ туда дойдете, возмите моево дѣтину, онъ васъ туда проводить.
B  Т7  Иванъ, поди съ симъ господиномъ, и укажи ево милости, гдѣ живетъ господинъ Н. (квартиру).
A  Т8  Весьма благодарствую вамъ, государь мой, за такую милость, которую вы иностранному человѣку оказываете, а онъ вамъ обратно услужить не можетъ.
The speech is characterized by mutual displays of respect. A uses the polite address form *gosudar' moi* or *gosudar'* in all but one turn. B refers to the stranger as *evo milosti* when directing his servant to guide him to his destination (*T*_12). The very act of offering his servant as a guide signals a level of respect towards the foreigner. All of the signs of respect still permit the mixing of T/V with a second person singular imperative in *T*_12, *prosti*, followed by *gosudar' moi*, the second use of the term in the turn. Interrogative speech acts by both speakers fit standard patterns with the use of the particle *li* (*T*_1, *T*_8, and *T*_10) and the imperative in *T*_3. The Russianization of the servant’s name (*T*_7) is further evidence of the efforts to “domesticate” the text as compared with the French *Jean* and the German *Johann*.  

4.2.2 Mid-Level Imposition.

The mid-imposition-level dialogues contain some conflict between self-interest and the requirement for proper behavior. The mid-level impositions may also display a level of compulsion or obligation laid upon a speech partner to do something, such as comply with a request or accept an invitation, seen in some of the examples in the previous section. Mid-level imposition can also be signalled by a self-deprecating/self-lowering move in order to show deference to the speech partner.

---

61 See Mills, 1991 for further discussion of Russian interrogatives
Examples of conflicts of interest may be seen in many dialogues. The conflict between ostensible deference and obedience (a component of accepted/proper social behavior) is readily apparent in # R 9 (10), in which two men are each trying to get the other to pass through a door first. This particular dialogue is almost iconic for the genre. The most popular conversation books of the period all have a version of this scene. The universal nature of this scene extends to literature; Gogol recreates such a situation in *Dead Souls* when Chichikov and Manilov are shown trying to get through a doorway.

(10)

Разговор 9    Комплименты или учтивости, просить кого, чтобы вошел

A    T₁    Прощу войти, государь мой; пожалуй воиди. Я вась прошу войти:
B    T₂    Я за вами буду иметь честь слѣдовать.
A    T₃    Для чего вы не изволите войти! дверь отворена.
B    T₄    Подите передо мною, а я за вами. Изволь, изволь пойти.
A    T₅    Я не здѣлаю сею.
B    T₆    Вы дѣлаете очень много церемоній:
A    T₇    Не ть, вы очень много ихъ дѣлаете. Я иногда не дѣлаю какъ должность мою.
B    T₈    Войди же.
A    T₉    Я вамъ покорюсь, или я васъ послушаюсь; вы хотите, чтобъ я былъ не учтивъ, то я здѣлаю, чтобъ не быть непослушливымъ.

The protocol for certain behavior that showed respect for others was well-defined. The behavior guide, *Nauka byt' uchtivym* (1774) contains the following admonition:

Есть нѣкоторыя дѣла отъ натуры независящія, которыя однако согласіе честныхъ людей установило между нами, на пр: Снимать шляпу для засвидѣтельствованія нашего почтения, уступать первенство при дверяхъ, вышнее мѣсто въ комнатѣ, или за столомъ,
The speakers find themselves under a similar obligation to obey the other and to abide by some common sense rules regarding behavior, as is also laid out in *Nauka byt' uchtivym*.

This dialogue shows a variety of the positive, negative, and bald strategies described by Brown and Levinson. The difficulty of assigning Brown and Levinson's strategies to the utterances in the dialogues has already been mentioned. I will go through each turn here and discuss some of these difficulties with specific examples.

(11)

A  T₁  Прочу войти, государь мой; пожалуй вони. Я вась прошу войти:

Several elements in this utterance speak for calling it an example of the negative politeness strategy of deference per Brown and Levinson. The use of the verb *proshu* connotes a consideration of the face needs of the other; *prosit'* means to make a request, not a command. It adds a degree of indirectness to the request over the imperative. The address form *gosudar' moi* is to indicate respect (a discussion of the use of address terms in the text follows in 4.3) as does *pozhalui*. The forms of *pozhalui* and *voidi* are noteworthy for their singular form, in contrast to the second person plural of the two
The familiar form seems in some dialogues to have an emphatic function, urging the hearer to do as requested. This emphatic function seems to be at work in this text, but full consideration of this issue falls beyond the scope of this study. It should be noted that some T/V switches, as in #R 40 (9) above, are seemingly arbitrary. The initial invitation to enter is repeated, this time with the pronouns for the subject and the object, adding more formality to the utterance. It is possible that this final clause in the turn is an alternative, as is given at the end of T₆ in #R 31 (5) above, however, as in #R 31, such alternatives are enclosed by parentheses. Multiverbation can also be seen as a distancing device, since it renders language more autonomous and less tied to the inferential work of the interlocutor (see Lakoff). Brown and Levinson seem to see multiverbation as a stacking up of politeness moves (142).

The element of the utterance that is problematic for viewing it as an example of deference in Brown and Levinson's terms is the verb form void. Brown and Levinson write that the occurrence of such bald forms in invitations is intended to overcome H's reluctance to impinge (but would not be compatible with a desire on S's part to show deference). The fact that it is a familiar form of the verb would seem, in their view, even more of a face threat.

Studies of politeness in Slavic languages reveal other possibilities for the use of imperatives and, in doing so, provide counterevidence to claims about the universality of the politeness strategies. In discussing the differences between acceptable linguistic devices in English and Polish, Wierzbicka states, “It is essential to recognize that what is involved is not any differences in ‘powers of rationality and inference’, but differences

---

62 The use of T/V forms in Russian was not fixed in the eighteenth century. The ṭy form was used for singular address until the time of Peter I when the use of ṭy for singular address came into use. The exchange of ṭy for vy was gradual and remained unfixed in the early part of the eighteenth century; in conversation, the use of ṭy continued even later in the century (Unbegaun 1939, 272-73).
in ‘cultural logic’, encoded in language” (1985a, 175). She cites such differences as the “heavy restrictions on the use of the imperative in English and the wide range of use of interrogative forms in performing acts other than questions…” (150). Polish frequently uses imperatives where English requires more “tentative” constructions, such as offering advice, making offers, or issuing directives. Wierzbicka links the English restriction on the use of the imperative to a cultural concern with individual autonomy, while the Polish use of the imperative in certain contexts is linked to ideas about warmth, hospitality, spontaneity, and directness. Thus, cultural restrictions on the use of the imperative (or any other linguistic form) should not be confused with universal restrictions on the production of a linguistic form for the expression of a particular message.

The next turn could also be characterized as deference, as expressed by the phrase *imiet' chest' sliedovat*.

(12)  
B T₂  Я за вами буду имьть честь слъдовать.

Speaker B uses a formulaic phrase (calqued from French) to express the honor he will feel, and the verb *sliedovat* underscores the cultural image of the more important personage entering first, as noted above in the *Nauka byt' uchtivym*. The form *la...budu* serves as a signal to A that B will not execute the commands in T₁, and the move is one of “polite noncooperation.”

The next turn sees an increase in imposition level, as A’s language indicates some frustration that B has not already cooperated.

(13)  
A T₃  Для чего вы не изволите войти! дверь отворена.
This utterance is a bald on record usage. The speaker is moving quickly from the initial invitation, which he should expect to be refused, to a show of impatience with B for not obeying/accepting his offer to go through the door. The turn does include the politeness device, izvolite which also serves to create a degree of indirectness, similar to that seen with the use of proshu in T₁ (11). According to Dal’ (II, 16), the latter is used as a supplement to the verb to express politeness. Thus, even the bald on record effusion in (13) draws on polite linguistic devices. Brown and Levinson, who treat bald on record as lack of politeness, do admit the co-occurrence of different super-strategies, but provide no extensive discussion of how they function.

The next turn uses a mix of strategies as B attempts to convince A to go through the doorway first.

(14)

B T₄ Подите передо мною, а я за вами. Изволь, изволь пойти.

B begins with the second person plural imperative, on the face of things a bald on record move; however, he emphasizes that A should proceed him, peredo mnoiu and then repeats a phrase from his previous turn (12), a ia za vami. These phrases regarding the order in which the men should pass through the doorway are displays of deference, a negative politeness strategy. Finally, B uses another imperative form, but his time a second person singular form of a verb (izvol’ ) which is used for polite requests and commands. The Slovar’ Russkogo lazyka XVIII Veka (9: 25) defines the use of the imperative forms of izvolit’ “for the expression of a polite request or command.” Paradoxically, the very word that appears as an imperative in the bald on record strategy is a form of redress. Thus, bald on record is used in the imperative forms, but there are some mitigating politeness devices in the deferential request for A to precede B and the
shift in the forms of the imperative is noteworthy. The plural form is generally construed to mean respect and the singular form for familiarity. I would argue that the use of izvol' fits several strategies. Its meaning is linked to politeness and deference (negative politeness), but the familiar form can also be used to create a sense of camaraderie, that A and B share a friendly social bond and B is trying to cajole A into cooperating with his request to go through the doorway, which is an element of positive politeness, and the imperative form may be linked to bald on record. Conversely, the use of izvol' could be one of emphasis and thus an indicator of greater force. As has already been noted, usage of T/V was still not fixed and occurrences of T forms are not always indicative of a general reciprocal use of ty between speakers.

After T, the exchange clearly moves to a higher imposition level. A’s first invitation to B was not heeded, already on the second try he seemed rather frustrated at the way things were going, and now he refuses outright to cooperate with B’s request.

(15)
A  T,  Я не здѣлаю сею.

This turn is clearly a bald on record strategy. A is refusing to comply with B’s request and seems to be placing his own face needs above B’s. The bald, direct form of the refusal has nothing in it to mitigate the face threat, as izvolite does in (13). In this dialogue it is not clear where the encounter is occurring, whether it is at the home of one of the participants or in a public location, where neither speaker could be considered the “host.” As noted in the excerpt from Nauka byt’ uchtivym, one should yield passage through a doorway, but one should also not have to be asked to do something (by a superior) three or four times.
B’s response is notes A’s unwillingness to cooperate, but chooses to view it as an exaggerated sense of politeness, rather than as an explicit fact threat.

(16)

B T₆, Вы дёлаете очень много церемоний:

This turn demonstrates the negative politeness strategy of being conventionally indirect. On the surface, (16) seems a paradoxical statement, B is demeaning A’s “polite” behavior as part of his own polite behavior. Yet, A’s previous statement was anything but polite and B is using indirectness to try and get A to cooperate. The concept of standing on ceremony is a recurring one in the text, and deserves closer study.

A uses the same strategy of indirectness in his response.

(17)

A T₇, Нёт, вы очень много их дёлаете. Я имою не дёлаю какъ должность мою.

In contradicting B, A claims that B is the one making too much ceremony, and he adds the claim that he is only doing his duty, which seems to serve as a kind of higher authority to which he must answer. A’s contradiction is bald and direct then he turns to the cover of duty as a means of indirectness as he makes a final attempt to move B to comply and pass through the doorway. This turn provides another example of a mix of strategies, two strategies (bald and indirect) which should fail to function together according to Brown and Levinson’s predictions.

Now, B turns to a bald on record statement to compel A through the doorway.

(18)

B T₈, Войди же.
Up to this point, B has relied mostly on negative politeness strategies to express himself, but he is ready to move on and thus issues a strong directive for A, with the particle *zhe* which carries the sense of compelling, pressing, or coercing. The imperative may not be the strongest verb form available to the Russian speaker. Wierzbicka points out that in Polish, when the speaker is frustrated and wishes for his will to be carried out, the infinitive is the construction typically seen when a speaker issues a directive in anger. Thus, the Russian imperative may not have the same pragmatic force as the German and French imperative forms in the parallel texts.

The final turn sees A at last yielding to B, but not without a final dig.

(19)

\[ \text{A} T, \quad \text{Я вамъ покорюсь, или я вась послушаюсь; вы хотите, чтобы я былъ не учтивъ, то я здѣлаю, чтобы не быть непослушнымъ.} \]

As A finally relents, he reproaches A for compelling him to be obedient at the cost of being polite. This turn uses the negative politeness strategy of acknowledging the incurrence of a debt, here the debt of being the first to pass through the doorway, but it is a rather grudging acknowledgment and does not fit the self-deprecating pattern typical of negative politeness. In fact, it operates as an indirect reproach towards B for his behavior.

The lack of face redress in some utterances, including the final one, certainly raises this dialogue to the mid-imposition level. There are FTAs present in each turn as each speaker tries to get the other through the doorway first. The most threatening FTAs are the bald-on-record utterances. Speaker B achieves his goal of not being the first through the doorway, meaning that A fails. However, this dialogue inculcates a norm of competitive politeness. Rather than smoothing their relations, they have used
“politeness” in such a way that they have made their encounter more difficult. A behavior guide has advice on this point.

Ho всёчески надлежит стараться о избежании того неудобства, чтобы вежливость не была до крайности простираема: ибо от чрезмѣрной вѣжливости дѣются невѣжливыми. Всего же болѣе наблюдать должно, чтоб неприятное притворство не вкрадывалось. Isskustvo iav't'sia v sviet s uspiekhom, 26.

This dialogue seems contrary to some of Brown and Levinson's claims that politeness will increase as the level of imposition increases, as it does in the course of this dialogue. The strategies in use here are the lower-numbered strategies (bald without redressive action or with redressive action using positive politeness or negative politeness) not the higher-numbered strategies (off-record, or don’t do the FTA) predicted by Brown and Levinson.

The dialogue (20) below offers another example of an uncooperative speech partner and a conflict of interest.

(20)
Разговор 10  По вступлени́й.

A  T₁  Я радуюсь, государь мой, что васъ нахожу въ добромъ здоровье. Прощу меня извинить, что я такъ умѣлъ прити къ вамъ. Но однакожъ, право государь мой, мнѣ было не возможно исполнить мою должность ранѣе сего, для тѣхъ причинъ, о которыхъ я вамъ имѣю честь донести тотчасъ.

B  T₂  Не трудитесь пожалуйте, васъ извинять, для того, что это такое дѣло, которое зависит отъ вашего ученства. И я не имѣю ничего требовать съ сей стороны или въ разсужденіи сего.

A  T₃  Вы очень изрядно дѣлаете: однакожъ я васъ прошу то же учинить и съ моей стороны.

B  T₄  Оставимъ комплименты, сядемъ, вотъ вамъ стулъ, государь мой, покорно прошу сѣсть.

A  T₅  Я сидѣль теперь только позвольте, чтобъ я стоялъ.
The guest (A) arrives prepared to deliver his excuse for his tardiness (T₁), combining negative politeness strategies of apology (preparing to deliver the overwhelming reasons that require an apology) and on record incurrence of a debt (or here failure to pay a standing debt). The host tells him not to go to the trouble, remarking that it is a matter of his politeness and he has no demands on it (T₂). In this turn B refuses to hear A’s excuse, a clear FTA, yet he seems to distance himself from the matter by saying that it is A’s affair and not his own. He also avoids indebting A (the same negative politeness strategy as in T₁) by saying that he can place no demands on him. He chooses to let stand the distance between himself and A; in effect he passes up the opportunity to show friendliness or solidarity with A. A still hopes to win understanding from B and wants B to see the situation from his point of view (T₃) and he turns to a mix of negative politeness and positive politeness strategies. He compliments B (positive politeness), but then he contradicts him (an FTA) and asks for consideration from him, using vocabulary typical of deference (negative politeness) situations (*ia vas proshu*) (see 4.4 below). But B is ready to move on and offers his guest a seat (T₄) again, with a mix of strategies. He begins by suggesting that they drop the compliments, which in this context, is a bald move, but he does so with a first person plural form, thus, including A and B, drawing on a positive politeness strategy. He repeats this move in the next clause, inviting B to be seated and reiterates the invitation with the vocabulary of deference, *pokorno proshu* (see 4.4 below). But A refuses (another FTA), saying that he has just been standing (T₅). His statement is direct, but he does include a mitigating *pozvol’te* so that he requests rather than demands to remain standing. By offering a reason for his request, his utterance may be considered as the negative politeness strategy of apology, which includes a substrategy
of giving overwhelming reasons. Now it is A who maintains the existing distance and the encounter is clearly at mid-imposition level. B leaves it with “As you wish,” again not trying to establish a closer bond with A (T₃). This final remark does not seem to fit the politeness model seen in the dialogues of the very attentive host who is continuously aiming to provide for the comfort of his guest. The host, on the one hand, seems to be allowing the guest to decide what is most comfortable, but the form of the response indicates a lack of attention to one’s guest, that he is not looking after his guest as a Slavic host should. See 4.2.4.3 for a discussion of Slavic hosting style.

Given his guest’s generally uncooperative attitude, one can see where a host would lose patience and interest in trying to please. The guest’s frustrated attempts to explain his tardiness to his host raise this encounter to the mid-imposition level. The host’s disinterest to the guest’s dilemma also contributes to the imposition level. Both the guest and the host are unsuccessful in achieving their immediate goals; the guest can’t give his excuse and the host is unable to seat the guest. Nearly every speech turn here contains an FTA as each speaker tries to get the other to do something, whether it is to hear out an excuse or to take a seat.

Mid-imposition level dialogues can also demonstrate a level of compulsion laid on one party by the other.

(21)

Разговор 21 О курении табаку

A  T₁  Али вы, государь мой табаку не курите?
B  T₂  Нетъ, курю, государь мой, когда бываю съ такими въ компаніи, которые меня нѣкоторымъ образомъ курить понуждаютъ; будучи же дома не курю.
A  T₃  Изволь взять, вотъ трубки и табакъ.
В Т₄ Какой это у васъ табакъ?
А Т₅ Виргинской.
В Т₆ По духу слышно, онъ очень крѣпко:
А Т₇ Есть у меня другой полегче.
В Т₈ Пожалуй прикажи мнѣ тово дать
А Т₉ Тотчасъ велю принести.
А Т₁₀ Бергамъ, поди принеси сюда свертокъ (картузъ) табаку, которой у меня на столѣ лежить.
А Т₁₁ Этотъ прежняго прѣятнѣ и легче.
В Т₁₂ Какомъ бы онъ легокъ ни былъ? однако мнѣ кажется все крѣпко. Я набью трубку, только пожалуйте вы, государь мой, не принуждайте меня пить вина, понеже табакъ къ вину не пригоденъ.
А Т₁₃ Не погнѣвайтеся пожалуй, государь мой, вино вамъ вредить не будетъ.
В Т₁₄ Послушайте, государь мой, милостиво, (не поставьте во гнѣвъ) я такъ не обыкъ, вино вить скоро въ голову проходить, и я куря табакъ, вина пить не могу, мнѣ оно не здорово, ибо отъ нево у меня голова болить. Лучше запивать пивомъ табакъ, и я безъ пива курить не могу, ибо съ табаку жажда береть.
А Т₁₅ Тотчасъ вамъ, государь мой, подамъ ево. Я служанку уже за пивомъ послалъ; я ево у себя въ погребу не держу за тѣмъ, что очень рѣдко пью.

In #R 21 (21), the guest states that he only smokes when compelled to in company (T₂), and then the host precedes to give him tobacco and a pipe (T₄). The guest then has to beg not to be forced to drink wine, having agreed to smoke (T₁₂ and T₁₄). The host allows the guest to drink beer as he wishes (T₁₃). In the opening turn, A makes an observation, which by implicature serves as a kind of indirect request. In T₂, B tries to avoid saying ‘no’ to A by giving reasons for when and why he smokes (a positive politeness strategy). A responds with in a move similar to that in (14), urging him to take a pipe and tobacco (T₄) using the singular form of izvol’.
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when B is asking for a lighter tobacco, he also uses the singular forms of pozhalui prikazhi. As seen above in (11) and (14), the use of such familiar forms is not necessarily an indication of face threat, but seems to serve as a (usually) cordial emphatic device. In T₁₀, the singular imperative forms occur, as expected, in A’s orders to his servant. Later in the conversation (T₁₂), A is struggling with the harsh tobacco he has been offered and begs not to be forced to drink as well. He speaks openly about his difficulties with the, to his taste, harsh tobacco, but nevertheless proceeds to smoke the pipe. He asks his host not to coerce him to drink. He uses redress with pozhaluite and gosudar’ moi, common deference terms and adds the general maxim that wine does not go with tobacco, thus drawing on another negative politeness strategy of stating the FTA as a general rule. A blithely disagrees with his guest (T₁₃), but relents when B provides more reasons why he cannot drink wine with tobacco and requests beer instead.

The conflict between the host and the hapless guest clearly makes this a mid-imposition level dialogue. The guest is subject to the desires of the host for him to smoke and drink. The host (A) succeeds in getting his guest to consume what is offered, and the guest is only partially successful, by getting the host to offer beer and not just wine. The encounter has several FTAs, in the offers of tobacco and wine and in the guest’s attempts to get an alternative beverage. Hospitality serves as a ritualized imposition in the dialogues. See discussion of Slavic hosting style in 4.2.4.3.

In #K 46 (22), compulsion is used again to achieve a speaker’s goals.

(22)
Комплименты 46 Удержать кого у себя обедать.

| A | T₁ | Пожалуйте, государь мой, со мною отобедайте, |
| B | T₂ | Ей мнѣ не можно того здѣлать; есть у меня нѣкоторая нужда, которую я въ первомъ часу исправить желалъ бы. |
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A tries to arouse sympathy for himself in order to coerce B to stay and dine (T₃), and he capitulates, citing the call to obey. Again this dialogue has a mix of strategies. In T₁, the initial request is a direct one, with the softeners, *pozhaluite, gosudar' moi* and the imperative, *otobiedaite.* The softeners serve as forms of deference. It is a simpler version of the invitation than that found in the French and German columns. These versions offer greater redress to the potential guest: *Monsieur, vous aurez la bonté, de manger la soupe avec moi; Mein Herr, Sie werden so gütig seyn, und die Mittags-Suppe mit mir essen.* The Russian invitation is missing any mention of the favor that the guest will be doing the host by dining with him. T₂ functions as a refusal plus an excuse. Here again the Russian text deviates from the French and German. They each include the concept of obedience in their excuses; *Je ne saurais vous obeir; Ich kann Ihnen nicht gehorchen.* The Russian text, by contrast, cites B’s inability (*nie ne mozhno*) in his refusal.⁶³ In the Russian, no actual redress is offered, only some mitigation in B’s excuse that he has a need (*nuzhda*) that he wishes to take care of at that time. T₃ sees speaker A making a greater effort to persuade his guest to stay. He plays on B’s emotions by telling him that he (B) will be doing him a great favor and that he (A) is alone. A uses a marker, *vit’* as he tells B that he is alone; this marker is used to appeal to B’s state of knowledge and the implications that this information has for A, i.e. that dining alone is undesirable (see Smith and Jucker). A combines these indirect pleas with a mild directive, telling B that he can delay his business until another day; thereby assuming that his invitation is more important than B’s own affairs and downgrading his

⁶³ The role of obedience and duty in politeness is discussed below in 4.4.
nuzhda (need) to dielo (affair). This utterance is neither negative politeness or positive politeness, but it is an FTA; it calls into question B’s ability to judge priorities. Thus, an indirect speech act functions as a command, with plenty of redress vocabulary (gosudar’ moi, velikuiu milost’, pozhaluete (but note the second-person plural indicative verb form rather than the more frequent imperative form)), but no imperative. Duty is given as a reason to comply with the request (T2). In this context, it appears as an almost resigned capitulation to A. This dialogue offers a study of contrasts – it has one speaker, A, giving commands, using both direct and indirect forms, and another, B, who is called upon to obey, despite his own needs and wishes. The juxtaposition of command and obey (or not wishing to obey) is less obvious in the Russian text since it omits the clause citing obedience in T2, but the contrast between the two speakers goals remains clear.

The next dialogue, #R 49

(23), shows a situation in which the compulsion of the host is less graciously received by the guest, but even he, in the end, must comply with the host’s request.

(23)

Разговоръ 49 Званой гость приходить

A T1 Государь мой, я нѣсколько опаздалъ, пожалуйте не погнѣвайтесь на меня, что васъ задержалъ, ибо одиннатцать давно уже было.

B T2 Вы, государы мой, всегда въ самую пору приходите, и обьшаній своего не забываете, (и слова своего держитесь).

A T3 Желалъ бы я, государы мой, чтобъ въ воли моей состояло, исполнять то всѣчески, чего ваша честь и моя должность отъ меня требуютъ.

B T4 Государь мой, вы сюда пришли не комплименты строить, чего ради извольте скинуть шпагу.

B T5 Бертрамъ, прими шпагу и епанчу у сего господина.

B T6 Пожалуй, сядь тутъ, это мѣсто вамъ назначено.

132
The initial turn is similar to (20), in which the guest apologizes to the host for his tardy appearance, but here the host is less harsh and has a flattering response and the guest offers the host an additional dose of deference ($T_3$). At this point the dialogue could possibly be considered a low-imposition level dialogue, but the situation begins to deteriorate from $T_3$ on. First the host remarks to his guest that he did not arrive simply to pay compliments ($T_4$). Then he orders his servant take the guest’s sword and cloak in $T_5$ (another example of lack of redress to a servant, compare (11), (14), and (21)). The guest then refuses the first seat offered to him on the grounds that it belongs to another ($T_7$). In this respect he is following the guidelines set forth in Nauka byt' uchtivym:

“Если она прикажет нам сесть, то надлежит повиноваться с нькоторым доказательством принуждения, которое принимает наше къ ней почтеніе…” (Nauka byt' uchtivym, 29). Such a requirement validates a kind of “conventionalized disgruntledness.” One cannot simply and graciously (at least not in our present-day concept of grace) accept what is offered. Rather one must make a display to emphasize one’s respect for the other.

---

64 The concept of “dropping the compliments” is a recurring one in the dialogues and is an area that deserves further study.
The first clause of \( T_1 \) is another deviation between the Russian and French and German texts. The French and German texts include a phrase about obedience which the Russian text omits: *Ce sera donc pour vous obeir, so solls denn seyn, Ihnen zu gehorchen*. The Russian phrase is also noteworthy for its syntax (but I offer no explanation for it here).

Mid-imposition level dialogues can also involve a certain lowering of the self. In dialogues in which a gift is being offered, self-deprecation can be on the side of the giver. The speakers in the following examples seem to be questioning their worthiness to offer anything. In the excerpt from \#K 69 (24), the giver shows considerable hesitation when offering the gift:

\[(24)\]
\[A \quad T_1 \quad Смей ли я вамь, государь мой, подарить сию табакерку? пожалуй, будет угодно, примы.\]

The speaker employs extreme indirectness, in his vocabulary choice, *smieiu*, and the use of the conditional particle *li*, and he includes the conventional deference device, *gosudar’ moy*. Nonetheless, he then uses the singular form of *pozhalui* and of the imperative, *primi*, adding more evidence that the use of the singular form of the imperative is not always a face threatening move, but in the Russian texts examined, seems to have an emphatic force. The French and German texts once again incorporate the maxim of obedience while the Russian texts deletes it: *elle est à votre service; sie steht zu Ihren Diensten; pozhalui, bude ugodno, primi*.

A similar reluctance to make an invitation occurs in \#R 48 (25):

\[(25)\]
\[A \quad T_1 \quad Не смей вась, государь мой, попросить, чтобь у меня отобдатъ, опасаясь дабы не лишить вась лучшаго кушанья (стола).\]
The speaker also uses indirectness, suggesting that his potential guest may be deprived of a better meal if he accepts A’s invitation.

In #70 (26), it is the recipient who claims that he is unworthy of receiving the gift.

(26)

О ТОМЪ ЖЕ

А

Т1

Ежели вы, государь мой, меня любви своей удостоите, то пожалуйте примите отъ меня сей малой подарокъ.

В

Т2

Хотя я ни мало не достоинъ, чтобы вы меня дарили, однако я оной подарокъ прину въ засвидѣтельствованіе моего послушанія.

А

Т3

Покорнѣйше вась, государя моего, прошу, не столь смотрѣть на вещь, какъ на доброе сердце.

В

Т4

Хотяъ вашь подарокъ еще вдвое меньше былъ, однако я всегда онаго недостоинъ; и вашу благопріятность я всегда за самой великой подарокъ почитать буду, которымъ вы меня одолжить можете: напрасно изволили вы столь много тратиться; а между тѣмъ благодарствую вамъ за подарокъ, которой хранить буду въ память того друга, которой мнѣ ево подарилъ.

While accepting the gift, the recipient says how unworthy he is and that he accepts the gift as evidence of his obedience (T3); in his thanks he lowers himself again, restating that he is not worthy and that the giver need not have wasted so much on him (T4). The self-deprecation, deference, and obedience in the dialogue is expressed using mostly negative politeness strategies with each speaker tries to show his regard for the other. In T1, the negative politeness strategies of hedges (ezheli) and minimizing the imposition, in this case the imposition of the gift (maloi podarok) work with the deference signal gosudar’ moi and pozhaluite. The strategy of minimizing the imposition appears again in T3 as the giver, speaker A, downplays the gift itself (ne stol’ smotriet’ na veshch’). Again, it works with the deference markers porknieishe vas, gosudaria moego, proshu. The final turn uses both negative politeness and positive politeness.
strategies. Speaker B makes more self-deprecating remarks (after the initial self-deprecating response in T.), about his unworthiness, and he adds some complimentary remarks about A (vashu blagopriiatnost' ia vsegda za samoi velikoi podarok pochitat' budu), linking them with the obligation he has toward A (kotorym vy menia odolzhit' mozhete) followed by more self-deprecation, finally ending with elaborate thanks for the gift.

4.2.3 High-Level Imposition.

High imposition level dialogues are, not surprisingly, few in number. A high-imposition encounter was clearly not being held up as a model for the reader. A high level of imposition is marked by conflict and face threat beyond the FTA of the conversation itself. Conflict in the dialogues, contrary to Brown and Levinson, is not always signalled by higher number strategies (i.e. off-record and don't do the FTA) which can in fact accompany low- or mid-imposition FTAs (cf.(24)-(26)). Bald on record, negative and positive politeness strategies occur frequently. Since it is not possible to gauge the possibility of not doing the FTA in the dialogues, this will not be considered in the discussion. The other strategies occurred in all imposition levels, with positive politeness strategies being more common in low-imposition dialogues and less common in high-imposition dialogues.

The high-imposition level dialogues may be loosely grouped into those that have a direct challenge to a speaker or his wishes or a claim he has made and those that couch the challenge in more indirect means, such as off-record statements, simply ignoring what his speech partner is saying, or disregarding the rules of standard or expected behavior. The high-imposition level encounter may begin in the same way as a mid- or

---

65 See Brown and Gilman, 1989 for a discussion of how they were able to evaluate this strategy in a study of Shakespeare plays.
low-level encounter, but the imposition level continues to increase over the course of the conversation as attempts at repair (returning the conversation to a lower imposition level) are either absent or unsuccessful.

The source of conflict in (27) is A's direct challenge of a speaker's (B) claims regarding his whereabouts (T₃).

(27)

Разговоръ 7 Спрашивать кого, откуда идеть.
A T₁ Откуда вы идете, государь мой?
B T₂ Изъ дому.
A T₃ А я думаль, что отъ братца вашего.
B T₄ Я чаяю для того, что не по той дорогъ я шоль.
A T₅ Я былъ у васъ, государь мой, и мнѣ тамъ сказали, что вы у брата вашего были.
B T₆ Это подлинно, что я тамъ былъ, да уже тому съ часъ, какъ я отъ него пошелъ.
A T₇ Я былъ вчера также у васъ, однакожъ я не имѣлъ щастія васъ дома застать: это знакъ, что вы очень рѣдко дома живете.
B T₈ Государь мой я очень сожалѣю, что меня дома не было, какъ вы пожаловали, чтобъ вамъ имѣть честь служить.

The dialogue begins with a bald on record FTA, though it does include the softener, *gosudar' moi* (T₁). The Russian text in T₂ includes only the bald response, but the German and French texts include complete sentences with softening address forms: *Je viens de chez nous, Monsieur? Mein Herr, ich, komme von Hause*. In T₃, speaker A challenges B's response. He hedges his challenge somewhat with the phrase *A ia dumal*, but the effect is still confrontational. Although the challenge is on-record, the implication that B is lying is an off-record. The French and German texts have more redress as they include more deferential forms in referring to the brother: *J'ai cru que vous veniez de chez Monsieur votre frere. Ich habe gemeint, sie kamen von Ihrem Herrn Bruder*. In T₄, B offers an explanation why A may have doubted his answer in T₂.
since he came from a different direction. A pursues his suit with another utterance that supports his off-record assertion (T₃). He repeats *gosudar’ moi* as he continues his challenge to B. The phrase here signals the FTA. Again the French and German texts have *Mr. vôtre frere*; *den Herrn Bruder* while the Russian text has only *u brata vashego*.

In T₆, B offers some redress by admitting that he had been at his brothers, but then states that he left there an hour earlier. By providing some explanation, however incomplete, he does offer a kind of apology; in Brown and Levinson terms, apology is a negative politeness strategy which can consist of giving overwhelming reasons. This characterization of B’s behavior in politeness terms is yet another instance where the categories of Brown and Levinson seem inadequate for the language of the dialogues. In T₇, A again makes an off-record challenge to B. This challenge does provide B some form of an out, saying that he is rarely at home. In T₈, B finally makes an apology and pays him some deference (*vam imiet’ chest’ sluzhit’*) and he uses a polite form of address (*gosudar’ moi*) to A for the only time.

The source of conflict in (28) is also due to a direct challenge of a claim made by one speaker. The conflict is all the more interesting as it involves participants from different social groups.

(28)

Разговоръ 86 Чевронной полновѣской.

A  T₁  Пришоль я, мой другъ, отдать вамъ недоплаченя деньги, которая я вамъ долженъ.

B  T₂  Я весьма сожалю, что вы столько трудитесь, и за тѣмъ только сюда пришли; не почто было вамъ спѣшить.

A  T₃  Сколько еще я вамъ долженъ?

B  T₄  Шесть гульденовъ (на васъ осталось еще долгъ шесть гульденовъ).
A  $ T_5 $ Вонь вамь червонець.
B  $ T_6 $ Полновѣсной ли этоть червонець?
A  $ T_7 $ Полновѣсной, сударь, я самь ево вьсилъ.
B  $ T_8 $ Не думаю, чтобь онь пошолъ: (чтобь его взяли:) кажеть мнѣ онь нѣсколько легокъ: между тѣмъ посмотрю, возьмуть ли ево: ежелижь не возьмуть, то вамь назадъ отдать.
A  $ T_9 $ Черновецъ хорошъ, пойдетъ.

The interlocutors are not social equals and the imposition level of the conversation grows as the conversation continues and the relative power of the speakers changes. In the opening turn, A uses an address form reserved for a social inferior, *moi drug*, despite the fact that he is returning a debt owed to him. B responds with an apology, complete with redress features (*ves' ma sozhjaleiu, stol'ko trudetes', ne poshto...spieshit*), that A has had to inconvenience himself ($T_2$). The turns $T_5$-$T_5$ are business-like in that they are brief, direct statements without the redress seen usually in the dialogues. For example, in $T_3$, A does not make a counterapology in return for B’s remark in $T_2$ that he regrets that A incurred any inconvenience in returning the money. The alternative sentence in $T_4$ does include redress factors, and the longer turn does support a claim of Brown and Levinson's that the more negative politeness used, the more polite the speech act. They link the amount of effort expended in face preservation with the perception of concern for the other’s wants. “So some simple compounding of hedges and indirectness, particles, and so on, increases the relative politeness of expressions” (143). But the stakes rise when B questions the weight of the money offered for the debt ($T_5$). B does mitigate the FTA by questioning the weight of the piece rather than stating baldly that it is underweight. As A tries to convince B that

66 In the *Domashnie Razgovory* this term seems to have this limited application, but other texts employ the term widely. See 4.3 below for more discussion of address terms.
the money is valid, he now uses a term of address, *sudar’*, that is used by servants to masters (in this text at least, see 4.3) (T adviser). B uses the negative politeness strategy of hedges (*ne dumaiu, kazhetsia, neskol’ko, mezhdu tiem, li, ezhelizh*) in his response. He maintains his contention that the money is underweight, and he asserts his right to return it if he is proven correct (T adviser). A ends with a final attempt at reassurance, but he has already lost face before himself and his interlocutor (T adviser).

Indirect challenges to a speaker’s wishes may occur in the social pressure to accept an invitation as is evident in (29) and (30) below. A high-imposition-level dialogue may contain a signal that the speaker is counting on his fellow interlocutor to follow the speaker’s plans. In #K 45 (29), A extends an invitation, which is an imposition in and of itself; the potential guest must either accept an invitation and take on an obligation to the host, or he must decline and pay redress to the host in his refusal.

(29)

Комплименты 45 Звать кого в гости.

A  Т1 Пожалуйте, государь мой, завтра ко мнѣ отобѣдать, чѣмъ богъ послалъ: Я намѣренъ звать къ себѣ въ гости пріятели, то прошу нокорно, придите и вы.

B  Т2 Вы великую со мною, государь мой, милость здѣлаете, ежели меня отъ того уволите: ибо меня нѣкоторая нужда притти къ вамъ не допускаеть.

A  Т3 Тому статься не лѣзя, я въ надеждѣ на васъ то дѣлаю. У меня вить богатова кушанья нѣтъ, а вы гостямъ будете очень пріятны.

B  Т4 Такъ ужъ не могу я упустить сего случая, чтобъ лишиться вашего общества и вашихъ пріятелей.

A  Т5 Вы меня симъ много одолжите.

B  Т6 Добро инъ быть такъ, буду.

A  Т7 Я въ двенадцатомъ часу васъ ждать стану.

B  Т8 Приду всеконечно.

In the initial turn, A downplays his offerings, *chem bog poslal*, but does not leave B the kind of out seen in low-level impositions (see 4.2.1). B’s response (T adviser) is a
refusal, as expected, but rather than give reasons such as not wanting to impose on A, he states that A does him a great favor if he excuses him since he has something else to do. Thus he does not pay adequate redress to A. The reply by A in T₁ conveys a rather desperate appeal for B to attend. This utterance by A begins with an on-record contradiction (Tomu stat'sia ne l'zia) and then uses the off-record strategy of giving association clues, by stating that he planned the event counting on B and that the other guests will be pleased to see B. B is compelled to accept (T₂), as he is pressured to feel that he will be the centerpiece of the coming luncheon. When B agrees, under this social coercion to attend, A clearly acknowledges his debt (T₃). This dialogue is discussed again in 4.2.4.

The buildup of the imposition can occur through repetition of the same FTA as each party seeks to carry out his will. #K 61 (30) has a guest requesting his host not to accompany him.

(30)

Комплименты 61 Просить гостя, чтобы хозяин его не провожал.

A  T₁  Государь мой, я вашь покорный слуга, и веъма благодарствую за оказанную мнѣ честь и учитость

B  T₂  Напрасно изволите за столь малое благодарить.

A  T₃  Добро, послушать вась, только прошу вась, государь мой, пожалуйте отпустите меня, и себя не утруднайте.

B  T₄  Я за честь себя почту, государь мой, чтобы вась проводить.

A  T₅  Пожалуйте же, не изволите изъ покоя выходить.

B  T₆  Я вить недалеко вашь провожу: ктомууж вы мнѣ позвольте, чтобы я у себя въ дому дѣлал то, что мнѣ должно.

A  T₇  Государь мой, я почти итти далѣе не могу, пока моей просьбы не исполните: того ради паки вась прошу, оставте меня пожалуйте, и далѣе итти не трудитесь.
The dialogue begins with a typical predeparture statement of thanks and debt acknowledgment, to which the host replies in an expected manner ($T_1$ and $T_2$). The work *naprosno* has the meaning of *bezvinno, bez prichiny* according to the *Slovar' Akademii Rossiiskoi*, thus it serves to underscore the self-deprecating move in $T_2$. The guest (A) acknowledges his duty to obey the host (B), but nonetheless asks B to let him go unaccompanied and not trouble himself ($T_3$). The response emphasizes the honor that the host (B) will feel in the act ($T_4$). When the request is repeated, it is marked by a hedge, *-zh* which acts as a “strengthener” (Brown and Levinson’s term), adding emphasis to the request ($T_5$). The host, however, only talks about how little he will do (negative politeness - minimizing the imposition and the hedge *vit’*) and that it is his duty and right to do as he wishes in his own home ($T_6$). In the final attempt A is clearly getting frustrated, and brings up B’s failure to obey A’s request ($T_7$). B stubbornly states how he will follow A with his eyes as long as he remains in view ($T_8$). A exasperatedly responds that B even brings jokes to courtesy ($T_9$). This dialogue is also discussed in the following section.

4.2.4 Comparison of Imposition Levels.

The previous sections have included examples of the respective imposition levels. In this section a comparison of some similar dialogues will illustrate how an encounter can move from a low- to mid- to high-level of imposition. The varying amount of negotiation seems to be an intentionally built-in feature of the work, since the dialogues are ordered in small groups of similar topic or situation and the titles indicate their close relations. #R 3 (31) is titled *Komplimenty pri vizitie* and #R 4 (32) is titled *o
The groupings of the dialogues indicate that the author did so in order for the reader to benefit from comparing different reactions and their outcomes. The Domashnie Razgovory offers variations of situations for learners; the reader has models for common, low-threat encounters as well as models of high threat or high imposition situations as in #R 7 or #K 61. In this way the Domashnie Razgovory fills a special niche in books on conversation and behavior. It and its fellow conversation books provide concrete examples for the reader in how to deal with a variety of situations and a number of permutations of how a particular scenario may play itself out, frequently depending on the relative cooperativeness of one's interlocutor. The behavior guides typically offer only very general guidelines for behavior and few concrete examples. The conversation books create a dual role for themselves, providing models of speech and models of behavior in variations on social "themes." The very labelling of the dialogues indicates a consciousness of a category of speech behavior and hence a recognition of its social role.

4.2.4.1 Two Visits.

The following two dialogues, #R 3 (31) and #R 4 (32), both feature guests coming to pay their respects; in each dialogue, the guests feel the burden that their visit is imposing on the host. In (31), the guests allow themselves to be convinced that their visit is welcome, while in (32), the guest, seeing that the host is occupied, insists on leaving, despite the host’s invitations to stay.

(31)

Разговоръ 3 Комплименты при визите

A B 

T₁  

Вы намъ позволили, государь мой, приехать къ вамъ, мы приехали отдать вамъ долгъ нашъ, и провъдать о здоровье вашемъ.

B T₂  

Я вамъ, государи мой, покорно благодарствуя за честь, которую вы мнѣ здѣлали. Моя дѣлность была, приѣхать къ вамъ мнѣ
это очень беспокоить, что вы своим учитствовом предиспорили мою должность.

A T₃ Вы так говорить изволите, и вы не поставите того в вину, что мы прислали отнять у вас четверть часа от вашего времени, которое вам очень дорого.

B T₄ Мне ныть приятное времени какъ то, которое я препровожу вь вашей приятной компании.

In (31), the guests (A) show an understanding of the social requirements they are fulfilling, repaying a 'debt' and inquiring about B's health (T₁). The host (B) responds with similar remarks about duty and the fact that they have surpassed him in doing their duty (T₂).

(32)

Разговор 4 о томъ же

A T₁ Не погнѣвайся, государь мой, что я васъ моимъ визитомъ обеспокоилъ.

B T₂ Вы не можете меня обеспокоить; и я тотъ часъ буду къ вашимъ услугамъ; прошу покорно войти въ эту комнату.

A T₃ Я думаю, что вамъ недосугъ, государь мой,

B T₄ Никакъ, государь мой, я ничемъ не занятъ.

A T₅ Я подлинно вижу, что недосугъ, и я васъ не задержу.

B T₆ Покорно прошу не торопиться, мнѣ никакова дѣла ныть, и повѣрьте мнѣ, что у меня ныть такого недосуга, котораго бы я не отставилъ для васъ.

A T₇ Я буду въ иное время шастіе имѣть, пользоваться долѣ вашею приятною компаніею. Рекомендую себя въ вашу милость.

B T₈ Я вашъ покорный слуга, пока имѣть честь буду васъ опять видѣть. Ежели вамъ угодно; прошу какъ найскорее ко мнѣ зайти.

A T₉ Я буду такъ скоро, какъ мнѣ возможно будетъ.

B T₁₀ Чымъ скорѣе, тымъ мнѣ приятне.
In (32), the guest (A) begins by apologizing for disturbing the host (T₁), who responds that the guest couldn’t disturb him and invites him into a room (T₂). The guest feels that he is disturbing the host (T₃ and T₄), and from this point on in the conversation, the host is trying to convince the guest to stay and the guest is making moves to leave. The encounter remains formal and there is no blatant display of impatience, or frustration (compare (30) -T₉), and the host invites the guest to come again soon (T₁₀), which the guest promises to do (T₁₁). (32) is lengthier, as the two parties negotiate the FTA. While (31) basically consists of only the FTA of the visit, (32) has the FTA of the visit and the FTAs of the guest not being persuaded by (or not believing) the host, and the second invitation. Both dialogues use positive and negative politeness, but the intense effort that the host makes trying to convince the guest to stay in (32) moves it from a low- to a mid-level imposition.

The two dialogues display similar situations and some similar moves by the speakers, but they also display different reactions by the guests; in (31), the guests emphasize the host’s will (vy nam pozvolil, Vy tak govorit’ izvolite) and at the same time reminding him that they are the intruders (my priekhali oniat’ u vas...). In both dialogues, as stated in (31) in T₃, the guests indicate a general concern with “invading” the host’s space and time. In both dialogues, the hosts counter that the guests are welcome. The host does do most clearly in (31)-T₄. The efforts to convince the guest to stay in (32) are less emphatic and must be repeated several times and still do not succeed. Each dialogue has utterances in which the sincerity of the previous speaker’s remarks is questioned; in (31)- T₅(Vy tak govorit’ izvolite) and in (32)-T₅ (la podlinno vizhu). In the first dialogue, the host uses the maxim of nothing being more enjoyable than his guests’ company to counter the questioning of his sincerity, but in the second dialogue, the host must be more explicit as he works to retain his guest (povier’te mnie).
Thus, a reader could read and envision alternative turns of speech and outcomes to the situations presented in the conversation books.

4.2.4.2 The Insistent Host.

Examples #K 61 (33) and #62 (34) are dialogues in which the departing guest asks the host not to accompany him, but the host is insistent. The build-up effect of repeated arguments by each speaker to have his way brings both of these dialogues out of the low-imposition level group. #K 61 was discussed above as (30).

(33)

Комплименты 61  Просить гость, чтобы хозяин не провожал.

A  T₁  Государь мой, я ваш покорный слуга, и весьма благодарствую за оказанную мнё честь и учтивость

B  T₂  Напрасно изволите за столь малое благодарить.

A  T₃  Добро, послушать васъ, только прошу васъ, государь мой, пожалуйте отпустите меня, и себя не утруждайте.

B  T₄  Я за честь себя почту, государь мой, чтобы васъ проводить.

A  T₅  Пожалуйтежъ, не извольте изъ покоя выходить.

B  T₆  Я вить недалеко васъ провожу: ктомужъ вы мнё позвольте, чтобъ я у себя въ домъ дѣ лалъ то, что мнё должно.

A  T₇  Государь мой, я люби ити далье не могу, пока моей просьбы не исполните: того ради паки васъ прошу, оставте меня пожалуйте, и далье ити не трудитесь.

B  T₈  До тыхъ поръ за вами въ стльду смотръ буду, пока вы изъ глазъ выдете.

A  T₉  Вы къ учтивству и шутки прибавляете.

(33) moves to a high level of imposition in T₇ and T₉, as A demands that his request be fulfilled and then closes the dialogue with an exasperated remark about B’s behavior. Such a remark is uncommon in the Domashnie Razgovory; a speaker may
complain about yielding on grounds of duty, but a complaint about the level of
politeness of this type is unique. The utterances in (33) suggest that the host's need to
accompany his guest is the result of a strong motivation to carry out his duties as a host;
they allow the reader to see a model of how such persistence can be countered.

The next dialogue remains at the mid-imposition level because the host is willing
to refrain from overzealously pursuing his duties.

(34)

62 O ТОМЪ ЖЕ

A T₁ Прощу васъ, государь мой, не трудитесь со мною далъе итти.
B T₂ Государь мой, я здѣсь васъ одново не покину.
A T₃ Останьтеся пожалуйте, не изволите итти изъ покоеvъ для меня.
B T₄ Государь мой, позвольте мнѣ отдать вамъ надлежающую честь, и
не лишите меня того удольствія, чтобы васъ проводить.
A T₅ Государь мой, вы меня очень много одолжаете; покорнѣйше васъ пропшу, не ходите далѣе со мною.
B T₆ Не погнѣвайтесь же пожалуйте когда вы мнѣ не позволятье
dолжность мою исполнить.

The frequent use of gosudar' moi (T₁, T₂, T₄, and T₅) points to a high number of
FTAs. The need to address one's interlocutor with a formal term of address beyond the
first turn is a strong indicator of an FTA (see discussion below). Despite the frequent
use of gosudar' moi, the imposition level does not become inflated. The two parties are
careful to indicate respect for the other through the address terms and the reference to
duty. The final three turns each have some component that addresses honor or duty,
thus offering a kind of 'social out' for behavior which is dictated from without. The host
(B) emphasizes that he must be allowed to show his guest the "necessary" honor, clearly
establishing the act as a social obligation (T₄). By signalling a willingness not to
accompany A in Tg when B asks A not to be angry with him for not fulfilling his duty, B shows that he will not be as insistent as the host in (33), and therefore, serves the reader as a model of a graceful way to end such an encounter.

4.2.4.3 Dinner Invitations.

A group of dialogues dealing with invitations for dinner show a range of imposition levels. The dialogues appear in descending order of imposition (#K 45- #R 47) with a final dialogue (#R 48) that serves as a kind of bridge between the low- and mid-levels. The forms of the invitations and the reactions to them show how the imposition level of a dialogue evolves. The first dialogue of the group, #K 45 (discussed above as (29)) has the highest imposition rating. The invitation is for a dinner party, with multiple guests, presumably raising the face threat of the encounter when compared to an invitation to dine with the host alone, but the host also tries to downplay the imposition of the invitation by making the affair seem modest by saying that the fare will be chem bog postal and that the guests, including A, are friends.

(35) #K 45
A T1 Пожалуйте, государь мой, завтра ко мнě отобъдатъ, чѣмъ богъ послать: Я намѣренъ звать къ себѣ въ гости приятели, то прошу покорно, придайте и вы.

The invitation below of the mid-level dialogue (#K 46 and listed above as (22)) is simple and direct and displays a “normal” level of deference. The variations between the French and German columns and the Russian text are discussed above.

(36) #K 46
A T1 Пожалуйте, государь мой, со мною отобъдайте,
The invitations of the low-level dialogues (#R 47 and #R 48) display greater hesitation on the part of the host to impose his invitation and his food on the potential guest.

(37) #R 47
A \( T_1 \) Жела́ть бы́ я вась, государь мой, удержать у себя обе́дать, ежели бы́ я то имь́ть, что вамь бы прй́ятно было.

(38) #R 48
A \( T_1 \) Не смы́ю вась, государь мой, попросить, чтобь у меня отобды́вать, опасаясь дабы не лишить вась лучшаго кушанья (стола).

The responses to the invitations in #K 45 and #K 46 are similar in sense. Both guests cite other business, but in the high-imposition-level dialogue the guest, with relatively little redress toward A, requests that he be released from any obligation.

(39) #K 45
B \( T_2 \) Вы вели́кую со мною, государь мой, милость здйлаете, ежели меня оть това уволите: ибо меня вькоторая нужда притти къ вамь не допускается.

As noted in the discussion of #K 46 (22) above, the French and German texts for this turn include the phrases regarding obedience in their refusals. The absence of this redress factor in the Russian text quickly raises the dialogue to the mid-imposition level.

(40) #K 46
B \( T_2 \) Ей мнь не можно того здйлать; есть у меня вькоторая нужда, которой я въ первымъ часу исправить желалъ бы.

The guests in the low-level dialogues, like their hosts, show reluctance to impose on the other. In #R 47, a compliment precedes the show of reluctance, providing additional redress.
The high-level dialogue (#K 45) has the FTA that marks it as a high-imposition situation. The host rejects the guest's refusal and tells him why he must come.

The hosts in the mid- and low-level dialogues each remark on the honor he will feel if the guest joins him. The host in the mid-level dialogue (#K 46) uses additional pressure to get the guest to stay, telling him that he is alone and that B's business can wait another day.

The "bridge" dialogue between the low and mid imposition levels (#R 48) drops the talk of honor and favor and uses a line (46) #R 48 which here indicates that the speakers are intimate enough to dispense with such formulas. The guest indicated a reluctance to impose in the previous turn and the final turns of the dialogue (53) #R 48, maintain a friendly note.
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(46) #R 48
A T₃ Бе́зъ ком плimentовъ, пожалу́йте останьтесь.

In (47) #K 45 the guest has been forced into a situation in which he must accept the invitation, the host having pointed out how the event is centered on him. His reply seems slightly touched with irony as he has little choice but to agree to come.

(47) #K 45
B T₄ Такъ ужъ не могу я упустить сего случая, чтобъ лишиться вашего общества и вашихъ прияте́лей.

The mid-level (#K 46) and the “bridge” (#R 48) dialogues between low- and mid-levels share an identical line at this point, when the guest showing a knowledge of his social duty, agrees to come.

(48) #K 46
B T₄ Добръ, инъ послушать васъ.

Although the words are the same, the affect is not. In #K 46 the guest feels coerced into accepting the invitation despite other plans after the host has claimed that he is alone and that B’s business can wait another day.

(49) #R 48
B T₄ Добръ инъ послушать васъ, (инъ будь по вашему).

In #R 48 the guest admits that he has no other plans, but makes the requisite plea of not wishing to impose (42) #R 48 which the host counters by telling him to drop the compliments and invites him again to stay (46) #R 48. So, when the guest agrees (49) #R 48, the pressure is not as great as it was in #K 46.

The low-level dialogue features a response emphasizing honor and pleasure.
The mid-imposition-level dialogue, #K 46 and the low-imposition-level dialogue, #R 47 end at this point. The high-level dialogue, #K 45 continues with the host clearly acknowledging his debt and the guest rather resignedly repeating that he will be there.

(51) #K 45
A T₅  Вы меня симъ много одолжите.
B T₆  Добро инъ быть такъ, буду.

Finally, the host in #K 45 uses more coercion to ensure that is his guest will indeed come when he states that he will begin waiting for him at 12 o’clock. The guest assures him that he will come.

(52) #K 45
A T₇  Я въ двенадцатомъ часу васъ ждать стану.
B T₈  Приду всеконечно.

The “bridge” dialogue, #R 48 ends on a friendlier tone as the host downplays the quality of the meal, saying that they will not feast, rather he will serve his own usual fare, and the guest praises the food, the host rewards the both of them with some good wine.

(53) #R 48
A T₅  Я не пасся, но поставлю вамъ обыкновенное мое всегдашнее кушанье, а именно говядину:
B T₆  Это мясо очень хорошо.
A T₇  Но мы наградимъ сей недостатокъ хорошимъ виномъ.
4.2.4.4 The Slavic Host.

Another group of dialogues features situations in which the host chides the guests for not eating enough. К 52, the first of the group is mid-imposition level.

(54)

Комплменты 52 Просите хозя́ння гостей, чтобь кушали.

A $T_1$ Вы, государь мой, не кушаете, развь кушанье вамъ не нравится?

B $T_2$ Напрасно, государь мой, вы сие говорите, кушанье очень хорошо пристропано. но мнь есть не хочется, я вить и малымъ съѣть бываю, да и никогда много есть не могу.

A $T_3$ Да и вы, государь мой, больше разговариваете, нежели кушаете.

C $T_4$ Напрасно изволите говорить, я ничего больше не дѣю, какь есть.

A $T_5$ Не погнѣвайтесь вы на меня, я положу вамъ не много сихъ квитовыхъ яблокъ, не ждите, государь мой, подчиванья.

D $T_6$ Я и безъ того самъ брать буду, я уже не жду подчиванья, за столомъ сидючи.

A $T_7$ Вы очень хорошо дѣйствуете.

C $T_8$ Не могу теперь больше есть, я уже теперь того одолѣлъ, (голодъ) которой меня сперва мучилъ. (я уже сыть нался).

A $T_9$ Возмите кусокъ сего кулечка, и отвѣдайте (покушайте)

C $T_{10}$ Онъ весьма хорошо приготовленъ: я больше ево поѣмъ, нежели вы думаете: я уже давно такова хорошева кушанья не ѣдалъ.

The host urges at least two guests to eat more ($T_1$ and $T_3$). The common guest complaint is that he cannot eat more ($T_2$, $T_4$, and $T_6$). The host asks a guest not to be angry with him for serving him a bit more quince ($T_7$) and urges him not to wait to be treated by the host (ne zhдite, goсудар’ moi, podчиван’ia). This less bashful guest (D) is only to happy to cooperate (ia uzhe ne zhdu podчиван’ia) ($T_6$), and he earns praise from the host ($T_7$). Another guest, claiming to be unable to eat more, is urged to have
more cake ($T_3$). Anna Wierzbicka describes the Polish hosting style, which can be extended to a general Slavic cultural style, including Russian:

the unwritten rule of Polish hospitality, according to which the host does not try to establish the guest’s wishes as far as eating and drinking is concerned but tries to get the guest to eat and drink as much as possible (and more). A hospitable Polish host will not take no for an answer; he assumes that the addressee can have some more, and that it would be good for him or her to have some more, and therefore that his or her resistance (which is likely to be due to politeness) should be disregarded. (1985a, 154)

R 53 has a similar scenario and is also a mid-imposition level dialogue.

(55)

Разговор 53 О том же

A $T_1$ Государь мой, я прикажу это блюдо снять, понеже вижу, что вы больше ужь не кушаете: вы, какъ видно, не любите пироговъ (до пироговъ не охотники).

B $T_2$ Напрасно, изволите говорить, я ихъ очень люблю; да кжь можетъ чрезъ мѣру есть? я ужь весьма доволенъ.

A $T_3$ Я тому не врью.

B $T_4$ Повѣрьте пожалуйте, я истинно довольно ѣлъ.

A $T_5$ Скушай пожалуй еще ножку цыплячью, прикажите положить ей предъ себя: а салатъ сами изволите брать: я бы вамъ подалъ, томо салатъ подавать не обычно.

The host expresses, indirectly, disappointment ($T_1$ and $T_3$) with the guest who claims to be full already ($T_2$ and $T_4$). The refusal in $T_2$ is very similar to the refusal turns in #K 52- $T_2$ and $T_4$ (54), employing the same vocabulary (Naprasno, izvolite govorit’) and the same move of praising the food, but claiming to have eaten enough or more than enough. The moves by the host and guest in $T_3$ and $T_4$ echo similar moves in #R 4 (32) in which a speaker openly doubts the sincerity of the other (la tomu ne vieriu and Povier’te pozhaluite, ia istinno dovol’no iel). The host fulfills his sense of hospitality in $T_5$ by pushing more food on his guest. He attempts to minimize the imposition of more
food (a negative politeness strategy) by using familiar forms and diminutives (*Skushai pozhalui eshche nozhku tsypliač'iu*). This use of diminutives illustrates another point that Wierzbicka makes about the Polish (Slavic) hosting style.

The diminutive praises the quality of the food and minimizes the quantity pushed onto the guest’s plate. The speaker insinuates: ‘don’t resist! it is a small thing I’m asking you to do – and a good thing!’ The target of the praise is in fact vague: the praise seems to embrace the food, the guest, and the action of the guest desired by the host. The diminutive and the imperative work hand in hand in the cordial, solicitous attempt to get the guest to eat more. (1985a, 167)

Such elements of the Slavic hosting style are missing from the French and German versions of the text: the chicken leg is not referred to using a diminutive and the verb forms are second person plural forms.

R 54 offers a slightly different scenario and here the guest is able to retain a controlling role in the conversation. This dialogue is referred to above as example (8).

(56)

Комплименты 54 Просить хозяинъ гостей, чтобъ пили и прохлажались (вселились).

**A**  
**T**₁  
Господа, что пить не изволите? пожалуйте кушайте буде не противно: разве вино вамъ не нравится?

**B**  
**T**₂  
Вино это очень деликатно, оно весьма хорошо, оно мнъ довольно вкусно кажется: не Мозельское ли оно?

**A**  
**T**₃  
Правда такъ, государь мой.

**B**  
**T**₄  
Оно очень изрядно, оно ни старо, ни ново.

**A**  
**T**₅  
Вы конечно охотники больше до Рейнвейну.

**B**  
**T**₆  
Я и ево пью; токмо Мозельское лучше всѣхъ прочихъ. Нъмечскихъ винъ люблю.

**A**  
**T**₇  
Но вы, государь мой, не пьете: инъ семъ выпьемъ вмѣстѣ.

**B**  
**T**₈  
Съ охотою, государь мой.
Here the host is pushing the guests to drink, assuming that they must not care for the wine if they aren't drinking. The first guest turns the challenge into a chance to compliment the host on the wine and they precede to discuss the merits of Mosel wine before beginning a lengthy round of toasts. By keeping the host from feeling the need to continue urging the guest to drink and complimenting him on his wine choice, the guest keeps the encounter at a low imposition level. The dialogue continues with the host and guest toasting each other repeatedly.

4.2.4.5 Negotiation.

One of the features that can distinguish the different imposition-level dialogues from one another is the amount of negotiation that occurs in the attempt to achieve speaker goals. For example, #R 3 (31) has only four turns, while #R 4 (32) has ten turns. The increased amount of negotiation in the high-imposition level dialogues is, of course, a function of the increasing face-threat level as the dialogue continues.

(57) #R 4
A T₃ Я подлинно вижу, что недосуг, и я вась не задержу.
B T₆ Покорно прошу не торопиться, мнѣ никакова дѣла нѣть, и повѣрьте мнѣ, что у меня нѣть такого недосуга, котораго бы я не отставилъ для вась.

As a speaker is thwarted in his desire to achieve his goal, he must try again in another speech turn or else acquiesce. This is illustrated by the two adjacent dialogues about hosts trying to accompany their guests home. # K 61 (33) has nine turns and (34) has six. Though #K 61 has a preliminary exchange of thanks and response, the “negotiation” turns are 3-9. The negotiations are slightly more involved as the guest (A) is more forthright in his desire not to be accompanied (as seen in T₃); he expresses his exasperation in T₄.
A T₃ Добро, послушать ваш, только прошу ваш, государь мой, пожалуйте отпустите меня, и себя не утруждайте.

B T₄ Я за честь себя почту, государь мой, чтоб ваш проводить.

A T₅ Пожалуйтежъ, не извольте изъ покоя выходить.

B T₆ Я видъ недалеко вась провожу: ктомужь вы мнѣ позвольте, чтобъ я у себя въ дому дѣлалъ то, что мнѣ должно.

A T₇ Государь мой, я почти итти далѣе не могу, пока моей просьбы не исполните: того ради паки вась прошу, оставьте меня пожалуйте, и далѣе итти не трудитесь.

B T₈ До тѣхъ поръ за вами въ слѣдъ смотрѣть буду, пока вы изъ глазъ выдете.

A T₉ Вы къ учтивству и шутки прибавляетъ.

A similar result is seen in a comparison of the group of dialogues numbered #K 45 - #R 48. These dinner invitations range from the high-imposition level #K 45 (29), with its eight turns and arm-twisted guest, to the four turns of the mid- and low-level dialogues #46-48 (36) #K 46 (53) #R 48.

(58) #K 61

(59) #K 45

A T₃ Тому статься не льзя, я въ надеждѣ на вась то дѣлаю. У меня вить богата кушанья нѣть, а вы гостьмъ будете очень приятны.

B T₄ Такъ ужъ не могу я упустить сего случая, чтобъ лишиться вашего общества и вашихъ приятелей.

(48 has seven turns, but the last three turns are about the meal itself). Dialogues with fewer turns may not be showing complete interchanges, but merely presenting reader with some alternative lines, but the alternative location may offer an alternative tactic as well. The dialogues never begin as high-imposition-level dialogues; rather, the imposition increases as one or both parties becomes more contentious or less cooperative – in short, when he fails to follow expected norms of behavior.
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4.3 Address Terms in the *Domashnie Razgovory*.

In the selected dialogues from the *Domashnie Razgovory* the reader finds the following terms of address for males: *gosudar'*, *gosudar' moi*, *moi gosudar'*, *sudar'*, *gospodin* – with and without a title or name, and the plural form, *(moi)gospoda*, and *moi drug*. These terms are complemented by the corresponding feminine terms: *gosudarynia*, *gosudarynia moia*, *sudarynia*, and *moi gospozhi*. These words are defined in the *Slovar' russkogo iazyka XVIII veka* published by the Academy of Sciences\(^6\) and the *Slovar' Akademii Rossiiskoi* (1806-22).

The definitions for *gosudar'* and *gospodin* have some common features. The terms are each used as definitions for the other and both also have meanings of ruler, leader. *Gospodin* is also defined as a holder of property, whether land, people, or things. It is also defined as a member of the privileged class: Ночевал у меня «в трактире» молодой господин из Кенигсберга – правда сказать, барин предобрядой. [Н. М. Карамзин. *Письмо русского путешественника*, 1797-1801.]

It is also used as a form of polite reference or address to such a privileged person and may be used with a surname or title: Господин фельд маршал отдал дщерь свою в супружество сыну господина адмирала. [Ведомости времени Петра Великого (1703-17).]

It can also occur (most frequently in the plural to a group) as a form of polite address: Доброї вечер сударыня!...Господа! слуга ваш покорной. [Ж. де Мемье. *Граф Сент-Меран или Новые заблуждения сердца и ума*. 1795 (Russian Translation by P. I. Makarov) (*Slovar' Russkogo iazyka XVIII Veka*. vypusk 5, 190-91).]

\(^6\) The dictionary is still in progress and the most recent volume (10) ends with *krieposttsa*.

The dictionary uses a modified, modern orthography (ё is used, but ё is not used).
surname or title and is used most frequently as a term of reference to a third person rather than as a term of direct address.

The term *gosudar'* shares definitions with *gospodin*, including the use as a term of polite address to a member of the privileged class: [Скотинин:] Хорошо, государь мой! а как по фамилии, я не досыпал. [Павлов:] Я называюсь Правдин. [Д. И. Фонвизин. Недоросль. (1782) (Slovar' Russkogo izyka XVII Veka. vypusk 5, 200.)] Both terms can be used when wishing or needing to show respect or courtesy.

The term of address most frequently encountered in the *Domashnie Razgovory* is *gosudar'* usually accompanied by the possessive pronoun *moi*. It occurs 59 times in the dialogues examined with *moi* in the postposition, 12 times with *moi* in the preposition, and two times with no adjective. It is the most common address form in the greetings that are typically found in the dialogue openings.

(60) #R 3

A  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T_1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Вы намъ позволил, государь мой, пріѣхать къ вамь, мы пріѣхали отдать вамь долгъ нашъ, и провѣдать о здоровь вашемъ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T_2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Я вамъ, государь мой, покорно благодарсвую за честь, которую вы мнѣ здѣсали. Моя бы должность была, пріѣхать къ вамь мѣня это очень безпокойть, что вы своимъ учтивствомъ предускорили мою должность.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, occurrences of *gosudar' moi* are limited to the opening phrases as in (60) #R 3. More frequent instances are often indicative of FTAs, as can be seen in (61), where *gosudar' moi* appears in T_1, T_2, T_4, and T_5. All are instances of FTAs. The dialogue begins with speaker A trying to take leave of B; he uses *gosudar' moi* as a sign of respect to soften the FTA (T_1). In T_2, B uses *gosudar' moi* as a softener with the same motivation. In T_4 and T_5, the speakers are each trying to persuade the other to yield
to their wishes, which they perceive as honor to their interlocutor and pleasure and duty for themselves.

(61)

62

О ТОМЪ ЖЕ

A T₁ Прошу вась, государь мой, не трудитесь со мною далье итти.
B T₂ Государь мой, я здсь вась одною не покину.
A T₃ Останьтесь пожалуйте, не извольте итти изъ покоеvъ для меня.
B T₄ Государь мой, позвольте мнѣ отдать вамъ надлежающую честь, и не лишите меня того удовольствія, чтобы вась проводить.
A T₅ Государь мой, вы меня очень много одолжаете; покорнѣйше вась прошу, не ходите далье со мною.
B T₆ Не погнѣвайте же пожалуйте когда вы мнѣ не позволяете должность мою исполнить.

Gosudar' can also show up occasionally in repair situations, when a speaker is trying to recover from a previous speech error, whether the speaker's own or another's as in T₆ below.

(62)

Разговоръ 14 Потчиваютъ чаемъ

A T₁ Знаю, государь мой, что вы любите чай пить; не изволите ли ево напиться, а тотчасъ сварить прикажу.
B T₂ Правда, государь мой, что я очень люблю чай и всякое теплое питье, но теперь пить мнѣ ево не хочется, понеже недавно кофѣй пилъ.
A T₃ Это ваша отговорка.
B T₄ Къ тому жъ у меня великій жарь, а ежели напиться мнѣ еще чайу, то конечно будетъ умереть. Ибо чай, какъ сказываютъ, въ поть бросаетъ. Не погнѣвайтесь, скажу вамъ, я боюсь поту такъ, какъ огня.
A T₅ Да и вы, государыня, пить не хотитежъ?
C  Тг

A  Тг

A  Тг

The utterance in Тг is related to a more frequent move of suggesting or telling one's interlocutor "to drop the ceremony or the compliments" (compare (46) #R 48, #R 49 (23) and #R 9 (10)). This move assumes, as does the Polish (Slavic) host described by Wierzbicka that any "resistance" by the guest is due to politeness and therefore "should be disregarded" (1985a, 154).

The absence of address forms in some dialogues may be context-dependent, as some dialogues are continuations of the previous one; in others, the context clearly indicates that the dialogue begins in medias res, negating the need for such greeting turns, or it may indicate the ellipsis of the opening greetings in the dialogue in the interest of saving space. Additionally, there are instances such as (63) where the Russian text does not include a term of address but the French and German texts do: *Ou allez vous Monsieur?*; *Wo gehen Sie hin mein Herr?*

(63)

Разговоръ 30 О прогуливанъ

A  Тг Куда вы изволите идти?

As mentioned above, the phrase *moi государь* (with a preposed adjective) occurs much less frequently and only once in the first turn. However, when it does occur, it is more likely to be at the beginning of the turn (7 out of 12 occurrences).

(64)

Разговоръ 31 Звать кого съ собою прогуливаться

A  Тг *Мой государь* вы всегда въ трудахъ упражняетесь.

B  Тг Не очень много, *мой государь*, я дѣлаю только, для прогнанія
своей скуки.

A T₃ Я не хочу вам делять мъшать.

B T₄ Мой дяла не весьма нужны: я чрезъ три дня изъ дому не выходить, и я весьма радъ, что вы ко мнъ пожаловали.

A T₅ Мой государь, понеже я увидѣлъ, что воздухъ столь пріятень и ясень (на дворъ столь пріятно и ясно), то пришолъ я къ вамъ спросить, не поволите ли прогуляться.

B T₆ Мой государь, вы величайшее утождение мнѣ дѣлаете; ибо мнѣ сидѣть дома одному скушно, да и дѣла мои не таковы, чтобъ имъ весьма спѣшить, (не къ спѣку).

A T₇ Дѣло делять мнѣ всегда время, а прогуливаться съ вами не всегда случай имѣю.

The behavior guide. Nauka byt' uchtivym provides some guidelines for the use of gosudar', though it does not mention the other terms of address used in the conversation books. Nauka byt' uchtivym advises the reader not to answer a yes/no question with simply yes or no, but to attach milostlivoi gosudar', milostlivaa gosudarynia, vashe vysokorodie or Preposkhoditel' stvo, or other similar phrases(15). The book also tells the reader that it is discourteous to use the addressee's rank or surname after gosudar' moi (17), rather one should simply say tak gosudar' moi. It is interesting that the behavior guide provides such specific information on this term, which also occurs so frequently in the Domashnie Razgovory.

The other conversation books examined for this study show other alternatives. The Weguelin books use terms of address relatively infrequently; gosudar' moi is the most common, but the sample size is a much smaller than in the Domashnie Razgovory. The Karzhavin texts show an overwhelming preference for sudar'; gosudar' moi occurs only a few times. As with the Weguelin texts, the sample size is smaller than in the Domashnie Razgovory, but the use of such terms is more common than in the Weguelin texts. Sudar' is defined as a particle in the Slovar' Akademii Rossiiiskoi (1806). A brief survey of some popular contemporary comedies indicates that sudar' was the more
common term; gosudar’ moi occurs infrequently in the plays, though the context of the plays differs from that of the conversation books, as the plays’ characters are often related, or at least well acquainted. No familial terms of address are used between speakers in the conversation book, thus it can be assumed that the speakers portrayed are not related and any judgments about the level of intimacy or friendship must be inferred from the context. The Frequenzwörterbuch der russischen Schriftssprache des 18. Jahrhunderts, however, indicates that gosudar’ was far more common than sudar. But both terms are less frequent than the term drug, according to the Frequenzwörterbuch. The dictionary provides no information on the context in which the terms are used, only the number of occurrences in a particular writer’s selected works. This information gap is problematic since drug and gosudar’ may be used as common nouns, and gospodin and gosudar’ may be used with titles. According to the Frequenzwörterbuch, Fonvizin used the term gosudar’ more frequently than any other writer surveyed, but in the play Brigadir, it is the term sudar’ that occurs most frequently.

Drug has the most widespread usage among the authors surveyed for the Frequenzwörterbuch. It was especially favored by Catherine II. The term drug as a form of address occurs frequently in the memoirs of Anna Evdokimovna Labzina (1758-1828) written in 1810. She uses the term drug moi (and its variant, moi drug) in both positive and negative politeness contexts. Her benefactor addresses her thus: Doch’ moia i drug moi! (75). Labzina addresses her husband with the term after he says that he

---

69 The compilers of the dictionary used selected works (mostly journalistic and political in nature) by selected authors (Kantemir, Trediakovsky, Lomonosov, Sumarkov, Fonvizin, Catherine II, Novikov, and Karamzin) to establish frequency of usage.

70 Sudar’ occurs more frequently in Brigidir than the dictionary indicates for the total in Fonvizin’s works surveyed for the dictionary, which included journalistic and political writings but not his comedies. Such a discrepancy signifies that the figures must be used with caution.
loves and values her (though his actions contradict this): *Do sikh por eshche ia ne
videla, moi drug, etogo, a chto budet vpered' – ne znaiu* (68). She quotes her mother as
using it to address her: *Drug moi! Vyslushai ot menia vse spokoino, chto ia budu tebe
gоворit'* (27). Both women seem to have a strong religious faith and the term may be
linked to their religious beliefs; Anna Evdokimovna to her husband: *Drug moi! Bog ne
trebuet ot nas bol' she niche go, kak chistoty serdets nashikh i predaniia sebia v voliu
Ego...* (75).

The usage of the term *drug* in the *Domashnie Razgovory* (1749) is, however,
quite limited. In the dialogues used in this study it appears in only one dialogue, #R 86
(28). It is used in the initial turn when the man coming to pay his debt addresses the
moneylender.

(65)
A  \( T_1 \)  

Пришохь я, мои друг, отдать вамъ недоплаченныя деньги,
которыя я вамъ долженъ.

Since it appears only once in the dialogues any conclusions drawn must be
tentative, but the absence of the term in other contexts suggests that, in this text at least,
it is reserved for use by a social superior to his inferior, as in the patronizing greeting
above.

A similar situation exists around the term *sudar'* in the *Domashnie Razgovory*. It
occurs twice in the text, once in the same dialogue #R 86 and also in #K 85 (66), a
dialogue in which a guest is asked why he is not talking. The term is used when the
guest, having already explained his behavior, is urged to eat and drink.

(66)
A  \( T_5 \)  

Извольте дѣлатъ, какъ вамъ угодно; только прошу уже хоть
покушать.
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In #R 86 the term is used by the man repaying the debt, but by this point in the conversation, the relative power of the two speakers has shifted and A is not in a superior position as he was in the beginning of the dialogue. The moneylender questions the weight of the piece that A is using to repay the debt, and the debtor must try to convince him that it is correct.

(67)

Based on the limited evidence of the data for sudar' in the Domashnie Razgovory, the term seems to be used when a speaker wants to show deference and play up the superior position of the other, even if the status is only temporary. This variety of usages suggests a state of flux or uncertainty in address terms in the eighteenth century and that it is a topic worthy of further study.

4.4 Duty as Social Maxim.

In section 4.2, I discuss the dialogues by imposition level, but other approaches to the dialogues are also insightful to the meaning and function of the conversation books. In this section, I discuss a group of dialogues in which duty has a central role in certain utterances and in the strategy used to relay the speaker's message. Social duty is a value that is embedded in the culture of behavior of the eighteenth century; consequently, it is reflected extensively in the speech of the era. The dialogues included in this grouping share certain vocabulary which reflect an attitude of deference and awareness of obligation, signifying an understanding of the requirements of polite behavior. The dialogues are manifestations of the ethic that the conversation books and behavior guides promoted. A respectable member of society should have a sense of
honor, duty, and respect towards his peers and his superiors, as well as a sense of responsibility towards his inferiors, especially his servants. This social charge is demonstrated by the existence of such books as *Nastavleniia poleznyia dlia slug kotoryia tak zhe ne budet bez polezny i dlia samykh khoziaev*, as well as admonitions in general behavior guides to treat servants correctly. One behavior guide lists the social virtues that one must possess: "услужливость, учтивость, кротость, веселость, и гибкой и обстоятельствам сообразующийся нрав" (*Druzheskie Soviety*, 39). Thus, a sense of duty and obedience was central to the concept of politeness in the eighteenth century.

The authors of the behavior guides understood the role of politeness in smoothing human relations. It required sacrifice of selfish qualities in order to promote peaceful relations with others.

Вълнливость заключается въ безпрерывномъ жертвованіи урпямствомъ, самолюбиемъ, своенравиемъ, и странномыслиемъ; она подобна прелестному лаку, которымъ пророда наводится чрезъ искусство, для смаченія рѣзкихъ во нравахъ красокъ. Она соединяетъ людей, обязуетъ ихъ любить другъ друга посредствомъ всеобщихъ сходствій ею на нихъ изображаемыхъ; безъ нее общество представляло бы только непристойность, пороки и сраженія. *Iskusstvo iavit’ sia v sviet s uspiekhom*, 25-26.

The group of dialogues which I consider as the "duty" dialogues share some common vocabulary and attitudes which fall into several themes, including service, obedience, obligation, and the sense of *dolzhnost*.

There are some speech acts in which some formulaic phrases that express these themes typically appear, such as openings, closings and requests. Some examples will illustrate these themes.

---

71 The term *dolzhnost* is used here to distinguish this subgroup from the general concept of duty. A more complete discussion of the term follows below.
The concept of service is one that, like *dolzhnost*, relates to all of the themes listed above. It may be observed in two very different dialogues. The first example comes from a high-imposition level dialogue in which the exchange is relatively strained; the second example comes from a low-imposition level dialogue in which a stranger is asking for help in locating an apartment and receives ready assistance. In example (68) (taken from #R 7 (27) above), the speaker, who has been caught in an awkward situation, uses the service ideal as a way to offer amends for his behavior, repair the situation, and salvage some face.

(68)

```
В  Т₁     Государь мой я очень сожалью, что меня дома не было, какъ вы пожаловали, чтоб вамъ имѣть честь служить.
```

The following examples from #R 40 ((9) above) echo the vocabulary of service found in the preceding example. In (69), the local states that he can speak enough French to be of service. In (70), the foreigner acknowledges the assistance that he has received even though he is not in a situation to offer similar service to his helper.

(69)

```
В  Т₂     Говорю, да не много, однако столько что вамъ услужить могу.
```

(70)

```
А  Т₃     Весьма благодарствую вамъ, государь мой, за такую милость, которую вы иностраннemu человѣку оказываете, a онъ вамъ обратно услужить не можетъ.
```

Obedience has an interesting role in the model of polite behavior. It seems to be one of the most important qualities that a person can display in relations with others, a clear indication of respect for one's peer or superior. Citing obedience gives a speaker an acceptable way to yield to the other. In this example, the speaker is agreeing to accept an invitation. #K 46 (71) is numbered as (22) above, see also (49) #R 48.
A similar tactic may be used to try to avoid complying with another's wishes. In #K 61 (72), numbered as (30) above, speaker A initially seems to be obeying, but then requests his host to leave him, rather than accompany him home as he wishes to do.

The call to obedience may also be useful to the speaker who alludes to it. In #70 (73), (26) above, the speaker receives a gift and uses obedience as grounds for accepting the gift even though he considers himself to be unworthy.

The importance of obedience in the realm of polite behavior is clear in the following two examples, which show that obedience, or at least a show of obedience, has an even higher place in the hierarchy of correct behavior than courtesy itself. In both dialogues, #R 9 (74) numbered as (10) above, and #R 49 (75) numbered as (23) above, a speaker must finally yield to another and each one clearly cites the need to obey despite the impolite behavior that it causes.

A Т₃  Я вам покорюсь, или я вас послушаю; вы хотите, чтоб я был не учитыв, то я здѣлалъ, чтоб не быть непослушнымъ.
(75)

А Т9 Быть садиться, будь по вашему: лучше быть неучтиво, нежели упрямому.

Admitting an obligation may occur when giving thanks or acknowledging or incurring a debt. Offering thanks can involve lengthy statements as in the two examples below. #R 3 (76) is example (4) above and #R 8 (77) is listed above as (7). In (76), speaker B not only gives thanks, but he states that he failed in his duty to attend to the other, and openly states that this obligation disturbs him. In (77), the speaker gives thanks for the attention that he has received from the other and acknowledges the debt that he thus incurs in an on-record statement. It is this kind of obligation to another that the speaker in #K 61 (72) is trying to avoid.

(76)

В Т2 Я вам, государи мой, покорно благодарствую за честь, которую вы мнь здйлали. Моя бы должность была, приехать к вам мнь это очень беспокоить, что вы своим учитывством предускорили мою должность.

(77)

С Т4 Это знакъ, государь мой, что вы меня любите, по тому что вы обо мнь думаете, и что вы хотли по меня посылать. Я вамъ покорно благодарствую, за ваше напоминаніе, проси васъ, чтобъ меня всегда в вашей памяти сохранить. Я бы желалъ быть, столько щастливъ, чтобъ имыть случай вамъ услугу показать.

The on-record statement of obligation appears to be part of prescribed behavior.

И сие равным образомъ значитъ нарушеніе почтенія къ какой нибудь особь, когда будетъ ей отвчать, (какъ многие дылаютъ) послѣ того какъ она сказала, что для насъ похвальное, или несходственное съ нашей учитывостью, вы смотрите милостивой государы. Не надобно вовсе употреблять такихъ словъ, но перевернуть рчь другимъ образомъ и сказать; вы меня приводите въ стыдъ, государь мой, ето моя должность, и проч. Nauka byt' uchtivym, 17. (Emphasis mine)
Further examples of such duty driven compliments appear in #R 3 (4) and #R 33 (82).

Not all debt acknowledgment must be as involved as the above examples. Clear and direct statements of debt also occur. In this dialogue, speaker A has coerced someone into accepting an invitation and here A is acknowledging his obligation to speaker B. (78) is numbered above as (29).

(78)

\[ A \quad T, \quad Вы меня симь много одолжите. \]

A sense of dolzhnost' marks several dialogues. Dolzhnost' signifies an understanding of the social requirements for correct behavior. On-record expressions of one's sense of dolzhnost' may occur when a speaker is attempting to execute an act which fulfills that dolzhnost' or when simply communicating one's understanding of dolzhnost' and its requirements. Dolzhnost' may serve as the motive for a certain activity, and thus, gives a speaker an out for his behavior should his speech partner find it problematic. The situation in which the two men are trying to get the other through the doorway first (Numbered above as (10)) includes such a move.

(79)

\[ A \quad T, \quad Ньть, вы очень много ихъ дѣлаете. Я иною не дѣлаю какъ должность мою. \]

A host feels a particularly strong sense of dolzhnost' and does not care to be hindered in his actions. In this scene, (30) above, the host is being insistent about accompanying his guest home and the guest just as insistent that he not do so.

(80)

\[ B \quad T, \quad Я вить недалеко вась провожу: ктомужь вы мнѣ позвольте, чтобь я у себя въ дому дѣлалъ то, что мнѣ должно. \]
A speaker may be thwarted in his attempt to carry out his *dolzhnost'* by the actions of his interlocutor. In (34), the companion dialogue to (30), the host allows the guest to have his way, but with the admonition that he has been prevented from fulfilling his *dolzhnost*.

(81)

B T₆ Не погнавайтесь же пожалуйте когда вы мне не позволяет должность мою исполнить.

One of the few dialogues in the *Domashnie Razgovory* that features women speakers allows the male speaker to display his awareness of his *dolzhnost* towards women.

(82)

Разговор 33 Прогуливаются в саду.

A T₁ Мои госпожи, я за шастіе себь почитаю, что в садъ вошоль, и возъимьль случай увидьть в немъ васъ красавиць.

B T₂ Пожалуйте не издъвайте надь нами.

A T₃ Никакъ, Государыни, не извольте тово думать; я не за тымъ сюда пришоль, я довольно вдаю, какъ мнѣ васъ почитать должно.

B T₄ Благодарствуемъ вамъ господинъ за ваше прыятство.

B T₅ Вы, какъ кажется, пришли сюда прогуляться.

A T₆ Подлинно такъ; я прихожу иногда сюда, вдая, что сей садъ есть найлучшей въ семь городѣ.

B T₇ Правда такъ, и можно здсь довольно веселиться.

A T₈ Я и вчера здсь былъ, но не имьль шастія васъ въ немъ видьть.

B T₉ Какуюжъ бы принесла пользу наша при томъ бытностъ?

A T₁₀ Я бы имьль отъ того совершенное свое удовольствіе.

B T₁₁ Вы только надь нами издъваетесь, (играете).

A T₁₂ Никакъ, государыни, я не шуть съ вами говорю.

In T₉, speaker A explicitly his knowledge of required behavior. The behavior guides provide clear guidelines for interaction with women.
The book also advises the reader that women are inclined to fall into jokes in their conversation, thus, one should always add something serious to the conversation.

Formulaic phrases expressing deference, and thus a sense of duty, may occur in some speech acts. A common phrase found in openings and closings is *pokornyi sluga*.

(83) Разговоръ б Встрѣтившись или идучи въ стрѣчу.
A Т₁ Покорный слуга, государь мой.
B Т₂ Я вашій такъ же покорный.

Requests typically include the phrase, *proshu pokorno* or variations thereof.

This phrase is also frequent in Labzina's memoir. #R 4 (84) is listed above as (32) and #70 (85) is listed above as (26).

(84)
B Т₂ Вы не можете меня обспокоить; и я тотъ часъ буду къ вашимъ услугамъ; прошу покорно войти въ эту комнату.

(85)
A Т₃ Покорнйшь вась, государя моего, прошу, не столь смотреть на вещь, какъ на доброе сердце.

These examples show that a sense of duty imbued not only the actions of a polite person, but his speech as well. A sense of honor and duty were core values in the society and the behavior guides and they emphasized their place in one's words and actions.

Учтивость, о которомъ я намѣренъ сообщить нѣсколько наставленій, состоитъ въ стыдливости и чистности, которыя всякой долженъ наблюдать въ своихъ словахъ и дѣйствіяхъ. Когдажъ сія благопристойность не другое что есть, какъ честной стыдъ,
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It has been noted that the Russian text deletes phrases which include mention of duty or obedience, for example in #K 46 (22) and #R 49 (23). The examples discussed above show that the sense of duty was ingrained to such a degree that a "competition" seemed to occur in the exchanges. Each speaker tries to fulfill his sense of what his duty is regardless of what consequences it might have on the interaction. The sense of duty also competes with the equally familiar desire not to impose. The duty displayed in the dialogues is neither negative or positive politeness, thus it brings to light a gap in Brown and Levinson's theory. According to Brown and Levinson, a sense of duty should cause a speaker to back off and withdraw, but in the dialogues, the speakers insist on pursuing it.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has used a variety of means to examine a genre, the conversation book, and a single text from that genre, the *Domashnie Razgovory*, in order to test a theory of linguistic politeness, that of Brown and Levinson, and to gain information about the Russian language in the eighteenth century. In Chapter One, I discussed the concept of a social history of language and the elements of society, history, and linguistics that it should examine. In Chapter Two, I addressed the circumstances, social, cultural, and linguistic, that led to the need for the new genre of the conversation book and its companion genre, the behavior guide. The conversation book was a response to a new norm of behavior for Russian society, closely modeled on the norms of Western Europe. It provided a model of language behavior that was disseminated in foreign language textbooks for at least a century, from the mid-eighteenth century until the mid-nineteenth century. The genre, including the *Domashnie Razgovory* in particular, was important enough to be published by the Academy of Sciences Press, the nation's leading press, after a sometimes controversial editing process. In Chapter Three, I discussed, with some criticisms, the theory of linguistic politeness of Brown and Levinson, and in Chapter Four, I used the theory in a close analysis of the *Domashnie Razgovory* to test the theory and to focus on the techniques of politeness in eighteenth-century Russian. I found that certain address terms,
especially gosudar' moi, were favored over others, such as sudar', and that frequent use of address terms could be a signal of a FTA. I also found that too much politeness could result in an impolite interaction. Moreover, a maxim of social behavior emerged, the maxim of duty. This call to duty was signalled by specific vocabulary and behavior, and in the hierarchy of accepted social behavior, it occupied a higher place than politeness.

I began the analysis attempting to assign rigorously a strategy from Brown and Levinson to each utterance of dialogue, but eventually realized that this approach was not feasible or correct. Brown and Levinson only look at individual speech acts (in the 1987 reissue of their book, they state that they may have erred in this reliance on speech acts). Moreover, they are only looking at instances of conflict; they offer no account of the role of non-conflict-related utterances within the negotiations of speaker relations that is linguistic politeness. The failure to deal with the non-face-threatening speech acts and to provide a “neutral” basis from which the relative face threat of an utterance can be determined is a crucial flaw in Brown and Levinson's account and is an area ripe for further study. The ideas of Bakhtin regarding speech genres may be helpful in defining the place of a “neutral” baseline of interaction from which to consider face threat. This baseline will shift with each new configuration of participants (each “change of footing” see Goffman 1981).

In the above analysis, where I have referred to Brown and Levinson's strategies, I have made the assignments with a broad understanding of each category rather than simply adhering to the restricted definitions given by Brown and Levinson. Nevertheless, I frequently had great difficulty in deciding on a strategy assignment for a particular utterance. Many speech acts in the Domashnie Razgovory included multiple elements of positive and negative politeness or of “off-recordness” and bald on record. While Brown and Levinson acknowledge that they may have erred in viewing politeness
speech acts in isolation and state that they do allow for hybrids of positive and negative strategies (230), they give little indication of how they see the two types of strategies functioning together. While acknowledging that positive politeness and negative politeness may work together smoothly in some cases, they also write that they can fail to function together (hybridize) and instead create a “painful” and clumsy interaction. The dialogues in the *Domashnie Razgovory* provide ample examples of strategy mixing that do not have this painful effect, and as mentioned above, a number of utterances use multiple strategies, positive and negative. The definitions of the strategies themselves are also problematic and allow for varying and various interpretations, which makes them difficult to use effectively. The term “plastic” has been suggested for this characteristic of the strategies (D. Collins, personal communication). It also throws into question Brown and Levinson's claims of universality. While the individual strategies are problematic, the superstrategies that subsume them (e.g. positive politeness: claim common ground, convey that S and H are cooperators, fulfill H’s want for some X; negative politeness: be direct, don’t presume/assume, don’t coerce H, communicate S’s want to not impinge in H, impersonalize S and H, redress other wants of H’s; and off-record: invite conversational implicatures, be vague or ambiguous) seem to be less so. However, there is insufficient data to determine if these superstrategies are exhaustive and comprehensive. By contrast, Brown and Gilman conflate the positive politeness and negative politeness categories in their study of politeness in Shakespeare’s plays. Such an approach seems valid when the examination of the particular strategies is not the main focus of a given study.

While some of the speech patterns that can be observed in the conversation books may have been passing fads, others have remained in the language, and it is only by study of the broad range of genres that we can see how the language took shape and
what social, linguistic, and historical factors played a role in that development. We see in these texts the kinds of speech genres that “set the tone” for the epoch and the development of the literary language. In “Discourse in the Novel,” Bakhtin writes about the “taste” that words have of a certain profession, person, or time. I think that we can expand this sensibility to speech genres as well. Bakhtin writes that speech genres are relatively stable, but also that new ones are always being developed, and it seems logical to assume that, at times, others may be discarded. One sees in the conversation books the development of new speech genres. This awareness of the continual development of new speech genres is echoed by Worth’s (1985) argument for a social history of the language and his call for a study of a wider group of genres than had previously been considered in linguistic research on the literary language. Thus, this study is an attempt to write a chapter in that history for Russian in the eighteenth century.

The “taste” of the language continues to evolve from the eighteenth century to the present. Kostomarov’s recent book lazykovoï vkus epokhi addresses the changing tastes of the times in its very title. Although it is primarily concerned with lexical and phraseologic changes through what he terms “liberalization”, mostly due to the wide-reaching influence of current mass media, the book is an effort to examine the state of the language and how it is being effected by certain means.

The present work presents a close examination of a particular genre, the conversation book, with dual purposes — to test the validity of a theory and to note some of the devices used in the language of the time to conduct certain kinds of speech behavior. This study shows that the theory described by Brown and Levinson appears to be yet incomplete; it is still missing a means of accounting fully for the mix of strategies, an integrated view of strategies in context of speech, and an openess or awareness of cultural and social norms that affect language use. Some of the devices for
conducting conversation in a particular social milieu in eighteenth-century Russia, such as correct responses to threats of imposition, the usage of address terms, and the maxim of duty, are described above. A complete accounting of the speech genres of politeness in eighteenth-century Russian will require a more comprehensive survey of the literature than is within the scope of this study. This study provides a framework for future investigations of this kind.
APPENDIX

DIALOGUES FROM THE DOMASHNIE RAZGOVORY

These dialogues provided the data for Chapter Four.

Разговор 3  Комплименты при визите

A  Т₁  Вы намь позволили, государь мой, притехать къ вамь, мы притехали отдать вамь долгъ наше, и провѣдать о здоровь вашемь.

B  Т₂  Я вамь, государи мои, покорно благодарствую за честь, которую вы мнѣ здѣлали. Моя бы должность была, притехать къ вамь: меня это очень беспокоить, что вы своимь учтивствомь предусмотрели мою должность.

A  Т₃  Вы такъ говорить изволите, и вы не поставите того въ вину, что мы притехали отнять у васъ четверть часа отъ вашего времени, которое вамъ очень дорого.

B  Т₄  Мне ньть приятнѣе времени какъ то, которое я препровожу въ вашей приятной компаниѣ.

Разговор 4  о томъ же

A  Т₁  Не погнѣвайся, государь мой, что я васъ моимъ визитомъ обеспокоилъ.

B  Т₂  Вы не можете меня обеспокоить; и я тотъ часъ буду къ вашимъ услугамъ; прошу покорно войти въ эту комнату.

A  Т₃  Я думаю, что вамъ недосугъ, государь мой,

B  Т₄  Никакъ, государь мой, я ничемъ не занятъ.

179
A T_1 Я подлинно вижу, что недосугъ, и я вась не задержу.
B T_2 Покорно прошу не торопиться, м„ никакова дьла нъть, и
повѣрьте мнѣ, что у меня нъть такого недосуга, котораго бы я
не отставилъ для вась.
A T_3 Я буду въ иное время шастѣ имѣть, пользоваться долѣ вашею
пріятною компаніею. Рекомендуя себя въ вашу милость.
B T_4 Я вашъ покорный слуга, пока имѣть честь буду вашъ опять
видѣть. Ежели вамъ угодно; прошу какъ нанскоря къ мнѣ
зайти.
A T_5 Я буду такъ скоро, какъ мнѣ возможно будетъ.
B T_10 Чѣмъ скорѣе, тѣмъ мнѣ пріятнѣ.

Разговоръ 6 Встрѣтившись или идучи въ стрѣчу.
A T_1 Покорный слуга, государь мой.
B T_2 Я вашъ такъ же покорный.
A T_3 Все ли у васъ въ добромъ здоровье? а особливо вашъ батюшка,
какъ можетъ?
B T_4 Слава Богу, по маленькую.
A T_5 А матушка ваша? она такъ же въ добромъ ли здоровье?
B T_6 Она очень худо можетъ.
A T_7 Я безмѣрно сожалѣю о ея нездоровьѣ, и желаю, чтобъ она скоро
оздоровѣла.
B T_8 Я вамъ покорно благодарствую за ваше доброе желаніе. Желаю,
чтобъ Богъ сохранилъ въ добромъ здравіи всю вашу фамилію.
A T_9 Я вамъ того же желаю отъ всего моего сердца.

Разговоръ 7 Спрашивать кого, откуда идетъ.
A T_1 Откуда вы идете, государь мой?
B T_2 Изъ дому.
A T_3 А я думалъ, что отъ брата вашего.
B T_4 Я хочу для того, что не по той дорогъ я шолъ.
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A T₅ Я был у васъ, государь мой. и мнѣ тамъ сказали, что вы у брата вашего были.

B T₆ Это подлинно, что я тамъ былъ, да уже тому съ часъ, какъ я отъ него пошель.

A T₇ Я былъ вчера также у васъ, однако жъ я не имѣлъ шастія васъ дома застать: это знакъ, что вы очень рѣдко дома живете.

B T₈ Государь мой я очень сожалѣю, что меня дома не было, какъ вы пожаловали, чтобъ вамъ имѣть честь служить.

Разговоръ 8

Приходить къ статьи.

A T₁ Давно уже я не имѣлъ чести вида тъ г. Сазе, где бы онъ былъ? надобно послать провѣдать объ немъ. Стучить не кто, кажется, будто кто у дверей.

B T₂ Это г. Сазе.

A T₃ Вы пожаловали, государь мой, очень къ статьи, я обѣ васъ думалъ; и ежели бы вы не пришли, я бы послать васъ искать.

C T₄ Это знакъ, государь мой, что вы меня любите, по тому что вы обо мнѣ думаете, и что вы хотѣли по меня послать. Я вамъ покорно благодарствую, за ваше напоминание, прося васъ, чтобъ меня всегда въ вашей памяти сохранить. Я бы желалъ быть, столько щастливъ, чтобъ имѣть случай вамъ услугу показать.

A T₅ Вы очень учтивы, государь мой. А я приму всегда ваше намѣреніе за самое дѣло.

Разговоръ 9

Комплименты или учтивести, просить кого, чтобъ вошоль.

A T₁ Прощу войти, государь мой; пожалуй вонди. Я васъ прошу войти:

B T₂ Я за вами буду имѣть честь слѣдовать.

A T₃ Для чего вы не изволите войти! дверь отворена.

B T₄ Подите передо мною, а я за вами. Изволь, изволь пойти.

A T₅ Я не здѣлаю сею.

B T₆ Вы дѣлаете очень много церемоній:

A T₇ Нѣтъ, вы очень много ихъ дѣлаете. Я иною не дѣлаю какъ должность мою.
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В Тг Bohah xce.
A Тг BaMt хо Kopioсb, h a h h с a c t нocAymaiocb; su x o T H re ,<i>To6t x</i> абJJTh BC yHTHBt, TO SJjkJIXIO, HTOÔt H6 ÔblTb aenOCAyiHAHMt.

Потчивають чаемь
A Tг Bohopt 10 IIo BcryiuiemH. A Тг BaAyiocb, rocyAapb Мoâ, hto sa c t нaxoAcy b t AoôpoMt SAopoBbt. npom y MCHA H Мo 3 BHHTb, HTO X TBKb yMCAAHAt npHTTH K t B aMt.

Разговоръ 10  По вступлений.
A Тг Bohopt 10 IIo BcryiuiemH. A Тг BaAyiocb, rocyAapb Мoâ, hto sa c t нaxoAcy b t AoôpoMt SAopoBbt. npom y MCHA H Мo 3 BHHTb, HTO X TBKb yMCAAHAt npHTTH K t B aMt.

А Тг B pyAHTCcb noAcaAyHTC, e a c t HSBHHATb, a a a x o r o , h t o 3 t o x a e o, Cнo , K O Topoe saB H C H Tt o T t B aM e ro  yHTHBCXBa. H a n e H M tio H H H ero Т p e ô o B a it e t c e â CTopHU.

В Тг HO cx aB H M t KOMHAHMCHTU, CAACMt, B O Tt BBMt CXyAt, TOCyABpb MOË, HOKopHo n pom y c t c r b .

А Тг М OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

В Тг K a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Tj S n a io , rocyAapb MOë, hto bu ajoôhtc; hc H3boahtc ah CB HaHHTbCA, a TOTHaCt CBapHTb n p H K a x y .

Потчивають чаемь
A Tг Bohopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

В Тг K a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

Разговоръ 14  Потчивають чаемь
A Тг BOAbTC, HXOÔt X CTOAAt. B Tг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
A Тг МыCt CBaM t HM tiO HCCTt AOHCCTH TOTHaCb.

B Тг К a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

В Тг K a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

Потчивають чаемь
A Тг BOAbTC, HXOÔt X CTOAAt. B Tг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
A Тг МыCt CBaM t HM tiO HCCTt AOHCCTH TOTHaCb.

Разговоръ 14  Потчивають чаемь
A Тг BOAbTC, HXOÔt X CTOAAt. B Tг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
A Тг МыCt CBaM t HM tiO HCCTt AOHCCTH TOTHaCb.

A Тг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
B Тг B Tг К a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

B Тг К a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

Потчивають чаемь
A Тг BOAbTC, HXOÔt X CTOAAt. B Tг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
A Тг МыCt CBaM t HM tiO HCCTt AOHCCTH TOTHaCb.

A Тг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
B Тг B Tг К a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

B Тг К a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

Потчивають чаемь
A Тг BOAbTC, HXOÔt X CTOAAt. B Tг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
A Тг МыCt CBaM t HM tiO HCCTt AOHCCTH TOTHaCb.

A Тг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
B Тг B Tг К a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

B Тг К a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

Потчивають чаемь
A Тг BOAbTC, HXOÔt X CTOAAt. B Tг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
A Тг МыCt CBaM t HM tiO HCCTt AOHCCTH TOTHaCb.

A Тг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
B Тг B Tг К a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

B Тг К a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

Потчивають чаемь
A Тг BOAbTC, HXOÔt X CTOAAt. B Tг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
A Тг МыCt CBaM t HM tiO HCCTt AOHCCTH TOTHaCb.

A Тг Я сидъlt теперь только позвольте, чтобь я стоялъ.
B Тг B Tг К a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.

B Тг К a K t B a Mt yrocHBO. ПаaroBopt 14 H o T H B B aiO T t H a c Mt A Тг Б u OHCHb H 3 PAAHO AtABCt OAHBKOXCt X B aC t ApOIHy TO XC yHHHHTbt, MOëë CTOpOHU.
я выпью чашку.

B T₆ Тотчасъ поднесутъ, сударыня, и думаю я, что уже готовъ.
A T₇ Изволите ли ему чашку выпить, пока горячо? ибо когда чай простынетъ, то уже онъ непръятенъ.

Разговоръ 14 Потчиваютъ чаемъ
A T₁ Знаю, государь мой, что вы любите чай пить; не изволите ли ево напиться, а тотчасъ сварить прикажу.
B T₂ Правда, государь мой, что я очень люблю чай и всякое теплое питье, но теперь пить мнѣ ево не хочется, понеже недавно кофій пилъ.
A T₃ Это ваша отговорка.
B T₄ Къ томужь у меня великой жаръ, а ежели напить мнѣ еще чай, то конечно будетъ умереть. Ибо чай, какъ сказываютъ, въ поть бросаетъ. Не погнѣвайтесь, скажу вамъ, я боюсь поту такъ, какъ огня.
A T₅ Да и вы, государыня, пить не хотите жъ?
C T₆ Никакъ, мой государь, я выпью чашку.
A T₇ Тотчасъ поднесутъ, сударыня, и думаю я, что уже готовъ.
A T₈ Изволите ли эту чашку выпить, пока горячо? ибо когда чай простынетъ, то уже онъ непрѣятенъ.

Разговоръ 15 О Употребленіи чая
A T₁ Питье чая въ Европѣ вошло въ великой обычай.
B T₂ Особливо же въ Англіи и Голландіи.
C T₃ Много ево расходится также въ Нѣмецкой землѣ и во Франціи, и мнѣ думается, что въ сравненіи Агличанъ и Голландцовъ не меньше ево у нихъ исходить, такъ и у восточныхъ народовъ.
A T₄ Не погнѣвайся, государь мой, нынѣ уже не столь великъ на него расходъ какъ прежде былъ, понеже кофій, по моему мнѣнію, больше любить стали.
C T₅ А мнѣ кажется, что чай еще лучше пьютъ, нежели кофій.
В Т₀ Сие зависть отъ произволений жителей каждого города.

А Т₁ Но рѣдко ссыкать можно самой прямой чай, понеже Китайцы всегда мѣшаетъ въ нево другія травы, для большей своей прибыли.

С Т₂ Однако, государь мой, нашоль я преизрядный чай у Голландскихъ купцовыхъ, и не дорого ево продаютъ.

В Т₃ Думается мнѣ, что сие уменьшение цѣны и честь ево уменьшило. Но хотѣль бы я знать такъ ли чай въ Китаѣ приготовляютъ, какъ въ Европѣ его пьютъ.

А Т₄ Мнѣ сказывали, что также, кромѣ того, что мало или и ничево сахару въ нево не кладуть.

В Т₅ Можетъ статься, что по примѣру Китайцовъ многѣе пьютъ только одну волу, держа кусокъ леденцу во рту.

Разговоръ 16 О томъ же (Продолжение Р 15- О употреблении чая.)

А Т₁ Что вы, государь мой, думаете о семь чая?

В Т₂ Онъ, мнѣ кажется, Тебу, (черной чай) которой нынѣ въ великой чести становится.

С Т₃ Довольно вѣдаю, мои государи, что есть такой чай, которой Тебу называется, но я такова еще не пивалъ.

В Т₄ Добрые знатоки лучше всякаго другаго чая ево ставятъ.

С Т₅ Не ради ли того, что дороже его покупаютъ?

А Т₆ Но въ такой великой ихъ разности нѣтъ мнѣ нужды, лишь бы только былъ мнѣ чай. Вотъ, какой я вчера купилъ. И понеже я вѣдаю, что вы силу въ чая знаете, то прошу сказать, каковъ онъ.

В Т₇ Вижу, что вы хорошей чай выбрали, но онъ сухъ, цвѣтомъ изрядень, очень душистъ, и не измѣтъ, однимъ словомъ сказать, онъ самой доброй, и думать можно, что онъ имѣеть въ себѣ всѣ чрезвычайныя свойства и доброты, какія ему столь многіе приписывають.

С Т₈ Можетъ быть вы купили ево для друзей.

А Т₉ Правда такъ, я купилъ ево для васъ, и для всѣхъ моихъ друзей.
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Разговор 21  О курении табаку

А  Т₁ Али вы, государь, мой табак не курите?
Б  Т₂ Нет, курю, государь мой, когда бываю с такими в компании, которые меня некоторым образом курить понуждают; будучи же дома не курю.
А  Т₃ Изволь взять, вот трубки и табак.
Б  Т₄ Какой это у вас табак?
А  Т₅ Виргинской.
Б  Т₆ По духу слышно, он очень крепок.

А  Т₇ Есть у меня другой полегче.
Б  Т₈ Пожалуй прикажи мнь тово дать
А  Т₉ Тотчас вело принести.
А  Т₁₀ Бертрам, поди принеси сюда сверток (картуз) табаку, которой у меня на столе лежит.
А  Т₁₁ Этот прежняго прятнне и легче.
Б  Т₁₂ Какомь бы онь легокь не былъ? однако мнь кажется все крепокъ. Я набью трубку, только пожалуйте вы, государь мой, не принуждайте меня пить вина, понеже табакъ къ вину не пригодень.
А  Т₁₃ Не погнъвайтеся пожалуй, государь мой, вино вамь вредить не будеть.
Б  Т₁₄ Послушайте, государь мой, милостиво, (не поставьте во гнѣвъ) я такъ не обыкъ, вино вить скоро въ голову проходить, и я куря табакъ, вина пить не могу, мнѣ оно не здорово, ибо отъ нево у меня голова болить. Лучше запивать пивомъ табакъ, и я безъ пива курить не могу, ибо съ табаку жажда беретъ.
А  Т₁₅ Тотчасъ вамъ, государь мой, подамъ ево. Я служанку уже за пивомъ послать; я ево у себя въ погребу не держу за тьмъ, что очень рѣдко пью.

Разговор 22  О Употреблении табаку

А  Т₁ Желалъ бы я знать, мои господа, давно ли уже въ Европѣ

---

72 The speakers are not generally marked in the dialogues. The speaker identifications in the examples are my own, unless otherwise noted. In dialogue 22, however, the speakers are marked, though
табакъ извѣстенъ.

В Т2 Во извѣстіе вамъ, государь мой, доношу сіе, онь знакомъ сталъ по сысканіи Америки. Гианпашцы назвали его такъ, по имени Табако, провинціи королевствъ Юкатанскомъ, гдѣ ево сперва нашли, и употребленіе сей нынѣ столь общей травы ввели.

С Т3 Вы правдиво сказали, столь общей травы, а я почитаю се за всеобную.

А Т4 Я считаюся между тѣмъ (въ числѣ тѣхъ находуся,) которые ево очень много употребляютъ, ибо я ево курю и нюхаю: но сіе обыкновеніе весьма худо, отъ котораго отстать надлежалобъ.

С Т5 Правда я табаку не курю, но токмо много нюхаю.

С [В] Т6 Въ прочемъ великиѣ торгіи имъ отправляются во всѣхъ Европейскихъ государствахъ, хотя онъ дешевою цѣною покупается.

С Т7 Какой вы, государь мой, нюхаете табакъ?

А Т8 Бразильской.

С Т9 Толченой или тертоей?

А Т10 Тертоей, ибо я обыкновенно самъ ево тру.

С Т11 Пожалуйте мнѣ ево понюхать.

А Т12 Тотчасъ, государь мой; извольте.

В Т13 Я также ево немношко нюхну; хотя ево не охотно принимаю, только Клеракской лучше ставлю Бразильского. Между тѣмъ вижу, что Бразильской табакъ не худъ: однако подлинныхъ признаковъ нѣть, по которымъ бы ево покупать.

А Т14 Пожалуй скажи намъ, какъ ево узнавать.

В Т15 Тоненькія палочки Бразильскаго табаку должны быть самыя черныя, при отрѣвѣ имѣлиъ хорошей лоскъ, и пріятной духъ, и лежа долго не портились.

---

the letters in the Russian column contain errors, the identification from the French and German columns are shown in the brackets.
Разговоръ 30  О прогуливаньѣ

A T₁ Куда вы изволите итти?
B T₂ Иду прогуливаться.
A T₃ Я бы охотно съ вами вместѣ пошолъ, ежели бы зналъ, что то вамъ непротивно будетъ.
B T₄ Мой государь, съ вами вместѣ прохоживаться мнѣ весьма пріятно будетъ.
A T₅ Да кудажь пойдемъ?
B T₆ Пойдемъ за городъ въ новые ворота, а оттуда возвратимся въ Майнцкіе, и такъ пріятной сей путь насть увеселить.
A T₇ Чего ради либо въ аллеѣ, либо между деревьями проходимись, сколько намъ угодно будетъ, или сколько время допустить; послѣ чего намъ лучше ужинать захотется.

Разговоръ 31  Звать кого съ собою прогуливаться

A T₁ Мой государь вы всегда въ трудахъ упражняетесь.
B T₂ Не очень много, мой государь, я дѣлаю только, для прогнанія своей скуки.
A T₃ Я не хочу вамъ дѣлатъ мѣшать.
B T₄ Мои дѣла не весьма нужны: я чрезъ три дня изь дому не выходилъ, и я весьма радъ, что вы ко мнѣ пожаловали.
A T₅ Мой государь, понеже я увидѣлъ, что воздухъ столь пріятенъ и ясенъ (на дворѣ столь пріятно и ясно), то пришолъ я къ вамъ спросить, не поволите ли прогуляться.
B T₆ Мой государь, вы великое угожденіе мнѣ дѣлаете; ибо мнѣ сидѣть дома одному скушно, да и дѣла мои не таковы, чтобъ ими весьма спѣшить, (не къ спѣху). Дѣло дѣлать мнѣ всегда время, а прогуливаться съ вами не всегда случай иметь.

Разговоръ 33  Прогуливаются въ саду.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Т</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Т₁</td>
<td>Може госпожи, я за щастіє себе почитаю, что въ садь вошоль, и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>возьимѣть случай увидѣть въ немь вась красавицъ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Т₂</td>
<td>Пожалуйте не издѣвайтесь надь нами.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Т₃</td>
<td>Никакъ, Государыни, не извольте тово думать; я не за тѣмъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>сюда пришоль, я довольно вѣдаю, какъ мнѣ вась почитать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>должно.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Т₄</td>
<td>Благодарствуемъ вамъ господинъ за ваше прѣятство.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Т₅</td>
<td>Вы, какъ кажется, пришли сюда прогуляться.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Т₆</td>
<td>Подлинно такъ; я прихожу иногда сюда, вѣдая, что сей садъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>есть найлучшей въ семь городъ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Т₇</td>
<td>Правда такъ, и можно здѣсь довольно веселиться.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Т₈</td>
<td>Я и вчера здѣсь былъ, но не имѣлъ щастія вась въ немъ видѣть.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Т₉</td>
<td>Какуюжь бы принесла пользу наша при томъ бытность?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Т₁₀</td>
<td>Я бы имѣлъ отъ того совершенное свое удовольствіе.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Т₁₁</td>
<td>Вы только надь нами издѣвается, (играет).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Т₁₂</td>
<td>Никакъ, государыни, я не шутя съ вами говорю.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Разговоръ 34 Спрашивать о чемъ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Т</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Т₁</td>
<td>Государыня моя, мнѣ сказывали, что ваша сестрица въ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Лейпцигѣ поѣхала, чего ради пожалуйте выведите меня изъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>сего сумѣнія, и не скройте отъ меня, поѣхала ли она, или</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>пѣть? ибо мнѣ сводили по утру сказывали, что она еще здѣсь.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Т₂</td>
<td>Государыня моя, я тотчасъ вамъ объявлю: тѣ, отъ которыхъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>вы слышали, что моя сестра въ Лейпцигѣ поѣхала, неправду</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>вамъ сказали, и надъ вами только смѣялись; моей сестрицѣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>нѣть никакой нужды въ Лейпцигѣ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Т₃</td>
<td>При томъ, мнѣ запоздлино говорили, что она туда уѣхала, и</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>оттуда назадъ быть не намѣрена.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Т₄</td>
<td>Впервые я сія вѣсти слышу.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Т₅</td>
<td>А я вамъ говорю самую правду.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Разговоръ 40 Пріѣзжему указываютъ, кого ищеть.
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A  Т₁  Говорите ли вы, государь мой, по Французски?
B  Т₂  Говорю, да не много, однако столько что вамъ услужить могу.
A  Т₃  Пожалуйте, государь мой, скажите мнѣ гдѣ живетъ господинъ N.
B  Т₄  Онъ живетъ здѣсь блиско, (въ сосѣдствѣ).
A  Т₅  Я очень долго искалъ ево квартиры.
B  Т₆  Не дивно, ибо онъ переѣхалъ. Онъ недалеко отсюда живетъ, вы тотчасъ туда дойдете, возмите моево дѣтиму, онъ васъ туда проводить.
B  Т₇  Иванъ, поди съ симъ господиномъ, и укажи ево милости, гдѣ живетъ господинъ N. (квартиру).
A  Т₈  Весьма благодарствую вамъ, государь мой, за такую милость, которую вы иностранному человѣку оказываете, а онъ вамъ обратно услужить не можетъ.
B  Т₉  Не Французъ ли вы?
A  Т₁₀  Такъ, государь, я Французъ.
B  Т₁₁  Умѣете ли вы по Нѣмецки?
A  Т₁₂  Нѣть, государь мой, я никогда не бывалъ въ Нѣмецкой землѣ. Прости, государь мой, я вамъ весьма благодарствую.
B  Т₁₃  Не на чемъ (за что) благодарить.

Комплименты 45  Звать кого въ гости.
A  Т₁  Пожалуйте, государь мой, завтра ко мнѣ отобѣдать, чѣмъ богъ послалъ: Я намѣренъ звать къ себѣ въ гости пріятелей, то прошу покорно, придите и вы.
B  Т₂  Вы великую со мною, государь мой, милость здѣлаете, ежели меня отъ тово уволите: ибо меня нѣкоторая нужда притти къ вамъ не допускается.
A  Т₃  Тому статься не лзя, я въ надеждѣ на васъ то дѣлаю. У меня
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вить богатова кушанья нѣть, а вы гостямъ будете очень пріятны.

B T_4 Такъ ужъ не могу я упустить сего случая, чтобъ лишиться вашего общества и вашихъ пріятелей.

A T_5 Вы меня симъ много одолжите.
B T_6 Добро инъ быть такъ, буду.
A T_7 Я въ двенадцатомъ часу васъ ждать стану.
B T_8 Приду всеконечно.

Комплменты 46 Удержать кого у себя обѣдать.

A T_1 Пожалуйте, государь мой, со мною отобѣдайте,
B T_2 Ей мнѣ не можно того здѣлать; есть у меня нѣкоторая нужда, которую я въ первомъ часу исправить желалъ бы.
A T_3 Вы, государь мой, великую милость со мною здѣлаете, ежели пожалуете у меня останетесь: я вить одинъ, (у меня нѣть никово) вы можете сѣ дѣло до другова дни отложить.
B T_4 Добро, инъ послушать васъ.

Разговоръ 47 О томъ же.

A T_1 Желатель бы я васъ, государь мой, удержать у себя обѣдать, ежели бы я то имѣлъ, что вамъ бы пріятно было.
B T_2 У васъ всегда богатой бываетъ столъ; только я васъ теперь обспокоить не хочу.
A T_3 Ежели вы симъ малымъ обѣдомъ довольны будете, то я сіѣ потому себѣ за великую честь и угожденіе.
B T_4 Наипаче я приму то за честь и удовольствіе.

Разговоръ 48 О томъ же

A T_1 Не смѣю васъ, государь мой, попросить, чтобъ у меня отобѣдать,
опасаясь дабы не лишить вас лучшего кушанья (стола).

B T2 При семь случау у меня ничево не пропадет; но я уж и так прежнею вашею милостію довольн.

A T3 Безъ комплиментовъ, пожалуйте останьтесь.

B T4 Добро инъ послушатъ васъ, (инъ будь по вашему).

A T5 Я не пасся, но поставлю вамъ обыкновенное мое всегдашнее кушанье, а именно говядину:

B T6 Это мясо очень хорошо.

A T7 Но мы наградимъ сей недостатокъ хорошимъ виномъ.

Разговоръ 49  Званой гость приходит

A T1 Государь мой, я нѣсколько опаздалъ, пожалуйте не погнѣвайтесь на меня, что васъ задержалъ, ибо одиннатцать давно ужъ било.

B T2 Вы, государь мой, вѣса въ самую пору приходите, и обыкнанія своего не забываете, (и слова своего держитесь).

A T3 Желать бы я, государь мой, чтобъ въ воли моей состояло, исполнить то всячески, чего ваша честь и моя должность отъ меня требуютъ.

B T4 Государь мой, вы сюда пришли не комплименты строить, чего ради извольте скинуть шпагу.

B T5 Вертрамъ, прими шпагу и епанчу у сего господина.

B T6 Пожалуй, сядь туть, это мѣсто вамъ назначенено.

A T7 Я тамъ не сяду, это мѣсто господина Р.

B T8 Прощу покоркно, сядь туда пожалуй.

A T9 Выть садиться, будь по вашему: лучше быть неучтиву, нежели упрямъ.

Комплименты 50  гостей сажать.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Пожалуй господин Совежникъ, изволь съесть сюда.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Весьма мнѣ пріятно будетъ, ежели отъ того меня свободите.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Что много спорить? прошу покорно.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Сіе въ вашей только воль состоятъ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Пожалуй же сядь тутъ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Право не сяду, мнѣ и здѣсь хорошо.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Но вамъ тамъ лучше будетъ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Не погнѣвайтесь же, мой государь, добро ужъ быть тутъ състь, а вы тамъ сядьте.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Садись, мой государь, безъ церемонія, вить у круглова стола нѣть большова мѣста: ктомужь всегда то мѣсто, гдѣ вы сядете, знатно будетъ. Что намъ напрасно время терять въ церемоніяхъ? ибо между тѣмъ кушанье простынетъ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Комплименты 52 Просить хозяина гостей, чтобъ кушали.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Вы, государь мой, не кушаете, развѣ кушанье вамъ не нравится?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Напрасно, государь мой, вы сіе говорите, кушанье очень хорошо пристрѣпано. но мнѣ ѣсть не хочется, я вить и малымъ сытъ бываю, да и никогда много ѣсть не могу.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Да и вы, государь мой, больше разговариваете, нежели кушаете.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Напрасно изволите говорить, я ничево больше не дѣлаю, какъ ѣмъ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Не погнѣвайтесь вы на меня, я положу вамъ не много сихъ квітовыхъ яблокъ, не ждите, государь мой, подчиванья.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Я и безъ тово самъ братъ буду, я уже не жду подчиванья, за столомъ сидючи.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A  T₁  Вы очень хорошо дёлаете.
C  T₂  Не могу теперь больше ёсть, я уже теперь того одолёл, (голодъ) которой меня сперва мучилъ. (я ужъ сьть нафился).
A  T₃  Возмите кусокъ сего куличка, и отвѣдайте (покушайте)
C  T₁₀  Онъ весьма хорошо приготовленъ: я больше его поѣмъ, нежели вы думаете: я уже давно такова хорошева кушанья не ѣдалъ.

Разговоръ 53  О томъ же

A  T₁  Государь мой, я прикажу это блюдо снять, понеже вижу, что вы больше ужъ не кушаете: вы, какъ видно, не любите пироговъ (до пироговъ не охотники).
B  T₂  Напрасно, изволите говорить, я ихъ очень люблю; да ктожъ можетъ чрезъ мѣру ёсть? я ужъ весьма доволень.
A  T₃  Я тому не вѣрю.
B  T₄  Повѣрьте пожалуйте, я истинно довольно ѣлъ.
A  T₅  Скушай пожалуй еще ножку цыплячью, прикажите положить ее предъ себѣ: а салатъ сами изволите брать: я бы вамъ подалъ, токмо салатъ подавать не обычно.

Комплименты 54  Просить хозяина гостей, чтобъ пили и прохлажались (вселились).

A  T₁  Господи, что пить не изволите? пожалуйте кушайте буде не противно: развѣ вино вамъ не нравится?
B  T₂  Вино это очень деликатно, оно весьма хорошо, оно мнѣ довольно вкусно кажется: не Мозельское ли оно?
A  T₃  Правда такъ, государь мой.
B  T₄  Оно очень изрядно, оно ни старо, ни ново.
A  T₅  Вы конечно охотники больше до Рейновейну.
B  T₆  Я и ево пью; токмо Мозельское лучше всѣхъ прочихъ.
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Немецких винь люблю.

A T₇ Но вы, государь мой, не пьете: инъ семь выпьемъ вмѣстѣ.

B T₈ Съ охотою, государь мой.

C T₉ За здоровье господина Н.

B T₁₀ Добро, будь по тому.

A/C? T₁₁ Господинъ Капитанъ, что вамъ приятно.

B T₁₂ Мнѣ ничто такъ не приятно, какъ ваша дружба.

A T₁₃ Благодарствую за ваше пріятство.

B T₁₄ Господа, принимайтесь за рюмки, и выпьемъ за здоровье всѣхъ друзей.

C T₁₅ Хорошо, выпьемъ.

B T₁₆ Господинъ Н. за ваше здоровье.

A T₁₇ Покорнѣйше благодарствую.

A T₁₈ Теперь господа, выпьемъ еще по рюмкѣ Венгерскаго вина.

B T₁₉ Венгерское вино очень крѣпко и пьяно, я лучше выпью еще рюмку Мозельскаго вина.

A T₂₀ За ваше здоровье, государь мой, и благодарствую, что ко мнѣ пожаловали.

B T₂₁ Я напротивъ того за ваше здоровье выпью, и благодарусвую за ваше угощеніе.

A T₂₂ Государь мой, не на чемь вамъ мнѣ благодарить.

Разговоръ 55 Жажду уголить.

A T₁ Пожалуй, государь мой, прикажи подать мнѣ стаканъ пива, ибо чрезмѣрно пить хочется.
B  T₂  Не подать ли лучше, государь моя, вамь рюмку вина?

A  T₃  Благодарствую, государь моя, я теперь пить вина не хочу, ибо очень тепло: а я и безъ того очень горячъ, такъ что одново вина пить не могу: я уже ево пилъ, но жажды имъ запить (утолить) не могу, а пиво лучше утолять жажду, нежели вино.

B  T₄  Правду изволите говорить, да и я до пива великой охотникъ: вотъ вамь самое хорошее, и очень студеное.

A  T₅  Благодарствую. Ахъ! сколь оно мнѣ приятно. Я весьма вамь обязанъ.

B  T₆  Господинъ N. не изволите ли и вы ево?

C  T₇  Никакъ, государь мой, я до пива не охотникъ, я лучше люблю пить вино, не много смѣшавъ съ водою когда жажду утолить хочу.

B  T₈  Я того дѣлатъ не могу, и не люблю вина съ водою? но охотно пью вино по Нѣмецкому обыкновенію а именно чистое и безъ воды.

A/C?  T₉  Вы, государь мой, очень хорошо дѣлаете.

Комплименты 57  При окончаніи обѣда.

A  T₁  Пожалуйте не погнѣзавайтесь господа, на небогатой обѣдѣ; въ другое время лучше уже про васъ припасусь.

B  T₂  Обѣдъ (трактаментъ) вашъ очень хорошъ былъ.

C  T₃  Въ немъ не было ни въ чемъ недостатка.

D  T₄  Напрасно вы извиняетесь, государь мой, наипаче должны мы благодарить вамъ за всѣ утѣшности, которыя вы намъ оказать изволили (за ваше къ намъ благопріятство).

A  T₅  По крайней мѣрѣ, господа мои, вы увѣрены быть тоже тѣ, что я вамъ быть весьма радъ: чего ради васъ покорнѣйше прошу, сей малой обѣдъ за благо принять.

D  T₆  Ей, ей мнѣ стыдно слышать ваши такія рѣчи: благодарствую
вамъ за ваше угощеніе, и прошу не оставить меня своею милостью.

О ТОМЪ ЖЕ

А Т₁ Не погнѣвайтесь пожалуйте, государь мой, что я васъ у себя удержалъ, и столь худо васъ подчиваю: надѣюсь на вашу благосклонность и пріязнь, что вы меня въ томъ не осудите.

Б Т₂ Вы, государь мой, учтивостію свою менѣ предупредили; надлежало было мнѣ просить у васъ прощенія, и благодарить васъ за благопріятное ваше угощеніе.

А Т₃ Мой государь, пріятели между собою безъ всѣхъ церемоній обходятся, чего ради не изволите о томъ говорить, 

Б Т₄ Вы, государь мой, очень вѣжливы, чего ради не говоря другова чево, сіе только скажу: Простите, государь мой, я вамъ благодарствую.

Разговоръ 59 Двѣ дѣвицы мимо идутъ.

А Т₁ Эти двѣ дѣвушки кто таковы?

Б Т₂ Онѣ двѣ сестры.

А Т₃ Которая изъ нихъ большая?

Б Т₄ Та, которая въ красной епанчѣ.

А Т₅ По этому, которая ростомъ больше, та моложе, (меньшняя) какъ слышу.

Б Т₆ Подлинно такъ, государь мой, она, по видимому, любить желтой цвѣтъ; ибо она часто въ такомъ платѣ ходить, а другая зеленой любить.

А Т₇ Зеленой и желтой цвѣты пріятны кажутся.

Б Т₈ Правду говорите: и сево дни по утру шла съ ними ихъ тетка въ алоей епанчѣ, а на сіѣ три цвѣта смотрѣть очень пріятно было.
A T₁ О томъ не сомнѣваюсь, и желалъ бы я ихъ видѣть.

Разговоръ 60 Гости расходятся.

A T₂ Мои господинъ, вы всѣкочечно посидите еще здѣсь нѣсколько време?н? 

B T₃ Никакъ государь, мы уже совсѣмъ собрались итти.

C T₃ Да и я совсѣмъ готовъ домой итти, только жду назадъ господина N. проститься съ нимъ и съ его сожительницей.

A T₄ Такъ инъ я напередъ пойду, ибо пора уже мнѣ итти.

C T₅ Я за вами тотчасъ слѣдовать имѣю.

A T₆ Вы столь долго останься здѣсь можете, сколько вамъ угодно. Благодарствуя вамъ, государь мой, и всей компанией за честные ваши разговоры. Простите мои господинъ, я вашъ покорнѣйший слуга.

B T₇ Простите господинъ Капитанъ, завтра имѣть буду я честь, увидѣться съ вами у господина N.

A T₈ Наипаче я сие за честь себѣ почту.

Комплimentы 61 Просить гость, чтобъ хозяинъ ево не провожать.

A T₉ Государь мой, я вашъ покорный слуга, и весьма благодарствую за оказанную мнѣ честь и учтивость

B T₉ Напрасно изволите за столь малое благодарить.

A T₉ Добро, послушать васъ, только прошу васъ, государь мой, пожалуйте отпустите меня, и себя не утруждайте.

B T₉ Я за честь себѣ почту, государь мой, чтобъ васъ проводить.

A T₉ Пожалуйтежь, не изволите изъ покоя выходить.

B T₉ Я вить недалеко васъ провожу: ктому жъ вы мнѣ позвольте, чтобъ я у себя въ дому дѣлалъ то, что мнѣ должно.
А Т₇ Государь мой, я почти итти далее не могу, пока моей прозъбы не исполните: того ради паки васъ прошу, оставте меня пожалуйте, и дале итти не трудитесь.

В Т₈ До тыхъ поръ за вами въ слъдъ смотрять буду, пока вы изъ глазъ выдете.

А Т₉ Вы къ учиству и шутки прибавляете.

62 О ТОМЪ ЖЕ

А Т₁ Прошу васъ, государь мой, не трудитесь со мною дале итти.

В Т₂ Государь мой, я здсь васъ одною не покину.

А Т₃ Останьтесь пожалуйте, не извольте итти изъ покоея для меня.

В Т₄ Государь мой, позвольте мнѣ отдать вамъ надлежащую честь, и не лишите меня того удовольствія, чтобъ васъ проводить.

А Т₅ Государь мой, вы меня очень много одолжаете; покорнѣйше васъ прошу, не ходите далее со мною.

В Т₆ Не погнѣвайтесь же пожалуйте когда вы мнѣ не позволяете должность мою исполнить.

Комплименты 65 Просить нѣкто перочиннога ножика.

А Т₁ Нѣть ли у васъ, государь мой, перочиннога ножичка?

В Т₂ Есть государь мой, извольте брать.

А Т₃ Пожалуйте дайте мнѣ ево на часть.

В Т₄ Съ охотою дамъ, токмо онъ тупъ: вотъ возмите.

А Т₅ Я ево стану беречь, чтобъ не испортить.

В Т₆ Да и портить уже нечево.

А Т₇ Вы прежде сказывали, что перочинной ножикъ худо рѣжеть, (тупъ), однако жъ я перо свое хорошо очинили.

В Т₈ Это отъ того, что вы чинить весьма умѣете.
A T₁ Вы шутите надо мной: вотъ вамъ ево задть, благодарствую.

Комплименты 69 Подарить кого чьмь

A T₁ Смью ли я вамъ, государь мой, подарить сию табакерку? пожалуй, буде угодно, прими.

B T₂ Не могу не принять столь изряднаго подарка, наипаче же изъ пр́ятныхъ вашихъ рукъ: я вамъ, государь мой, за него весьма обязанъ: желаль бы и я имьть у себя такую вещь, которая бы вась достойна была, и онуюбъ я вамъ отъ сердца моего подарилъ.

A T₃ Продолженіе вашей дружбы почту я за пр́ятнйшей подарокъ.

B T₄ Государь мой, я весьма сожалю, что имъящагося къ вамъ высокопочитанія ни чьмъ инымъ какъ словами засвидѣтельствовать могу.

70 О ТОМЪ ЖЕ

A T₁ Ежели вы, государь мой, меня любви своей удостоите, то пожалуйте примите отъ меня сей малой подарокъ.

B T₂ Хотя я ни мало не достоинъ, чтобъ вы меня дарили, однако я оной подарокъ приму въ засвидѣтельствованіе моего послушанія.

A T₃ Покорнйше вась, государя моего, прошу, не столь смотреть на вещь, какъ на доброе сердце.

B T₄ Хотябы вашъ подарокъ еще вдвое менѣе былъ, однако я всегда оного недостоинъ; и вашу благопріятность я всегда за самой великой подарокъ почитать буду, которымъ вы меня одолжить можете: напрасно изволили вы столь много тратитесь; а между тмъ благодарствую вамъ за подарокъ, которой хранить буду въ память того друга, которой мнъ ево подарилъ.
Комплменты 85 Спрашивается, для чего не говорят.

А Т1 Государь мой, для чего вы ни слова не говорите?

Б Т2 Я государь мой, за честь почитаю ваш слушать; на что не льзя всём вдруг говорить, но надобно кому нис ны нас молчать.

А Т3 Не думаю я, чтобы то причиною тому было. но опасаюсь, не досадно ли что вам? вы потупясь сидите.

Б Т4 Не извольте того думать, не о чем ми печалиться, когда я с такими честными людьми бы быть вмести удостоился, и меня столь изрядно принимают: я тогда говорить стану, когда до меня череда дойдет.

А Т5 Извольте дать, как вам угодно; только проведу уже хоть покушать.

Б Т6 Добро сударь, буду исполнять вашу волю; и вы подлинно скажете, что я себя не забываю, и столько пью и ем, сколько и другое.

А Т7 Все в вашей воле состоит, и я бы желал государь мой, чтобы вам что нисбуд изъ кушанья понравилось.

Б Т8 Мой государь, ныть тут ничего, чтобы весьма приятно не было.

Разговор 86 Червонной полновесной.

А Т1 Пришолъ я, мой другъ, отдать вамъ недоплаченя деньги, которая я вамъ долженъ.

Б Т2 Я весьма сожалю, что вы столько тружитесь, и за тьмъ только сюда пришли; не почто было вамъ спшить.

А Т3 Сколько еще я вамъ долженъ?

Б Т4 Шесть гульденовъ (на васъ осталось еще долгу шесть гульденовъ).

А Т5 Вотъ вамъ червонецъ.
B T₆ Полновесной ли этот черновець?
A T₇ Полновесной, сударь, я самъ его въсилъ.
B T₈ Не думаю, чтобъ онъ пошолъ: (чтобь его взяли:) кажется мнѣ онъ нѣсколько легокъ: между тѣмъ посмотрю, возьмутъ ли его: ежелижъ не возьмутъ, то вамъ назадъ отдать.
A T₉ Черновець хорошъ, пойдетъ.
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