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The Categorization of Address Forms and Honorific in Spoken Discourse

JARIAH MOHD. JAN

Department of English Language, Faculty of Languages & Linguistics,
University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur

Introduction
In general, the level of formality in an interaction is influenced by familiarity and power asymmetries among the participants that in turn influence their choice of language forms, such as the addressee terms and T/V pronouns. It is thus natural to observe that in almost every language and society and in every social role-relationship, when one speaks to another, one can choose from a host of options as to how to address or name the hearer. One must classify oneself and others using factors such as kinship, social position and age. One’s choice will tell the addressee how one sees the relationship with him and one will have infringed a norm or rule if one uses wrong terms to indicate the characteristics. The use of certain address terms and personal pronouns such as honorifics like Sir/Madam and the personal pronoun you [V] imply that there is a distant relationship between the parties who are involved in the interaction. The detachment of the parties from one another and/or the situation is thus emphasised. This in turn increases the level of formality of the spoken interaction.

The term formality is used in a variety of ways in the literature. It is most commonly used to refer to the occurrence of certain language forms which are considered to be more formal than others in an interaction, such as the use of personal pronoun you [V] instead of you [T] and deferential address term Sir/Madam instead of first names (FNs).

The concept of informality, on the other hand, can be defined as the opposite of formality, that is, the occurrence of certain language forms which are considered to be less formal than the others, such as, the use of the pronoun you [T] instead of the pronoun you [V] and the use of first name (FNs) instead of honorific titles.

The following section therefore examines the different address terms and discusses the concept of honorific in Malaysia. The manner in which formality can be illustrated in the spoken discourse in panel discussion of Global talk show is also examined in this study. The different address terms of concern here are the following:

1. The address terms people use to address each other such as honorific (honourable), titles (doctor, professor), first names (FNs), last names (LN);

2. Combined use of different address terms such as [title+FN] and [honorific/title/honorific title+FN+LN] which are used to address people in different contexts.
Forms of Address and the Concept of Formality

The study of the form of address is also known as the study of the semantics of social structure. Terms of address are markers of the social identities and interpersonal relationships in a society. They reveal "...one’s feelings towards others, relationship of solidarity, distance, power, respect and one’s awareness of social customs (Jarirah Moh. Jan, 1999: 206). According to Toh Kim Eng (1994: 30-31), the use of terms of address "...can reflect individualism, instrumentality, collaterality (emphasising kin relationship, group affiliation, goals and ascribed roles), affectivity and conformity, fear of scorn, deviation, ridicule or ostracism."

Terms of address can be pronouns and the extension of the pronominal system which are personal names, kinship terms, pseudo-kinship terms, classifiers or titles, terms of endearment, friendship terms and no naming or the zero form when the name is unknown or not used.

Address Systems

Address systems govern the terms of address speaker uses in social interaction. All languages make use of the address forms and the linguistic choice made indicates the relationship that the speaker perceives exists between him and the hearer.

One of the earliest studies of forms of address is by Brown and Gilman (1960) who concentrated on the pronom system in Indo-European languages. The European development of two singular pronouns of address began with the Latin 'tu' which was originally grammatically used to mark the singular, 'you' and 'vous' which was a form of address to the emperor. This plural form of address was eventually extended to other power figures. In Italian, the pronouns are 'tu' and 'lei', in Russian, 'ty' and 'vva', in German, 'du' and 'Sie', in French, 'tu' and 'vous' and in Spanish, 'tu' and 'usted'. English has only one pronoun of address, that is, 'you' for singular and plural reference. In the past, English speakers used 'thou' which was a form of familiar address for a single person and 'ye'. However, 'ye' was then replaced by 'you'.

Kroger et al. (1979) adopted T and V symbols for wider use to encompass not only pronominal usage but also nominal address usage. They ordered forms of address in terms of their 'formality' and 'informality'. V was used for formal terms of address and T for the informal forms. Formal terms of address are those which describe the addressee as a member of category, for example, 'Professor'. The informal forms are terms that recognise the addressee as a multiple person with many names depending on the conditions of interaction or ways the person is regarded, for example, 'Lily' and 'Mama'.

Pronouns have two dimensions, a) authority and distance and b) absence of authority and closeness. The T and V forms are used by social groups differently. The upper classes began to use the V form with each other to show respect or politeness. The lower classes used mutual T to show familiarity. With the popularity of the solidarity dimension, T now represents informality or familiarity and V, formality. Mutual reciprocal
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of T marks equality and denotes either solidarity and intimacy while mutual Vemphasizes unfamiliarity. The upper classes addressed the lower with T. On the other hand, the lower classes addressed the upper classes with V. This asymmetrical, non-reciprocal, T/V usage of V to superior and T to inferior, symbolises a ‘power’ relationship between speakers.

The mutual T for solidarity or intimacy has gradually replaced the mutual V for politeness. Solidarity has become the preferred choice of semantic in interpersonal relationships. Though this may be the case, power is still very much a part of modern social structure (Wardhaugh, 1986: 256).

**Power and Solidarity**

Language often encourages or forces us to define our relationship with the person we are talking to in terms of power and solidarity. The word ‘power’ is derived from the Latin word ‘potere’ which means ‘to be able’. Psycholinguists, sociologists and political scientists define ‘social power’ as:

‘... the ability or capacity of (one person or group) to produce (consciously or unconsciously) intended effects on the behaviour or emotions of another person (or group).’

(Scanzoni and Scanzoni, 1981: 439)

*Power* is a term that refers to the differential right to control another person’s behaviour or to make decisions about matters concerning others. The bases of power are physical strength, age, birth, sex, wealth, profession or institutionalized role, army, state or within the family.

In relationships involving at least two persons with deferential rights and obligations and an imbalance of power, the asymmetric, non-reciprocal forms of address are likely to be exchanged. Such relationships are in those that exhibit age status differences (adults-children) and occupational differences (employer-employee).

*Solidarity* concerns the social distance between people, the social characteristics they share (religion, political membership, family, profession, sex, region of origin, race, interests etc.) and the frequency of contact which leads to the discovery of ‘like-mindedness’ (Brown and Gilman, 1960).

Solidarity is symmetrical. The forms of address change are symmetrical or reciprocal, with V becoming more probable as solidarity declines. Reciprocal T is exchanged to mark solidarity. However, the right to initiate the reciprocal T usually belongs to the member of the dyad with more power, for instance, from an elder than from a younger, from the employer than from the employee. Though this may be the case, the reciprocal, solidarity semantic has grown with social mobility and an egalitarian ideology. The modern