

Regional and dialectal address terms in contemporary Italian fiction

It has been noted that alongside with culture-specific concepts, address terms and vocatives appear among the most likely code-switched elements in a multilingual literary text (Jonsson 2012, see also Callahan 2004). However, they are usually not regarded as types of *realia* (Leppihalme 2011), even though authors use them to geographically contextualize the plot and to construct the regional identities of their characters. The aim of this paper is to outline the interfaces between address terms and *realia*, on one hand, and between vocatives and other elements that contribute to the illusion of orality in literary dialogue (interjections, exclamations, tags), on the other. A literary sociolinguistics approach is adopted in order to study the role of address terms in multilingual and dialectal fiction. The analysis is based on a corpus of 33 fictional prose works, published between 1991 and 2011, by 11 Italian authors who represent the new wave of literary dialect (Ala-Risku 2016). The corpus contains elements of various Italian dialects (Sicilian, Neapolitan, Romanesco, Lombard, Genoese) and Romance minority languages (Friulian, Sardinian), but also other languages (e.g. Spanish). When it comes to genre differences, detective novels have proved to be particularly fertile for analysis of address terms and politeness. They often depict a professional context with strict hierarchies that allow us to examine interaction between higher-ranking interlocutors and their subordinates or employees, the state authorities and ordinary people (Imperato 2013). In fact, these dynamics can be observed both in contemporary and historical setting in the novels of Sardinian Marcello Fois and Sicilian Andrea Camilleri. Moreover, lawyer Sebastiano Satta, Fois' protagonist, as well as Camilleri's Inspector Salvo Montalbano are central figures around which all the other characters revolve. Therefore, the choice of nominal address terms by them can be analysed as indicators of a language repertoire that ranges from strict dialect to standard Italian and from colloquial regional accents to highly formal language use. A primary source of information is formed by the recurrent and explicit metalinguistic comments authors make through narrator's voice to comment on the characters' language choices, in general, and the use of address terms in particular (Santulli 2010).

References

- Ala-Risku, R. (2016). *Contrasti e commistioni: plurilinguismo, dialetto e metalingua nella narrativa italiana contemporanea*. PhD thesis, University of Helsinki. Helsinki: Unigrafia, <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-2761-7>.
- Callahan, L. (2004). *Spanish/English Codeswitching in a Written Corpus*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Imperato, C. (2013). “L’uso delle forme allocutive in un corpus di romanzi italiani”. Suomela-Härmä, E. - Härmä, J. - Havu, & E. (a c. di), *Représentations des formes d’adresse dans les langues romanes*. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 173-199.
- Jonsson, C. (2012). *Making Silenced Voices Heard: Code-switching in Multilingual Literary Texts in Sweden*. In Sebba, M. – Mahootian, S. – Ead. (Eds.) *Language Mixing and Code-Switching in Writing*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge: 212-232.
- Leppihalme, R. (2011). *Realia*. In Gambier, Y. – van Doorslaer, L. (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* 2nd Ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 126-130.
- Santulli, F. (2010). *Montalbano linguista: la riflessione metalinguistica nelle storie del commissario*. Milano: Arcipelago edizioni.

Agnese Bresin, University of Melbourne
John Hajek, University of Melbourne
Leo Kretzenbacher, University of Melbourne

agnese.bresin@unimelb.edu.au
j.hajek@unimelb.edu.au
heinz@unimelb.edu.au

Italian regions as communities of address practice. A case study of restaurant encounters

This paper examines the underinvestigated research area of address in Italian service encounters, with a novel focus on restaurant encounters. Language practices may vary substantially from region to region in Italy. In fact, the concept of contemporary spoken Italian is often broken down into regional varieties of Italian (e.g. Tosi, 2001). Apart from their historical, political and administrative aspects, Italian regions can also be understood as distinct communities of practice (Eckert, 2006), each with their own specific linguistic and cultural identity.

This research project utilises the interaction between waiters and customers as a case study to investigate regional variation in Italian pronominal address practices. A primary research question is: to what extent do restaurant customers and waiters report different address practices across Italian regions? Five geographically dispersed Italian regions were selected: Emilia in the north, Umbria and Lazio in the centre, Salento in the south and the island of Sardinia. Following Clyne et al.'s (2009) methodology, a combination of quantitative and qualitative data were collected. A large scale survey was completed by 519 restaurant customers, and interviews and focus groups involved both waiters and customers living in any of the five regions examined.

This study shows the extent of regional variation in reported address practices in Italian restaurant encounters. The regional variation identified is associated, among other variables, to the specific cultural and linguistic context of each region, including local dialects. In other words, Italian regions are interpreted as communities of address practice.

References

- Clyne, M., Norrby, C., & Warren, J. (2009). *Language and human relations: Styles of address in contemporary language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Eckert, P. (2006). Communities of practice. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 683-685). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
Tosi, A. (2001). *Language and society in a changing Italy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Chiara Ghezzi, University of Bergamo

Address patterns in Goldoni's plays: variation and politeness in a tripartite system

This study focuses on variation in address term patterns in Italian comedies written during the 18th century. Some pragmatic and sociolinguistic considerations show how (im)politeness, and particularly the notion of 'face', are implicated in the use of both pronominal and nominal forms of address in three Goldoni's plays, representatives of the central stage of the playwright's production (*La famiglia dell'antiquario*, *La bottega del caffè*, *La buona moglie*). In the 18th century, the Italian system of address is characterized by a tripartite pronominal system which includes an intimate/familiar *tu* 'you.2SG', a distant *Voi* 'you.2PL' and a polite *Ella* lit. 'she.NOM' or *Lei* lit. 'she.ACC'. The polite pronominal forms often co-occur with titles as *Vostra Signoria* 'Your Lordship'. In this century, the system of address is rather unstable, as the domains

of use of different pronominal forms, especially as regards those of *Lei* and *Voi*, are reconfiguring. Differential address tends to switch from the previous *Voi*, which has become too common, to the more refined *Vostra Signoria*, third person singular pronouns and related forms. *Voi* instead becomes the unmarked form of address to show respect, regardless of social status. Conversely, intimate relations are given more prominence and *tu* is used in an increased number of contexts in moments of anger or special empathy (Molinelli 2015: 301-305). By analyzing the social relationships between the different characters in the plays, taking into consideration both social (e.g. social status) and pragmatic factors (e.g. the context of interaction), this study argues for the existence of usage patterns for specific types of relations as family kinship (e.g. husband-wife) and official relationships (e.g. superordinate-subordinate) (Mazzon 2003). These usage patterns are identified through the analysis of pronominal forms of address and their interaction with nominal forms. But, most importantly, they can be highlighted by pronoun retractability, i.e. pronoun switches, or by situations in which characters deviate from expected patterns (Mazzon 2000: 135, 2003). The presentation will show that these deviations are representative of the changing social attitudes of the characters towards each other in a society in a state of flux, as that of 18th century Venice. These switches can be related to politeness phenomena, as they represent social devices, reflecting the changing levels of distance vs. intimacy and/or power vs. solidarity.

Zenzi M. Griffin, Paulina Franco, University of Texas

Latency to select a form of address

Even in the relatively informal United States, speakers vary in their preference to address another person using a first name such as "Helen" as opposed to a title and last name as in "Ms. Mirren" (Brown & Ford, 1964; Ervin-Tripp, 1972). We report the results of a study examining how properties (such as estimated age, gender, and rated familiarity) for 105 celebrities affected whether US undergraduates imagined feeling comfortable addressing them by their first names. We replicated previous reports on how these well-studied variables influence address preferences. Specifically, undergraduates were more likely to say they were comfortable addressing younger, more familiar, and female celebrities by their first names than older, less familiar, and male celebrities. Moreover, we examined the impact of these variables on latencies to answer. From the perspective of psycholinguistic work on word production (see e.g., Griffin, 2010), we discuss the relationship between the variables that influence the choice of address form and the speed of selecting a form of address.

Çiler Hatipoğlu, Middle East Technical University

Social and politeness meanings of the second person singular pronoun SEN in Turkish: A comparative analysis

Forms of address are of vital importance for successful interaction and have long been regarded as salient indicators of the type of relationship between the interlocutors (Adair 2016; Bayyurt & Bayraktaroglu 2001; Braun 1988; Chen 2016). Turkish, similarly to many Indo-European languages, has two second person pronouns for a singular addressee: SEN (i.e., the familiar/intimate you/Tu) and SIZ (i.e., the formal you/Vous). The current study focuses on the first of those and aims to achieve two goals. First, to identify the social meanings and the level of politeness associated with this pronoun in present day Turkish and, second, to compare and contrast these meanings with the ones identified a decay ago (Hatipoğlu 2008). By doing these, the study hopes to uncover whether or not the functions of this particular address form and the interpretations of its level of politeness have changed in a decay. Which,

in turn, it is hoped, will reveal important information related to how relations were and are defined and classified in the Turkish society.

To have comparable corpora, the data in the present study were collected from groups of participants with parallel characteristics to the earlier study (i.e., university students with age range 18–35) and the questionnaire used ten years ago was utilized again. The data collection tool consisted of two sections. The first part was designed to elicit information related to the students' background while the latter section included open and close ended questions aiming to gather data related to the meaning, function and level of politeness of SEN in various contexts in the Turkish society.

The findings of the study show that some of the more stable meanings (e.g., closeness) and patterns of use (e.g., when addressing family members) related to the pronoun SEN in Turkish have remained unchanged in the last ten years; but the results also show how factors such as developments in technology, globalisation and political change in the country have created new meanings and interpretations of this address term in the Turkish society.

Tuuli Holttinen, University of Helsinki

Forms of address in native and non-native speakers' requests

Knowing how to address other people and to realize different speech acts are both essential pragmatic skills. For learners of second/foreign languages (L2), they may be problematic because the practices between their first language (L1) and the target language differ often considerably. Address practices in requests are especially interesting because requests have traditionally been considered as “face threatening acts” (Brown & Levinson 1987), and one of the elements that can either reduce or strengthen the imposition of the request is the way the speaker refers to the hearer. In this paper, I will study how Finnish learners of L2 French address their interlocutors when making requests, and compare their address practices to speakers of L1 Finnish and L1 French.

Finnish and French have the same means of referring to the hearer (“formal” V-form *te/vous*, “informal” T-form *sinä/tu*, impersonal constructions), but the ways these forms are used differ significantly between the two languages (Isosävi 2010; Havu, Isosävi & Lappalainen 2014). Thus, Finnish learners of L2 French are faced with a possible problem when choosing forms of address in French.

The data of this paper have been gathered by using an oral Discourse Completion Test (DCT) in which the participants (speakers of L1 Finnish and L1 French; beginner, intermediate, and advanced learners of L2 French) reacted to different situations requiring the production of a request. After responding to the request scenarios, the participants were interviewed about the test and the language choices they made.

The research questions of the study are: 1. How do speakers of L2 French, L1 Finnish, and L1 French address their interlocutors when making requests? How do the address practices vary between beginner, intermediate, and advanced level learners? 2. How do the speakers explain the linguistic choices they made?

The results show that the usage of T-form/V-form/impersonal constructions varies considerably between the investigated groups and that there is a development towards a native-like usage from the beginner level to the advanced level. Impersonal constructions are more used in Finnish than in French, which is also reflected in the requests produced by Finnish learners of French. The metalinguistic explanations provided by the participants shed some light on when and why the choice of address forms is difficult for the learners.

Johanna Isosävi, University of Helsinki

How do Finnish and French focus groups participants view usage of address forms in each other's cultures?

In the study of address forms, the term “politeness” can hardly be avoided. Laymen often compare different languages: which language is the most polite? Finnish has been regarded in the media as a “clumsy” language – in comparison with English and French – which lacks established terms for calling a waiter (Isosävi 2010: 184).

In this paper, I aim to examine perceptions of the use of address forms by people who come from a different culture. I will focus on two groups: firstly, French people living in Finland, and their perceptions of the use of address forms in Finland, and, secondly, Finns who are living or have been living in France, and their perceptions of the use of address forms in France. According to previous studies, there are differences in the use of forms of address: in Finnish, the informal pronoun of address sinä (tu, T-form) is much more used than the more formal te (vous, V-form), while nominal forms of address (such as herra/Monsieur) are less used than in French or other European languages (Isosävi & Lappalainen 2015).

The corpus was collected through focus groups, which have the advantage of providing data on shared and contrasted conceptions (Dervin 2015). The data includes audio and video recordings of three French focus groups (13 participants), and two Finnish focus groups (9 participants). The questions asked were related to politeness: e.g. what the participants think is considered polite/impolite in Finland/France, and what causes them problems.

According to the preliminary results, the French participants, perhaps surprisingly, do not seem to be disturbed by the dominant use of T-forms in Finland, but they are more surprised by the wide use of first name or last name alone in formal contexts. The Finnish participants, especially students who returned from Erasmus exchange, emphasized the use of V-forms and nominal forms of address in France. Living between two cultures also raised a special question for French teachers living in Finland: should a teacher use the T- or the V-form when addressing a student? On the basis of different views expressed by the participants, the choice between these forms does not seem to be only a pedagogical question, but also a way to establish rapport with students.

Bettina Kluge, University of Hildesheim

„Muy querida amante y esposa mía“ – nominal forms of address in the 16-18th century in letters by emigrants to the Spanish Americas to their wives

The Archivo General de Indias, Seville/Spain, holds a valuable treasure for the diachronic study of the Spanish of the Americas: the so-called *cartas de llamadas*, private letters from persons who already emigrated to the Americas, presented to the authorities by applicants who also wished to make the dangerous journey. In most cases, these letters were written by family members (sometimes aided by professional scribes), who undergo considerable efforts to convince their loved ones to travel to the New World. A first collection of letters, encompassing the years 1540 to 1616, was published by the historian Enrique Otte (1993) and was later philologically re-edited by Marta Fernández Alcaíde (2009). Other publications include Macías / Morales (1991), whose corpus consists of 226 letters written in the 18th century, and Stöckl (2012 a, b), with 1214 letters from 1492 to 1824 (accessible via internet). Not all of

these publication cater to philological needs (e.g. in respect to orthography), but all are serviceable as they preserve nominal address, which is the point of interest in this talk.

Bentivoglio (2002-2004) has studied a subcorpus of 31 letters, written by emigrated husbands to their wives in Andalucía in the 16th century. The study is limited to pronominal forms, however (*vos*, *vuestra merced* and *ella*), and does not take into account nominal forms – possibly because in the 16th century the variation in nominal address is minimal, if one discards the question of graphic variation for *senhora*. The panorama changes drastically in later centuries, however. The talk will trace the important changes in nominal address between husband and wife, and discuss how this is a reflection of changes in the social relation between partners in marriage (and, as suggests Stangl 2012a, we must not forget that these letters were written with the implicit purpose in mind to present them to the authorities in order to ask for an emigration licence). I will also put special emphasis on the speech acts performed in the letter, and the way these can be related to nominal address (e.g. CONVINCING vs. REPRIMANDING the wife).

For instance, in the following three examples, greetings change from *Señora mía* ('My lady', 1572) to *Yja querida mía* ('my beloved girl', 1691) and *Mi mui estimada esposa y señora de todo mi apresio* ('my very respected wife and lady of all my esteem', 1788).

Carta 99 (Alonso de Mesa a su esposa Catalina de Castañeda, 5.5.1572) [corpus Stangl 2012b: 88] Señora mía: [...] En ésta no más sino que N[uest]ro S[eñ]or os me guarde como yo deseo de Méjico e de mayo cinco de de <sic> mill e quinientos e setenta e dos, el que más que a sí os quiere, v[uest]ro Alonso de Mesa.

Carta 894 (Juan Antonio de Cisneros a su esposa Isabela María de Cabrera y Oñate, 4.4.1691) [corpus Stangl 2012b: 701] Yja querida mía: [...] Pídele a la Majestad que me dé buen suseso que nel [...] <ilegible> biaxe consiste todo nuestro buen suseseso <?> y descanso y a Dios, que te me guarde y deje ber, Puerto Belo y abril 4 de 1691 años, tu esposo que más quisiera berte quescribirte,

Carta 46 (José Nogales a su esposa Rosa Nogales y Reynal, 14.5.1788) [corpus Stangl 2012b: 50] Mi mui estimada esposa y señora de todo mi apresio: [...] Blm tu mui amante esposo que con ansias berdaderas anela por berte,

Finally, the corpus as a whole shows very well the degree of conventionalization and formation of discourse traditions, most strikingly in the formulaic use of leavetaking at the end of the letter, centered on the construction 'your loving husband who is more anxious to see you than to write to you'.

Heinz L. Kretzenbacher, University of Melbourne
John Hajek, University of Melbourne
Anne H. Fabricius, Roskilde University

"Lånt, men ikke kopieret": The Danish 3pl address pronoun *De* as a historic calque from German *Sie* and its present use amongst Danish university students

Danish, as other neighbouring languages, such as Slovene, Czech and Slovak, calqued the German 3pl V address pronoun *Sie* in the 18th century. The calqued Danish V pronoun *De* was clearly a loan, but not simply a copy from German – "lånt, men ikke kopieret", as a Danish grammar insists (Hansen & Heltoft 2011: 437). The *De* address being fully integrated into the Danish language rather than a recognisably

“German” address form might be one historical reason for the fact that among the *Sie* calques in European languages, Danish *De* is the one that is still most widely used.

The paper gives a short overview over the history and present use of Danish *De* before discussing a survey of *De* usage amongst Danish university students. As with other V pronouns in Scandinavian languages, such as *ni* in Swedish, advanced age of the interlocutor is a major trigger for *De* use, but there are also particular domains (e.g. communication – above all written communication – with the authorities) where it is considered the appropriate address form.

Hanna Lappalainen, Kaarina Mononen, University of Helsinki

Addressing by first names in the Finnish context

One of the typical ways to address participants is to use one’s first name. However, in Finnish, the use of first names is not typical, not even in multi-party conversations (Havu et. al. 2014; Seppänen 1989; Yli-Vakkuri 2005). Seppänen (1989) has shown in her case study that the use of first name as a part of addressing has special interactional functions in everyday conversations, but on the whole, only few studies have examined it in authentic conversations.

The aim of our study is to explore when and why the first names are used in Finnish conversations as well as how multimodal practices are combined with using first names; e.g. what is the role of gaze, touching and other multimodal practices in addressing? The analysis is based on two kinds of Finnish databases, multi-party everyday conversations and interaction between caretakers and residents in an old people’s home. By comparing these data we try to find out how the ways to use names are similar or dissimilar in these contexts. The data have been analyzed from the perspective of interactional sociolinguistics.

On the basis of our previous observations, the names are used in both contexts for attracting one’s attention, whereas their function as showing intimacy and empathy is a much more sensitive and context-bound question. We will also discuss the role of individual differences in these practices and the changes in the Finnish addressing culture in general (see also Isäsävi & Lappalainen 2015).

Tatiana Larina, Peoples’ Friendship University of Russia
Neelakshi Suryanarayan, University of Delhi

Marking politeness and respect: variation between English and Hindi address forms in a bilingual Indian context

This paper is part of an ongoing research project investigating the influence of culture and understanding of politeness on communicative styles (Larina and Suryanarayan 2013, Larina 2015). It presents some peculiarities in the use of address forms by Indian bilinguals (speakers of Indian English and Hindi) in everyday interaction with relatives, acquaintances and strangers, switching between English and Hindi address forms in different social contexts.

The results of the study show that Indian bilinguals make little distinction between English and Hindi when addressing relatives, acquaintances and strangers and in many cases, while talking in English, demonstrate their adherence to the Indian tradition of using Hindi kinship terms even while addressing strangers, thereby transferring their attitudes and values into the English language. To show more respect, they often add specific Hindi honorific suffixes. The paper attempts to explain these peculiarities through the impact of native cultural values, social organization, categorization of reality

on speech patterns and communication style of bilinguals by drawing from various studies on bilingualism, post-colonial pragmatics (Anchimbe and Janney, 2011), cultural differences (Hofstede 1984, 1991), cultural values and scripts (Wierzbicka, 2003), Politeness Theory (Brown and Levinson, 1987, Leech 2014) and Speech Accommodation Theory (Giles et al 1977).

Aurélie Marsily, Catholic University of Leuven

How to address a professor? Address practices in request formulations by Spanish native and non-native students

Though Spanish and French are two Romance languages and therefore share numerous linguistic characteristics, there are some notable differences between those two languages. Spanish is a pro-drop language while French is not. However, both languages have many features in common, such as the fact that they are T/V languages (Brown & Gilman 1960).

In this paper, we examine the ways in which native speakers and French-speaking learners of Spanish address their interlocutor, with a focus on the methodological issues related to analysing non-native use of address forms. We will focus on the use of address in naturalized interactions and on the factors that determine the speakers' choice of address terms towards their interlocutors. More precisely, we will analyse the use of informal singular address *tú* and formal singular address *usted* in Spanish.

The corpus is the central issue of this paper and has been compiled with video-recorded naturalized interactions between a student and a teaching assistant. This methodology is inspired by Tran (2006) and focuses on the production of spontaneous and authentic requests by students.

The literature (Blum-Kulka & House 1989; Haverkate 2006; Bataller 2013) allows us to present some hypotheses, namely on the one hand, that Spanish is a more direct language than French and, on the other hand, that French-speaking learners of Spanish tend to transfer this indirectness in the L2. This would mean that Spanish native speakers use more frequently the *tú* form and that the French-speaking learners tend to use the formal form in the same situations.

The research questions that will be tackled in this presentation include the following: (1) Which factors influence the way Spanish native and non-native speakers use address terms in naturalized interactions? (2) How do these speakers determine the use of *tú* and *usted* in those interactions with a teaching assistant? (3) How do the cultural differences influence the way Spanish native speakers and French-speaking learners of Spanish use address terms in Spanish?

The analysis of the corpus will then shed light on the interpretation of status/power and solidarity/distance as expressed through the use of address forms in request formulations.

Piera Molinelli, University of Bergamo

The origin of T/V distinction in Latin: a false myth?

The seminal study by Brown and Gilman about the distinction between “a familiar and a polite pronoun” (1960: 254) has been widely discussed as regards several theoretical aspects, but not as regards the rise of this opposition in Latin (with a few exceptions, cf. Haverling 1995). Brown and Gilman recall previous scholars (Byrne 1936 and Châtelain 1880) in explaining the rise of the T/V dichotomy as

expression of power distinction due to the presence of two emperors in the Roman Empire in the fourth century.

This presentation challenges this statement by discussing and bringing new data on the following points:

- the presence of two emperors is not decisive in itself, because in republican Rome there were two consuls and this did not trigger a T/V distinction; other socio-cultural conditions have to be called into question;
- in the fourth century the T/V distinction is actually attested in written documents, but firstly, and before, this appears in the Christian context, where the authority is a single person;
- the analysis of some documents attesting dialogic forms during a span of 4-5 centuries (e.g. Cicero's *In Verrem*, letters both of secular and ecclesiastic domain, Molinelli 2015) shows that the use of non referential plural begins from the first person NOS with inclusive values some centuries before the two emperors;
- while non referential NOS spread to other values (inclusive > majestic), another linguistic device is at work: nominal address terms extend to serve asymmetric relationships;
- once the type *nosta clementia/benignitas/maiestas* is established to address a single power position, the symmetric address form VOS develops;
- the role of the Christian hierarchy and its establishing during the first three centuries of our era is widely unconsidered as regards these studies, but the letters of the first Popes and outstanding Christian authorities unveil the encoding of formal relationships in the society;
- we can find several bridging contexts for both strategies during some centuries, but, interestingly, no explicit information on politeness distinction is found in contemporary description of the Latin language or in formal education (as attested in *Colloquia scholica*, a collection of bilingual didactic texts).

The purpose of this presentation is to deepen the Latin situation in order to lend more weight to the semantic-pragmatic processes and to the sociocultural conditions, which are at the origin of the ego>Nos and then tu>Vos developments. Allegedly, we can finally leave the two emperors' hypothesis aside.

María Irene Moyna, Texas A&M University

Strategies of polite address in Uruguayan Spanish: Is tú the new usted?

This study explores formal address in Uruguayan Spanish (USp), by complementing quantitative results with new qualitative interviews. It was found that although participants claim they use *usted*, they express social anxiety with this form. Their uncertainty is related to the perception that *usted* is now reserved for situations of extreme distance, typically age-based. That said, interviewees are not ready to do away with a binary politeness system, and use strategies to prevent conflation of the formal/informal contrast. Some speakers take advantage of USp's two informal address pronouns (*tú* and *vos*) to elevate *tú* to the functions of *usted*.

Although *usted* has received limited attention in descriptions of USp (Ricci & Malán de Ricci 1977), a recent questionnaire-based quantitative study showed that this form is still used in situations of social distance or power difference, although answers exhibited high variability and elicited metalinguistic commentary (Moyna 2015). *Usted* was most frequent with unknown elderly addressees, followed by service encounters with professionals; informal forms were more frequent in the workplace.

The present study supplements these results with the responses of fifteen speakers to an in-depth interview on perceived pronoun usage and attitudes. It confirmed that *usted* has retreated noticeably from USp usage in the 21st century: respondents agreed that only situations of extreme social distance

require it. For example, *usted* is deemed natural with elderly addressees, especially those unknown to the speaker. Differences in *usted* use by class relate to the fact that speakers of different strata view their position in the social hierarchy as closer or farther from that of their interlocutors. For example, it was reported that working class children are more likely than middle class children to use *usted* with their teachers, who they consider to be more socially distant.

In terms of pragmatic value, *usted* typically conveys respect. However, several speakers recalled instances where *usted* had been deployed temporarily as a marked form for functions such as mocking hyper-formality, criticism, or rebuke. When it comes to changes in address over time, older interviewees noted two apparently contradictory forces. As they get older, they are more likely to receive *usted*; however, relaxed social mores lead to more frequent informal address. These societal changes have bred a certain degree of anxiety about the politeness value of *usted*. Thus, being the recipient of *usted* was shocking for younger addressees who saw it as inappropriately distant. Employing this form can also be fraught. Several young participants described complex alternative strategies, including address avoidance or mirroring the address form choice of their interlocutor. Some of these speakers promoted *tú*, which older speakers already employ for friendly mitigation, to the role of a mid-distance all-purpose polite form. This maintains a contrast with *vos* while avoiding the undesirable effects of extreme distance.

To summarize, qualitative interviews confirm that *usted* has become ambiguous in USp. However, its elimination hasn't lead to the loss of two levels of politeness, but rather to a range of alternative politeness strategies.

Joske Piepers, Maria van de Groep, Hans van Halteren, Helen de Hoop, Radboud University Nijmegen

Fictively addressing places in Dutch tweets

On Dutch social media, cities and other places are often addressed as if they were people (e.g., “Amsterdam, you were great today!”). Since a place cannot actually function as a conversational partner, this is a clear case of fictive interaction with a fictive addressee (cf. Pascual 2014). For our corpus study of this phenomenon, we used the TwiNL collection of Dutch tweets (Tjong Kim Sang & Van den Bosch 2013), and selected all tweets that started with one of the more than 1,000 names of places and events coming from a preselected list, and that were followed by a second person personal or possessive pronoun. From this set of 33,000 tweets, we randomly selected

600, which we annotated for different characteristics. We distinguished among utterances that could have had a human addressee (e.g., “Amsterdam, you are beautiful in the sunlight”), those that would usually not be said to a human addressee (e.g., “Amsterdam, you smell like kebab”), and those that cannot be said to a human because humans do not possess the qualities described (e.g., “Amsterdam, your canals are beautiful”). Whereas the second type could in principle be said to a person, this would be considered impolite. However, the real addressees of these tweets are not the fictive addressees, but the readers of the tweets. Politeness is thus not an issue, as the tweets are about the fictive addressees, or rather about the speakers’ personal experiences at the places addressed. Hence, these tweets are egocentric (like most tweets), referring to the speakers and their experiences.

Brandt and Pascual (2016) argue that fictive interaction can be used in marketing to promote a particular product. In our case, the “promoted product” can be understood as the speaker’s personal experience. Even though utterances of the type “X you are Y” have more characters than straightforward assertions of the type “X is Y”, they seem to be the most economical way to evoke such a complex interpretation, one that involves not just an objective or factual predication of a place, but rather a speaker’s subjective

experience. In fact, fictive interaction not only goes beyond the objectivity of the predication, but also beyond the subjectivity of the experience, as it ultimately gives rise to intersubjectivity, which has been argued to be the essence of linguistic meaning (Sandler 2016). Hence, the real addressees, i.e., the readers of the tweets, will get engaged with the speakers' experiences, feel invited to share them, and empathize with the speakers. Strikingly, the type of tweets that cannot have a human addressee show the personification of the fictive addressee to be incomplete. This affects the language that is used, even to the extent that we encounter tweets that would be ungrammatical in case of a human addressee (e.g., "Amsterdam, you are raining"). While many linguistic constructions in language have been developed out of (fictive) interaction, we have now come across a phenomenon that shows more or less the opposite pattern: a fictive inanimate addressee that stretches language beyond the limits of grammar.

Juanjuan Ren, Freie Universität Berlin

The Generalization of Kinship Terms in Chinese Academic Setting among students

In every language, kinship term plays an important part in the address form system, reflecting the respective cultural traditions and social conventions. In Chinese society, it is common to use kinship terms to designate a person without genetic or affinal relationship. This phenomenon, which I describe as "generalization of kinship terms", also exists in Chinese academic settings, especially among postgraduate and Ph.D. students guided by the same supervisor, e.g. *shimei* (academic younger-sister or younger-sister fellow student) is derived from the kinship term *meimei* (younger-sister).

Based on questionnaire and interview data, the study examines how Chinese students use generalized kinship terms to address each other, and attempts both to ascertain the extent to which kinship terms are generalized in Chinese academic settings, and to discover the rules governing their use: in some situations it seems to be determined by biological age difference, and in others by other factors such as degree of intimacy, enrollment year, subject and regional difference. The study then discusses reasons that may cause the choice of kinship terms in Chinese academic settings.

Doris Schüpbach, University of Melbourne

Address as a marketing tool? The case of Coop to go in German-speaking Switzerland

Address – and particularly the choice between the T-form *Du* and the V-form *Sie* – is still a contentious issue for many German-speaking Swiss. This is apparent, for example, in the high number of articles in newspapers and on news platforms dealing with this issue and the high number of comments these articles generate. This was also the case when *Coop*, a major Swiss supermarket chain, recently launched a new type of outlets – *Coop to go*, specializing in take-away foods – where it is a policy to address the customers with *Du*. This is unlike the policies and practices in other shops of the chain and, more generally, in service encounters where *Sie* is the unmarked form.

This paper investigates how this 'new' address regime is implemented, how it functions in practice and how customers, staff and the general public react to it.

Data include participant observation, interviews with staff, managers and customers, company documents, newspaper articles and readers' comments. In combination, this data set allows us to

consider the issue from different perspectives and to produce case study in which practices – reported and observed – and attitudes of customers and staff as well as of the general public can be investigated, analyzed and triangulated.

In this context, T-address seems to be predominantly used as a marketing tool: to project a youthful image and thus appeal to young affluent urban customers; to establish a close customer relationship and to increase customer loyalty; and to differentiate *Coop to go* from its many competitors.

Horst Simon, Linda Gennies, Freie Universität Berlin

Are you real? – Methodological problems in the study of address forms in multilingual textbooks from the Early Modern period

When studying diachronic variation and change in address practices, particularly in spoken language, the task of finding appropriate and reliable sources presents itself as a major challenge. A promising, yet so far rather neglected type of research material are historical textbooks for the teaching of foreign languages. Those textbooks, which gained a fairly wide distribution in Early Modern Europe, were all multilingual, containing up to eight languages, and were mainly addressed at tradespeople, craftsmen and travellers of all sorts. As such, they dealt with relatively authentic everyday language which was most notably conveyed in the form of model dialogues.

As part of our research project we have built a corpus of around 400 textbooks by different authors from the 15th to 17th century, generally containing a grammar, a dictionary as well as the aforementioned model dialogues. These dialogues, which comprise various communicative situations such as sales or table talk, are consistently composed in two or more languages arranged in parallel so as to enable the reader to follow the translation equivalents closely. In addition, since several of the textbooks in question have been frequently revised and reissued – sometimes over a period of more than 100 years – these model dialogues are also available from different points in time.

The corpus of these historical foreign language textbooks thus offers an outstanding opportunity to study early modern address forms from both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective, either comparatively or focusing on variation and change within an individual language. – However, there are several methodological pitfalls one has to be aware of when using such a corpus: First, there is, e.g., the problem of determining whether certain unusual forms can be taken as ‘real data’, representing for instance evidence for rare results of language change due to language contact or if they are merely instances of ‘bad’ translations resulting from the author’s lack of fluency in the respective language. Second, the stability of certain forms does not necessarily mean that they were in fact preserved by the language community, but it could also be explained by the often more or less unaltered reprint of parts of these textbooks. In our presentation, we will discuss these and other methodological problems and hint at possible solutions by examining various text samples.

Canan Terzi, Gazi University

The use of think-aloud protocols in address research: the factors influencing pre-service English teachers' choice of forms of address in English

Thinking aloud is a data elicitation method mostly used in translation studies. During a thinking aloud session, the respondent is asked to verbalize whatever crosses their mind about a given task or problem to be solved (Jääskeläinen, 2010) and in the meantime their verbalization, their thinking aloud is audio or video recorded. Then the recordings are transcribed and these transcriptions of the recordings are called Think Aloud Protocols (TAPs). There are basically two types of verbal reports: the first is a *think-aloud*, which asks the respondents to verbalize their thoughts while they are doing a given task and the second is a *retrospective report*, which asks the respondents to verbalize their thoughts immediately after they perform a given task (Ericsson & Simon, [1984], 1993; McKay 2006; Bowles, 2010). In addition to this categorization, Ericsson and Simon ([1984], 1993) proposed another type of verbal protocols during which the respondents are asked about their motives and reasons for their responses--their 'overt behavior', which may not otherwise be available to the researcher. Bowles (2010) referred to such verbal reports as *metalinguistic*.

The type of think-alouds used in this study is a metalinguistic think-aloud since it aimed to investigate the factors that influence pre-service English language teachers' choices of forms of address; a detailed account of their justifications of their choices regarding forms of address were required to get clearer insight about the underlying factors. During the think-alouds in the present study the participants were asked of their reasons for choosing the particular form of address, when the reasons are not readily available from the verbalization. The obtained think aloud protocols provided both quantitative and qualitative sets of data. The qualitative analysis of the written protocols was done using a coding scheme. First, the transcribed data were segmented and then each segment was coded according to the type of information they provided. In conclusion, the verbal reports obtained from the think-aloud study made it possible to have better insight about pre-service English language teachers' decision-making processes regarding their choices of address forms.

Roel Vismans, University of Sheffield

Plural address pronouns in Dutch and German

Clyne et al. (2009: 80) refer to the German plural pronoun *ihr* as 'an intermediate form to express plurality or collectivity in mixed groups, where different interlocutors exchange T and V, and even among groups of V users.' Haeseryn et al. (1997: 240) make a similar claim for the Dutch plural pronoun *jullie*:

[h]et [is] niet ongebruikelijk om tegenover iemand die men niet tutoyeert, toch het voornaamwoord *jullie* te bezigen als men 'de toegesprokene en en degenen met wie hij [sic] op een of andere manier verbonden is' bedoelt. Er moet dan wel echter wel een zekere mate van 'vertrouwelijkheid' tussen de gesprekspartners bestaan.

These claims suggest that the familiar 2nd-person plural pronouns of Dutch and German are deployed in similar ways in similar circumstances. Clyne et al. (2009: 97) mention for example 'a common practice ... for professors and lecturers to call their students *ihr* as a group but *Sie* individually.' And a study of Dutch email correspondence Vismans (in prep.) suggests that *jullie* 'is less familiar than [the singular T-pronouns] *je* and *jij*, and at the same time more familiar than [the V-pronoun] *u*' and therefore that it 'can be regarded as a transitional ploy between *u* and full-blown *tutoyement*'.

A full-scale contrastive study of the Dutch and German uses of the familiar 2nd-person plural pronoun has never been carried out. However, a preliminary study (Shahtaheri 2016) of their use in online fora has highlighted significant differences. This paper builds on this preliminary study by further corpus research and subjecting the data to a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis.

Jane Warren and John Hajek, University of Melbourne

Tutoyer le Président: Media representations of address choice and political power in the French presidential regime

Tutoyer le Président: C'est être plus proche de l'information ou plus proche du pouvoir? [Calling the President *tu*: Is it being closer to information or closer to power?]. In 2009, this question appeared in the left-wing French newspaper *Libération*. It was part of a major publicity campaign to promote the newspaper's metamorphosis and explicit 'civic mission' (Joffrin 2009), in an effort to improve circulation figures and guarantee the paper's future. The campaign, called *l'Info est un combat* [Information is a battle], reflected the paper's intent to provoke debate. It was also a nod to the state of France's increasingly fragmented and diverse news media environment, where social media and digital formats are sidelining traditional print and broadcast media.

The campaign's linguistic framing of the relationship between the French press and the President, inspired by then President Nicolas Sarkozy's preference for *tutoiement*, is the starting point for this paper. It will examine how the French media and particularly the press have reported on the use of second-person address pronouns *tu* and *vous* by and to the last four French presidents – François Mitterrand, Jacques Chirac, Nicolas Sarkozy and François Hollande – over a period of 35 years (1981 to 2016). Media texts provide a widely accessible source of data across a considerable timeframe, which has facilitated the tracking of reported address pronoun use over time in this study. This is in a French media context where journalists and media owners have close links with political elites, and many journalists have a deferential attitude towards the presidential office (Kuhn 2013: 133). The paper will show how individual presidential address preferences can contradict or complement the address practice norms of high office, political party, and society of the time. It will also explore how media discussions of presidential address choices have helped shape public perceptions of successive French presidents.

Camilla Wide, University of Turku
Catrin Norrby, Stockholm University
Jenny Nilsson, Institute for Language and Folklore (Sweden)
Jan Lindström, University of Helsinki

Plural ni 'you' as a resource for managing interpersonal relations

In Swedish, T address, expressed with the second person singular pronoun *du*, is the dominating form of address in all types of situations. V address, expressed with the second person plural pronoun *ni*, is rare, but occurs to a limited extent in certain types of service encounters. However, a third possible option is to use *ni* with plural reference to address either an institution collectively through its representative (*Har ni biljetter till Jesus Christ Superstar* 'Do you.PL have tickets to Jesus Christ Superstar?') or to address, for example, a group of customers through one customer taking care of the transaction for the whole group (*Hur många biljetter vill ni ha?* 'How many tickets do you.PL want?'). In our paper we explore this use of plural *ni* in a corpus of service encounters recorded at box offices in Sweden and Finland. As we will show, in some cases the context clearly shows that the pronoun *ni* is

used collectively to refer to an institution or a group of people. In other cases distinguishing between plural *ni* and *ni* expressing V address is methodologically more challenging. The ambiguity of plural *ni* can also be used as a resource by speakers themselves who want to avoid either T address or V address, or who want to create somewhat greater distance to the interlocutor by choosing plural *ni* instead of T address with the singular pronoun *du*. In our presentation we discuss such cases of plural *ni* as a resource for managing interpersonal relations and compare its use in Finland Swedish and Sweden Swedish.

Maria Yelenevskaya, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology

Forms of address in a multilingual society: When cultural conventions meet and clash (a case of Israel)

Israel is a multilingual society with two official languages, Hebrew and Arabic, and thirty five languages spoken in informal settings (Lewis et al., 2016) Although Hebrew hegemony is overwhelming in all spheres of life, English has acquired major importance in public settings, in particular, in business, tourism and academia. This paper explores how Hebrew communication patterns based on the spirit of community and solidarity (Katriel 2012) on the one hand, and widely accepted Americanization of Israeli culture on the other are reflected in the forms of address in academic settings. Despite internalization of science and a high degree of standardization of academic discourse, local conventions of politeness and manifestations of status and hierarchies differ from country to country. The paper will discuss the use of FN and TLN as reflection of hierarchical, interethnic and gender relations. I will analyze which cultural conventions of expressing politeness and accepted among members of the three largest speech communities: Hebrew, Arabic and Russian are transformed and which are preserved when communication is conducted in English. Finally, I will dwell on the attitudes to the cultural conventions of “the other” on the part of students, and will look into pedagogical implications of discussing forms of address in multicultural settings in order to increase young people’s tolerance and respect for cultures that are not their own. The study is based on 20 informal interviews with students, participant observation of various academic events recorded in the author’s ethnographic diary. These range from conferences and lectures to department meetings and reception hours for students. The analyzed sample includes oral interactions and electronic correspondence between administration and faculty members, professors and students, as well as messages addressed by faculty to their peers.