

Joachim Grzega

**Preface to  
Papers from the 1st Eurolinguistics Conference  
at the Europäisches Haus Pappenheim**

From 5 to 7 April 2013, the Europäisches Haus Pappenheim (EHP) held its first Eurolinguistics Conference. The EHP is funded by the town of Pappenheim (a small town in Southern Germany) and the European Union and opened in October 2012 as an institute of Europe-related research and training in politics, culture and language(s) (<http://www.ehp-online.eu>). It is thus the first research center that officially focusses on Eurolinguistics, institutionalizing concepts that Sture Ureland and Giuseppe Gaetano Castorina have begun with ELAMA and Eurolinguistica-Sud. I feel honored that both were also present at the conference and that I was chosen as the director of the EHP to establish such a Eurolinguistic institute.

Due to the low presence of true Eurolinguistics in European studies programs, one goal of the EHP is to involve students in Eurolinguistic work. Moreover, the EHP aims at bringing Eurolinguistics closer to a lay audience. Therefore, the last day of the conference addressed the general public. Apart from a presentation of a book for students (Grzega 2013a), a book for a general audience (Grzega 2012), Eurocom publications, the series Studies in Eurolinguistics, and student projects coordinated by Bea Klüsener and myself, visitors could hear and discuss the research results by conference participants, who had transferred, just a few hours before, their core findings into a style that was also accessible to laypeople. The audience was very much interested and engaged in discussions much deeper and longer than was planned. The feedback that the EHP got afterwards was all positive and I would like to express my gratitude to all colleagues who were willing to participate in this attempt to make detailed research results interesting for non-experts.

Before the start of detailed Eurolinguistic analysis, we should define what we mean by *Eurolinguistics* and *European*. There are various definitory possibilities.

1. *Europe* can be defined geographically, politically or cultural-anthropologically.
2. *European feature* may be defined as common only in Europe or it may also occur in other parts of the world.
3. *European language* may be defined only as an indigenous language or also encompass migrant languages. It may refer only to varieties of these languages within Europe or also to the varieties brought to other areas. It may refer only to the standard or also to non-standard varieties.
4. In the strict sense of the word, a study that is termed *Eurolinguistic* needs to investigate the commonalities among all European languages (e.g. Reiter 1991, 1999). It may be seen as an unrealistic goal to collect comparable data from all European languages, but we should strive for coming to this goal as close as possible. A representative Eurolinguistic selection could therefore be defined as covering at least one member of each subgroup in one of the following groups of languages and cultures: (a) referring to historical-anthropological-cultural parameters, with structures in circles: more central as well as more peripheral countries; (b) referring to the geographical parameters: northern, western, southern and eastern countries; (c) referring to historical-linguistic parameters:

members of all major Indo-European language groups (Germanic, Romance, Balto-Slavic) and the major non-Indo-European language family (Finno-Ugric); (d) referring to synchronic linguistic parameters: members of Western European languages (Standard Average European), East-Central European languages, the Balkan languages, and, potentially, Russian.

The EHP hopes to be able to hold annual EuroLinguistics conferences and to highlight issues that have so far played but a minor role within EuroLinguistics. The theme of the first conference was therefore a “Focus on Semantics and Pragmatics”. While the form-oriented branches of EuroLinguistics have quite well been shed light on, the content-oriented branches such as semantics and pragmatics have attracted far fewer linguists. This is also illustrated by the fact that the handbook edited by Hinrichs (2010) could only present a Europragmatic chapter labeled as “sketch” (Grzega 2010) and the fact that Kortmann and van der Auwera did not include a pragmatic chapter at all in their handbook (2011). The first truly Europragmatic attempts were carried out on address pronouns by Helmbrecht (2005, 2010), on connotations and diverse speech-acts by myself in three books (Grzega 2006, 2012, 2013b), and on address pronouns and various speech-acts in the contributions of Volume 5 of the *Journal for EuroLinguistiX*, where the same questionnaire was used by all contributors (cf. the synopsis article Grzega 2008). Finally, if Europragmatic studies on spoken language have been rare, those on written language have even been rarer (cf. Pöckl 2010).

The conference was held in the belief that europragmatics and eurosemantics can lead to results that may rather rapidly than slowly turn out relevant for:

- improving the teaching of intercultural competence for Europe and the teaching of English as a global language
- improving translation and interpreting in the EU context
- facilitating and improving the teaching of European languages
- facilitating EU-relevant political discourses on inter-national as well as inter-municipal levels
- facilitating international business as well as international tourism
- understanding socioeconomic similarities and differences within Europe

If semantic and pragmatic issues of one language or a small set of languages can be studied through synchronic, diachronic and applied approaches, so can a larger set.

At the conference, contributions came from Germany, Austria, Italy, France and Finland. This anniversary volume of the *Journal for EuroLinguistiX*—it is vol. 10—offers a selection of the contributions. The first five papers focus rather on methodological issues, the next two on concrete features, then there are two contributions on language learning and finally a few notes on cross-cultural communicative analyses in university teaching:

- Joachim Grzega: “Methodological Challenges of Semantic and Pragmatic Studies in EuroLinguistics” (p. 4ff.)
- Jacques François: “Semantische Karten für die vergleichende lexikologische Analyse europäischer Sprachen” (p. 15ff.)
- Wolfgang Pöckl: “Konfixe in europäischen Sprachen” (p. 29ff.)
- Laura Ferrarotti: “The Linguistic Landscape in Multilingual Urban Settings: An Introduction” (p. 38ff.)
- Manuela Cipri / Giuseppe Gaetano Castorina: “A EuroLinguistic Approach to Terminology” (p. 45ff.)
- Harald Haarmann: “Who Invented the Theater? Reflections on the Most Ancient Layer of Our

- Cultural Vocabulary” (p. 50ff.)
- Ernst Kretschmer: “Lothars Wut und Francos Mut: Überlegungen zum europäischen Soma- tismus am Beispiel der Leber” (p. 56ff.)
  - Claudia Polzin-Haumann / Christina Reissner: Mehrsprachigkeit und Interkomprehension – von der Wissenschaft in die Praxis (p. 67ff.)
  - Joachim Grzega: “Report on Developing and Testing the *Language Workout* Method: The First Research Project at the Europäisches Haus Pappenheim (EHP)” (p. 76ff.)
  - Joachim Grzega / Bea Klüsener: “A Few Notes on Practising Europragmatic Studies with Students” (p. 90ff.)
  - Joachim Grzega: “Rezension zu Uwe Hinrichs’ Buch *Multi Kulti Deutsch*” (p. 95ff.)

In the organization of the conference, I was assisted by Wilma Vogel and Bea Klüsener, whom I would like to thank for this. Financial help came from the town of Pappenheim and its mayor, Uwe Sinn, as well as the European Union. For valuable help in the editing process, I would like to thank Claudia Sand.

During the preparation of the publication, we received news that our friend Giuseppe Gaetano Castorina, president of EuroLinguistica-Sud, died. He firmly believed in the impact of EuroLinguistic research for the creation and promotion of a European citizenship. The EHP will always remember this belief.

*Pappenheim, 4 December 2013*

*Joachim Grzega  
Europäisches Haus Pappenheim  
Marktplatz 1  
DE-91788 Pappenheim  
grzega@pappenheim.de*

## References

- Grzega, Joachim (2008), “Elements of a Basic European Language Guide”, *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 5: 118-133.
- Grzega, Joachim (2010), “Kulturpragmatische Gemeinsamkeiten in den Sprachen Europas”, in: Hinrichs 2010: 739-751.
- Grzega, Joachim (2012), *Europas Sprachen und Kulturen im Wandel der Zeit: Eine Entdeckungsreise*, Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Grzega, Joachim (2013a), *EuroLinguistik*, [Studienbibliografien Sprachwissenschaft 43], Tübingen: Julius Groos.
- Grzega, Joachim (2013b), *Studies in Europragmatics*, [EuroLinguistische Arbeiten 7], Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Helmbrecht, Johannes (2005), “Typologie und Diffusion von Höflichkeitspronomina in Europa”, *Folia Linguistica* 39: 417-452.
- Helmbrecht, Johannes (2010), “Höflichkeitspronomina in Europa – Synchronie und Diachronie eines arealtypologischen Merkmals”, in: Hinrichs 2010: 691-710.
- Hinrichs, Uwe (ed.) (2010), *Handbuch der EuroLinguistik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kortmann, Bernd / van der Auwera, Johan (eds.) (2011), *The Languages and Linguistics of Europe: A Comprehensive Guide*. Berlin etc.: de Gruyter.
- Pöckl, Wolfgang (2010), “Eurotextologie”, in: Hinrichs 2010: 729-738.
- Reiter, Norbert (1991), “Ist EuroLinguistik Gotteslästerung?”, in: Feldbusch, Elisabeth et al. (eds.), *Neue Fragen der Linguistik: Akten des 25. Linguistischen Kolloquiums Paderborn 1990*, 109-113, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Reiter, Norbert (ed.) (1999), *EuroLinguistik: Ein Schritt in die Zukunft*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.