



This is a repository copy of *Address negotiations in Dutch emails*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/126340/>

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:

Vismans, R.M. orcid.org/0000-0002-4503-6045 (2019) Address negotiations in Dutch emails. In: Kluge, B., Moyna, M.I., Horst, S. and Warren, J., (eds.) *It's not all about you : New perspectives on address research*. John Benjamins Publishing Company , pp. 254-279. ISBN 9789027204158

<https://doi.org/10.1075/tar.1.10vis>

© 2019 John Benjamins. This is an author-produced version of a chapter subsequently published in *It's not all about you : New perspectives on address research*. For all re-use permissions please contact the publishers.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Roel Vismans

Abstract

This chapter presents a qualitative analysis of address forms in a small corpus of Dutch emails/email chains, in particular their strategic use in moving from a more formal, distant relation between correspondents to a more familiar one. In addition to pronominal address forms, it also considers other linguistic features, including salutations and signing off formulae, and style. Adopting a discursive approach, the chapter identifies a number of different strategies in negotiating address, including avoidance of address forms and the use of the plural familiar pronoun *jullie* as a transitional form between formal and familiar address. The chapter makes an original contribution to the (currently rather limited) research on address in computer-mediated communication (CMC) and comments on the hybridity of email.

Key words

Address forms, second-person pronouns, Dutch, politeness, computer-mediated communication, email, hybridity, discursive approach.

1. Introduction¹

The academic literature on address of the last decade or so amply illustrates that the use of address forms in conversations between individuals rarely remains static. Among many other authors, Clyne et al. (2009: 23 ff.) align their observations on the dynamic nature of address to a discursive trend in politeness studies (e.g., Eelen 2001; Watts 2003), which can in turn be traced back to earlier critiques of Brown and Levinson's politeness model of the late 1970s and 1980s (cf. Brown & Levinson 1987). In this trend, politeness is regarded "as something which is discursively constructed by interlocutors" (Clyne et al. 2009: 25), who evaluate each other's (verbal) behavior in terms of what is appropriate in the given context. Along these lines, Vismans (2015, 2016) shows how address in Dutch can be very subtly negotiated in conversation between two people who have only recently been introduced and who build up

¹ I am grateful to the editors, two anonymous reviewer and my Sheffield colleague Jan Windebank for their constructive observations on earlier drafts of this chapter.

their relationship in the course of an hour-long discussion. These discussions sometimes move back and forth between more and less formal address forms. Email is a genre in which we can see similar address negotiation in action, but because of its asynchronous nature it happens in slow motion.

The basic pronominal address choice in standard (northern) Dutch² is often presented as a binary one between the familiar (singular) pronoun *jij* (plus its oblique and possessive forms *jou* and *jouw*), and the distance (singular or plural) pronoun *u* (possessive *uw*). However, there are two further forms that are relevant for this study: unstressed familiar *je*³ and plural familiar *jullie*. There has been some speculation that these two forms can be used to refine the binary choice between distance and familiarity, and that they therefore play a role in address negotiation. Thus, Vermaas (2002: 64) quotes several authorities (dictionaries and earlier 20th-century Dutch linguists) who “make a distinction between *je* and *jij* indicating that it boils down to *jij* being a direct form of *je* and that *je* is also an indefinite pronoun”. More explicitly, Haeseryn et al. (1997: 240)⁴ comment that “it is not uncommon to use the pronoun *jullie* to someone one does not address with the familiar pronoun [i.e., emphatic *jij*; the authors here use the verb *tutoyeren*; RV]”, when there is “some kind of connection” and “a certain degree of familiarity” with the addressee. With an even greater degree of familiarity but still some reserve, they deem *je* more likely than the emphatic forms. Finally, they suggest a schematic representation of the “increasing degree of “familiarity” ...: *jullie* → *je* → *jij/jou*”. In this context, it is worth pointing out that Clyne et al. (2009: 155) suggest that the German second-person plural pronoun *ihr* has a similar intermediate function. Table 1 gives the full paradigm for pronominal address forms in standard Dutch.

	Formal	Familiar	
		Stressed	Unstressed (Personal)

² See Vismans (2015) for more on address in the main varieties of Dutch as a pluricentric language, spoken in the Netherlands and Flanders.

³ *Je* also functions as the most frequently used generic pronoun in Dutch, alongside the less frequent and more formal *men* (‘one’). Generic *je* is not a major feature of the data in this chapter, nor its analysis. For more on generic *je*, see e.g., de Hoop & Tarenskeen (2015) and references there.

⁴ Vermaas (2002) is the most comprehensive study of modern Dutch address forms. She provides a historical overview from Middle Dutch onwards, although its substantive component is a study in apparent time over three generations since the Second World War. Haeseryn et al. (1997) is the most authoritative grammar of standard Dutch. Translations of Vermaas (2002) and Haeseryn et al. (1997) are my own.

					and Possessive)
	Personal	Possessive	Personal	Possessive	
Singular	<i>u</i>	<i>uw</i>	<i>jij</i> (subject)	<i>jouw</i>	<i>je</i>
			<i>jou</i> (object)		
Plural			<i>jullie</i>		<i>(je)</i>

Table 1. Pronominal address forms in standard Dutch.

This chapter aims to present a first exploration of the various strategies for negotiating address in general email correspondence in Dutch, by means of a qualitative study of a small number of emails and email chains. In doing so, it also considers the role *jullie* and unstressed *je* play in these negotiations. Before data for this paper are presented and discussed in Section 4, we first review relevant literature on address, followed by a methodological section on the collection and analysis of the data. The chapter concludes with a detailed discussion of its findings. We will adhere to the convention of using *T* and *V* to refer to (pronominal) address forms expressing familiarity and distance respectively.

According to de Oliveira (2013: 292) the study of negotiated address in computer-mediated communication (CMC) has only just begun. Email, a specific type of CMC, has long been recognized for its hybrid nature because it has features that are typical of both spoken and written discourse. Although hybridity is also present in other forms of CMC, email allows us to study the negotiation of address between two specific interlocutors over time better than some other types of CMC, for example discussion boards. This chapter therefore makes a contribution to the study of both negotiated address in CMC and the hybridity of CMC.

2. Background

2.1 Address in Computer Mediated Communication

De Oliveira (2013) provides a wide-ranging review of the address literature, but she dedicates the bulk of her paper to studies on the use of address forms in CMC. She identifies three prevailing trends in that most of these studies are concerned with: (a) the interaction between address forms and greetings; (b) attitudes and reactions to norms of addressing behavior; (c) the use of address in online educational environments. In addition, she observes that address is rarely the single focus of research, which leads her to plead for more studies in which it is.

Of interest for our purposes are de Oliveira's (ibid. 297-297) references to studies by Gains (1999) and Murray (2000), which show different norms of behavior in business and academic emails: academic emails are much more likely to include greetings and other routines than emails in a business environment. However, more recently Waldvogel (2007) compared the greeting and closing routines in the internal emails of two organizations, viz., an academic institution and a manufacturing plant. Her findings (ibid. 462 ff) contradicted the claims of Gains (1999) and Murray (2000), i.e., greetings were used more prolifically in the manufacturing plant than in the educational institution. Waldvogel (ibid. 471) links this difference to cultural differences between the organizations, esp. "the more friendly and familial culture of the manufacturing plant" and the "business first, people second culture" of the educational institution. Although this chapter also presents a mixture of academic and business emails, there is a qualitative difference with Waldvogel's study, as it is not concerned with internal communications within an organization, but communication between individuals in an external environment. Despite its modesty, our dataset complements Waldvogel's findings: it reveals that greeting and closing routines in this type correspondence between individuals are important and continue to be so throughout a chain.

As de Oliveira (2013: 300) writes, "[e]vidence of conversational norms as regards address form usage can be inferred from violations of those norms" and some of the studies she mentions (viz. Kretzenbacher 2005, de Oliveira 2003 and Graham 2007) describe the strong reactions people can have when such violations occur. Online norms can differ from those in face-to-face contact, as can be gleaned from the section on CMC address in the contrastive study by Clyne et al. (2009: 116-123), covering English, French, German and Swedish. The authors surveyed a number of chat groups on various aspects of address, and their French and German data show a consensus that *T* is regarded by many as the conventional, unmarked address form on the internet, witness quotes (1) and (2).

(1) *Il est extrêmement rare de voir des personnes qui vouvoient dans un forum.*

'It is extremely rare to see people using *vous* in a forum.' (ibid. 117).

(2) *Im Internet ist das Duzen ein geschriebenes Gesetz.*

'On the internet the use of *du* is a written law.' (ibid. 120).

However, Clyne et al. (2009) also show that this 'law' is not universally applied. For German, it has been effectively nuanced further by Kretzenbacher (2011: 239):

Contrary to widespread assumption, we see that the internet is not really “a different country” in respect to the complex rules of address in German, and while *du* has become the default pronoun in many forums, this cannot be said to be the case across the board.

According to Kretzenbacher (ibid.) many discussion fora have developed rules for address in their netiquette policies for this reason. There is thus something of a disconnect between norm (as formulated by the speakers in (1) and (2)) and actual practice when it comes to online address. In any case, email (the focus of the present paper) is a different type of interaction than discussion fora. The initial stages of the chains in our dataset resemble traditional correspondence by letter, whereas further down the chain it can develop into something more akin to face-to-face conversation. This is best illustrated by the chain in example VI in the appendix (see also Section 4.5), which begins like a formal letter but ends more conversationally with practical arrangements about when and where to meet. As such, our data demonstrates why email can be regarded as hybrid, as an early form of ‘media convergence’ (Herring 2013: 4 ff).

De Oliveira (2013: 302) also discusses the use of address in online educational environments. She briefly reviews a number of studies that concentrate on address as a foreign language acquisition issue and on collaborative learning on- and offline. In this context, she comments that the speed and frequency with which we move between on- and offline communication – and also between different modes of online communication – may lead to the confusion of address modes that may be appropriate for one medium but not for another. This comment is not evidentially supported, however, so it would be interesting to investigate the extent to which such confusion really occurs.

De Oliveira (ibid. 303-304) raises three issues in relation to the literature she reviews. First, many studies use address forms as a diagnostic, as one of a number of indicators for a particular broader phenomenon (e.g., developing group dynamics, in Postmes et al. 2000). Despite decades of address research, many studies still deploy an essentialist view of address forms as ‘stable identity markers’ instead of recognizing the fluidity of identity and of address use. Secondly, two types of ‘interpretive imprecision’ frequently occur. One views each use of *T/V* at face value as an indication of intimacy/respect rather than entertaining the option of insincerity, while the other ascribes familiarity (through use of *T*) to CMC as an essential characteristic, even when it is also the unmarked mode of similar offline activity.

Thirdly, discursive approaches are underutilized in the study of address in CMC. De Oliveira therefore advocates future research with address as its focus rather than as a diagnostic, and she recommends using discursive research methodologies. This chapter contributes just such a focused study of address in CMC along discursive lines.

2.2 Address in Dutch CMC

One particular study that de Oliveira criticizes along these lines is Postmes et al. (2000), which used address pronouns as a diagnostic in a complex study of the construction of social groups in a CMC environment. Other communication characteristics considered in the study were, for example, the use of slang, abbreviations, superlatives, and flaming. The use of *je* and *u* was coded as “informal” and “formal”, and absence of address pronouns as “absent”. It is this blanket coding of the two pronouns that de Oliveira (2013: 299) objects to. Needless to say, since the study largely concerned communication between university students (on an online statistics course) in a closed CMC system, the incidence of *u* between students was very low (0.7%; Postmes et al. 2000: 355). The study is unclear, however, about the use of address pronouns between students and staff, and in fact pays no further attention to address forms.

There is little published research into Dutch forms of address and CMC, although there have been a few studies of online texts, including advertising. Thus, van Zalk & Jansen (2004) looked at the reception of persuasive texts (specifically, an online advertisement for a walking holiday) with variation in address pronoun use. They found that middle-aged readers appreciated the version with *je* more, and speculated that this is because it enhanced their image of themselves as relatively young and fit.⁵ Vismans’ (2007) study of online job advertisements for highly qualified applicants in the Netherlands and Flanders found significant differences in pronominal use between the two regions, which was triggered by significant differences between economic sectors. Advertisements for jobs in the media were more likely to use *je*, whereas jobs for the legal and financial sectors were more likely to be advertised using *u*, especially in Flanders. A similar study of address forms in banner advertisements on Dutch and Flemish newspaper sites (Vismans 2013a) also showed

⁵ Similarly, Janssen & Jansen (2005) found that younger readers of an informative text preferred a version with *u* to one with *je*, because they want to be taken seriously. However, their study did not concern an online text.

significant differences between sectors, but not between regions or newspaper types (quality vs. tabloid).

None of the above studies are concerned with interactive CMC, like email, but in the last decade or so there have been a few student projects at Dutch universities that do concern email and other interactive CMC. Jansen (2004) analyzed emails between people of the same age group (old-old and young-young) and between the age groups (old-young and young-old). She found few striking differences between old (55-70) and young (20-35) participants, except that playing with language ('cyberplay') was prevalent in young-young emails. Moreover, the older age group never used *u* (whereas in young-old emails *u* occurred frequently). Prinsen (2007), concerned with Human-Computer Interaction (HCI), tested 120 respondents' satisfaction with two types of system messages/queries: error messages (e.g., 'the filename is not valid') and informative messages (e.g., 'are you sure you want to move this file to the bin?'). The messages varied in their use of second-person pronoun (absent/present, *je/u*) and also their background (work or play). She found a great deal of variation, but a preference for the absence of pronouns in error messages, which was favored because it comes across as non-judgmental. If there was a preference for an address form, there was a small preference for *u*, even among younger respondents. Moreover, there was also a large proportion of respondents who did not notice differences in pronoun use in the first place. Jansen (2011) found that irrespective of age all his respondents were indifferent as to which form of address was used in fictitious email chains between customers and customer service departments, although some of his results are likely to have been the effect of the experimental design.

Discursive analyses of Dutch address forms remain rare, however. An exception is Stommel (2012), who presents a discourse analysis of email chains between counselors and their clients. It is framed in a context of recipient design (cf. Sacks et al. 1974, cited in Stommel 2012: 146). The starting position in communication between professional and client tends to be formal, which is often reflected in prefabricated messages. Stommel's analysis demonstrates that occasionally clients explicitly ask for a more informal approach from their counselor, which they may frame as a request for *tutoyement* and use of first name. However, more frequently they indirectly indicate a preference for greater informality through their own language use. Stommel (ibid. 156) therefore concludes, *inter alia*, that "clients put effort in diminishing the social distance to their counsellor." However, counselors also frequently fail to respond to these direct and indirect attempts at distance reduction, which clients may then accept. This chapter, then, presents a further discursive analysis of address in Dutch

emails, but in this case the context for those emails is not as constrained as the client-counselor relationship in Stommel (2012). It will be interesting to see, therefore, what effect that looser context has on address negotiation in our corpus in comparison to hers.

3. Methodology for data collection and analysis

To recap, this chapter aims to explore the various strategies for negotiating address in general email correspondence in Dutch, in other words: How is Dutch address negotiated in general email correspondence between initially unacquainted correspondents? To investigate this we ideally needed chains of two or more email messages rather than individual messages, although single messages initiating a correspondence also proved to be relevant. Emails and email chains were collected in two ways. First, I identified a small number of email chains in my own correspondence. This raises the issue of investigator bias, in the sense that the spontaneity of one's own correspondence is affected once it becomes the subject of a research project and one is explicitly aware of the dynamics involved. I was careful, therefore, to select only material that predated the formulation of this project in spring 2006. Next, I asked a number of acquaintances for relevant email chains. Ethics approval for the project was obtained in accordance with University of Sheffield procedures.

Given the logistics of collecting such a narrowly defined corpus, it is not surprising that the search only yielded a small number of email chains (18) and two single emails. The small size of our corpus is an obvious drawback, but an advantage of the collection method is that it affords the investigator/author greater contextual insight, and hence a deeper analysis, than a more anonymous study would. The data is from a range of backgrounds, although the majority of the people involved are students and (academic) professionals: i.e., mostly white, middle class, well-educated and aged 25-50. The provenance of the corpus means that there is an obvious gender imbalance in the data. For this reason, we cannot consider gender as a factor in negotiating address in this chapter. Details of the corpus are provided in Table 2.

#	Initiator	gender	Correspondent	gender	Appendix	Chain
1	conference attendant	f	conference organizer	m	I	y
2	exchange student	f	tutor	m/f	IV	y
3	exchange partner	f	exchange organizer	m		y
4	conference attendant	m	conference organizer	m		n
5	customer	m	builder	m	II	y
6	conductor	m	librarian	m	VI	y
7	editor	m	author	m		y

8	conference attendant	m	conference organizer	m		y
9	exchange student	f	tutor	m		y
10	conference attendant	m	conference organizer	m		y
11	exchange partner	f	exchange organizer	m		y
12	conference attendant	f	conference organizer	m		y
13	conference attendant	f	conference organizer	m		y
14	language assistant	m	tutor	m		y
15	author	m	editor	m		y
16	editor	m	author	m		y
17	conference attendant	f	conference organizer	m		y
18	tutor	f	language assistant	m		y
19	author	m	editor	m	III	n
20	visiting author	m	academic	m	V	y

Table 2 Emails and email chains in the corpus.

The following section provides a qualitative analysis based on three single emails and three email chains, which are representative, in terms of phenomena observed in the entire corpus as well as the participants' role. As well as pronoun use, it considers features like salutations, avoidance strategies, and explicitness. The first four subsections focus on a number of individual strategies, especially those employed by the initiator of the correspondence. In the final subsection we consider the (implicit) negotiation of address in one longer email chain. Points for discussion are illustrated with brief excerpts from the data wherever possible, but the data is presented in full in the appendix (upper case Roman numerals for whole chains, lower case Roman numerals for turns within chains).

4. Address negotiation strategies

4.1 Address avoidance

Address avoidance was a common strategy. We can see this in (3) (I in the Appendix) where the salutation comprises both first and last name.

<p>(3) Beste Roel Vismans,</p> <p>Als spreker op het ALCS-congres in januari wilde ik me graag registreren, maar ik krijg het meegezonden formulier niet open. Is het mogelijk om het formulier nogmaals toegestuurd te krijgen?</p> <p>Met vriendelijke groet, [Voornaam, Achternaam]</p>	<p>Dear Roel Vismans,</p> <p>As speaker at the ALCS conference in January I'd really wanted to register, but I cannot open the attached form. Is it possible to be sent the form again?</p> <p>With friendly greetings, [First name, Surname]</p>
--	---

In Dutch there is a strong link between the use of familiar pronoun and first name without last name, so *Beste Roel* would have signaled greater familiarity, whereas a salutation like *Beste mijnheer Vismans* (‘Dear Mr. Vismans’, i.e., honorific plus surname) would have signaled the opposite.⁶ However, the emailer also avoids using pronouns in the body of the text by writing *het meegezonden formulier* (‘the attached form’) rather than *het formulier dat je/you hebt meegezonden* (‘the form you have attached’). Similarly, the writer uses the impersonal construction *Is het mogelijk om het formulier nogmaals toegestuurd te krijgen?* (‘Is it possible to be sent the form again?’) instead of *Kun je/Kunt u het formulier nogmaals toesturen?* (‘Can you send the form again?’). Note that this simultaneously allows her to avoid first-person reference, illustrating that address avoidance may also be motivated by other factors than address negotiation. The greeting which signs off the message (*Met vriendelijke groet*) is quite neutral, but the combination of the writer’s first and last name mirrors the salutation and indicates that she maintains a certain distance.

Example (4) is the opening turn of VI in the Appendix, a correspondence between the conductor of a choir and a librarian, which in total consists of eight ‘turns’, five by the conductor (A) and three by the librarian (B). In (4), A deploys similar strategies as the correspondent in (3) above: direct address avoidance and impersonal constructions (*Is dat nog steeds zo?* (‘Is that still the case?’) and *Is dat mogelijk?* (‘Is that possible?’). Moreover, instead of the combination first plus last name we saw in (3), A addresses the librarian by his role: *Beste bibliothecaris* (‘Dear librarian’). Given the professional situation, this is not uncommon and need not be interpreted as primarily an address negotiation ploy.

(4) Beste bibliothecaris,	Dear librarian,
Als oud-dirigent van X weet ik dat de salon een goedgevulde bibliotheek heeft (of had) met allerlei partituren en partijen van stukken die ooit door X gespeeld zijn. Is dat nog steeds zo?	As former conductor of X I know that the salon has (or had) a well-stocked library with all kinds of scores and arrangements of pieces that have in the past been played by X. Is that still the case?
...	...
Vooral het laatste stuk is erg kostbaar om te huren, dus wanneer het nog in de X bibliotheek ligt zou ik het materiaal graag lenen.	Especially the latter piece is very costly to rent, so if it is still in the X library I would like to borrow the material.
Is dat mogelijk?	Is that possible?

⁶ A salutation with *Beste* is fairly neutral in any case, whether in combination with honorific/title and surname, or with first name. At the formal extreme of the spectrum we could expect *Geachte* (‘Dear, esteemed’), accompanied by honorific/title + surname, whereas at the familiar extreme, *Lieve* (‘Dear, beloved’) followed by first name (or the name of the relation: *Lieve ouders* ‘Dear parents’), is reserved for very intimate relations. Even then, there may be gender-related restrictions to the use of *lieve*.

He maintains the salutation, *Beste bibliothecaris*, in her/his second turn (VI.iii) before initiating a more familiar tone in VI.v (see 4.5 below).

A different avoidance tactic is deployed in (5) (the salutation at the beginning of II.i in the Appendix), which is part of a correspondence with the supplier of a floor that the first writer had bought previously and for which new components are required. The salutation consists of just the word *Beste* ('Dear') followed by two dots. What could have gone through the writer's head here? Had he forgotten the correspondent's name? Did he not want to offend by using either first name or honorific plus surname? The use of *u* in the first sentence and subsequently *jullie* in the third paragraph (see sections 4.2 and 4.3 below) are indications that this writer is possibly using address in a covert strategy to arrive at a desired (informal) style later on in the correspondence.

(5) Beste..	Dear ..
Enkele jaren geleden [...] heb ik bij U een planken vloer gekocht, en die ligt er nog steeds in, tot volle tevredenheid. [...]	A few years ago already [...] I bought a wooden floor from you (V), and it still lies here, with complete satisfaction. ...
Er komt echter een verbouwing van de keuken aan en daarvoor zijn (20) extra planken nodig. [...]	However, we are going to do up the kitchen and for that we need (20) extra boards. [...]
Mijn hoop is daarom op jullie gevestigd: ik hoop dat jullie de oude nota van toen nog terug kunnen vinden[...]	My hope is therefore fixed on you (T, pl): I hope that you (T, pl) can still find the earlier invoice [...]

4.2 *V as opening gambit*

U is the Dutch pronoun of choice for official correspondence, certainly in letters but also in official emails (sometimes even in upper case, e.g., in example (5), although this convention is decidedly dated). That said, the lines are blurred between more and less formal official email correspondence, where pronoun choice may depend on contextual factors. For example, when two correspondents know each other and/or the topic of the correspondence is relatively light, *je* (rather than *jij*) is also used. In any case, we see initial *u* in II and V, where it is deployed as a classic negative politeness strategy to keep a distance and respect the interlocutor's personal space. Example (6) (V in the Appendix) is part of my own correspondence with a (quite well known) visiting author about the arrangements for the visit. The author's reputation and the fact that we were not acquainted in any way were sufficient reason to refrain from familiarity in the first email.

(6) Geachte heer [...]

Dear Mr..[...]

Ik ga er maar van uit dat **u** weet van **uw** bezoek aan Sheffield [...].

I assume that **you** (V) know of **your** (V) visit to Sheffield [...].

However, unlike in V, the correspondents in II are already acquainted, which they both make clear in their opening sentences. In example (7) (II.ii in the Appendix) the supplier of the goods uses *u* a few times, but also avoidance strategies such as the passive construction. The use of impersonal business jargon (*Onderhoudswas is altijd op voorraad* – ‘wax is always in stock’) in the last two sentences may also be seen as an element in address negotiation/avoidance and maintaining distance. However, jargon is of course used frequently in such professional contexts, so, like the use of ‘librarian’ in (4), it need not be interpreted as primarily an address negotiation ploy.

(7) Ik kan me **uw** naam nog herinneren. Fijn dat de vloer zo goed bevalt. Ik ga in de archieven duiken om het uit te zoeken. Het zou wel helpen als **u** wist hoe de vloer betaald is (contant of per bank).

I can still remember **your** (V) name. Great that the floor pleases so much. I am going to dive into the archives to sort it out. It would help if **you** (V) knew how the floor was paid (cash or via the bank).

[...]

[...]

Onderhoudswas is altijd op voorraad.

Wax is always in stock.

The chain in II contains one other brief message from the supplier with first name plus surname in the salutation, one *je* and more impersonal business jargon in the body of the text (*x is verkrijgbaar* – ‘x is available’; *y is niet leverbaar* – ‘y is not available’). However, for the initiator of the correspondence, the *U* in (5) is actually the only occurrence in the entire correspondence. In subsequent emails he generally addresses the supplier with first name and *je*. Moreover, halfway through this first email he uses the plural *T*-pronoun *jullie*. This can be interpreted as referring to the company as a whole, but at the same time also as a subtle transitional move towards wider *T* use and greater informality. The writer signals that desire for greater informality in other ways too, e.g., with ellipses (*is geen haast bij* – lit. ‘is no rush with’; *mag ook later* – lit. ‘may also later’) and lexical choice (*een likkie*, the informal form of the diminutive *likje* which here implies *een likje verf* – ‘a lick of paint’).

4.3 Jullie and asking permission

Jullie is also used in (8) (IV in the Appendix), a message from a Dutch exchange student who had emailed a colleague earlier with an offer of assistance with conversation classes, addressing the colleague with honorific plus surname and *u*. The colleague had responded

with first name and *je*, copying me in, and I had replied to the student in a similarly familiar tone. The student's next email is a new opening gambit to both of us, which could easily have retained *u* to address us together. What is significant here is that she indicates a desire for using the same informal tone as us, but not without a rather elaborate salutation that includes asking our permission for first name use: *als ik zo vrij mag zijn* ('if I may be so bold'). Such a permission request is of course an overt strategy in which the subsequent use of *jullie* fits neatly.⁷ Stommel (2012: 149) observes that such overt strategies are relatively rare and her examples, too, are accompanied by elaborate mitigation.

<p>(8) Beste meneer Vismans en [titel achternaam], als ik zo vrij mag zijn, Beste Roel en [voornaam],</p> <p>ten eerste wil ik even melden dat ik het super leuk vind dat jullie zo snel en enthousiast reageren! [...] Graag hoor ik waar het dinsdag is en ik zal er dan zijn!</p> <p>Groeten, [Voornaam]</p>	<p>Dear Mr. Vismans and [title, surname], if I may be so bold, Dear Roel and [first name],</p> <p>first I want to report that I find it super nice that you (T, pl) react so fast and so enthusiastically! [...] I'd like to hear where it is on Tuesday and will be there then!</p> <p>Greetings, [First name]</p>
--	--

A similar combination of plural *jullie* and permission for familiarity is also visible in (9) (V.ii in the Appendix), but there are some salient differences. The visiting author in V has received a formal email outlining the arrangements for the visit (cf. (6)) and replies with a hedging strategy in the salutation: first name plus last name. This is followed by *jullie* twice and only then the request for permission for *tutoyement*. Given the author's greater authority, the request is somewhat spurious, however, which is subtly expressed through an encouragement to *doe vooral hetzelfde* ('be sure to do the same').⁸ Nevertheless, the author could also have chosen to retain *V* and use *u* instead of *jullie*.

<p>(9) Beste Roel Vismans, Ja, ik wist van de uitnodiging om naar Sheffield te komen en ik zie daar zeer naar uit. Hoe het precies te regelen is met tijden en treinen, daar weet ik niets van. Kom ik eerst bij jullie en ga ik vandaar naar Hull of andersom en hoe de treinenloop is, dat laat ik allemaal graag aan jullie over. Misschien zou je (mag ik tutoyeren? Doe vooral hetzelfde)</p>	<p>Dear Roel Vismans, Yes, I knew of the invitation to come to Sheffield and I am looking forward to it very much. How exactly this is to be arranged with times and trains, that I do not know. Am I going to you (T, pl) first and then to Hull or the other way around and what the train timetable is, I prefer leaving all that to you (T, pl). Perhaps you (T, sg) (may I say</p>
--	---

⁷ The use of address pronouns between Dutch university tutors and students is often asymmetrical. In Vismans (2013b) almost 80% of university students reported addressing their non-professorial tutors with *u*. This contrasts with a much more informal culture in many UK universities, including Sheffield, to which this exchange student may be adapting.

⁸ See Vismans (2004) for further discussion of this example.

dat voor me willen uitzoeken? Ik zal met liefde spreken (over mij en mijn werk, want daar weet ik het meeste van) zolang als **je** maar wilt. [...]

je? Be sure to do the same) would like to find out for me? I will speak with pleasure (about myself and my work, because that is what I know most about) as long as **you** (T, sg) wish. [...]

4.4 *T as opening gambit*

In contrast with what we have seen in 4.1-4.3, many emailers do not shy away from using *je* in their first approach to someone they do not personally know. Nevertheless, they may still be hedging their bets. We can see this in the salutation in (10) (III in the Appendix), where the writer begins with the formal *Geachte* plus honorific plus surname, immediately followed by the less formal *Beste* plus first name.

(10) Geachte Mijnheer Vismans, Beste Roel,

Er is de laatste maanden wat correspondentie tussen **jou** en X geweest over een [...] bijdrage aan [naam tijdschrift]. [...]

Je weet nu, dat ik mijn best heb gedaan. Maar hier geldt ook: ieder heeft het druk, druk, druk.

Met vriendelijke groet,
[Titel, Voornaam, Achternaam]
[Details instelling]

Dear Mr. Vismans, Dear Roel,

The last few months there has been some correspondence between **you** (T, sg.emph) and X about a [...] contribution to [journal name]. [...]

You (T, sg) know now that I have done my best. But here also applies: everyone is busy, busy, busy.

Best wishes,
[Title, First name, Surname]
[Details institute]

Two further things must be noted about this message, however. First, it obviously comes from the academic domain, and circumspection such as shown by the correspondent in (10) is not uncommon in academic circles, also in other languages (e.g., English *Dear John, if I may*). The more familiar approach may also be due to the fact that the writer refers to earlier correspondence between the recipient and one of his close colleagues, so there is already a connection between the two correspondents. Secondly, the first pronominal address form he uses, is emphatic *jou*. Such forms are less common, but here it is (grammatically) required by the context, because of the coordination of *jou* and ‘X’ in the same prepositional phrase. In that context he had no choice but to use an emphatic form, unless he had used a different construction.

4.5 *Implicit negotiation*

This subsection takes VI in the Appendix as a case study to illustrate how the correspondence can gradually bend to greater familiarity without ever making it explicit. In VI this is clearly driven by A, who opens the correspondence, as we have already seen in (4), with the

recipient's role in the salutation: *Beste bibliothecaris* ('Dear librarian').⁹ The request for a score from the library is, however, quite an imposition, which A deploys a fair amount of face work to mitigate, although not by means of pronominal address. In fact, A does not use any pronominal address form in this first turn, nor in his second turn (VI.iii in the Appendix). B's response in (11) (VI.ii in the Appendix) displays quite a high level of formality, not just in terms of pronominal address, but also in other respects: the salutation with *Beste* followed by just the surname; the verb form *heeft*;¹⁰ lexical items from a formal register like *onlangs* ('recently') and *spoedig* ('soon').¹¹

<p>(11) Beste [Achternaam A],</p> <p>Onlangs had ik uw e-mail gelezen waarin u vroeg of u enkele stukken uit onze bibliotheek mocht lenen. [...] Laat me weten wanneer u tijd heeft, dan kunnen we spoedig een afspraak maken.</p> <p>Met [...] groet, [Initialen, Achternaam B] [functie B in X]</p>	<p>Dear [Surname A]</p> <p>Recently I read your (V) email in which you asked if you (V) could borrow a few pieces from our library. [...] Let me know when you (V) have time, then we can make an appointment soon.</p> <p>With [...] greetings, [Initials, Surname B] [function B in X]</p>
---	--

The reaction to the request is quite positive, and A responds (VI.iii in the Appendix) in a similar tone to his first email, again not using any pronominal address form. It is not until the third turn in example (12) (VI.v in the Appendix) that he decides to move to address with *T*. However, he also uses *jullie*¹² and avoids a salutation. The correspondence is now at the stage of making practical arrangements and there is a hint of urgency. There are also signs of further informality, e.g., the use of the abbreviation *ff* (for *even* – 'just', informally pronounced /effə/).

<p>(12) Helemaal goed: kun je dinsdag de 27e in de ochtend?</p> <p>De tijd begint een beetje te dringen n.l., want voor de zomervakantie moeten de partijen bij de orkestleden liggen.</p>	<p>Completely good: can you (T, sg) [make it] Tuesday the 27th a.m.?</p> <p>The time is pressing namely, for before the summer the scores must be with the members of the orchestra.</p>
---	--

⁹ Incidentally, A in (VI) is the same person as the writer in (5) (II.i in the Appendix).

¹⁰ The conjugation of the verb *hebben* allows for *u hebt* and *u heeft*. According to Haeseryn et al. (1997: 95, n. 60) the latter is regarded as slightly more formal than the former.

¹¹ The librarian uses an idiosyncratic closure formula in his/her first two turns, which has here been masked to ensure anonymity.

¹² Note the unusual (singular) verb form *maak*. The usual verb form with *jullie* is the plural, here *maken* (cf. Haeseryn et al. 1997: 71).

Maak **jullie** maar een contract en stel een borg vast: dat is allemaal geen probleem.

You (T, pl) make a contract and fix the deposit: all that is no problem.

Laat me nog wel ff weten hoeveel borg, want dan moet ik bijtijds pinnen....

But just let me know how much the deposit, for I must go to the cash point in time ...

The next message (V.vi in the Appendix) is again from A to B, who has not responded to the proposed practical arrangements. There is now a much greater sense of urgency and (hence?) informality: first name in the salutation, more abbreviations, alternative spelling (*meeltje* vs. *mailtje* ('email message')) and ellipses. B accommodates (VI.vii in the Appendix) and adapts his style to that of A with a move to first name in the salutation, a more routine closing formula and a more neutral tone overall. The correspondence ends (informally) with an exchange of mobile numbers.

5. Discussion and conclusion

So how do initially unacquainted correspondents negotiate address in Dutch emails, and what role do *je* and *jullie* play in this? First, we have seen explicit negotiation by means of requests for permission to use *je* (8, 9) and also granting permission (9). The latter example, in which one author both requests and grants permission, can be seen as a very subtle authorization mechanism. Other common explicit negotiation tactics, not exemplified here, are one-way permissions (*Zeg maar je, hoor* 'By all means say *je*'), or proposals (e.g., *Zullen we elkaar tutoyeren?* 'Shall we say *je* to each other?'). Secondly, there are avoidance tactics. Not every occurrence of address avoidance must necessarily be seen as an instance of address negotiation, however. Certain professional conventions may for example be another reason for not addressing directly. *U* is regularly deployed in a first approach, but not exclusively so. It can probably be regarded as a default in a first approach, also in view of Prinsen's (2007) finding that there is a slight preference for *u* (albeit in the context of HCI rather than email). However, *u* is rarely sustained throughout a chain, and some correspondents are happy to initiate with *je*.

In contrast with the findings of Gains (1999), Murray (2000) and Waldvogel (2007) salutation and closing routines are used widely throughout our corpus. In fact, these conventional features of correspondence are regularly used as a strategic component in address negotiation. For example, in the data both *T* and *V* pronouns occur with a salutation combining first and last name (with or without title or honorific) in several ways (I, II.ii, III,

IV, V.ii). This hedging strategy runs counter to the perceived wisdom that in Dutch *je/jij* is always used in conjunction with first name and *u* with title/honorific plus last name.

Of the different *T* forms (emphatic, non-emphatic, and plural), the emphatic ones are used sparingly, so non-emphatic *je* plays an important role. It is unlikely, however, that *je* is used exclusively to express a lower level of familiarity than the emphatic forms, if we consider the anaphoric nature of address pronouns. In anaphoric contexts the natural cline from nominal, through emphatic pronominal, to non-emphatic and clitic is widespread, not just in Dutch. Nevertheless, the scarcity of emphatic forms in the data is an indication of their highly familiar connotation. Plural *jullie*, on the other hand, can be regarded as a transitional ploy between *u* and full-blown *tutoyement*, both in explicit negotiations (8, 9) and in the more implicit kind of negotiation exemplified in the chain in VI in the Appendix, where one of the correspondents gradually introduces more and more familiarity. When viewed from a distance, as we do here with the entire correspondence in front of us, this may seem a bit like a war of attrition, but in reality the exchange takes place over a period of days or longer, so for the correspondents it is a gradual process of accommodation. Clyne et al. (2009: 156-7) imply with their “scale of grammatical resources” that the expression of address in each language is dependent on its specific grammatical means. In Dutch that includes *jullie*, whose use gives rise to an additional implicit strategy: ‘Use an intermediate address form’. In German, *ihr* can be used in a similar way (cf. *ibid.* 155). However, such apparent similarities may only be superficial and require further contrastive research beyond just Dutch and German.¹³

It may be interesting to compare this paper’s findings briefly with address negotiations in face-to-face conversations between strangers. Vismans (2015, 2016) discusses 45-minute conversations broadcast by radio, hosted by a journalist whose guest is someone who has been in the news recently, for example sports people, artists, authors, etc. The setting is fairly informal (easy chairs, a drink), and the show is broadcast live between midnight and 1 a.m. Host and guest have not met until about half an hour before the broadcast, which is prepared by a small editorial team that has maintained some distance in their contact with the guest. This means that it is largely up to the two speakers to make the conversation work. In the vast majority of these discussions, address immediately takes on a familiar tone, but there are also negotiations, while a small minority are formal throughout. Some of the negotiations

¹³ In a recent conference paper (Vismans 2017), I discussed a preliminary study of address use in online Dutch and German Q&A fora which showed that in these fora *ihr* is used regularly but *jullie* rarely.

are explicit, for example with the host asking a guest how (s)he prefers to be addressed. In other negotiations the host makes a surreptitious transition from *V* to *T* in the course of the program, and there are also sometimes avoidance strategies. These features are not dissimilar to the negotiation of address in email exchanges discussed here, but there are also salient differences as a result of differences in context and medium. Thus, emphatic forms occur more frequently than in email exchanges, as might be expected, given that stress is relevant in speech. On the other hand, *jullie* is used rarely, and never as a transitional ploy. It is, after all, a plural address form and the radio conversations are between two individuals. However, the greatest difference with the email data discussed in this chapter lies in the fact that in some of the conversations one or both participants switch back and forth between *V* and *T* several times. These switches depend on the topic of the conversation (light and personal vs. serious and public) or on the affect interlocutors convey, for example when a participant becomes emotional. Some participants are clearly aware of what is going on and even comment on their own switching behavior. It seems that in the spoken context such switches can happen without attracting too much attention, whereas in writing they would be much more noticeable. So unlike the participants in some of these face-to-face conversations, the email correspondents in this chapter never move back and forth between different levels of formality in address form. Moves only ever occur from *V* to *T*. This difference between the data in this chapter and those in Vismans (2015, 2016) is again an indication of the hybrid nature of email: in this respect it is more akin to letter correspondence, where a move between address forms, if it occurs, only happens from *V* to *T*.

Another interesting comparison can be made between this chapter's findings and those in Stommel (2012). We saw in 2.2 that both sets of data contain examples where requests for permission to use *T* are accompanied by elaborate mitigation strategies. In a similar vein, 4.5 describes a chain in which one of the interlocutors indicates a preference for informality indirectly through his own behavior, which is similar to that of some of the clients in Stommel (2012). However, unlike some of Stommel's other clients, none of our interlocutors ever explicitly ask for a more informal approach. This is understandable. In Stommel's narrower context of a client-counselor relationship, the client may feel in a position to make such explicit requests, whereas this would be unlikely in our more businesslike context.

The discursive approach applied in this chapter has proved useful for bringing to light some aspects of address use in general email correspondence in Dutch. In particular, it has allowed us to highlight a number of common address negotiation strategies. However, a

larger and more varied corpus would permit a more refined analysis of negotiations about Dutch address forms in CMC. This could, for example, take context and interlocutor characteristics, such as age and gender, into account to a much greater extent than has been possible here. It would also allow us to observe any changes in behavior that may have occurred since the collection of the data presented here, which are by now over a decade old.

References

- Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson (1987). *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clyne, Michael, Catrin Norrby & Jane Warren (2009). *Language and human relations. Styles of address in contemporary language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de Hoop, Helen, and Sammie Tarenskeen (2015) It's all about you in Dutch. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 88. 163-175.
- de Oliveira, Sandie Michelle (2003) Breaking conversational norms on a Portuguese users network: Men as adjudicators of politeness? *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 9.1. DOI: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2003.tb00361.x.
- de Oliveira, Sandie Michelle (2013) Address in computer-mediated communication. In: Susan C. Herring, Dieter Stein & Tuija Virtanen (eds.) *Pragmatics of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 291-313. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Eelen, Gino (2001) *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Gains Jonathan (1999) Electronic mail – A new style of communication or just a new medium? An investigation into the text features of email. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(1). 81-101.
- Graham, Sage Lambert (2007) Disagreeing to agree. Conflict (im)politeness and identity in a computer-mediated community. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39. 742-759.
- Haeseryn, Walter, Kirsten Romijn, Guido Geerts, Jaap De Rooij & Maarten. C. van den Toorn (1997) *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Herring, Susan C. (2013). Discourse in Web 2.0: Familiar, reconfigured, and emergent. In Deborah Tannen & Anna Marie. Tester (Eds.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 2011: Discourse 2.0: Language and new media*, 1-25. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Jansen, Petra (2004). "U mag wel jij zeggen hoor!" Een onderzoek naar de talige representatie van de relatie tussen schrijver en geadresseerde in e-mail. University of Tilburg: Bachelor's Dissertation. <http://goo.gl/JfeHZe>. (22 March, 2016).
- Jansen, Sjoerd (2011). Aanspreken en e-mailinteractie. Een onderzoek naar aanspreekvormen in meezijdige communicatie. University of Utrecht: Master's Dissertation. <http://goo.gl/tZpNfA>. (22 March, 2016).
- Janssen, Daniel, & Frank Jansen (2005). U en je in Postbus 51-folders. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing*, 27.3. 214-229.
- Kretzenbacher, H. Leo (2005) hier im großen internetz, wo sich alle dududuzen" Internet discourse politeness and German address. Paper given at the 3rd International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE) Amsterdam 2005.
- Kretzenbacher, H. Leo (2011) Perceptions of national and regional standards of addressing in Germany and Austria. *Pragmatics* 21:1. 69-83.
- Murray, Denise E. (2000) Protean communication: The language of computer-mediated communication. *TESOL Quarterly* 34(3). 397-421.
- Postmes, Tom, Russell Spears & Martin Lea (2000) The formation of group norms in computer-mediated communication. *Human Communication Research* 26.3. 341-371.
- Prinsen, Lutien (2007) Het zegt u tegen me! 'Beleefde' user interfaces en user satisfaction. University of Groningen: Bachelor's Dissertation. <http://goo.gl/U60caZ>. (22 March, 2016).
- Sacks Harvey, Emanuel E. Schlegoff & Gail Jefferson (1974) A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking in conversation. *Language* 50(4). 696-735.
- Stommel, Wyke (2012) Salutations, closings and pronouns: Some aspects of recipient design in online counselling. *Communication & Medicine: an interdisciplinary journal of healthcare, ethics and society* 9 (2). 145-185.
- van Zalk, Franceina & Frank Jansen (2004) Ze zeggen nog je tegen me. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing* 26. 265-277.
- Vermaas, Hannie J.A.M. (2002) *Veranderingen in de Nederlandse Aanspreekvormen van de Dertiende t/m de Twintigste Eeuw*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Vismans, Roel (2004) U and non-u: learning to use Dutch second-person pronouns. *Dutch Crossing. A Journal of Low Countries Studies* 28.1/2. 142-162.
- Vismans, Roel (2007) Aanspreekvormen in Nederlandse en Vlaamse personeelsadvertenties voor hoogopgeleiden. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing* 29.4. 289-313.

- Vismans, Roel (2013a) Aanspreekvormen in Nederlandstalige banneradvertenties. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing* 35.3. 254-276.
- Vismans, Roel (2013b) Address Choice in Dutch 1: Variation and the Role of Domain. *Dutch Crossing* 37.2. 163–87.
- Vismans, Roel (2015) Negotiating address in a pluricentric language: Dutch/Flemish. In Catrin Norrby & Camilla Wide (eds.) *Address Practice as Social Action. European Perspectives*, 13-32. London: Palgrave.
- Vismans, Roel (2016) Jojoën tussen u en je: over de dynamiek van het gebruik van Nederlandse aanspreekvormen in het radioprogramma *Casa Luna*. *Internationale Neerlandistiek* 54.2. 117-136.
- Vismans, Roel (2017) Forms of address in online Dutch and German Q&A fora. Conference presentation, 6th Germanic Sandwich Conference (Münster, 17-18 March, 2017) INAR4 (Helsinki, 8-9 June, 2017).
- Waldvogel, Joan (2007) Greetings and closings in workplace email. *Journal of Computer-mediated communication* 12,2. 456-477.
- Watts, Richard (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix¹⁴

I. Correspondence with conference attendee

Beste Roel Vismans,

Als spreker op het ALCS-congres in januari wilde ik me graag registreren, maar ik krijg het meegezonden formulier niet open. Is het mogelijk om het formulier nogmaals toegestuurd te krijgen?

Met vriendelijke groet,

[Voornaam, Achternaam]

Dear Roel Vismans,

As speaker at the ALCS conference in January I'd really wanted to register, but I cannot open the attached form. Is it possible to be sent the form again?

With friendly greetings,

[First name, Surname]

II. Correspondence from builder about earlier work

i. Beste..

Enkele jaren geleden al weer (was 't in 2003?) heb ik bij **U** een planken vloer gekocht, en die ligt er nog steeds in, tot volle tevredenheid. Niks kromtrekken of bol staan ofzo: gewoon hartstikke strak en nog steeds vindt iedereen het prachtig.

Er komt echter een verbouwing van de keuken aan en daarvoor zijn (20) extra planken nodig. Het probleem is alleen wel dat ik de nota van destijds niet meer terug kan vinden, zodat ik niet meer precies weet welke vloer ik had. (heb) Het was een kloostervloer of kasteelvloer, dat weet ik dus niet meer: wel weet ik dat de planken 19 cm breed zijn.

Mijn hoop is daarom op **jullie** gevestigd: ik hoop dat **jullie** de oude nota van toen nog terug kunnen vinden en vervolgens die plankensoort ook nog hebben, want dan wil ik daar 20 planken van bestellen. Ik kom ze dan natuurlijk een keer ophalen wanneer daar gelegenheid voor is (is geen haast bij) en nu ik zie dat **jullie** ook een filiaal in [X] hebben is dat voor mij wel een stuk dichterbij. Kan ik ze dan ook daar ophalen? (dat zou ergens in mei ofzo worden: mag ook later)

Meteen wil ik er dan een grote bus onderhoudslak bij kopen, want m'n bestaande vloer heeft wel weer een likkie nodig.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Dear ..

A few years ago already (was it in 2003?) I bought a wooden floor from **you** (V), and it still lies here, with complete satisfaction. Nothing like warping or bulging or so: just really cool and everyone still finds it magnificent.

However, we are going to do up the kitchen and for that we need (20) extra boards. The problem is just that I cannot find the invoice from earlier, so I don't know exactly what floor I had (have) It was a convent floor or a castle floor, that I don't know any more: I do know that the boards are 19 cm wide.

My hope is therefore fixed on **you** (T, pl): I hope that **you** (T, pl) can still find the earlier invoice and also still have that kind of board, because then I want to order 20 boards like that. Of course I will come and pick them up some time then when there is an occasion for that (no rush) and now I can see that **you** (T, pl) also have a branch in [X] and that is a lot closer for me. Can I pick them up there too? (that would be sometime in May or so: later is also good)

At the same time I then want to buy a large tin of varnish, because my existing floor needs another lick (of paint) again.

Best wishes,

¹⁴ The emails in this appendix have been copied verbatim, including any spelling and other errors. Editorial work has only been carried out to guarantee the anonymity of the correspondents. The English renderings are halfway between word-for-word glosses and proper translations.

	[Voornaam, Achternaam]	[First name, Surname]
ii.	Beste [Voornaam, Achternaam],	Dear [First name, Surname],
	Ik kan me uw naam nog herinneren. Fijn dat de vloer zo goed bevalt. Ik ga in de archieven duiken om het uit te zoeken. Het zou wel helpen als u wist hoe de vloer betaald is (contant of per bank). Dat scheelt ongeveer de helft in het zoeken.	I can still remember your (V) name. Great that the floor pleases so much. I am going to dive into the archives to sort it out. It would help if you (V) knew how the floor was paid (cash or via the bank). That makes a difference of about half in looking.
	De vloerdelen kunnen uiteraard ook in [X] opgehaald worden. Onderhoudswas is altijd op voorraad.	The floor parts can obviously also be picked up from [X]. Wax is always in stock.
	Met vriendelijke groeten,	Best wishes,
	[Voornaam, Achternaam] [Naam bedrijf]	[First name, Surname] [Company name]

III. Correspondence about journal contribution

	Geachte Mijnheer Vismans, Beste Roel,	Dear Mr. Vismans, Dear Roel,
	Er is de laatste maanden wat correspondentie tussen jou en X geweest over een [...] bijdrage aan [naam tijdschrift]. [voorstel over bijdrage aan tijdschrift]	The last few months there has been some correspondence between you (T, sg.emph) and X about a [...] contribution to [journal name]. [proposal about contribution]
	Je weet nu, dat ik mijn best heb gedaan. Maar hier geldt ook: ieder heeft het druk, druk, druk.	You (T, sg) know now that I have done my best. But here also applies: everyone is busy, busy, busy.
	Met vriendelijke groet,	Best wishes,
	[Titel, Voornaam, Achternaam] [Details instelling]	[Title, First name, Surname] [Details institute]

IV. Correspondence with Dutch student in Sheffield

	Beste meneer Vismans en [titel achternaam], als ik zo vrij mag zijn,	Dear Mr. Vismans and [title, surname], if I may be so bold,
	Beste Roel en [voornaam],	Dear Roel and [first name],
	ten eerste wil ik even melden dat ik het super leuk vind dat jullie zo snel en enthousiast reageren!	first I want to report that I find it super nice that you (T, pl) react so fast and so enthusiastically!
	[arrangementen voor conversatielessen.]	[arrangements for conversation classes.]
	Graag hoor ik waar het dinsdag is en ik zal er dan zijn!	I'd like to hear where it is on Tuesday and will be there then!
	Groeten,	Greetings,
	[Voornaam]	[First name]

V. Correspondence with vesting Dutch author (cf. Vismans 2004: 145-46)

- i. Geachte heer [...] Dear Mr.. [...]
- Ik ga er maar van uit dat **u** weet van **uw** bezoek aan Sheffield [...]. I assume that **you** (V) know of **your** (V) visit to Sheffield [...].
- Ik zou willen voorstellen dat **u** 's middags om een uur of vier spreekt. We verwachten een lezing van ongeveer een uur, inclusief vragen en discussie, gevolgd door een borrel. Het gehoor zal voornamelijk bestaan uit studenten en docenten Nederlands, en andere docenten in de vakgroep [...]. Dat is wel een beetje afhankelijk van de taal waarin **u** spreekt, want niet alle germanisten begrijpen Nederlands. Ik laat dat geheel aan **u** over. De vierdejaars studenten kennen **u** al een beetje van het vertaalproject dat volgende week wordt afgesloten. I would like to propose that **you** (V) speak in the afternoon at around four o'clock. We expect a lecture of around an hour, including questions and discussion, followed by a reception. The audience will mainly consist of students and teachers of Dutch, and other teachers in the department [...]. That depends a bit on the language in which **you** (V) will speak, because not all germanists will understand Dutch. I leave that entirely up to **you** (V). The fourth-year students will know **you** (V) a bit from the translation project that will be concluded next week.
- [...] [...]
- met vriendelijke groet Yours sincerely
- ii. Beste Roel Vismans, Dear Roel Vismans,
Ja, ik wist van de uitnodiging om naar Sheffield te komen en ik zie daar zeer naar uit. Hoe het precies te regelen is met tijden en treinen, daar weet ik niets van. Kom ik eerst bij **jullie** en ga ik vandaar naar Hull of andersom en hoe de treinenloop is, dat laat ik allemaal graag aan **jullie** over. Misschien zou **je** (mag ik **tutoyeren**? Doe vooral hetzelfde) dat voor me willen uitzoeken? Ik zal met liefde spreken (over mij en mijn werk, want daar weet ik het meeste van) zolang als **je** maar wilt. Yes, I knew of the invitation to come to Sheffield and I am looking forward to it very much. How exactly this is to be arranged with times and trains, that I do not know. Am I going to **you** (T, pl) first and then to Hull or the other way around and what the train timetable is, I prefer leaving all that to **you** (T, pl). Perhaps **you** (T, sg) (may I **say je**? Be sure to do the same) would like to find out for me? I will speak with pleasure (about myself and my work, because that is what I know most about) as long as **you** (T, sg) wish.
- [...] [...]
- Met een vriendelijke groet, Best wishes,

VI. Correspondence between conductor and librarian

- i. Van: A From: A
Verzonden: maandag 29 mei 2006 Sent: Monday 29 May 2006
Aan: B To: B
Onderwerp: [geen] Subject: [none given]
- Beste bibliothecaris, Dear librarian,
- Als oud-dirigent van X weet ik dat de salon een goedgevulde bibliotheek heeft (of had) met allerlei partituren en partijen van stukken die ooit door X gespeeld zijn. Is dat nog steeds zo? As former conductor of X I know that the salon has (or had) a well-stocked library with all kinds of scores and arrangements of pieces that have in the past been played by X. Is that still the case?
- Ik voer in november met mijn koor in Y namelijk twee stukken uit die ik ook eens met X gedaan heb en vroeg me af of ik de partituren alsmede de orkestpartijen van X zou kunnen lenen. Het gaat om In November I am namely performing two pieces with my choir in Y that I have done with X in the past and I wondered whether I could borrow the scores as well as the arrangements from X. It

[namen van twee koren].

Vooral het laatste stuk is erg kostbaar om te huren, dus wanneer het nog in de X bibliotheek ligt zou ik het materiaal graag lenen.

Is dat mogelijk?

Ik kan me goed voorstellen dat X nooit aan zoiets begint, maar wellicht is er voor een enkele gelegenheid ... een uitzondering te maken.....

In afwachting en met vriendelijke groet,

[Voornaam, Achternaam A]

concerns [names of two choral pieces].

Especially the latter piece is very costly to rent, so when it is still in the X library I would like to borrow the material.

Is that possible?

I can imagine that X never does such a thing, but perhaps an exception can be made for one single occasion.

Awaiting your reply, best wishes,

[First name, Surname A]

ii.

Van: B
Verzonden: donderdag 8 juni 2006
Aan: A
Onderwerp: Lenen stukken uit X Bibliotheek

Beste [Achternaam A],

Onlangs had ik **uw** e-mail gelezen waarin **u** vroeg of u enkele stukken uit onze bibliotheek mocht lenen.

Het lijkt mij handig om hiervoor een afspraak met mij te maken, zodat **u** zelf in de bibliotheek kunt kijken of de stukken daar liggen.

Voor het lenen van de stukken hadden we een borg in gedachten van een nader te bepalen bedrag.

Laat me weten wanneer **u** tijd heeft, dan kunnen we spoedig een afspraak maken.

Met [...] groet,

[Initialen, Achternaam B]
[functie B in X]

From: B
Sent: Thursday 8 June 2006
To: A
Subject: Borrowing pieces from X Library

Dear [Surname A]

Recently I read **your** (V) email in which **you** (V) asked if **you** (V) could borrow a few pieces from our library.

It seems to me best to make an appointment with me, so that **you yourself** (V) can look in the library if the pieces are there.

For the loan we had considered a deposit of an amount to be decided.

Let me know when **you** (V) have time, then we can make an appointment soon.

With [...] greetings,

[Initials, Surname B]
[function B in X]

iii.

From: A
To: B
Subject: RE: Lenen stukken uit X Bibliotheek
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006

Beste Bibliotheecaris,

Dat is goed nieuws: het gaat om een viertal stukken waarvan ik weet dat X ze in ieder geval al eens gespeeld heeft en waarvan ik tenminste een sterk vermoeden heb dat het materiaal ervan in de bibliotheek ligt:

Is woensdagmiddag a.s. een optie om langs te komen?

Anders woensdagmorgen, ik heb dan de tijd tot ongeveer 11.30, dus dan zouden we vroeg moeten

From: A
To: B
Subject: RE: Borrowing pieces from X Library
Date: Mon, 12 Jun 2006

Dear Librarian,

That is good news: it concerns four pieces of which I know that X has in any case played them some time and whose materials I expect will be in the library:

Is Wednesday afternoon next a possibility for visiting?

Otherwise Wednesday morning, then I have time until circa 11.30, so then we would have to meet

	afspreken (9.00 uur/ 9.30 uur?)	early (9/9.30 a.m.?)
	Verder ben ik erg bezet deze week.	Further I am very busy this week.
	Laat me maar weten of 't kan en wat de borg moet worden: dat is uiteraard geen probleem.	Just let me know if it's possible and what the deposit must be: that is no problem of course.
	Met vriendelijke groet,	Best wishes,
	[Voornaam, Achternaam A]	[First name, Surname A]
iv.	Van: B Verzonden: maandag 19 juni 2006 Aan: A Onderwerp: RE: Lenen stukken uit X Bibliotheek	From: B Sent: Monday 19 June 2006 To: A Subject: RE: Borrowing pieces from X Library
	Beste [Achternaam A],	Dear [Surname A],
	Ik heb met het bestuur nog even gepraat over de borg. Het leek ons het handigst om een contract op te stellen voor eventuele schade.	I have briefly talked with the governors about the deposit. It seems best to us to make a contract for possible damage.
	Volgende week ben ik vrij, dus als u dan tijd heeft, kunnen we een afspraak maken om de bibliotheek te bekijken.	Next week I am free, so if you (V) then have time, we can make an appointment to visit the library.
	Met [...] groet,	With [...] greetings,
	[Initialen, Achternaam B] [functie B in X]	[Initials, Surname B] [function B in X]
v.	[Details ontbreken, maar ergens tussen 19 en 26 juni 2006, van A aan B]	[Details missing, but somewhere between 19 and 26 June 2006, from A to B]
	Helemaal goed: kun je dinsdag de 27e in de ochtend?	Completely good: can you (T, sg) [make it] Tuesday the 27 th a.m.?
	De tijd begint een beetje te dringen n.l., want voor de zomervakantie moeten de partijen bij de orkestleden liggen.	The time is pressing namely, for before the summer the scores must be with the members of the orchestra.
	Maak jullie maar een contract en stel een borg vast: dat is allemaal geen probleem.	You (T, pl) make a contract and fix the deposit: all that is no problem.
	Laat me nog wel ff weten hoeveel borg, want dan moet ik bijtijds pinnen....	But just let me know how much the deposit, for I must go to the cash point in time ...
	Groet,	Greetings,
	[Voornaam, Achternaam A]	[First name, Surname A]
vi.	From: A To: B Subject: RE: Lenen stukken uit X Bibliotheek	From: A To: B Subject: RE: Borrowing pieces from X Library
	Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006	Date: Mon, 26 Jun 2006
	Beste [Voornaam B],	Dear [First name B],
	Ik had je dit meeltje vorige week gestuurd, maar je hebt nog niet gereageerd. Het was kennelijk aan je	I had sent you (T, sg) this mail last week, but you (T, sg) have not reacted yet. It has apparently

aandacht ontsnapt, maar omdat de tijd nu wel heel ernstig begint te dringen stuur ik **je** dit mailtje nog een keer:

[vorig bericht]

Dinsdagmorgen heb ik inmiddels een andere afspraak staan, maar ik zou nog wel steeds kunnen, zij het vanaf ongeveer 11.00 uur / 11.30 uur, zoiets.

Laat me maar weten of dat lukt.

Anders event. woensdagmorgen? Ik heb dan tijd tot 12.30 uur, dus tijd genoeg.....

[Voornaam, Achternaam A]

vii.

Van: B
Verzonden: dinsdag 27 juni 2006
Aan: A
Onderwerp: RE: Lenen stukken uit X Bibliotheek

Beste [Voornaam A],

Ik heb helaas een vergissing gemaakt,

deze week heb ik onderzoeksweek, waardoor ik tot 19.00 bezig ben, volgende week heb ik vanaf dinsdag vrij, is dinsdag 4 juli een optie?

Er zijn geen borgkosten, alleen het contract..

Nogmaals excuses voor het ongemak.

Vriendelijke groet,

[Voornaam, Achternaam B]

viii.

Van: A
Verzonden: woensdag 28 juni 2006
Aan: B
Onderwerp: RE: Lenen stukken uit X Bibliotheek

Beste [Voornaam B],

Dinsdag 4 juli heb ik maar tijd tussen ,grofweg 11.00 en 13.00 uur.

Dat is krap, maar ik waag het erop, want die partijen moeten eigenlijk voor de zomer bij de orkestleden liggen.

Ik ben dan om 11.45 uur in de sociëteit; oké?

Inmiddels lijkt het alleen om de twee intermezzi van [componist C] te gaan, de rest is al besteld bij [leverancier D] en/of [leverancier E].

Nou ja, maakt niet uit; ik kom gewoon voor [componist C]; kom ik weer 's in de salon ook.

escaped **your** (T, sg) attention, but because time is seriously pressing I am sending **you** (T, sg) this mail once again:

[previous message]

Tuesday morning I have meantime a different appointment, but I could still make it, albeit from circa 11/11.30, something like that.

Just let me know if that works.

Otherwise perh. Wednesday morning? Then I have time until 12.30, so enough time.....

[Firstname, Surname A]

From: B
Sent: Tuesday 27 June 2006
To: A
Subject: RE: Borrowing pieces from X Library

Dear [First name A],

I have unfortunately made a mistake,

this week I have research week, whereby I am busy until 19.00, next week I am free from Tuesday, is Tuesday 4 July a possibility?

There is no deposit, just the contract..

Once again apologies for the inconvenience.

Best wishes,

[First name, Surname B]

From: A
Sent: Wednesday 28 June 2006
To: B
Subject: RE: Borrowing pieces from X Library

Dear [First name B],

Tuesday 4 July I only have time between ,roughly 11.00 and 11.30.

That is tight, but I chance it, for those arrangements must actually be with the members of the orchestra before the summer.

Then I am in the society at 11.45, okay?

Meantime it only seems the concern the two intermezzos of [name composer C], the rest has been ordered with [name supplier D] and/or [name supplier E].

Well, no matter; I just come for [name composer C]; also a reason for me to visit the salon again.

(wellicht kun **je** ze vast opzoeken...?)

(perhaps **you** (T, sg) can look for them
meanwhile...?)

Heb **je** een 06? Want dan verloopt de communicatie
wellicht wat sneller.

Have **you** (T, sg) a mobile number? For then
communication is perhaps a bit quicker.

Mijn nr is: ...
Groet,
[Voornaam A]

My number is: ...
Greetings,
[First name A]