THE HISTORICAL VARIATION OF THE PRAGMEME 'GREETING' IN ROMANIAN

MIHAELA-VIORICA CONSTANTINESCU[1]

Abstract. The article focuses on greetings and phenomena related to greetings from the perspective of pragmatic act and speech act theories. Greetings reflect a communicative behaviour with ritual roots. The analysis is based mainly on a corpus of written texts from the 17th – 19th centuries and on several corpora of present-day spoken Romanian. Greetings are utterances whose goal varies across time: in the premodern and at the beginning of the modern Romanian society the goal of a greeting is both to produce gratification and to highlight the obligations of social inferiors towards their superiors, in a rigid hierarchy (the preferred allopracts being mainly nonverbal). When the social hierarchy gradually begins to lose its rigidity, greetings are used to produce gratification and social bonds or even to promote a type of self-image. In the transition from marking social obligations to marking social bonds, some ritual forms have become conventionalized, obscuring for their users their original meaning.

Keywords: pragmeme, allopract, pract, greeting, speech act, ritual, convention.

1. PRELIMINARY REMARKS

This article focuses on greetings and on phenomena related to greetings from the perspective of the theory of pragmatic acts (Mey 2001, 2016b) and speech act theories (Austin 1962; Searle 1965, 1969). Greetings reflect a communicative behaviour with ritual roots. Not only verbal greetings are interesting, but also some conventional, autonomous gestures that could be categorized as allopracts. Metadiscursive comments indicate newly adopted and 'acclimatised' forms or old ritual forms that underwent the process of conventionalisation.

[1] Mihaela-Viorica Constantinescu is PhD lecturer at the Department of Linguistics, University of Bucharest. Teaching and research interests: Pragmatics, Stylistics, Rhetoric, Argumentation, Romanian as a foreign language. Member of a research group dealing with the study of Romanian parliamentary discourse. Publications: articles and studies in peer-reviewed journals and collective volumes; two author books: on Romanian political humour during the communist period – *Umorul politic românesc în perioada comunistă. Perspective lingvistice* (2012), on im/politeness in the mid-nineteenth century Romanian Principalities – *Principatele române între Orient şi Occident: dinamica modelelor culturale ale politeții şi impoliteții în secolul al XIX-lea* (revised edition 2016). E-mail: constantinescumv@gmail.com.

RRL, **LXIII**, *1–2*, p. 73–97, Bucureşti, 2018

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

The analysis is based on a corpus containing several interactions mentioned in chronicles (from the 17th to the 18th centuries), ceremonial literature (18th century), memoirs (18th and 19th centuries) belonging to Romanian authors from the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia and on data from corpora of present-day standard Romanian, collected after 2000. The analysis aims to highlight the significance of some frequent (non)verbal greetings (including leave-taking), considering also the comments of bystanders or participants, viewed as evidence of how they interpret or designate a type of non/verbal behaviour.

2. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. Speech acts and pragmemes

The speech act theory is one of the most important theories in the pragmatic field and detailed presentations are largely available. For this reason, in our article, we shall focus only on some taxonomic issues, felicity conditions and illocutionary force. More attention will be given to the recent pragmatic act theory (PAT) proposed by J.L. Mey (for detailed discussions and applications see Allan, Capone and Kecskes 2016).

Echoing well-known linguistic categories (morpheme-allomorph; phoneme-allophone), J.L. Mey (2001: 221) brings forward three concepts: the pragmeme[2] ("generalized pragmatic act"), the allopract[3] ("a concrete and different realization of a particular realization of a particular instantiation of a particular pragmeme") and the practs ("instantiated individual pragmatic acts", "a particular pragmeme in its realizations"). Capone (2016: xviii-xix) considers that conventionality of language use represents the basis of pragmemes, forms "entrenched in cultural traditions". A pragmeme has to be contextualized in the social praxis of a culture (Capone 2016: xxii).

The norms for the interpretation of pragmemes come from a societal perspective on language (Capone 2005: 1358). Mey considers the communicative situation a "societal context", which includes the participants and their 'worlds' (at a local, social, or even global level): "The situation in which a particular utterance occurs (or does not/cannot occur, due to situational restrictions) determines its uptake, and even its understanding (or misunderstanding)" Mey (2016a: 120). One should not overlook the dynamicity of

[2] "The pragmeme captures a function from user to user, from user to the world, and vice versa; as such, it is a pragmatic function, establishing and warranting a particular pragmatic act. The pragmeme is thus the embodied realization of all the pragmatic acts (or 'allopracts') that can be subsumed under it" (Mey 2016b: 139). For the apparent synonymy between the allopract and the pract see Vasilescu's (2016: 323) observation: "allopracts are the actual units of communication, i.e. real utterances of real speakers addressing real interlocutors in unique, unrepeatable real life situations. If my reading is correct, J.L. Mey placed pragmemes on an abstract level, practs on an intermediate level of abstraction between the abstract pragmeme and the concrete allopracts, and allopracts on the immediately perceptual empirical level".

[3] We consider that Wong (2016) proposed an equivalent, *alloprag,* that matches the analogy better than the *allopract*: "Such pragmemic variations could be called alloprags, the pragmatic analogues of allophones, allomorphs and allolexes. Thus, the acts of saying 'hello' and of saying 'how are you' can be considered alloprags of the same pragmeme of greeting" (Wong 2016: 580).

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

communication and the active relationship between individuals and societal conditions (Kecskes 2010: 2890), the speaker and the hearer being equally involved in interaction[4].

A point emphasised among others by Norrick (2016), influenced by Pike's tagmemics (1967), is that the "socio-cultural speech event always precedes and defines the local speech act" (Norrick 2016: 151). As a result, the force of a pragmeme (as "filler" in an interaction) is determined by its position ("slot"): "the force of the pragmatic unit is determined by its cultural, contextual slot. Participants in interaction do not begin with a literal reading and then derive a contextual force from it via inference but vice versa" (Norrick 2016: 165). A more detailed approach based on the same idea appears in Vasilescu (2016), while the view is indirectly echoed by Fetzer's (2016) suggestions of considering the role of different discourse units as macro, meso and micro pragmemes that have actualizations in macro, meso and micro practs[5].

There are several proposals for defining, identifying or differentiating pragmemes and allo/practs. For instance, Wong (2016) defines a pragmeme considering three parameters: the motivation, the dictum and the illocutionary effect. For A. Fetzer (2016: 260), in order to count as a pract attached to a pragmeme, a discursive unit needs illocutionary force, content and textual meaning. Vasilescu (2016) proposes a frame for differentiating synonymous practs: "(i) the propositional content design; (ii) the problem-solving mode; (iii) relationship projection; (iv) communicative attitude projection; (v) perspective projection; (vi) stance projection; (vii) social validation" (Vasilescu 2016: 317). In the next section, some of these ideas will be presented in more detail, and we shall try to combine some of the theoretical suggestions in our frame of analysis.

2.2. Greetings

Greetings are considered by J.L. Austin and J. Searle, in the traditional speech act theory, behabitives or expressives, respectively. In J. Searle's theoretical frame, greetings have no propositional content, no sincerity condition, and their essential rule is the following: "the utterance indicates courteous recognition of the hearer" (Searle 1965, *apud* Alexandrescu 2001: 367).

Following Capone's observations (2005: 1357), greeting could be seen as a pragmeme whose goal is to bring interactional effects such as social gratification or rights/obligations and social bonds (depending on the historical and social evolution).

[4] See J.L. Mey (2016a: 116): "Contemporary developments in speech act theorizing starts out from the assumption that not just the speaker, but also the hearer(s) is (are) involved essentially in the act's co-creation, both essentially, as to the original intention (its 'illocutionary point') and existentially, with regard to the ultimate result (its 'perlocutionary effect'). The reason is that all use of language is an interactionally situated, pragmatic phenomenon, not something that solely belongs to one of the agents involved, the speaker". See also Kecskes's view influenced by Relevance Theory: "Speaker's intention is expressed in lexical items whose selection is affected not only by recipient design but also by speaker's egocentrism governed by salience. Salience, which operates subconsciously and automatically, may affect word selection and utterance formation just like recipient design" (Kecskes 2016: 6).

[5] For example, some conversational routines – "meso pragmemes, such as opening and closing sections, can also be realized as generalized meso practs, for instance 'how are you?', 'how are you doing?', 'how nice to see you', or 'it was so good to see you, we must meet again some time', 'give us a call when you're in town' or 'keep in touch' for mundane spoken interaction" (Fetzer 2016: 255).

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

As far as greetings are concerned, the illocutionary force indicating devices (IFIDs) are both verbal and nonverbal, or, in PAT's terms, the allopracts are verbal, nonverbal or mixed. Our understanding of verbal and nonverbal illocutionary force indicating devices starts with some of Austin's considerations. Displaying feelings or attitudes towards an interlocutor could be nonverbal, manifested by conventional or ritual gestures and postures. Austin mentioned gestures among IFIDs. Some conventional, autonomous gestures could be considered illocutionary mechanisms (Payrató 2009: 175). Gestures are not simple language accessories, but actions in themselves, reflecting interactional strategies (Heeschen *et al.* 1980: 141 *apud* Payrató 2009: 176). In J.L. Mey's PAT, gestures[6] are important too: "As integral parts of pragmemes, body moves are naturally part of, and may naturally represent, the whole pragmatic act which realizes a particular pragmeme" (Mey 2001: 227). In an article dealing with silence in literary texts, Kurzon also states that the allopracts corresponding to a particular pragmeme could be verbally and even non-verbally expressed (Kurzon 2016: 268).

Farese (2015) emphasizes the fact that greetings do have a meaning (a propositional content)[7], which consists mainly in attitudes and feelings: "a given "greeting" is carefully chosen by speakers of different languages because they are aware that it conveys a particular meaning and decide, accordingly, whether or not to express such a meaning is appropriate to the situation" (Farese 2015: 1). For his demonstration, Farese uses the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM, developed by Goddard and Wierzbicka 1994, 2002), a tool whose advantages and disadvantages are acknowledged (Farese 2015: 3-4): on the one hand, NSM is a "culturally neutral tool", a set of semantic primes shared by all languages, and on the other hand, the limitations come from the limited vocabulary and grammar (which lead to lengthy, complex, time-consuming descriptions). Farese makes a comparison between the English *hi* and the Italian *ciao* in order to demonstrate that they are not equivalent. The frame offered involves four common parameters: WHAT I WANT TO SAY TO YOU NOW, WHY I WANT TO SAY IT (the reason), HOW I WANT TO SAY IT (the dimension/length of the greeting), HOW I THINK ABOUT YOU WHEN I SAY THIS (the attitude of the speaker, the interpersonal relationship speaker-addressee), and an additional one, applying only to *ciao* – WHAT I FEEL WHEN I SAY THIS (emotional aspects) (Farese 2015: 4). Unlike *hi* (that could be used also to greet a superior), the use of *ciao* seems to derive from an equal position/status speaker-addressee ('this someone is someone like me'): it could be only the desired projection of an attitude, not a real stance[8]. *Ciao* involves for the Italian

[6] Or – more generally – nonverbal action: "our situationally determined actions need not be solely or primarily language-determined or language-oriented. The words, or in general, the linguistic expression taken by itself, may in certain cases be completely or partially expendable" (Mey 2016a: 121).

[7] "(…) this paper questions the assumption that they are devoid of semantic content. This study is aimed at showing that forms of address and ''greetings'' convey a paraphrasable interactional meaning (Wierzbicka, 1992) consisting of expressed attitudes and feelings" (Farese 2015: 1).

[8] "It is important to clarify that I am not arguing that the people saying *Ciao Gianni*, or *ciao, ci vediamo dopo* (*ciao, see you later*) actually consider the interlocutor as 'someone like me', but that this is the attitude they express in saying *Ciao*. Some Italian speakers would probably object to this component because *Ciao* can also be said to children. Again, this does not mean that an adult usually thinks about the child as 'someone like me', but that they choose to relate to the child in this way in that particular exchange. Even when an adult has never seen a child before they could say *Ciao* to that child and talk to the child as if the two knew each other well and as if they were 'peers'" (Farese 2015: 12).

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

speakers "some kind of "warm" feeling towards the interlocutor, captured with a component 'when I say this, I feel something good towards you'" (Farese 2015: 13), while for *hi* the situation is different[98].

The description of *ciao* in Italian, according to Farese, is the following (we cite it as this greeting also appears in the Romanian corpus and it could allow for a parallel):

> Ciao (Gianni, maestra,*Professoressa,*SignorRossi)
> [A] WHAT I WANT TO SAY TO YOU NOW
> I want to say something good to you now
> [B] WHY I WANT TO SAY IT
> I want to say it because I want to do something
> like people often do when it is like this:
> they can see someone somewhere for a short time
> they can say something to this someone during this time
> they couldn't say this to this someone today [m] before
> [C] HOW I WANT TO SAY IT
> I want to say it in a short time
> [D] HOW I THINK ABOUT YOU WHEN I SAY IT
> when I say it, I think about you
> like I can think about someone if I know this someone well
> at the same time I think about you like this: ''this someone is someone like me''
> [E] WHAT I FEEL WHEN I SAY IT
> when I say it, I feel something good towards you (Farese 2015: 14)

We could try to map these categories with Vasilescu's (2016) allopracts differentiating factors: WHAT I WANT TO SAY TO YOU NOW would map the propositional content design, WHY I WANT TO SAY IT – the problem-solving mode, HOW I THINK ABOUT YOU WHEN I SAY THIS – the relationship, communicative attitude, perspective and stance projections, together with social validation, and WHAT I FEEL WHEN I SAY THIS – the affective domain of stance. The attitude parameter (we use attitude as a cover term for relationship, perspective, stance) allows the identification of various situational identities[10], but more importantly it seems instrumental in differentiating allopracts.

J. Wong (2016) partially describes the pragmeme of greeting using also the Natural Semantic Metalanguage. The author illustrates the speech act/pragmeme of greeting based on the English routines (for example, 'How are you?', 'good morning', 'hi', 'hey' and 'yo'[11]), that, although present different forms or meanings, share the same function (Wong

[9] Some of the differences between *hi* and *ciao*: while *hi* could be used only at the beginning of an exchange, *ciao* can be used both in initial and final position; *hi* could be repeated to the same addressee during the same day, while *ciao* is impossible to repeat; *hi* involves something good said 'in a very short time', *Ciao* – something good said 'in a short time' (Farese 2015: 15).

[10] "Situational identity is the identity an individual constructs for himself/herself in a specific situation of interaction at a particular moment by selecting and combining features of his/her available identities […] adequate for that particular interaction" (Vasilescu 2016: 308-309).

[11] "To use an example, in an informal context, one could greet someone by saying 'hello' or 'how are you' (i.e. in free variation). However, in a formal and perhaps archaic British context, one might say 'how do you do' (i.e. complementary distribution), which is not something one would say in an informal situation. Such pragmemic variations could be called alloprags […] of the same pragmeme of greeting" (Wong 2016: 579–580).

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

2016: 575). Wong proposes three parameters (the motivation, the dictum and the illocutionary effect), but only the first two are used in the description of the pragmeme of greeting.

Wong focuses on the dictum parameter, stating that: "the dictum is something that is considered representative of a speech act and has to be compatible with all the different ways the speech act could be performed" (Wong 2016: 576). That means that all the allopracts share a core meaning. For the pragmeme of greeting, the dictum includes a semantic component: 'I want to say something good to you now' (Wong 2016: 576; Farese 2015: 9), which is nevertheless common to other "positive" oriented pragmemes – wishes, compliments, praises, etc. (only the motivation and the illocutionary effect parameters would be different).

In our view, the parameter of motivation – as described by Wong – stands for a combination between the essential condition and the preparatory conditions as presented by Searle (1965):

> Someone X greeted someone Y =
> ('motivation')
> Someone X said something to someone Y
> because this someone X wanted this someone Y to feel something good.
> Before this someone X said it, they had not seen this someone Y for some time.
> ('dictum')
> This someone X said it with some words.
> These words said something like this:
> 'I see you now.
> I feel something good now because of this.
> I say something to you now.
> I want you to feel something good now because of this' (Wong 2016: 576)

Indeed, in Wong's presentation, the motivation offers the information about the context, thus mapping Searle's preparatory conditions. It also maps WHY I WANT TO SAY IT (Farese 2015) and the problem-solving mode (Vasilescu 2016). The dictum covers a psychological state and the way to express it: "When the greeter sees the addressee, they feel something good and say something because they want the addressee to feel something good" (Wong 2016: 577). The dictum could map the WHAT I WANT TO SAY TO YOU NOW and WHAT I FEEL WHEN I SAY IT parameters (Farese 2015) and the propositional content design together with the affective domain of stance (Vasilescu 2016). The parameter concerned with attitude has no equivalent in Wong's description.

The third parameter proposed by Wong is the illocutionary effect – "what the addressee is expected to think after the speech actor has articulated the dictum" (Wong 2016: 577). The ideal situation, a successful speech act, involves an addressee who thinks what is expected from him to think[12] (of course the speaker could predict the uptake of the addressee and his expectations, see Vasilescu 2016: 313). This parameter has no match in

[12] The Austinian or Searlean metalanguage is sometimes fuzzily used. See for instance the need to define a syntagm: "The term 'perlocutionary intention' is shorthand for an illocutionary intention to have the hearer/reader recognize the illocutionary point of the utterance (the message) in order to achieve a certain perlocutionary (cognitive/behavioural) effect" (Allan 2016: 77). We consider that this definition of the 'perlocutionary intention' is equivalent to Wong's 'illocutionary effect'.

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

Farese's (2015) model of description. We shall use the parameters proposed by Farese (2015) and add the illocutionary effect parameter (Wong 2016) in order to capture the characteristics of various Romanian allopracts (slightly or loosely adapting the NSM norms).

Another aspect under focus is the importance of culture: in performing a pragmeme, the participant observes the culture rules, as "an inappropriate use of a pragmeme could potentially lead to confusion or cultural misunderstanding" (Wong 2016: 580). In addition to this, cultural norms are diachronically variable, prone to changes (Wong 2016: 581).

2.3. Greetings as ritual/conventional forms

According to Kádár (forth.), rituals develop through intracultural and/or intercultural appropriation in order to accommodate socio-historical changes in a culture/society. A ritual is a repetitive action re-affirming by its performance the ideology of a relational network or of a society. M. Terkourafi and D. Kádár (2017) draw a comparison between convention and ritual based on several parameters: the audience, noticedness, spatio-temporal coordinates, recurrence, normativity and formality-sequentiality. Conventions and rituals have in common recurrence, normativity (for active participants) and formality-sequentiality, which differentiate them from other practices. But there are also differences between the two: while conventions do not need a public, rituals work for a real or imaginary public; conventional behaviours are noticed by outsiders, while rituals imply acknowledgment by the participants (and not necessarily by outsiders); conventional behaviours have no space or temporal restrictions, while rituals require special circumstances.

Ritualization involves two interconnected stages: on the one hand, the metadiscourse about an interactional behaviour (Kádár and Haugh 2013), on the other hand, adopting and repeating a behaviour within a group or society. D. Kádár (forth.) considers that ritualization begins to conventionalise when the behaviour's importance no longer appears in metadiscourse, i.e. conventionalisation equals losing prominence (Terkourafi 2001).

Capone has noticed the connection between ritualized actions and standardized forms: "The interesting thing about ritualized actions and their contextual interpretations is their standardized form; most of the time, even slight variations are not permitted. It is one deficiency of speech act theory to have failed to notice that ritualized actions take on ritual shapes, and that anything that departs from this ritual shape takes on a different significance" (Capone 2005: 1364).

Intercultural appropriation (Kádár forth.) means the adoption by a society of rituals belonging to another society, while making sure that the adopted rituals are inter/culturally adequate. Studying this intercultural appropriation and the ritualization that could emerge in interaction in a new cultural setting reveals both the complexity of the intercultural contact and the historical sociopragmatic characteristics of a ritual (Kádár forth.).

If greetings (i.e., allopracts) could be seen as manifestations of a social ritual or convention (due to the distinct slot they fill in interaction), then it is interesting to analyse the situations when members of a culture adopt allopracts or even pragmemes from another culture and the way they are adapted to a new environment. In the Romanian culture there are various cases of allopracts' "adoption", in different time periods, due to the historical-social factors. The analysis will present some cases in which the participants are aware of the difference in ritual shape and try to bridge the gap with reasonable and coherent explanations for the readers or addressees.

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

3. DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis presents some nonverbal and verbal allopracts, sketching a cultural profile starting with the 16th century. The data analysis focuses mainly on interactions between Romanian participants (regardless of the region they come from): when greeting, the participants sometimes use gestures or formulae borrowed from different cultures or languages and adapt them to the Romanian cultural frame (we label this type of situation intracultural setting). We shall also consider interactions between Romanians and foreigners, mostly in official settings, when the Romanians try to act according to the expectations of their addressees, using gestures or formulae specific to the addressee's culture or cultural area (we label this type of situation intercultural setting).

3.1. Intercultural setting

The intercultural interactions excerpted from the corpus reveal mainly official, court settings. The interactants are, mostly, Romanian and Ottoman officials; rarely in the 17th, more frequently from the 18th century on, the interactants are Romanians and representatives of a Western/central European power. The greetings performed result from a complicated calculus, according to the status of the receiver (Constantinescu 2015a).

Some of the greetings used in the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries are adopted from the Ottoman world (intercultural appropriation). One such greeting gesture is a type of bowing called *temenea* (< Tk. *temenna*, DLR s.v.); the gesture is polyfunctional, frequently mentioned as a greeting or leave-taking form. Another gesture is the kissing of the Sultan's or of an Ottoman official's foot, as well as kissing the lower part of his clothing (we present bellow some of our findings from Constantinescu 2016).

Ceremonial literature from the Phanariot period records the appropriate greetings to a khan (< tc. *hăn*) or to a pasha (Gheorgachi, 34v-35r). Self-humility in greetings is mandatory for a vassal prince. Not only the prince has to perform the gesture of kissing the khan's foot, but also the noblemen must imitate the behaviour both in the initial phase and at the end of the meeting. The author insists on the performance of the behaviour in official settings, for high rank participants. The gesture is appropriated from the Ottoman culture and performed according to the expectations of the guest. The examples attest the importance of social norms, the importance of recognizing the superior status of the interlocutor. A participant with a rich experience in intercultural interactions recognises the ritualistic/conventional gestures of different cultures; thus he could choose the type of performance adequate both to his/her purposes and to the interlocutor's expectations. Some relevant examples could be excerpted from the memoirs of Ianache Văcărescu regarding his mission at the Imperial Court in Vienna (Ist Oth, 16v).

Humilitas had been for centuries a key value in premodern Europe (Kohnen 2008, Held 2010, Culpeper and Demmen 2011), and – in some regions – it remained a value even in the (early) modern period. Conventional gestures and formulae are means of self-presentation and maintaining self-image (Bax 2011). Through his adequate behaviour, *ego* acknowledges and re-attests both his social status and that of *alter* (Constantinescu 2015b); there is a necessity of maintaining a balance between glorifying the superior and self-humility from the inferior. The s*tatu-quo* is maintained with a transparent and fix hierarchy (Bax 2011: 275; Palander-Collin 2009: 264).

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

Turkish gestures are performed also in the 19th century, in special court settings, in the presence of an Ottoman official (see Lăcusteanu's memoirs regarding an official visit of the ruling prince of Wallachia south of the Danube, discussed in Constantinescu 2016): the ritualistic behaviour involves three bows from each participant, but the amplitude of the bow depends on the inferior-superior relationship: the Romanian prince is a vassal to the sultan, while the pasha or the vizier is the representative of the sultan, thus a superior. The gesture is re-enacted only in the presence of a representative of the culture from which the gesture had been adopted. The prince's gesture in the first half of the 19th century, interculturally appropriated in the previous centuries, became historicized for the readers in the second half of the 19th century due to the modernization of the Romanian society and to the rapid appropriation of Western behaviours.

A description of the nonverbal allopract *temenea* or *plecăciune* involves a change in the frame: the verb 'say' should be replaced by 'show'; the allopract is performed both at the beginning and at the end of the interaction; for the HOW I THINK ABOUT YOU… parameter, there are two possibilities: if the social status is equal – 'this someone is someone like me', but more likely there is a social imbalance – 'this someone is not someone like me, this someone is my superior'; as regards WHAT I FEEL… parameter, it could be less salient, especially when the addressee is a social superior (we cannot hypothesise the psychological state of a person showing his/her social inferiority in the premodern or early modern period); as for the WHAT I WANT YOU TO THINK parameter, it could be understood that the speaker shows an observance of the social norms, abides by the rules and acts according to the expectations of his/her superior/equal; if the addressee is a superior, then the glorification of the addressee is simultaneous with the initiator's humility.

3.2. Intracultural settings

According to the corpus, in intracultural settings from the 16th-17th centuries, there are several ways of expressing greetings, enacting verbal and nonverbal allopracts. Bowing was an important nonverbal allopract – *închinăciune*, from *a se închina* (inherited from Lat. *inclinare*), or *plecăciune*, from *a (se) pleca* (Lat. *plicare*), or *temenea* (< Tk. *temenna*) (DA s.v., DLR s.v.) – mainly when greeting a social superior. The gesture of bowing, accompanied by removing one's hat, was followed by kissing the lower part of the outfit of a social superior (the gesture of the prince in the presence of an Ottoman official spread in the Romanian society of the 18th-early 19th century). The nonverbal allopracts still in use in the present-day Romanian society involve only head movements (bows are perceived as old-fashioned). In what follows, the presentation focuses only on verbal allopracts.

3.2.1. *Ziua bună – bună ziua*

In the chronicles, the most frequently used leave-taking formula is „ziua bună" (Engl. "good day"); it is frequently mentioned in a phrase functioning as a speech act formula – *a-şi lua ziua bună* (Engl. "to take one's leave"). As many greetings have a similar form both in initiating and ending an interaction (greetings related to the time frame), it could be presumed that the initial greeting was also „ziua bună" (Engl. "good day"). This form of greeting is still in use in rural communities. The present-day „bună ziua" (Engl. "good day"), although has the same lexical components as the old greeting, changed the order of the adjective and noun, placing the adjective in front of the noun, as

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

the French and Italian equivalent greetings (*bonjour*, *buongiorno*), and unlike the standard word order in Romanian (noun – adjective).

A description of the pract *bună ziua/ziua bună* in present-day Romanian involves the consideration of various allopracts: a) a common aspect is that the allopract is performed both at the beginning and at the end of the interaction; b) for the HOW I THINK ABOUT YOU… parameter, there are several possibilities: if the social status is equal – 'this someone is someone like me', someone that the speaker knows a little or someone that the speaker knows well, but he/she wants to show distance from that person; if there is an official context – 'this someone is not someone like me'; c) as regards the WHAT I FEEL… parameter, it could be less salient in official contexts or if the addressee is less known, but the parameter could be extremely salient if the addressee is someone well known by the speaker and a person of equal social status (it will imply 'coldness', 'distant attitude'); d) for the WHAT I WANT YOU TO THINK parameter, it could be seen as follows: the speaker wants to observe the norms and expects that the addressee is aware of that; in some situations, the observance of norms is accompanied by the intention to maintain distance ('I'm distant to you').

As a greeting, „ziua bună" is rarely used in mid-19th century prose or plays; it usually appears in the lines of low rank characters. The corresponding French formula is frequently used by members of the social elite or by those imitating it:

(1)	Iorgu: *Bonjour*, cucoană Zoiță; *bonjour*, cucoane Agamemnon; de mult nu am avut norocire să vă văd. (VA T2, 42)	Iorgu: *Bonjour*, Mrs. Zoiță, *bonjour*, Mr. Agamemnon; it has been a while since I had the happiness of seeing you.
(2)	Cu toți (către Caragiali): *Bonjur*. Caragiali: *Bonjur*! Însă *puțin îmi pasă de ziuă, poate fi cât de bună şi cât de rea*; dar noaptea! (PND, 157–158)	Everyone (to Caragiali): *Bonjour*. Caragiali: *Bonjour*! *I couldn't care less about the day, it could be as good or as bad as it can be*, but the night!
(3)	Tarsița (cu dragoste): *Bonjour*, Lențo... Vin' să te sărut, îngeraşule... (...) Elena: *Bonjour*, cucoană Tarsiță... (VA T2, 321)	Tarsița (lovingly): *Bonjour*, Lența... Let me kiss you, little angel... (...) Elena: *Bonjour*, Mrs. Tarsița…

This greeting, in Romanian, French, Italian and other Romance languages, originates from a wish: for example, in French, *bon jour* "happy/favourable day" (TLFi s.v.). See Caragiali's answer playing upon the interference greeting-wish, by decomposing the greeting in a wish: „puțin îmi pasă de *ziuă*, poate fi cât de *bună* şi cât de rea" ("I couldn't care less about the *day*, it could be as *good* or as bad as it can be"). Studies dedicated to greetings show that many formulae have their origin in wishes (of good health, for example), some influenced by the religious life (see Grzega 2008 for English; Pietreanu 1984 for Romanian).

A description of the allopract *bonjour* in the situations quoted above highlights: a) an equal social status – 'this someone is someone like me'; b) HOW I WANT TO SAY IT – the speaker wants to convey a modern stance (a person open to Western values); c) WHAT I FEEL… parameter – it implies 'warmth' (affection); d) WHAT I WANT YOU TO THINK parameter could be seen as follows: the speaker wants to say something good to the

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

addressee following the socially accepted norms of conduct among equals sharing the same openness to Western cultural values.

In Romanian, another greeting related to the time frame is *a pohti noapte bună* (in our examples, it is present both in dialogue and in narrative sequences):

(4)	– Domnule, *am cinste să-ți poftesc noapte bună*. (K OI, 41)	– Sir, *I have the honour of bidding you good night*.
(5)	Atunce fieştecare îşi ia pălăria şi, *poftindu-şi noapte bună*, se duce la casa sa şi câteodată la casa altuia. (K OI, 93)	Then every man takes his hat and, *bidding good night*, goes home or, sometimes, to someone else's home.

At the origin of the greeting is a wish, marked by a performative verb *a pofti* (meaning 'to wish'), as it could be seen from the speech act formula (*poftindu-şi noapte bună* "bidding good night") or from the extended formula (*am cinste să-ți poftesc noapte bună* "I have the honour of bidding you good night").

3.2.2. *Greetings-wishes*

Some forms of greetings (equivalent to the English "welcome") occur in specific adjacency pairs of wishes, in use in present-day Romanian (a conversational routine). The examples, very frequent in the 19th century corpus, could have been the old forms of greeting:

(6)	Bumbaşârul: *Bine ai venit sănătos*, preasfinte părinte. Ce mai veste dă la Bucureşti? Episcopul: *Bine v-am găsit* pă toți *sănătoşi*, fiii mei, nici eu nu mai ştiu ce să vă mai spui. (ITR, 97)	The tax gatherer: *Welcome (in good health)*, your grace. What news from Bucharest? The bishop: *Good to find you in good health*, my sons. I no longer know what to tell you.
(7)	– *Buna vreme*, arhon şatrar! – *Bine te-am găsit*, cuconaşule! (PRR, 110)	– *Hello (good day)*, arhon! – *Good to find you*, young lord!
(8)	Afin: Ce minune!... Cucoana Chiriţa? Chiriţa: Cucoana Nastasiica! Afin: *Bine-ai venit.* Chiriţa: *Bine-am găsit*. (Se sărută.) (VA T1, 361)	Afin: What a surprise!... Mrs Chiriţa? Chiriţa: Mrs Nastasiica! Afin: *Welcome*. Chiriţa: *Good to find you* (They kiss)
(9)	Galuscus: *Bine-aţi venit*, fraţilor! Ve salut, salve! Ţăranii: *Bine-am găsit*, cucoane. (VA T1, 606–607)	Galuscus: *Welcome*, brothers! I salute you, salve! The peasants: *Good to find you*, sir.
(10)	[...] mulţimea strânsă acolo înconjura trăsura, cu *capetele descoperite* şi cu strigăte de: – *Să trăiţi*! Tata *îşi scotea şi el pălăria* şi li zicea: *Bine v-am găsit! Să trăiţi* şi voi cu nevestele şi copiii voştri! Dar *puneţi pălăriile în cap*! (RR, 427–428)	The crowd gathered around the carriage, *bareheaded*, shouting: – *May you live*! My father *took off his hat* and said to them: – *Good to find you! May you live* with your wives and children! But *put your hats on!*

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

Variation of elements in the adjacency pairs is minimal: *bine ai venit-bine (te/v)-am găsit* (Engl. "welcome" – lit. "good to find you"), *buna vreme-bine te-am găsit* (Engl. lit. "good time" – "good to find you") sau *să trăiți-bine v-am găsit* (Engl. lit. "may you live" – "good to find you"); only the first element of the pair varies (it is the act performed by the host), while the second element (performed by the guests) is the same. The formal wish *să trăiți* is performed by the inferiors; it is interesting to see the detailed presentation of the gestures: the peasants are bareheaded when greeting their superior; the character with a superior social status also takes off his hat when greeting them and asking that they put on their hats (taking off the hat and remaining bareheaded is a nonverbal allopract of the greeting performed by a person with a low social status to a superior).

A description of the allopracts combining greetings and wishes usually involves: a) for the HOW I THINK ABOUT YOU… parameter, the social status is equal – 'this someone is someone like me'; b) WHAT I FEEL… parameter could be salient if it evokes a good feeling produced by meeting the interlocutor; c) WHAT I WANT YOU TO THINK parameter – the speaker and the addressee emphasise the positive feelings produced by the encounter.

In the 19th century corpus, characters of a lower rank use different allopracts for leave-taking that have in common the idea of good health (as *vale* in Latin):

(11) Miron: Nu plânge, fata mea, om îmbla degrabă! *Rămâi sănătoasă*, puică! [...]
Terinte: (...) *Să te găsesc sănătoasă*, Vochițo, şi pe dumneta cumătriță. Vin', Miroane!
Domnica: *Să mergi sănătos*, bădică. Păzeşte-te pe drum. (PND, 463)

Miron: Don't cry, girl, we'll be back soon! *Take care* (lit. "stay in good health"), darling!
Terinte: (...) *Take care* (lit. "May I find you in good health"), Vochița, and you too, neighbour. Come, Miron!
Domnica: *Go with God* (lit. "go in good health"), dear. Take good care on the road.

These leave-taking allopracts are still in use, more frequently in rural communities. The allopracts also involve the communication of a 'warm' feeling towards the interlocutor and the concern of the speaker for the interlocutor's safety (WHAT I WANT YOU TO THINK parameter).

3.2.3. *Hand kissing*

One of the oldest and most frequent greetings is „sărut mâna" (Engl. lit. "I kiss your hand"). In the case of this greeting the transition from nonverbal to verbal performance is evident. Kissing a superior's hand as a way of greeting is an old practice, still in use in the mid-19th century Romanian Principalities. The ritual of kissing the hand is a tributary gesture, attested in a vast trans-European space – for example, the convention is mentioned in correspondence manuals in the Lower Countries (the Netherlands) in the 17th century (Bax 2011: 273), but also in Central and Eastern Europe, even in modern times. Pietreanu (1984: 71) considers that the formula *sărut mâna* is based on the gesture (a transition from the nonverbal to the verbal allopract), in the feudal period being influenced by the norms of suzerainty.

In the 19th century corpus, kissing the hand of a superior or of a priest is a frequently performed gesture:

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

(12) Rusetoaie: Sluga sfinţiii tale. *Dă-mi mâna să ţi-o sărut* şi mă blagosloveşte. [...]
Iancul Cocorăscul: *Sărut mâna* prea sfinţiii tale, părinte. (ITR, 69)
Lady Ruset: I'm your grace's servant. *Give me your hand to kiss* and bless me.
Iancu Cocorăscu: *I kiss your hand*, your grace.

(13) Tata îl primeşte vesel şi prieteneşte, *dându-i mâna să i-o sărute*. (IG, 192)
My father receives him cheerfully and friendly, *giving his hand to be kissed* by him.

(14) Când văzu pe domnitoriu coborându-se, se sculă maşinaliceşte şi când se apropiă *îi sărută mâna*. (Sion, 63)
When he saw the prince descending, he rose automatically and as the prince approached, *he kissed his hand*.

The 19th century corpus offers also the possibility to detect comments on the disappearance or loss in frequency of the gesture from the family sphere or from the relationship between inferior-superior:

(15) Legăturile de familie erau în genere strânse şi bazate pe sâmţirile de dragoste între soţi şi de respect din partea copiilor către părinţi. (*Respect manifestat zilnic prin sărutatul mânii* şi prin multe mici nuanţe în obiceiuri casnice, dispărute astăzi din societate.) (VA P, 358)
Family connections were tight and based on love between spouses and on respect from the children towards their parents. (*That respect was daily shown by kissing the parents' hand* and by many small shades of deference in the household routine, nowadays obsolete).

(16) Lunătescu: [...] Las' că *nu se mai catadicsesc să ne sărute mâna ca mai-nainte* [...] (VA T2, 95)
Lunătescu: *They don't bother anymore to kiss our hand as they did before*.

(17) Neamuş (încet, către Vulpe): Văzut-ai aşa obrăznicie! *Radu n-au sărutat mâna* vărului Iorgu.
Trufandachi: Lipsa de sevas. (VA T2, 292)
Neamuş (quietly, to Vulpe): Have you ever seen such rudeness! *Radu did not kiss* cousin Iorgu's *hand*.
Trufandachi: Lack of respect.

The examples reveal divergent frames of reference between the new and old social practices, illustrating the diachronic relativity of politeness (Kádár and Haugh 2013): children stopped kissing their parents' hands, the persons with lower social status no longer kiss the hand of their superior. The observations made by Neamuş and Trufandachi (commenting on the fact that Radu, perceived by them as socially inferior to Hârzobeanu, didn't kiss his hand) reveal the new mentality of the youth educated abroad.

A new practice, under Western influence, is the kissing of a woman's hand in gallantry, verbally (a verbal allopract) or gesturally performed (nonverbal allopract):

(18) Nalbă: *Sărut mâna* matale, cucoană Caliopi (...) (VA T1, 812)
Nalbă: *Good day* (lit. "I kiss your hand"), Mrs Caliopi.

(19) Aghiotantul: *Sărut mâna*, verişoară; eşti frumoasă în astă seară ca o zână! (VA P, 87)
The officer: *Good evening* (lit. "I kiss your hand"), cousin; you are as beautiful as a fairy tonight!

(20) Alecu: Mademuasel Cati... *sărut mânile*... (Voieşte să iasă) (VA T2, 99)
Alecu: Miss Cati... *good day* (lit. "I kiss your hand") (he wants to leave)

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

We hypothesize that the transition from the nonverbal to the verbal allopract is mediated by correspondence, mainly family correspondence. There are several examples with this formula in private letters between family members, addressed to a parent or to an elder brother:

(21) Cinstită dumneata mamă, cu plecăčune *sărut cinstită măna dumitale* şi rog pre puternicul dumnezeu să dăruiască dumitale fericită sănătate înpreună cu tot binele. (27 mai 1703, ISF 1935: 10)

My honourable mother, *I humbly kiss your honourable hand* (lit. bowing, I kiss your honourable hand) and I pray the Almighty to give you good health and everything that is good.

(22) †Cinstitului, mai marelui mieu frate, dumneata neane Ştefănică, cu multă plecăciune închinându-mă dum., *sărut cinstită măna dumitale*, rugând pre mult milostivul şi atot putearnecul Dumnezeu ca să ție şi să păzească pă dumneata supt mare mila Sfinții Sale, cu întreagă sănătate, înpreună şi cu alalte toate fericiri şi norociri. (20 Sept. 1713, ISF 1935: 12)

† To my honourable elder brother, Ştefănică, I bow to you, *I kiss your honourable hand*, praying Almighty God to have you under His care and protection, in good health, together with all the other happy blessings.

(23) Cu multă fiiască plecăciune,
sărut mânile dumitale, băbacă,
Răvaşurile dumitale din 26 avgust/7 septvr. şi din 30 avgust/11 septvr. le-am primit totdată. (K SNC, 5)

With filial bowing
I kiss your hands, father,
I have received your letters from 26 August/7 September and 30 August/11 September at the same time.

(24) Cu multă fiască plecăciune, *sărut mânele* şi sunt al dumitale prè plecat şi supus fiu,
M. Kogălniceanu (K SNC, 6)

With filial bowing, *I kiss your hands* and I am your most devoted and obeying son,
M. Kogălniceanu

(25) Cu fiiască plecăciune *sărut mânile dumitale*, băbacă, şi sunt al dumitale prea plecat şi supus fiu,
Mihalaki Kogălniceanu (K SNC, 7)

With filial bowing *I kiss your hands*, father, and I am your most devoted and obeying son,
Mihalaki Kogălniceanu

Since the pressure of the norms of conduct is high even for the written greeting, the allopract transposes the gesture into words. In the early 18th century letters of our corpus, the formula appears only in the beginning of the text, while in the 19th century letters the formula is both a form of opening and closing the text.

The gesture of the hand kissing is important in some court ceremonies; for example, before their matrimony, the members of the aristocracy have to ask for the princely benediction:

(26) Cu câteva zile înainte de nuntă, dacă mirele şi mireasa erau de neam de boier, se făcea *cherofilima* (*sărutare de mână*) la curte, unde tinerii cu toate rudele lor erau duşi cu alai spre a săruta mâna lui vodă şi a doamnei, cerându-le binecuvântarea. (IG, 61)

A few days before the wedding, if the groom and bride were from the aristocracy, they performed the *cherofilima* (*hand kissing*) at the court, where the young couple with all their relatives were taken to kiss the prince's and the princess's hand, asking for their blessing.

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

V. A. Urechia (U, 98) takes part in a ceremony at the Spanish court, in Madrid. The ritual is called *besamanos* (Pietreanu 1984 mentioned that the formula „le beso la mano" stopped being used after the Middle Ages).

„Săru(t) mâna" (see also Pietreanu 1984) is used very frequently in present-day Romanian both in formal and informal settings. In formal settings, it is used as a greeting from a man to a woman[13], in direct interaction, and from a lay person to a priest (accompanied by the address form *părinte* "father"):

(27)	A: 'neața.	A: morning.
	B: *săru' mîna* ↓ bună dimineața.	B: (lit.) *I kiss your hand* ↓ good morning.
	A: ă: să vi-l prezint pe fratele meu↓ răzvan şi ei sînt colegii mei dan [udrea↓ sportu	A: a: let me introduce my brother răzvan to you ↓ and they are my colleagues dan [udrea ↓ sports
	B: [îmi pare bine	B: [nice to meet you
	A: răzvan	A: răzvan
	D: alina fechete↓ de toate (IVLRA: 86)	D: alina fechete↓ everything
(28)	A: *săru' mîna* ((către B)) dosare plic↑ # de toate neamurile↓ CUM îți trebuie. (IVLRA: 133)	A: ((addressing the lady in the shop)) (lit.) *I kiss your hand* ((to B)) files ↑ of all kinds↓ WHAT KIND of file do you need.
(29)	A: *săru' mîna*. pentru: internațional↑	A: (lit.) *I kiss your hand*. fo:r international ↑
	B: imediat vin. imediat. (IVLRA: 137–138)	B: I'll be with you in a second. in a second.
(30)	A: *sărut*_J *mîna*>↓ cosmin burlacu _J la telefon↓>_îmi cer mii de scuze↑... (IVLRA: 259)	A: (lit.) *I kiss your hand*↓ cosmin burlacu speaking↓ I apologize...

In informal settings, within the family or among neighbours or family friends, it is used by the young(er) to greet the old(er) members of the group (at any moment of the day). Sometimes it is used by (both male and female) students to address their teachers (as in the example below, B is a female student and A is a female teacher):

(31)	A: _P da ↓>	A: _P yes ↓>
	B: alo ↑	B: hello ↑
	A: _P da ↓ >	A: _P yes ↓ >
	B: *sărut mîna* ↓	B: (lit.) *I kiss your hand* ↓
	A: bună ziua.	A: good day.
	B: _¡ sînt y*** >. (IVLRA: 178)	B: _¡ I'm y*** >.

The formula is also connected with another pragmeme, that of thanking (this value is also used with older members of the family, neighbours or family friends, or informally, between friends).

[13] M. Pietreanu (1984: 71) considers that this use, due to the French and Spanish gallantry vassal relationship, was metaphorically extended to gender relationships.

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

According to Pietreanu (1984: 71-73) there are similar formulae in different Romance languages, but those formulae did not survive in premodern and modern times. Still, the formula is used in Slavic and Germanic languages in a wide area of the former Austrian or Austro-Hungarian Empire. See, for example, the germ. *Küss die Hand!* (mentioned in the memoirs of Urechia, p. 56, from mid-19th century) or Hung. "(Kezét) csókolom"[14]. According to Haumann, Koch and Sorning (2005: 86), the greeting *Küß die Hand* (addressed to ladies) is considered by present-day Austrian speakers very formal and old-fashioned.

The description of the *sărut mâna* allopracts varies both diachronically and synchronically: a) for the HOW I THINK ABOUT YOU WHEN I SAY IT parameter it is important to mention two situations: a1) 'this someone is not someone like me, this someone is my superior'; a2) a gender marked difference 'this someone is not someone like me' – the speaker is a male and the addressee is a woman; b) as regards the affective parameter, we could add 'respect' to 'I feel good towards you'; c) WHAT I WANT YOU TO THINK – "I want you to think that: I want to say something good to you, I want to say it because I want to do something that people often do in this situation, I think that you are my superior/not like me (gender bias), I feel something good towards you, I respect you".

3.2.4. *Humiliative allopracts*

In the 19th century texts a frequent formula of humility occurs when speakers address a higher social status person (see also Held 2005 for Italian; Pietreanu 1984 for Romance languages and the former Austro-Hungarian Empire):

(32)	Clevetici (închinându-se contesei): D-nă contesă, primiți omagele mele. Contesa (cu mândrie): A! d-ta eşti? Clevetici: *Al d-voastră respectuos serv...* (VA T2, 569)	Clevetici (bowing to the countess): My lady, please receive my homage. Countess (proudly): Ah! it's you? Clevetici: *I'm your (most) respectful servant...*
(33)	Vulpe (întrând prin fund): Cu buna dimineața, cucoane Nastasachi. Lipicescu (preocupat): *Sluga...* (VA T2, 308)	Vulpe (entering from the back): Good morning, Mr. Nastasachi. Lipicescu (working): (I'm) *Your servant...*

In the case of Clevetici, the formula appears as a means of perseverance, since the countess did not respond to his initial greeting. For Lipicescu it is a conventional allopract, the character being engaged in his current activities ("busy").

These humiliative allopracts are no longer in use in the 20th century or in present-day Romanian. Still, there is a pract used in Transylvania, former part of the Austrian and then Austro-Hungarian Empire, *servus*, common to the space of the former empire, with humiliative origin (which appeared maybe under religious influence); nowadays, this connotation is probably lost for its users – *servus* is probably "bleached", a simple conversational routine, with unknown origin. In Austria, *servus* is a frequent greeting, both

[14] *Csókolom,* abbreviated from *Kezét csókolom*, is considered "a rather formal greeting": "Although usually this expression is reserved for men addressing women, you will also hear children using *csókolom* with adults of either gender; adults may also use it with much older adults" (Rounds and Solyom 2014: 39).

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

in initial and final position in interactions, and sometimes it combines with other greeting formulae: for example, in leave-taking, *Grüß dich servus*, *Servus baba*, "the more intimate usually in second position" (Haumann, Koch and Sornig 2005: 86).

We have found an interesting interaction with metadiscursive comments regarding the different ways of greeting in Romania. D is from Transylvania, B is his fiancé, born and raised in the South of Romania, but living in Transylvania, while the other participants are from the South of Romania:

(34) 100. A: cum se salută↑ cu servus?
101. B: <Z servus.> SERvus↑
102. D: servus la cluj e chiar încetățenit servus /ol/ #
103. B: ăla-i chiar ungu[resc.
104. D: [ăla-i chiar unguresc servus /ol/
105. A: da' servus nu-i unguresc?
106. D: ba da.
107. B: ba da↓ ba [da.
108. D: [păi așa eram obligați noi în transilvania să salutăm servus. servus servi în[seamnă sclav
109. A: [stai un pic⊥ adică sună frumos servus.
110. B: sună frumos da'-
111. D: sună frumos dar↓
112. B: era sunt sclavul [tău.
113. D: [latinescu
114. B: <J practic.>
115. D: de la el # ## îi cam
116. B: sînt sclavu tău↓ sînt [sclavu tău↓
117. A: [a↓ să fii servil să fii umil.
118. B: <R da da da da># ## # (IV II: 365–366)

100. A: how do you greet ↑ with servus?
101. B: <Z servus.> SERvus↑
102. D: in Cluj servus is frequently used as servus /ol/ #
103. B: that's really Hunga[rian.
104. D: [that's really Hungarian servus /ol/
105. A: but servus is Hungarian isn't it?
106. D: yes.
107. B: yes↓ it [is.
108. D: [That's how we were forced to greet in Transylvania servus. servus servi [means slave
109. A: [wait a minute⊥ I mean servus sounds nice.
110. B: it sounds nice but-
111. D: it sounds nice but↓
112. B: it meant I am your [slave.
113. D: [in Latin
114. B: <J practically.>
115. D: from that # ## it's quite
116. B: I'm your slave↓ I'm [your slave↓
117. A: [a↓ to be servile to be humble.
118. B: <R yes yes yes yes># ## #

D (and B) consider that *servus* is a form of greeting borrowed from Hungarian, they seem to be unaware of the larger area of this form within the former central-European empire. They know the etymology of the greeting, the Latin noun *servus* meaning 'servant, slave', and the humiliative origin of the formula. Participant A also glosses the meaning – "să fii servil, să fii umil" ("to be servile, to be humble").

It is interesting to trace the transformation the pract underwent: from a humiliative routine, *servus* became an informal routine (the equivalent of *bună* from the other regions of Romania): a transition is clear as regards HOW I THINK ABOUT YOU WHEN I SAY IT parameter – from 'this someone is not someone like me, this someone is my superior' to 'this someone is someone like me', from a less salient affective content to 'warm' affectivity, from implying inferiority and respect to implying equality, friendship or intimacy.

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

Participant B, knowing both intracultural codes of greeting, also mentions the perception of the informal common greeting *bună* "hi" (very frequent in many regions) in Transylvania:

(35)	119. B: acolo dacă zici bună no eşti bu:nă sau	119. B: if you say there hi (lit. good) so you are goo:d or
	120. D: hha[HAHAHAhah	120. D: hha[HAHAHAhah
	121. F: [hha[HAHAHAhah	121. F: [hha[HAHAHAhah
	122. B: [hhaHAHAHAhah	122. B: [hhaHAHAHAhah
	123. C: [hhaHAHAHAhaHEHEEheheh	123. C: [hhaHAHAHAhaHEHEEheheh
	124. D: bună↓ sînt cătălina.	124. D: hi (lit. good)↓ I'm cătălina.
	125. B: # # sînt bună. (IV II: 366)	125. B: # # I'm good.

Bună originates from *bună ziua*, an elliptic form. But the adjective *bună* (Engl. "good") has some connotations: in Romanian slang it means 'sexy, hot'. The participants are aware of these connotations (see the general laughter), while B and D try to construct a fantasy scenario playing with the denotation and connotation of *bună* (lines 119, 124-125).

3.2.5. *Leave-taking*

In the 19th century Romanian created – following a French or French and Italian model – a new form of leave-taking. The form *a/la revedere* is considered a calque from French *au revoir* (Stanciu-Istrate 2006: 241–242):

(36)	Elena (întinzând mâna lui Radu): *A revedere*, amicul meu. (VA T2, 321)	Elena (holding out her hand to Radu): *Good bye*, my friend.
(37)	– *A revedere*, domnule Alexis!... îi zise ea... Spune Alinei că o sărut de o mie de ori...*A revedere*! – *A revedere*, bâigui Alexis, ameţit şi îndreptându-se spre uşă. (VA P, 495)	– *Good bye*, mister Alexis! ... she said. Tell Alina that I send her a thousand kisses...*Good bye*! – *Good bye*, mumbled Alexis, confused and heading towards the door.
(38)	Hârzobeanu: Aşa-mi place să te văd... veselă ca o garofă... *A revedere*... (VA T2, 347)	Hârzobeanu: This is how I like to see you... happy as a carnation... *Good bye*...
(39)	Nicu: [...] *La revedere*, d-le Safir; când vei avea gust să mai râzi, voi fi gata să-ţi mai dau o lecţie de scrimă. (VA T2, 273)	Nicu: [...] *Good bye*, mister Safir; when you are again looking for amusements, I'll be ready to offer you another fencing lesson.

Both Fr. *au revoir* and It. *arrivederci* derive from more complex formulae: Fr. *adieu jusqu'au revoir*; It. *addio fino a rivederci*); in these formulae, Fr. *adieu* or It. *addio* had the key role of a greeting. The final part of the formula was gradually used as a new way of greeting, developing a temporal difference (the duration of the separation from the interlocutor). In the first part of the 19th century the ever more frequent allopract for leave-taking is *adio* (< it. *addio*, fr. *adieu*, grammaticalized and pragmaticalized from expressions with religious and affective connotations: It. *vi raccomando a Dio* – TLIO, Vocabolario... Zingarelli, Enciclopedia Treccani s.v.; Fr. *(je) vous (re)commande à Dieu* – DEHF, TLFI s.v., used between close friends or family members):

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

(40)	Antohi (sculându-se): [...] *Adio!* Vă las să puneți țara la cale [...] (VA T2, 542)	Antohi (getting up): [...] *Adieu!* I leave so that you can go on with your plans.
(41)	*Adio*; ie-ți copilița pe brațe și spune-i că moșul ei are să-i aducă de giucărie pe sultanul de Maroc. (VA P, 194)	*Adieu*; take your little daughter in your arms and tell her that her uncle is going to bring her the sultan of Morocco as a toy.
(42)	Smaranda, Elenca, Luxandra: *Adie, adie*, seara bună [...] (PND, 76)	Smaranda, Elenca, Luxandra: *Adieu, adieu*, good evening.
(43)	Dimitrache: *Adie*, sărut mânușiță și mă rog nu mă uita. (PND, 64)	Dimitrache: *Adieu*, I kiss your little hand and please don't forget me.
(44)	*Adio,* domnul meu, urmă luându-și capela, ești într-o zi de spleen, nu vrei să mă înțelegi. Sunt șerbul d-tale! (CN PT, 258)	*Adieu*, dear sir, he said taking his coat, you have a day of spleen, you refuse to understand me. Your servant!
(45)	*Adieu*, poartă-te bine; este de prisos să-ți spun că aș dori să fiu în treabă împreună cu tine. Numai dacă ar vrea și alții. Al tău prietin, M. Kogălniceanu (K SNC, 23)	*Adieu*, behave yourself; it is useless to say that I would like to be with you. Only if the others would allow it. Your friend, M. Kogălniceanu
(46)	[...] încântat de vizita lui *își luă adio*, promițând de a veni – după grațioasa invitare a oaspeților – de câte ori trebile plasei îi vor da timp. (CN 2, 243)	[...] delighted by his visit *he took his adieus*, promising – after the graceful invitation of the hosts – to come again, whenever the business allows him to.
(47)	[...] a doua zi ne pornirăm la mănăstiri, dupe ce *ne luarăm adio* de la d. Oteteleșeanu, cu care veniserăm până acolo [...] (GA, 223)	[...] the next day we went to see the monasteries, after *taking our adieus* from mister Oteteleşeanu, with whom we had come.

Adio is attested for the first time in Romanian in 1821 in a translation from French (Bernardin de Saint Pierre, translated by Leon Asachi). *Adio* is explained as „obicinuită urare de ziua bună, ce însemnează rămâi în paza lui Dumnezeu" ('common wish of good day which means may God protect you', Ursu and Ursu 2004: 205). At the beginning, the formula is similar to *a/la revedere*. In time, it develops different values regarding the duration of the separation. *La revedere* is very frequently used as a leave-taking allopract in present-day Romanian.

It is obvious that the HOW I WANT TO SAY IT parameter changed in time for these allopracts: in the early and mid-19th century it involved 'I adopt a modern stance (I am a person open to Western values)', an implication lost starting with late 19th century. Another change for this parameter: it seems that at first *adio* was more frequent due to its shorter form. When the two routines differentiated thanks to the 'duration of separation' aspect, this length condition lost its prominence.

3.2.6. *The most recent verbal allopracts*

Probably in the second half of the 20th century Romanian borrowed the greeting *ciao* (a form of intercultural appropriation) from Italian. The allopract is used both in the initial phase of an interaction and as a leave-taking formula (like in Italian, see Farese 2015):

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

(48)	A: bună c***↓ CE faci. B: *cia:u* d***: bine uite sunt aca:să↓ [...] (IVLRA: 171)	A: hi c***↓ how are you. B: *cia:o* d***: fine well I'm at home↓
(49)	A: (succes) B: electromecanică↓ A: da. multă baftă. B: mersi la fel. A: *ciao.* B: *ciao.* (IVLRA: 229)	A: (good luck) B: electromecanics↓ A: yes. good luck. B: thanks the same to you. A: *ciao.* B: *ciao.*
(50)	A: (ia s-asculți aicea)↓ da? B: da A*: ciao*. trei_[unu_doi B: [la reveDEre. +A: nouă_trei şapte_patru [trei_unu_trei trei_şapte patru_trei. (IVLRA: 230-231)	A: (so stay tuned)↓ ok? B: yes A*: ciao*. three_[one_two B: [good bye. +A: nine_three seven_four [three_one_three three_seven four_three.
(51)	A: ((rîde)) <Z bine florina> E: te-am pupat. [la revedere. A: [<Z *ciao*>. (IVLRA: 232)	A: ((laughs)) <Z ok florina> E: kisses. [good bye. A: [<Z *ciao*>.

Ciao in used as an informal greeting, mainly by young speakers; it conveys familiarity (*ciao* is also used in Austria, for instance, being considered "quite popular (among intimates)", Haumann, Koch and Sornig 2005: 86). For the Romanian speakers, the origin of this form is probably unknown. They are aware that it is Italian, but they surely ignore the connection with *servus*: *ciao* originates in the Veneto dialect, from the medieval Latin *sclavus*; the humiliative formula was used mainly among friends. The form was spread in the north of Italy in late 19th-early 20th century. What differentiates the use of *ciao* in Romanian from its original use in Italian (as presented by Farese 2015) is the HOW I WANT TO SAY IT parameter: a Romanian speaker wants to promote a certain self-image of a modern, original, self-confident, playful and open to Western values person.

More recently, young speakers use an allopract borrowed from English:

(52)	A: /*HElău*/↓ B: salut. A: CE faci. B: uite↓ îmi cer ăştia de la doctorat↓ dosar plic↓ cu clape. (IVLRA: 33)	A: *hello* ↓ B: hi. A: how are you. B: look↓ the doctoral school administrative team requires↓ a file folder ↓ with fold-up flaps.

involving the same desire to promote a cosmopolitan self-image. Through *ciao* and *hello* (maybe the observations also apply to *bonjour* in the 19th century), the speaker is not concerned only with conveying a 'I want to say something good to you now' meaning, but rather with emphasizing a self-image and promoting interpersonal relationships based on the valorisation of cultural openness.

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

4. FINAL REMARKS

As a pragmeme, a greeting is an utterance whose goal varies across time: in the premodern and also at the beginning of the modern Romanian society the goal of a greeting is both to produce social gratification and to highlight the obligations of social inferiors towards their superiors, in a rigid hierarchy, where the social position is clearly marked and assumed by interactants. According to our corpus, the preferred allopracts in this case are mainly nonverbal, the gestures and postures being more important than the verbal allopracts. When the hierarchy gradually begins to lose its rigidity – in a sense of gradual democratisation –, greetings produce social gratification and social bonds (this accounts for the various verbal allopracts in use in present-day Romanian), or even promote a type of self-image. In the transition from marking social obligations to marking social bonds (especially, closeness, familiarity), some ritual forms have become conventionalized, obscuring their humiliative original meaning.

At the same time, in the Romanian culture, one can notice a specific readiness for intercultural appropriation – influenced by the relationship with the addressee – and the ability to discern the adequate behaviour adopted from another culture according to the interlocutor, to the interpersonal relationship and to the goals of the performer. From a sociopragmatic point of view gestures or posture could indicate an act that can also have a verbal realization, but at some historical moments and in some intercultural interactions the nonverbal realization is preferred.

Four parameters seem important for describing the allopracts of greeting: HOW I WANT TO SAY IT, HOW I THINK ABOUT YOU…, WHAT I FEEL… and WHAT I WANT YOU TO THINK. As regards the HOW I WANT TO SAY IT parameter, the analysis reveals that the length of the greeting is less important than the desire of the speaker to emphasize a self-image and to promote a type of interpersonal relationship based on the valorisation of cultural openness: he/she wants to convey a modern stance, to present him-/herself as a modern, original, self-confident, playful person, open to Western values (an image he/she projects also on the addressee). This behaviour is illustrated by the use of *bonjour*, *la revedere*, *adio* in the 19th century or the present-day use of *ciao* or *hello*. It is important to notice that this connotation could be lost due to frequency and generalisation of use (the case of *la revedere* and *adio*). For HOW I THINK ABOUT YOU… parameter, instrumental factors are the equality of status, the perceived superiority of the addressee or the official frame of the interaction (*bună ziua*), as well as a gender bias (*sărut mâna*). The affective parameter, WHAT I FEEL…, could be less salient in official contexts or if the addressee is less known (*bună ziua*; bowing). The parameter could be extremely salient to imply 'coldness' (to greet a well-known person with equal status with *bună ziua*) or, on the contrary, 'warmth' in the case of *bonjour*, *servus*, combining greetings and wishes, the equivalents of Lat. *vale*; 'warmth' and 'respect' in the case of *sărut mâna*. WHAT I WANT YOU TO THINK parameter allows many interpretations: the speaker wants to observe the norms and expects that the addressee is aware of that, the speaker abides by the rules and acts according to the expectations of his/her superior/equal (bowing, *bună ziua*); the observance of norms is associated with the intention to maintain distance ('I'm distant to you' – greeting a well-known person with *bună ziua*); the glorification of the addressee is simultaneous with the greeter's humility (nonverbal allopracts); the speaker wants to convey the sharing of cultural values (*bonjour*, *ciao*, *hello*); the speaker and the addressee emphasize the positive

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

feelings produced by the encounter (the combination of greetings and wishes); the speaker shows concern for the interlocutor's safety (the formulae echoing the Latin *vale*).

In time, the perception of the greeting values changes: *bonjour*, *ciao*, *servus*, *hello* are forms indicating in present-day Romanian familiarity, common ground; *bonjour* became part of the jargon, while *la revedere* and *adio* gained a strong position as leave-taking formulae. Within intracultural interactions, the variety of practs is influenced by several cultural orientations in time. The most resistant forms of greeting, *bună ziua* and *sărut mâna* have undergone a slow process of transformation: *bună ziua* changed word order following the pattern in other Romance languages; *sărut mâna* shifted from a nonverbal allopract to a verbal allopract: initially circumscribed to the private, family sphere, the greeting seems to migrate and expand in formal settings – it is used by students when addressing teachers; the greeting also enriched its sphere with the gallant use, starting probably with the 19th century. *Servus* changed from a formal into an informal routine: it shifted from a less salient affective greeting, a formula indicating the speaker's inferiority and respect towards the addressee, to a 'warm' greeting, a formula conveying equal status, friendship or intimacy.

SOURCES

CN 2 – Costache Negruzzi, *Opere*, vol. II, *Proză, poezie*, ediție critică de Liviu Leonte, Bucureşti, Minerva, 1984.

CN PT – Costache Negruzzi, Opere, vol. 1. *Păcatele tinereţelor*, ediție critică, cu studiu introductiv, comentarii şi variante de Liviu Leonte, Bucureşti, Minerva, 1974.

GA – Grigore Alexandrescu, *Poezii. Proză*, ediția a doua, text stabilit şi note de I. Fischer, antologie şi repere istorico-literare de Mircea Anghelescu, Bucureşti, Minerva, 1985.

Gheorgachi – *Literatura românească de ceremonial: condica lui Gheorgachi, 1762*, studiu şi text de Dan Simonescu, Bucureşti, Fundația Regele Carol I, 1939.

IG – Ion Ghica, Scrisori către V. Alecsandri, ediție îngrijită de Radu Gârmacea, Bucureşti, Humanitas, 2014 [volum realizat după ediția din 1887].

ISF – Nicolae Iorga, *Scrisori de familie ale vechilor Brâncoveni. Două arzuri ale ţării către sultan în secolul XVIII*, Academia română, Memoriile secțiunii istorice, seria III, tomul XVI, mem. 10, Monitorul oficial şi imprimeriile statului, 1935.

Ist Oth – Ianache Văcărescu, *Istoria othomanicească,* ediție critică, studiu introductiv, note şi glosar de Gabriel Ştrempel, Bucureşti: Editura Biblioteca Bucureştilor, 2001.

IV II – Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu (coord.), *Interacțiunea verbală* (*IV* II). *Aspecte teoretice şi aplicative. Corpus*, Bucureşti, Editura Universității din Bucureşti, 2007.

IVLRA – Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu (coord.), *Interacțiunea verbală în limba română actuală. Corpus (selectiv). Schiță de tipologie*, Bucureşti, Editura Universității din Bucureşti, 2002.

ÎTR – *Începuturile teatrului românesc*, antologie, prefață şi note de Tiberiu Avramescu, Bucureşti, Editura Tineretului, 1963.

K OI – Kogălniceanu, Mihail, *Opere*, vol. I, text stabilit, studiu introductiv, note şi comentarii de Dan Simonescu, Editura Academiei RSR, 1974.

K SNC – Kogălniceanu, Mihail, *Scrisori. Note de călătorie*, texte îngrijite, adnotate şi prezentate de Augustin Z.N. Pop şi Dan Simonescu, Bucureşti, Editura pentru Literatură, 1967.

L – *Amintirile colonelului Lăcusteanu*, text integral, stabilit după manuscris, text stabilit, note şi indici de Rodica Pandele Peligrad, prefață de Mircea Anghelescu, Iaşi, Polirom, 2015.

PND – *Primii noştri dramaturgi*, ediție îngrijită şi glosar de Al. Niculescu; antologie, studiu introductiv şi note biobibliografice de Fl. Tornea, colecția Scriitori români. Bucureşti, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură şi Artă, 1960.

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

PRR – *Pionierii romanului românesc*, antologie, text stabilit, note şi prefaţă de Şt. Cazimir. Bucureşti, Editura pentru literatură, 1962.
RR – Radu Rosetti, *Amintiri. Ce am auzit de la alţii. Din copilărie. Din prima tinereţe*, Bucureşti, Humanitas, 2013.
Sion – G. Sion, *Suvenire contimpurane*, ediţie integrală, Iaşi, Polirom, 2014.
U – V.A. Urechia, *Din tainele vieţei. Amintiri contimporane (1840-1882)*, Iaşi, Polirom, 2014.
VA P – Vasile Alecsandri, *Opere*, vol. IV *Proză*, text ales şi stabilit, note şi variante de Georgeta Rădulescu-Dulgheru, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1974
VA T1 – Vasile Alecsandri, *Opere*, V, *Teatru*. Text ales şi stabilit, note şi comentarii de Georgeta Rădulescu-Dulgheru. Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1977.
VA T2 – Vasile Alecsandri, *Opere*, vol. VI *Teatru*. Text ales şi stabilit, note şi comentarii de Georgeta Rădulescu-Dulgheru. Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1979.

REFERENCES

Alexandrescu, V. (ed.), 2001, *Pragmatique et théorie de l'énonciation*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.
Allan, K., 2016, "The Pragmeme of Insult and Some Allopracts", in: K. Allan, A. Capone, I. Kecskes (eds), *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*, Springer International Publishing, 69–84.
Allan, K., A. Capone, I. Kecskes (eds), 2016, *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*, Springer International Publishing.
Austin, J.L., 2003 [1962], *Cum să faci lucruri cu vorbe*, traducere de S. Corneanu, prefaţă de V. Alexandrescu, Bucureşti, Editura Paralela 45.
Bax, M., 2011, "An evolutionary take on (im)politeness: Three broad developments in the marking out of socio-proxemic space", *Understanding Historical (Im)Politeness*, Special issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, M. Bax and D. Z. Kádár (eds), 12, 1/2, 255–282.
Capone, A., 2005, "Pragmemes (a study with reference to English and Italian)", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 9, 1355–1371.
Capone, A., 2016, "Introducing the Notion of the Pragmeme", in: K. Allan, A. Capone, I. Kecskes (eds), *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*, Springer International Publishing, xv–xxiv.
Constantinescu, M-V., 2015a, „Observaţii asupra mărcilor comportamentale ale politeţii la cronicari (sec. XVII-XVIII)", in: M. Sala, M. Stanciu-Istrate, N. Petuhov (eds), *Lucrările celui de-al cincilea simpozion internaţional de lingvistică*, *Bucureşti 27-28 septembrie 2013*, Bucureşti, Enciclopedic Gold, 763–776.
Constantinescu, M-V., 2015b, *Principatele române între Orient şi Occident: dinamica modelelor culturale ale politeţii şi impoliteţii în secolul al XIX-lea*, Bucureşti, Editura Muzeul Naţional al Literaturii Române.
Constantinescu, M-V., 2016, "Performativitate gestuală şi comunicare interculturală în perioada premodernă", in: M. Codleanu, F. Nicolae (eds), *Analele Ştiinţifice ale Universităţii „Ovidius" din Constanţa. In honorem Petre Gheorghe Bârlea*, 2, Ovidius University Press, Constanţa, 205–216.
Culpeper, J., J. Demmen, 2011, "Nineteenth-century English politeness: Negative politeness, conventional indirect requests and the rise of the individual self", *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 12, 1/2, 49–81.
Dicţionarul limbii române, Bucureşti, Librariile Socec & Comp. şi C. Sfetea, 1913 ş.u. [DA].
Dicţionarul limbii române (serie nouă), Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1965 ş.u. [DLR].
Dictionnaire étymologique et historique du français, J. Dubois, H. Mitterand et A. Dauzat, Paris, Larousse, 1995. [DEHF]
Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti (Enciclopedia Treccani), www.treccani.it.

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

Farese, G.M., 2015, "Hi vs. Ciao: NSM as a tool for cross-linguistic pragmatics", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 85, 1–17.
Fetzer, A., 2016, "Pragmemes in Discourse", in: K. Allan, A. Capone, I. Kecskes (eds), *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*, Springer International Publishing, 249–264.
Goddard, C., A. Wierzbicka, 1994, "Introducing Lexical Primitives", in: C. Goddard, A. Wierzbicka (eds), *Semantic and Lexical Universals. Theory and Empirical Findings*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 31–56.
Goddard, C., A. Wierzbicka, 2002, "Semantic Primes and Universal Grammar", in: C. Goddard, A. Wierzbicka (eds), *Meaning and Universal Grammar. Theory and Empirical Findings*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 41–85.
Grzega, J., 2008, "Hal, hail, hello, hi: Greetings in English language history", in: A. H. Jucker, I. Taavitsainen (eds), *Speech Acts in the History of English*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 165–193.
Haumann, S., U. Koch, K. Sornig, 2005, "Politeness in Austria: Politeness and Impoliteness", in: L. Hickey, M. Stewart (eds), *Politeness in Europe*, Multilingual Matters LTD, 82–99.
Heeschen, V., W. Schieffenhoevel, I. Eibl-Eibesfeld, 1980, "Requesting, giving and taking: The relationship between verbal and nonverbal behavior in the speech community of Eipo, Irian Jaya (West New Guinea)", in: M.R. Key (ed), *The Relationship of Verbal and Nonverbal Communication*, The Hague, Mouton, 139–66.
Held, G., 2005 [1992], "Politeness in linguistic research", in: R.J. Watts, S. Ide, K. Ehlich (eds), *Politeness in Language. Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*, Second revised and expanded edition, with a new introduction by R.J. Watts, Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 131–154.
Held, G., 2010, "Supplica la mia parvidade… Petitions in medieval society — a matter of ritualized or first reflexive politeness?", *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 11, 2, 194–218.
Kádár, D.Z. (forthcoming), "Historical intercultural socio-pragmatics: A study on ritualisation", *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*.
Kádár, D.Z., M. Haugh, 2013, *Understanding politeness*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Kecskes, I., 2010, "Situation-bound utterances as pragmatic acts", *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 11, 2889–2897.
Kecskes, I., 2016, "Deliberate Creativity and Formulaic Language Use", in: K. Allan, A. Capone, I. Kecskes (eds), *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*, Springer International Publishing, 3–20.
Kohnen, T., 2008, "Directives in Old English: Beyond politeness?", in: A.H. Jucker, I. Taavitsainen (eds), *Speech Acts in the History of English*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 27–44.
Kurzon, D., 2016, ""TONGUE-TIED": Pragmemes and Practs of Silence in Literary Texts", in: K. Allan, A. Capone, I. Kecskes (eds), *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*, Springer International Publishing, 265–286.
Le Trésor de la langue française informatisée (http://atilf.atilf.fr/tlf.htm) [TLFi]
Mey, J.L., 2001, *Pragmatics: An Introduction*, 2nd revised edition, Oxford, Blackwell.
Mey, J.L., 2016a, "Pragmatics Seen Through the Prism of Society", in: K. Allan, A. Capone, I. Kecskes (eds), *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*, Springer International Publishing, 105–132.
Mey, J.L., 2016b, "Why We Need the Pragmeme, or: Speech Acting and Its Peripeties", in: K. Allan, A. Capone, I. Kecskes (eds), *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*, Springer International Publishing, 133–140.
Norrick, N.R., 2016, "Narratives in Conversation as Pragmemes", in: K. Allan, A. Capone, I. Kecskes (eds), *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*, Springer International Publishing, 149–166.
Palander-Collin, M., 2009, "Variation and change in patterns of self-reference in early English correspondence", *Historical Sociopragmatics*, Special Issue of *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, J. Culpeper (ed), 10, 2, 260–285.

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

Payrató, L., 2009, "Non-verbal Communication", in: J. Verschueren, J-O. Östman (eds), *Key Notions for Pragmatics*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 163–194.
Pietreanu, M., 1984, *Salutul în limba română. Studiu sociolingvistic*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.
Pike, K. L., 1967 [1954], *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*, second edition, The Hague, Mouton.
Rounds, C., E. Solyom, 2014, *Colloquial Hungarian (eBook and MP3 Pack): The Complete Course for Beginners*, London, Routledge.
Searle, J.R., 1965, "What is a speech act", in: M. Black (ed), *Philosophy in America* Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 221–239.
Searle, J.R., 1969, *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Stanciu-Istrate, M., 2006, *Calcul lingvistic în limba română*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române.
Terkourafi, M., 2001, "The distinction between generalized and particularized implicatures and linguistic politeness", in: P. Kuhnlein, H. Rieser, H. Zeevat (eds), *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on the Formal Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue*, Bielefeld, Zif, 174–188.
Terkourafi, M., D.Z. Kádár, 2017, "Convention and ritual (im)politeness", in: J. Culpeper, M. Haugh, D.Z. Kádár (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)Politeness*, Palgrave Macmillan, 171–195.
Tesoro della lingua italiana delle origini, P.G. Beltrami (coord.), Florence, CNR/Accademia della Crusca, http://tlio.ovi.cnr.it/TLIO. [TLIO]
Ursu, N.A., D. Ursu, 2004, *Împrumutul lexical în procesul modernizării limbii române literare (1760-1860)*, Iaşi, Cronica.
Vasilescu, A., 2016, "Towards a "Theory of Everything" in Human Communication", in: K. Allan, A. Capone, I. Kecskes (eds), *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*, Springer International Publishing, 305–334.
Vocabolario della lingua italiana di Nicola Zingarelli, 1993, dodicesima edizione, a cura di M. Dogliotti e L. Rosiello, Bologna, Zanichelli.
Wong, J., 2016, "The 'emes' of Linguistics", in: K. Allan, A. Capone, I. Kecskes (eds), *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*, Springer International Publishing, 567–584.

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)

BDD-A27737 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:41:11 UTC)