



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Gerbrand Bredero wants to borrow a painting: proleptic negotiation

Jansen, J.

Publication date

2013

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Journal of Dutch Literature

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Jansen, J. (2013). Gerbrand Bredero wants to borrow a painting: proleptic negotiation. *Journal of Dutch Literature*, 4(1), 62-87. <http://journalofdutchliterature.org/jdl/vol04/nr01/art03>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Gerbrand Bredero Wants to Borrow a Painting. Proleptic Negotiation¹

Jeroen Jansen, University of Amsterdam

Abstract

In a letter to Badens, his painting teacher, Gerbrand Bredero asks for the loan of a painting to make a copy of it. The act of writing (a letter) requires a proactive role in managing the reader's reactions. In what at first sight may look like a simple, insignificant and most of all polite letter, it is argued that, from the viewpoint of argumentation theory, negotiation and bargaining tactics, this politeness may be considered as a carefully devised and potentially effective strategy, contributing to extracting a promise from Badens, and to remove any possible objections from the latter in fulfilling his promise. Whilst starting the letter from the relatively powerless situation of a pupil asking his master to act, by showing a mutual interest and by applying anticipated argumentation and negotiation, Bredero seeks a reasonable balance which he simultaneously turns to his own advantage.

Keywords: Proleptic Negotiation, Bargaining, Proleptic Argumentation, Pragmatic-Dialectical Theory, Request, Bredero, Epistolary Theory, Politeness Theory, Argumentation Theory, Strategy, Promise

Introduction

From the Dutch dramatist and poet Gerbrand Bredero (1585-1618) only six letters are known, posthumously published by the Amsterdam bookseller Cornelis van der Plasse, who was also his personal protector.² The addressees of these letters come from fairly different social backgrounds, ranging from a young widow, unknown to us, to whom he declares his love, to a colleague-poet with an established reputation at that time: Pieter Hooft. The same disparity applies to the (letter-like) dedications to his drama. Here the social differentiation may be even more pronounced. Bredero dedicated his tragedy *Rodd'rick ende Alphonsus* (1616) to Hugo de Groot (Grotius), an internationally renowned scholar, whereas *Griane* (1616) is dedicated to a certain 'Maria', who remains otherwise unknown to us. Despite these differences some obvious similarities emerge in his prose. In this

respect literary histories frequently mention the respectful tone. The almost constant humbleness is considered as excessive and sometimes as not serious. Knuttel, for instance, described Bredero's polite modesty as 'half concealed irony' ('half verholen ironie').³

However, textual elements such as respect, politeness and irony always happen in relation to a specific audience and situation, and may sometimes mean more than usual courtesy or witty word play.⁴ Raymond W. Gibbs assumes that 'authorial intentions are essential for establishing meaningful coherency in narratives'.⁵ Even authors who seem to take a back seat in their work, reveal themselves by their rhetoric: 'an author cannot choose to avoid rhetoric; he can choose only the kind of rhetoric he will employ'.⁶ While reading Bredero's prose (letters, prefaces, dedications, orations – all of which being argumentative discourse),⁷ one may be struck by the fact that Bredero poses as a very polite and humble man on the one hand, while always urgently asking for something and determined to get it on the other. What he is generally asking for in those texts is love, friendship, protection, recognition or a meeting. This made me wonder *how* exactly he acts to succeed, rhetorically. In other words: how does he ultimately seek to get his wishes fulfilled? In this article I take the view that politeness and eloquence can be regarded as parts of a personal, well-chosen rhetorical strategy, which allows the letter writer to engage in an argument with his addressees and get his way in the end.⁸ The process is viewed as a kind of problem-solving activity, involving mutual interests and aiming at an acceptable solution for both parties. A letter is the kind of communication that involves a joint construction of meaning by the writer and addressee. Many factors will influence in some way how the participants' speech can and should be understood and how meaning is generated, such as the kind of politeness, argumentation skills and establishing symmetric or asymmetric relations between the participants.⁹

By taking a discourse analytic perspective that integrates recent approaches in argumentation, negotiation and communication, one gains an insight into the way the writer is anticipating and speaking (writing, thinking) from the viewpoint of the other, the addressee. Which opportunities does the anticipatory character of discourse offer for the way in which Bredero is arguing, for his use of politeness strategies, and for his negotiating and cooperative attitude? We will show how exactly Bredero deals with the process.

Epistolary Politeness

Seventeenth-century letters normally contain polite remarks and expressions. It has been argued recently that poets such as Hooft and Constantijn Huygens (diplomat, writer and assistant of the Princes of Orange) 'seem to restrict themselves [in their correspondence] to rather superficial compliments'.¹⁰ Except for a few shallow remarks on poetry, stylistic ornamentation and witty word play of all

kinds, these letters should mainly have been occupied with the usual display of politeness ('het bekende bescheidenheidsvertoon'). The self-abasement is considered 'almost a game, in which the two players were involved in a modesty competition'.¹¹ Indeed, expressing politeness in Dutch letter-writing is to a considerable extent culturally and historically determined, even ritualized. The degree of courtesy in addressing in seventeenth-century dedications and letters reflects the stringent rules on this subject by late-medieval and early renaissance letter-writing manuals, especially Italian and French ones.¹² The way the addressee is treated largely depends on the power relations and social differences between letter-writer and addressee, while the measure of politeness in the continuation of the letter is strongly linked with the illocution, in Bredero's case usually a wish or request. Social positions were confirmed in the salutation and introduction.¹³ When Bredero addresses his painting teacher in a letter (see below) as 'my dear, respected and beloved master, this triple politeness closely corresponds to the prescription in for example *Le Grant et vray art de pleine rhétorique* (1521) by Pierre Fabri. According to Fabri, a letter writer addressed to someone of a higher social rank had to use at least three superlative¹⁴ or comparative adjectives. Addressing an equal in social position required sheer comparative or positive adjectives, whereas adjectives were to be avoided when addressing someone of a lower social rank.¹⁵

Similar approaches can be found in Dutch letter-writing manuals, for instance in Daniel Mostart's *Nederduytse Secretaris* (1635). When addressing a socially higher ranking person in writing, one had to put awe, submission and attentiveness in one's words, according to Mostart.¹⁶ And when appealing to someone, one had to 'diminish' oneself, even if one were greater or more important than the addressee in other areas.¹⁷ Indeed, as the seventeenth-century practice of letters writing affirms, letters are brimming over with politic behaviour, sometimes even with formulaic, ritualized utterances.¹⁸ Whether these letters are actually polite is entirely a matter of whether they are deemed as such by those involved.¹⁹ Our assessment of the situation is based on reconstruction.

Epistolary Negotiation

As indicated before, Bredero's letters usually contain a request or wish and may be thus regarded as a kind of problem-solving activity, involving mutual interests and seeking an acceptable solution for both parties. In fact, the letter-writer appears to be a bargainer, negotiating between the addressee and himself. Negotiation involves a discussion in which two or more parties influence each other on the way to a common goal, where interests are combined and exchanged to obtain mutual advantage.²⁰ Moreover, it is a strategic exchange of interest between the parties, each of which pursues its own goal whilst expecting that through this exchange it will obtain a greater advantage.²¹ People engage in social exchange to

gain rewards. It is in their own interest to exchange with others. Besides, negotiators seek to frame any given issue in order to steer negotiations in the direction desired by the framer.²² Just like in the case of letter-writing manuals, in order to find out in which way Bredero negotiates according to tradition we could have started a search for historical theoretical sources on that topic, preferably in Dutch.²³ But there are certain difficulties and restrictions in finding these. Firstly, books on negotiation from that period are scarce compared to handbooks on epistolary items. The letter-writing manuals originate from a rich medieval tradition, while books on bargaining, trading and negotiation do not have such a long history. Secondly, as far as I can see, these sources hardly discuss any negotiating techniques, and if they do, they do so rather superficially. Overall, they deal with other subjects. For example, in 1540 *Den coopliden handboecxkin* (The Manual of Merchants) was published, a rather popular edition as appears from a number of re-publications. This book does not discuss negotiation and bargaining techniques, but rather almanac-like subjects useful to the commercial traveller, such as currencies, measures, distinctive features of different countries, their products, sunrise and sunset hours, diseases and annual fairs. It is not impossible that Bredero studied such books during his school education,²⁴ but these small books merely contained some factual and practical information meant for traders abroad.

It is more likely that Bredero, apart from following general principles of rationality and logic, gained some knowledge about negotiating and arguing strategies from actual practice, and from rhetorical handbooks. He may have given his own interpretation of such strategies by pondering general ethical lessons on topics such as possession, friendship and services (in return), as discussed in Seneca's *De Beneficiis*,²⁵ and in *Les Sentences, Conseil, et bons enseignemens des sept saiges de Grece* (1562).²⁶ The latter contains wise sayings from Greek philosophers, explained in French by the Paris author and bookseller Gilles Corrozet (1510-68), and translated into Dutch. This is where we also encounter for example the bargaining-like saying: 'Largiri cum utilitate' (give generously to serve a useful purpose) attributed to the Greek philosopher and tyrant Periander of Corinth, with the following explanation by Corrozet:

Be generous to those through whom your own profit will grow and your loss will fade away. And do not squander your temporary goods, nor waste them by great, excessive, dissipating generosity. But give generously from your goods to your friends, who will recognize them and recompense you for them in return. It is a fool's and imprudent man's act to mistreat his generosity and treat it badly.²⁷

Rather general advice, indeed, and mentioning this text here would not have been very interesting had we not known for certain that Bredero was acquainted with this source and used information from it in other work.²⁸

However, this article is not a study of source material. My method to uncover Bredero's epistolary tactics mainly concerns modern text analysis, in which to a lesser degree context analysis is involved. The speech act theory can provide a basis for formulating how the content of a large part of seemingly diverse standpoints is structured. Whilst it is clear that the content of an utterance – say the semantic basis – and the implicature of the utterance on the base of the context may vary,²⁹ it is important to consider the extent to which a certain illocutionary act is binding. Moreover, one has to assess the relation of power between the writer and the addressee.³⁰ It is my basic assumption that Bredero is strategically seeking an acceptable balance in this power relation to increase the binding character of his claim.

The Request

Around 1610 Bredero wrote a letter to his painting teacher Francesco Badens, asking for the loan of a painting. It concerned a painting by the Flemish Baroque painter and etcher of the Antwerp school Sebastian Vrancx (1573-1647). Bredero frames his request with considerable politeness and benevolence, informing the addressee that the loan was a fervent wish of his father, the cobbler Adriaen Cornelisz Bredero (1559-1646). According to the letter, the loan had already been agreed. Bredero wished to make a copy of the painting soon, a reproduction, to please his father.

At that time, in 1610 Amsterdam, there was obviously no bodily, physical propinquity and as a result direct oral communication between the pupil and his teacher, and this letter describes the situation in black and white.³¹

Signor Francesco Badens,

With all due politeness and respect, and kind regards to you, my dear, respected and beloved Sir, I pray, on behalf of my father, who cordially expresses the wish that perhaps you might be willing to lend to us that which you have promised him (as you know, the small painting by Sebastian Vrancx), which will be a pleasant favour and a token of immense friendship to him. We will not leave this unrewarded and will not fail to show you the gratitude that you deserve. In every possible way, you will have a good, indeed a very good friend in both me and my father. I am aware that our wish is big, bold and impudent, and that you love and treasure this painting yourself but because we trust in your affection and your kind promise, we mustered up courage to make this friendly yet innocent and simple small request and to submit it to your mild

and kind benevolence, whilst hoping nothing but that our request will be granted. In return we offer you our affection, energy and good will, to be used as you see fit. Please, do make use of it to the extent that you wish. You will find us cooperative and willing. Who knows when one may be able to assist another; no one lives only for himself [Romans 14: 7].

If you do us this favour and grant our wish, we hereby promise you that we will not take this copy out of the house as the copy will solely be made for my father's pleasure who wishes to keep it like a jewel, flat, together with his gems and precious artefacts. Now would be a convenient time for me. I am also aware that you are not keen on an abundance of words. A sensible man has soon heard enough, or 'a un bon Entendeur il ne faut qu'un parole' [a word is enough for the wise man]. The sooner you were to agree to this, the better. You will be doing a good deed.

G.A. Bredero³²

The salutation and close of the letter contain traditional elements. So does the remark in the *peroratio* that Bredero knew that his addressee was not keen on an abundance of words, in order to round off the discourse. The body of the letter, however, is fascinating. Bredero is intent on pushing ahead the redemption of a promise to his father. The letter can be seen as a private conversation between Bredero and Badens. Conversation functions correctly when both the speaker and hearer follow a mutually shared set of conventions, in their aim for mutually determined interactional goals. In this case, the interactional function of Bredero's words are directed towards controlling the interaction that is achieved by the words: the protagonist seeks to make the antagonist grant his request. He tries to remove obstacles, or – from a proleptic point of view – anticipates obstacles and countervoices, as we will discuss in the next paragraph.

Proleptic Argumentation

This letter is actually a one-sided conversation. But it implies interaction, as well as interrelational and contextual knowledge from the participants, thus an interest in the organizational context, cultural knowledge systems and the parties' identities. Bredero refers to this knowledge, looking back when mentioning the promise and seemingly looking ahead when meeting the antagonist's wishes, namely the conditions for treating the painting. An indispensable starting point in a reasonable exchange of argumentative moves is agreement: the participants know or believe that there is enough common ground to conduct a discussion. In negotiation practice common ground is an essential condition as well: once the initial climate has been established, common ground is sought regarding the objectives of the negotiation.³³ To realize the interactional goals, Bredero is behav-

ing rationally, he is cooperative and in tune with the goals and acts of the other participant. That is why the letter is not only monologic but also ‘proleptic’: the writer is displaying his awareness that Badens might object, and pre-emptively answers any possible contributions by the addressee. We hear the implicit voice of the other as an underlying ‘voice’, which can be detected by looking for polyphonic elements, like modal adverbs and negation.³⁴ But the dialogic character is more explicit at a different level,³⁵ in the way Bredero arranges a possible contribution of the addressee by mentioning restrictions or conditions with regard to his own behaviour, his own acts and his position. This contribution could be interpreted as related to (reacting to, anticipating, answering) a possible counter-voice, or counterargument. Proleptic techniques (like proleptic argumentation) are very important when writing a persuasive essay, or when delivering a persuasive speech, as Michael Leff has shown with examples such as Demosthenes, Cicero, Burke and Lincoln.³⁶ But these techniques are at least as relevant in (argumentative) letters, such as the one written by Bredero. Proleptic argumentation can be defined as ‘the anticipation and answering of an objection or opposed argument before one’s opponent has actually put it forward’.³⁷ In proleptic argumentation the arguer has to recognize the possible objections and counterarguments, and respond to this criticism in advance, before the point in the sequence of argumentation where the other party actually voices the objection.³⁸ In this particular letter the discussion concerns Bredero wanting to borrow a painting from his teacher. When he states that ‘you love and treasure this painting yourself...’, this 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. Anticipating on this perceived weakness,³⁹ we hear the proleptic voice of the opponent: ‘Even though you love and treasure this painting, you should (be prepared to) lend it to us’. The supporting arguments are: ‘we will not take this copy with us out of our house [so it will not be copied by others or be damaged]’, and ‘wishes to keep it like a jewel, flat,⁴⁰ together with his gems and precious artefacts [so it will not be noticed by others]’.

In face-to-face discussions, rational interactants actually take up the other’s purposes when working towards an accepted common goal, making their interaction a truly joint activity.⁴¹ In a written monologue, this common goal and the joint activity are organized by one side, the arguer. In addition, Bredero is expected to act reasonably, for instance by using common critical standards and by anticipating that the other will comply with the same standards. Moreover, he gives Badens the impression that he is trying to see the issue from the other point of view as well, and to treat it in a reasonable way. For example, in making this promise: ‘we will not take this copy out of the house’, Bredero implicitly refers to the special value the painting has to himself and to the act of copying it, but also to the weight Badens is supposed to attach to this painting. Thus, in this 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.

In a nutshell, proleptic argumentation is a ‘rhetorical tool’ that can be used to persuade an antagonist or an audience that you are attempting to be reasonable and trying to take their viewpoint and interests into account,⁴² whilst at the same time – from a strategic viewpoint – manipulating this balance for your own benefit. In this way the method of anticipating objections can be an extremely powerful tactic in terms of strategic manoeuvring.⁴³

Proleptic Negotiation

Proleptic argumentation demands a certain amount of empathy (or at least the appearance of it), as the proponent has to look at the issue from the opponent’s point of view and use the opponent’s commitments as premises in arguments that have conclusions favourable to the proponent’s side.⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵ At least, this is what we encounter in Bredero’s letter: you could say his argumentation is largely cooperative, as he builds moral community.⁴⁶ This cooperativeness is indicated here explicitly by the statement that Badens will find Bredero and his father ‘cooperative and willing’ (‘willich ende bereyt’) to make use of their benevolence. But the polite way of acting is also conducive to further cooperation. Negative emotions reduce the likelihood of a cooperative association. To mitigate any negative affect, individuals may plan to use verbal cues that express likability or friendliness.⁴⁷ Though Bredero is well-mannered in all his letters and dedications, in this case he had to be particularly polite as the situation concerns 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 has a negative character, and its purpose is to reduce the discord implicit in the competition between what Bredero wants to achieve and ‘good manners’.⁴⁸ In this case his goal is getting Badens to lend him the painting. The politeness principle is therefore required to mitigate the intrinsic discourtesy of the goal.⁴⁹

It is tempting to look at the way in which Bredero creates this cooperativeness in a specific proleptic manner. I will do so by referring to his negotiating techniques or better: negotiating *strategies*. The strategy is to be found in a kind of proleptic negotiation, as Bredero fulfils the offers and demands of both sides, as we will see below. We know that strategies and communicative tactics often change as negotiators anticipate their opponents’ plans.⁵⁰ In this case, Bredero pulls the strings in advance. He is not only using prolepsis as an argumentation technique but also for framing the issue for the addressee by negotiating in a proleptic debate.⁵¹ I would like to call this ‘anticipated’ or ‘proleptic’ negotiation, to be de-

defined as: ‘the bargainer recognizes possible needs and fears of his opponent, mentions them and fulfills them in advance (for example by way of promises), in order to reach a mutually satisfactory outcome, based on cooperation (at face value)’.⁵²

Negotiation implies effective (i.e. rhetorical or even strategic) interaction. Both parties need each other and are prepared to compromise from the very beginning, i.e. prepared to give something in exchange of getting something. This is the necessary starting point from which it will be possible to negotiate the conditions.⁵³ In negotiation the parties have certain things in common but also perceive their interests to be diverging. They seek to find complementary or shared interests besides the conflicting ones.⁵⁴ According to Robert van Es, in his study on the ethics of negotiating, the basic rule to succeed in negotiating is to exercise psychological power, by manipulating the convictions of your opponent to make him think that he is your equal, and that you are striving both for the same course.⁵⁵ In order to be successful Bredero has to calculate which path to take and what phrasing to choose, and to develop a special feeling for suitable arguments that might influence the preference dispositions of the addressee.⁵⁶ In a positive sense negotiation may be considered as a means to achieving a fair compromise for both.⁵⁷ As the dialogue is enabled to move forward because the participants are willing to take on commitments in a collaborative way,⁵⁸ this collaboration can be manipulated by one side in a ‘monologic discussion’. Due to the proleptic character of the negotiation, Bredero has the opportunity to steer the bargaining process.

In his letter to his painting teacher Badens, the interaction between Bredero and his addressee is not of a strictly economic kind but – due to the offer of friendship – rather social,⁵⁹ based on establishing equity,⁶⁰ rather than prompted by a pure individualistic motive.⁶¹ This social exchange involves the voluntary transference of some objects or activities (resources) by his opponent in order to receive resources in return.⁶² The situation could have been slightly problematic for Bredero, due to the social position of the addressee in relation to his own. When two people are in an exchange relationship there are two environments. The choices are based on previous histories of reinforcements,⁶³ about which we have no information in this case. Bredero holds out the prospect of goodwill to Badens. No more and no less.

In any event, the letter does not assume an *appearance* of pure self-interest, which can be defined technically as a negotiation aimed at seeking rewards from others that results in a desire to maximize one’s own rewards minus costs, as well as a consideration of one’s rewards and costs in relation to the other’s rewards and costs.⁶⁴ Bredero’s willingness to compromise and to consider the opponent’s needs is a clear indication that he is a bargainer who wishes to appear fair and kind.⁶⁵

But is he? The fairness of an exchange is determined by the norms shared within social groups. If one does not receive exactly the same resource as the one given, the preference is for receiving a similar one.⁶⁶ Can the exchange of the loan of a picture on one side and gratitude and services in return on the other be called 'fair'? Although Bredero gives the impression of a fair exchange, we do not know the real value of the services he offers. The exchange is partly based on trust: Bredero and his father 'trust' in Badens' 'affection' and 'kind promise', while Badens is supposed to have faith that Bredero's assurances concerning the treatment of the painting and concerning the offer of friendship, will be actualized in a concrete service in return. Thus, the noncommittal and prospective nature of the friendship promise makes the return offer less tangible. On the other hand, Bredero's and Badens' resources are particularistic, as they stem from particular people providing them.⁶⁷ Restricting it to just one item (the loan of the painting) could have led to a better agreement and to satisfaction on both sides.⁶⁸

Fair as it may seem, Bredero's negotiating with friendship and services in return has an evident strategically 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 where 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.⁶⁹ 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.

Strategic Choices

It is clear that both social and persuasive power are at stake. When considering the links between power relations and language, researchers tend to explore assertive and emotional styles of communication as an evidence of the link between social power and strategies.⁷⁰ We shall now have a closer look at the strategic choices that Bredero makes. There are three points of interest, all closely connected with each other. Firstly, Bredero suggests a fair exchange as he becomes concerned not just with his own rewards and costs but also with Badens' rewards and costs. The friendship Badens will receive is not only with Bredero himself but also with his father. By drawing his father into the negotiation, the impression of un-selfishness is reinforced.⁷¹ The copy of the painting will only be made, as he explains, for his father's 'pleasure'. It reinforces the 'fairness' of the exchange, because he is mitigating his own involvement in the negotiation. In addition, it makes the loan more rewarding. As Homans describes 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'.⁷² Bredero's task is therefore to make Badens

believe that the action of lending the painting is a valuable one, in order to make him realize how ‘rewarding’ this resource (his act of lending) will be in the end.⁷³

Secondly, negotiation or bargaining implies the concept of persuasive action which is intrinsically related to the use of some sort of power.⁷⁴ Bredero adds an element of additional power for himself as he talks on behalf of his father and himself. ‘We’ versus ‘you’. This is a strategic choice, which starts with Bredero mentioning the promise made between Badens and Bredero’s father. After that, Bredero argues in the ‘we-form’. He thus expresses mutual self-interests. This is negotiation through the manipulation of perceptions of losses and gains. Individuals who see an outcome as a potential gain make more concessions and consider the negotiated outcome as more fair than do those with a negative frame or see their trade-offs as losses. Therefore, Bredero increases the potential gain for Badens by offering his addressee the friendship of both, father and son.⁷⁵ To give himself more power Bredero arranges the text and characterizes the different objects according to a preconceived idea. Amongst other things he qualifies the wish expressed by his father and himself as ‘big, bold and impudent’ (‘groot, stout, ende onbeschaemt’), whereas a little later in the same sentence it is qualified as an ‘innocent and simple small request’ (‘onnoosel, eenvoudig Requestjen’). We may assume that it is not an ill-chosen or random wording. Bredero manages to contrast the supposed bold nature of his wish against Badens’ ‘mild and kind benevolence’ (illustrating Leech’s modesty and approbation maxim: maximize dispraise of self and praise of other),⁷⁶ while the wording concerning the innocence and simplicity of his request serves as a prelude to the assignment of goodwill by Badens (this is Leech’s tact maxim: minimize cost to other).⁷⁷ Bredero’s request is therefore big and small at the same time, creating a kind of witty antithesis: it is big in that it makes the man Badens (who will lend the painting) more important, and simultaneously the request is small in that it does not present the act of lending as insurmountable, so as to tempt Badens into making an immediate move.

Closely linked to this point is the third strategic choice: reciprocity. The American psychologist Robert Levine emphasises in this respect for the *reciprocity rule*, which he considers to be a ‘powerful, unspoken rule of social engagement and social order’ that lays the foundation of ‘cooperative, prosocial, unselfish human relationships’.⁷⁸ As requests are potentially face-threatening acts violating the addressee’s freedom of action, the cooperation of the addressee was seen as an important factor, while framing the request in politeness, even weakening the position of the authoritative protagonist, concerned a consideration for the addressee’s wish not to be imposed upon.⁷⁹ Thus Bredero uses the notion of reciprocity in a strategic manner by recognizing in advance the interdependence: both parties have to cooperate and Bredero is testing the delicate balance between his own needs and those of his addressee. Both have a complementary interest, albeit a different one, but not an obstructing concern.⁸⁰ In order to negotiate

effectively, the offer must be credible and make the other party believe it will be a fair deal. Part of it is to respond to possible wishes and demands in advance.⁸¹

Proleptic cooperativeness implies one side organizing and constructing the mutual interest. Bredero is asking something and is offering something as well, and implicitly the opponent is accepting and answering. These wishes exceed the painting and the service in return. In this case mutuality is evident from the display of humbleness (explicit in phrasings such as ‘... who cordially expresses the wish that perhaps you might be willing to...’ and ‘I am aware that our wish is big, bold and impudent’) and from the request for help, but also from the faith offered by Bredero, faith in the ‘kind promise’, against the requested redemption of the promise. Both promise and redemption are significant means to strengthen the relational integrity,⁸² affected humbleness and modesty are important to strengthen authority.⁸³ Humbleness is of course also a means to anticipate negative results (see Leech’s modesty maxim).⁸⁴ Promises can only be understood by reference to power. In negotiation, promises have the greatest convincing power and are simple to generate.⁸⁵

The way in which Bredero anticipates his opponent’s possible needs becomes clear where he fills in his own and his antagonist’s promises and wishes. Against the promise made by Badens (‘to lend to us that which you have promised him (as you know, the small painting by Sebastian Vrancx’), Bredero presents a promise by himself and his father to Badens, strategically formulated in a conditional way: ‘If you do us this favour and grant our wish, we hereby promise you that we will not take this copy out of the house...’. And against his wish to borrow the painting, Bredero puts forward not only the face-oriented characterization of this wish which in the eyes of his opponent is ‘big, bold and impudent, but also Badens’ proleptic wish to deploy the benevolence, energy and good will of both Bredero and his father: ‘to be used as you wish’, he says in a revealing way.

Boldness in Bargaining

Bredero is trading trust against trust, one promise against another, a wish against a wish. It sounds like a well-chosen balance. But he then turns this balance to his advantage, in a polite yet rather peremptory way: ‘... hoping nothing but that our request will be granted’. He concludes the letter with the statement: ‘The sooner you were to agree to this, the better. You will be doing a good deed.’ In other words: hurry up, live up to your promise, we are waiting. And Bredero is substantiating this urgency with an additional argument: ‘Now would be a convenient time for me’, which means: I have time to make the copy right now. By making these claims Bredero seeks to appear strong to his opponent.⁸⁶ Through these moves he anticipates the arguments he expects from his addressee, showing that he, in any case, cannot affect the opinion he defends. In this way the writer compels the other to confirm or approve his thesis.⁸⁷ Indeed, when asking for the

loan, Bredero might redress the threats to his face and to Badens' face in various ways. But the mention of the promise does not indicate the slightest form of mitigation. The phrasing transforms the negative face-threatening act from what could have been considered as a polite request virtually into a threat. Despite expressing adequate courtesy and offers in return, Bredero threatens his addressee's positive face when he urges Badens to hurry, whilst showing no consideration for his addressee's feelings and wishes at that point in time.⁸⁸ On the other hand, traditional though it may seem, his earlier (proleptic) remark about the addressee not being keen on an abundance of words ('A sensible man has soon heard enough, or 'a un bon Entendeur il ne faut qu'un parole') may also be considered as an instantiation of Grice's well-known maxim of quantity, the second of which states: 'Do not make your contribution more informative than is required'.⁸⁹

The boldness at the end of the text may be regarded as one of the main characteristics of Bredero's personal prose style.⁹⁰ It is also part of his strategy. He appears to act like a modest and polite citizen, but this humbleness is always his contribution in the exchange of interests (as well). Moreover, he uses this courtesy as a preamble to a request, hope or demand for something in a seemingly unavoidable way.

Conclusion

Politeness is not merely a conventional phenomenon in seventeenth-century letter-writing, just as humbleness is not merely a personal characterization of Bredero as a well-mannered Amsterdam citizen. Politeness and humbleness can also be part of the bargaining process, as anticipation on the antagonist's reaction, aimed at beneficial effect and success. From the beginning until the end Bredero negotiates to reach a mutually satisfactory outcome. At the beginning of the letter, the balance of power is not in Bredero's favour: in essence, he is a pupil facing his teacher who possesses something the pupil wishes to have. For this reason Bredero relies on virtually the entire repertory of linguistic and rhetorical possibilities, following general principles of rationality and logic, and using his knowledge of negotiation and argumentation strategies learnt from actual practice and rhetorical handbooks, to gain control of the situation and to restore the imbalance. Bredero makes efficient use of a proleptic form of tactic consultation, in which he determines the contributions of both sides. The request to his teacher Badens to lend him the painting, whilst reminding Badens to redeem his promise, goes hand in hand with something in return: he and his father will give Badens affection, energy and good will, to be used as the latter sees fit. Bredero adds: 'Please, do make use of it to the extent that you wish. You will find us cooperative and willing'. He concludes that paragraph with a saying: 'no one lives only for himself'. Bredero appears to be putting his commitment into perspective,

but this qualification is a saying from the Bible that exudes acceptance and invulnerability. His choice of words indicates that his argument could be labelled a ‘cooperative argumentation’,⁹¹ reasoning from the interdependence of two people who are in the same situation together but cannot turn back.⁹²

This ‘solidarity’ demands negotiation with mutual respect. In this letter politeness therefore becomes part of the discursive social practice in which Bredero intends to realize his own wishes, without becoming unreasonable. He guides both parties in their cooperative discursive search for a reasonable and mutually acceptable solution and acts like a facilitator, who is responsible for both the process and its content.⁹³

Bargaining rules and normative practices include specifying preferred outcomes prior to the negotiation, exchanging proposals and counterproposals, and engaging in dynamic movement through social interaction.⁹⁴ This is just one side of the bargaining process. Proleptic negotiation is a problem-solving activity, employing strategies and tactics aimed at reaching a mutually acceptable agreement,⁹⁵ bringing in eloquence, rhetoric and persuasion to pursue one’s aim. Bredero’s tactics consist of finding a balance in the power relation between him and his teacher. He endeavours throughout to achieve equality, in order to make his claim increasingly binding. Eventually he turns this balance to his own advantage, by expounding his view in a rather perspicuous and compelling way. He reinforces his negotiating position until the end.⁹⁶

Examining the way in which a polite request is formulated and developed, as a ‘reminder’ of a promise and in order to explore one’s own negotiation space, was one of the main challenges in analysing this short letter on the basis of negotiation strategies. In the analysis I have illustrated three points: 1. praise, politeness and modesty are not just personal or traditional elements but may be considered as a strategic component to test the delicate balance of power between one’s own desires and fears and those of the opponent; 2. the theoretical aspects of proleptic negotiation explain Bredero’s filling in the offers and demands of both sides, reinforcing his own position; 3. most statements in this letter can be interpreted as having been written strategically, reflecting the discourse of an eloquent, persuasive and skillful bargainer of the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Notes

1. I would like to thank Dr Francisca Snoeck Henkemans (University of Amsterdam) for her valuable comments on earlier versions of this paper. All translations are mine unless indicated otherwise.
2. See G.A. Bredero, *Proza: uitgegeven, vertaald en toegelicht*, ed. by J. Jansen (Hilversum: Verloren, 2011), p. 16, pp. 21-2, p. 42 and p. 68. The letters are published on pp. 92-134.
3. G.A. Bredero, *Volledige werken*, ed. by J.A.N. Knuttel (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1929), Vol. 3, p. LVII.

4. Linda Hutcheon, *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony* (London / New York: Routledge, 1994), p. 45.
5. Raymond W. Gibbs, *Intentions in the Experience of Meaning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 185.
6. *Ibidem*, p. 188.
7. Collected in: Bredero, *Proza*.
8. There is little research on historical cases of Dutch argumentative discourse using modern rhetorical theory, argumentation theory or cognitive poetics. Fundamental in this context is the dialectical and rhetorical analysis (2003) by Van Eemeren and Houtlosser of the *Apologie* (1581), a substantial pamphlet that justifies William the Silent's actions in the Dutch revolt against the Spanish intruders (Frans van Eemeren and Peter Houtlosser, 'Strategic Manœuvring: William the Silent's Apologie. A case in point', in *Communication and Culture: Argumentative, Cognitive and Linguistic Perspectives*, ed. by L.I. Komlósi, P. Houtlosser, and M. Leezenberg (Amsterdam: Amsterdam: International Centre for the Study of Argumentation (Sic Sat), 2003), pp. 177-85). Both the argumentative analysis by Arjan van Leuvensteijn (2004) of a few passages in a tragedy (1619) by Samuel Coster according to the Toulmin-model ('De leugen regeert...'), and by Kessler and Šorm (2010) of a poem by the sixteenth-century Antwerp author Anna Bijns, on the basis of a pragma-dialectical approach ("En groet vooral de ketters niet!"...'), are innovative as well. All three show how modern argumentation theory provides us with adequate tools for the analysis of historical, persuasive texts.
9. See Robert Maier, 'Negotiation and Identity', in *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*, ed. by Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), p. 229.
10. Ton van Strien, "'De gewone verontschuldigen". Literatuur in de brieven van Hoofft en Huygens', *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde* 124 (2008), 211-8 (p. 211).
11. Irma Thoen, *Strategic Affection? Gift Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Holland* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007), p. 189. Van Strien, "'De gewone verontschuldigen"....', pp. 212-3 and p. 217.
12. In this respect Marcel Bax ('Epistolary Presentation Rituals Face-work, Politeness, and Ritual Display in Early Modern Dutch Letter-Writing', in *Historical (Im)Politeness*, ed. by Jonathan Culpeper and Dániel Z. Kádár (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010), p. 50) refers to seventeenth-century Dutch letter-writing manuals, such as Daniel Mostart's *Nederduytsse secretaris* (1635) (see Nanne Streekstra and Marcel Bax, 'Knippen, kopiëren en plakken in retrospectief. Briefmodellen, briefgenres en epistolaire beleefdheid in de Gouden Eeuw, in *Studies in taalbeheersing* 3, ed. by Wilbert Spooen, Margreet Onrust and José Sanders (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2009), p. 350). However, these Dutch manuals describe an already existing (Italian and in particular French) tradition.
13. See J.J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), p. 234, p. 263 and p. 266.
14. See Claude La Charité, 'Les Epistres morales et familières (1545) de Jean Bouchet: de la hiérarchie médiévale au dialogue humaniste', *Études françaises* 38.2 (2002), 25-42. E.g. 'A tresredoutable, trespuissant, et felicissime Prince Loys de Valoys [...] Jehan Bouchet

- [...] rend treshumble salut', Jean Bouchet, *Epistres Morales et Familières du Traverseur*, Poitiers, 1545), fol. 1r, published online <<http://gallica.bnf.fr>>.
15. Pierre Fabri, *Le Grant et vray art de pleine rhetorique...* Paris, 1521, p. 109 verso (fol. D3v). See La Charité, 'Les Epistres morales et familières (1545) de Jean Bouchet...', p. 37.
 16. Daniel Mostart, *Nederduytse secretaris Ofi Zendbrieffschryver, met een Tytelboexken*. (Amsterdam: voor Dirck Pietersz., 1637), p. 25: 'But a man of a lower position, writing to a person of a higher position, must put awe, respect, submission and attentiveness in his words, according to his status. He must raise his style, and embellish it, according to the nobility and dignity of the person, to whom he writes, using rather verbosity than stateliness, curb and brevity' (in the Dutch original: 'Maer een lager moet aen een hooger, naer zijnen staet, meerder oft minder bewijs doen van ontzagh, eerbieding, vernederingh, en gedienschtigheit van woorden; verheffende zijn stijl, en die vercierende, naer de grootheit en waerdigheid van den persoon, daer hy aen schrijft, eer wijdloopigheit, dan deftigheit en ingebondenheit en korthheit gebruykende').
 17. *Ibidem*, p. 86: 'And the one who requests must always diminish himself, as much as decency [*decorum*] demands, even though he were greater in all other fields than the one who is being requested' (in Dutch: 'Ende in allen gevalle moet de geen, die verzoekt, voor zo veel de welvoegenheit belangt, zich verkleenen, alwaer hy, in allen anderen zaeken, grooter als de verzochte').
 18. See Richard J. Watts, *Politeness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 168-9; also Thoen, *Strategic Affection?*, p. 189: 'The literary elite made it a habit for the writer of a letter to humiliate himself with respect for the receiver'.
 19. See Jim O'Driscoll, 'Epilogue', in *Historical (Im)Politeness*, ed. by Jonathan Culpeper and Dániel Z. Kádár (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010), p. 271.
 20. Robert van Es, *Negotiating Ethics. On Ethics in Negotiation and Negotiation in Ethics* (Delft: Eburon, 1996), p. 182. See also J. Sawyer and H. Guetzkow, 'Bargaining and negotiation in international relations', in *International Behavior: A Social-Psychological Analysis*, ed. by H.C. Kelman (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), p. 479.
 21. Van Es, *Negotiating Ethics*, p. 184.
 22. Michael E. Roloff, *Interpersonal Communication. The Social Exchange Approach* (Beverly Hills / London: Sage, 1981), p. 31. Harald Müller, 'Arguing, Bargaining and All That: Communicative Action, Rationalist Theory and the Logic of Appropriateness in International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations* 10.3 (2004), p. 415.
 23. Bredero did not have the advantage of a Latin school education. He knew a little French, but must have had a strong preference for texts in Dutch vernacular (Bredero, *Proza*, p. 14, pp. 16-7 and p. 23).
 24. See on Bredero's education: Bredero, *Proza*, pp. 23-9.
 25. See Bredero, *Proza*, pp. 154-163. Bredero became acquainted with Seneca through the 1562 translation of *De Beneficiis* by D.V. Coornhert.
 26. *Les Sentences, Conseils, et bons enseignemens des sept saiges de Grece*, fol. K5v. In his prose Bredero often deals with questions such as services in return and friendship (see e.g. *Proza*, pp. 20-1 and pp. 44-6). On the instrumental character and historic development of friendship, see M. Aymard, 'Friends and Neighbors', in *A History of Private Life. Passions of the Renaissance*, ed. by Ph. Aries and G. Duby (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 447-91; Luuc Kooijmans, *Vriendschap en de kunst van het overleven in de*

- zeventiende en achttiende eeuw (Amsterdam: Bakker, 1997) on different cases of friendship; and on seventeenth-century relationships and the exchange of gifts, see Thoen, *Strategic Affection?*, pp. 164ff.
27. *Les Sentences*, fol. K5v. The Dutch text reads as follows: ‘Bewijst aen de sulcke u beleefftheyt milt, / Door welcke u profijnt wast ende u schade smilt. / En verstroyt noch en verquist niet u tijtelijck goet door de groote overdadighe quistelijcke milttheyt: maer geeft mildelijck uwen vrienden van u goet, diet sullen bekennen ende wederom verdienen. Tis eens sots ende onwijsens werck, qualijck te leggen ende bestellen sijne weldaden’.
 28. Jeroen Jansen, ‘Bredero onder de Wijzen. Geleende geleerdheid in de brief (1611) aan Carel Quina’, *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde* 126 (2010), 347-72.
 29. Jan Berenst, ‘Relationeel taalgebruik. Conversatieve strategieën in interpersonele en interculturele communicatie’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Groningen, 1994), p. 182.
 30. J.A. Thomas, ‘Discourse Control in Confrontational Interaction’, in *The Pragmatics of Style*, ed. by Leo Hickey (London / New York: Routledge, 1989), pp. 133-53; Berenst, *Relationeel taalgebruik*, p. 182.
 31. The addressee of the letter, Badens, is known to Bredero, but not immediately present. As Bredero will not have realized that this letter was to be published (it was published posthumously), any other audience (readers) were unknown to him. Although early modern epistolarity can be considered beyond the dyadic model of single sender and single recipient (see Gary Schneider, *The Culture of Epistolarity. Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2005), pp. 22-3), the release of vernacular correspondence was unusual at the beginning of the seventeenth century (Johan Koppenol, ‘Brieven aan de samenleving: Coornhert, zijn uitgevers en het Brieven-boeck’, in *D.V. Coornhert (1522-1590): polemist en vredezoeker. Bijdragen tot plaatsbepaling en herwaardering*, ed. by J. Gruppelaar and G. Verwey (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010), p. 71). Bredero wrote this letter to his teacher, and we may assume that it is more thoroughly considered as far as contents and style go than our current hasty and fleeting emails. In any case, the writer will have considered the moment at which the addressee will have read the text. In what follows for ‘Bredero’ one should read: the writer of the letter and for ‘Badens’: the addressee of the letter.
 32. Bredero, *Proza*, pp. 92-4. The original letter reads 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 stucxken 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 danckbaerheyt 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 stucxken lief ende waert is: nochtans vertrouwende op u jonst ende op u gunstige belofte, soo hebben wy ons verkleect 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 believen die te ghebruycken; steltse vry te werck naer u eygen begeeren, ghy sult ons willich ende bereyt vinden; wie weet waermen elckanderen 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'.

I have concentrated on the letter. It is preceded and followed by a four-line verse about virtue and thankfulness which I have omitted here as I consider them as adornment, rather than arguments. Any of their potential argumentative value is supposed to coincide with that of the prose.

33. Richard Cascarino and Sandy van Esch, *Internal Auditing. An Integrated Approach*. (Lansdowne, South Africa: Juta Academic Publishers, 2007), pp. 117-9.
34. Modal verbs as in: '... if you might perhaps be prepared to loan us...'; negotiations as in: 'We will not leave this unrewarded and will not fail...'. The Russian linguist Mikhail Bakhtin declared that all discourse is heteroglossic (multi-voiced), as it is constructed from bits and pieces of other voices. See Jeroen Jansen, 'Vondels "Aenleidinge"'. *Polyfonie en dialogisme*, in *Neerlandistiek.nl* 09.02 (May 2009) (online publication); Jacques Bres et al. (eds), *Dialogisme et polyphonie. Approches linguistiques*, (Brussels: De Boeck-Duculot, 2005) ; Pierre Larrivé, 'La plausibilité psychologique des analyses polyphoniques: l'acquisition maternelle normale des présuppositions négatives', in *Le sens et ses voix. Dialogisme et polyphonie en langue et en discours*, ed. by Laurent Perrin (Metz: Université de Metz, 2006), pp. 461-79.
35. See, for these levels, Jan Renkema, *The Texture of Discourse. Towards an Outline of Connectivity Theory* (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2009), pp. 15-20.
36. Michael Leff, 'Rhetorical Prolepsis and the Dialectical Tier of Argumentation, in *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation*, ed. by Frans van Eemeren et al., (Amsterdam: International Centre for the Study of Argumentation (Sic Sat), 1999), pp. 510-3.
37. Douglas Walton, 'Proleptic Argumentation', in *Argumentation and Advocacy* 44 (2008), p. 143.
38. See Bilal Amjarso, *Mentioning and Then Refuting an Anticipated Counterargument. A Conceptual and Empirical Study on the Persuasiveness of a Mode of Strategic Manœuvring* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2010), pp. 14-9.
39. Patrick Clauss, 'Prolepsis: Dealing with Multiple Viewpoints in Argument', in *Dissensus and the Search for Common Ground*, ed. by H.V. Hansen et al. (Windsor, ON; OSSA, 2007), p. 12.
40. I.e. lying flat on its side and secured, therefore not visible for others.
41. Van Eemeren, *Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse*, p. 6.

42. Walton, 'Proleptic Argumentation', p. 143.
43. Ibidem, p. 154. Proleptic argumentation can be considered as a form of strategic maneuvering, inasmuch as it uses presentational devices that can be tailored to the task of resolving a difference of opinion and to steer the discourse (discussion) rhetorically into a direction that has a persuasive force as great as possible, to support the own standpoint and interests best. See Van Eemeren and Houtlosser, 'Strategisch manoeuvreren in argumentatieve teksten', p. 148; Van Eemeren and Houtlosser, 'Managing Disagreement', p. 151; Andrea Rocci, '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 (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2009), pp. 257-8. Whether Bredero applies all strategies consciously is irrelevant, although the term 'strategy' seems to have a strong connection with awareness and consciousness. Thoen (*Strategic Affection?*, pp. 151-95) describes different relationships in which the exchange of gifts plays a part. In some of these cases, the rhetoric of the gift had a strategic value, as it was used as a means to force the other individual to behave in a way that brought benefit to the donor.
44. Walton, 'Proleptic Argumentation', p. 154. See on the problematic definition of 'commitment': Douglas Walton and Erik C.W. Krabbe, *Commitment in Dialogue: Basic Concepts of Interpersonal Reasoning* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995), pp. 13ff.
45. Josina M. Makau and Debian L. Marty, *Cooperative Argumentation. A Model for Deliberative Community* (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2001), p. 88; Van Eemeren, *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse*, p. 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'.
46. Makau and Marty, *Cooperative Argumentation*, p. 106.
47. Michael E. Roloff and Jerry M. Jordan, 'Achieving Negotiation Goals: the "Fruits and Foibles" of Planning Ahead' in *Communication and Negotiation*, ed. by Linda L. Putnam and Michael E. Roloff, (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992), p. 28.
48. Leech, *Principles of Pragmatics*, pp. 104-5.
49. Ibidem, p. 105.
50. Roloff and Jordan, 'Achieving Negotiation Goals', pp. 21-45.
51. Roloff, *Interpersonal Communication*, pp. 133ff.
52. Linda L. Putnam and Michael E. Roloff (eds), *Communication and Negotiation* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992), p. 3.
53. Edda Weigand, 'Games of Power', in *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*, ed. by Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal, (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), p. 74.
54. Van Es, *Negotiating Ethics*, p. 159.
55. Ibidem, pp. 115-6. The interest in power 'as a discourse phenomenon in terms of participants' differential potential to enable and constrain one another's actions' may be considered in the Foucaultian tradition, as a philosophically renewed attention to the discursive or dialogic procedure which makes things happen' (Giuseppe Mininni, 'Interlocutionary Scenarios as Negotiation of Diatextual Power', in *Negotiation and Power in*

- Dialogic Interaction*, ed. by Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), p. 113). See Gunnar Olsson, *Lines of Power. Limits of Language* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991).
56. See Franz Hundsnurscher, 'The Grammar of Bargaining', in *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*, ed. by Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal, (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), p. 89.
 57. See G. Homans, *Social Behavior. Its Elementary Forms* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1961), p. 75. J. Rubin and B. Brown (*The Social Psychology of Bargaining and Negotiation* (New York: Academic Press, 1975) describe bargainers who have cooperative motives in which they seek to maximize joint profits rather than just their own profit.
 58. Walton and Krabbe, *Commitment in Dialogue*, p. 9.
 59. See Roloff, *Interpersonal Communication*, p. 15. Peter Blau has pointed out that, while the objects of economic exchange are open to bargaining, the objects of social exchange usually are not (*Exchange and Power in Social Life* (New York: Wiley, 1964)). But the distinctions between economic and social relationships are not sufficiently clear so as to make them mutually exclusive, as Roloff states (*ibidem*, p. 15). Bredero may be considered as someone who bargains for social exchange (see below).
 60. J. Adams, 'Inequity in Social Exchange', in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, ed. by L. Berkowitz (New York: Academic Press, 1965), Vol. 2, pp. 267-300.
 61. Roloff, *Interpersonal Communication*, p. 26.
 62. *Ibidem*, pp. 13-31. See also on the request of services (in return) the relationship between P.C. Hooft and Giacomo Badovere at the beginning of the seventeenth century: Thoen, *Strategic Affection?*, pp. 166-72.
 63. Roloff, *Interpersonal Communication*, p. 39.
 64. *Ibidem*, pp. 26-7 and p. 31.
 65. Fair and kind by matching the frequency and size of his opponent's concessions (in particular, the loan of the picture and thus the redemption of the promise). See Roloff and Jordan, 'Achieving Negotiation Goals', p. 31.
 66. Roloff, *Interpersonal Communication*, p. 44 and p. 55.
 67. *Ibidem*.
 68. R.N. Bontempo reports that in the positive frame, a one-issue agenda leads to greater agreement, higher satisfaction with outcomes, and more perceived fairness than does a multi-item agenda ('Heuristics and Negotiations: Effects of Frame and Agenda', Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management Association, San Francisco, August 1990, via: Putnam and Holmer, 'Framing, Reframing, and Issue Development', pp. 131-2).
 69. Maraldi and Orlandini, 'A case of negotiation.. ', p. 165. Haft-van Rees, *Taalgebruik*, pp. 37-8.
 70. Mininni, 'Interlocutory Scenarios as Negotiation of Diatextual Power', p. 113; Julie Diamond, *Status and Power in Verbal Interaction: A Study of Discourse in a Close-Knit Social Network* (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996); Sik Hung Ng and James J. Bradac, *Power in Language. Verbal Communication and Social Influence* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1993).
 71. The concept of self-interest assumes that self-interest may be malevolent or benevolent. Some individuals do seek a profitable exchange in which they are only concerned with

- maximizing rewards and minimizing costs, regardless of the profits of others, from individualistic motives. Rubin and Brown, *The Social Psychology of Bargaining and Negotiation*; Roloff, *Interpersonal Communication*, pp. 25-6.
72. Homans, *Social Behavior*, third proposition, p. 25.
 73. Roloff, *Interpersonal Communication*, p. 37.
 74. Weigand and Dascal (eds), *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*, p. vii.
 75. M.A. Neale and M.H. Bazerman, 'The Effects of Framing and Negotiator Overconfidence on Bargainer Behavior', *Academy of Management Journal* 28 (1985), pp. 34-49; Putnam and Holmer, 'Framing, Reframing, and Issue Development', p. 131.
 76. Geoffrey N. Leech, *Principles of Pragmatics* (London / New York: Longman, 1983), pp. 135-6.
 77. Idem, pp. 104ff.
 78. Robert Levine, *The Power of Persuasion: How We're Bought and Sold* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2003), pp. 65-89: 'When someone does something for us or gives us something, we feel obligated to do something for that person in return. The favor may create any of several feelings: gratitude, a sense of decency and social responsibility, or simple feelings of guilt. No matter which, it activates one of the most powerful of social norms, the reciprocity rule, whereby we feel compelled to repay, in equitable value, what another person has given to us'. Clauss, 'Prolepsis: Dealing with Multiple Viewpoints in Argument', pp. 13-4. Roloff, *Interpersonal Communication*, pp. 120ff.
 79. Brown and Levinson, *Politeness*, p. 66; Thomas Kohlen, 'Towards a History of English Directives', in *Text Types and Corpora. Studies in Honour of Udo Fries*, ed. by Andreas Fischer, Gunnel Tottie and Hans Martin Lehmann, (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag), p. 165 and pp. 173-4.
 80. See Van Es, *Negotiating Ethics*, p. 199.
 81. According to Jacques Moeschler (*Argumentation et Conversation: Éléments pour une analyse pragmatique du discours* (Paris: Hatier, 1985), p. 172 et p. 195) anticipated negotiation ('*négociation anticipée*') is an argumentative strategy that aims at anticipating eventual counter-arguments and refusing them at the same time (a '*stratégie argumentative visant à anticiper les contre-arguments que l'on pourrait opposer et à les refuser par là-même*'). According to this definition, proleptic negotiation amounts to more or less the same as proleptic argumentation. Mirka Maraldi and Anna Orlandini, 'A Case of Negotiation. The Argumentative Concession in Latin', in *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*, ed. by Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), p. 163 (constructions along with '*bien que*', '*même si*'). According to Moeschler an example of '*négociation anticipée*' is: '*Bien qu'il fasse froid, on pourrait aller se promener, non?*' (Although it is cold, we could go for a walk, couldn't we?) (Moeschler, p. 172; Maraldi and Orlandini, p. 163).
 82. Makau and Marty, *Cooperative Argumentation*, pp. 48-52 and p. 69. Walton and Krabbe, *Commitment in Dialogue*, pp. 17ff.
 83. Modesty can be an element of the author's strife to strengthen his authority. See Kevin Dunn, *Pretexes of Authority. The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), p. 4: 'The speaker is to win authority for himself through the appearance of spontaneous eloquence and affected modesty'. See Judith Kessler, "'Please do not mind the crudeness of its weave": Literature, Gender and the

- Polemic Authority of Anna Bijns', in *Literary Cultures and Public Opinion in the Low Countries, 1450-1650*, ed. by Jan Bloemendal, Arjan van Dixhoorn and Elsa Strietman (Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2011), pp. 69-75.
84. Leech, *Principles of Pragmatics*, pp. 136ff.
85. Katia P. Sycara, 'Persuasive Argumentation in Negotiation', in *Theory and Decision* 28 (1990), 220. Promises use functional and argumentative power, for example when promising to help another participant. See Maier, 'Negotiation and Identity', p. 234. Pamela Gibbons, James J. Bradac and Jon D. Busch ('The Role of Language in Negotiations: Threats and Promises', in *Communication and Negotiation*, ed. by Linda L. Putnam and Michael E. Roloff (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992), pp. 156ff.) argue that threats and promises can show us how language functions as speech acts and as linguistic and paralinguistic cues.
86. According to Roloff and Jordan ('Achieving Negotiation Goals', p. 31) there is a positive correlation between the desire to appear strong to the opponent and being argumentative during negotiation.
87. Maraldi and Orlandini, 'A Case of Negotiation', p. 163.
88. See Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 69-74, p. 204 and pp. 215ff.
89. H. Grice, *Logic and Conversation*, in *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, ed. by P. Cole and J. Morgan (New York: Academic Press, 1975), pp. 41-58.
90. See Bredero, *Proza*, pp. 11-2.
91. See Makau and Marty, *Cooperative Argumentation*, p. 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'.
92. Cf. Thomas, 'Eschewing Credit', p. 289: 'We might then see the writer as entering not so much into a market transaction, but into a form of exchange which more closely resembles the system of obligation and reciprocation that attends classical gift theory, in which the name designates not a producer but a transmitter'.
93. See Van Eemeren, *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse*, p. 148.
94. Putnam and Roloff, *Communication and Negotiation*, p. 3.
95. *Ibidem*.
96. Watts, *Politeness*, p. 255.

Bibliography

- Adams, J., 'Inequity in Social Exchange', in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, ed. by L. Berkowitz (New York: Academic Press, 1965), Vol. 2, pp. 267-300.
- Amjarso, Bilal, *Mentioning and Then Refuting an Anticipated Counterargument. A Conceptual and Empirical Study on the Persuasiveness of a Mode of Strategic Maneuvring* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2010).
- Aymard, M., 'Friends and Neighbors', in *A History of Private Life. Passions of the Renaissance*, ed. by Ph. Ariès and G. Duby (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 447-91.

- Bax, Marcel, 'Epistolary Presentation Rituals Face-work, Politeness, and Ritual Display in Early Modern Dutch Letter-Writing', in *Historical (Im)Politeness*, ed. by Jonathan Culpeper and Dániel Z. Kádár (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010), pp. 37-85.
- Berenst, Jan, 'Relationeel taalgebruik. Conversationale strategieën in interpersonele en interculturele communicatie' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Groningen, 1994).
- Blau, Peter M., *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (New York: Wiley, 1964).
- Bouchet, Jean, *Epistres Morales et Familières du Traverseur*, Poitiers, 1545, <<http://gallica.bnf.fr>>.
- Bredero, G.A., *Volledige werken*, ed. by J.A.N. Knuttel (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1929), Vol. 3.
- Bredero, G.A., *Proza: uitgegeven, vertaald en toegelicht*, ed. by J. Jansen (Hilversum: Verloren, 2011).
- Bres, Jacques, et al. (eds), *Dialogisme et polyphonie. Approches linguistiques*, (Brussels: De Boeck-Duculot, 2005).
- Brown, Penelope, and Levinson, Stephen C., *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- Cascarino, Richard, and Esch, Sandy van, *Internal Auditing. An Integrated Approach* (Lansdowne, South Africa: Juta Academic Publishers, 2007).
- Clauss, Patrick, 'Prolepsis: Dealing with Multiple Viewpoints in Argument', in *Dissensus and the Search for Common Ground*, ed. by H.V. Hansen et al. (Windsor, ON; OSSA, 2007), pp. 1-17 <http://jakemachina.com/OSSA/pdf/170_Clauss.pdf>.
- Der cooplieden handboucxkin* (Gent: bij Joos Lambrecht, 1544).
- Diamond, Julie, *Status and Power in Verbal Interaction: A Study of Discourse in a Close-Knit Social Network* (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1996).
- Dunn, Kevin, *Pretexes of Authority. The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994).
- Eemeren, Frans H. van, et al., *Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse* (Tuscaloosa / London: University of Alabama Press, 1993).
- Eemeren, Frans H. van, *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse. Extending the Pragma-Dialectical Theory of Argumentation* (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010).
- Eemeren, Frans van, and Houtlosser, Peter, 'Strategisch manoeuvreren in argumentatieve teksten', *Taalbeheersing* 21 (1999), 142-56.
- Eemeren, Frans van, and Houtlosser, Peter, 'Managing Disagreement: Rhetorical Analysis within a Pragma-Dialectical Framework', *Argumentation and Advocacy* 37 (2001), 150-7.
- Eemeren, Frans van, and Houtlosser, Peter, 'Strategic Manoeuvring: William the Silent's Apologie. A Case in Point', in *Communication and Culture: Argumentative, Cognitive and Linguistic Perspectives*, ed. by L.I. Komlósi, P. Houtlosser, and M. Leezenberg (Amsterdam: International Centre for the Study of Argumentation (Sic Sat), 2003), pp. 177-85.
- Es, Robert van, *Negotiating Ethics. On Ethics in Negotiation and Negotiation in Ethics* (Delft: Eburon, 1996).
- Fabri, Pierre, *Le Grant et vray art de pleine rhétorique...* Paris, 1521 (a copy of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München can be accessed online via Google.books).
- Gibbons, Pamela, Bradac, James J., and Busch, Jon D., 'The Role of Language in Negotiations: Threats and Promises', in *Communication and Negotiation*, ed. by Linda L. Putnam and Michael E. Roloff (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992), pp. 156-75.
- Gibbs, Raymond W., *Intentions in the Experience of Meaning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

- Grice, H., *Logic and Conversation*, in *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, ed. by P. Cole and J. Morgan (New York: Academic Press, 1975), pp. 41-58.
- Haft-van Rees, M.A., *Taalgebruik in gesprekken. Inleiding tot gespreksanalytisch onderzoek* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 1989).
- Homans, G., *Social Behavior. Its Elementary Forms* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1961).
- Hundsnurscher, Franz, 'The Grammar of Bargaining', in *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*, ed. by Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal, (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), pp. 77-90.
- Hutcheon, Linda, *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony* (London / New York: Routledge, 1994).
- Jansen, Jeroen, 'Vondels "Aenleidinge". Polyfonie en dialogisme', in *Neerlandistiek.nl* 09.02 (May 2009) (online publication).
- Jansen, Jeroen, 'Bredero onder de Wijzen. Geleende geleerdheid in de brief (1611) aan Carel Quina', *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde* 126 (2010), 347-72.
- Kessler, Judith, "'Please do not mind the crudeness of its weave": Literature, Gender and the Polemic Authority of Anna Bijns', in *Literary Cultures and Public Opinion in the Low Countries, 1450-1650*, ed. by Jan Bloemendal, Arjan van Dixhoorn and Elsa Strietman (Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2011), pp. 55-89.
- Kessler, Judith, and Šorm, Ester, "'En groet vooral de ketters niet!" Een argumentatieve analyse van Anna Bijns' refrein over het venijn van een slang', *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde* 126 (2010), 121-49.
- Kohnen, Thomas, 'Towards a History of English Directives', in *Text Types and Corpora. Studies in Honour of Udo Fries*, ed. by Andreas Fischer, Gunnel Tottie and Hans Martin Lehmann, (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag), pp. 165-75.
- Kooijmans, Luuc, *Vriendschap en de kunst van het overleven in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw* (Amsterdam: Bakker, 1997).
- Koppenol, Johan, 'Brieven aan de samenleving: Coornhert, zijn uitgevers en het Brievenboek', in *D.V. Coornhert (1522-1590): polemist en vredezoeker. Bijdragen tot plaatsbepaling en herwaardering*, ed. by J. Gruppelaar and G. Verwey (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010), pp. 65-83.
- La Charité, Claude, 'Les Epistres morales et familières (1545) de Jean Bouchet: de la hiérarchie médiévale au dialogue humaniste', *Études françaises* 38.2 (2002), 25-42.
- Larrivée, Pierre, 'La plausibilité psychologique des analyses polyphoniques: l'acquisition maternelle normale des présuppositions négatives', in *Le sens et ses voix. Dialogisme et polyphonie en langue et en discours*, ed. by Laurent Perrin (Metz: Université de Metz, 2006), pp. 461-79.
- Leech, Geoffrey N., *Principles of Pragmatics* (London / New York: Longman, 1983).
- Leff, Michael, 'Rhetorical Prolepsis and the Dialectical Tier of Argumentation', in *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation*, ed. by Frans van Eemeren et al. (Amsterdam: International Centre for the Study of Argumentation (Sic Sat), 1999), pp. 510-3.
- Les Sentences, Conseil, et bons enseignemens des sept saiges de Grece, avec une briefue & familiere exposition sur chascune autorité & sentence. Le tout mis nouvellement en langue Françoysse & bas Alleman, tresutiles & prouffitables pour un chascun, specialement pour la Ieunesse. De Sententien, Raet,*

- ende goede leeringhen der seven wijsen van Griecken, met een ghemeyne corte expositie op elcke autoriteyt ende sententie. Nu nieuwelijck gestelt in Franchoyse ende Nederlaantsche tale, seer nut ende profijtelijck voor eenen yghelijcken, sonderlinghe voor de Jonckheyt. Antwerp, bij Ian van Waesberghe op onse Vrouwen Kerckhof. Inden schilt van Vlaendren, 1562.
- Leuvensteijn, Arjan van, 'De leugen regeert. Vlysses' argumentatiestrategie en Polyxena's offerdood in Costers tragedie', in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde* 120 (2004), 155-69.
- Levine, Robert, *The Power of Persuasion: How We're Bought and Sold* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2003).
- Maier, Robert, 'Negotiation and Identity', in *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*, ed. by Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), pp. 225-37.
- Makau, Josina M., and Marty, Debian L., *Cooperative Argumentation. A Model for Deliberative Community* (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2001).
- Maraldi, Mirka, and Orlandini, Anna, 'A Case of Negotiation. The Argumentative Concession in Latin', in *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*, ed. by Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), pp. 149-66.
- Mininni, Giuseppe, 'Interlocutionary Scenarios as Negotiation of Diatextual Power', in *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*, ed. by Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), pp. 107-22.
- Moeschler, Jacques, *Argumentation et Conversation: Éléments pour une analyse pragmatique du discours* (Paris: Hatier, 1985).
- Mostart, Daniel, *Nederduytse secretaris Oft Zendbriefschryver, met een Tytelboexken*. (Amsterdam: voor Dirck Pietersz., 1637).
- Müller, Harald, 'Arguing, Bargaining and All That: Communicative Action, Rationalist Theory and the Logic of Appropriateness in International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations* 10.3 (2004), 395-435.
- Murphy, J.J., *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).
- Neale, M.A., and Bazerman, M.H., 'The Effects of Framing and Negotiator Overconfidence on Bargainer Behavior', *Academy of Management Journal* 28 (1985), 34-49.
- Ng, Sik Hung, and Bradac, James J., *Power in Language. Verbal Communication and Social Influence* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1993).
- O'Driscoll, Jim, 'Epilogue', in *Historical (Im)Politeness*, ed. by Jonathan Culpeper and Dániel Z. Kádár (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010), pp. 265-87.
- Olsson, Gunnar, *Lines of Power. Limits of Language* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991).
- Putnam, Linda L., and Roloff, Michael E. (eds), *Communication and Negotiation* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992).
- Putnam, Linda L., and Holmer, Majia, 'Framing, Reframing, and Issue Development', in *Communication and Negotiation*, ed. by Linda L. Putnam and Michael E. Roloff (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992), pp. 128-55.
- Renkema, Jan, *The Texture of Discourse. Towards an Outline of Connectivity Theory* (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2009).

- Rocci, Andrea, '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 (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2009), pp. 257-83.
- Roloff, Michael E., *Interpersonal Communication. The Social Exchange Approach* (Beverly Hills / London: Sage, 1981).
- Roloff, Michael E., and Jordan, Jerry M., 'Achieving Negotiation Goals: the "Fruits and Foibles" of Planning Ahead' in *Communication and Negotiation*, ed. Linda L. Putnam and Michael E. Roloff, (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992), pp. 21-45.
- Rubin, J., and Brown, B., *The Social Psychology of Bargaining and Negotiation* (New York: Academic Press, 1975).
- Sawyer, J., and Guetzkow, H., 'Bargaining and negotiation in international relations', in *International Behavior: A Social-Psychological Analysis*, ed. by H.C. Kelman (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), pp. 466-520.
- Schneider, Gary, *The Culture of Epistolarity. Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2005).
- Snoeck Henkemans, Francisca, 'Commentary on Patrick Clauss: "Prolepsis: Dealing with Multiple Viewpoints in Argument"'. Online publication <http://jakemachi-na.com/OSSA/pdf/171_SnoeckHenkemans_on_Clauss.pdf>.
- Streekstra, Nanne, and Bax, Marcel, 'Knippen, kopiëren en plakken in retrospectief. Briefmodellen, briefgenres en epistolaire beleefdheid in de Gouden Eeuw', in *Studies in taalbeheersing 3*, ed. by Wilbert Spooren, Margreet Onrust and José Sanders (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2009), pp. 343-57.
- Strien, Ton van, "'De gewone verontschuldigen". Literatuur in de brieven van Hooft en Huygens', *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde* 124 (2008), 211-8.
- Sycara, Katia P., 'Persuasive Argumentation in Negotiation', *Theory and Decision* 28 (1990), 203-42.
- Thoen, Irma, *Strategic Affection? Gift Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Holland* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007).
- Thomas, J.A., 'Discourse Control in Confrontational Interaction', in *The Pragmatics of Style*, ed. by Leo Hickey (London / New York: Routledge, 1989), pp. 133-53.
- Thomas, Max W., 'Eschewing Credit: Heywood, Shakespeare, and Plagiarism before Copyright', *New Literary History* 31 (2000), 277-93.
- Walton, Douglas, 'Proleptic Argumentation', in *Argumentation and Advocacy* 44 (2008), 143-54.
- Walton, Douglas, and Krabbe, Erik C.W., *Commitment in Dialogue: Basic Concepts of Interpersonal Reasoning* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995).
- Watts, Richard J., *Politeness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Weigand, Edda, 'Games of Power', in *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction*, ed. by Edda Weigand and Marcelo Dascal, (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), pp. 63-76.
- Weigand, Edda, and Dascal, Marcelo (eds), *Negotiation and Power in Dialogic Interaction* (Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001).