



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Kádár, Daniel Z.

Review: Taavitsainen, Irma and Andreas H. Jucker (2003). Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Hardback ISBN 90-272-5348-X

Original Citation

Kádár, Daniel Z. (2007) Review: Taavitsainen, Irma and Andreas H. Jucker (2003). Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Hardback ISBN 90-272-5348-X. *Journal of Politeness Research Language Behaviour Culture*, 3 (1). pp. 159-164. ISSN 1612-5681

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/13136/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

References

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman (1968). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In *The Sociology of Language*, Joshua Fishman (ed.), 252–275. The Hague: Mouton.
- Eelen, Gino (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: Saint Jerome.
- Lakoff, Robin (1973). The logic of politeness; Or minding you Ps and Qs. *Chicago Linguistics Society*. 9: 292–305.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12 (4): 402–426.
- Mills, Sara (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watts, Richard J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taavitsainen, Irma and Andreas H. Jucker (2003). *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Hardback ISBN 90-272-5348-X (Eur.)/1-56611-310-8 (US); 441 pp. Price: Euro 130.00/USD \$ 156.00.

Reviewed by Dániel Z. Kádár, Department of East Asian Studies, Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary, danielkadar@yahoo.co.uk.

The (de-)systemization of terms of address (henceforth TOA) is a thoroughly researched issue in pragmatics, and it is difficult to attain resounding success under the shadow of “classics” like Braun (1988). Yet Jucker and Taavitsainen were able to edit a book that will be prospectively influential for the further study of TOA. The *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems* is an innovative compilation which comprises writings from well-known authorities on TOA research in a well-arranged way. Even though the contributors present different ideas on temporally and spatially diverse languages, the reader gains a comprehensive and challenging insight into the contemporary research of historical TOA. Hence the work is not only relevant for TOA specialists, but is also a basic handbook for readers with more general interest.

In general, the work has two main areas of focus. First, it draws attention to language *diversity*. Although “diversity vs. systematic application” is often mentioned in relation to modern TOA, diachronic studies tend to observe TOA in overtly systematic terms. Jucker and Taavitsainen’s compilation expertly demonstrates the assumption that historical communication is as flexible as contemporary communication. Second, the book re-introduces *philology* to modern communication studies. Although many researchers prefer modern data, this work proves the claim that the vast amount of historical data, which can be gained with

the aid of philology, can greatly contribute to the understanding of language use.

One problematic aspect of the book is that the authors do not include contemporary discourse/conversation analytic politeness research in their analyses. Contributors instead are engrossed in the study of the validity of books and articles that were written decades ago, (e. g., Brown and Gilman 1960; Brown and Levinson 1987), instead of focusing on the historical application of modern frameworks. This problem is supposedly rooted in the fact that TOA research is of long-standing traditions, thus researchers in the majority of cases try to “reinforce” instead of “innovate”, as is also reflected by some of the chapter conclusions. This drawback, however, does not decrease the academic value of Jucker and Taavitsainen’s compilation.

Chapter 1, by Taavitsainen and Jucker, functions as an introduction to the volume. The authors list the key issues of diachronic TOA research, arranged in the following groups:

- a) “Historical pragmatics”: the authors discuss the necessity of cross-fertilization the methodologies within pragmatics and historical linguistics when diachronically examining TOA.
- b) “Data”: this section raises the possible solutions for the problems that researchers unavoidably meet when studying historical data.
- c) “Politeness”: the authors show the relevance of politeness theories for the proper understanding of TOA.
- d) “Norms, deviation and markedness”: this section shows how researchers can manage the regular conflict between personal “deviations” and normative beliefs when studying the interactional application of socially non-marked and marked TOA.
- e) “Retractability and symmetry”: the authors summarize the retractible vs. non-retractible opposition of “addressing systems” (i. e., the degree of stability in the interactional application of TOA in a given language).

In Chapter 2, Burnley examines the T/V (*thou/ye*) pronominal choice in Middle English. He demonstrates the maze of complex factors that influence the choice between T and V forms in a medieval social context. As it turns out from the case study of Chaucer’s language, there are many other factors beside the “power” and “solidarity” semantics of Brown and Gilman (1960) that can influence the selection of T/V forms. For example, even though in the medieval world a “hunger for reverence” influenced the pronominal choice (p. 34), many writers preferred using the T form “of epistolary address between cultivated individuals” (p. 37).

In Chapter 3, Hunt re-examines the problematic issue of T/V (*tu/vus*) choice in Old and Middle French. Many scholars suggest that the choice between T/V forms is arbitrary in Old and Middle French. However, analysis of the Anglo-Norman drama “Seinte Resureccion” demonstrates the “selection of the [T/V] forms [in fact] *corresponds* [my emphasis] to the dramatic and psychological requirements” (p. 56).

Honegger studies the forms of address in Chaucer’s “The Knight’s Tale” in Chapter 4. This challenging contribution points out the limitations of the “pure pronominal theory” when examining TOA in discourse. Honegger involves *nominal* TOA and other elements of adversion in his examination of the seemingly inconceivable pronominal choice in Chaucer’s work. As he points out, “the prevalent model of pronominal address must, if necessary, be complemented by a ‘situational’ analysis that takes into account all linguistic and non-linguistic elements of adversion” (p. 78). Examining addressing phenomena from this perspective can help bring nearer the Western-data biased domain of addressing theories and the diachronic research of other, “exotic” languages (like Classical Chinese, where pronominal forms play less of a role in polite communication than nominal TOA (cf. Kádár forthcoming).

In Chapter 5, Simon examines the diachronic development of pronouns of address in German. He claims that although a binary (T/V) pronominal selection can be observed both in Middle High German (MHG – *du/ir*) and Modern Standard German (MSG – *du/Sie*), these phenomena have to be analyzed differently because in MHG interactants can freely shift between the T and V forms, unlike in MSG. This difference is rooted in the fact that in MHG the second person plural (*ir*) gains its polite interpretation through a pragmatic reinterpretation rule; it is used only in instances when negative politeness is needed. In MSG, on the other hand, *Sie* is grammaticalized as the *honorific pronoun*. In sum, this article illuminates the complex development of the German address system from a retractible to a non-retractible one.

In Chapter 6, Betsch examines the development of Czech TOA in the period between the 1300s and the 1700s. Even though in contemporary Czech one finds a simple binary T/V (*ty/vy*) opposition, a few centuries earlier a surprisingly complex grammaticalized TOA system was applied according to elaborated social practices. And, as turns out from Betsch’s analysis, German influences made the Czech system of TOA even more complex.

Nevala studies English TOA and subscription formulae in fifteenth to seventeenth century family correspondence in Chapter 7. As she shows, historical changes in the hierarchical structure of the “nuclear family” manifest themselves in the choice of formulae with positive or negative politeness value. A “general movement” can be observed in the course

of time towards preference for forms expressing positive value (p. 160). However, the activity of this trend depends upon both the nature of given familiar role relations (certain relations became equal sooner than others, and on social status (members of the royal family preferred using deferential formulae, compared with the gentry). Nevala also points out that although in family correspondence TOA are applied according to pre-constructed models, in reality “the manner in which the sender addresses the recipient was negotiable” (p. 162).

In Chapter 8, Bentivoglio examines sixteenth-century Spanish TOA in private documents that were written to family members from the New World. Her study exemplifies how versatile the social development of TOA can be. Bentivoglio proves the assumption that the traditional Spanish V form *vos* (which disappeared from standard Spanish) had co-existed for a few decades with the new form *vuestra merced* in the language of Spanish colonists. And the two forms could be simultaneously applied in discourse, in order to express personal beliefs.

Busse attempts to examine the relation of pronominal and nominal TOA in Shakespeare’s works in Chapter 9. He categorizes nominal TOA into groups of different (positive/negative) politeness value, and examines the issue as to whether pronominal T/V (*thou/you*) forms can only co-occur with these forms in accordance with the “power/solidarity” semantics. As it turns out from statistical evidence, “there are quite a number of cases [...], which run counter to the rules of power and solidarity semantics, as, for instance, when masters chide their servants as *you rascal* or *you rogue*” (p. 215). Hence Busse proves the claim that a micro-level analysis is needed for the comprehensive understanding of pronominal choice.

In Chapter 10, Mazzon analyzes pronominal switches in three Shakespeare plays. She aims to prove the assumption that politeness issues have to be analyzed, beside “traditional” notions of TOA research, as “anger/affection” vs. “coldness/neutrality”, in order for us to be able to describe personal changes of pronouns properly in talk (p. 240). Mazzon examines pronominal switches in relation to nominal TOA in a wide range of social relationships.

Similar to Mazzon, Stein concentrates on pronominal switches in Shakespeare’s drama in Chapter 11. Even though in Elizabethan society the V pronoun gradually became the unmarked form, Shakespeare exploited the expressive potentials of switches between traditional T and V forms. Stein examines several dramatic role-relations where either the T or the V form is non-marked, and proves the claim that marked switches are contextually accountable. Besides, Stein’s research supports the notion that the successful control of pronominal switches in Elizabethan society is power-dependent: “it is the higher classes amongst

themselves [...] that are the mainstay of pronominal emotion management” (p. 302).

In Chapter 12, Walker examines the use of *you* and *thou* in Early Modern English. In order to show the complexity of the disappearance of the T form, she studies both “constructed” and “authentic” (recorded) dialogues, as well as taking gender issues into consideration. *Thou* in fact has different frequencies of occurrence in various texts, depending on its discourse application, the type of the given text, and the gender and social class of the interactants. Walker thus highlights that the disappearance of *thou* was by no means a clear-cut process. She also argues that – contrary to former beliefs – “the main explanation for the decrease in *thou* over time is not clearly related to the influence of gender, but perhaps the less frequent application of the status rule” (p. 339).

Hickey examines the second person singular vs. plural pronominal distinctions in vernacular varieties of English across the world in Chapter 13. Although the overseas varieties of English did not adopt the traditional T/V (i. e., singular/plural) distinction (because of the low-status associations of *thou*), their vernaculars “tend to have a specific plural form like *ye*, *youse*, *y’all*, *unu*, *yupela*, etc.” (p. 364). Hickey’s study comprehensively introduces the possible input sources of these plural forms.

Seppänen’s philological/conversation analytic study in Chapter 14 shows that interlocutors can be politely referred to with demonstrative pronoun + noun structures in Finnish. The application of such structures is rather ambiguous – in some contexts they express politeness, while in others they convey irony – as their interpretation is basically influenced by a lexical choice among demonstrative pronouns. While the “*se* + *noun*” structure is used as a polite form of *address*, the “*tää* + *noun*” and “*toi* + *noun*” structures can more easily convey teasing connotations, and a sense of *referring to* rather than *addressing*.

In Chapter 15 Hickey studies “those nuances with which Germans perform their social exchanges”, in spite of their “rigid” T/V system (p. 401). Even though at first sight the German pronominal system does not allow much freedom for speakers to communicate according to refined social relationships, the scale of formality in addressing can be elaborately controlled.

In sum, the *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems* is a varied and absorbing collection which is a must for every researcher with interest in TOA theories.

References

- Braun, Friederike (1988). *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

164 *Book reviews*

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In *Style in Language*, Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), 253–76. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kádár, Dániel Z. (forthcoming) *Terms of (Im)Politeness: A Study of the Communicational Properties of Traditional Chinese (Im)Polite Address Terms*. Budapest Monographs in East Asian Studies Series. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University.