Making sense of terms of address in European languages through the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM)

Article *in* Intercultural Pragmatics · November 2016

DOI: 10.1515/ip-2016-0022

CITATIONS
12

READS
146

1 author:

Anna Wierzbicka
Australian National University
315 PUBLICATIONS **11,902** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Anna Wierzbicka*

Making sense of terms of address in European languages through the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM)

DOI 10.1515/ip-2016-0022

Abstract: Building on the author's earlier work on address practices and focusing on the French words *monsieur* and *madame*, this paper seeks to demonstrate that generic titles used daily across Europe have relatively stable meanings, different in different languages, and that their semantic analysis can provide keys to the speakers' cultural assumptions and attitudes. But to use these keys effectively, we need some basic locksmith skills. The NSM approach, with its stock of primes and molecules and its mini-grammar for combining these into explications and cultural scripts, provides both the necessary tools and the necessary techniques. The unique feature of the NSM approach to both semantics and pragmatics is the reliance on a set of simple, cross-translatable words and phrases, in terms of which interactional meanings and norms can be articulated, compared, and explained to linguistic and cultural outsiders. Using this approach, this paper assigns intuitive, intelligible and cross-translatable meanings to several key terms of address in French and English, and it shows how these meanings can account for many aspects of these terms' use. The paper offers a framework for studying the use of terms of address in Europe and elsewhere and has implications for language teaching, cross-cultural communication and education.

Keywords: address practices, cultural scripts, intercultural communication, miscommunication, NSM-based pragmatics

1 The puzzle

In a novel by the American author Diane Johnson, a young American woman, Isabel, arrives in Paris as an au pair and tries to communicate with the French. The task proves unexpectedly difficult, as she trips repeatedly over (seemingly) simple communicative tasks such as saying "Good morning" in French to her

***Corresponding author: Anna Wierzbicka,** Australian National University,
E-mail: Anna.Wierzbicka@anu.edu.au

new acquaintances. To illustrate, her first conversation with an elderly French gentleman, Monsieur Cosset, goes as follows:[1]

> "—Bonjour, mademoiselle."
>
> "Bonjour, Monsieur Cosset," I said, startled.
>
> "You should say, 'Bonjour, monsieur," he said. (...) This confused me. (...) why was I not to use his name?" (Johnson 2004: 119)

Some time later, Isabel receives a card from the same gentleman (known in her circle as "Oncle Edgar") with an invitation to an exhibition, and an expensive present.

> The card said "Bonjour, mademoiselle" and suggested an *exposition* the next week, rather an educational-sounding one about André Breton. Perhaps I was given it for being a *bonne élève*, for I had remembered to say "Bonjour, monsieur," when greeting him, and not just "Bonjour" or even "Bonjour, Monsieur Cosset." (No one, not even the magisterial Oncle Edgar, has been able to make me understand the logic of this rule.) (p. 161)

This paper will attempt to provide the explanation that this bewildered "American in Paris" was looking for in vain. More than that, the paper aims at providing a framework within which helpful and illuminating answers to such questions can be offered in general.

The two main tools on which this framework relies are known as "explications" and "cultural scripts," which are formulated in the same metalanguage, based on simple and cross-translatable words. This metalanguage, which has already been applied to the study of terms of address and their use in a number of different languages (e. g. Wierzbicka 2015, In press a, b; Farese 2015b), is known under the acronym "NSM" (from Natural Semantic Metalanguage). The basic assumptions of the NSM approach are stated briefly in Section 3, with some key references to more comprehensive explanations published elsewhere.

2 A semantic approach to intercultural pragmatics

The basic premise of this paper is that words like *monsieur* and *madame* (or *Mr*. and *Mrs*.) have relatively stable meanings and that these meanings can be pinned down through paraphrases formulated in simple and cross-translatable

1 I am grateful to Bert Peeters for drawing my attention to this quote.

words and phrases. (See Wierzbicka 2015, In press a, b; Farese 2015b). This premise goes against the grain of the prevailing current emphasis on variation in address usage and on "interactional and contextual details" (Norrby and Wide 2015: 4). As Norrby and Wide (2015: 2) put it, "address in a given language is not a static system but is better understood as a dynamic resource for negotiating and establishing social relationships in interaction that resonates with the overall sociocultural values of a particular speech community, social network or community of practice." One can only agree that address in a given language is not a "static system", but to be useful even as a "dynamic resource" it needs to be learnable, and in order to be learnable, it does need a degree of stability. It is this aspect that is in focus in this paper, which is a semantic, rather than sociolinguistic study of terms of address.

Similarly, in their paper "Diachronic perspectives on address term systems", Jucker and Taavitasainen (2003: 10) state that "sociolinguistic research over the last four decades has taught us that usage is always susceptible to synchronic and diachronic variation". Again, I agree: Variation is always there and the study of variation is of course essential. Presumably, however, this variation is not limitless. Accordingly, we also need to ask: what are its limits and what kind of methodological framework allows us to pinpoint the stable points?

And a third quote. In his editorial introduction to the inaugural issue of *Intercultural Pragmatics*, Istvan Kecskes (2004:13) contrasted "two extreme approaches to word meaning, one of which states that each word has an invariant meaning (e. g. Wierzbicka 1996), while the other claims that meaning is a function of use and there is no uniform set of attributes that constitutes the meaning of a linguistic expression (Wittgenstein 1953)". It is an honor to be contrasted with Wittgenstein, but as colleagues and I have sought to show in many publications on historical semantics and pragmatics (cf. e. g. Wierzbicka 2006, 2010; Bromhead 2009), positing invariants is not tantamount to denying change or variation (or if it seems extreme, this is so because it goes against the current). As I see it, our approach is not extreme but balanced. I will return to this point in Section 4.

3 The framework

The key feature of the NSM approach to semantics and pragmatics is the use of the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) for elucidating all meanings, including interactional ones, through paraphrases formulated in simple words and phrases available in any natural language. The central idea of NSM theory,

supported by a decades-long program of systematic cross-linguistic research, is that despite their enormous diversity, all natural languages share a common core: a small vocabulary of sixty-five or so conceptual primes and a "universal grammar" (the combinatory properties of the primes). The set of universal conceptual primes identifiable as distinct word meanings in all languages includes elements such as "someone," "something," "people," "good," "bad," "know," "think," "want," and "feel." The full set of semantic primes is given in Table 1 below (see Goddard and Wierzbicka 2002; Wierzbicka 1996; Goddard 2011; Goddard et al. 2014a). This inventory uses English exponents, but equivalent lists have been drawn up for many other languages as well (see Goddard and Wierzbicka 2002; Peeters 2006; Goddard 2008).

Table 1: Semantic primes (English exponents), grouped into 12 related categories.

1.	I, YOU, SOMEONE, SOMETHING~THING, PEOPLE, BODY, KIND, PART
2.	THIS, THE SAME, OTHER
3.	ONE, TWO, MUCH~MANY, LITTLE~FEW, SOME, ALL
4.	GOOD, BAD, BIG, SMALL
5.	THINK, KNOW, WANT, DON'T WANT, FEEL, SEE, HEAR
6.	SAY, WORDS, TRUE
7.	DO, HAPPEN, MOVE
8.	BE (SOMEWHERE), THERE IS, BE (SOMEONE/SOMETHING), (IS) MINE
9.	LIVE, DIE
10.	WHEN~TIME, NOW, BEFORE, AFTER, A LONG TIME, A SHORT TIME, FOR SOME TIME, MOMENT
11.	WHERE~PLACE, HERE, ABOVE, BELOW, FAR, NEAR, SIDE, INSIDE, TOUCH
12.	NOT, MAYBE, CAN, BECAUSE, IF, VERY, MORE, LIKE

The NSM approach to semantic and cultural analysis has been employed in hundreds of studies across many languages and cultures. (A large bibliography is available at the NSM Homepage.) As these studies demonstrate, the minilanguage of universal conceptual primes can be used to portray ways of thinking, acting, and speaking, in an illuminating as well as precise manner and to do so without cultural or linguistic biases, without theoretical preconceptions, and in a unified framework (see Wierzbicka 1992; Goddard et al. 2014a). Further, evidence suggests that in addition to the universal semantic primes listed in Table 1, there exist universal "semantic molecules"–fairly complex meanings which can be defined in terms of primes but which function as integrated units and thus facilitate a conceptual "chunking" in the building of more complex concepts. Current NSM research suggests that these universal semantic molecules include, inter alia, "men," "women," and "children" (see Goddard

2010; Goddard et al. 2014a, ch. 2). There are also molecules shared by some, but not all, languages, for example, "surname," and "name" (which will also appear in this paper).

The use of NSM allows us to decompose complex interactional meanings into configurations of simple concepts that are shared across languages, and to do so in cross-translatable sentences of ordinary language. This safeguards NSM-based semantic interpretation from the Anglocentrism inherent in taking English words – whether colloquial or technical – as basic analytical tools (Wierzbicka 2014; Goddard et al. 2014a). By contrast, NSM-based semantic components such as "I know who this someone is," "this someone is a man," "I don't know this someone well," or "people can know some good things about this someone" (which will be used in this paper) can be rendered in French (German, Chinese, Malay, etc.) sentences just as easily as in English, with no change in meaning. Accordingly, they can be tested both against linguistic evidence and against the intuitions of native speakers, and if necessary, can be perfected and adjusted in consultation with them (see Goddard et al. 2014b). A key point to note about such components is that they are not sociolinguistic observations about the usage but semantics hypotheses about the meanings in the speakers' minds. (Hence the first-person frame.)

In this paper, I will try to show that terms of address such as "monsieur" and "madame" in French or "Mr." and "Mrs." in English carry precise interactional meanings and that these meanings can be elucidated through NSM. My special focus will be on French, but the perspective will be cross-linguistic and cross-cultural.

4 Two basic "rules" of French interaction

The two most basic "rules" for successful verbal interaction in French have to do with the pronouns *tu* and *vous*, both translated into English as *you*, and with the use of the nouns *monsieur* and *madame* in addressing people. I have discussed the use and the meaning of *tu* and *vous* elsewhere (Wierzbicka, in press a), and here I will focus almost exclusively on *monsieur* and *madame*. It should be noted, however, that there is a broad correlation between the two rules: normally, if one addresses someone with the nouns *monsieur* or *madame*, one does not address them with the pronoun *tu*. (The reverse is not the case: the use of *vous* to address a person does not entail the use of *monsieur* or *madame* to him or her.)

Leaving aside the use of *tu* and *vous*, and also ignoring, for the sake of simplicity, the use of the noun *mademoiselle* (broadly comparable to *Miss*), one

can state the following, very rough, guideline: when one speaks French, it is good to use the words *monsieur* and *madame* frequently and widely (*monsieur* to men, and *madame*, to women).

There is no comparable guideline for modern English (as spoken in countries like the US, UK, Canada, and Australia). As a first approximation, we can say that the "logic" behind this broad and frequent use of the words *monsieur* and *madame* is that from a French cultural point of view, saying something to someone should often be accompanied by indicating that one thinks about the addressee at the moment of speaking as a man or a woman deserving of respect. This is a very general cultural norm, valid not only for speakers of French, but also for speakers of many other European languages (and many languages outside Europe too). Generally speaking, however, this norm is not valid for speakers of modern (Anglo) English – a fact which often causes them considerable difficulties in intercultural communication.

For example, when Diane Johnson's heroine Isabel thinks she has learned her lesson and avoids using the combination of *monsieur* with a surname, she still runs into trouble.

> One day I ran into l'oncle Edgar again, near Notre Dame. He looked imposing and dignified, in a navy blue suit with little ribbons in his lapel and a white handkerchief in the pocket, very like a diplomat. When I said, "*Bonjour*," he said, "Say *bonjour, monsieur*,' not just '*bonjour*.'" Another puzzle. (2004: 131)

Using NSM, this norm, shared by speakers of most European languages, can be formulated (in part) as follows:

[A] [many people think like this:]
when I want to say something to someone
if I don't know this someone (very) well
it can be good if I say something like this at the same time:
"when I say this, I think about you like this:
'people can know some good things about this someone'"

To comply with this norm, speakers of European languages can draw on the basic repertoire of terms of address which these languages provide, such as "monsieur" and "madame" in French, "Herr" and "Frau" in German, "Signore" and "Signora" in Italian, and so on. The meaning of such terms of address is partly language-specific (cf. Wierzbicka 2015 on German, and Farese 2015b on Italian), and the cultural scripts associated with these forms are by no means identical, but some core components of both the meanings and the cultural scripts are the same. Arguably, the component "when I say this to you, I think

about you like this: 'people can know some good things about this someone'" is one of those components which are shared by many European languages.

Returning to French, the fact is that the words *monsieur* and *madame* provide French speakers with two very handy tools for complying with that broad norm, and moreover, for doing so with just one word (*monsieur* or *madame*).

But while a script of this kind can be found operating in many European countries, in France it appears to be taken further than in most others, especially in service encounters. As most people who have traveled to France in recent decades will recognize, in France one is more likely to be greeted, for example, in shops with "Bonjour, monsieur" and "Bonjour, madame" than with comparable expressions in most other European countries.

In Britain, or in North America, there is no way to replicate a phrase like *Bonjour, madame* or *Bonjour, monsieur* because there are no nouns comparable to *monsieur* and *madame* in modern English. Bilingual dictionaries may suggest "Mr." and "Mrs." as rough English counterparts of *monsieur* and *madame*, but these English words cannot be used on their own, and normally require the presence of a surname (see Sections 11 and 12).

At the same time, as Diane Johnson's novel illustrates, in French, when the speaker does know the addressee's surname, it can be advisable not to use it: "Bonjour, monsieur" can sometimes be regarded as more appropriate than, for example, "Bonjour, monsieur Cosset." Like Diane Johnson's American heroine Isabel, many newcomers to the French language and culture would like to understand "the logic" of this usage, and would benefit from having it explained to them. As I will try to show, NSM can help here.

5 Variation of use and relative stability of meanings

In the literature on forms of address, both pronominal and nominal, there is currently a great emphasis on variation. The idea that words like *tu* (you-sg) and *vous* (you-pl) or *monsieur* and *madame* may have had a stable meaning over the last century, and across many different varieties of French, seems unacceptable to some scholars in variational pragmatics. Focussing on quantitative research, they seek to document variation in the use of such forms as their main task, and often seem to a priori reject the possibility that variation could co-exist with a considerable measure of stability.

From a semantic point of view, however, variation and "in-variation" are not mutually exclusive. Yes, the use of terms of address changes over time and varies across the social spectrum, but differences in their use do not necessarily indicate differences in meaning.

For example, judging by English novels and plays, combinations of "Mr." and "Mrs." with a surname appear to be far less frequent as forms of address now than they were fifty or a hundred years ago, but this fact does not show by itself that the meaning of the words "Mr." and "Mrs." has changed. Rather, this drop in frequencies may indicate that for many speakers of English the meaning of such terms of address has become less congenial: they have moved away from them because they prefer to relate to their interlocutors in other ways (see Section 12).

Elsewhere, I have investigated in some detail the semantic history of the German word *Herr* as a form of address and I did find evidence for semantic changes in the course of the last century. I have also found, however, evidence for the continuity of various semantic components (Wierzbicka 2015).

Furthermore, once we have identified all the semantic components making up the meaning of a word like *Herr* at a given stage of its semantic evolution, we are in a much better position to make sense of the variation in its use than we would be without such clear reference points. For example, the fact that in the contemporary German novel *Der Campus* the women's rights commissioner Frau Ursula Wagner uses *Herr* as a form of address far less than the departmental secretary Frau Eckert, can be shown to be related to the differences in the two women's social attitudes rather than to any differences in the meaning of the word *Herr* in their speech. The simplest hypothesis consistent with all the data is that the women's representative Frau Wagner finds the meaning of the word *Herr* less congenial than the socially more conservative Frau Eckert: the two women differ in their use of this term because it means the same for both of them, not because it means something different.

The same applies to the use of address words and phrases in other European languages. For example, if shopkeepers in present-day France tend to use greeting like "Bonjour, madame," "Bonjour, monsieur" to their customers more frequently than the other way around, we don't need to assume that the shopkeepers and their customers endow the words *monsieur* and *madame* with different meanings. Rather, it makes sense to hypothesize that these meanings are more congenial for providers of services than for their clientele.

Having said this, it needs to be pointed out that in all languages, polysemy is widespread and that usually when new meanings emerge they co-exist for some time with older meanings, and that the resulting polysemy needs to be consciously recognized by linguists and language teachers, as it is

unconsciously recognized by speakers themselves. I will discuss one such case of an emergent new meaning in the section on the combination of "monsieur" with a surname (Section 7).

Finally, it is worth pointing out that from the point of view of intercultural communication and language teaching, a one-sided emphasis on variation, to the exclusion of any information about synchronically stable meanings (including new meanings arising through polysemy) is unhelpful. What an "American in Paris" like Diane Johnson's heroine Isabel needs to hear is what the meanings conveyed by different forms of address are, not why it is "impossible" to state any stable meanings. She also needs to hear some reliable "rules" for using different forms of address appropriately: appropriately to the situation, and to the attitude to a particular interlocutor at a particular moment. I have put the word "rules" in quotes here because it is not a matter of trying to impose a certain code of behavior on the language-and-culture learners, but rather, of alerting them to unconscious or largely unconscious cultural scripts which most "insiders" sense and most "outsiders" don't. (Sociolinguistic surveys often fail to reveal the existence of such "rules" precisely because the respondents are not consciously aware of them.)

I will come back to French "cultural scripts" which influence the use of address forms such as *madame* and *monsieur* across a broad spectrum of variation in Section 13. For the moment, it is important to emphasize that in a given lingua-culture the meanings of interactional words such as terms of address work hand in hand with this lingua-culture's cultural scripts. As already mentioned, the use of the NSM framework allows us to articulate both the meanings of words and the cultural scripts in the same metalanguage and thus bring to light their mutual dependence and interconnection.

6 The meaning of "monsieur"

French dictionaries tend to gloss the word *monsieur* in the same way as English dictionaries gloss the word *mister* (often simply as "title"). But if *monsieur* and *mister* are described in the same way, this doesn't give us any insight into either the similarities or the differences between them, or into the logic of their use. By contrast, using simple and cross-translatable words of NSM we can pinpoint both the similarities and the differences in these words' meanings, and lay the foundations for the French and Anglo cultural scripts that underpin their use. I start by explicating the word *monsieur* used by itself as a term of address:

[B] ***Bonjour, monsieur.***
[I say to you: bonjour]
a. when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
b. "this someone is a man
c. people can know some good things about this man,
d. as they can know some good things about many men"
e. I don't think about you like this: "I know this someone very well"

Component (a) indicates that *monsieur* expresses a way of thinking about the addressee; (b) categorizes the addressee as a man; (c) acknowledges something like the "respectability" of the addressee; (d) accounts for the fact that, unlike *Herr* in German or *Signore* in Italian, *monsieur* cannot possibly be used to address God; and (e) explains why people normally don't use *monsieur* to address their brothers or their close friends.

Importantly, no intimation is given in this explication as to the basis for the perception of the addressee's "respectability." This is consistent with the very wide use of the term *monsieur*, which is applicable both to strangers in the street (when, for example, asking for directions) and to people known to be in an elevated social position.

For example, in Georges Duhamel's classic saga *Chronique des Pasquier* (1933–1945), the main protagonist, brilliant young scientist Laurent, addresses his old professors (and "masters", as the title of the volume describes them) simply as "monsieur" (e. g. vol. 6, p. 196, 109, see also vol. VIII p. 245), just as Diane Johnson's (2004) protagonist, the parliamentarian, expects to be addressed by the young au pair, and just as shopkeepers in twenty-first century France address their anonymous customers. (In his letters to his closest friend Justin, Laurent refers to these professors as "M. Chalgrin" and "M. Rohner", where "M." stands for "monsieur"). Thus, "monsieur" as a courteous form of address spans widely across the social spectrum, and also apparently maintains its stability over considerable time – from Duhamel, to present-day France.

7 "Monsieur" plus surname, in a private sphere

At first blush, an address phrase like *monsieur Martin* may seem to be identical in its interactional meaning to an English address term like "Mr. Brown": formally, they both consist of a basic title and the addressee's surname. In fact, however, the two are very different from one another, if only because

each is unconsciously perceived by the interlocutors against the background of other communicative options, and these options are in each case different. Above all, "monsieur Martin" is perceived against the background of "monsieur," whereas "Mr. Brown" is not perceived against the background of "mister."

To see what exactly the combination of *monsieur* with a surname conveys in French it will be useful to examine its use in a text like Simenon's detective novel *L'ombre chinoise*, where this combination occurs many times. The first time we hear it when the police inspector Maigret, who is investigating a crime committed in an apartment block, talks to the concierge about the tenants. (There are 28 apartments in the building, we are told.) One tenant, returning home, approaches them and asks the concierge about any mail which may have arrived for him.

— Rien pour moi?
('Nothing for me?')
— Rien, monsieur Martin...
('Nothing, monsieur Martin...') (1932: 14)

Evidently, the tenant feels no need to address the concierge as "madame," whereas she, more courteously, does address him as "monsieur" – adding, however, the surname. Part of the message of the concierge's greeting appears to be "I know what your surname is, I don't know many other things about you." Coming from someone responsible for 28 apartments, such a message makes sense.

Similarly, when Maigret starts questioning the tenants, he too initially addresses them with "monsieur" (and "madame") plus surname. He doesn't know these people, but he wants to (initially at least) treat them courteously, and he wants to show each of them that while he doesn't know much about them, he knows at least what their surname is. Likewise, when Maigret takes leave of the concierge, having spent an hour or so with her collecting information about the tenants, he says to her "Till tomorrow, madame Bourcière" ("A demain, madame Bourcière") – with the basic courtesy of "madame" and a "limiting" message of "I know what this someone's surname is, I don't know many other things about this someone."

On the other hand, when Diane Johnson's heroine Isabel says "Bonjour monsieur Cosset" to a public figure (a parliamentarian), such a message can be perceived as inappropriate and even potentially offensive.

To take an older example, when in George Duhamel's "*Chronique des Pasquier*" (1933–1945) the director of the scientific institute where the young scientist Laurent works repeatedly addresses Laurent as "monsieur Pasquier,"

the reader guesses a certain hostility towards Laurent behind that form of address, and the director's desire to put him down. After all, the director knows that Laurent is already known as an outstanding young scientist. By addressing him as "monsieur Pasquier" he appears to reduce him to the level of someone who can be presumed to deserve some basic human respect but about whom not much is known beyond his surname.

In her introduction to the 2010 volume on French nominal forms of address, Catherine Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2010: 22) writes:

> "Monsieur/madame" + surname: this usage is still sometimes disputed by the normativists. All the manuals of *savoir-vivre* remind you: in contrast with other languages (such as English), in French "the surname should never follow 'monsieur' or 'madame' in 'worldly relations' ("rapports mondains")...

As Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2010: 22) further notes, however, the same manuals quickly add that there are many exceptions to this "rule", and she adds: "It is not very surprising that this usage – more 'personalised' than the anonymous "Madame/Monsieur", and therefore more cordial – characterises, above all, situations where it is important to indicate that one 'recognises' one's interlocutor, as in shops and services."

The observation about indicating that one recognizes one's addressee fits in well with the situation when the concierge addresses a tenant as "monsieur Martin," but not so well with Maigret's use of "madame Bourcière" to take leave of someone to whom he has been talking for an hour. The component proposed here: "I know what this someone's surname is, I don't know many other things about this someone" can fit a wide range of examples, including those where adding a surname to "monsieur" and "madame" can be seen as "personalizing" and therefore relatively courteous (I would say "courteous" rather than "cordial"), and also those where it can be seen to be a snub or a social gaffe. (I don't think the combination of "monsieur" and a surname is ever cordial in the sense of expressing good feelings toward the addressee.)

[D] ***(Bonjour), Monsieur Martin*. (Cf. Bonjour, Monsieur)**
[I say to you: bonjour]
a. when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
b. "this someone is a man
c. people can know some good things about this man,
d. as they can know some good things about many men"
e. **at the same time, I think about you like this**:
"I know what this someone's surname is, I don't know many other things about this someone"

If this explication is correct, it helps explain why a man with a public persona like Monsieur Cosset may feel slightly annoyed when addressed by the American au pair as "Monsieur Cosset": component (e) (in bold) is clearly inappropriate in this case. At the same time, when the concierge in Simenon's detective novel greets one of the tenants with "Bonjour, monsieur Martin", the same message is entirely appropriate, and the greeting is fully acceptable.

Why is the admonition to use "monsieur" rather than "monsieur Cosset" such a puzzle to an "American in Paris" like Diane Johnson's Isabel? Clearly, the reason is that she is, consciously or unconsciously, equating "monsieur" with "mister (Mr.)". She takes "Good morning, Mr. X" as a base line (as English-French dictionaries suggest), and ends up with "Bonjour, monsieur Cosset". But "monsieur" is *not* an equivalent of "Mr.", because "Mr." is only a kind of "prefix" to the surname and has, so to speak, no meaning of its own (apart from the combination with a surname). This is not the case with "monsieur".

Thus, a combination of "monsieur" with a surname is possible in French, but it is not always appropriate (cf. Claudel 2004), and superficially analogous address phrases such as "monsieur Martin" and "Mr. Brown" do not have the same interactional meaning at all – if only because "monsieur Martin" competes, so to say, with "monsieur", whereas "Mr. Brown" does not compete with a hypothetical "Mr.". I will explore these differences further in Section 11.

8 "Monsieur" plus a surname in the public sphere

In her conclusion to the volume *S'addresser á autrui: Les formes nominales d'adresse en français* Kerbrat-Orecchioni quotes Molière's play "Georges Dandin", where one of the characters affirms that one has to use "Monsieur" without a surname to "those who are above us" ("ceux qui sont au-dessus de nous"). In this context, she comments that the present-day usage "retains a trace of this ancient distinction, with the difference that in Molière's times it refers essentially to a hierarchical organisation of the society (...), whereas today it is rather a matter of a horizontal axis, that is, the degree of "familiarity" (familiarité)."

At the same time, Kerbrat-Orecchioni admits that the term "familiarity" (*familiarité*) is rather "ambiguous" (*ambigu*) here, as it can either refer to the nature of the relation between the interlocutors, more or less "close" (*proche*), or reflect a certain "register" (*registre*), because, as she puts it, "monsieur" is without doubt

more elevated than "monsieur Dupont" ("«monsieur» relevant d'un registre incontestablement plus soutenu que «monsieur Dupont»".) (p. 350)

In this context, Kerbrat-Orecchioni notes that there is a difference between the mundane greetings like "monsieur Dupont" and the use of address forms like "monsieur Sarkozy" in political debates. As she puts it, "in some contexts, but only in some contexts, monsieur/madame + surname can still be regarded as inelegant and for example constant use of "Bonjour, monsieur Dupont", "Merci, madame Durand" and the like in telemarketing can irritate people to whom it would never occur to condemn the use of address phrases like 'madame Royal' and 'monsieur Sarkozy' in our [political] debates as vulgar." (p. 350).

Using NSM, we can pinpoint the emergent meaning of address phrases like "madame Royal" and "monsieur Sarkozy" with precision, distinguishing it from the older and more established meaning of "monsieur Dupont" and "madame Durand" (in the private sphere) as follows:

[E] ***(Bonjour), Monsieur Sarkozy***
(I say to you: Bonjour.)
a. when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
b. "this someone is a man,
c. people can know some good things about this man,
d. as they can know some good things about many men"
e. at the same time, I think like this:
f. "this someone is someone not like many other people
g. if I say this someone's surname, people here can know many things about this someone"

In this new usage of the combination "Monsieur + surname", the component of "personal distance" is replaced, so to speak, by the presentation of the addressee to an audience in components f and g. An audience is always envisaged in the case of a public debate involving a political figure like Nicolas Sarkozy; and this audience ("people here") needs to know whom the presenter or moderator is addressing at a given point. At the same time it is assumed that the person in question is someone well known.

9 "Monsieur" combined with another title

In addition to phrases like "Monsieur Martin", the word *monsieur* can also sometimes appear in address phrases in combination with another title (and without

a surname). For example, as already mentioned, in Duhamel's *Chronique*, young scientist Laurent consistently addresses his boss, the director of the institute where he works, as "Monsieur le directeur", and the concierge in Simenon's novel addresses police inspector Maigret as "Monsieur le commissaire". What exactly is the interactional meaning embedded in such appellations?

If we assume that "monsieur" means here the same as in other contexts, the question narrows down to the semantic contribution of phrases like "le directeur" and "le commissaire". In the NSM framework, two hypotheses, A and B, suggest themselves here.

A.
when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
"this someone is someone not like many other people"

B.
when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
"this someone is someone above many people"

The fact that "monsieur" is usually not combined with "Professeur" and that for example Laurent addresses his old professor as simply "Monsieur", suggests that the title following "monsieur" implies a superior position in some hierarchy (hypothesis B) rather than unusual distinction (hypothesis A). As noted by Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2014: 19), "the use of hierarchical titles [like "professeur"] is avoided in France in an academic environment, and is often regarded as ridiculous". At the same time she notes, with reference to André (2010), that some hierarchical titles [such as "directeur"] are used "in certain professional milieus". This is consistent with what we see in literature of the earlier periods such as Duhamel's *Chronique des Pasquier* and Simenon's detective novels. This leads me to the following explication of address phrases such as "Monsieur le directeur" and "Monsieur le commissaire":

[F] ***(Bonjour), Monsieur le directeur (Monsieur le commissaire)***
[I say to you : Bonjour]
a. when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
b. "this someone is a man,
c. people can know some good things about this man,
d. as they can know some good things about many men"
e. **at the same time, I think about you like this**:
"this someone is someone above many people"
f. I don't think about you like this: "I know this someone very well".

It is noteworthy that in English, phrases like "Mr. Director" and "Mr. Inspector" are, generally speaking, not used at all. It is true that the word "mister" occurs in combinations like "Mr. Speaker", "Mr. Chairman", or "Mr. President", but as English dictionaries often recognise, this is not the meaning of "Mr." which has its close counterpart in "Mrs.". A woman who holds the position of a parliamentary speaker is normally addressed as "Madam Speaker", not "Mrs. Speaker". Furthermore, as noted for example by *Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary*, this second meaning of "Mr." can be called upon only in addressing a person who holds the position in question, and not in referring to him, whereas "Mr." in the sense matched with "Mrs." can be used both in address and in reference.

10 "Monsieur" combined with a first name

Another, relatively minor, way of addressing people outside the circle of one's family and friends is by combining "monsieur" or "madame" with the addressee's first name. Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2010: 22) describes this type as "reserved for certain social functions which are quite particular (...), with a value combining respect and familiarity", and she illustrates this special tone with a reference to one of Yves Montand's songs, whose narrator, an employee of a large grocery shop, clearly enjoys being addressed by the customers as "Monsieur Paul".

[G] ***(Bonjour), Monsieur Paul***
[I say to you : Bonjour]
a. when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
b. "this someone is a man,
c. people can know some good things about this man,
d. as they can know some good things about many men"
e. at the same time, I think about you like this:
"I know this someone, I know some good things about this someone
I can feel something good towards this someone because of this"
f. I don't think about you like this: "I know this someone very well"

In the explication above, I have tried to account for this particular tone combining something like "respect" with something like "familiarity", and also, I would add, with a certain "warmth" by positing component (e): "(when I say this to you), I think about you like this: 'I know this someone, I know some good things about this someone, I can feel something good towards this someone because of this'".

11 "Monsieur" vs. "Mr.": The meaning of English address phrases like "Mr. Brown"

I have already noted that address phrases like "Mr. Brown" do not compete in English with the single word "mister". What do they compete with, then? As rightly noted with Diane Johnson's heroine Isabel, they compete, above all, with a zero address phrase, that is, no address phrase or word at all. Being a good learner, Isabel remembered to say "Bonjour, monsieur", but she could not understand why she should avoid saying to him either "Bonjour, monsieur Cosset" or simply "Bonjour".

As noted earlier, a simple "Bonjour" would have been inconsistent with the French cultural script encouraging speakers to indicate how they are thinking about the addressee at the moment of speech. A more expressive "Bonjour, monsieur Cosset" could be perceived as inappropriate for other reasons, as discussed in Section 6. But how exactly did the (inappropriate) message of "monsieur Cosset" differ from that of "Mr. Cosset," which would have been quite appropriate if the conversation was taking place in English?

According to my interpretation, the message of, roughly speaking, "respectability" is the same in the case of "monsieur" (and also, "monsieur" plus surname) as it is in the case of "Mr. Brown":

> when I say this, I think about you like this:
> "people can know some good things about this man
> as they can know some good things about many men"

In the case of "Mr. Brown", however, the assumption of such "respectability" is based on a certain knowledge about the addressee. Accordingly, the addressee's identity needs to come first in the explication.

[H] ***(Good morning), Mr. Brown*. (Cf. *Good morning, Mr.)**
[I say to you: Good morning]
a. when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
b. "this someone is a man,
c. I know some things about this man, I know what this man's surname is"
d. at the same time, I think about you like this:
e. "people can know some good things about this man,
f. as they can know some good things about many men"
g. I don't think about you like this: "I know this someone well"
h. I don't think about you like this: "this someone is someone like me"

The two final components of "Mr." posited in the explication above differ in two respects from the final component of "monsieur" (and consequently, of "monsieur Martin", too). First, "monsieur" can be used to address people whom one purports to know well (though not *very well*), and so it is compatible with an attitude of greater "familiarity" than "Mr. Brown". Second, addressing someone as "Mr. Brown" appears to also imply an absence of something like "chumminess" – a concern which is, arguably, not part of the meaning of "monsieur". Both these implications of "Mr." are nicely illustrated by the following examples from English literature cited by the OED:

> 'Well, Mr. Burgon?'..'Mister at the end of 20 years!..I wish you wouldn't call me Mister'. (J. W. Burgon 1888)
>
> Stop, mon cher, stop; don't call me Mister; we are to be friends. (E. Bulwer-Lytton 1837)
>
> We're all good friends..We don't use no Mister and Missus. (P. Moyes 1975)

Thus, the last components of "monsieur" and "Mr. Brown" can be contrasted as follows:

> ***Monsieur***
> ...
> I don't think about you like this: "I know this someone very well"
>
> ***Mr. Brown***
> ...
> I don't think about you like this: "I know this someone well"
> I don't think about you like this: "this someone is someone like me"

In Irène Nemirovsky's short novel *Le bal* (2002 [1930]), a nouveau-riche couple, Monsieur and Madame Kampf, decide to give a ball. In the course of the preparations, Madame Kampf gives orders to servants, who respond, as expected, with "Oui, madame" ("Yes, *madame*"). But when the English governess Miss Betty responds to Madame Kampf's orders, the response is always "Yes, Mrs. Kampf" (in English). There is no way the governess, anxious to keep her post, could be wanting to convey to her terrifying employer the message "I don't know many things about you". It is also inconceivable that the servants would want to convey such a message. This is why the servants couldn't possibly address their employer in French as "Madame Kampf". But in English, "Mrs. Kampf" carries no such message, so "Mrs. Kampf" is entirely appropriate – and indeed necessary – for the English governess in that household to use.

A good illustration of how address phrases like "Mr. Brown" and "Mrs. Brown" are perceived by speakers of English comes from an autobiographical passage in Bill Bryson's book *Notes from a Big Country* (1998):

> In England, I used the same accountant for over a decade, and our relations were always cordial but businesslike. She never called me anything but Mr. Bryson and I never called her anything but Mrs. Creswick. When I moved to America, I phoned an accountant for an appointment. When I came to his office, his first words to me were, 'Ah, Bill, I'm glad you could make it.' We were pals already. Now when I see him I ask him about his kids. (p. 160)

Commenting on this passage (which she adduces in a French translation by C. and D. Ellis), Kerbrat-Orecchioni describes the use of "Bill", in contrast to "Mr. Bryson", as "familier et égalitaire" ('familiar and egalitarian'). Terms like these, however, are not sufficiently fine-grained to allow us to pinpoint the interactional meaning in question with precision, as it can be done through NSM.

Speaking loosely, one could say that the wide use of "monsieur" and "madame" in France, regardless of the addressee's social position, and the avoidance of titles (compared, for example, with Italy, cf. Ravazzolo 2014) reflects an "egalitarian ethos"; and one could say the same about the widespread use of first names in the US (not to mention Australia). Yet if both "monsieur" and "Bill" are "egalitarian", each of them is "egalitarian" in a different sense. The same applies to slippery and protean labels like "familiar" and "familiarity".

For Bryson (as I interpret his remarks), "Bill" implies being treated like "a pal", that is, perhaps, "someone like me", whereas "Mr. Bryson" implies "I don't think about you like this: 'I know this someone well'" and "I don't think about you like this: 'this someone is someone like me'" – components absent from "*Monsieur* Bryson". Thus, NSM components such as "this someone is (not) someone like me", "I know (don't know) this someone well," and "I know (don't know) this someone very well" allow us to capture distinctions and concerns which cannot be accounted for with conventional labels such as "familiarity", "equality", "egalitarianism", "reserve" or "distance".

12 "Mr." and "Mrs." in different varieties of English

The component "I don't think about you like this: 'this someone is someone like me'", posited here for "Mr." but not for "monsieur", is so important for any in-depth comparison of these two terms of address that I need to dwell on it a little longer. In doing so, I will draw on my personal experience over more than 40 years of living with Australian English.

To begin with, in Australia, when parents arrive for a parent-teacher meeting, a teacher may address a mother as "Mrs. Brown", or vice versa, but

normally, no mother would address another mother in this way. When two mothers who don't know each other well meet at school, they may check each other's first names and start using these names more or less from the start, or they may avoid any overt form of address. But addressing each other as "Mrs. Brown" and "Mrs. Jones" would normally be regarded as very odd. The component: "I don't think about you like this: 'this someone is someone like me'" would account for this. I will add two facts from my personal experience.

First, I will note that both my husband and I are often addressed by doctors' and dentists' receptionists as "Mr. Besemeres" and "Mrs. Besemeres", and also, that if we go to see the same practitioner for some time, after a while, the receptionist switches to "John" and "Anna". The second example concerns an elderly couple ("Mr. Manning" and "Mrs. Manning") who often looked after our daughters when they were children, and who were like grandparents to them. My (Australian) husband addressed Mr. Manning initially as "Mr. Manning", and after a short time, by his first name (Ern). As for Mrs. Manning, my husband addressed her for a long time as "Mrs. Manning", but after some years, he started to avoid this form of address (as "too distant"), without moving, however, to her first name (which was "Tessie", from Beatrice).

As these examples illustrate, "Mr." and "Mrs." as terms of address are used differently in different parts of the English-speaking world, but there is no need to posit different meanings for these forms of address in different varieties of English. The simplest hypothesis would be that if "Mr." and "Mrs." as a form of address are used more widely in Britain than in Australia or in America, it is because the interactional meaning of "Mr." and "Mrs." (as explicated here) fits socio-cultural attitudes and values in Britain better than those in America or in Australia. (Cf. e. g. Fox 2005; Paxman 1999; Hirst 2010; Goddard 2012a, b. For Irish English see Barron 2008). It is the cultural scripts that are different, rather than the meaning of "Mr." and "Mrs." as such.

Arguably, the main reason why "Mr." and "Mrs." as terms of address can be felt to be less congenial in Australian culture than in British culture has to do with component (i) (in the explication of "Mr. Brown"): "when I say this to you, I don't think about you like this: this is someone like me" which (according to my analysis) is inherent in the meaning of these two terms.

Australian cultural critic Donald Horne in his classic *The Lucky Country* (1964: 35) linked the relevant aspect of Australian speech culture with the assumption that "all people are the same".

> Since Australian friendliness often lacks knowledge of social forms and ceremonies it can sometimes seem so strange to be taken for rudeness, usually for the one reason: that most Australians are bereft of feelings of difference; they think that all people are the same, that

> what is good for oneself is good for anyone else. Their openness and friendship-seeking is based on this belief.

More recently, Australian historian John Hirst (2006: 301) has sought to capture this aspect of Australian speech culture with the phrase "egalitarianism of manners."

British visitors to, and commentators on, Australia, from D.H. Lawrence (1923), to British journalists J.D. Pringle (1965) and Michael Davie (2000), have often summed up their impressions in a similar way. For example, Pringle, in his *Australian Accent* described Australians as follows:

> Equality is the very air they breathe. There is a blessed freedom from the minor class distinctions which plague life in England. On a newspaper the drivers of the office cars are perfectly equal to – and often more intelligent than – the reporters who use them. They call each other by their Christian names and drink together off-duty. (Pringle 1965: 111)

Michael Davie, in his book *Anglo-Australian Attitudes* (2000: 24) writes in a similar vein: "Casual English visitors observe the absence of the indicators to which they are accustomed – the scarcity of titles, the lack of formal deference with which employees treat employers...."

Such comments from British commentators must give us pause: what sort of "formal deference" would British observers expect in the speech of employees to their employers, or from drivers of office cars to reporters in a newspaper office, in lieu of the first names, whose use they find surprising? Presumably, what they have in mind is appellations like "Mr. Brown", which imply not so much "deference" as "reserve" and "distance" (one may recall here Lawrence's words about Australians' "lack of reserve in manner", which the British hero of *Kangaroo* "hated").

But terms like "deference", "reserve," and "distance" are neither clear nor precise, and they are certainly not cross-translatable. I submit that using NSM components such as "I don't think about you like this: 'I know this someone well'" and "I don't think about you like this: 'this someone is someone like me'" we can get to the bottom of perceptions such as those quoted above, both Australian and British. We can also show, with clarity and precision, the differences between the interactional meanings embedded in terms of address like "Mr." and "monsieur", and also, between the cultural scripts linked with such terms of address in different languages (e. g. French and English) and in different varieties of the same language (e. g. British English and Australian English).

If, as argued here, the meaning of "Mr." (and "Mrs.") includes the component: "I don't think about you like this: 'this someone is someone

like me'", then this by itself would explain a great deal about the relative avoidance of this turn of address in Australia in comparison with Britain. The variation in the use of terms like "Mr." and "Mrs." across Englishes deserves systematic investigation and would no doubt yield valuable results from the point of view of variation in cultural scripts across English-speaking societies. (For models in this area, see in particular Goddard 2012a; see also Section 13.3).

13 Some French and English cultural scripts

In this section, I will take a quick look at some cultural scripts that are associated, within each linguaculture, with terms of address such as "monsieur" and "madame" in French, and "Mr." and "Mrs." in English. Since the metalanguage in which these cultural scripts and the explications of the terms of address are formulated is the same, the links between the two can be easily seen.

13.1 French cultural scripts for addressing people with the words "monsieur" and "madame"

As we have seen, from a French-speaking insider's point of view, the two basic terms of address, "monsieur" and "madame", can be seen as linked with two main "cultural scripts" for addressing people outside the family: one for strangers and another, for people whom one knows but whom one doesn't know very well. Both these scripts recommend adding the words "monsieur" and "madame" (as appropriate) when saying things to people outside one's family and circle of friends. Using NSM, we can formulate the script for talking to strangers as follows:

[J] *A French cultural script for speaking to a man whom one doesn't know*
[In France, many people think like this:]
a. when I want to say something to a man,
b. if I don't know this man,
c. it is good if I say something like this to this man at the same time:
"when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
'people can know some good things about this man'"
d. I can say this with one word if I say the word "monsieur"

The script for talking to people whom one doesn't know very well can be virtually identical, with only a minimal difference in component (b): "if I don't know this man" in script [J], and "if I don't know this man very well" in script [K]:

[K] *A French cultural script for speaking to a man whom one doesn't know very well*
[In France, many people think like this:]
a. when I want to say something to a man,
b. if I don't know this man very well,
c. it is good if I say something like this to this man at the same time:
"when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
'people can know some good things about this man'"
d. I can say it with one word if I say the word "monsieur"

13.2 An English cultural script for addressing people with the words "Mr." and "Mrs."

There are at least two differences between the English cultural script recommending the use of "Mr." and "Mrs." as terms of address (in England), and the French ones recommending the use of "monsieur" and "madame". First, French has three scripts (one for strangers, one for people whom one knows but not very well, and one for people whose surname one knows, without knowing much else about them), whereas English has only one script, targeting people whom one doesn't know very well and excluding strangers. Second, the two main French scripts require "one word" (only "monsieur", or "madame") whereas the English script requires two words ("Mr." and the surname, or "Mrs." and the surname).

[M] *An English cultural script for speaking to a man whom one doesn't know very well*
[In England, many people think like this:]
a. when I want to say something to a man,
b. if I don't know this man very well,
c. it is often good if I say something like this to this man at the same time:
d. "when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
'people can know some good things about this man'"
e. I can say it to a man with two words, like this:
first I say the word "Mr.", after this I say man's surname

One might add that the English cultural scripts recommending a (limited) use of "Mr." and "Mrs." work hand in hand with scripts recommending impersonal forms of address such as "Excuse me", which can be seen as an impersonal substitute for terms of address. In French, on the other hand, "Excuse me" has its common counterpart in "Pardon, monsieur" and "Pardon, madame". In many situations, when one needs to say something to a stranger in England, "Excuse me" as a form of address would be perfectly acceptable, whereas a bare "Pardon" would often be judged as less acceptable in France.

One final point. As mentioned earlier, it is well known that there is a great deal of variation in the use of forms of address like "Mr." and "Mrs." across English-speaking countries, and that for example, in Australia their use is far more restricted than in England. This is linked, I have argued, with differing cultural scripts. While it would be outside the scope of this paper to discuss such differences here in any detail, I will nonetheless include here what I see as the Australian counterpart of the "Mr." script. It will differ from the English script in components (f) and (g), which can all be linked with the "distinctiveness of Australian egalitarianism" (cf. Hirst 2006, 2010).

[N] *An Australian cultural script for speaking to a man whom one doesn't know well*
[in Australia, many people think like this:]
a. when I want to say something to a man,
b. if I don't know this man well
c. it can be good if I say something like this to this someone at the same time:
d. "when I say this to you, I think about you like this:
'people can know some good things about this man'"
e. I can say it to a man with two words, like this:
first I say the word "Mr.", after this I say this man's surname
f. I can't say this to a man like this
if I often do things with this man in the same place where I do things with other people
g. I can't say this to a man like this for a very long time

This script [N] differs from its English counterpart [M] in the phrasing of component (c) ("it can be good" in [N], "it is often good" in [M]), and in two additional components (f) and (g), which have no counterparts in script [M]. Component (f) says, roughly speaking, that one usually can't address men as "Mr." if one often engages in shared activities with them and (g) says that one normally can't address a man as "Mr." if one has known him for a long time.

14 Conclusions and further perspectives

Evidence from bilingual and bicultural experience (as reflected in literature and also in personal testimonies, cf. e. g. Farese 2015c) shows that in European languages and cultures there are hidden "rules" governing expected ways of addressing other people, and that these "rules" differ from country to country, and from language to language. "Universalist" pragmatics operating with crude distinctions such as that between "positive" and "negative" politeness was unable to bring such rules to light (cf. Goddard 2007). Unquestionably, great progress has been made in pragmatics since many of its practitioners have come to question and reject such simplistic and ethnocentric notions (cf. e. g. Schneider 2010). Nonetheless, in recent years, too, the field has remained to a large extent undertheorized. Simplistic distinctions such as that between "familiar" and "polite" forms of address, or between "T" and "V", are still widely relied on, and the focus of attention is often on collecting more data rather than on finding a framework within which the amassed data can be made sense of. Like its predecessors (e. g. Wierzbicka 2015, In press a, b), this paper aims at showing that such a framework can be found in the NSM theory of semantics and pragmatics.

For example, according to NSM-based pragmatics, to make sense of the variation in the use of the word "Mr." and "Mrs." as terms of address, or of the differences in use between "Mr." in English and "monsieur" in French, we need to establish what these words mean. To do so in a verifiable way, we need to let go of technical terms (such as "polite", "familiar", "distance", "formality", and so on) and look for semantic components intelligible to native speakers and testable in context; and if we want to do so without ethnocentrism, we need to formulate our hypotheses (that is, the hypothesized semantic components) in cross-translatable words, put together into cross-translatable phrases and sentences.

For example, components like "this someone is someone like me," "I don't know this someone well," and "people can know some good things about this someone" are both intelligible to "ordinary speakers" (as they are non-technical and very simple) and essentially cross-translatable, as the following renderings into the French version of NSM illustrates:

French

Ce quelqu'un est quelqu'un comme moi.
Je ne connais pas bien ce quelqu'un.
Les gens peuvent savoir de bonnes choses sur ce quelqu'un.

Thus, the unique feature of the NSM approach to pragmatics is its reliance on a set of cross-translatable words and phrases of ordinary

language, in terms of which interactional meanings and "rules" can be articulated, compared, explained to linguistic and cultural outsiders, and tested against the intuitions of linguistic and cultural insiders (cf. e. g. Wierzbicka 2003; Goddard and Wierzbicka eds. 2004; Goddard ed. 2006; Wong 2014; Farese 2015a; Ye 2013). Using this approach, this paper assigns intuitive, intelligible and cross-translatable meanings to several key terms of address in French and English, and it shows how these meanings can account for aspects of these terms' use.

In conclusion, this paper, I believe, offers a useful model for studying the use of terms of address across Europe and elsewhere, and that it presents a framework within which their use can be not only investigated empirically but also made sense of. Using this framework we can show how differences in address practices can be linked with, and explained in terms of, differences in history, culture, attitudes and values (cf. Wierzbicka 2015, in press a, b). At the same time, I venture to suggest that the paper has wide-reaching implications for foreign language teaching, intercultural communication training and cross-cultural education in Europe and beyond. For arguably, here as elsewhere, nothing is as practical as a good theory.

Acknowledgments: I would also like to thank Bert and Gian Marco Farese for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this paper. The final versions of the explications and scripts owe a great deal to Cliff Goddard.

References

André, Virginie. 2010. Les formes nominales de l'adresse dans l'interaction entre maître et élèves à l'école primaire. In Kerbrat-Orecchioni (ed.), 2010, 63–88.

Barron, Anne. 2008. The structure of requests in Irish English and English English. In Klaus P. Schneider & Anne Barron (eds.), *Variational pragmatics: A focus on regional varieties in pluricentric languages*, 35–68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bromhead, Helen. 2009. *The reign of truth and faith in 16th and 17th century English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bryson, Bill. 1998. *Notes from a big country*. London: Doubleday.

Claudel, Chantal. 2004. De l'utilisation du système d'adresse dans l'interview de presse écrite française. *Langage et société* 2(108). 11–25.

Davie, Michael. 2000. *Anglo-Australian attitudes*. London: Secker & Warburg.

Duhamel, Georges. 1933–1945. *Chronique des Pasquier*. Paris: Mercure de France.

Farese, Gian Marco. 2015a. *Hi* vs. *Ciao*: NSM as a tool for cross-linguistic pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 85. 1–17.

Farese, Gian Marco. 2015b. Generic titles as forms of address in Italian: their meaning unpacked through NSM. Paper presented at the INAR 3 International Conference, Texas A&M University, College Station, USA, October 9 and 10, 2015.
Farese, Gian Marco. 2015c. Global English: A perspective of an international student in Australia. Paper presented at Global English, Minimal English: Towards better Intercultural Communication, An International Symposium, Humanities Research Centre, Australian National University, July 2 and 3, 2015.
Fox, Kate. 2005. *Watching the English: The hidden rules of English behaviour*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
Goddard, Cliff. 2007. A response to N.J. Enfield's review of Ethnopragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4(4). 531–538.
Goddard, Cliff. 2010. Semantic molecules and semantic complexity (with special reference to "environmental" molecules). *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 8(1). 123–155.
Goddard, Cliff. 2011. *Semantic analysis: A practical introduction*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Goddard, Cliff. 2012a. "Early interactions" in Australian English, American English, and English English: Cultural differences and cultural scripts. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44. 1038–1050.
Goddard, Cliff. 2012b. Cultural scripts and communication style differences in three Anglo Englishes. In Barbara Barbara Kyrk-Kastovsky (ed.), *Intercultural miscommunication: Past and present*, 101–120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Goddard, Cliff (ed.). 2006. *Ethnopragmatics: Understanding discourse in cultural context*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Goddard, Cliff (ed.). 2008. *Cross-linguistic semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Goddard, Cliff & Anna Wierzbicka. 2014a. *Words and meanings: Lexical semantics across domains, languages, and cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Goddard, Cliff & Anna Wierzbicka. 2014b. Semantic fieldwork and lexical universals. *Studies in Language* 38(1). 80–127.
Goddard, Cliff & Anna Wierzbicka (eds.). 2002. *Meaning and universal grammar: Theory and empirical findings*, 2 vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Goddard, Cliff & Anna Wierzbicka (eds.). 2004. Special issue on cultural scripts. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 1(2).
Hirst, John. 2006. The distinctiveness of Australian democracy. In *Sense and nonsense in Australian history*, 292–312. Melbourne: Black Inc. Agenda.
Hirst, John. 2010. *The Australians: Insiders & outsiders on the national character since 1770*. Melbourne: Black Inc.
Horne, Donald. 1964. *The lucky country: Australia in the sixties*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
Johnson, Diane. 2004. *Le divorce*. New York: Random House.
Jucker, Andreas H. & Irma Taavitsainen. 2003. Diachronic perspectives on address term systems: Introduction. In Andreas Jucker & Irma Taavitsainen (eds.), *Diachronic perspectives on address term system*, 1–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Kecskes, Istvan. 2004. Editorial: Lexical merging, conceptual blending, and cultural crossing. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 1(1). 1–26.
Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine. 2010. Introduction. In Catherine Kerbrat-Orecchioni (eds.), S'addresser à autrui: Les formes nominales d'addresse en français, 7–33. Chambéry: Éditions de l'Université de Savoie.
Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine. 2014. Présentation. In Kerbrat-Orecchioni (ed.), 2014, 7–34.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine (ed.). 2010. *S'adresser à autrui: Les formes nominales d'adresse en français*. Chambéry: Éditions de l'Université de Savoie.
Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine (ed.). 2014. *S'adresser à autrui: Les formes nominales d'adresse dans une perspective comparative interculturelle*. Chambéry: Éditions de l'Université de Savoie.
Lawrence, D. H. 1923. *Kangaroo*. London: W. Heinemann.
Nemirovsky, Irène. 2002[1930]. *Le bal*. Paris: Grasset.
Norrby, Catrin & Camilla Wide (eds.). 2015. *Address practice as social action: European perspectives*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
NSM Homepage. https://www.griffith.edu.au/humanities-languages/school-humanities-languages-social-science/research/natural-semantic-metalanguage-homepage.
Paxman, Jeremy. 1999. *The English: A portrait of a people*. London: Penguin.
Peeters, Bert (ed.). 2006. *Semantic primes and universal grammar: Empirical evidence from the romance languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Pringle, J.D. 1965. *Australian accent*. London: Chatto and Windus.
Ravazzolo, Elisa. 2014. L'Emploi de formes nominales d'adresse dans l'émission italienne *Radio Anch'io* approche comparée de corpus radiophoniques en italien et en français. In Kerbrat-Orecchioni (ed.), 177–218.
Schneider, Klaus P. 2010. Variational pragmatics. In Mirjam Fried, Jan-Ola Östman & Jef Verschueren (eds.), *Variation and change: Pragmatic perspectives*, 239–267. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Simenon, Georges. 1932. *L'ombre chinoise*. Paris: A. Fayard.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 1992. *Semantics, culture and cognition: Universal human concepts in culture-specific configurations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 1996. *Semantics: Primes and universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 2003. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 2006. *English: Meaning and culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 2010. *Experience, evidence and sense: The hidden cultural legacy of English*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 2014a. *Imprisoned in English: The hazards of English as a default language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 2015. A whole cloud of culture condensed into a drop of semantics: The meaning of the German word 'Herr' as a term of address. *International Journal of Language and Culture* 2(1). 1–37.
Wierzbicka, Anna. In press a. Terms of address in European languages: A study in cross-linguistic semantics and pragmatics. In Keith Allan, Alessandro Capone, Istvan Kecskes & Jacob Mey (eds.), *Pragmemes and theories of language use*. Springer.
Wierzbicka, Anna. In press b. Terms of address as keys to culture and society: German *Herr* vs. Polish *Pan*. *Acta Philologica*.
Wong, Jock. 2014. *The culture of Singapore English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ye, Zhengdao. 2013. Understanding the conceptual basis of the 'old friend' formula in Chinese social interaction and foreign diplomacy: A cultural script approach. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 33(3). 365–385.

Bionote

Anna Wierzbicka

Anna Wierzbicka, born and educated in Poland, is Professor of Linguistics (Emerita) at the Australian National University. Together with Cliff Goddard, Wierzbicka created the "Natural Semantic Metalanguage," based on empirical cross-linguistic investigations, which can serve as a basis for comparing meanings across languages and cultures. Her latest books *are Imprisoned in English: The Hazards of English as a Default Language* (Oxford University Press 2014) and (with Cliff Goddard) Words *and Meanings: Lexical Semantics Across Domains, Languages, and Cultures* (Oxford University Press 2014).