

Strategic maneuvering as an epistolary strategy, anno 1610*

Jeroen Jansen

University of Amsterdam

Around 1610 the Dutch author Gerbrand Bredero wrote a letter to his painting teacher Francesco Badens, asking for the loan of a painting to make a copy of it. The act of writing (a letter) asks for a proactive role in managing the reader(s)' reactions. Although at first sight the letter may look like no more than a simple, insignificant and most of all polite piece of correspondence, it is argued that, from the viewpoint of strategic maneuvering, Bredero's approach may be considered as a well-thought-out and potentially effective strategy, contributing to pinning Badens to a promise. An analysis from the perspective of argumentation theory allows us a better understanding of certain characteristics in this letter. Bredero's choice from the 'topical potential' especially finds expression in proleptic formulated objections of the addressee to fulfilling his promise. Starting the letter from the seemingly low power situation of a pupil asking his master to do something, in every stage of the communication Bredero is aiming at a reasonable balance and turning this balance to his own advantage at the same time.

Keywords: proleptic argumentation, pragma-dialectical theory, felicity conditions, request, strategic maneuvering

1. Introduction

Only six letters written by the famous Dutch dramatist and poet Gerbrand Bredero (1585–1618) still remain, each of them showing him as a polite, eloquent Amsterdam citizen.¹ His addressees fairly differ in social standing, diverging from a young widow, unknown to us, to whom he declares his love, to a colleague-poet with an established reputation at that moment: Pieter Hooft.

In one of those letters (ca 1610), Bredero asks his painting teacher Francesco Badens to lend him a painting. Francesco (Frans) Badens (1571–1618) was born in Antwerp, and had lived in Amsterdam since his earliest youth. In 1598 he bought a

house at the Kalverstraat, a mere five minutes walk from the place where Bredero lived (Oudezijds Voorburgwal). In this letter Bredero is framing his request in a lot of politeness and benevolence, telling his addressee that the loan was a fervent wish of his father, the cobbler Adriaen Cornelisz Bredero (1559–1646). According to the letter, there was already agreement on this loan. Bredero wants to make a copy of the painting, a reproduction, to please his father.

Signor Francesco Badens.

After having done all polite marks of honour and kind regards to you, my dear, respected and beloved master, I ask you, on behalf of my father, who asks and begs very friendly, if perhaps you would be prepared to loan us what you have promised him (as you know: the little painting by Sebastian Vrancx),² by which you will do a pleasant service and an extreme great friendship to my father. We will not leave this without a service in return, not without displaying to you the gratitude you deserve. In whatever way, you will have a good, indeed, a very good friend with me and my father. I know for sure that our wish is big, bold and impudent, and that this painting is beloved and dear to you. Because we trust in your affection and your kind promise, we have still taken courage to make this friendly yet innocent, simple, little request and to submit it to your mild-mannered, kind politeness, hoping nothing else than that our request will be granted. Against this we put our benevolence, energy and good will to deploy these in compliance with your wish. Please, make use of it, as much as you like. You will find us cooperative and willing to do so. Who knows where one may lend assistance to one another; none of us lives to himself alone [Romans 14:7].

If you do us this favour and let our wishes come true, we hereby promise you that we will not take this copy with us out of our house. For it [making the copy] only happens because of my father's pleasure, who will keep it as jewellery on its flat, along with his gems and precious objects, and this is a convenient time for me. Further, I know for sure that you are not keen on an abundance of words. Quickly a sensible man has heard enough, or 'a un bon Entendeur il ne faut qu'un parole' [a word is enough to the wise]. If you agree on this, then the sooner the better. This way you will do a good deed.

G.A. Bredero.³

The act of writing as well as the content of this letter raises several questions, some of which must remain unanswered in the absence of contextual data. The most obvious one of the latter is: why this letter? Was there no bodily, physical propinquity and therewith direct oral communication between the pupil and his teacher that very moment: Amsterdam 1610? Or was there a need for Bredero to describe the situation in black and white? And what was the reaction of Badens? We don't know. Neither do we have any knowledge of the relation between Bredero and Badens, apart from this letter. What we do know is that it is brimming with apparently

traditional politeness and elegance, memorizing the promise and repeating the request for the loan of the painting (a 'reminder'). However, new perspectives are opened up if we regard this letter as a kind of problem-solving activity by Bredero, involving mutual interests and aiming at an acceptable solution for both parties. In this paper I will argue that Bredero's utterances can be considered as parts of a personal, well-chosen rhetorical strategy, by which he engages in an argument with his addressee, builds up an argumentative frame, and concludes in a quite persuasive, vigorous way. As it is my basic assumption that Bredero is strategically trying to achieve an acceptable balance in this power relation to enlarge the binding character of his claim (the request of the loan), I have chosen to analyze the letter by way of the concept of strategic maneuvering, i.e. the combination of a pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation with a rhetorical approach to argumentative discourse, as introduced by Van Eemeren and Houtlosser (2002b). According to Van Eemeren, 1. by making choices from the topical potential, 2. by adapting to audience demand, and 3. by choosing an effective presentation, arguers attempt to achieve a balance between their dialectical aim of resolving a dispute in a reasonable way and their rhetorical aim of resolving the dispute to their advantage (cf. Van Eemeren 2010: 94–95). My analysis will follow these three aspects in which the strategic maneuvering is manifest in the different stages of the discussion, although the three aspects work towards a common goal and cooperate closely, even overlap, in every stage of the discussion.

First of all, I will argue that in this letter Bredero is trying to convince his addressee to fulfill his promise about the loan of the painting. Therefore, the topical potential for Bredero in the argumentation stage is constituted by inventing reasons why Badens could have hesitated, and by answering these countermoves in advance. This kind of proleptic ('in advance') arguing will be discussed here. As Bredero was able to arrange the discussion, he will have chosen his own counterarguments, omitting unattractive statements.

In the section on audience demand it will be shown that Bredero's polite, attentive and cooperative acting, continually emphasizing mutuality and unselfishness, has a strategic character. In this way Bredero tries to make Badens's consideration more acceptable and agreeable for himself.

In the final section on stylistic devices I will discuss the element of increasing power that Bredero shapes for himself by mentioning that he is talking on behalf of his father and himself. This will appear a stylistic choice with strategic implications. Bredero is not only expressing mutual self-interests here, but also negotiating through manipulating perceptions of losses and gains.

2. Topical potential

In every utterance with argumentative value the arguer has to make an expedient choice from the options (*loci argumentorum*) available at a particular discussion stage, the topical potential that is regarded the most useful to present the own standpoint as adequate as possible. As regards making a selection from the topical potential, a party's strategic maneuvering in the *confrontation stage* aims for making the most effective choice among the potential issues for discussion. The disagreement space, in this case determined by the request, is restricted in such a way that the confrontation is defined in accordance with that party's preferences (Van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2008: 16). In the very beginning of the letter the difference of opinion (the justness of the request) is veiled by politeness and indirectness ('After having done all polite marks of honour and kind regards to you [...], I ask you, on behalf of my father, who asks and begs very friendly, if perhaps you would be prepared to...').

In the *opening stage*, each party's strategic maneuvering is directed at creating the most advantageous starting point, for instance by calling to mind, or eliciting, helpful 'concessions' from the other party (Van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2008: 16). Bredero indirectly presents his standpoint in the form of a request. His standpoint may be reconstructed as an assertion: my request to you to lend me the painting is justified and should be granted. In the text he gives a justification of the request. In memorizing the role of the father the starting point of the request must have been mutually acceptable, and therewith the disagreement space belonging to the request may be restricted as well:

- a. Bredero asks on behalf of his father,
- b. the father asks and begs very friendly,
- c. the promise was already made to Bredero's father,
- d. Badens will do a pleasant service and an extreme great friendship to his father.

In the *argumentation stage*, starting from the 'status topes' associated with the type of standpoint at issue, each party normally chooses a strategic line of defense that involves a selection from the available *loci* that best suits that party (Van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2008: 16). The 'trust' in Badens's affection, his 'kind promise', and the characterization of the request as 'friendly yet innocent, simple, little' and of the addressee's attitude as 'kind' and 'mild-mannered' underline the personal feelings and impressions of the protagonist. They are useful strategic aids to limit (and even veil) differences of opinion.

2.1 Proleptic argumentation

The arguments ‘pro’ are taken from the disagreement space of the request, as are the arguments to take the edge off the possible counterarguments. As a letter is not a mean to allow *both* parties putting forward their arguments, we have to look closely to the proleptic character of some of Bredero’s utterances: the writer is displaying his awareness that Badens might object, and answers in advance possible contributions by the addressee (Walton 2008: 143; cf. Amjarso 2010: 14–19). As an argumentation strategy (*prolepsis*), proleptic argumentation may be defined as the anticipating and subsequently responding to an argument before it has been made. The topical potential in this stage of the discussion gives way to answering proleptic countermoves. It is a general and natural attitude of people to conduct argumentation with attention to the practical consequences of speech, making an orientation to resolution of dispute over any identifiable proposition subordinate to the pragmatic import of the disputed issue. In other words, people will argue with things others say (or might say) in a fashion that is determined by the speech acts through which the arguments are conveyed and by the activity type in which virtual standpoints are contained (Van Eemeren et al. 1993: 114). In this particular letter the discussion is about Bredero wanting to borrow a painting from his teacher. When he states:

I know for sure that our wish is big, bold and impudent, and that this painting is beloved and dear to you...

the second half of the sentence is a statement on the relation between the addressee and the object (i.e. the painting). Implicitly Bredero doubts whether Badens will lend him the painting. To minimize the resistance, Bredero must first implicitly honour the addressee and his background. Besides, he anticipates and admits to (or recognizes) the perceived weakness (cf. Clauss 2007: 12). Therefore, we hear the proleptic voice of the opponent, Badens, like (the unexpressed parts are between brackets):

Badens:
 (– I will not lend you the painting’)
 = because it is beloved and dear to [me]
 (= and I’m afraid it will be copied by others’)
 (when they notice it’)

Bredero uses the unexpressed premises to get the starting point for his own defense. He answers them in an anticipated countermove:

Bredero:

- Even though this painting is beloved and dear to you, you should (be prepared to) lend it to us
 - because:= we will not take this copy with us out of our house [so it will not be copied by others]
 - = my father will keep it as jewellery on its flat [side], along with his gems and precious objects [so it will not be noticed by others (to copy it)]

Bredero has recognized a weakness in his own position (the possible copying by others), which is a strength to the other side as well, and mentions this strength.⁴ The counterarguments he expects, are conceded and answered. Thus, Bredero is not only the protagonist of his own standpoint but also the antagonist of the counter-standpoint.

In sum, as the difference of opinion is about the loan of the painting, and Bredero is trying to convince his addressee to fulfill his promise, the topical potential for Bredero in the argumentation stage is constituted by inventing reasons why Badens could have hesitated, and by answering these countermoves in advance.

There is a difference between anticipating imaginary objections that an opponent might come up with — which is proleptic argumentation — and responding to criticisms that have been put forward earlier.⁵ The main difference is that in proleptic argumentation the arguer is in the position of inventing and arranging the argumentation for both sides, so he can put forward those counterarguments that are the most strategic ones from his point of view, for his own cause. Douglas Walton regards as the basic problem for proleptic argumentation ‘how to guess in advance what the most powerful objections of your opponent are likely to be’ and he has proposed a few methods for solving this problem (Walton 2008: 143, 154). However, the idea that an arguer must solely be aimed at the most powerful objections of his opponent can be under discussion. As the arguer can manipulate the discussion distracting his opponent from important issues relating to the standpoint, from a more strategic point of view he may decide not only to puzzle his head over what his opponent will consider ‘the most powerful objections’, but also to choose those objections the protagonist can answer or reject in the most powerful, that is, the most convincing and reasonable way.

The ‘guess’ in Walton’s definition must remain a guess as the arguer cannot really know what the other party has in mind. Therefore, I prefer a more strategic, persuasive coloured definition, in which the notion of *topical selection* is used. Proleptic argumentation is to mention and refute

- a. the most powerful counterarguments you presume/expect and

- b. those counterarguments, selected from the topical potential and relevant to the discussion, that you can answer or reject in the most powerful way, this is with the most powerful arguments from your own point of view, without making false promises.

This dichotomy is necessary as the chosen counterarguments are fictively attributed to the antagonist in the discussion, but may or may not reflect the antagonist's actual objections. Therefore, a) is uncertain, as the arguer runs the risk — this point is already made by Quintilian (*Inst. orat.* VII.1.2.12) — not to know exactly what the most powerful objections of his opponent are, or worse: that he will think up counterarguments the opponent would not have dared to express or would never have thought about (Amjarso 2010: 16, 70). In that case, the persuasiveness can be harmed. So it is essential to add b). As the success of this method depends to a large extent on the ability of the arguer to invent fair counterarguments (Tindale 2004: 84–85, 144; cf. Rocci 2009: 267), 'relevant to the discussion' must be added. The counterarguments must be formulated in an appropriate way, without making false promises, as this would imply unreasonableness and a violation of the Gricean maxim of Quality ('Do not say what you believe to be false or that for which you lack adequate evidence'). So the protagonist has to avoid mentioning in advance powerful counterarguments that he cannot answer in a convincing or reasonable way (cf. Van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2002b: 16–17, 25–26; Van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2009: 4–5; Amjarso 2010: 70). It is more persuasive to formulate a possible objection on the basis of the own strong arguments. When Bredero states:

I know for sure that [...] this painting is beloved and dear to you.

The implicature remains unexpressed:

[So you may be afraid that something happens to this painting, and I am afraid you will not lend it to me]

The most powerful, convincing and reasonable 'answers' for Bredero must have been:

- = we will not take this copy with us out of our house
- = my father will keep it as jewellery on its flat

Bredero does not mention something like

† [so we will promise to return it quickly].

We may assume that this is an example of a statement (or promise) that cannot be fulfilled by Bredero in a reasonable way. Therefore, it would have undermined the mutual faith, important for future occasions.⁶ That Bredero could not fulfill such a promise is, of course, not more than a supposition of mine. In fact, it does not

matter that much, as Bredero's apparently worries about a different counterargument (namely that copying the painting would lead to more copies, which would have decreased the value of the original painting). It is more important to notice that the way in which arguments and counterarguments are mentioned, follow from the strategic arrangement by one side. Therefore, the selection as well as the *arrangement* (disposition) of topical potential contribute to strategic maneuvering. Anyway, choosing to address a specific counterargument can help the arguer to shift focus and to distract the addressed party from a possible weak aspect in the own defense (e.g. the uncertainty about a short-term return of the painting) (cf. Amjarso 2010: 68).

Thus, as Bredero was able to arrange the discussion he will have chosen his own counterarguments, omitting unattractive — and therefore unpersuasive — proleptic statements as well, such as:

† [you will state that many have the intention to make a copy of this painting]
= we will not take this copy with us out of our house.

Instead of this, he more neutrally and implicitly puts forward: 'this painting is beloved and dear to you'. The counterargument between brackets can be regarded as too confrontational to be mentioned explicitly. Bredero is mitigating the countervoice, restricting the 'disagreement space' at the same time, in such a way that the confrontation is defined in accordance with both party's preferences (Van Eemeren & Houtlosser 2002a, 139).

The protagonist decides what will be the most powerful objection on the basis of the self assessed quality of his rebuttal of this objection. The purpose of the proponent's putting forward an argument is to create a conclusion favourable to the proponent's side. With regard to an audience this purpose is to create an atmosphere of an exchange with them, as Tindale (2004: 84–85) states, as the arguer is 'trying to conceive things from the other point of view and treating that point of view in a reasonable fashion'. I should like to add here: 'and treating that point of view in a persuasive (strategic) way as well'.

2.2 Felicity conditions of a request

Both the arguments pro and the potential counterarguments can be related to the felicity conditions for a speech act, which define the general grounds upon which an act (the request) must be defended and upon which it may be challenged (Van Eemeren et al. 1993: 105). On the basis of these conditions, one may decide whether the speech act of the request is to be considered successful or not. Felicity conditions connect underlying goals and speech acts as components of plans. As we will see, in his request-letter Bredero passes through all felicity conditions for

speech act performance, starting from common ground (i.e. an accepted stand-point). After all, right from the start Bredero mentions that Badens has already made a promise about lending the little painting ('as you know...'). This crucial information implies that there is a commonly shared starting point in the opening stage of the discussion about a certain painting that can be lent (Van Eemeren and Grootendorst 1983: 158–161).

Still, Bredero had to write this letter to underline the request. The felicity conditions of the request are the (possible) points of criticism for this speech act and supply arguments. A request is a particular speech act type, with the following conditions (between brackets the way Bredero meets these conditions):⁷

1. Propositional content condition: The utterance by speaker (S) makes reference to a future action (A) to be performed by the listener (L) [Bredero asks Badens to lend him the painting];
2. Essential condition: Making the utterance counts as an attempt to get L to perform A [Bredero explicitly expresses his 'trust' that Badens will fulfill his promise (and will come into action)];
3. Sincerity condition: S actually wants L to perform A [Bredero refers to his father, 'who asks and begs very friendly, if perhaps you would be prepared to loan us...'. Moreover, Bredero explicitly mentions his wish, and is 'hoping nothing else than that our request will be granted'];
4. Preparatory condition:
 - a. The elements associated with the performance of A (e.g. time, place, objects) exist ['After having done all polite marks of honour and kind regards to you [...] I ask you [...], if perhaps you would be prepared to loan us [...] the little painting by Sebastian Vrancx...; [...] this is a convenient time for me'];
 - b. L has the ability to do A ['...if perhaps you would be prepared to loan us ...'];
 - c. L is willing to do A ['...what you have promised him (as you know: the little painting by Sebastian Vrancx)...'];
 - d. L would not do A in the absence of the request ['I know for sure that our wish is big, bold and impudent, and that this painting is beloved and dear to you'];
 - e. there is some good reason to perform A, i.e. some need for A or benefit from its performance ['I ask you, on behalf of my father, who asks and begs very friendly, if perhaps you would be prepared to loan us... [...] by which you will do a pleasant service and an extreme great friendship to my father. [...] If you do us this favour and let our wishes come true, we hereby promise you [...]. For it [making the copy] only happens because

of my father's pleasure... [...]; this is a convenient time for me. [...] This way you will do a good deed'].

In fact, letters are one-sided conversations. But they imply interaction, as well as interrelational and contextual knowledge from the participants, thus an interest in the organizational context, cultural knowledge systems and the identities of parties. Bredero is referring to this knowledge, looking backwards in mentioning the promise and, apparently looking forward in meeting the antagonist's wishes, when he describes the conditions for the handling (and storage) of the reproduction. To realize the interactional goals, Bredero is acting rational, cooperative, tuned to the expectations and acting of the other participant (Badens). To clarify the structure of the 'negotiation', the utterances may be regarded as rational, rule-governed discourse, to which (in a face-to-face discussion) sequential rules and turn-taking organization belong. These specify what well-formed sequences of speech acts are and what not. Moreover, they show how one speech act can follow another in an acceptable way. An acceptable continuation for a request is an acceptance or refusal (Labov 1970: 76; Haft-van Rees 1989a: 20–21).

In speech act theory, the relation between two successive utterances is described as 'adjacency pairs', the basic unit of sequence construction. Adjacency pairs are composed of two turns produced by different speakers which are placed adjacently and where the second utterance is identified as related to the first (Schegloff 2007: 13; Haft-Van Rees 1989a: 29). Due to mentioning the promise, the letter as a whole may be considered as a relevant second pair part, in which Bredero is showing to understand that the prior turn (the promise by Badens to lend the painting) was the sort of first pair part of which this is a relevant second. Indeed, if we consider the letter as a relevant second part, we may argue that the relevance of it, except for being a reminder, could have been constituted by Bredero's remark that he had time to make the copy at that very moment ('...and this is a convenient time for me'). With regard to the first part: Badens must have had the intention to achieve that the antagonist (Bredero's father) would have understood that the protagonist has made a promise to him, as well as what this promise implied.

The answer of Badens to be expected to this letter can be considered a second pair part as well, making the letter to become the first part of a next adjacency pair, by which the whole 'discussion' mounts up to a three-turn sequence (cf. Schegloff 2007: 13ff, 21). In this case, the content of the last turn is the most uncertain of the three: we don't know whether the request of Bredero is accepted or refused. It is even possible (but not very likely) that it was followed by no reaction at all. If the request was accepted, the antagonist would have tried to save the protagonist and himself loss of face, by meeting the interactional goals of the speaker as much as possible. Likewise, the protagonist (Bredero) memorizes and resolves possible

barriers to the acceptance of the request. He does so to minimize the danger of refusal. In a face-to-face discussion the mutual willingness is made explicit at once. In the monologue context of a single letter, being after centuries the only evidence of what must have been at least a three-turn discussion, the contribution by the letter writer as a first pair part of an adjacency pair merely creates *expectations* of what will have followed. In this way, the utterances in the letter may be interpreted as preliminary to the answer.

An utterance which effects acceptance (or non-acceptance) of a request is relevant as an illocutionary act because in it a speech act is performed which is complementary to the one performed in the initiating utterance. The felicity conditions of this (non) acceptance closely mirror those of the initiating speech act (the request) (Jacobs and Jackson 1983a: 60; Haft-Van Rees 1989b: 389). In issuing a request, the speaker implies that he assumes the hearer to be willing and able to perform the requested action, by virtue of the hearer having recognized that the request is an attempt to get the hearer to perform some action (Jacobs and Jackson 1983b: 287).

Pairs are conditionally relevant. Expressing himself, Bredero performs a certain communicative (main) act, by which he tries to reach the interactional effect that Badens will accept this act and will tune his reaction to the interactional goal proposed. If the first pair part (the request) is performed in a valid way, this will guarantee the validity of the second pair part (the acceptance) (Jacobs and Jackson 1983a: 60). After all, if the speaker has the right intentions, the preconditions for the acceptance by the addressee have been fulfilled.

The selection of arguments has been made to justify that his request is justified. The acceptance by the addressee (L) of the request by the speaker (S) has the following felicity conditions. Notice that acceptations have symmetrical felicity conditions with those of the request by the speaker (S), mentioned earlier.

1. Propositional content condition: L understands that the utterance by S refers to A to be performed by L;
2. Essential condition: the acceptance counts as an attempt by L to perform A;
3. Sincerity condition: L understands that it is the wish of S to perform the requested action;
4. Preparatory condition:
 - a. The elements associated with the performance of A (e.g. time, place, objects) exist;
 - b. L is able to do A;
 - c. L is willing to do A;
 - d. L would not do A in the absence of the request by S;
 - e. L understands that there is some good reason to perform A, i.e. some need for A or benefit from its performance.

With regard to the preparatory condition, Bredero asks whether Badens is prepared to loan him the painting:

I ask you, on behalf of my father, who asks and begs very friendly, if perhaps you would be prepared to loan us what you have promised him (as you know...)

Seen from the perspective of speech act theory, this is not a pure question. After all, Bredero knows already that Badens is prepared to loan, due to the promise (L is able and willing to do A). Therefore, his utterance functions as a different speech act. He inquires after the realization of one of the preparatory conditions for a request (L must be able to comply with the request), and he does so in an indirect way, asking after the satisfaction of this felicity condition for a request (cf. Haftvan Rees 1989a: 27).

By looking at the symmetrical felicity conditions of a request and its acceptance with regard to the letter by Bredero, we may expect Badens to have accepted the request, although this is not certain. The addressee may have demanded justification in terms of any or all of the corresponding felicity conditions, or he may have objected to the act's performance on the grounds that one or more conditions fail. Anyhow, Bredero has shown that he thinks to comply with the conditions, and that possible criticism by the opponent on the fulfilling of those conditions does not hold.

It remains to notice that some utterances in the text are not part of the felicity conditions but are still a form of framing aimed at getting Badens to grant Bredero's request. Moreover, there seems to be a shift in the argument where Bredero expands the request with a temporal element ('this is a convenient time for me [to make the copy]') and where he suggests to do all he can to prevent the copy from being reproduced by others. As we will see in the next paragraph, the implication is here that Bredero is not driven by self-interest, but that he takes the desires, wishes or even expectations of Badens into account.

3. Audience-directed framing

One of the concerns in strategic maneuvering is that the moves that are made in each stage of the discourse must be adapted to audience demand, that is in this case: to comply with the addressee's preferences (Van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2008: 16). In general, adaptation to audience demand will consist in an attempt to create in each stage the required 'communion'. In the *confrontation stage*, in which the difference of opinion is established, this aspect of strategic maneuvering may, for example, be manifested by the avoidance of contradictions that appear unsolvable in view of the other party's commitments. Each party is trying to assign the status enjoying the widest agreement to the elements on which he is basing his

argument (Van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2008:16). The standpoint remains implicit during a large part of the letter. Bredero takes assumed sensitivities of Badens into consideration and manages to make his request sound as a carefully-worded, appeal, in a very polite way ('if perhaps you would be prepared to loan us...'), mitigating (or even concealing) the urgency of the loan, and avoiding directness.

In the *opening stage*, in which the points of departure are determined, the status of a widely shared value judgment may be conferred on personal feelings and impressions, and the status of a fact on subjective values (Van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2008:16). In referring to the promise already made by Badens, the starting point of the request (as a 'reminder') seems to be mutually acceptable. Bredero mentions the promise made to his father, to underline what was agreed upon, 'as you know: the little painting...'. Moreover, Bredero lets Badens know that by redeeming this promise he will do a pleasant service and an extreme great friendship to his father. In other words, Bredero is suggesting a fair exchange as he becomes concerned not just with his own rewards and costs but also with the rewards and costs of his father and of Badens. After all, the friendship Badens will get is not only with Bredero himself but also with his father. By drawing his father into the negotiation, the impression of un-selfishness is enlarged. Besides, it makes the loan more rewarding. As Homans has described in his analysis of human behaviour, 'the more valuable to a person is the result of his action, the more likely he is to perform the action' (Homans 1961, third proposition:25). So the task for Bredero is here to make Badens think the action of lending the painting is a valuable and rewarding one, in order to make him realize how 'rewarding' this resource (his act of lending) will be in the end (Roloff 1981:37).

In the *argumentation stage*, the stage in which the protagonist defends his standpoint, strategic adaptation to audience demand may be achieved by quoting arguments the other party is known to agree with or by referring to argumentative principles that party adheres to (Van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2008:16). Bredero is supposed to act reasonably, for instance by using common critical standards and by anticipating that the other will comply with the same standards. The copy of the painting will only be made, as Bredero explains, because of his father's 'pleasure'. It strengthens the 'fairness' of the exchange, because Bredero is mitigating his own involvement in the negotiation once again. Moreover, he will give Badens the impression that he is trying to conceive the subject from the *his* point of view as well, and to treat it in a reasonable way. For example, in making this promise in return: 'we will not take this copy with us out of our house', Bredero is implicitly referring to the special value he attaches himself to the painting and to the act of copying it, but also to the weight Badens is supposed to attach to this painting. So, in this kind of proleptic technique both sides are represented, which will make the statement sympathetic in the eyes of the addressee and his own arguments more

persuasive as well. Proleptic argumentation demands a type of move in which the arguer anticipates the arguments attributed to his addressee, showing that he, in any case, cannot weaken the opinion defended. It demands a certain amount of empathy (or at least the appearance of it) as well, as you have to look at the issue from the opponent's point of view and utilize the opponent's commitments as premises in arguments that have conclusions favourable to the proponent's side.⁸ To achieve this kind of one-sided benevolence the arguer not only has to consider the arguments of both sides but also create the impression of a mutual comprehensive understanding, and of cooperativeness.⁹ At least, this is what we encounter in Bredero's letter: you could say his argumentation is largely cooperative, as he builds moral community (Makau and Marty 2001: 106). This cooperativeness is indicated here explicitly by the statement that Bredero and his father 'trust' in Badens's 'affection' and 'kind promise'. Besides, Badens will find Bredero and his father 'cooperative and willing' to give him in return their 'benevolence, energy and good will' to deploy these in compliance with Badens's wish, to make use of it, as much as he likes. Thus, Bredero also indicates what the antagonist may win. He concludes that paragraph with a saying: 'none of us lives to himself alone'. It looks like Bredero is putting his commitment into perspective, but this qualification is a saying from the Bible that radiates acceptance and invulnerability. His choice of words indicates that Bredero's argument may be named as a kind of 'cooperative argumentation',¹⁰ reasoning from interdependence of two who are in the same boat, or at least, are in this situation together and cannot turn back.

The polite way of acting is also helpful to further cooperation. Negative emotions lessen the likelihood of a cooperative association. To mitigate negative affect, individuals may plan to use verbal cues that express likability or friendliness (Roloff and Jordan 1992: 28). Though Bredero is well-mannered in all his letters, here he had to act so in particular, as the situation is one of a competitive goal, namely asking or begging goodwill, to be fulfilled as soon as possible. As the illocutionary act (a request) restricts the addressee's freedom of action, the politeness could have been of a negative character. After all, its purpose was to reduce the discord implicit in the competition between what Bredero wants to achieve, and what is 'good manners' (Leech 1983: 104–105). However, Bredero's letter is almost completely dominated by positive politeness, due to his continuous attempt to reach reciprocity. As it is Bredero's goal getting Badens to lend him the painting, doing justice to the politeness principle remains required to mitigate the intrinsic discourtesy of the goal (Leech 1983: 105).

Finally, in the *concluding stage*, there is an evaluation of the extent to which the initial difference of opinion has been resolved. We may expect that Bredero is aiming for effectiveness here, with the task to convince the other party of the acceptability of his standpoint. Besides, he makes the promise to handle the painting,

when loaned, very carefully: he and his father will not take the copy with them out of their house, the making of the copy is solely intended to his father's pleasure, and the latter will keep the copy out of view, 'along with his gems and precious objects'. In other words, there will not be any opportunity for others to see the copy and to make a reproduction of it themselves (or to 'steal' the invention, i.e. the subject or the portrayal).¹¹ After a rather traditional close of the letter, referring to the addressee's surely not being 'keen on an abundance of words', the final remark is crucial: 'This way [by the redemption of your promise and lending the painting] you will do a good deed', stressing the emotional and rewarding value of the requested act, promoting an affective attitude (cf. Hansen & McLeod 2012: 167–169). This looks like the peroration in classical rhetoric, that conventionally employed appeals through pathos.

All in all, audience adaptation is largely brought about by the polite, attentive and cooperative way of Bredero's acting, continually emphasizing mutuality and unselfishness. Fair as it may seem, Bredero's negotiating with friendship and services in return evidently has a strategic character if we consider this kind of negotiation as a concessive move. In general, such a move enables the bargainer to realize different strategies of negotiation, for example the type by means of which the speaker tries to forestall and at the same time to refuse eventual counter-arguments. But in this case the strategic value can be connected with the strategic choice that tries to mitigate the threat to the interlocutor's face and to obtain his positive regard for a different point of view (Maraldi and Orlandini 2001: 165; Haft-van Rees 1989a: 37–38). After all, Bredero is not only pinning Badens to his promise, but he also tries to make Badens's consideration more acceptable and agreeable for himself.

4. Presentational devices

Besides topics and audience-orientation a third aspect of strategic maneuvering are presentational devices: choices of ways of presenting that are appropriate for the purposes of the arguer, e.g. to make his criticisms seem reasonable and more conclusive at the same time. The relevant stylistics mostly consist in the phrasing and verbal framing of the moves a party makes. Repetition as a figure of thought may be regarded as an important means within the presentational devices of Bredero's letter. In the *argumentation stage* turns of thought may contribute to the impression of a well-considered and well-built discourse. Bredero is trading a promise (by Badens) against another promise (by himself and his father), a wish of his against a wish of his addressee ('to deploy these in compliance with your wish'), all to make it sound like a well-chosen balance.

In each stage of the discussion stylistics must be systematically attuned achieving the effect on the other party that this party aims for by making these moves (Van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2008: 16). This means, for example, that each party may exploit politeness strategies and cooperation principles in a specific and deliberate way, to get the discussion moving in an certain direction. As we have seen, in this letter Bredero passes through all felicity conditions for the performance of the speech act 'request'. At the same time the required level of politeness is reached. According to Geoffrey Leech (1983: 132), politeness is distinguished into various maxims: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. It is clear that Bredero has framed his discourse to realize these maxims in almost every utterance, with every sentence, directly from the *confrontation stage*.

Between brackets the maxims of the politeness principle according to Leech:

After having done all polite marks of honour and kind regards to you, my dear, respected and beloved master, I ask you, on behalf of my father, who asks and begs very friendly, if perhaps you would be prepared to loan us what you have promised him [1] (as you know: the little painting by Sebastian Vrancx), by which you will do a pleasant service and an extreme great friendship to my father [2]. We will not leave this without a service in return, not without displaying to you the gratitude you deserve [3]. In whatever way, you will have a good, indeed, a very good friend with me and my father [4]. I know for sure that our wish is big, bold and impudent [5], and that this painting is beloved and dear to you. Because we trust in your affection and your kind promise [1; 6], we have still taken courage to make this friendly yet innocent, simple, little request and to submit it to your mild-mannered, kind politeness [3; 6], hoping nothing else than that our request will be granted. Against this we put our benevolence, energy and good will to deploy these in compliance with your wish. Please, make use of it, as much as you like [3]. You will find us cooperative and willing to do so [2]. Who knows where one may lend assistance to one another; none of us lives to himself alone [2]. (*etc.*)

- 1 = agreement maxim (minimize disagreement between self and other/maximize agreement between self and other)
- 2 = tact maxim (minimize cost to other/maximize benefit to other)
- 3 = sympathy maxim (minimize antipathy between self and other/maximize sympathy between self and other)
- 4 = generosity maxim (minimize benefit to self/maximize cost to self)
- 5 = modesty maxim (minimize praise of self/maximize dispraise of self)
- 6 = approbation maxim (minimize dispraise of other/maximize praise of other)

These maxims can be considered as the most general strategies, concentrated on the actualization of targets that by way of the communicative, pragmatic principles.¹² The stylistics underline this politeness and contribute to the impression of

total respect and cooperativeness. To this impression of politeness several figures make a valuable contribution:

1. tautology ('marks of honour and kind regards'; 'dear, respected and beloved', 'asks and begs'),
2. self-correction / reinforcement ('you will have a good, indeed, a very good friend'),
3. litotes ('We will not leave this without a service in return...'; 'not without displaying...'),
4. enumeration ('our wish is big, bold and impudent'; 'this friendly yet innocent, simple, little request').
5. amplification (i.e. the repetition of words or expressions while adding more detail to it, in order to emphasize what might otherwise be passed over, evident from the use of the above-mentioned figures).

Bredero adds an element of increasing power for himself in the fact that he is talking on behalf of his father and himself: 'we' against 'you'. This is a stylistic choice with strategic implications. In this way he is not only expressing mutual self-interests. It is also a kind of negotiation through manipulating perceptions of losses and gains. Individuals who view an outcome as a potential gain make more concessions and see the negotiated outcome as more fair than do those who hold a negative frame or see their trade-offs as losses. Therefore, the potential gain for Badens has been increased by Bredero, as he offers his addressee the friendship with both, father and son (Neale and Bazerman 1985: 34–49; Putnam and Holmer 1992: 131). To increase the power to himself Bredero arranges the text and characterizes the different objects according to a preconceived idea. He tells us among other things that the wish of his father and himself is 'big, bold and impudent, while in this very sentence the same wish is characterized as an 'innocent, simple, little request'. Not an ill-chosen, coincidental phrasing, we may assume. Bredero is able to contrast the supposed bold nature of his wish against the mild-mannered, kind politeness and benevolence of Badens (Leech's modesty and approbation maxim: maximize dispraise of self and praise of other), while his wording about the innocence and simpleness of his request serves as a prelude to the assignment of the goodwill by Badens (Leech's tact maxim: minimize cost to other). Thus, Bredero's request is big and small at the same time, creating a kind of witty antithesis: it is big to make the person of Badens (who will lend the painting) more important, and the request is small to not present the act of lending as insurmountable, and to tempt Badens into making an immediate move.

In the *concluding stage*, each party will direct all its efforts towards achieving the conclusion of the discourse desired by that party, for instance, by pointing out what the consequences are of accepting a certain complex of arguments (Van

Eemeren and Houtlosser 2008: 16). After Bredero has accomplished for himself mutually accepted agreement, he vigorously turns the balance to his own advantage, in a quite compelling way, without being impolite:

...hoping nothing else than that our request will be granted.

From a pro-forma indirect request at the beginning of the letter ('... if perhaps you would be prepared to loan us what you have promised him...'), the character of the utterances has moved to a conditional direct request in the end: 'If you agree on this, then the sooner the better'.¹³ In other words: hurry up, live up to your promise, we are waiting for it. Bredero is substantiating this urgency by an additional argument: '... and this is a convenient time for me', which means: I have time to make the copy right now. By making these claims Bredero tries to appear strong to his opponent.¹⁴

This thoroughness and urgency are, especially in the concluding stage, supported by presentational devices as a part of Bredero's negotiation strategy. Bredero has a fairly high level of lexical diversity, which will rate him as more competent, effective, and less anxious (Gibbons, Bradac, and Busch 1992: 165; cf. Bredero 2011: 42ff). Anyhow, his language is *not* indirect, avoiding, or noncommittal. According to Gibbons, Bradac and Busch (1992: 165ff.) there are five dimensions, semantic and syntactical choices, that reveal the writer's feelings about his proposition in negotiating: 1. polarized language; 2. high and low immediacy; 3. language intensity; 4. lexical diversity; 5. high-power language style. This letter shows that Bredero is not using polarized language, but by contrast a high immediacy, resulting from the desire to move close to his addressee. He employs a high language intensity, from a positive attitude (Gibbons, Bradac, and Busch 1992: 164). The high immediacy character is given by (*italics mine*):¹⁵

1. spatio-temporal markers that indicate displacement across time and space: 'and *now* it will be convenient to me'.
2. denotative specificity that shows the less specific, the less immediate: 'If you agree on this, then *the sooner the better*. This way you will do a good deed'.
3. selective emphasis markers that refer to the order of items in an utterance; first order is more immediate than subsequent order (cf. linguistic intensifiers): 'by which you will do a *pleasant service* and an *extreme great friendship* to my father'.
4. agent-action-object markers that indicate the degree a speaker associates with the referent: 'Against this *we put our benevolence, energy and good will*'.
5. modification indicators that signal a speaker's uncertainty: 'if *perhaps* you *would* be prepared'; 'you will do [...] friendship'.

The use of high or low immediacy can be considered as an unconscious process in which a speaker's affective states influence his lexical and syntactic choices. However Bredero constantly increases immediacy and positive affect with his teacher (cf. Gibbons, Bradac, and Busch 1992: 164), using a choice of the presentational devices, by which he may maneuver strategically.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have shown that the argumentative analysis and evaluation of an apparently simple and polite letter reveals much about the strategic effects of the conventional language of supplication and benefits in several ways from the dynamics of strategic maneuvering. Although the letter may contain just a monologue one-sided 'discussion' about the (already promised) loan of a painting, an approach on the basis of the three aspects of strategic maneuvering (topics, audience demand, and stylistics) makes it possible to take the strategic design of the discourse into consideration and to further a more accurate and realistic treatment of the letter being argumentative discourse in a predominantly negotiating and proleptic form.

At the very start of the letter, the balance of power is not favourable for Bredero, being a pupil facing his teacher who possesses something Bredero wants to have in the short. A well-chosen part of the complete repertory of presentational devices is put into action to focus all attention on Bredero's being polite, cooperative and unselfish. Right from the start, the promise is brought to mind. Bredero acts like a kind of moderator, helping his father and showing unselfishness. In the argumentation stage, Bredero efficiently uses a proleptic form of tactic consultation, in which he determines the contributions of both sides. Giving even weight to the mutual interests, those of himself and of the other, he underlines cooperativeness. As the first pair part of the felicity conditions for Bredero's request is performed in a valid way and therewith the preconditions for the acceptance by the addressee are complied with, the validity of the second pair part (the acceptance of the request and commitment to do the act) is guaranteed. Bredero thinks that he has complied with the conditions, to exclude criticism by Badens on the being fulfilled of those conditions. Although the request is presented indirectly, imbued with politeness, Bredero managed to meet all felicity conditions, justifying the request.

Traditional as it may seem, politeness is not only a sheer conventional phenomenon in seventeenth-century letter writing, as humbleness is not only a sheer personal characterization of Bredero being a well-mannered citizen. They may, from a different viewpoint, also constitute a strategically chosen part of a bargaining process, a form of framing aimed at getting the antagonist to grant Bredero's request, as well as an anticipation of the reaction of the antagonist, pointed at

beneficial effect and success. At the end, the phrasing makes the negative face threatening act of a request evolve from what could have been considered as a polite request to almost a threat, when Bredero emphasizes the urgent character of the loan ('this is a convenient time for me', 'the sooner the better').

Examining the way in which this kind of argumentative discourse may be valued, has been one of the main challenges for having analyzed this little piece of correspondence on the basis of strategic maneuvering. In the analysis three points has been illustrated: 1. Praise and modesty are not just personal or traditional elements but may also be considered as a clever and elegant strategy; that is why 2. the theoretical aspects of strategic maneuvering render account for almost every feature of the (seemingly) natural, 'human' and therefore 'living' argumentation in this discourse; that is why we may conclude that 3. almost all utterances in this letter seem to have been written strategically, reflecting the discourse of an eloquent, persuasive, and reasonable bargainer at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Notes

* I would like to thank dr. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans (University of Amsterdam) for her valuable comments on earlier versions of this paper, and two reviewers for their helpful comments on later drafts.

1. Cf. Bredero 2011: 16, 21–22, 42, 68; the letters are published on pp. 92–134.
2. A Flemish Baroque painter and etcher of the Antwerp school (1573–1647).
3. Bredero 2011: 92–94. The letter in the original runs as follows: 'Naer alle beleefde eerbiedinge, ende vrundelijcke groetenisse aen u mijn lieve eerwaerdighe Heer ende beminde Meester: Soo bidd' ick u uyt de naem van mijn Vader, die wel hartelijck bid ende begeert, oft het u wille nu wel sou wesen ons te willen leenen het gene ghy hem hebt toegeseyt (ghelijck ghy weet, het stuccken van S. Vrancx) met welcke ghy mijn Vader een aengename dienst, ende een over-groote vrundtschap sult doen; het welcke wy niet onvergouden en sullen laten, sonder u daer en teghen danckbaerheit te bewysen, nae u waerde, 't sy oock in wat het sy, sult ghy my ende mijn Vader voor een goede, ja over-goede Vrundt hebben. Ick weet wel dat ons begheeren groot, stout, ende onbeschaemt is, ende dat u 't selfde stuccken lief ende waert is: nochtans vertrouwende op u jonst ende op u gunstige belofte, soo hebben wy ons verkloecht dit vrundelijck, doch onnoosel, eenvoudig Requestjen, te bieden ende toonen aen u goed-aerdige milde heushey, verhoopende oock anders niet als dat ons versoeck ons sal toe gelaten worden. Waer tegen wy u opofferen onse goede genegenthey, macht ende wil, om naer u believe die te ghebruycken; steltse vry te werck naer u eygen begeeren, ghy sult ons willich ende bereyt vinden; wie weet waermen elck-anderen kan te hulp komen, niemant leeft voor sich selfs. By aldien ghy ons dese jonste doet, ende laet onse wensch gheschien: soo belooven wy u hier neffens, dat wy de Copy niet uyt ons huys sullen laten gaen, want het gheschiet alleenlijck om de sinnelijckhey van mijn Vader, die 't selfde tot een cieraet op syn plat bewaren wil by syn Juweelen ende schat, ende 't souw my nu wel moghen beuren. Voordts weet ick wel dat ghy met overvloedt van woorden niet beholpen en

sijt: den Verstandighen is haest ghenoech gheseyt, of: *a un bon Entendeur il ne faut qu'un parole*. Ist u wil hoe eerder hoe liever; dus doende sult wel doen.' The letter is preceded and followed by a four-line verse about virtue and thankfulness which I have omitted here.

4. Clauss has distinguished two types of prolepses, the first if an arguer explicitly recognizes weaknesses to his own position, and the second if the arguer recognizes strengths to the other side. This is a strange division according to Snoeck Henkemans (2007:2), as both types will mainly coincide with each other.

5. I consider the counterarguments by Bredero ('we will not take it with us out of our house'; 'my father will keep it as jewellery on its flat...') as 'proleptic', as there is nothing to suggest that there was earlier communication between Bredero and his teacher on this very subject (apart from the promise to Bredero's father). But in fact we do not know this for sure.

6. It would undermine the commitment, comparable with someone making a declarative statement and not committing himself to this statement. Cf. Walton and Krabbe 1995:23.

7. Based on: Van Eemeren et al. 1993:4, 104–105, an extended version of Searle 1970:66.

8. Walton 2008:154. See on the problematic definition of 'commitment': Walton and Krabbe 1995:13ff.

9. Makau and Marty 2001:88; Van Eemeren 2010:154: 'In order not to be perceived as non-cooperative, unresponsive, impolite or even rude by their primary audience, the participating parties cannot afford to ignore each others' questions, statements and other contributions to the exchange, and their strategic maneuvering has to be conducted accordingly'.

10. Cf. Makau and Marty 2001:88: 'The essence of cooperative argumentation is its presumption of interdependence. Both people and positions are interdependent; that is, we rely on one another to ensure our well-being and we depend on each other's perspectives to generate meaning and a comprehensive understanding'.

11. One may notice that Badens could have been afraid not that the original was copied by others but that his painting would get lost if it went out Bredero's house. The latter may be true (as well). However, the remark on keeping the painting 'as jewellery on its flat side, along with his gems and precious objects' must mean that Bredero wants to hide it by storing it away, invisible for anybody who happened to visit the house.

12. Cf. Berenst 1994:108, 232. In this case of proleptic argumentation, there is no need to change the developed strategy, as the addressee is actually no (attendant) participant in the discussion. Cf. Walton and Krabbe 1995:18.

13. Cf. the scheme in Jacobs and Jackson 1983b:296.

14. According to Roloff and Jordan (1992:31) there is a positive correlation between the desire to appear strong to the opponent and being argumentative during negotiation.

15. The five-fold division is based on Gibbons, Bradac, and Busch 1992:163.

References

- Amjarso, Bilal. 2010. *Mentioning and then Refuting an Anticipated Counterargument. A Conceptual and Empirical Study on the Persuasiveness of a Mode of Strategic Manoeuvring*. Ph.D. thesis, Amsterdam.
- Berenst, Jan. 1994. *Relationeel taalgebruik. Conversationale strategieën in interpersonele en interculturele communicatie*. Ph.D. thesis, Groningen.
- Bredero, G.A. 2011. *Proza*, ed. by Jeroen Jansen. Hilversum: Verloren.
- Clauss, Patrick. 2007. "Prolepsis: Dealing with Multiple Viewpoints in Argument." In *Dissensus and the Search for Common Ground*, ed. by Hans V. Hansen, Christopher W. Tindale, J. Anthony Blair, Ralf H. Johnson, and D.M. Godden, 1–17. Windsor, ON: OSSA. Online publication [http://jakemachina.com/OSSA/pdf/170_Clauss.pdf].
- Van Eemeren, Frans H., Rob Grootendorst, Scott Jacobs, and Sally Jackson. 1993. *Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse*. Tuscaloosa/London: University of Alabama Press.
- Van Eemeren, Frans H. 2010. *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse. Extending thePragma-Dialectical Theory of Argumentation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van Eemeren, Frans H., and Rob Grootendorst. 1983. *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussion. A Theoretical Model for the Analysis of Discussions Directed towards Solving Conflicts of Opinion*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Van Eemeren, Frans H., and Peter Houtlosser. 2002a. "Strategic Maneuvering: Maintaining a Delicate Balance." In *Dialectic and Rhetoric: The Warp and Woof of Argumentation Analysis*, ed. by Frans H. van Eemeren and Peter Houtlosser, 131–159. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Van Eemeren, Frans H., and Peter Houtlosser. 2002b. "Strategic Maneuvering with the Burden of Proof." In *Advances in Pragma-Dialectics*, ed. by Frans H. van Eemeren, 13–28. Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
- Van Eemeren, Frans H., and Peter Houtlosser. 2008. "Strategic Manoeuvring in Argumentative Discourse: Exploring the Boundaries of Reasonableness." In *Understanding Argumentation. Work in Progress*, ed. by Frans H. van Eemeren, David Cratis Williams, and Igor Z. Zagar, 13–25. Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
- Van Eemeren, Frans H., and Peter Houtlosser. 2009. "Strategic Maneuvering. Examining Argumentation in Context." In *Examining Argumentation in Context. Fifteen Studies on Strategic Maneuvering*, ed. by Frans H. van Eemeren, 1–24. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gibbons, Pamela, James J. Bradac, and Jon D. Busch. 1992. "The Role of Language in Negotiations: Threats and Promises." In *Communication and Negotiation*, ed. by Linda L. Putnam and Michael E. Roloff, 156–175. Newbury Park etc.: Sage Publications.
- Haft-van Rees, M. Agnes. 1989a. *Taalgebruik in gesprekken. Inleiding tot gespreksanalytisch onderzoek*. Leiden: Nijhoff.
- Haft-van Rees, M. Agnes. 1989b. "Conversation, Relevance, and Argumentation." *Argumentation* 3 (1989): 385–93.
- Hansen, Hans V., and McLeod, Jane. 2012. "Petitioning the King: The Case of Provincial Printers in Eighteenth-Century France." *Argumentation* 26 (2012): 161–70.
- Homans, Georg 1961. *Social Behavior. Its Elementary Forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Jacobs, Scott, and Sally Jackson. 1983a. "Speech Act Structure in Conversation. Rational Aspects of Pragmatic Coherence." In *Conversational Coherence: Form, Structure and Strategy*, ed. by Robert T. Craig and Karen Tracy, 47–66. Beverly Hills: Sage.

- Jacobs, Scott, and Sally Jackson. 1983b. "Strategy and Structure in Conversational Influence Attempts." *Communication Monographs* 50 (1983): 285–304.
- Labov, William. 1970. "The Study of Language in its Social Context." *Studium General* 23.1 (1970): 30–87.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London/New York: Longman.
- Makau, Josina M., and Debian L. Marty. 2001. *Cooperative Argumentation. A Model for Deliberative Community*. Prospect Height, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Maraldi, Mirka, and Anna Orlandini. 2001. "A Case of Negotiation. The Argumentative Concession in Latin." In *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*, ed. by Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal, 149–166. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Neale, Margaret A., and Max H. Bazerman. 1985. "The Effects of Framing and Negotiator Overconfidence on Bargainer Behavior." *Academy of Management Journal* 28 (1985): 34–49.
- Putnam, Linda L., and Majia Holmer. 1992. "Framing, Reframing, and Issue Development." In *Communication and Negotiation*, ed. by Linda L. Putnam and Michael E. Roloff, 128–155. Newbury Park etc.: Sage Publications.
- Rocci, Andrea. 2009. "Manoeuvring with Voices. The Polyphonic Framing of Arguments in an Institutional Advertisement." In *Examining Argumentation in Context. Fifteen Studies on Strategic Maneuvering*, ed. by Frans H. van Eemeren, 257–283. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Roloff, Michael E. 1981. *Interpersonal Communication. The Social Exchange Approach*. Beverly Hills/London: Sage Publications.
- Roloff, Michael E., and Jerry M. Jordan. 1992. "Achieving Negotiation Goals: The "Fruits and Foibles" of Planning Ahead." In *Communication and Negotiation*, ed. by Linda L. Putnam and Michael E. Roloff, 21–45. Newbury Park etc.: Sage Publications.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John R. 1970. *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Snoeck Henkemans, Francisca. 2007. Commentary on Patrick Claus: "Prolepsis: Dealing with Multiple Viewpoints in Argument". Online publication [http://jakemachina.com/OSSA/pdf/171_SnoeckHenkemans_on_Clauss.pdf].
- Tindale, Christopher W. 2004. *Rhetorical Argumentation: Principles of Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Walton, Douglas. 2008. "Proleptic Argumentation." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 44 (2008): 143–54.
- Walton, Douglas, and Erik C.W. Krabbe. 1995. *Commitment in Dialogue: Basic Concepts of Interpersonal Reasoning*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Author's address

Jeroen Jansen
 Department of Dutch Language and Culture
 University of Amsterdam
 Spuistraat 134, 1012 VB Amsterdam
 The Netherlands
 j.jansen@uva.nl

About the author

Jeroen Jansen is an assistant professor at the Department of Dutch studies of the University of Amsterdam and teaches early modern Dutch literature. He is currently leading the project: 'Pretextual Strategies. The Rhetoric of Ethos, Literary Authority and (Con)Textual Identity in Renaissance Preliminary Texts'. <http://home.medewerker.uva.nl/j.jansen/>