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ABSTRACT
Anne Stepan Keown: METAPHORICAL MOTIVATIONS FOR POLITENESS STRATEGIES: LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE FROM RUSSIAN, POLISH, AND CZECH
(Under the direction of Laura A. Janda)

This dissertation is an examination of address with pronouns and their related forms in Russian, Polish, and Czech. Our treatment of the topic is unique in that we seek to understand not just who uses what forms when, but how these forms are motivated, what they mean, and what this says about the conceptual structures that underlie usages of forms of address in each of the three languages. The questions we examine include: What motivates plural and third person address? Why is it logical, and what does it mean, to address one person as plural or as third person? Do plural and third person address differ in meaning, or are they simply two versions of essentially the same thing? What do Russian, Polish, and Czech forms of address have in common, and how do they differ?

We seek to answer these questions through an analysis of forms of address in the framework of cognitive linguistics. Specifically, we examine two phenomena, one of which is asymmetrical address, the circumstance in which one speaker receives a polite or formal form and the other receives the intimate or informal form. We also examine switches in address, whereby one speaker suddenly changes the form of address he or she uses with interlocutor. Data for these analyses are drawn from two films and two plays in each language (Russian, Polish, Czech) and from a research project in which native speakers wrote scripts based on short video clips.
Our analysis of asymmetrical address and switches in address reveals how speakers' fundamental understanding of **spatial relations** (such as UP/DOWN, BIG/SMALL, OUT/IN, and FAR/NEAR) structures their language use. It is by examining manipulations of speakers' conceptual as well as physical space that we discover how linguistic forms of address reflect and reinforce social relationships.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Nastojaschaja i lučšaja veživost’ ta, kotoraja osnovana na iskrennosti. Istinnaja veživost’ neražljučna s uvaženiem k ličnosti drugogo i bez nee nevozmožna.
The real and best politeness is that which is founded on sincerity. True politeness is inseparable from respect for the personality of another, and without it impossible.
-Nikolaj Vasil’evič Šelgunov

Grzeczność nie jest nauką łatwą ani małą.
Politeness is not an easy or insignificant science.
-Judge in Pan Tadeusz (by Adam Mickiewicz)

Buď přijemný a milý ve tváři, vlídný a zdvořilý ve způsobech, přívětivý a pravdomluvný ústy, vroucí a upřímým srdečem. Miluj a tak milován budeš.
Have a pleasant and kind face, amicable and polite manners, friendly and truthful mouth, earnest and sincere heart. Love and so you will be loved.
-Jan Amos Komenský

1.1 Background

The issue of politeness is a very complicated one in any language. The ability to manipulate politeness strategies is one of the last skills acquired when learning a second language. With time and practice it is certainly possible to acquire the wealth of politeness strategies available in a given language; the difficulty lies, however, in the fact that these strategies do not necessarily transfer from one language to another. For instance, Slavic languages have a polite form of address which, as one textbook tells us, is used “between adults and by children addressing adults…The informal variant…is used in families, among close friends and young people, and when addressing God, a child, and a pet” (Lubensky et al. 1996: 12). To some English speakers, this distinction might seem irrelevant or trivial; after all, we do not mark the relationship between
speaker and addressee by means of pronouns. As students of Slavic languages, we are
told that, when in doubt, we should simply err on the side of formality.

Upon closer examination, however, we discover that the issue of forms of address
is far from simplistic. Nikolaj Gogol’ even comments on the system of Russian address
(in general) in Dead Souls (47):

\[\text{Nadobno skazat’, čto u nas na Russi esli ne ugnalis’ ešče koj v čem}
drugom za inostrancami, to daleko peregnały ix v umenii obraščat’ja.
Peresčitat’ nel’zja vse ottenkov i tonkostej našego obraščenija. Francuz
ili nemec vek ne smeknet i ne pojmet vseh ego osobennostej i različij; on
počti tem že golosom i tem že jazykom stanet govorit’ i s millionščikom, i
s melkim tabačnym torgašom, kotja, konečno, v duše popodličaet v meru
pered pervym. U nas ne to: u nas est’ takie muddericy, kotorye s
pomeščnikom, imejuščim dvesti duš, budut govorit’ sovsem inache, neželi s
tem, u kotorogo iix trista, a s tem, u kotorogo iix trista, budut govorit’ opiat’
ne tak, kak s tem, u kotorogo iix pjať’asot, a s tem, u kotorogo iix pjať’asot,
opiat’ ne tak, kak s tem, u kotorogo iix vosem’asot, -- slovom, xot’ vosxodi
do milliona, vse najdutsja ottenki.

It should be said that if we in Russia have not yet caught up with
the foreigners in some things, we have long over-taken [sic] them in the
means of address. It is impossible to count all the shades and niceties of
our means of address. The Frenchman or the German will never grasp or
understand all the particularities and differences; with almost the same
voice and language he will start to speak with a millionaire, and with a
petty tobacco vender although, of course, in his soul he is appropriately
base to the first. It is not like that with us. Among us there are wise
fellows who will speak altogether differently with a landlord having two
hundred serfs than with one who has three hundred, and with one who has
three hundred they will not speak as they would with one having five
hundred, and with one having five hundred, again, not as with one having
eight hundred; in a word, although you go to a million, they will always
find shades (of difference) (translation in Friedrich 1966: 220).

Although Gogol’ is exaggerating here, the subject of address in Russian, as well as in
Polish and Czech, is indeed a complicated one and worth a closer look.

In this dissertation, we undertake an analysis of one politeness strategy common
to Russian, Polish, and Czech: address with pronouns and their related forms, which
include verbal forms, possessive adjectives, and the pronouns themselves in various cases
(Stone 1981a: 56). These forms, and the notations that we use to represent them, will be discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

1.2 Purpose of this study / research questions

Our treatment of the topic of polite address is unique in that we seek to understand not just who uses what forms when, but how these forms are motivated, what they mean, and what this says about the conceptual structures that underlie Russian, Polish, and Czech usages of forms of address. The questions we attempt to answer include: What motivates plural and third person address? Why is it logical, and what does it mean, to address one person as plural or as third person? Do plural and third person address differ in meaning, or are they simply two versions of essentially the same thing? What do Russian, Polish, and Czech forms of address have in common, and how do they differ?

We seek to answer these questions through an analysis of forms of address in the framework of cognitive linguistics. Specifically, we examine two phenomena, one of which is asymmetrical address, the circumstance in which one speaker receives a polite or formal form and the other receives the intimate or informal form. We also examine switches in address, whereby one speaker suddenly changes the form of address he or she uses to address an interlocutor.

Our analysis of asymmetrical address and switches in address reveals how speakers' fundamental understanding of spatial relations structures their language use. It is by examining manipulations of speakers' conceptual as well as physical space that we discover how linguistic forms of address reflect and reinforce social relationships.
1.3 Relevance of this study

In addition to linguistics, the subject of this dissertation is relevant to cognitive science, psychology, sociology, and even history. Politeness as a topic of linguistic inquiry is very important; in communication with people of other cultures, a thorough understanding of appropriate behavior (linguistic and otherwise) is necessary to engender good relations between speakers of different languages. After all, if I were speaking to someone in Russian and I violated any basic tenet of linguistic politeness, my Russian interlocutor might become offended and hostile to any further communication with me, regardless of the actual content of my message. Through a cognitive linguistic analysis of politeness strategies in various languages, we can gain a better understanding of how speakers of other languages perceive and understand their world.

The topic of polite pronominal address is also relevant to sociology. Any examination of the way people address one another must include some description of the social setting -- the context -- of the utterances under analysis. Questions about why Russians, Poles, and Czechs address each other with certain forms in certain situations, why they switch forms, and why certain forms are perceived as inappropriate or rude all involve the sociology of language.

Finally, forms of address are bound to historical and ideological change. Even within the time period since World War II, address forms have undergone significant transformations, especially in Polish. Although the focus of this dissertation is not historical change, we do find extensive influence of communist norms among our Polish data. Thus, history is taken into account to some extent in our examination of the motivations of polite (and rude) address in the three languages under consideration.
1.4 Scope of the study

We examine address forms in Russian, Polish, and Czech since World War II. Our data is drawn from two films and two plays in each language. From these twelve creative works we recorded various instances of mutual address and attempted to catalog every instance of asymmetry, switches, and unusual or unexpected forms of address. We also conducted a research project of our own design in order to obtain naturalistic data on current forms of address. The results of the project include mutual address as well as asymmetry and switches.

1.5 Structure of the dissertation

This dissertation is structured as follows: in Chapter 2 we present a review of relevant literature followed by a discussion of our unique approach to the subject. Specifically, we discuss the framework of cognitive linguistics and the metaphors germane to the issues involved with forms of address in Russian, Polish, and Czech. Chapter 3 is a presentation of data gleaned from films and plays in each of the three languages; this chapter is intended primarily as a survey of available, typical forms of address as used in creative works. Chapter 4 is a survey of data on forms of address gleaned from the research project undertaken for this dissertation. In Chapter 5 we present an analysis of the most revealing phenomena instantiated in the data from Chapters 3 and 4: asymmetrical address and switches in address. Chapter 5 provides the bulk of the analysis within the framework of cognitive linguistics with respect to metaphors that motivate address with pronouns and their related forms. Finally, Chapter 6 presents conclusions and implications of our analysis, as well as suggestions for further research.
Chapter 2: Theoretical perspectives

2.1 Introduction

Chapter 2 begins with definitions of pronouns and polite address. We then present a review of literature devoted to the subject of address with honorific pronouns and their related syntactic forms. The summary of past treatments of the topic will be followed by a discussion of cognitive linguistics, the framework in which analysis of polite forms will be undertaken in Chapter 5. The use of metaphor in the conceptualization of social relations and how it relates to honorific address will be outlined in preparation for a more detailed analysis in Chapter 5.

2.1.1 What are pronouns and forms of address?

Most agree that a pronoun is a functional word that is used instead of a noun or name. According to Helmbrecht (2003:185), “[s]peakers use personal pronouns [my boldface] in order to direct the attention of the addressee to one or more human individuals who may be present or absent in the actual speech situation. Usually, this act of reference is an integral part of a speech act, or more generally of a communicative exchange”. Pronouns are a crucial, perhaps universal, element of language use which allows us to simply “point” (linguistically) to people or things we want to talk to about.¹

In many languages, personal pronouns can exhibit distinctions that reflect the attitude of the speaker to the addressee, or their relative social status; most often variation

¹See also Friedrich 1966; Jakobson 1984; Jucker and Taavitsainen 2003; Croft and Cruse, forthcoming.
in the grammatical category **number** (singular, plural) is implemented to this end.

**Person** can also show variation to reflect status or relationship (Head 1978). “Person characterizes the participants of the narrated event with reference to the participants of the speech event. Thus first person signals the identity of a participant of the narrated event with the performer of the speech event, and the second person, the identity with the actual or potential undergoer of the speech event” (Jakobson 1984:45). Third person is generally assigned to someone in the background, someone who is not an active participant in the communicative event.

The languages we examine in this dissertation have been selected specifically because they provide examples of variations in both number (Russian and Czech) and person (Polish) with regard to personal pronouns in the addressing function. Russian and Czech have implemented 2pl as the honorific / polite / formal form, whereas in Polish, a system of third person address has emerged.

The issue of address with plural or third person forms, however, goes well beyond pronouns. Gerald Stone (1977: 491), discussing address in Slavic in general, makes the valid assertion that “[i]n all second-person verbal forms the existence of the pronoun is implied even if not expressed”. In another article specifically on Polish pronouns, he states, “[a]ddress…consists not only of the pronouns themselves but also of verbal forms agreeing with them grammatically” (Stone 1981a: 56). Often in Polish² “the pronouns themselves are superfluous in the subject of a sentence and little used in the nominative except for emphasis” (Stone 1981a: 56). Stone further points out that the pronouns are declined and have possessive forms that are also declined (Stone 1981a: 56-57). Thus, the

² In Czech, too, but not in Russian, pronouns are not usually used in the nominative case. Here Stone refers to all pronominal forms except the nominal forms pan, pani, państwo, which are functionally pronouns but are obligatory in address.
issue is not simply about pronouns proper in the nominative case; it involves verb forms
(nonpast and past, conditionals, imperatives), possessive adjectives, which can reflect the
case of the noun modified, and pronouns in the nominative and other cases.
Manipulations of the grammatical categories of person and number -- be it of pronouns,
adjectives, or verbs -- allow speakers to reflect and reinforce their relationships to each
other.

We present in Appendix A an outline of the forms involved in the type of address
we are considering in this analysis. As the reader will quickly realize, there are in fact a
large number of possible forms that can reflect patterns of address. Following convention
(Brown and Gilman 1960), we refer to address involving ty ‘you sg’ and its related forms
by means of the symbol T. Similarly, we refer to address of a single individual with vy /
wy ‘you sg formal’ and its related forms by means of V. In Polish, third person address
with pan ‘sir’ and pani ‘madam’ (and other nouns that substitute for pan, pani in this
role) will be noted as P. Plural address will follow similar conventions: Vpl will be used
for true plural address in the three languages, and Ppl for address with panowie ‘sirs’,
panie ‘madams’, and państwo ‘ladies and gentlemen’. Parsing of examples, then, will
appear as in the Russian one given below, with the address form boldfaced in both the
original and the translation, and labeled as to form in the translation only:

_Nu i kak tebe Galja, nравится?_ ‘Well what do you [T] think about Galja -- do you like her?’

We do note that the symbols T, V, and P refer to forms only; the actual meanings of T, V,
and P address can vary from language to language and even within each language; thus,
we do not use these symbols to imply general uniformity of meaning.

---

3 Nouns such as ojciec ‘father’, siostra ‘sister’, etc. can substitute for pan, pani in the addressing function.
We further try to refrain from the inaccurate term "pronoun" when possible and instead use "address form", "T address pattern", and so on. However, there do occur instances in which avoidance of the term "pronoun" would yield convoluted or unwieldy constructions. The reader is to understand that the topic we examine involves what is generally meant by the term "pronoun" in studies of politeness: the pronoun as well as its syntactically related forms (verbs, possessives, and so on; again, see Appendix A for forms implied by the term "pronoun").

2.1.2 What is "polite" address?

What, then, is "polite" address? And is it always "polite"? We answer the second question first: no, what is commonly called "polite" address is not always "polite". It can, of course, be polite, but it can also be neutral or rude. A number of factors -- the speaker's relationship to the hearer, the speaker's construal of the situation, the speaker's dialect, absolute factors such the speaker's age -- combine to create patterns of address that can change from situation to situation, speaker to speaker and even within one situation with the same speaker. V and P, which are generally thought of as "polite" or "formal" forms in the Slavic languages we analyze in this dissertation, can just as easily express rudeness and anger. T, the "informal" form, can be used to insult as well as to endear. When we explore the multiple meanings of T, V, and P pattern address, we will realize that the range of meanings that can be assigned to each form of address has emerged from a coherent system of human knowledge about spatial relations, especially vertical orientation, size, distance, and containment.

What is conventionally labeled "honorific", "polite", or "formal" address is simply the use of non-T address based on the situation and the speakers' relationship to...
each other. In Russian and Czech, there is only one form of polite address: the second
person plural vy and its associated syntactic constructions doubles as both a neutral plural
and a singular honorific address form. In Polish, however, third person address forms are
used: pan ‘sir’, pani ‘madam’, panowie ‘sirs’, panie ‘madams’, państwo ‘ladies and
gentlemen’. Wy is the Polish plural equivalent of ty; that is, it is the familiar plural. Polish
wy does have a history of use as a singular polite pronoun as well, although it is no longer
commonly used in this context (see sections 2.2.2.2.1.3 and 2.2.2.2.2.1.2 below).

As we shall discuss in section 2.2.2.2.1, T was the only singular form of address
available to speakers of Russian, Polish, and Czech for many centuries. V / P address,
then, is a later, secondary (albeit cognitively motivated) development in each of the
languages. T can be considered for a number of reasons to be the “generic” form of
address: it was historically primary, it was for a long time more common in rural areas
than V / P address (the “new” forms had not spread outward from the cities, see Stone
1981a, Friedrich 1966), and it is used in idiomatic constructions that do not refer to a
specific addressee. At this point we examine the latter, which we will label non-
referential T for future reference.

In the Russian example below, we find a mixture of referential (V) address and
non-referential (T) address:

U menja blestjaščaja ideja! Lučšega nakazanija emu ne pridumaeš’! Vy dadiše im
vygovor, čto ugodno -- im vse tryn-trava. Daže esli ix progrnati s raboty -- vse ravno, ix
ničem ne prošiběš.
I have a brilliant idea. A person wouldn’t be able to think up [T] a better punishment!
If you give [V] them a reprimand, even if you fire them, all the same, it won’t make a
dent. Nothing will faze them...(lit. ‘one won’t get through [T] to them)

Although the forms in question are second person (T) forms, these statements are directed
to no one in particular. In the Russian example, we see a true form of address (V) that is
otherwise consistently maintained throughout the dialog, in addition to the non-referential T forms.

In the following Czech example, a school principal is complaining to no one in particular about the reaction of students to a question he has asked. Neither of these T forms signals anything about the situation, nor interpersonal relationships of the people involved in it.

Ředitel: Mluv s nima zeleně, mluv s nima fialové nebo bledě modře, všechno stejný. Pořád na tebe zírá stádo tupých obličejů. Hergothýml.
Principal: Talk [T] with them green, talk [T] with them violet or pale blue, it’s all the same. The bunch of mindless faces keeps staring at you [T]. God in heaven.

Non-referential T forms will not be discussed because they are never conditioned by social or situational factors. When a speaker uses non-referential T, he or she is not actually addressing his or her interlocutor with T; rather, the speaker is making a generalization, and one of the conventional ways to do this in Russian, Polish, and Czech is by using a T form.

2.1.3 Summary

The focus of this dissertation is the cognitive motivations for usage of T, V, and P address. We claim that address with personal pronouns and their related forms is motivated by speakers’ perceptions of physical space and spatial relations. Through the use of metaphor speakers are able to bridge the gap between grammatical forms available to them and their perceptions of their interlocutor and the situations in which they find themselves. By manipulating the grammatical categories of number and person, speakers can not only reflect but also reinforce (and even attempt to impose) their interpretation of social relations involved in the exchange.
We now present a review of the literature relevant to the topics of address in general and address in Russian, Polish, and Czech.

2.2 Background and review of literature

2.2.1 Introduction

In this dissertation, we undertake an analysis of one politeness strategy common to Russian, Polish, and Czech: address with pronouns and their related forms. There are two broad perspectives under which most of the significant literature relating to the subject can be categorized. Formalists seek to analyze the (morpho-) syntactic realizations of address to a single person with a plural or third person form. In the Slavic languages, address with a polite form often results in “mismatched” syntax, and agreement issues have provided a great deal of material for analysis. Functionalists, among whom we include ourselves, seek to understand meaning and motivation for usage of forms of address in various situations.

In fact, the majority of literature on this topic in Slavic tends toward the functionalist perspective. The origins of address in various Slavic languages, descriptions of address patterns at various times in the language and culture’s history, and changes in patterns of address have been discussed to some extent, as have descriptions of modern address forms in various languages. However, a comprehensive, comparative analysis of address among three Slavic languages (Russian, Polish, and Czech) in the framework of a relatively young methodology, cognitive linguistics, has not been accomplished. This dissertation is an attempt to fill that gap and ideally pave the way for further research on this topic in this framework.
Within the functionalist literature we divide the works between those concerned with address in general and those concerned specifically with one or more of the Slavic languages we analyze in this presentation. Among the non-Slavic related works we find those which provide a sociolinguistic analysis, and those generally more contemporary works which undertake analysis in the framework of cognitive linguistics.

Among the works dealing specifically with Russian, Polish, and / or Czech, we find three main types: 1) historical descriptions of address or theories as to the development of address in each language, 2) descriptive analyses in which the author describes tendencies in address either within the language or among languages (comparative analyses), and 3) prescriptive analyses in which the author notes the “proper” forms of address in certain situations.

In this review of the literature on the subject of address, we offer only a nominal review of syntactic (formalist) analyses of general agreement issues. Formalist works, if they are noted, are noted without great detail, as we place this dissertation squarely in the functionalist context. Emphasis, then, is placed on significant works on the topic of forms of address that deal with the meaning and motivation, not the syntax, of polite address, with regard to both Slavic and non-Slavic languages.

Below we present a brief outline of the literature we review in this section:
POLITE PRONOUNS AND THEIR RELATED FORMS

- Functionalism
  - General address
    - Sociolinguistic analysis
    - Cognitive linguistic analysis
  - Address in Slavic
    - Historical: pre-20\textsuperscript{th} century
    - Descriptive: 20\textsuperscript{th} century and beyond
      - Within a single language
      - Comparative
    - Prescriptive
- Formalism: Specific to Slavic only

Again, as our dissertation belongs to the body of scholarship that seeks to find meaning and motivation in types of address in Russian, Polish, and Czech, we begin with a thorough review of relevant literature in the functionalist tradition of linguistics.

2.2.2 Functionalism

We define functionalism in general as an approach to linguistics whereby the intent of the speaker, the communicative purpose of the data (utterance, structure) must be taken into account. The focus of a functionalist approach to language is description, not prediction; crucially, the motivation of structures in relation to speaker intent is important and is taken into account in a functionalist approach to linguistics.

We begin our review by examining seminal works from the functionalist perspective on general address with pronouns and their related forms, which is a fairly recent topic of inquiry. We first review sociolinguistic analyses, and then move on to cognitive linguistic treatments, since this dissertation undertakes analyses in the framework of cognitive linguistics.

2.2.2.1 Works on address in general

Analyses of the phenomenon of address in general are described in this section. We further divide the section into two frameworks: sociolinguistics and cognitive
linguistics. As we will see, much of the work in the sociolinguistic framework foretells later research that is clearly identified with the cognitive framework. Any discussion of issues of address cannot ignore social aspects, the context, of the situations under scrutiny. Cognitive linguistics takes the “how” of sociolinguistics one step further and provides a plausible “why” in response to questions about address: not just how one is addressed, but why that address form is logical.

2.2.2.1.1 Sociolinguistics

In this section we discuss two works in particular: Brown and Gilman’s 1960 analysis of the pronouns of power and solidarity, and Brown and Levinson’s theory of face (1987). We also discuss older (pre-1990) and more recent (post-1990) works utilizing these works in their analysis. We conclude this section by suggesting that sociolinguistic analyses of these types do not go far enough in explaining the meanings and motivations of polite address. One must take into account cognitive motivations as well.

Brown and Gilman (1960: 253) were the first to suggest that address with pronouns (and their related syntactic structures) are associated with “two dimensions fundamental to the analysis of all social life -- the dimensions of power and solidarity. Semantic and stylistic analysis of these forms takes us well into psychology and sociology as well as into linguistics and the study of literature”. Brown and Gilman’s work represents the basis for a great deal of other literature on the subject of address. Other scholars\(^4\) have elaborated the themes of power and solidarity in various ways, but

---

\(^4\) Many scholars, including Adler 1978, Popov 1985, Braun 1988, Comrie \textit{et al.} 1996, Listen 1999, and Bruti 2000 base much of their argument on Brown and Gilman’s “The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity” (1960), which is considered the one of the most important articles written on the subject of pronominal address.
Brown and Gilman were clearly the source of many theoretical notions that support our analysis in this dissertation. In addition, they established the convention, which we follow, of representing any informal pronoun (du, tu, ty, and so on) as T, and any polite pronoun (Sie, vous, vy) as V. We therefore devote a significant portion of this discussion, as well as later analysis, to their work on power and solidarity in pronominal address.

"The pronouns of power and solidarity", Brown and Gilman's (1960) seminal article on the subject of polite address, essentially represents a theory of the historical development of address with pronominal forms in European languages. They state explicitly, "The European development of two singular pronouns of address begins with the Latin tu and vos" (Brown and Gilman 1960: 254). They suggest that originally only tu 'you sg' was used to address a single person in Latin. In the fourth century AD one began to address the Roman emperor not as tu, but as vos 'you pl' (Brown & Gilman 1960: 255). Brown and Gilman also propose two possible explanations for this innovation in Latin. First, this use of vos in the singular might have developed reciprocally in response to the emperor's use of nos 'we', not ego 'I', to refer to himself. After all, the emperor is the ruler of all and the representative of all.

Alternatively, the use of vos in addressing the emperor might also have arisen when, during the fourth century, the Roman Empire was divided into two sections. The Western part was ruled from Rome, and the Eastern part from Byzantium. It was decreed that each emperor should be addressed as vos, for in addressing one emperor a person was, in actuality, addressing both. They do note, however, "the usage need not have been mediated by a prosaic association with actual plurality, for plurality is a very old and

---

5 We will discuss metonymy, the part representing the whole, in subsequent sections.
ubiquitous metaphor for power” (Brown and Gilman 1960: 255). Of course, at the same time, in addressing either emperor, one was also addressing a person vastly more powerful than himself; it is possible that in time vos became associated with the accordance of respect to a person in any position of power. From Latin, it is thought that the use of plural pronouns to show honor to a powerful ruler spread to heads of other states, then subsequently trickled down to the masses as a way to address not only someone in power but strangers, distant relatives, and so on.

We will return to a discussion of power and solidarity semantics in Chapter 5; briefly, though, the power semantic, according to Brown and Gilman (1960: 255), derives from one speaker’s ability to “control the behavior of the other. Power is a relationship between at least two persons, and it is nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior”. The power semantic is characterized by asymmetrical address; one speaker gives T but receives V.

The solidarity semantic, on the other hand, concerns differences not in power, but in the degree to which speakers feel kinship or similarity to each other. Brown and Gilman suggest the solidarity semantic involves primarily mutual (V-V or T-T) address, as they assume that speakers will feel mutually the same degree of solidarity (or lack thereof). Strangers will know they are strangers, and brothers will know they are brothers.

Brown and Gilman suggest two tendencies in languages that have polite address with pronominal forms: first, languages move from the power semantic (asymmetrical address) toward the solidarity semantic, meaning that mutual address (V-V or T-T) is the preferred, if not exclusive, form of address. Second, once a language has moved away from asymmetrical address to mutual address, mutual T begins to spread to areas

---

6 We will also examine the role of metaphor in motivating polite address.

What are the motivations for these tendencies in address? Brown and Gilman conclude that in the evolution of forms of address there was a stage in which the solidarity rule was limited to address between persons of equal power. This seemed to yield a two-dimensional system in equilibrium...and we have wondered why address did not permanently stabilize there. It is possible, of course, that human cognition favors the binary choice without contingencies and so found its way to the suppression of one dimension [asymmetrical address]. However, this theory does not account for the fact that it was the rule of solidarity that triumphed. We believe, therefore, that the development of open societies with an equalitarian ideology acted against the nonreciprocal power semantic and in favor of solidarity. It is our suggestion that the larger social changes created a distaste for the face-to-face expression of differential power (Brown and Gilman 1960: 267).

That is, as status-bound, static societies developed into democracies, address with pronouns and their related forms “democratized” as well.

Overall, Brown and Gilman’s power and solidarity semantics are the beginnings of a comprehensive theory of the motivation for polite address, as we will argue below in section 2.3 and illustrate in Chapter 5. There are, of course, weaknesses: asymmetrical address, although less common than mutual address, is, in fact, alive and well in Russian, Polish, and Czech. Switches, though often temporary, also involve the power semantic, and are not necessarily associated with “transient attitudes”. Finally, Brown and Gilman do not completely account for address in what we call impersonal or scripted situations (business transactions in which neither, or perhaps both, parties have power, but formal address is not completely motivated by the fact that the interlocutors do not know each
other well). Brown and Gilman are essentially correct; their power and solidarity semantics, however, do not go far enough to explain the variation that appears within languages and between languages.

Adler’s *Naming and Addressing* (1978) is essentially an application of Brown and Gilman’s notions of power and solidarity semantics to a wide variety of European languages, with emphasis on the history and change of address with pronouns and their related forms. His brief analysis of Slavic (notably Russian and Serbo-Croatian) utilizes Brown and Gilman’s (1960) theory as to the continuing development of address, suggesting that socialism might be propelling the spread of mutual T address (Adler 1978: 228-232).

Bruti (2000), in her analysis of address in Shakespeare’s English, claims we must take into account not just power and solidarity (Brown and Gilman 1960), but also “the conventional meanings associated with varying degrees of emotional proximity and familiarity. So the generalizing rule that ... you was used to convey social distance or respect, whereas thou was employed to address the lower social ranks or inferiors, expressing respectively contempt or familiarity within the family...does not account for those cases in which thou was used to express temporary feelings or either distance or proximity” (Bruti 2000: 27-18). Bruti’s article is an attempt to motivate what have been considered “unmotivated” switches and asymmetries in Shakespearean English; she correctly asserts that simple power and solidarity do not go far enough to explain fluctuations in pronoun use, which, as it turns out, are not as random as once thought. Mazzon (1995: 40) had earlier come to a similar conclusion: switches in address should "be seen as exquisitely social devices, closely reflecting the degree of distance"
vs. intimacy and the power vs. solidarity conveyed by any exchange”.

Jucker and Taavitsainen (2003), in their introduction to *Diachronic perspectives on address term systems*, an entire volume dedicated to historical analyses of address in various European languages by various scholars, note that retractability (what we call switches) and asymmetry have been (and continue to be) viable phenomena in most European languages. The degree to which speakers can switch between forms of address (retractability) varies from language to language. And some languages (such as Swedish) have developed systems in which one class uses symmetrical address, whereas another uses asymmetrical. Clearly, address is much more fluid and complicated than Brown and Gilman originally proposed.

Brown and Levinson’s 1987 analysis of politeness with regard to what they term “face” is another (perhaps the other) fundamental work on politeness. Their approach is quite different from, yet in some ways related to, Brown and Gilman’s work on power and solidarity. Brown and Levinson suggest that people are “endowed with two particular wants -- roughly, the want to be unimpeded and the want to be approved of in certain respects” (Brown and Levinson 1987: 63). “Face” is the “public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself, consisting in two related aspects: (a) negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal reserves, rights to non-distraction -- i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition (b) positive face: the positive consistent self-image or ‘personality’ claimed by interactants” (Brown and Levinson 1987: 66). Threats to one’s negative face might include orders, requests, suggestions, threats, and warnings, as each of these acts potentially infringe on the right of the hearer to freedom of action; the speaker is, in fact, attempting to impose his will on the hearer. Threats to one’s
positive face might include criticism, ridicule, complaints, and contradictions. Anything that might be perceived as an attack on one’s self or personality is a threat to positive face.

With regard to address with pronouns and their syntactic entailments, Brown and Levinson (1987: 203-204) suggest that “[o]n the one hand, ‘you’ (plural) provides a conventional ‘out’ for the hearer... That is, since it does not literally single out the addressee, it is as if the speaker were giving [the hearer] the option to interpret it as applying to him rather than, say, to his companions”. Brown and Levinson also suggest that plural address can be directed toward a hearer as a representative member of a certain group (again, metonymy will be addressed below).

Third person address, they suggest, derives from the use of referent titles. “Here the underlying principle seems to be the distancing afforded by speaking to the addressee as if the speaker (or the hearer) were not present... Just as ‘you’ (singular) gives H [the hearer] no ‘out’, nails him with an FTA [face threatening action], so the use of names may do likewise”. A speaker can use a third person pronoun or title to distance the hearer from the conversation.

Ultimately, Brown and Levinson suggest different motivations for the use of polite forms: whereas Brown and Gilman posit power and solidarity, Brown and Levinson posit the desire to redress face threatening acts by diffusing the recipient of address (making him or her plural) or by distancing the hearer from the conversation (making him or her third person). Although power / solidarity and redress for face threatening acts might on the surface seem unrelated, a metaphorical analysis (see section 2.3.3 below) will reveal how much they both have in common.
Head (1978) surveyed over 100 languages in another attempt to discern universals in politeness strategies; his study, however, deals not with the social factors conditioning pronoun use but with the relationship between 1) variation of grammatical categories and 2) degrees of respect or social distance in pronominal reference. His findings include the following:

- variation in number is most widespread, and usually nonsingular shows more respect, honor, and so forth
- alternation of person indicates greater differences in degree of respect or social distance than does alternation of number, while alternation of both categories shows greater difference in social meaning than does change of only one of them
- reduction and substitution of nouns or nominal expressions are common ways of introducing use of third person pronouns into address systems
- when employed so as to convey social meaning, categories distant or non-proximate, exclusive, and indefinite or impersonal usually indicate greater respect or social distance than do the respective opposing ones, while those of inanimate and non-human typically indicate less respect than do their counterparts

Although we make no claim to universality, these conclusions, as we will show in our analysis in Chapter 5, are substantiated by the Russian, Polish, and Czech data we have gathered. The cognitive analysis we employ is an attempt to link these generalities about grammatical categories to social factors as well, which Head does not do in his analysis.

Friederike Braun (1988) presents still another broad survey of address forms -- not just pronouns -- beginning with an overview of address in European languages based on a survey she conducted with native speakers of those languages. We discuss Braun's survey here because it was her questionnaire on which our original MA thesis survey was based (see 3.1). Braun incorporates the notions of power and solidarity, as well as face, in the presentation of her data, but points out that, in contrast to Brown and Gilman's and Brown and Levinson's description of the development and motivation of forms of address, "variation in address is not an exception but rather the rule" (Braun 1988: 23).
Braun also calls particular attention to the special functions of V address that do not fit into the system Brown and Gilman describe.

For example, Braun notes that V can be used in Spanish to address cats and dogs; in essence, "speakers remind themselves that cats and dogs are not 'members of the family'" (Braun 1988: 42). Further, "in Northern regions of France, an older sister uses vous to a younger one, but says tu to the other family members" (Braun 1988: 44). That is, in some varieties of French, vous can express a higher degree of intimacy than tu. She notes that this type of V usage "does not at all harmonize with the characteristics otherwise attributed to the V form. V usage of this kind also interferes with the interpretation of T-V asymmetry or V-V symmetry...[T]he fact remains conspicuous that markers of intimacy appear in the shape of V pronouns" (Braun 1988: 45).

Braun suggests that previous accounts of politeness, including Brown and Gilman 1960 and Brown and Levinson 1978, are generally too simplistic. Braun's research leads her to the conclusion that universals in address are hard to find, and that forms of address "have address-specific meanings and functions, regardless of the meanings and functions they may have in other contexts" (Braun 1988: 304-307). That is, V does not always imply high status, power, and so on of the speaker who receives it. Address, Braun suggests, is much more complex and flexible -- even between the same speakers in the same conversation -- than analyses have generally presented it to be.

We agree that address is complex and flexible. However, a closer examination of the "exceptions" (such as addressing an animal with V) would likely reveal motivations that are coherent with the cultures in which these forms are found, and might fit the model of power and solidarity in a way that is different but no less viable. For example,
V address to a dog is not motivated by power but by solidarity (or, more precisely, lack thereof; V is obviously an attempt to reinforce the distance between animal and human [self]). It happens that in this particular Spanish-speaking culture, address to animals is not motivated by the power scale, but by the solidarity scale (a dog is addressed as a stranger, not as an inferior, as it is in many European cultures). The use of V, though, is consistent in its cognitive motivation. V address is just implemented differently in different languages and cultures. Braun, however, makes no attempt at an analysis of these exceptions.

In summary, a great deal of the literature on forms of address has been influenced by Brown and Gilman’s (1960) article on the relationship of power and solidarity to address and Brown and Levinson’s (1987 [1978]) book which analyzes politeness in terms of “face”. These two works and the works that derive from them provide a great deal of insight into the workings of address systems. Brown and Gilman’s analysis, however, is somewhat limited in its scope: it is mainly a historical thesis on the development of address in European languages. “The pronouns of power and solidarity” does not adequately account for the vast variation that occurs in modern address systems.

Brown and Levinson’s analysis, on the other hand, is an attempt to discern universals in various politeness strategies (of which address forms are only a small part) among a wide range of languages. However, Brown and Levinson’s analysis proceeds from the assumption that just about every encounter is a “face threatening action”. The notion of “face”, for example, does not account well for the fact that in certain situations, polite address is simply required (we label these “impersonal” situations). We suggest that the concepts power and solidarity motivate a great deal of T, V, and P usage;
however, to understand the relationship of grammar, power and solidarity, we must undertake analysis of address forms in another framework: cognitive linguistics.

2.2.2.1.2 Cognitive linguistics

In her 1996 article “Towards a cognitive approach to politeness”, Escandell-Vidal notes that politeness studies have generally been undertaken in the framework of sociolinguistics. In the realm of cognitive linguistics, which is itself a fairly young field, little work has been done on politeness. Janda (2000: 22), too, points out that at a recent ICLA (International Cognitive Linguistics Association) meeting the scholar “Suzanne Kemmer specifically devoted her talk to summarizing achievements [in cognitive linguistics] to date and suggesting ‘areas ripe for exploration with cognitive concepts and methods’. At the top of her list is sociolinguistic variation”.

But what exactly is cognitive linguistics? Escandell-Vidal (1996: 634) provides an excellent description of three main ideas on which cognitive linguistics is based:

First, the idea that the mind is a symbolic system: as human beings, we need to map all our perceptions of the persons, objects and events in the real world on to internal representations; our knowledge can be seen, thus, as a set of assumptions. Second, the idea that human knowledge is highly structured: our internal representations do not merely form a list, but a complex network of sets of organized items. Third, the idea that perception, behaviour and understanding depend crucially on previous knowledge. These are common assumptions in cognitive psychology and artificial intelligence, and have proved relevant also for explaining natural language processing by humans.

Escandell-Vidal proposes that “social aspects of communication have to be explained in terms, not of inferential patterns working on universal principles [for example, Brown and Levinson 1978 (1987)], but of the structure and contents of specific knowledge: the emphasis is to be put especially on context, and not on inferential devices” (Escandell-Vidal 1996: 640). Context, she claims, is related to knowledge: “[I]n
our minds, previous utterances, extralinguistic situations and encyclopaedic knowledge all have the same status: they are all internal representations. This opens the possibility for a cognitive pragmatics of social action: social and situational aspects of communication are interesting to cognitive pragmatics because they are mapped on to mental representations” (Escandell-Vidal 1996: 640).

In her conclusion, Escandell-Vidal (1996: 645) suggests that social behavior reflects systematic knowledge specific to the culture in which the language is spoken. Further, politeness is an acquired ability; it is learned and integrated into knowledge that speakers already have. With regard to other non-cognitive theories of politeness, she concedes that the “conception of interpersonal relations (i.e., of distance and power), and the notion of face (with its positive and negative sides) are constitutive parts of any politeness system” but that differences in politeness conventions in language and cultural understandings of politeness “depend on different selections for their values. We will have to allow some degree of internal variation in order to explain really strategic and creative politeness” (Escandell-Vidal 1996: 647)7.

Since Escandell-Vidal’s 1996 article, a few cognitive analyses of politeness phenomena have appeared. Listen (1999) presents a historical analysis of the emergence of polite Sie in German within the framework of cognitive linguistics. He suggests that the “study of linguistic politeness must consider the context within which polite language is used. Function and form depend upon one another in a social semantic that derives meaning from this relationship” (Listen 1999: 5). He further acknowledges that distance, indirectness, and power are crucial to understanding politeness phenomena, and that

7 The way in which cognitive linguistics can provide a link between grammatical categories, social context, and politeness strategies is the topic of the section on theory below (2.3).
metaphor and metonymy play a key role in the semantics of pronouns of address (Listen 1999: 35).

Although his study is an analysis of historical development specific to German, Listen’s work provides an excellent model for further studies on pronominal address in a cognitive context. We agree with his assertion that “[p]ragmatic notions such as social distance, indirectness, and sociopolitical power (Brown & Levinson 1978 [1987]; Brown & Gilman 1960), which have long been associated with linguistic politeness, are realized, e.g., in metaphoric and metonymic models invoked by the grammatical categories plural and third person” (Listen 1999: 148). We incorporate a great deal of Listen’s work on this topic in our analysis of contemporary polite address in Russian, Polish, and Czech; further details on his study and the theory behind it appear below in section 2.3.3 and in Chapter 5: Analysis.

Others have also dealt with the topic of address in the cognitive framework, but not to the extent that Listen has; his is, to our knowledge, the most thorough cognitive linguistic analysis of politeness involving pronouns and their syntactic entailments. Helmbrecht (2003) discusses address with second person pronouns in general, based on a statistical survey of 100 languages. His conclusions include two theories as to the development of polite pronouns in specific languages: they may be explained functionally “on the basis of pronoun usage with respect to certain underlying strategies of positive and negative politeness” (Helmbrecht 2003: 199). Further, he concludes that polite pronominal forms might emerge due to “contact-induced borrowing” based on his analysis of the distribution of polite forms in various regions around the world.

More relevant to our topic, however, is Helmbrecht’s assertion that the
The relational structure of personal pronouns includes two poles, the origo and the referential target. The origo is the cognitive ground for the act of pointing, the referent of the pointing is the figure. The peculiarity of personal pronouns is that they have lexicalized this relation...The principal deictic nature of pronouns reflects the cognitive representation of the speech event, i.e. the relation between two individuals in a dyadic conversation. However, personal pronouns also reflect social relations. Speakers have clear concepts of the social relations in their society and their position in this network. Politeness distinctions in personal pronouns take up aspects of these social relations and the cultural practices which are associated with them (Helmbrecht 2003: 199).

The notions of SELF (speaker) and OTHER (hearer, subject) are extremely important, as Helmbrecht notes, in understanding the motivations of polite address.\(^8\)

Inchaurralde (1997) discusses the relationship of space, reference, and emotional involvement in a variety of grammatical instantiations. Most relevant to our topic is his analysis of the relation of space to the grammatical category of person as well as to diminutive and augmentative behavior. He notes that “[s]pace is assumed to consist of different regions with motion across them. Characteristically, any speaker identifies certain regions of space as his / her own, and he / she feels attached to or detached from them in different degrees. Regions of space can be attached to the hearer (second person) or to other people in the background (third person)” (Inchaurralde 1997: 135).

Inchaurralde goes on to suggest that space has good and bad areas. Good areas and the things in them are connected with the SELF (first person), but other areas (second person, third person) may be just as good, less good, or bad. There are also certain processes associated with the SELF’s (speaker’s) physical or psychological space, which is always assumed to be good. These include, for example,

\(^8\) For fascinating insight into the role of the concepts SELF-OTHER in pronoun use, see Itakura’s (1992) article on the use of personal pronouns to test not only language ability but “self-consciousness” in chimpanzees.
the tendency to make one's own space a "whole" (i.e., to increase its size)
the tendency to situate one's space in the center
the tendency to connect one's space to as many other spaces as possible
the tendency to place one's space high up or to move it upward
the tendency to be in the foreground (Inchaurralde 1997: 136).

The tendency for a speaker to increase his or her personal space "has as a consequence the fact that other entities may get into it, provided they are 'small' enough to do so. If this is not the case, that which is outside and wants to get inside the area is felt as hostile and, therefore, bad" (Inchaurralde 1997: 137). Diminutive marking on nouns, then, is a way to allow other (presumably good) things into a speaker's psychological space. So, too, might be the use of T address. Augmentative marking on nouns, however, is a way to keep other (presumably bad) things out of a speaker's psychological space. V address can be seen, in some circumstances, as a parallel behavior (Inchaurralde 1997: 138-141). Wierzbicka (1980) presents a similar analysis of diminutive and augmentative behavior.

The tendencies described above are related to the concepts of power and solidarity: the tendency to situate one's space in the center, the tendency to be in the foreground, and the tendency to place one's space high up or to move it upward are all related to power and status. The tendency to connect one's space to as many other spaces as possible and the tendency to increase the size of one's space are related to notions of inclusion and solidarity. Inchaurralde's (as well as Wierzbicka's) analyses of size and space are extremely important to our discussion of pronominal semantics in Russian, Polish, and Czech and will be revisited in sections 2.3.2.2 and 2.3.3 below.

Finally, we have consulted a number of other sources on cognitive linguistics in general which we do not detail here, as they do not deal specifically with issues of
address or pronominal semantics. However, in our discussion of metaphor, metonymy, grammatical categories, pronominal semantics and the encoding of social relations, we will detail their contributions to the field of cognitive linguistics. The scholars cited will include Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 1999; Kovecses 2002; and Janda 1999, 2000, 2002a.  

2.2.2.2 Works specific to address in Slavic  

We continue the review of relevant literature with an examination of works on address written in and about the languages under consideration in this dissertation: Russian, Polish, and Czech. The majority of these works are descriptive, either within a historical context or with regard to contemporary address forms. Works by western authors do frequently reference Brown and Gilman (1960), and the notions of power and solidarity are not infrequently part of the descriptions of address in each language.  

We begin with a discussion of works on the history of pronominal address in each language, followed by descriptions of modern usage within each language. Polish stands out as the language on which the most research has been undertaken; politeness seems to be a topic of both scholarly interest and popular concern to Poles. Czech is by far the least researched language with respect to the subject of address; scholars writing on the subject comment on this fact as well: “Podle mého názoru si oblast řečové etikety zaslouží daleko více pozornosti -- a je třeba říci, že polská jazykověda je ve zpracování této oblasti lidské komunikace nesrovnovatelně dále než česká” (“In my opinion the area of speech etiquette deserves far more attention -- and it must be noted that Polish linguistics is incomparably farther along in work in this area of human communication than Czech” (Skwarska 2001: 137).

---

9 The following are also useful sources on cognitive linguistics in general: Turner 1987; Lakoff and Turner 1989; Langacker 1999; Janda 2002b; and Croft and Cruse, forthcoming.
Three comparative analyses, all involving Polish and other languages, are also discussed. Finally, the functionalist section concludes with sample prescriptive works about each language.

2.2.2.2.1 Historical: pre-20th century

2.2.2.2.1.1 Introduction

Russian, Polish, and Czech have in common the fact that address to a single person can be accomplished via a system of тв ‘you sg’ versus other forms of address, expressed through plural or third person. The history of address in all three languages shows diverse and interesting evolution; the West Slavic languages (Polish and Czech) both had competing systems of V and P address. V was eventually established in Czech, but P emerged in Polish. Russian, on the other hand, has only had V address; however, V usage has changed throughout the centuries (as has polite address in Polish and Czech).

This section is important because 1) it represents a great deal of literature specific to these languages on the subject of address and 2) it is important to examine, if only briefly, semantic developments and changes in address forms over time. The changes we review support and expand our view of the cognitive motivations of address with pronouns and their related verb forms. Thus, this section serves as part of the review of literature but also details the history of development of address forms in Russian, Polish, and Czech.

2.2.2.2.1.2 Russian

Many scholars have debated the origin of V address in Russian. One popular theory is that Russian borrowed the usage from French in the eighteenth century. Although not addressing the subject explicitly, Matthews (1960: 64) comments that “it
was French influence which shaped the modern Russian language and literature in post-
Petrine times right up to the early nineteenth century. In this connexion too we may note
that the eighteenth-century trend in Russia, as elsewhere in Europe, was aristocratic, and
the class cleavage... became more marked through the accumulation of privileges by the
gentry (dvorjanstvo) [my italics]". Sumarokov, an eighteenth-century Russian writer,
cited in Comrie et al. (1996: 250), believed that addressing one person with V was a new
phenomenon in Russian, and he attributed its appearance to French. Much more recently,
Paul Friedrich (1966: 223) overtly states, "French determined Russian pronominal
usage". He cites the linguistic scholar Isačenko (1960: 414), who claims "the French
manner of address to one person in the plural number appeared in the eighteenth century
and rapidly became current among the educated circles".

Most scholars agree that French did, indeed, have a tremendous impact on the
Russian language and its literature during the eighteenth century. However, not all agree
that V address was one of the results of that influence. Comrie et al. (1996: 250) refer to
the work of Černyx (1948), who theorized that V address became popular during the
eighteenth century not because of the influence of French, but because of German and
Dutch. Fedorova (1965: 56-57) also cites Černyx, claiming "značitel'nuju rol' v ee
rasprostanenii sygrala diplomatičeskaja perepiska, kotoraja pomogla našim predkam
osvoit' takuju formu obraščenija, kotoraja byla podobnoj sootvetstvujuščim formam v
zapadno-evropejskich jazykax, prežde vsego, vidimo, germanskix" ("Diplomatic
correspondence, which helped our ancestors assimilate this kind of form of address,
similar to corresponding forms in western European languages [first and foremost,
Germanic] played a substantial role in its dissemination").
Some Soviet scholars, such as Kravčenko, contend that singular \( V \) was a Russian innovation (Popov 1985: 334). Kravčenko is among a group of Soviet scholars who exclude the possibility of outside influence on the development of the Russian language (Popov 1985: 336). There is evidence, however, to support the notion that the use of Russian second person plural \( v y \) as a singular pronoun was neither derived from French, as is popularly believed, nor was it a Russian innovation, as some Soviet scholars contended. Instead, this usage quite possibly appeared due to the influence of Latin.

In Russian the use of plural \( v y \) to address a single person is first attested in the fifteenth century during the reign of Ivan III (1462-1505); it appears primarily in diplomatic correspondence (Popov 1985: 332; also Comrie et al. 1996: 250, citing Černyx 1948: 91-98). Popov (1985: 332) contends this early use of \( V \) occurs mainly in messages between Moscow and Rome, in which case the influencing language would unquestionably have been Latin.

Popov (1985: 336) also acknowledges that the influence from Latin might have originated through correspondence with rulers of other countries, not just the Holy Roman Empire. "In view of the fact that until the eighteenth century the language of diplomacy throughout Europe was Latin", it is possible that \( V \) address in Russian could have arisen through correspondence in Latin with other European monarchs (Popov 1985: 336). Popov (1985: 332) theorizes that through his contact with the West and his efforts to establish himself as the leader of an emerging nation, Ivan imitated the habits of other leaders of European countries. His use of \( V \) to address another monarch is one example of such a habit.\(^{10}\)

\(^{10}\) See also Croiskey's Muscovite Diplomatic Practice in the Reign of Ivan III (1987) for a discussion of the influence of foreign monarchies on (and the use of other languages in) the Russian court.
V pattern address, though begun in the fifteenth century in diplomatic correspondence, did not spread immediately throughout the population. In fact, T continued to be used almost exclusively among the vast majority of the population to address one person, regardless of rank, age, or gender. It was not until the nineteenth century that there emerged any substantial singular V usage among the majority of Russian speakers. Until that time, as Popov (1985: 332-333) notes, singular V “appeared only sporadically and inconsistently, often alternating with ты in the same message, sometimes even in the same sentence”.

Fedorova (1965: 57) also noticed and commented on Peter I’s sporadic use of singular V: “Петр I ‘последовател’но везливо’ лишь в посланиях к зарубежным государям, в переписке с соотечественниками он форму везливости либо не употреблял, либо использовал ее не последовательно” (“Peter I is consistently polite only in messages to foreign monarchs; in correspondence with compatriots he either does not use the polite form or uses it inconsistently”). That is, Peter was much more careful to use singular V when addressing monarchs of other European countries than he was when addressing his own countrymen.

V pattern address also began to appear in secular Russian literature of the early eighteenth century (Popov 1985: 334). Singular V, then, by the beginning of the eighteenth century, was still being used inconsistently to express politeness, formality, and respect. It was during this century, however, that the usage of V to address a single person became entrenched, largely due to the influence of French and German\(^{11}\) (although it likely originated two centuries earlier through the influence of Latin).

---

\(^{11}\) We also see the earliest legislation of pronominal use during the eighteenth century: “Пётр I ввел в обращение V-адресацию даже в обращениях между равными” (Peter the Great probably himself imposed V-address by decree”) (Lauson 1982: 37).
However, singular V did not reach all segments of the population; in fact, most of the Russian spoken during this century did not have singular V. “[T]he middle and especially low classes were slow to adopt it. In Russian, they continued to address God, the czar, and each other only with ti”¹² (Popov 1985: 330). V address remained largely among the aristocracy, those who could read and speak other languages.

Fedorova (1965: 56) cites Černyx (1948) in explaining that “rasprostranenie ee...napravleno ‘sverxu vniz’, i v XVII-XIX vv. ono šlo dostatočno medlenno. Prostye russkie ljudi v XVIII-XIX vv. etoj formoj ne pol’zujutsja ne tol’ko voobšče, no i pri obraščenii k vysokopostavlennym licam ili predstaviteljam gospodstvujuščich klassov” (“Its dissemination... is directed ‘from the top down’, and in the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries went rather slowly. The simple Russian people in the eighteenth to the nineteenth centuries did not use this form not only in general, but also not in address to persons of high rank or representatives of the ruling classes”).

Usage of polite address with pronominal and related forms throughout the nineteenth century has been the subject of several academic works, most notably Friedrich (1966). By the nineteenth century, the use of V was at least to some extent a part of most Russians’ language, although peasants in some remote areas never fully accepted the usage and continued to use T.

Friedrich (1966: 220) describes the Russia of this time as having “richly chambered and ostentatiously marked” levels of society. “Social differences were signaled by manner, dialect and hereditary occupation, and upheld by a legal and

---

¹² Russians have consistently addressed God as ti; however, the French address him as vous (Vachek 1987: 278).
governmental system of prescribed qualifications, rights, and obligations” (Friedrich 1966: 220).

Mutual V address, Friedrich suggests, was found in formal situations such as the courtroom and university examinations. It was also the only acceptable form of address between members of the highest social classes, likely an influence from French (Friedrich 1966: 230-233). Mutual T address, on the other hand, was most common between members of the lowest social classes, who generally used T with everyone. However, the gentry would address each other with T in certain contexts: for instance, members of a regular card game, or men who attended university together, would address each other with T, despite the fact that their social standing generally demanded mutual V address (Friedrich 1966: 234-236).

Asymmetrical address was a common phenomenon in nineteenth century Russian. Children and parents used T with each other until the children were of school age; at that point, the children addressed their parents as V, but were addressed by them as T (Friedrich 1966: 234). Among the gentry, any relatives separated by one or more generations used V asymmetrically; the older generation, of course, gave T to and received V from the younger.

Among all segments of the population, asymmetrical V address could arise when a power differential was apparent. For example, teacher-student, law officer-criminal, military officer-soldier13 pairings resulted in V-T (Friedrich 1966: 235). T was also used to “members of minority groups whose poverty and ethnic status were clear...In sum,

13 “In the army the regulations before 1917 actually named the ranks (officers down to sub-ensign...) which were to be addressed [V], and added: ‘To all lower ranks not named in the above list [T] will be used’” (translation in Conrie et al. 1996: 250-251, original Russian also in Černyň 1948: 107).
asymmetrical relationships were automatic when social differences were clear and mutually felt” (Friedrich 1966: 236).

The history of V, it seems, parallels that which Brown and Gilman (1960) describe for other European languages: V was initially used to address the monarch, and it gradually spread downward to the masses. V was previously used asymmetrically; however, once V address was established, mutual V also emerged. Asymmetry, however, did not disappear.

Further, we note that third person address -- singular or plural -- did not develop in Russian. Perhaps the lack of P address in Russian can be attributed to a lack of extensive contact with Germans or speakers of other languages with third person address systems.

2.2.2.2.1.3 Polish

The literature on polite address in Polish is fairly robust. The most recent and thorough work on the history of address in Polish has been accomplished by Gerald Stone. The following review summarizes the history of V and P address in Polish, based largely, but not exclusively, on Stone (1984, 1985, 1989).

In Jaka jesteś, polszczyzno? (Miodek 1996: 29-31) the etymology of the word pan ‘sir’, also the polite pronoun of address, is explored, beginning with the question, “Jak to się stało, że słowem pan, które jest iminiem własnym greckiego pogańskiego bożka, zaczęto się zwracać do Boga i każdego Polaka?” (“How did it happen that we began to address God and every Pole with the word pan, which is the name of a certain Greek pagan god?”) Of course, this misunderstanding is immediately rectified, and it is
suggested that *pan* derives from a Turkish-Tatar word for 'city official' (see also Brückner’s *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, 1957).

Stone (1984, 1985, 1989) has written several articles covering the history of the development of the system of polite address in Polish. He references Brown and Gilman (1960), noting that “[s]ystemy tego rodzaju są przedmiotem klasycznego artykułu R. Browna i A. Gilmana, ale polski system nie jest i chyba nigdy nie był tak prosty, ani z punktu widzenia językoznawczego, ani społecznego” (“systems of this type are the subject of a classic article by R. Brown and A. Gilman, but the Polish system is not and probably never was so simple, from either the linguistic or the social point of view”) (Stone 1989: 135).

Poles have a long history of interest in the subject of their forms of address. In his article on Polish address before 1600, Stone (1984: 45) points out that the topic of the origin of *ty* address, unique among the Slavic languages, was raised as early as 1874, but has received very little attention since 1916\(^4\).

The first unambiguous example of address with a form other than *ty* appears in 1429 in a love letter from a man to a woman. Usage in this letter fluctuates between *T*, *twa miłość* ‘your grace’, and third person verbal forms used in address (not reference) (Stone 1984: 49). “The fact that the letter shows honorific forms used by a man to a woman is significant, for all the known evidence indicates that the reciprocal honorific is always preceded chronologically by the asymmetric power semantic. We can hardly suppose that women gave (*T*) to men while receiving honorific pronouns themselves. The letter may therefore be taken as evidence of reciprocal honorific address between men

\(^4\) See Tyszyński 1874, Grosse 1907, Los 1916, Brückner 1916.
and women in the early fifteenth century" (Stone 1984: 50). This form of P address was generally reserved for the nobility and higher classes of Polish society.

Another honorific, V (written wy in Polish), "is first attested unambiguously in a manuscript of the Magdeburg Verdicts (Ortyle magdeurskie) thought to have been written about 1480 (Stone 1984: 50). Stone goes on to say that there is ample evidence that V address was part of normal usage by the sixteenth century. He also suggests that V might have emerged due to the large German populations living in most Polish towns at that time; contact with speakers using Ihr as a singular form of address might have played some role in the emergence of V (Stone 1984: 52).

By the early sixteenth century, then, we find both V and P pattern address among various groups of the Polish population. “Whereas noun substitution [P address] may have been originally restricted to the szlachta [‘nobility’], [V address] was probably suitable for addressing the inhabitants of towns” (Stone 1984: 52).

Further, Stone’s research reveals that, among inhabitants of towns (who were of lower social classes than the szlachta), one would address one’s father or mother with V, but a servant would receive T. Relative age, too, was likely a factor and could result in asymmetrical address (V-T) even between brothers and sisters (Stone 1984: 52).

Eventually, the desire to flatter led to the appropriation of P forms (twa miłość ‘your [T] grace’, wasza miłość ‘your [V] grace’) by town dwellers, which resulted in P address becoming quite common among both the nobility and the lower classes. During the sixteenth century both 2sg and 3sg verbs could be used with wasza miłość, which eventually becomes waszmość due to “vowel-stacking and the disappearance of its
second and third vowels” (Stone 1984: 56). Further, “by the end of the sixteenth century twa miłość had been completely replaced by wasza miłość” (Stone 1984: 56).

Essentially, then, up until the second half of the seventeenth century, address with only pan, pani, państwo (that is, the P address of modern Polish) was practically unheard of (Stone 1989: 136). Stone traces the evolution of P forms (1989: 140) by first noting:

zaimkowy waszmość jest starszy niż waszmość pan. Badanie tekstów od piętnastego do osiemnastego wieku ujawnia, że prosta forma pan z funkcji zaimkowej (tzn. jako gramatyczny, chociaż nie społeczny ekwiwalent zaimków ty i wy) pojawiła się dopiero w drugiej połowie osiemnastego wieku. Do tego czasu formy stworzone przez kontrację formuły wasza miłość jeszcze były w użyciu. W dodatku od końca szesnastego wieku obserwujemy dziesięciopolobową formę wasza miłość mój miłosć, która bardzo szybko ściąga się do waszmość mój mości pan, do waćpan i wacpan, i nareszcie do prostego pan.

Pronominal waszmość is older than waszmość pan. Research of texts from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century reveals that the simple form pan in the pronominal function (that is, as a grammatical albeit not social equivalent of the pronouns ty and wy) first emerged in the second half of the eighteenth century. Until that time the forms created through contraction of the formula wasza miłość ‘your grace’ were still in use. In addition, since the end of the sixteenth century we observe the ten-syllable form wasza miłość mój miłosć pan ‘your grace my gracious lord’, which very quickly contracts to waszmość mój mości pan, to waćpan and wacpan, and finally to simple pan.

This is how the modern form was eventually obtained; originally, P address was reserved for higher levels of society. As is the tendency with polite forms, the P forms of polite address gradually trickled down to the masses. However, wy_sg had also been available to speakers not of the nobility; V address in Polish has always had a different -- lower, more “working class” status from P address. Stone (1989: 141) notes that “wśród chłopów użycie grzecznościowego wy zachowało się do dnia dzisiejszego” (“among country men the use of polite wy has continued to the present time”).
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We recall Brown and Gilman’s (1960) assertion that polite forms of address generally originate from the power semantic and eventually spread to the masses, at which point they move away from expressions of power (asymmetrical address) toward solidarity (mutual V or P). Stone (1989: 142), citing Tyszynski 1874, points out that in the late nineteenth century any thought of non-asymmetrical address was considered illogical:

Mianowanie przez daną jednostkę drugiej tegoż położenia towarzyskiego jednostki wyrazem pan, jest pewnym jej przyznawaniem nad sobą wyższości, a tym samym zamiast stopniowego zbliżania się i równania sprawia oddalenie.[...]

Zwracanie się zaś do osób towarzysko niższych z tem mianownikiem pan jest już wprost bezgłośną, kiedy więc dziś słyszymy jak np. urzędnik w biurze do swych podwładnych, nauczyciel do uczniów, majster do czeladników mówi co chwila pan, jest to karykaturą loiczną.

Addressing by a given individual of another individual of the same social status with the expression pan is certain acknowledgement of his superiority over him, and by the same token instead of becoming closer and equal to each other, causes distance.

By contrast, addressing to persons socially lower with this pronoun pan is just simply illogical, when today we hear for example an official to his subordinates in an office, a teacher to his pupils, a master to his journeymen says pan every minute, it is a caricature of logic.

Stone (1989: 142) comments, “[j]ego słowa ilustrują ocenę situcj, która dokładnie odpowiada kategoriom Browna i Gilmana, ale rozwój języka polskiego poszedł jednak w innym kierunku” (“[h]is words illustrate the evaluation of a situation which corresponds exactly to Brown and Gilman’s categories, but the development of Polish set off in a different direction”).

Polish, then, developed a system of competing forms of address (T, V, and P). V and P both appeared during the fifteenth century; in terms of polite address, P was generally used among the nobility, and V was reserved for the lower working classes.
Asymmetry was a viable part of the system of address in Polish at least until the end of the nineteenth century.

2.2.2.2.1.4 Czech

Michael Betsch (1998, 2000, 2003) presents the most comprehensive account of the history and development of polite address in Czech before 1700 by examining over one hundred letters and various historical documents. We immediately notice similarities in the development of Czech and Polish address.

Until the fourteenth century, T pattern address was the only means of addressing one person in Czech. The first examples of non-T address come from literary texts from the second half of the fourteenth century: *Tvá milost* ‘Your [T] grace’ + 3sg verb is used as a form of address to show respect. Thus, in Czech, the 3sg (what we label P) / T opposition is the earliest that developed, but it is still relatively rare in the fourteenth century. Betsch takes care to point out that the P address that originally emerges in Czech is not based on address in German, because at this time German used *ihr* (V) address to show respect (Betsch 2003: 128-129).

In the fifteenth century, address with *Tvá milost* continues, but another form of address emerges: *vy* (2pl) and its associated verb forms begin to be used as an honorific. “In an address with abstract nouns such as *milost*, this might also lead to a shift from the possessive pronoun of the second person singular (*Tvá milost* ‘Your [T] grace’) to the corresponding plural pronoun (*Vaše Milost* ‘Your [V] Grace’)...Address with *vy* and *Vaše Milost* is attested as early as 1421 in a letter to Oldřich z Rožemberka by the city of České Budějovice” (Betsch 2003: 129).
Over time, there was a great deal of mixing of address forms; however, evidence does point to the fact that *Tvá milost* ‘Your [T] grace’ was used to address someone worthy of respect (that is, worthy of P address) but not as worthy as someone who was addressed with *Vaše milost* ‘Your [V] grace’. Thus, as in Polish, within the 3sg honorific forms, we also find a T / V distinction. Betsch points out that “use of the ‘respect’ forms during the fifteenth century seems thus to have been generally asymmetric; they marked primarily a difference in social status” (Betsch 2003: 131).

During the sixteenth century, we find address with *ty, vý* and *Vaše Milost*. “[T]y was still much used, it was not yet as much restricted to addressees of low status as in the next century” (Betsch 2003: 132). In addition, there was still a good bit of fluctuation between the three forms; generally, however, nobles of the highest status were addressed with *Vaše Milost* and *vý*. In the latter half of the sixteenth century, however, *pán* ‘lord’ began to be used in the addressing function. It is thought that this use was borrowed into Czech from German, and was used by “lesser nobility” to address each other (Betsch 2003: 134).

Czech address with *pán*, of course, is very similar to address in modern Polish. Betsch contends, however, that Polish *pan / Czech pán* address arose independently of each other. Address with *pán* in Czech resulted from contact with German; further, during the eighteenth century, address with Czech *pán* was replaced by the true 3sg pronouns *on ‘he’ and ona ‘she’* (Betsch 2000: 168-9). Such a substitution did not, obviously, take place in Polish, although it did in German.

We have already discussed the emergence of Polish *pan* from longer formulae involving the phrase *wasza miłość*; in addition, Betsch (2003: 135) notes, “Polish *pan-
address can thus hardly have been borrowed from Czech (or German), because it emerged in Polish only at a time when pán (Czech) or der Herr (German) had almost disappeared from usage”.

With the rise of onkání ‘address with on[‘he’]’, onakání ‘address with ona[‘she’]’, and, around the middle of the eighteenth century onikání ‘address with oni [‘they’]’ as the pronoun marking the highest status, the use of Vaše Milost declined and eventually disappeared. Thus, the Czech and German systems of address resembled each other a great deal (Betsch 2003: 142).

“During the National Revival, beginning at the end of the eighteenth century, a new norm of modern literary Czech language was created; this norm had only vý as the allegedly traditional national polite pronoun of address, and as this new norm became widely accepted, the old address system was confined to the substandard” (Betsch 2003: 142; Betsch 2000)\(^{15}\).

Czech, like Polish, developed a system of address that included T, V, and P; however, the Czech and Polish forms of address developed independently of each other. Asymmetry was a viable part of the system of address in Czech at least until the end of the nineteenth century. During the nineteenth century, V address had been established as standard in Czech, but P address still existed as a nonstandard variant.

2.2.2.2.1.5 Summary of historical developments

Historically all three languages have had honorific address involving second person plural, third person singular, and third person plural pronouns (with the exception of Russian, which does not seem to have ever had third person address). However, over

\(^{15}\) See also Wellek 1963, Vachek 1987, Chloupek 1987, for more information regarding the influence of German and other languages on the evolution of Czech.
time, each language streamlined its system of honorific pronominal address to just one standard form: V in Russian and Czech, P in Polish.

Can we speak of analogy and syncretism in motivations for linguistic phenomena? Whether or not we apply these labels, I suggest that the same processes that affected the phonological and morphological aspects of Russian, Polish, and Czech affected the motivations for polite pronoun usage. Just as Russian, Polish, and Czech have significantly streamlined their noun paradigms (relative to Late Common Slavic declension), they have also streamlined their system of polite pronouns. In all three languages the actual number of polite forms first increased, then decreased, as has the variety of situations in which they are supposed to be used (for example, to show absolute power over someone).

2.2.2.2 Descriptive: 20th century and beyond

We continue the review of relevant literature by examining works on contemporary (20th century and later) address. The majority of these works focus on address forms within one language (Russian, Polish, or Czech); however, there are three worth mentioning that compare Polish with other languages. We begin with works focusing on a single language.

2.2.2.2.1 Within a single language

2.2.2.2.1.1 Russian

The history of address in the twentieth century is best documented in Comrie, Stone, and Polinsky (1996). Of particular interest are various attempts to legislate pronoun use -- forbidding T and requiring mutual V -- most notably in factories, among union members, and in the army (Comrie et al. 1996: 250-251). Let us begin, then, by
examining pronominal address at the turn of the (twentieth) century. In Comrie et al. (1996: 250-251) we see that by the early 1900s, perhaps in the spirit of the impending revolutions in Russia, attempts at reform in pronominal address were made. We recall that there were, during the nineteenth century, a number of spheres in which V address was institutionalized; V was required to lend an air of solemnity and dignity to certain occasions. Before the revolution, V address was required in the academic environment: even interactions between students required the formal pronoun (Comrie et al. 1996: 252). There were other spheres, too, in which asymmetrical address was required; officers received V from soldiers and gave T. As noted previously, army regulations before 1917 actually specified which ranks received V and which received T (Comrie et al. 1996: 251).

Some of the earliest attempts at address reform were brought about in industry and the army. For example, in 1912 the Lena strikers demanded that the management address the workers (individually) as V, not as T, as had been the practice previously (Comrie et al. 1996: 251). The most drastic changes in address in the army came with the revolution in 1917. The seventh point of Decree No.1 of 1 March 1917 (as cited in Comrie et al. 1996: 251 and Lahusen 1982: 5, originally quoted by Černyx 1948: 108) declared:

Gruboe obraščenie s soldatami vsjakix voinskix činov i, v častnosti, obraščenie s nimi na ty vospreščaetsja i o vsjakom narušenii sego, ravno kak i o vsex nedorazumenijax meždu oficerami i soldatami, poslednie objazany dovodit' do svedenija rotnyix komitetov.

Offensive treatment of soldiers of all military ranks and in particular addressing them with [T] is forbidden, and any infringement of this, as well as any misunderstandings between officers and soldiers, must be reported by the latter to their company committees (translation in Comrie et al. 1996: 251).
Decrees issued by the Provisional Government also addressed V usage. For example, decree No. 114 of 5 March 1917 stated “...in addressing all soldiers, both on and off duty, [V] will be used” (Shornik ukazov...1918: 318, cited in Comrie et al. 1996: 251). In 1918 the Bolsheviks released the Ustav vnutrennej služby, in which it was stated “All military personnel when addressing each other, both on and off duty, use [V]” (Ustav...1918: 10, cited in Comrie et al. 1996: 251).

Comrie et al. (1996: 251) point out that T address lingered in the Red Army despite the attempts of the Bolsheviks to legislate V. They suggest that this happened because “a large proportion of the new commanders in the Red Army came from the ranks and from that social level at which [T] was unmarked, but also because they used it to express solidarity rather than power” (Comrie et al. 1996: 251).

Among the general population, “peasants still addressed each other reciprocally with [T]; in the first years after the revolution when the revolutionary spirit still prevailed, everybody said [T] to everybody” (Adler 1978: 229). Soldiers and officers reciprocated T, even though they were not supposed to; members of the Communist party used T exclusively. Kantorovič (1966: 79) explains the spread of T:

Net na svete bolec krepkogo i intimnogo tovarišchestva, čem soldatskoe bratstvo, čem sodružestvo borcova za rabočee delo v gorjačic dni revolucii. V uličnom boju, v okope, poxode ‘ty’ samo sletaet s jazyka, kogda oklikaes’ tovarišča.

There is not in this world a stronger and more intimate solidarity than the brotherhood of soldiers, than the concord of champions of the workers’ cause in the fiery days of revolution. In battle on the street, in the trench, on the march ‘ty’ itself flies from the tongue when you call to your comrade.

V address immediately after the revolution was “almost extinct” and was used only by a small number of members of the former middle class (Adler 1978: 229).
However, V address crept back into usage, and by the middle of the twentieth century address with V was widespread. Kantorović (1966: 81) attributes this to the increase in education among Russians and the growth of the Soviet intelligentsia. The asymmetrical usage of V (V-T) had diminished, but not vanished; it remained in use in certain situations and actually became a topic of great controversy among workers and those being treated unfairly with T (see 2.2.2.2.3, on prescriptive literature).

Symmetrical V address in the twentieth century occurs in many of the same situations as it did in the previous century. For instance, Nakhimovsky (1976: 90), documenting address in the 1970s, found that mutual V was still common at the university.\(^{16}\) However, during the nineteenth century, especially formal situations such as examinations required mutual V, but professors could often use T with students and expect to receive V from them. Interactions between students even required V. In the 1970s, however, professors used V with students, and students reciprocated. It was also common for students within the same department to use mutual T with each other, even if they did not know each other very well. Nakhimovsky (1976: 90) points out that “to begin the slow ceremonial \(\nu\)-transition- \(\eta\) with every girl in the class would be too burdensome… However, when meeting a girl at a party or dance, [a young man] will always say \(\nu\)”.

Nakhimovsky (1976: 91) argues that status can no longer “foster an asymmetrical dyad. In general, asymmetrical usage…where the superior has a choice but the subordinate does not, does not exist in this system”. If there is a question about status,

\(^{16}\) Nakhimovsky (1976: 91) classifies V-address relative to “sociodialects”; his label “academic-professional sociodialect” includes situations in which V and T are mutual, and status relationships (teacher-student, boss-subordinate) are irrelevant. He also defines a “hierarchical sociodialect” in which V-address is asymmetrical (V-T). However, he does not suggest who might have this “sociodialect” or between whom address might be asymmetrical (Nakhimovsky 1976: 93-94).
generally the speakers will use V-V. However, as the data presented in Chapters 3 and 4 will reveal, we are not convinced Nakhimovsky’s statement accurately captures the real complexity of Russian address.

Comrie et al. (1996: 254) also state “the asymmetric usage in power relationships of all kinds has to a very large extent given way to reciprocal usage. The prevailing ethic condemned the use of [T] to subordinates as offending the spirit of Soviet Society”. The topic of asymmetrical address was even hotly debated in the press during the 1960s. As a result of such debates, “the workers in some factories succeeded in persuading the management to use [V]” (Comrie et al. 1996: 254).

Continuing our discussion of mutual address, Russians use V with new acquaintances “regardless of rank and age” (Comrie et al. 1996: 255). This is the modern tendency among the majority of Russians; in the nineteenth century, many peasants continued to use only T, even to new acquaintances. However, since the 1960s, the tendency among people under 35 or so is to use T with each other, even when first meeting. This is especially true among males, with whom mutual T “may be interpreted as a sign of solidarity” (Comrie et al. 1996: 255).

Nakhimovsky (1976: 83-88) also discusses the maturation of children with respect to address. That is, children address everyone as T when they are very young. It is accepted that children, until they reach a certain age, can address everyone as T. When children are about sixteen or seventeen, they “will begin their acquaintance with \(v_{\nu}\), although \(v_{\nu}\) is still not used in relationships with those of the same sex” (Nakhimovsky 1976: 87). Nakhimovsky (1976: 87) points out that this use of V is how one may define
“growing up” in conversation: Smotrite, Petja uže sovsem bol’šoj, s devuškami na vy razgovarivaet ‘Look, Petja is already grown up, he’s talking to girls with V’.

In the nineteenth century address between officers and soldiers was asymmetrical; there were specific regulations as to who gave and received T and V within the military. However, in the Red Army there arose the situation in which V address was the official rule, but asymmetrical (V-T) address and symmetrical T address were the norm.

Mutual T, as noted above in the section on changes legislated by the Bolsheviks, remains prevalent among soldiers (Comrie et al. 1996: 251; Nakhimovsky 1976: 88). Soldiers have to address officers as V; however, from officers to subordinates, T address remains an option (Nakhimovsky 1976: 88).

The tendency, then, in twentieth-century Russian usage is toward mutual V or mutual T. The scholars discussed above have documented changes and patterns in address in the army, the university, the family, and the workplace.

2.2.2.2.2.2.1.2 Polish

In addition to his work on historical address in Polish, Gerald Stone has also undertaken analysis of Polish address in the twentieth century. Stone (1981a:55) calls for “re-assessment of our understanding and knowledge of contemporary Slavonic address systems in terms of Brown and Gilman’s conceptual framework based on the sociological dimensions of power and solidarity”. His research, which is derived from observation of forms of address in Warsaw, conversations with Poles specifically on the topic of address, and consulting popular and academic sources, is an attempt at a coherent account
not only of the forms of address in Polish, but when, where, and why Poles address with T or P.

Stone begins with a description of the grammatical forms of address available to Polish speakers; we detail the same information in Appendix A. One issue on which scholars frequently disagree is the status of pan: is it a noun or a pronoun? Lubecka (1993) clearly classifies pan and pani as nominal bound forms, but Stone suggests that “though classified formally as nouns they are, in addition, pronouns”. He further uses the symbol P (following the convention begun by Brown and Gilman 1960 with T and V) to refer to address with pan or pani.

Essentially, P address is “used only to human beings, i.e. not to gods, other supernatural beings, or things personified”. Further, P is not used to address children or immediate kin (Stone 1981a: 60).

T address is generally not used to adult strangers; it is generally used between friends. T can be used at work as well. Asymmetrical address (P-T) is commonly found in primary and secondary schools. Finally, situational constraints can override “normal” pronoun usage: friends normally using mutual T will address each other with P at a business meeting or in other formal settings (Stone 1981a: 61).

Other types of P address exist as well; these types of P address frequently involve nouns naming kinship relations such as mama ‘mama’, tata ‘daddy’, ciocia ‘aunt’, and so on. Stone points out that “in the pronominal function…the would all be translated as ‘you’” (Stone 1981a: 61). The initiation of a (mutual) switch from P to T address is taken very seriously by Poles and is accompanied by a ceremony of bruderschaft ‘fellowship’; it
is generally initiated by the speaker considered to have the most power in the relationship (Stone 1981a: 68-69).

V pattern address in also available in Polish but its use is quite limited. V address is characteristic of the speech of rural dialects, but there have also been proposals that V should replace P as the standard form of address. V address, after all, was alive and well at the turn of the twentieth century; there are references to V among members of the legions in WWI and among workers in factories, institutes, clinics, and so on (Brückner 1916, also Stone 1981a: 63). Students also used V to each other during the early twentieth century (Nitsch 1951, Klemensiewicz 1946, also Stone 1981a: 63).

After 1945, the Polish (communist) authorities lent their approval to V address as opposed to P address: “it is the established non-familiar address form in the Polish United Workers’ Party and in the armed forces...it is theoretically the correct form for officials (like police) to use in their dealings with the public” (Stone 1981a: 63). Attempts to establish V address were motivated by belief that *pan, pani* were themselves NOT democratic (due to their associations with ‘lord’ / ‘lady’, two possible translations of the words, and derivatives of the nouns having to do with ‘lordliness’) (Stone 1981a: 64). In addition, V address is thought to be a calque of Russian address and therefore desirable to communist party members, but not to many others (Lubecka 1993: 38).

Lubecka (1993: 37) in her comparative analysis of address in Polish, French, and English, suggests that *obywatel* ‘citizen’ used as a P address form in combination with V verbal morphology

was a peculiarity of Polish used under the communist regime. This compound form of address served as a common way of addressing people by the police. *Wy* functioned then as an impersonal equalizer stressing the equality of all the people in the name of the law... The concept of an equal
social role, as it was in the case of the communist party members, was also conveyed by the pronoun \textit{w}y if the term of address \textit{towarzysz} expressing the idea of unity and ideological bound were present.

Lubecka also points out that in contrast to V+ \textit{towarzysz} ‘comrade’, V+ \textit{kolega} ‘colleague’ between communist party members suggested condescension and implied an asymmetrical relationship, despite the presence of mutual V.

The V of communism is practically extinct in modern Polish; however, V address is still used in the army today, especially by older soldiers, despite contemporary regulations requiring P address (Lubecka 1993: 38). Stone also points out that the communist V (which no longer exists) was different from the traditional dialectal V (which does still exist): country folk address each other politely as V, but use P to outsiders and expect to be addressed as P by them (Stone 1981a: 64). Within the family, too, some dialects allow V address to especially important members of the family (\textit{dziadek} ‘grandfather’, for example) (Lubecka 1993: 37).

Another variant in address involves not V, but P + 2sg (P+T): \textit{Za malo pan dałeś!} ‘You [P] gave [T] me too little!’ Skwarska (2001: 140) tells us these forms represent less distance between speakers as well as “pozitivní nalaďení vzhledem k neznámému partnerovi” “a positive disposition with regard to an unknown interlocutor”. However, Lubecka (1993: 50) describes P+T address as “offensive” because it is an “obvious violation of both the rules of grammar and the norms of etiquette”. Stone (1981a:66) suggests still another interpretation: P+T is “often assessed as ‘more democratic’ than P proper” by native speakers of Polish. It is more likely to be used by the working class, rather than the intelligentsia; Stone suggests it also represents a greater degree of
solidarity than pure P address (Stone 1981a: 67). Clearly, the P+T issue is one that requires further study.

Finally, Jaworski (1992) details T use and its relationship to the use of the vocative and / or first name of one’s interlocutor. He claims the shift to first names marks a decrease in formality and an increase in intimacy. The shift from P to T decreases distance between interlocutors along the dimension of formality only; the relationship is less formal, but not necessarily intimate. Jaworski’s main argument is that T use is generally not as problematic as switching to first names; one risks greater offense by using a first name with an interlocutor than by using T.

Address forms in Polish are quite complex. Although P is standard, V is used dialectally and was the ideological pronoun of choice for the communist party in Poland. There are (nonstandard) ways to mitigate the formality of P address; for example, one may use P with a T predicate. In addition, politeness distinctions are shown in the plural, with Vpl (informal) and Ppl (formal). Of the three languages we examine in this dissertation, modern Polish remains the most complex with respect to available forms of address.

2.2.2.2.1.3 Czech

Twentieth century usage of V in Czech is little documented in scholarly literature. The paucity of research on the issue of address in Czech is also noted by Knefóvá (1995: 36): “V české lingvistické literatuře není tato problematika [t.j., “hodnocení současných způsobů oslovovali”] dostatečně zpracována” (“The point at issue [that is, “an evaluation of the modern means of address”] is not sufficiently treated in the literature about Czech linguistics”). She notes that in dealing with this issue, she has traditionally had to rely
on her own personal knowledge of address, which, of course, is completely subjective (Kneřová 1995: 36). As a result of the lack of research done in this area, Kneřová conducted surveys of Czechs and Germans in order to compare and contrast their use of polite address. We will briefly examine the results of the address questionnaire completed by 112 Czechs.

In the questionnaire, the informants had to decide whether they would say T or V to a person when asking him for the time on the street. (This part of the questionnaire included pictures of eight individuals.) The informants were also presented with pictures of young people and people of uncertain age. Kneřová hypothesized that the younger respondents (high school- to college-aged) would choose to use T with these people, while any older informants would use V (Kneřová 1995: 42).

Among the more notable of Kneřová’s results are the following: fifty percent of the Czechs surveyed would address all eight unknown people in the photographs as V. However, as she predicted, the majority of young (high school- or college-aged) informants chose T for address to someone of unknown or unclear age; only 20 percent chose V (Kneřová 1995: 43).

Further, gender is evidently a factor in choice of T or V. Kneřová’s results (1995: 43) indicate that “muži vykají více ženám a méně mužům a naopak” (“men say V more to women and less to men, and vice versa”).

Kneřová further suggests that the modern tendency is toward symmetrical address in situations such as a classroom, even though one speaker (the teacher) clearly has power over the other (the student). Asymmetrical (V-T) address exists, but only in special circumstances.
Kneřová's brief study is certainly valuable, for it is one of the only works written on the subject of modern pronominal address in Czech. Other scholars have generally written about it only incidentally; for instance, address is sometimes mentioned in a study of syntax. Let us now examine other aspects of V address as presented by other authors.

Czech has apparently undergone in the twentieth century a simplification of the system of pronominal address (as Kneřová's study demonstrated). Vachek (1987: 280) discusses polite forms of address in relation to both German and Czech. The most important reason for this restructuring, he suggests, is "the simplification of mutual relations and contacts between the social groups constituting the language community" (Vachek 1987: 280). As a result, the limits which had formerly separated the population were abolished. Vachek notes that this process is commonly called "the democratization of language" (Vachek 1987: 280, originally Brown and Gilman 1960). This process, he claims, has been especially noticeable since the end of the second World War. "The change...concerns the increasing abolition of pronominal signals distinguishing the formal vs. the informal address" (Vachek 1987: 281).

Vachek suggests that young speakers of Czech seem to have generalized T, even when meeting for the first time. "This happens especially in the mutual contacts of Czech university students, whose way of addressing one another thus very markedly differs from the one which was common among the university students of the pre-war period" (Vachek 1987: 281). He notes, though, that young speakers still use V at the university to teachers and to those addressees significantly older than the speaker.

Occasionally we find articles about address in the Czech press. One in particular addresses the issue of address forms in the government. The article begins with the
declaration that “[č]lenové vlády Miloše Zemana vedou ‘dvoji život’” (“Members of Miloš Zeman's government live a ‘double life’”) (Ministří...1998). That is, when members of parliament are meeting with people before government sessions, on breaks, and at lunch, they call each other by first names and use T. However, when the time comes for official government business, protocol demands V. The formality of government meetings requires that the members address each other as V, and there is no deviation from this in the government chambers (“Ministří...” 1998). Clearly, certain situations in Czech require the use of mutual formal V.

Recall, too, that during the twentieth century V was not the only polite form of address available for many Czech speakers. Let us examine onkáni, onakáni, and onikáni, all variants of P address, in the twentieth century.

As noted above, on ‘he’ and oni ‘they’ as forms of P address17 were never accepted as standard polite forms. Educated speakers of Czech have historically insisted on “eradicating the use of oni in everyday conversation” and replacing it with V (Vachek 1987: 279). Both forms of address (onkáni and onikáni) enjoyed a fair amount of popularity colloquially, especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but in the twentieth century became “virtually extinct...in the period between the two wars” (Vachek 1987: 279). However, Vachek (1987: 280) also reports that “as late as the middle of the twentieth century the use of oni was often highly evaluated by some lower class speakers of Colloquial Czech who felt rather flattered if addressed in that manner”. Also, on ‘he’ / ona ‘she’, Vachek (1987: 280) claims, has survived even longer in this century and may still be used among the very oldest speakers to address young people.

17 Note that oni ‘they’ was used as a form of singular address only; thus, on ‘he’, ona ‘she’, and oni ‘they’ each represent P forms.
Vanek (1970: 137) reports that he “knows many members of the generation that grew up between 1900 and World War II” who use V, T, and P, while “his own generation” uses V and T only. Clearly, T and V are the most commonly used forms of address, but third person address has enjoyed some prevalence in this century. In fact, on some level it is alive today. In a relatively recent (7 May 1998) newspaper article titled “Překlad Faulknerova monumentálního románu Hluk a vřava je mistrovský” ("Translation of Faulkner's monumental novel The Sound and the Fury is masterful") the author comments, “Zajímavé je nenásilné odlišení černoošské angličtiny českými nářečními prvky. Určitou přehlednost do textu vnaší také onkáni a onikáni černých vůči bílým” ("The subtle setting off of black English by means of Czech dialectal elements is interesting. The onkáni and onikáni [P] of the blacks compared with the whites introduce a certain lucidity to the text") (Hanuš 1998).

Czechs today, then, will doubtless understand address with on and oni [both P] in the context of, for instance, a work of fiction, even if it is a means of address they do not themselves use. It is also worthy of note who in this twentieth century American novel is using these P forms in Czech: speakers of African-American Vernacular English (a dialect generally considered "substandard" by many English speakers) address others (presumably whites) with on and oni. We revisit this issue of third person address in Czech in Chapter 6.

The Czech system of address has more in common with modern Russian than with modern Polish; the reverse was true of pre-twentieth-century Czech. P address in Czech did continue until the mid-twentieth century; however, today it is rare. V and T remain the standard address forms, as in Russian.
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2.2.2.2.1.4 Summary

The majority of the literature on modern address in Russian, Polish, and Czech is descriptive in nature; that is, most involves explanations of who uses T, V, or P with whom, and when. Many of the authors note the decline of certain forms during the twentieth century: P in Czech, V in Polish. Most suggest a movement away from asymmetrical address (P-T or V-T). However, as we will see in the data presented in Chapters 3 and 4, asymmetry and switches in address forms are still viable aspects of modern address systems.

We now examine literature that compares address systems in various (Slavic and non-Slavic) languages.

2.2.2.2.2 Comparative between / among languages

Three comparative studies in particular are worthy of note, and all involve a comparison of Polish to other languages. First, Lubecka (1993) offers a sociolinguistic analysis in the differences in address in English, French, and Polish. Her concern is primarily with the differences in French vous [V] and Polish wy [V], as well as the relationship between mister, monsieur and pan, of which the latter two can be used as vocatives and (she claims) as nominal bound forms of address.\(^\text{18}\)

We have summarized the details of Polish V usage above in sections 2.2.2.1.3 and 2.2.2.2.1.2. French V (like V in Russian and Czech) consists of a much broader semantic field than Polish V:

\(^{18}\) "Forms of address belong to two categories due to their ability to create syntactically free or bound structures. The first ones are independent of the syntactic relationships among the elements of the whole utterance. The second are determined by the verbal component of the sentence. The independent (free) forms of address take the ending of the vocative case; the bound ones are expressed by the nominative case, if such a distinction exists in the grammatical system of a given language" (Lubecka 1993: 43).
The primary meaning of the French and Polish form of address expressed by the personal pronoun *tu* and *ty* is identical, but there is no one to one correspondence in the case of the French pronoun *vous* and the Polish pronoun *wy*. A lack of such a congruent relationship between the pronouns *vous* and *wy* results from the ability of the former to function as both a singular and a plural form without getting a status of a marked form of address. Thus, the semantic field of the Polish pronoun *wy* is included in the semantic field of *vous*, although in some archaic or dialectal usage of Polish, *wy* can be also applied to one referent (Lubecka 1993: 31).

Lubecka points out various differences in usage in pronouns in French, English, and Polish; for instance, *tu*, *you*, and *ty* can all be used in advertisements; “any potential receiver of the message of which they are carriers is designated as [T in French and Polish]. In these formulas it functions as an impersonal pronoun *chacun/anybody/kazdy* without pointing at any definite addressee”¹⁹ (Lubecka 1993:36). However, in French, *vous* can appear in advertisements in the same function, whereas in Polish, *wy* cannot.

The other focus of Lubecka’s work, the use of vocatives and nominal bound forms of address, begins from a premise with which we do not agree. While *monsieur* and *pan* can both be used as vocatives, *monsieur* is never (to our knowledge) a bound form used in pronominal manner such as Polish *P* (although she claims that it is). Further, Lubecka’s comparison of French *V* with the very limited and dialectal Polish *V*, though interesting, seems not as felicitous as a comparison of the true pronominal forms *vous* and *pan*. Lubecka’s native-speaker insights into *V* address, however, as well as “compromise” forms (*P+T*; see section 2.2.2.2.1.2 above) are invaluable in our analysis.

Skwarska (2001) offers an interesting comparison of Polish and Czech with regard to switching from *T* to *V/P* forms, refusing *T* forms, and so on. She points out that sometimes a mutual switch to *T* is simply a formality, that the relationship of the

₁⁹ Recall our discussion of “non-referential T” in 2.1.2.
speakers is already close but they have just chosen to remain on V; in other cases, switching to T might not signal any kind of intimacy at all. For instance, one might start working in a place where the culture requires T use to everyone. Intimacy is not increased, but inclusion in the group is signaled by T address (Skwarska 2001:138).

The central issue in Skwarska’s article questions whether address with Polish and Czech T is not polite, less polite, or completely unacceptable (Skwarska 2001: 139). She concludes that T to strangers (in both languages) happens primarily between men who are equals, say, at a soccer game, a bar, and so forth. In this instance, T is an expression of solidarity, of inclusion and desire to be included. T address in one direction also exists for both genders; the asymmetry, especially between an older and younger speaker is used either to emphasize the distance between them or to invade the space of the younger. T address is often used, again in both Polish and Czech, to “cizincům, a to zejména cizincům z Východu – Vietnament, Číňanům apod.” (“to foreigners, especially to foreigners from the East—to Vietnamese, Chinese, and so on”)20 (Skwarska 2001: 141).

Skwarska also discusses the mutual shift to T, which is an important cultural phenomenon in Polish (see also Pisarkowa 1979). The shift from P to T often involves a ceremony pić bruderschaft, brudzia ‘drinking to brotherhood’. In Czech, however, the switch is made by verbal suggestion only: Myslim, že bychom si mohli tykat ‘I think we could say T to each other’ or something similar is said to signal the switch from V to T. The author also notes that to refuse a switch to T in either language when an offer is made is quite rude.

Finally, Łucja Biel compares Kazuo Ishiguro’s The remains of the day with its Polish translation U schyłku dnia by Jan Rybicki in an effort to demonstrate how

---

20 See also discussions of race and address, 4.2.22, 5.3.1.2.1 and 6.2.5.1.
emotional distance as portrayed through language can actually change a character’s constitution. In the English version, Stevens, the main character, is emotionally cold and uses official, diplomatic language; the Polish approximation, however, (for example, English \textit{one} translated with first-person \textit{ja} ‘I’ forms in Polish, thus switching figure / ground orientations) makes the Polish Stevens a warmer person, less like his English counterpart (Biel 2000: 90, 93).

\subsection{Prescriptive}

We include only a few examples of literature that prescribes, rather than describes, rules of address with T, V, or P. A large part of this dissertation is dedicated to revealing how Russians, Poles, and Czechs construe situations via address forms; rather than reading secondary sources on the subject, we conducted an “experiment” in which volunteers wrote scripts in their native tongues based on short film clips. The project is detailed in Chapter 4. Thus, here we present only brief examples of the type of prescriptive literature that exists on the subject.

In Russian, Vladimir Kantorovič’s \textit{Ty i vy (zemtiki pisatelja)} (1966) gives voice to the public opinion concerning issues of address. He expresses his disapproval of \textit{neravnopravnoe ty} ‘unequal T’ throughout his book, citing relevant debates in the press and at public fora. Kantorovič (1966: 44) discusses a readers’ conference, for instance, at which “stornikam neravnopravnogo ‘ty’ dali sokrušajuščij otpor” (“supporters of unequal ‘T’ were given a smashing rebuff”). He quotes several workers who have strong opinions on the subject. An accountant had the following to say:

\begin{quote}
\textit{-- Počemu-to sčitaetsja, čto, obraščajas’ na ‘ty’, načal’nik milostivo daruet mne svoe blagovolenie... Nu a ja ne xoču milostej -- ja takaja že polnopravnaja graždanka. I prošu obraščat’ja so mnoj po-čelovečeski!}
\end{quote}
-- For some reason it is thought that, when he is addressing me with ‘ty’, the boss is graciously granting me his favor. But I don't want his favor; I am also a citizen with full rights. And I ask that you address me like a person! (Kantorović 1966: 45)

Another worker offered the following:

-- Osobenno grubo zvučit ‘ty’; -- spravedlivо utverždala pedagog L’javovskaja, -- kogda načal’nik-mužčina adresuet ego ženščinе-
poděznennoj.
-- ‘Ty’ sounds especially rude, correctly asserted the teacher L’javovskaja, when a male boss is addressing it to his female subordinate (Kantorović 1966: 45).

Still another worker suggested that a rule be included in the Pravila vnutrennego rasporjadka ‘Work regulations’ that all workers be addressed as V. Kantorović (1966: 31) further discusses passages involving address in the military, as well as address between a taxi-driver and his passenger. In both situations, someone is taking issue with T address as being disrespectful and unwarranted. Much of Kantorović’s Ty i vy is dedicated to the evils of asymmetrical address.

Not only do Kantorović’s book and the debate in the press (mentioned above) demonstrate that the issue of asymmetrical address was an important one to many Russians; they also point to the reality that asymmetrical address still existed in Russian well into the 1960s. In fact, as our data show, it still exists today to some extent, despite insistence to the contrary.

In Polish, Nitsch (1951: 93-94) comments on an instance of “incorrect” address with singular V that happened on a certain radio program: the discussant remarked “Napisalyście, obywatelko Antonino B., żeście otrzymały emeryturę…” (“You wrote [fem 2pl] citizen Antonina B., that you [2pl] received [fem pl] a pension...”) Nitsch is admonishing the strange syntax; it is considered nonstandard because the singular V
address of communism generally required a masculine plural predicate, regardless of the
gender of the speaker. Thus, the author is attempting to clarify not when V address
should be implemented, but how the predicates associated with V address should be
constructed.

A number of Polish language references, including dictionaries, provide
substantial entries for the pronouns of address. For instance, the *Inny słownik języka
polskiego* (2000: 10-12, 15, 870, 1069) contains lengthy definitions of *pan*, *pani*,
*pactwo*, and *ty* and *wy*, complete with examples. These richly textured reference
materials, compared to Smirnicky’s (1987: 101, 652) slender entries for Russian *ty* and *vy*
and Fronek’s (1999: 1148, 1193) even skimpier definitions for the Czech equivalents,
suggest that “average” Poles care more about this issue than “average” Russians and
Czechs.

It is worthy of note that although Czech scholars and grammarians do not seem to
write much about pronominal address, the issue is not infrequently a topic in the press.
We find, for instance, an article titled “Tykám, a ty si, dědo, zvykej!” (“I say T, granddad,
and get used to it!”) (1998). The article begins thus: “Sední si dědo ke stolu a jez. Dávej
pozor, kam šlapes. Takto dnes zcela běžně mluví mladá generace se svými o mnoho let
staršími prarodiči” (“Sit down [T] at the table and eat [T]. Watch [T] where you put [T]
your feet. Quite often these days the young generation speaks with their grandparents,
older than them by many years, in such a way”).

The author (who is unnamed) asserts that it was not long ago when young people
said V not only to their grandfather, but to their father as well. He suggests that some
may not consider this trend toward universal T important, but that it is in fact a sign of
the gradual loss of respect for one's elders. And this, he claims, is a serious matter:

"Ztráta všedobecné úcty ke stáří je však jedním ze znaků, že ze společnosti mizí dobré
mravy" ("The loss of universal respect for age is, however, one of the signs that good
manners are disappearing from society") ("Tykám..." 1998). To some extent, then,
Czechs are conscious of change in their system of address. Doubtless others share the
opinion of the anonymous author that the spread of T is a sign of greater problems in
society.

The literature that attempts to prescribe how Russians, Poles, and Czechs should
use forms of address (no asymmetry! too much T!) reveals that address forms are an
important part of the culture of the speakers of these languages. From prescriptive
literature, we move to a brief discussion of literature that approaches the subject of
address in a completely different way: by analyzing not meaning but form.

2.2.3 Formalism

We define a "formal" approach to linguistics as a rigorous, mathematical-
scientific approach to exploring the phenomena of language; descriptions of language are
formulated via models, not natural language, as is the practice of physics, for example.
These models, according to formalists, should be able to not only describe the language
but also to predict which structures will be grammatical and which will be
ungrammatical. Formalism is generally associated with the analysis of structure rather
than meaning; for example, in GB / Minimalism, the autonomy of syntax is assumed (that
is, context, background knowledge, social relation, and so on are irrelevant).

In this dissertation we do not take a formalist approach to the data; we are
cconcerned primarily with meaning and motivation of polite address in Russian, Polish,
and Czech. However, Slavic languages provide a wealth of challenges to syntactic
theories because of the very issue under consideration: agreement with polite pronouns.

Unfortunately, time and space do not permit a thorough analysis, or even
complete illustration by means of examples, of the many problems that arise when one
person is addressed in the plural or third person in Russian, Polish, or Czech. The
following are a few examples of formal address to one person in the past tense, with
grammatical information provided in brackets in the English translations:

R
A kak vy našli našego gubernatora?
‘And how did you [2pl] find [pl] our governor?’

Pol
Pewno, że boli. A wyście myśleli, że jak?
‘Of course it hurts. What did you [2pl] think [viri pl]?’

Za mało pan dalej!
‘You [lit.’sir’] gave [2sg] me too little!’

Chwileczkę; może świadek nie zrozumiał pytania?
‘Just a minute; maybe you [lit.’witness’] didn’t understand [3sg] the question?’

Cz
Śkoda, że jste tady nebył včera.
‘It’s too bad you [pl] weren’t [masc sg] here yesterday’.

Just a glance at the data above is all it takes to find intriguing challenges to
current theories of agreement. Each of the languages has implemented polite address in
syntactically different ways. Further, agreement issues of this type have rarely been taken
up in various theoretical frameworks. There have been some attempts, however, to define
the nature of the agreement relation in each of the languages, most generally within the
framework of Government and Binding (and its current implementation Minimalism).

For instance, Comrie 1975 is a broad look at the syntax of address in Polish, Serbo-
Croatian, Russian, Czech, several Romance languages, Greek, and German. Agreement issues specific to Russian are addressed in Babby 1973; Corbett 1979, 1983; and Crockett 1976.

An account of the syntax of Polish address was first undertaken in 1649 by Franciszek Meniński, a Frenchman who published a Polish grammar (see Stone 1985: 59). Buttler et al. 1971 and Stone 1981b also address issues of agreement with honorifics in Polish. Bogusławski (1987) compares address in Polish and German and suggests that addressing nouns such as ojciec ‘father’ are independent of nouns that express reference (again, ojciec); that is, he suggests ojciec the address form is a homonym of ojciec, the word used to talk about one’s father. Bogusławski makes a similar claim about German Sie; that is, sie ‘they’ and Sie ‘you’ happen to share the same form but are actually independent units of language. We do not agree; as we discuss at length below (2.3.3), address forms, be they pronouns or nouns, are metaphorically motivated semantic extensions of grammatical form. It is not a coincidence that plural and third person forms are often chosen as honorifics.

Finally, we have found very few analyses of Czech agreement issues in the context of any kind of formalism: Vanek 1970 and 1978 are attempts at such an analysis in the framework of GB.

We do not by any means suggest that formalist syntactic analyses of agreement are not worthy of study; on the contrary, we ourselves began such an analysis in the framework of HPSG (Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar) based on the work of Przepiórkowski 2000 and Kathol 1998. There is much work to be done on this issue, in whatever framework can accommodate the morphosyntactic manifestations of polite
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address in Slavic. Unfortunately, however, such an examination is well beyond the scope of this dissertation.

2.2.4 Conclusion of review of literature

Brown and Gilman’s (1960) discussion of power and solidarity and Brown and Levinson’s (1987) discussion of face are fundamental themes in the literature on politeness in general and address in particular. In the literature concerning Slavic languages, however, the concepts of power and solidarity, as opposed to the concept of face, are most often the theme around which descriptions of address (as well as prescriptions for address) are organized.

We suggest that Brown and Gilman were essentially correct in their assessment that power and solidarity are the major factors that motivate address; however, we must take into account human cognition to make the link between the power and solidarity semantics and the grammatical categories of number and person.

To our knowledge, analysis of T, V, and P address in Russian, Polish, and Czech in the framework of cognitive linguistics does not exist. As the review of literature reveals, most of the works on address forms in these Slavic languages involves description of historical and / or modern address patterns, prescriptions as to which address patterns should be used, or descriptive comparisons of address between or among languages.

The existence of such thorough historical and contemporary descriptions allows us to compare conclusions drawn from our own data gathered from films, plays, and the research project with descriptions provided by experts in the field. We use the data presented in Chapters 3 and 4 in our analysis (Chapter 5) of social power, social intimacy
and forms of address; analysis in the framework of cognitive linguistics reveals a link between power and solidarity, respectively, and fundamental concepts of spatial orientation.

2.3 Theoretical considerations: Metaphor

Cognitive linguistics is a theoretical framework that derives from the assumption that language is based on our experience of the world as human beings. Constructions in language emerge as a result of the way we as humans perceive the world around us. As we discussed in section 2.2.2.1.2 above, humans map their perceptions of people, objects, and events onto internal representations. Knowledge is structured; what we know does not form a list of facts but a network of information linked in various ways. Further, perception and understanding are dependent on embodied experience. In addressing someone, speakers are forced to categorize in one way or another their interlocutor based on the perception of their relationship to him or her. The way speakers categorize interlocutors and their relationships with them seems to be structured according to the way they perceive the physical world (Escandell-Vidal 1996: 634).

The most important mechanism in the grammatical encoding of social relations that is expressed by address with personal pronouns and their related forms is metaphor. We explore the meaning of metaphor in general in the section below.

2.3.1 What is metaphor?

The concepts of power and solidarity are crucial to understanding the relationship between grammar and social relations. Here we begin an examination of the way speakers conceptualize social power relations and social intimacy via metaphor. We will conclude that social power relations tend to be structured by UP / DOWN and BIG /
SMALL spatialization metaphors, and social intimacy tends to be structured by NEAR / FAR and CONTAINER (IN / OUT) metaphors.

What exactly is metaphor? "The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 5). Most people understand metaphor to be limited to creative use of language; for instance, the metaphor "Juliet is the sun" suggests that who Juliet is can be understood in terms of what the sun is. However, "metaphor is not just a matter of language, that is, of mere words...[H]uman thought processes are largely metaphorical...[T]he human conceptual system is metaphorically structured and defined. Metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible precisely because there are metaphors in a person’s conceptual system" (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 6). Linguistic metaphorical expressions and conceptual metaphor are separate, but related, entities.

What, then, is conceptual metaphor? Conceptual metaphor is the cognitive mechanism by which we make connections between the physical world as we experience it (the “sensorimotor domain”) and the abstract world of ideas and concepts. “Metaphor allows conventional mental imagery from sensorimotor domains to be used for domains of subjective experience...Conceptual metaphor is pervasive in both thought and language” (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 45).

Conceptual metaphors are “mappings across conceptual domains that structure our reasoning, our experience, and our everyday language” (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 47). Metaphorical mappings proceed from the source (physical or sensorimotor) domain to a target domain (abstract entities, events, states, and so on). Kövecses (2002:35)
provides the following table outlining sources and targets of metaphors. We present them here for illustration of possible source and target domains:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Domains</th>
<th>Target Domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL OBJECT</td>
<td>NONPHYSICAL OBJECT OR ABSTRACT ENTITIES (e.g., the mind(^{21}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTANCE</td>
<td>EVENTS (e.g., going to the race), ACTIONS (e.g., giving someone a call)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTAINER</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES (e.g., a lot of running in the game)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDELINEATED PHYSICAL OBJECTS (e.g., a clearing in the forest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHYSICAL AND NONPHYSICAL SURFACES (e.g., land areas, the visual field)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATES (e.g., in love)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to understand that conceptual metaphor is pervasive, ordinary, and mostly unconscious. It is an inescapable part of our cognition that develops when we are very young. For example, as a baby we connect (conflate) the physical experience of warmth with love and affection. “Early conflations in everyday experience should lead to the automatic formation of hundreds of primary metaphors that pair subjective experience and judgment with sensorimotor experience” (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 49). “The correlation arises out of our embodied functioning in the world, where we regularly encounter cases” in which AFFECTION correlates with WARMTH (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 54). We create hundreds of these correlations, known as primary metaphors, which we then use to build more complex metaphors (again, mostly unconsciously). In this

\(^{21}\) That the concept MIND is understood in terms of physical objects is evident in expressions such as “have something in mind”, “on my mind”, and so forth.
dissertation primary metaphors motivate the particular grammatical constructions used to show formality / politeness; we do not discuss the functioning of complex metaphor in thought and language.

As we mentioned above, the way we conceptualize is largely unconscious. For example, "[w]e do not see nearness and farness. We see objects where they are and we attribute to them nearness and farness from some landmark...[W]e use spatial-relations concepts unconsciously, and we impose them via our perceptual and conceptual systems" (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 30-31). Further, "[w]e acquire a large system of primary metaphors automatically and unconsciously simply by functioning in the most ordinary of ways in the everyday world from our earliest years. We have no choice in this. Because of the way neural connections are formed during the period of conflation, we all naturally think using hundreds of primary metaphors" (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 47).

But what does this all have to do with social power, social intimacy, and the grammatical categories number and person? Social power and social intimacy motivate a great deal of the observed patterns of address with pronouns and their related forms. We further contend that primary metaphors for social power and social intimacy motivate speakers' understanding of pronominal (and related) forms and what they can be used to express. After all, "[g]rammatical constructions are not arbitrary ways of putting meaningless forms together. Instead, they are means of expressing fundamental human experiences -- embodied experiences" (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 503). The grammatical categories plural and third person have been co-opted to reflect conceptualizations of social power and social intimacy.
Address forms are motivated by a particular type of metaphor for power and intimacy whose job it is to “make a set of target concepts coherent in our conceptual system” (Kovecses 2002: 35). Most of these metaphors involve human spatial orientations (UP / DOWN, NEAR / FAR, CENTER / PERIPHERY, and so on), hence they are called orientational metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 14) demonstrate how metaphorical orientations are grounded in our “physical and cultural experience”. They claim that “[t]hese spatial orientations arise from the fact that we have bodies of the sort we have and that they function as they do in our physical environment” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 14). That is, since we walk upright, verticality (UP / DOWN) is a concept with which we have direct experience in the physical world. Therefore, we (unconsciously) have come to understand, and talk about, abstract concepts in terms of things that are UP and DOWN. The same is true for NEAR / FAR, BIG / SMALL, IN / OUT, and so on.

We suggest that the general concept SPACE is what motivates honorific address in Russian, Polish, and Czech. Speakers’ experience of SPACE is further structured by image schemas. Structure via image schema means speakers understand the concept SPACE to have “bounded regions, paths, centers and peripheries, objects with fronts and backs, regions above, below, and beside things... Yet we now know that space in itself has no such structure... [H]ighly structured neural systems in our brain not only create image-schematic concepts for us but also create the experience of space as structured according to those image schemas” (Lakoff and Johnson 1999:508-509).

Image schemas emerge from our experience with the physical world: “we explore physical objects by contact with them; we experience ourselves and other objects as
containers with other objects in them or outside them; we move around the world; we experience physical forces affecting us” and so on (Kovecses 2002: 37).

Image schemas are often the source domains in orientational metaphors. Recall that we can divide the factors that motivate T, V, or P use into two general categories: social power and social intimacy. Social power is conceptualized -- understood via conceptual metaphor -- in terms of vertical orientation (UP / DOWN) and size (BIG / SMALL). Social intimacy is conceptualized -- understood via conceptual metaphor -- in terms of the container schema (IN / OUT) and distance (NEAR / FAR).

Having examined the structure and cognitive functions of metaphors, we may now pursue the question of which metaphors are relevant to the use of polite forms, and why. As we mentioned above, especially salient in the motivation of polite pronoun usage are metaphors that utilize orientation and physical space as a source domain. First we will examine in detail how space acts a source domain for social power and social intimacy. We will then provide evidence from Russian, Czech, and Polish of the proliferation of these particular space metaphors in each of these languages.

2.3.2 Relevant metaphors and evidence for them in Slavic

The following charts detail metaphors involved in conceptualization of relationships with and attitudes toward an interlocutor and are adapted from the inventory of “Representative Primary Metaphors” in Philosophy in the Flesh (Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 50-54). Although metaphor theory was discussed in detail above, we briefly review the terminology that will be used to chart the implementation of these metaphors in Russian, Polish, and Czech.
An **image schema**, labeled in the first column on the left in each chart below, represents our understanding of some aspect of the physical world; for instance, UP / DOWN is an image schema. We understand that UP and DOWN have to do with vertical orientation. When we encounter something not in the physical world, but in the abstract world of concepts, we make sense of it by relating it in one way or another to the physical world. In the case of interpersonal relations, we use **image schema metaphors**, shown in the second column of the chart, to categorize our relationship to our interlocutor. That is, we relate salient characteristics of the relationship to physical space (is this person UP relative to me? or BIGGER than me? or NEAR me? or OUT of my circle?) Our conceptualization of relationships as having size or a certain spatial orientation motivates the use of pronouns (polite or not).

Returning to the charts below, entailments or corollaries are given in the third column, if they exist. The **subjective judgment**, or the target of the metaphor, is the intangible, abstract concept that is understood in terms of the concrete; the **sensorimotor domain**, or the source for the metaphor, provides the physical, tangible, concrete basis for understanding the aforementioned abstract concept. Finally, **primary experience** is what we, as human beings having bodies structured the way they are, experience in the physical world and in turn draw on in our conceptualization of various abstract notions.

### 2.3.2.1 Social power metaphors

Social power relations tend to be understood in terms of the spatial orientations UP and DOWN. Brown and Gilman (1960), Listen (1999), and Jucker and Taavitsainen (2003) have noted that plurality is a common metaphor for power. Indeed, the motivation for the use of a plural form to show respect derives from our understanding of the relative
judgment MORE in terms of the spatial orientation UP. That is, MORE is understood to be UP because of our observations of physical properties; when we add a rock to the top of a pile, the pile becomes taller. There is more of the pile, and the top of the pile has been extended in an upward direction. Thus, MORE IS UP. The opposite is also true: LESS IS DOWN (see Lakoff and Johnson 1980).

2.3.2.1 MORE / LESS

In terms of forms of address, MORE simply means plural, and LESS means singular. If ja ‘I’ is singular (LESS), a group of ja’s becomes 1pl my ‘we’ (MORE). Since MORE IS UP, whatever is plural (MORE) can often also be UP. And since LESS IS DOWN, whatever is singular (LESS) can also often be DOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>image schema</th>
<th>metaphor</th>
<th>entailments/corollaries?</th>
<th>subjective judgement</th>
<th>sensorimotor domain</th>
<th>primary experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACE orientation: up-down</td>
<td>MORE IS UP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Vertical orientation, also bodily orientation</td>
<td>Observing rise and fall of levels of piles and fluids as more is added or subtracted; also getting taller when move from sitting to standing position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS IS DOWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>vertical orientation, also bodily orientation</td>
<td>Observing rise and fall of levels of piles and fluids as more is added or subtracted (also getting smaller when move from standing position to sitting, etc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent evidence that MORE IS UP / LESS IS DOWN holds in Russian, Polish, and Czech cultures appears in the three languages as well. For instance, in Russian we find examples such as Oni našli svyše soroka obrazcov ‘They found more [lit. higher] than forty examples’ and the expression snizitel’ cenu ‘lower the price’, which, of course, means to make a price LESS. In Polish we find, for example, Ceny idą w góre ‘Prices are going up’ (becoming MORE) and the expression tendencja spadkowa ‘tendency to decline’ referring to the action of stocks. Declining stocks, of course, have
LESS value. Finally, in Czech we have, for example, *Sašovi za to maminka zvýšila kapesné* ‘Mama raised Saša’s allowance because of that;’ that is, Mama gave Saša MORE allowance. In each of the three languages, then, MORE IS UP and LESS IS DOWN.

If we take MORE IS UP and LESS IS DOWN to be concepts pervasive in Russian, Polish, and Czech cultures, we must then examine what concepts are also UP and DOWN and thus coherent with MORE (plural) and LESS (singular), respectively.

### 2.3.2.1.2 FORMALITY / INFORMALITY

Let us begin with FORMALITY, which is UP, and INFORMALITY, which is DOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>image schema</th>
<th>metaphor</th>
<th>subjective judgement</th>
<th>sensorimotor domain</th>
<th>primary experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACE orientation: up-down</td>
<td>FORMALITY IS UP</td>
<td>formality</td>
<td>vertical orientation; also bodily orientation</td>
<td>As a child, noting a change in attitude when &quot;big people&quot; (adults) are around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMALITY IS DOWN</td>
<td>informality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English, examples of FORMALITY IS UP / INFORMALITY IS DOWN are abundant; for instance, we “dress up” for a formal occasion, and “dress down” for an informal one. The physical basis for this metaphor is, as a child, noticing a change in attitude when “big people” (adults) are around. As a child, we notice that adults interact with us differently than they do other adults.

In Russian, too, FORMALITY IS UP and INFORMALITY IS DOWN. We find this metaphor in the following description of “high style” and “low style” of language:

No vse že nel'zja govorit', čto cerkovnoslavjanskih nam ne rodnoj. On-čast' russkogo jazyka, ego "vysokij stil", kotorym vyražajutsja dušovnje ponjatiya. Bylo by ošibkoj dušovnje teksty, s kotorymi my obraščaemsja k Bogu, bez ogljadki perevodit' na "nizkij stil" - ot etogo mnogoe poterjaetsja.

But nevertheless one can’t say that Church Slavic is not native to us. It’s part of the Russian language, its “high style”, with which spiritual understanding is expressed. It
would be a mistake to carelessly translate spiritual texts, with which we address God, into “low style”- a lot would be lost from this.

According to the author, sacred texts, which are often associated with formality and formal language, should always use the “high style” of language. Poles also refer to styles of language and formality via metaphors of verticality:

*Był styl wysoki, podnoszący, przeznaczony dla tragedii. Był styl niski, prostacki, charakterystyczny dla komedii. I styl średni - powszedni. W dzisiejszym życiu publicznym miejsce języka “wysokiego” zajmuje język urzędowy, czasami naukowy...* 

There was a *high, lofty* style for tragedies. There was a *low*, simple style characteristic of comedies. And a *middle* style for everyday. In modern public life official, sometimes scientific language occupies the place of “*high* style” language.

Thus, again, FORMALITY and UP are coherent concepts in Polish. High style (UP) is associated with the serious events depicted in tragedies as well as official and scientific (FORMAL) language. We find evidence of the metaphor in Czech as well:

*Když se ale pohybujeme v nějaké situaci, která vyžaduje vyšší kultivované vyjadřování, vyšší styl, tak si dáme pozor, abychom skloňovali právě všechny části této složené řadové číslovky...* 

When we find ourselves in some kind of situation that requires more (*lit. higher*) sophisticated expression, *higher* style, then we pay attention so that we precisely decline all parts of this complex ordinal number...

The Czech example equates FORMALITY with UP. FORMAL situations require FORMAL (“higher style”) language and attention to grammar.

Thus, FORMALITY IS UP / INFORMALITY IS DOWN in Russian, Polish, and Czech.

2.3.2.1.3 RESPECT / DISRESPECT

As the chart below suggests, RESPECT IS UP and DISRESPECT IS DOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>image schema</th>
<th>metaphor</th>
<th>subjective judgement</th>
<th>sensorimotor domain</th>
<th>primary experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACE orientation: up-down</td>
<td>RESPECT IS UP</td>
<td>respect</td>
<td>vertical orientation; also bodily orientation</td>
<td>As a child, being physically smaller than people you must show respect to; also, being small and not receiving respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISRESPECT IS DOWN</td>
<td>disrespect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We suggest that the physical basis for RESPECT IS UP derives from the experience of being a child and, consequently, being smaller than your parents and others who to whom you must defer or show respect. Conversely, DISRESPECT IS DOWN derives from the experience of being a child and not being shown any respect (relative to other, bigger people).

Independent evidence that these metaphors exist is found in the three languages under discussion. Russian has the phrase smotre'i sverxu vniz, ‘look down on’, which means to DISRESPECT someone or something. In Polish we find phrases with similar meaning: patrzeć z góry or patrzeć z wysoka both mean ‘look down on’ in the sense of ‘not treat with respect’. Czech has expressions like Vzhlžím k němu s úctou a vážnosti ‘I look up to him with awe and respect’, which equates UP with RESPECT. Thus, RESPECT and DISRESPECT are understood in terms of vertical orientation.

2.3.2.1.4 HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE / BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE

In Russian, Polish, and Czech, HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE IS UP, and BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE is DOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>image schema</th>
<th>metaphor</th>
<th>subjective judgement</th>
<th>sensorimotor domain</th>
<th>primary experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACE orientation: up-down</td>
<td>HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE IS UP</td>
<td>being in control / having force / authority</td>
<td>vertical orientation</td>
<td>Finding that it is easier to control another person or exert force on an object from above, where you have gravity working with you; Physical size typically correlates with physical strength, and the victor in a fight is typically on top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE IS DOWN</td>
<td>being subject to control / force / subordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we see in the chart above, the physical basis for HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE IS UP emerges from our experience of being able to control something or
someone when we are above or on top of them; the converse is true (something is easily controlled when it is below or under us). Thus, BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE IS DOWN.

Russian has the expression *brat’/vzjat’verx nad kem-libo* ‘have the upper hand’, meaning ‘have the advantage over someone’. In Polish one can *wziąć pod kontrolę* ‘take (something or someone) under control’. And in Czech one can *nabýt vrchu* ‘gain the upper hand’ or *mit vrch* ‘have the upper hand’ *nad kým* ‘over someone’. HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE is clearly understood in terms of UP, and BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE is understood in terms of DOWN.

### 2.3.2.1.5 HIGH STATUS / LOW STATUS

HIGH STATUS IS UP and LOW STATUS IS DOWN, as the chart and examples below demonstrate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>image schema</th>
<th>metaphor</th>
<th>subjective judgement</th>
<th>sensorimotor domain</th>
<th>primary experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACE orientation: up-down</td>
<td>HIGH STATUS IS UP</td>
<td>status</td>
<td>vertical orientation also bodily orientation</td>
<td>Status is correlated with (social) power and (physical) power is up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW STATUS IS DOWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simply put, power of various kinds is understood in terms of UP and DOWN: UP because people who HAVE CONTROL OR FORCE (physical or metaphorical) are UP, and people who are SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE (physical or metaphorical) are DOWN. STATUS is correlated with power, albeit social power, and is therefore UP (HIGH STATUS, i.e., a lot of social power) or DOWN (LOW STATUS, i.e., little social power).

In Russian one can try *podnijat’ prestiž professii medsestry* ‘raise the prestige of the nursing profession’. One can also *ponizit’ v zvanii* ‘reduce (someone) to a lower
rank’. In Polish one website tells us *Chętniej słuchamy osób o wysokim statusie społecznym niż tych, których status jest niski* ‘We’d rather listen to a person of high social status than one whose status is low’. A Czech website on ethics points out one author’s point of view: *Smýšlím jeho argumentace je spíš povyšit status živocích než ponížit status jakýchkoli lidských jedinců* ‘The sense of his argumentation is to raise the status of animals rather than to lower the status of any kind of human individuals’. In all three languages, then, social status can be understood in terms of verticality (UP / DOWN).

Thus, vertical orientation structures our understanding of the abstract concepts of MORE and LESS. It also structures our conceptualization of abstract social factors such as FORMALITY / INFORMALITY, RESPECT / DISRESPECT, HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE / BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE, and HIGH STATUS / LOW STATUS. Linguistically, plural correlates with MORE and singular correlates with LESS. Thus, social situations involving factors associated with MORE (HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE, for instance) can motivate use of the plural (MORE) form V.

P, as we suggest below (2.3.3.2), can also be understood in terms of UP; P is DISTANT, which we generally correlate with DISTANCE OUT. However, DISTANCE can also be DISTANCE UP. Thus, asymmetrical use of P-T involves one speaker talking DOWN (T is DISTANCE DOWN, relative to P) to another.22

Social circumstances involving factors associated with LESS (BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE, for example) can motivate use of the singular (LESS) form

---

22 As Lawrence Feinberg suggests, another way we might understand P (and third person address in general) is via the metaphor of eye contact. T-pattern address parallels direct eye contact; P-pattern address, however, can be understood as linguistically averting the eyes. A speaker giving P to a powerful or important interlocutor does not directly address him or her, and likely does not make direct eye contact (he directs the eyes, and the forms of address, to a “third person”).
The three dialogs below, written by participants in the script-writing project discussed in Chapter 4, provide examples of situations in which one speaker HAS CONTROL OR FORCE and is, therefore, UP; the other IS SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE and is DOWN. Conversations are presented in Russian, Polish, and Czech, respectively, and each is between a prison guard and a prisoner:

Zaključennyj: Za čto vy so mnoj tak, seržant?
Oxannik: Počemu ne rabotaš?? Posmotri, vse zaključennye rabotaju, a ty?
Zaključennyj: Tak ja starajus', no ja že skazal vraču, čto ja bolen.
Oxannik: Ja ne verju v tvoi bolezni. Idi i rabotaj.
Zaključennyj: Da ne mogu ja. Ja sejčas upadu.
Oxannik: Ty upadeš' tol’ko ne zdes’, a v karcere.
Zaključennyj: Ne nado v karcere! Prošu vas.
Oxannik: Ax, ne nado. Togda rabotaj.
Zaključennyj: Xorošo, xorošo. Budu rabotať.
prisoner: Why are you [V] like this with me, sergeant?
guard: Why aren’t you working [T]? Look [T], all the prisoners are working, and you [T]?

prisoner: I’m trying, but I told the doctor that I’m sick.
guard: I don’t believe in your [T] illnesses. Go [T] and work [T].
prisoner: But I can’t. I’ll fall down right now.
guard: You’ll [T] fall [T], only not here but in lockup.
prisoner: Not the lockup! I’m begging you [V].
guard: Alright. Then work [T].
prisoner: Ok, ok. I’ll work.

więzień: Wiem o pana problemach finansowych.
strażnik: Stul gębę albo cię zabiję.
więzień: Mogę pana pomóc. Jestem księgowym znam się na tym.
strażnik: Jak to zrobisz w więzieniu?
więzień: Potrzebuję dostępu do akt pana i wszystkie papiery finansowe
strażnik: A jak wyjdzie sprawa na jaw?
więzień: Nikt się nie dowie.
strażnik: Co chcesz za to.
więzień: Nic szczególnego. Piwo dla chłopaków, spokój dla nas.
prisoner: I know about your [P] financial problems.
guard: Shut up [T] or I’ll kill you [T].
prisoner: I can help you [P]. I am an accountant, I know about these things.
guard: How will you do [T] it in prison?
prisoner: I need access to your [P] records and all your financial papers.
guard: And what if this leaks out?
prisoner: No one will find out.
prisoner: Nothing special. Beer for the boys, leave us alone.

vězeň: Jestli mě pustíte do lá, budete mít na krku vraždu.
strážce: Takových nehod už tu bylo.

vězeň: A co spoluvězni jsou za svědci.
strážce: Těm nikdo neuvěří. Teď mluv, kde jste prokopali tu díru.

vězeň: Jestli si myslíte, že to řeknu, tak se šerédně myšli...
strážce: Mluv, nebo tě shodím.

vězeň: Když vám to řeknu, zabijou mě spoluvězni. A radši se nechám zabít od vás.
strážce: Máš poslední šanci.

vězeň: Tak mě pustíte. Tam dole už o ničem nebudi vědět.
prisoner: If you let me fall [V], you'll have [V] blood on your hands.

guard: We've already had these kinds of accidents here.

prisoner: But what about the other prisoners as witnesses.

guard: Nobody'll believe them. Now tell [T] me where you dug that hole.

prisoner: If you think [V] that I'm gonna tell you, then you're sorely mistaken [V]...

guard: Talk [T], or I'll drop you.

prisoner: If I tell you [V], the other prisoners will kill me. And I'd rather let myself be killed by you [V].

guard: You have [T] one last chance.

guard: Then let me go [V]. I won't know about anything down there.

In each of the three conversations, the speaker with complete power (the guard) consistently addresses the prisoner as T; the speaker with no power (the prisoner) consistently addresses the guard with the polite form (V or P). We should also note that the participants in the project overwhelmingly preferred asymmetrical (V or P – T) address in this case. Thus, they had a strong sense that the differences in power between the guard and the prisoner should be expressed linguistically through address forms. We suggest that this sense has developed from their understanding, as humans, of things UP and DOWN.

Social power relations can also be understood in terms of BIG and SMALL.
2.3.2.1.6 MORE / LESS

Just as MORE IS UP and LESS IS DOWN, MORE IS also BIG and LESS IS also SMALL. MORE IS BIG / LESS IS SMALL derives from our experience that more of something (books, food, people) takes up a bigger space than less of something.

Again, in terms of forms of address, MORE is plural, and LESS is singular. Since MORE IS BIG, whatever is plural (MORE) can also be BIG. Since LESS IS DOWN, whatever is singular (LESS) can also be SMALL. Note, too, that MORE IS UP, and MORE IS BIG; therefore, UP and BIG are coherent concepts (think: “Look how big you’ve gotten! You’re all grown up!”). Since LESS IS DOWN and LESS IS SMALL, DOWN and SMALL are coherent concepts (“He’s a small man. I couldn’t think less of him! I really look down on him!”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>image schema</th>
<th>metaphor</th>
<th>subjective judgement</th>
<th>sensorimotor domain</th>
<th>primary experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACE: size</td>
<td>MORE IS BIG</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>size</td>
<td>The more you have of something, the bigger the space it occupies; the less you have of something, the smaller the space it occupies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a property</td>
<td>LESS IS SMALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of object or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Russian, as in English, we can talk about boľšie den’gi ‘big money’, which means ‘a lot of money’. In Polish, attitudes toward the sick can be expressed using mniejszy ‘small’: Człowiek chory to taki mniejszy człowiek ‘A sick person -- that’s some kind of lesser person’. Czech has expressions such as větší ‘greater, bigger’ with the meaning of MORE: Takže vy žádáte větší práva pro ženy? ‘So you are demanding more [lit. greater] rights for women?’

2.3.2.1.7 IMPERSONAL / PERSONAL

IMPERSONAL IS BIG and PERSONAL IS SMALL in Russian, Polish, and Czech, just as it is in English (think: big impersonal corporation).
The primary experience for these metaphors derives from our learning that the more people there are in a group around you, the less well you know each of them. Conversely, the fewer people there are in a group, the better you get to know each of them. Examples of IMPERSONAL IS BIG / PERSONAL IS SMALL follow in each of the three languages.

One Russian, commenting on the differences between Moscow and St. Petersburg, makes the following observation: Moskva dlja menja—eto probki, bol'soj gorod...On dejstvitel'no bolee bezlichnyj, nesravnimo bolee bezlichnyj. A Peterburg—bolee kommunal'nyj, v nem bol'še obščenija. 'Moscow for me is traffic jams, a big city...It's really more impersonal, incomparably more impersonal. But Petersburg [which is much smaller] is more communal, there's more social interaction there'.

On a Polish website we find a description of a real estate firm: Nie jesteśmy wielkim bezosobowym gigantem z dziesiątkami z ludnych ogłoszeń oferowanych - stworzyliśmy zgrany zespół, wymieniająca się i wspomagający ofertami z podobnych malutkich Biur. 'We're not a big impersonal giant with dozens of misleading advertisements of our offerings; we've created a tightly knit team that shares and supports each other with offerings from similar tiny firms'.

And in Czech, BIG and IMPERSONAL are equated in the following description of city size: ...město o padesáti až šedesáti tisících obyvatelů skýtá veškeré půvaby
kultury, které lidé očekávají od městského života, ale navíc s výhodou toho, že není tak velké, aby bylo neosobní ‘...a city of fifty to sixty thousand citizens offers all the perks of culture which people expect from city life, but moreover with the advantage that it’s not so big that it’s impersonal’.

Thus, in Russian, Polish, and Czech, IMPERSONAL can be understood in terms of BIG, and PERSONAL can be understood in terms of SMALL.

2.3.2.1.8 IMPORTANT / UNIMPORTANT

IMPORTANT IS BIG and UNIMPORTANT IS SMALL in each of our languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>image schema</th>
<th>metaphor</th>
<th>subjective judgement</th>
<th>sensorimotor domain</th>
<th>primary experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACE: size</td>
<td>IMPORTANT IS BIG</td>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>size</td>
<td>As a child, finding that big things, e.g.,parents, are important and can exert major forces on you and dominate your visual experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a property of object or substance)</td>
<td>UNIMPORTANT IS SMALL</td>
<td>Unimportance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, as a child, we learn that big things (parents or other adults) are important and can exert their influence on us; by contrast, small things (either us, as children, or things even smaller than us) are less important and have less influence on things around them.

Russian has the expression velikan sredi pigmeev ‘a giant among pygmies’, which is the equivalent of English ‘a giant among men’; note, however, that the Russian expression emphasizes an even greater disparity between sizes than the English: pygmies are smaller than ordinary men. In Polish one can make the point that Nie każdy musi być wielkim człowiekiem- być człowiekiem to już bardzo dużo ‘Not everyone must be an important [lit. great, big] person- to be a person is important [lit. great, big] enough’.

In Czech we learn that Pro mobilního operátora se stane klíčovým (důležitým, velkým)
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zákazníkem v okamžiku, kdy s ním podepisete tzv. rámkovou smlouvu (tento termín
používá především RadioMobil, princip však funguje u všech). ‘You will become a key
(important, big) customer for the mobile operator when you sign the so-called general
contract (this term is used mainly by RadioMobil, but the principle is the same for all of
them).’

Thus, the social power relations hierarchy can also be understood in the physical
terms of size (BIG and SMALL). The dialogs presented above, in the section on UP /
DOWN, between the prisoner and the guard, can also be motivated by BIG and SMALL.
That is, the guard is IMPORTANT in the life of the prisoner, as he determines treatment,
both good and bad, of the prisoner. The prisoner, however, is relatively UNIMPORTANT
to the guard. He is simply part of his job and generally has nothing to offer the guard.

Note, then, that since MORE IS UP and MORE IS BIG, concepts that are UP and
BIG, respectively, are often coherent with each other (HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE
IS UP, IMPORTANT IS BIG, for instance). Since LESS IS DOWN and LESS IS
SMALL, concepts that are LESS and SMALL are often coherent with each other
(BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE IS DOWN, UNIMPORTANT IS
SMALL, for example). Thus, often the construal of relationships and the forms used to
express this construal are multiply motivated by various (coherent) metaphors. We
believe, however, that multiple motivation only strengthens the case for conceptualization
of relationships in spatial terms.

2.3.2.2 Solidarity metaphors

We now examine metaphors for social intimacy, attitudes, and emotions. We
understand “attitudes” and “emotions” to mean the ways we feel about people we are
intimate with and not intimate with. That is to say, we do not imply that anger and other altered states of being (drunkenness, for instance) are inherently part of this scale. Altered states will be addressed separately (see section 5.3.1).

Social intimacy, attitudes, and emotions are generally structured by the spatial orientations NEAR / FAR (or CLOSENESS / DISTANCE) and container metaphors (that is, the concepts IN / OUT).

Recall that with regard to social power relations, in grammatical terms MORE simply means plural, and LESS simply means singular. We suggest that address to one interlocutor with a plural (MORE) form is motivated by speaker construal of the situation and / or the addressee as UP or BIG (both MORE). Address to one interlocutor with a singular (LESS) form is motivated by speaker construal of the situation and / or the addressee as DOWN or SMALL (both LESS). With regard to the social intimacy, however, proximity, not size, motivates pronoun use. That is, NEAR / FAR (and IN / OUT) motivate address based on the grammatical category of person, not number.

"Regions of space can be attached to the hearer (second person) or to other people in the background (third person)" (Inchaurrelade 1997: 135). The second person form, which is used to address the hearer, is thus NEAR, or CLOSE; it is often labeled the FAMILIAR form (and, as we shall see, FAMILIAR IS IN). Third person forms are FAR, or DISTANT; they are attached to people EXCLUDED from the conversation (and EXCLUSION IS OUT). However, when we address the hearer with not a second person but a third person form, we impose (or imply) a DISTANT relationship, or construal of the situation or the interlocutor as FAR or OUT with respect to ourselves. The opposite (NEAR and IN) is implied when we address someone with the second person form.
With regard to pronouns, then, NEAR (CLOSENESS) and IN are associated with second person (T) address, and FAR (DISTANCE) and OUT are associated with third person (P) address. But as we note below (2.3.3.2), V (which is obviously MORE but less obviously FAR and OUT) can be construed, via metonymy (the part stands for the whole, or the whole stands for the part), as FAR and OUT. That is, in addressing with V, one is actually addressing the entire group (plural, MORE) represented by the one person to whom one is speaking. A speaker only addresses with T someone he or she regards as IN and NEAR, someone who can be individuated and evaluated in a certain way (SIMILAR, NON-THREATENING, and so on).

We now examine concepts associated with intimacy, attitudes, and emotions.

2.3.2.2.1 INTIMACY / NON-INTIMACY

In Russian, Polish, and Czech, INTIMACY IS CLOSENESS and NON-INTIMACY IS DISTANCE. These metaphors derive from our common experience of being physically close to people we are intimate with, and not being physically close to people we are not intimate with.

---

2 This is how Listen (1999) motivates address with ihr vs. du in German. "Indirectness in social relations is another potential effect of plural address, in that a metonymy can be construed. By definition, a metonymy exists when a whole stands for a part or when a part stands for a whole. More generally, an entity X, associated with Y, can stand for Y. When HG ihr is used instead of du to address an individual, a whole stands for a part. Thus, this is a taxonomic metonymy. The collective group construed through plural stands for the individual with whom the speaker is interlocuting. Whether or not a group is actually present, or can be inferred to be an in-group associated with the hearer, is another issue. An entity is called not by its own name but by something associated with it.

This model has to do with the collective quality of plurality, i.e., plural as a grouping together of individuals. In effect, since ihr addresses a collective, it does not single out any particular individual. Drawing on the consequent lack of one to one directness in reference, LINGUISTIC EXCHANGE is equated with a SOCIAL RELATIONSHIP. Linguistic indirectness thus becomes mitigated social interaction. This metaphor relates not to the scope but the aggregate quality of a group" (Listen 1999: 48).
Independent evidence in Russian, Polish, and Czech suggests that near / far (CLOSENESS / DISTANCE) also structure degrees of INTIMACY in these languages as well. For instance, in Russian *Suščestvuet sueverie, čto bližkie rodstvenniki ne dolžny nesti grob* ‘There is a superstition that close relatives should not carry the coffin’. That is, relatives who were most intimate with the deceased should not be too hands-on at his or her burial. There is also a Russian proverb Čem bližše znaeš’, tem men’še počitašeś 24 ‘Familiarity breeds contempt’ [lit. The closer you know (something or someone), the less you appreciate (it or them).] Note too that closeness, in this case, also correlates with contempt, both of which motivate T.

In Polish, a report on the situation in Afghanistan notes that *W sobotę zginął w zamachu w środkowoafgańskiej prowincji Uruzgan bliski sojusznik i osobisty przyjaciel prezydenta Hamida Karzaja* ‘A close ally and personal friend of president Hamid Karzai was assassinated on Saturday in the central Afghan providence of Uruzgan’. That is, an intimate friend of President Karzai was killed.

And in Czech, from the film *Kolja*, the main character protests as the five-year-old boy is dropped off at his house: *Ale já jsem jenom vzdálený otec. Chci říct nevlastní. ‘But I am only a distant father. I mean to say, not his real father.’* Louka’s assertion that he is a *vzdálený* ‘distant’ father is meant to suggest that he has no intimate involvement with the boy, and therefore should not be responsible for him in any way. Thus, in the

---

24 The verb forms in the proverb are 2sg; this is an instance of non-referential T (see 2.1.2).
three languages under consideration, INTIMACY IS CLOSENESS and NON-
INTIMACY IS DISTANCE.

2.3.2.2.2 SIMILARITY / DIFFERENCE

Near / far also structures the concepts SIMILARITY and DIFFERENCE:

**SIMILARITY IS CLOSENESS** and **DIFFERENCE IS DISTANCE**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>image schema</th>
<th>metaphor</th>
<th>subjective judgement</th>
<th>sensorimotor domain</th>
<th>primary experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACE</td>
<td>SIMILARITY IS CLOSENESS</td>
<td>similarity</td>
<td>proximity in space</td>
<td>observing similar objects clustered together (flowers, trees, rocks, buildings, dishes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near-far</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE IS DISTANCE</td>
<td>difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>observing dissimilar objects not clustered together, but far apart (in the cupboard, cups go with cups, plates go with plates, and so on, but they each have their own place)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our understanding of things SIMILAR and DIFFERENT with respect to
CLOSENESS and DISTANCE derives from our observation that similar things tend to be
located close together, and dissimilar things tend to be located far apart.

**SIMILARITY IS CLOSENESS** and **DIFFERENCE IS DISTANCE** appear in
Russian, Polish, and Czech. For example, in Russian, one commentator notes

*Prostranstvo delit ljudu na bližnix i dal'nix. Konečno, ne prostranstvo vinovato, i čto xorošo vidno po tomu, čto mnogie prostranstvenno blizkie ljudi beskonečno daleki. “Vragi čeloveku domašnje ego.” Podlóst v tom, čto blizkie mogut byť real’no daleki ot nas, no fizičeski dalekie ljudi, kak by s nimi ne byli blizkie duxovno, vse ravno ostajutsja dal’nimi.*

Space divides people into near and far. Of course, space isn’t at fault, and that fact is
obvious because many people who are physically close are infinitely distant. “The
enemies of a person are at home”. The shame is that physically close people can in reality
be far from us, but physically distant people, no matter how close they are spiritually,
still remain distant.

Note this example provides excellent use of both metaphorical and physical distance. The
author is simply noting that people who live far away from each other (real distance)
might actually be more similar (metaphorical distance) than people who live close to each other (real distance).

In Polish one can proclaim Mój francuski daleki jest od perfekcji ‘My French is far from perfect’. This means, of course, that one’s French speaking abilities are not similar to perfect. And in Czech, one can talk about a barva sice blízká černí ‘a color rather close (i.e., similar) to black’. Thus, SIMILARITY IS CLOSENESS and DIFFERENCE IS DISTANCE.

The following dialogs, each between a brother and sister, are motivated, we suggest, by the conceptual metaphor INTIMACY IS CLOSENESS, and a brother and sister are to some degree intimate because they live in the same space, have known each other well for a long time, have much in common because they have the same family, and so on. The understanding of the relationship between brother and sister might also be said to be motivated by SIMILARITY IS CLOSENESS (they are of the same family, live in the same house, and so on).

R
Sestra: Nu čto, opjat’ iščeš’ pivo? Ne tam iščeš’.
Brat: Da razve možet byt’ pivo v ètom dome... tol’ko sok... Slušaj, a s kem èto ty včera na večerinke tak milo xixikala. Po-moemu, on nastojas’ij idiot...
Sister: Well what’s this, you’re looking [T] for beer again? You’re not looking [T] in the right place.
Brother: Could there really be beer in this house... only juice...Listen [T], who was that you [T] were giggling with so sweetly at the party yesterday? I think he’s a real idiot...

Pol
Siostra: Co robileš dzisiaj pod szkołą...?
Brat: Odczep się.
Sister: What were you doing [T] today near the school...?
Brother: Get outta here [T].

Cz
Sestra: Hele, nech to jidlo. Vždycky když s tebou potřebuji mluvit nemáš čas. Tak mě jednou vnímej.
Bratr: Co potřebuješ? Já nevím, co porád řešíš?
Sister: Hey, forget the food. Every time I need to talk to you [T], you don’t have [T] time. So for once pay attention [T] to me.
Brother: What do you need [T]? I don’t know- what are you constantly bothering with [T]?

The following dialogs between two strangers are also motivated by the same understanding of space; in this case, however, FAR (DISTANCE) is the physical concept by which we understand the relationship between these two people who do not know each other:

R
Neznakomec: Zdravstvujte.
Neznakomka: Zdravstvujte.
Male stranger: Hello (lit. Be well[V]).
Female stranger: Hello (lit. Be well[V]).

Pol
nieznajomy: Co pani czyta?
nieznajoma: Nie pański interes.
Male stranger: What are you [P] reading [P]?
Female stranger: None of your [P] business.

Cz.
Neznámý: Máte pěkný boty.
Neznámá: Hele, nechte mé na pokoji.
Male stranger: You have [V] nice shoes.
Female stranger: Hey, leave [V] me alone.

The concepts NEAR / FAR (CLOSENESS / DISTANCE) thus provide structure to perceptions of relationships. Size (BIG / SMALL), too, can provide the basis for understanding relationships in terms of attitudes toward people we like (generally SMALL) and people we do not like or are threatened by (generally BIG), as we shall see below.
2.3.2.2.3 POTENTIALLY THREATENING / NOT POTENTIALLY THREATENING

In terms of intimacy and attitude, POTENTIALLY THREATENING IS BIG and
NOT POTENTIALLY THREATENING IS SMALL. This size metaphor is best
demonstrated by diminutive and augmentative behavior in each of the languages under
consideration. Wierzbicka (1980:56) discusses the issue with respect to diminutives in
Spanish:

Spanish children automatically apply diminutive suffixes to small
and attractive persons and things, but by extension they, and indeed their
elders too, often apply them also in cases where there is no question of
smallness and perhaps not even any great idea of attractiveness either, in
cases where they wish to reduce something to proportions which are for
them emotionally manageable. Here the diminutive suffix gives an insight
into what is a deeply-rooted human characteristic: fear of things that are
big and a concomitant desire to reduce them to friendly proportions.

Inchaurralde (1997:138) further notes, in his discussion of the same issue in
Spanish, that diminutives are used when “we feel close to the entity...and for that reason
we make it enter our personal space by reducing its dimensions. We do not feel
threatened by the object and, therefore, it is included as part of our private territory by
making room in it”. That is, diminution of size, even linguistically, can be and often is
associated with positive, intimate feelings toward a person or object. The opposite is also
ture: augmentatives, which linguistically increase the size of a person or object, often
reflect negative feelings. Whereas we use diminutive forms to signal our affection for an
object or person and our desire to have it or him / her enter our personal space, we use
augmentatives to signal our desire to keep the object or person away from us and out of
our personal space. That “which is outside [our personal space] and wants to get inside
the area is felt as hostile and, therefore, bad” (Inchaurralde 1997:137).
Thus, metaphorically, THREATENING IS BIG and NON-THREATENING IS SMALL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>image schema</th>
<th>metaphor</th>
<th>subjective judgement</th>
<th>sensorimotor domain</th>
<th>primary experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACE size</td>
<td>THREATENING IS BIG</td>
<td>bad (morality)</td>
<td>size</td>
<td>Things bigger than you are threatening and might harm you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON-THREATENING IS SMALL</td>
<td>good (morality)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Things smaller than you are not threatening and can be controlled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of diminutive (NON-THREATENING) and augmentative (THREATENING) behavior are prevalent in Russian, Polish, and Czech. For instance, in Russian, the nose in the following example is clearly not described in a positive light and the negative attitude toward it is reinforced by the use of the augmentative (in boldface):

_Vrode by običnaja staruška, no kakoj u nee byl nos! Ručajus', čto za všu svoju žizn' vy takogo ogromnogo nosa ne videli. Ogo, nu i nosiščě._ ‘It seemed as if she was an ordinary old woman, but what a nose she had! I swear that in your whole life you never saw such a giant nose. Oho, what a _honker_.’

Noses can also be seen in a positive way by using the noun in its diminutive form. In this example, the smallness of the nose _nosik_ is obviously associated with other positive benefits:

_Malen'kij nosik pridaet licu ženščiny moložavost', pikantnost', povyšaet ee privlekačnost'. Posle izmenenija formy nosa u ženščin ne tołko lico, no daże vyraženie glaz menjaetsja. U nih ulučšaetsja samočuvstvie, oni stanovjatsja uverenee v sebe, xorosjeut, molodejut._

A little bitty nose imparts to a woman’s face youthful looks, piquancy, increases her attractiveness. For women, after changing the nose’s form not only the face, but even the expression of the eyes changes. Women feel better, they become more self-confident, they grow more beautiful, younger.

In Polish, things that are overwhelming (THREATENING to some extent) can be marked as an augmentative: _Chuchnij, śmierdzisz wódq._ ‘Let me smell your breath, you
stink of vodka’. The smell of vodka is overwhelming and bad; thus neutral vodka ‘vodka’ becomes the augmentative wódq.

Things and people which are NOT THREATENING and for which speakers have affection can be marked with diminutive morphology in Polish. In this case the kinship terms for grandmother and grandchildren: Babcia gromadziła wokół siebie swoje małe wnuczki a wnuczki prosiły ją: Babciu, babuniu, opowiedź nam bajkę, opowiadaj!

‘Granny gathered her little grandchildren around her and the grandchildren asked her: Granny, granny dear, tell us a fairy tale, tell us!’

Finally, the same relationships hold in Czech: augmentatives are used to express a negative quality about someone or something. For example, the old woman below is THREATENING and is overtly compared to a witch: Zazvonil jsem a otevřela mi velice stará a ošklivá babízna. Vypadala jako typická čarodějnice z pohádky. ‘I rang the bell and a very old and ugly hag opened the door. She looked like a typical witch from a fairy tale’.

By contrast, in Czech one can attach diminutive morphology to reinforce the positive qualities of a person or thing such as eyes, lips, and a nose: Já ho prostě miluji jako muže, který je krásný-ty modrý očka, rtíky, nosánek! ‘I just love him like a man who is handsome- those darling blue eyes, darling lips, that darling little nose!’

Thus, evidence of diminutive and augmentative behavior in Russian, Polish, and Czech suggests that, in fact, (POTENTIALY) THREATENING IS BIG and NOT (POTENTIALY) THREATENING IS SMALL.
2.3.2.2.4 RELATIONSHIPS, GROUPS OF HUMANS

Relationships and groups of humans can be understood in terms of the concepts IN / OUT and CONTAINERS. Containment metaphors require, obviously, the existence of some sort of container. In this case, we suggest RELATIONSHIPS ARE CONTAINERS, and ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS THAT GROUP HUMAN BEINGS ARE CONTAINERS as well. The containment image schema also implies the existence of objects or people who are IN the container and objects or people who are OUT of the container. That is, the concept of a CONTAINER implies IN / OUT, since an container contains some things but excludes others. Conversely, IN / OUT implies the existence of a CONTAINER; IN and OUT are relative terms, defined by the boundary of the CONTAINER.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>image schema</th>
<th>metaphor</th>
<th>entailments/ corollaries</th>
<th>subjective judgement</th>
<th>sensorimotor domain</th>
<th>primary experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPACE: containment</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIPS ARE CONTAINERS</td>
<td>Interpersonal relationship</td>
<td>being in a container; putting objects in a container; being outside a container; taking objects out of a container; sorting items into containers</td>
<td>Living in the same enclosed physical space with the people you are most closely related to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS THAT GROUP HUMAN BEINGS ARE CONTAINERS</td>
<td>Membership in institution or organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>Being (working, having fun) in the same physical space with people who have membership in a group in common with you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE: containment (in-out)</td>
<td>SIMILAR IS IN</td>
<td>Perception of kinds</td>
<td></td>
<td>observing that things that go together tend to be in the same bounded region (correlation between common location and common properties, functions, or origins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Includes organizations / institutions such as MILITARY, GENDER, AGE, SOCIAL CLASS, VILLAGE, FAMILY, MARRIAGE, COMPANY
Since the existence of CONTAINERS implies IN / OUT, these concepts also structure speakers' understanding of relationships. SIMILAR IS IN because we have observed that things that go together (are alike) tend to be in the same bounded region of space. DIFFERENT IS OUT because things that are different tend to be in different bounded regions of space. We understand FAMILIAR in terms of IN from our personal experience of living in the same physical space as people you are closely related to and know intimately. We understand UNFAMILIAR in terms of OUT from our experience of living in different physical spaces from people we are not closely related to and do not know well. Finally, MEMBERSHIP (BELONGING) IS IN because we are often in the
same physical space as people with whom we share membership in a group (such as FAMILY). EXCLUSION (NOT BELONGING) IS OUT because we do not commonly share physical space with people who belong to a group to which we do not belong.

The concepts IN / OUT are prevalent in structuring concepts of human relationships in Russian, Polish, and Czech. In Russian one might want to vstupit' v partiju ‘join the party (lit. enter into the party)’, služit’ v armii ‘serve in the army’. The first expression describes motion IN(TO) a CONTAINER, an ORGANIZATION THAT GROUPS HUMAN BEINGS (the party). The second describes location IN a CONTAINER, also an ORGANIZATION THAT GROUPS HUMAN BEINGS (the army).

In Polish, we learn that Polska, która ma przystąpić do Unii Europejskiej w 2004 roku, nie boi się już głośno mówić o tym na najwyższym szczeblu ‘Poland, who is supposed to enter the European Union in 2004, is not afraid to speak loudly about this at the highest level’. Again, we have motion IN(TO) a CONTAINER (the European Union).

Finally, in Czech, we have the following example of IN / OUT: Místopředsedou byl zvolen pan Ladislav Blažek z firmy Český porcelán. ‘Mr. Ladislav Blažek from the firm Czech Porcelain was named vice-chairman’. This use of z ‘from’ signals the man’s MEMBERSHIP IN the firm Czech Porcelain, and indicates that the office he has taken is IN a different organization.

If we consider the example dialogs given above between brother and sister and two strangers, respectively, we suggest that IN / OUT can motivate address forms as well (T between relatives, V or P between strangers). After all, brother and sister are IN the
same family, live IN the same house, and so on. Strangers, however, have no reason to believe they are IN anything with respect to each other. If two people do not know each other, they generally do not assume they have anything in common. Thus, the "default" assumption between strangers is that generally they are OUT with respect to each other.

2.3.2.3 Metaphor summary

We have presented independent evidence in Russian, Polish, and Czech supporting our claim that UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL, NEAR / FAR, and IN / OUT are viable sources for metaphors for various concepts relating to relationships. The following charts summarize what is UP, DOWN, BIG, SMALL, NEAR, FAR, IN, and OUT.

We begin with UP and DOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is UP?</th>
<th>What is DOWN?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MORE</td>
<td>LESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMALITY</td>
<td>INFORMALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPECT</td>
<td>DISRESPECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE</td>
<td>BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH STATUS</td>
<td>LOW STATUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concepts MORE, FORMALITY, RESPECT, HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE, and HIGH STATUS are coherent with our understanding of things that are UP on a vertical scale. To some extent, then, each of the abstract concepts is in turn coherent with each other. For example, since HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE IS UP and HIGH STATUS IS UP, HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE and HIGH STATUS are concepts that we often associate with each other.

Similarly, the concepts LESS, INFORMALITY, DISRESPECT, BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE, and LOW STATUS, are coherent with things that are DOWN on a vertical scale. Again, each of these concepts is, to some extent,
coherent with each other. For instance, since DISRESPECT IS DOWN and LOW
STATUS IS DOWN, a person might DISRESPECT someone with LOW STATUS.
Persons in situations involving INFORMALITY, DISRESPECT, BEING SUBJECT TO
CONTROL OR FORCE, and LOW STATUS can logically be addressed with the
singular (LESS, DOWN) form.

However, convention often dictates that unless one is trying to be deliberately
rude by reinforcing the interlocutor's low status, lack of control, and so on, one generally
uses a polite form, regardless of the reality of the situation. As we will see when we
examine our data, Russians, Poles, and Czechs can and in fact do often express
differences in social power through pronouns and the forms related to them (verbs,
possessives, and so on).

We continue our discussion with BIG and SMALL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is BIG?</th>
<th>What is SMALL?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MORE</td>
<td>LESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERSONAL</td>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
<td>UNIMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREATENING</td>
<td>NON-THREATENING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MORE, IMPERSONAL, IMPORTANT, and THREATENING are understood in
terms of BIG, and LESS, PERSONAL, UNIMPORTANT, and NON-THREATENING
are understood in terms of SMALL. The reader will undoubtedly notice that the abstract
concepts coherent with BIG are not necessarily coherent with each other (unlike UP /
DOWN above). That is, MORE and IMPORTANT can be positively evaluated, whereas
THREATENING is always negatively evaluated.

In the three Slavic languages under consideration, however, as stated above,
diminutive (SMALL) and augmentative (BIG) behavior strongly reinforces the fact that,
conceptually, NON-THREATENING IS SMALL and THREATENING IS BIG. 

Concepts such as BIG / SMALL can be positively and negatively evaluated; similarly, pronouns can be both positively and negatively evaluated. If a speaker addresses a stranger as T, when V or P is expected, rudeness or aggression is implied (that is, T has a negative evaluation). The motivating metaphor might be UNIMPORTANT IS SMALL or DISRESPECT IS DOWN. If a speaker were to switch from T to V with his or her mother-in-law, V might very well have a negative evaluation, as the speaker might be making an attempt to distance the hearer from himself or herself. That is, THREATENING IS BIG or EXCLUSION IS OUT (see below) might be the motivating metaphors.

In short, just as we acknowledge multiple motivations for pronoun use, we acknowledge various evaluations of the image schema metaphors that motivate usage. Thus, depending on context, T, V, and P can be both positively and negatively evaluated. In Chapter 5 we will examine this issue in greater detail.

We continue with concepts that are NEAR and FAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is NEAR?</th>
<th>What is FAR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTIMACY</td>
<td>NON-INTIMACY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMILARITY</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTIMACY and SIMILARITY are NEAR, and NON-INTIMACY and DIFFERENCE are FAR. People who are INTIMATE with each other often have much in common; that is, they are SIMILAR to each other in certain ways. Thus, INTIMACY and SIMILARITY, both NEAR, are concepts coherent with each other. People who do not know each other (are NON-INTIMATE) often perceive each other as very DIFFERENT from themselves. Much of human suffering has evolved because of this
(mis)understanding: the basis of segregation in the American South, for instance, is the belief that people who are DIFFERENT should be kept DISTANT. NON-INTIMACY and DIFFERENCE, both FAR, are coherent with each other.

IN and OUT are related to NEAR and FAR; the existence of a CONTAINER (real or metaphorical) implies that some things will be IN and some will be OUT. Things that are IN a CONTAINER might have a greater chance of being NEAR each other than things that are OUT of a CONTAINER, where space is virtually unlimited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is IN?</th>
<th>What is OUT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIMILAR</td>
<td>DIFFERENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILIAR</td>
<td>UNFAMILIAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERSHIP (BELONGING)</td>
<td>EXCLUSION (NOT BELONGING)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concepts SIMILAR, FAMILIAR, and MEMBERSHIP (BELONGING) are IN and are to some degree coherent with each other. MEMBERS of a club, for instance, join because they have some common (SIMILAR) interest. DIFFERENT, UNFAMILIAR, and EXCLUSION (NOT BELONGING) are OUT.

This concludes our examination of concepts relevant to human interaction with regard to social power and social intimacy. As humans we understand these abstract concepts in terms of spatial orientation and size: UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL, NEAR / FAR, and IN / OUT structure not only how we perceive situations and the people in them but also how we choose to address them with pronominal forms.

2.3.3 How metaphor bridges the gap

We now discuss how metaphor bridges the gap between grammatical categories and the social relations perceived by speakers.
2.3.3.1 What makes V UP and BIG? OUT and FAR?

Simply put, the mechanism that motivates V use in address to people who are, metaphorically speaking, UP and BIG relative to the speaker, is the reality that the concept PLURAL means MORE. In terms of grammar, plural literally means a number more than one (or, in some languages, a number more than two). If PLURAL IS MORE, and MORE IS UP, PLURAL is coherent with concepts that are also UP (for instance, RESPECT, HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE, and so on).

Similarly, since PLURAL IS MORE, and MORE IS BIG, PLURAL is coherent with concepts that are also BIG (for instance, IMPORTANT, IMPERSONAL). Listen (1999: 47), suggests a similar metaphorical motivation for polite German Sie (also plural in form): “Both the size and quantity aspects of plurality are significant in this conceptual metaphor. Thus, it relates to the scope of plurality in general. The relative extent of size of plural entities becomes the salient feature metaphorically imputed to the addressee”.

BIG and UP are concepts generally associated only with power. We claim social power is structured by the concepts UP / DOWN and BIG / SMALL. Plurality easily fits into this model, as we have shown above. However, how can we motivate V use to addressees that are OUT or FAR relative to the speaker? What is it about the concept PLURAL (and, therefore, V) that is OUT or FAR? Listen (1999: 48) addresses this issue in his analysis:

The answer seems to be that metonymic models are also possible… Indirectness in social relations is another potential effect of plural address, in that a metonymy can be construed. By definition, a metonymy exists when a whole stands for a part or when a part stands for a whole. More generally, an entity X, associated with Y, can stand for Y… The collective group construed through plural stands for the individual with whom the

---

26 We remind the reader that Brown and Gilman (1960: 255) also state that “plurality is a very old and ubiquitous metaphor for power”.
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speaker is interlocuting. An entity is called not by its own name but by something associated with it. This model has to do with the collective quality of plurality, i.e., plural as a grouping together of individuals.

That is, when a speaker addresses someone he or she construes as NOT BELONGING TO THE SAME GROUP (i.e., OUT relative to the speaker), he or she uses a plural form metonymically to address the whole unknown group represented in the person of the one interlocutor. Further, address, for example, to a stranger in the plural has the effect of not individuating that person. One is unable to individuate things from a great DISTANCE; thus, plurality can imply DISTANCE (FAR).

2.3.3.2 What makes P OUT and FAR? UP and BIG?

Address with P is most clearly motivated by OUT and FAR. Third person address is literally addressing with a form generally reserved for someone who is not part of the conversation, for someone about whom -- not to whom -- one is speaking. A person referred to in the grammatical third person is often also physically DISTANT from the interlocutors, who typically occupy first and second person; third person address, then, is DISTANT (FAR). Third person is also OUT; the DISTANCE implied by P suggests that there is too much (metaphorical) space between the speaker and addressee to allow MEMBERSHIP IN THE SAME GROUP, to allow someone addressed as P to be in the same personal psychological space as oneself. Listen (1999: 67) comes to a similar conclusion: “simple third person address can have distancing effects other than simply

---

27 Brown and Levinson (1987: 204) note that V in this use (motivated by the concepts OUT and FAR) does not “single out the addressee, it is as if the speaker were giving [the hearer] the option to interpret it as applying to him rather than, say, to his companions”; further, persons are representatives of their group, so address to “the group” in the form of a syntactically plural structure can be directed at a single person in reality. Brown and Levinson do not label their explanation of this V as OUT and FAR [our terms] as metonymy; metonymy is, however, what they describe.
deference to the addressee" because of the "general metaphor of physical distance for non-intimacy".

But how can $P$ be understood in terms of UP and BIG? $P$, in the case of Polish, is not plural. We suggest, however, that the DISTANCE implied by third person address, although often conceived as horizontal distance, can also be conceived of in terms of verticality. Thus, $P$ address can imply DISTANCE UP. Concepts coherent with UP, then, are coherent with $P$ address.

$P$ as BIG, we suggest, can be related to the concepts THREATENING / NON-THREATENING. If something is BIG (i.e., THREATENING), we want to DISTANCE ourselves from it. Thus, the address form $P$ is coherent with the concept THREATENING, which to some extent is coherent with other concepts that are BIG (IMPORTANT, IMPERSONAL, and so on). In addition, from a DISTANCE, collectives (plural entities) appear to be one object; hearers that are conceptually MORE, then, can be addressed in the singular if they are FAR AWAY (metaphorically speaking) enough from the speaker. Thus, $P$ address, though singular, is conceptually coherent with notions of UP and BIG, which are more transparently related to plurality.

We must also discuss the existence of Polish Ppl as opposed to Vpl with respect to size and distance: Ppl (panowie, panie, państwo) is, of course, used to address a group of people formally / politely. It is the plural equivalent of $P$. We contrast Ppl with Polish Vpl, which is used (theoretically) to address a group informally / intimately; Vpl is the plural equivalent of $T$. Thus, Vpl is CLOSE and IN (second person); Vpl is also SMALL (i.e., it is a group consisting of things thought of as SMALL, or NON-THREATENING) and DOWN with respect to the speaker. Ppl is DISTANT and OUT. Ppl is also a group
consisting of things thought of as BIG, or THREATENING; it can be DISTANT in an UP direction.

2.3.3.3 What makes T DOWN and SMALL? IN and NEAR?

T is easily understood in terms of DOWN, SMALL, IN, and NEAR. First, T is grammatically singular. The concept SINGULAR means ONE, and is therefore LESS than PLURAL (MORE). Concepts coherent with LESS, then, are also coherent with SINGULAR. Since SINGULAR IS LESS, and LESS IS DOWN and SMALL, interlocutors addressed with T can be conceived of in terms of concepts that are LESS (DISRESPECT, SUBJECT TO FORCE OR CONTROL, and so on) and SMALL (UNIMPORTANT, for example).

Again, verticality and size are metaphors for social power; in terms of social intimacy, T is NEAR and IN. T is a SMALL entity, we are NOT THREATENED by it; thus we allow it into our personal (psychological) space (i.e., we allow it to be NEAR us). We also recognize T as BELONGING TO THE SAME GROUP as ourselves; we are CLOSE enough to an interlocutor to individuate him or her as a singular entity.

2.4 Conclusion

We suggest that Brown and Gilman (1960) were essentially correct in their analysis of T and V forms; power and solidarity do motivate differences in address. Brown and Gilman’s thesis that the power semantic originally structured only asymmetrical address, and solidarity only symmetrical address, is likely correct from a historical perspective.

As the literature on address in Slavic reveals, Russian, Polish, and Czech adopted either grammatically plural address (logically motivated by the power semantic, since
plurality is an “old and ubiquitous metaphor for power” [Brown and Gilman 1960:255]) or third person address (logically motivated by the iconic relationship of third person to speaker and hearer; third person is usually in the background or otherwise excluded from a conversation) to express both power and solidarity. Though plurality is a metaphor for power (UP, BIG), it can represent distance (FAR, OUT) as well; similarly, though third person is grammatically distant (FAR, OUT), it can represent power (UP, BIG).

In Polish and Czech, both plural and third person address existed side-by-side for some time; evidence from Czech is particularly revealing as to the meanings of these address forms. By the nineteenth century, Czech had a complete system of address that incorporated both plurality and third person:

Most distant / polite oni (plural and third person; UP and BIG, FAR and OUT)
vy (plural and second person; UP and BIG, NEAR and IN)
on / ona (singular and third person; DOWN and SMALL, FAR and OUT)

Least distant / polite ty (singular and second person; DOWN and SMALL, NEAR and IN)

Thus, the most distant / polite / formal pronoun, oni ‘they’, was formally plural (metaphor for power) and third person (iconically distant). Vy was more polite than on ‘he’ / ona ‘she’, which was reserved for someone to whom one could not say ty but who did not deserve plural address. The least distant / polite / formal form was singular and second person.

As societies changed, so, too, did forms of address. Standard address in Russian and Czech is now with T and V, whereas standard address in Polish is now with T and P.

---

28 As Vanek (1970: 137) explains, onkání “was used to address persons who were thought to be persons of consequence because of their social status. Thus, it was used by servants to address the children of their employers, by children of the upper classes when talking among themselves, especially on more formal occasions. On the other hand, employers addressed their servants as ty, and members of the lower classes as a rule addressed each other using this pronoun”.
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Thus, at some point, though historically plural address was implemented to represent the power of an addressee, and third person was implemented because of its associations with distance, Russian and Czech established V address to accommodate all meanings of power (UP and BIG) and (lack of) solidarity (FAR and OUT); Polish established P in the same meanings

Conceptual metaphors for power and intimacy allow encoding of social relations in T, V, and P address. Speakers, largely unconscious of their conceptualizations of social factors in terms of spatial relations, manipulate conceptual space by manipulating forms of address. Often, speakers' manipulations of space via pronouns are accompanied by a change in their own physical space in relation to their interlocutor. In subsequent chapters we examine the relationships of conceptual space, physical space, power, solidarity, and forms of address. We do this by analyzing "marginal" phenomena in Russian, Polish, and Czech: asymmetrical address, and switches in address.

In the next chapter, Chapter 3, we leave our discussion of metaphor, power, and intimacy and present the data gleaned from Russian, Polish, and Czech films and plays. Chapter 4 follows with a presentation of data obtained through a research project that involved script-writing by native speakers of the three languages. We resume our metaphorical analysis, with respect specifically to the data on asymmetrical address and switches presented in Chapters 3 and 4, in Chapter 5.

---

29 See Appendix B for a diagram demonstrating how the axes (UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL, OUT / IN, FAR / NEAR) are aligned, and how these spatial concepts relate to T, V, and P.
Chapter 3: Data from films and plays

3.1 Introduction and background

One of the most important aspects of any linguistic research project is obtaining quality data. The analysis in this dissertation is based on modern (since 1945) Russian, Czech, and Polish language data taken from plays, films, and an original script-writing project of our own design.

The focus of this dissertation is modern usage of Russian, Polish, and Czech honorific pronouns and their related forms\(^1\). This topic, however, does not lend itself to easy collection of real data. How, other than by eavesdropping on and secretly recording conversations, might one find examples of spontaneous language involving forms of address?

There is no simple solution to this problem, as I discovered during the writing of *Polite pronouns in Russian and Czech: Metaphorical motivations for their origin and usage* (Keown 1999). For that project, I conducted case studies involving two Russian native speakers (aged 28 and 65, R1 and R2, respectively, in the tables below) and two Czech native speakers (aged 21 and 67, C1 and C2, respectively) and their use of polite forms. The participants in this study were asked some general information about their background and questions about how they would address and be addressed by various

---

\(^1\) See Appendix A.
people in various situations. The following is a sample of the types of questions asked during the interviews, which were conducted in Russian and Czech, respectively (questionnaire based on Braun 1988):

R
*Kak vy obraščaetes' k kassiru v banke?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Ž</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mladše vas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vašego vozrasta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starše vas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cz*

*Jak oslovujete úředníka v bance?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Úředník</th>
<th>Úřednice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mladší než vy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stejně starý jako vy (přibližně)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starší než vy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both mean:

'How do you address a teller in a bank?'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger than you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same age as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of these interviews was threefold: first, to determine possible ways in which address can vary from the general models proposed by other scholars, and why this might happen; second, to determine if there remains a significant difference in usage of address forms between an informant of a younger generation and one of an older generation. A third goal was to ascertain to what extent native speakers are themselves
conscious of changes in pronominal address; questions were asked as to frequency of \( t_y \) over \( v_y \) now versus in the past. Also, the informants were asked if they noticed either form of address (T or V) used more in emigration than in their homeland.

The results of these interviews are presented in the charts below:

### Table 3.1: How do you address the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_y ) FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) RESPECT, DISTANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_y ) DEPARTMENT, FAMILIAR, SIMILAR, COMMON EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) UNFAMILIAR, DIFFERENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) RESPECT, AUTHORITY, FORMALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) RESPECT, FORMALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_y ) FAMILIAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) SUBORDINATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) UNFAMILIAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_y ) FAMILIAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) UNFAMILIAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) AUTHORITY, RESPECT, FORMALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonhuman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_y ) THE NATURAL WORLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) SUBORDINATION*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) RESPECT, AUTHORITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) THE NATURAL WORLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.2: How are you addressed by the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_y ) FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) DISTANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_y ) DEPARTMENT, FAMILIAR, SIMILAR, COMMON EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) UNFAMILIAR, DIFFERENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) RESPECT, FORMALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_y ) SUBORDINATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( V_y ) RESPECT, FORMALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Personnel</th>
<th>$\nu_y$ RESPECT, FORMALITY</th>
<th>$\nu_y$ FAMILIAR</th>
<th>$\nu_y$ UNFAMILIAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate at work</td>
<td>$\tau_y$ FAMILIAR</td>
<td>$\nu_y$ AUTHORITY, RESPECT</td>
<td>$\tau_y$ FAMILIAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer at work</td>
<td>$\nu_y$ UNFAMILIAR</td>
<td>$\tau_y$ FAMILIAR</td>
<td>$\nu_y$ UNFAMILIAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss at work</td>
<td>$\nu_y$ RESPECT, FORMALITY</td>
<td>$\tau_y$ SUBORDINATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarize briefly, analysis of the data from the case studies provides both expected and unexpected results. For instance, it is not surprising that all four informants address most of their family members as $\nu_y$. Nor is there anything unusual in the fact that they each claim that interactions with various personnel (librarians, secretaries, and bus drivers, for example) require $\nu_y$ without exception. At work, they each would use $\nu_y$ with a boss, but $\tau_y$ or $\nu_y$ with peers or subordinates, depending on how close their relationship is. Three of the four said the same about the university environment; if they knew a student and were in the same department as him/her, $\tau_y$ would be appropriate; otherwise, they would use $\nu_y$. These responses are in line with the norms of modern-day address.

There were, however, responses that varied from the norm. For instance, C2 (age 67) felt that $\nu_y$ address was required between students regardless of familiarity; this response, perhaps, reflects a standard that existed several decades ago. C1 was the only informant who felt a professor could rightfully address a student as $\tau_y$; it is generally accepted that at the university level, students and professors address each other as $\nu_y$. Note that C1, however, did not attend university in Czech Republic and might be basing her response on prior school experience in which asymmetrical address (from student to teacher, $\tau_y$ from teacher to student) is acceptable. Similarly, C2 says a boss can address
a subordinate as ty; again, this response might reflect her age, as asymmetrical address in
the workplace was more acceptable decades ago than it is today. R2 and C1 also claimed
ty address would be appropriate to some nonhuman beings, such as ghosts (R2) and God
and the devil (C1); the standard language requires ty address to all nonhumans.

On the whole these four speakers share many commonalties with respect to use of
polite pronouns and their related forms. These case studies were simply meant to test the
models proposed by other scholars and hint at possible deviations from the prescribed
norm. I mention this project to highlight the difficulties involved in gathering
spontaneous, natural data on address in any language. The drawbacks of the case studies
include, first of all, the low number of participants; obviously for sound statistical
analysis of modern pronoun usage one would have to conduct hundreds of such
interviews. Also, the interviews required that native speakers report on their own
linguistic usage; it is a well-known fact that interviewees often report the standard or
expected form, when in reality they use (often unconsciously) a nonstandard or simply
different form. Based on the experience of writing my M.A. thesis, I decided that a
different approach must be used to gather the data I would need for analysis in my
dissertation.

An obvious source of data involving human interactions is plays and films.
Indeed, in this dissertation, much of the data is gleaned from these sources. For Russian, I
chose the movies Kalina krasnaja (1973) and Ironija sud’by (1975), and the plays Tri
devuški v golubom (1985) by Ljudmila Petruševskaja and Utinaja oxota (1967) by
Aleksandr Vampilov. The Polish data was gleaned from the films Człowiek z marmuru
(1977) and Psy (1992), Mrożek’s play Tango (1965) and Rózewicz’s play Kartoteka

Some of the films and plays we chose for this analysis were recommended as good sources of pronoun use to reflect relationships and drive the plot. For instance, both of the Polish plays (*Tango* and *Kartoteka*) were recommended for their stylized language and wide variety of address forms. The film *Człowiek z marmuru* was recommended for examples of address during communism (V), which is different from standard Polish address (P). *Utinaja oxota* was simply recommended as a good modern Russian play.

My intent in gathering data from these films and plays was to record a broad spectrum of situations and the pronouns, gestures, and spatial orientation or movement of speakers (in the case of films) in each situation. I was particularly interested in situations involving some kind of pronominal shift (for instance, from V-V to V-T) or use of one form of address where another is expected (for instance, V to a family member). The situations taken from these films and plays were then classified according to language and address form used, and notes were made if there was anything exceptional about the usage of an address pattern in the situation (for instance, an unexpected shift, use of 2sg predicate with P, a significant change in physical distance between speakers, and so on). It should be noted that the forthcoming discussion and analysis of the dialogs from films and plays is not intended as an exhaustive account of every address form in each work. My intent, as stated above, was simply to record a variety of possible address forms that appear in various creative works.
Scripted materials provide good examples of the types of address patterns available to various people in different situations. Films especially are exceptional sources and often afford excellent illustrations of the way pronouns and their related forms can be used to manipulate the metaphorical space between interlocutors, as films also provide visual cues (gesture, physical distance between speakers, posture, and so forth) that support the notion that what is happening in the scene with regard to pronouns is more than simply linguistic convention.

I will begin the discussion of the data from plays and films in each language (Russian, Polish, Czech) with brief plot summaries of the twelve works. The data will be presented according to type of interaction: for instance, we will begin with examples of mutual (symmetrical) T address in the three languages, followed by examples of mutual (symmetrical) V address, and so on. It is important to note that the data given below consist of only a few excerpts from each play or film; this is not intended to be an exhaustive presentation of every interaction.

The reader will also note that we present the data in this dissertation in a consistent order by language: first Russian, then Polish, and lastly Czech. As we will discuss below in sections 4.3.1 and 6.2.6, the data obtained in the script-writing project described in the next chapter suggest a distribution of preferences for address forms on a cline which extends from Russian, through Polish, and into Czech. Thus, we have chosen to present all data in this order in an effort to highlight this continuum where it appears.

3.2 Plot summaries

The first Russian film we examine, Ironija sud'by ‘The irony of fate’, opens with a commentary on the “sameness” of Soviet life; specifically, there are streets and squares
with the same name in every Soviet city, and of course the high-rise suburban apartment complexes are identical all across Russia. This “sameness” is reinforced when the hero, Ženja, gets drunk with his friends and ends up, barely conscious, boarding a plane to St. Petersburg (called Leningrad at the time). When he wakes up in the airport, he believes he is still in Moscow, and takes a cab to his address. He enters what he believes to be his building, uses his key to enter what he believes to be his apartment, and falls asleep. The true owner of the apartment, Nadja, returns, followed by her fiancé, and the remainder of the film consists of resolving the relationship between these three characters and Ženja’s attempts to return to Moscow, having realized the mistake he has made.

We continue our examination of address forms with Kalina krasnaja ‘Snowball berry red’. Vasilij Šukšin’s tragic film is about an ex-con (Egor) who is trying to make a new life for himself. Upon his release from prison he goes to stay with a pen-pal (Ljuba) and her family in a small village, but is consistently alienated from the life he is trying to experience. Unable to escape his past, he is eventually killed by members of his former gang.

This film provides a glimpse into life in rural Russia; I hypothesized that perhaps address norms that vary from urban usage might be evident in a film such as this. Also, I suspected the hero’s “special” status in society as an ex-convict might affect the way people interact with him. Although there are some interesting variations in address, as we will note below, we cannot say these are due solely to the rural setting or to the hero’s social status.

Tri devuški v golubom ‘Three girls in blue’ by Ljudmila Petruševskaja tells the story of three female cousins who are spending the summer at a rundown cottage outside
of Moscow with their children, husbands if they have them, and various neighbors in the area. The main characters are Ira, a single mother and the “newcomer” to the group, and Nikolaj Ivanovič, a married neighbor who begins a relationship with her.

Finally, *Utinaja oxota* ‘Duck hunting’ by Aleksandr Vampilov is the story of an alienated man (Zilov) and the way he systematically distances himself from his friends and coworkers. The play consists of a series of flashbacks in which he separates from his wife and angers his friends; it ends with the hero’s failed suicide attempt, a final effort to complete his isolation.

Next, we examine Polish films and plays. *Człowiek z marmuru* ‘Man of marble’ is Andrzej Wajda’s film about a young woman who is making her diploma film; she is attempting to document the rise and fall of Mateusz Birkut, a shock-worker during the 1950’s. The more she discovers about Birkut, the more difficulties she has getting the film made, as the political system that made him was the very one that eventually destroyed him. Through interviews with his former coworkers, his ex-wife, and others who knew him during that time she attempts to tell his story.

The second Polish movie is from the 1990s: *Psy* ‘The pigs’ is a 1992 cop drama that follows the lives of Franz Mauer and his coworkers, former members of the secret police who are trying to adapt to life in post-communist Poland. Franz is a relatively honest policeman trying to fight drug traffickers, but he soon finds out that not everyone on the police force is on the side of justice. His best friend even betrays him, and Franz kills him for it.

We continue with Mrożek’s play *Tango*, which makes extensive use of pronouns and their related forms to emphasize, even exaggerate, relationships. *Tango* is, on the
surface, an absurd family drama in which traditional familial roles have been distorted. The older generation behaves like children, and a member of the younger generation (Artur, the hero) is trying to restore morality and maintain the traditions that he believes have long held society together. The language is highly stylized; Artur in particular addresses his family with antiquated norms (P address).

We conclude our examination of the Polish works with *Karioteka* ‘The card index’. This absurd play is about a man who cannot get out of bed. A whole cast of characters involved in his life passes in and out of his bedroom. The audience is never sure of his name or his age, as they seem to change from scene to scene. As the hero’s identity changes, so does the way others relate to him. Relationships are marked by variations in address forms.

The final group of works consists of two Czech movies and two Czech plays. The movie *Kolja* is the story of a poor cellist, František Louka, barred for political reasons from playing in the state philharmonic, who agrees to a “fake” marriage to a Russian woman in return for a handsome sum of money. As it turns out, the Russian simply wanted Czech citizenship so she would be able to escape to West Germany. She leaves her five-year-old son Kolja behind, and the cellist is forced to take care of him. By the end of the movie the cellist, a confirmed bachelor, and the boy have come to love and depend on each other. Kolja is returned to his mother -- and the cellist to the philharmonic -- when Czechoslovakia’s communist regime collapses.

Another source of interactions for analysis is *Konec velkých prázdnin* ‘The end of the great vacation’, a miniseries based on Pavel Kohout’s novel of the same name. The
film tells the stories of several families and individuals, Czechs and Slovaks, who escaped into Austria in the early 1980s.

We continue with the play *Vyšetřování ztráty třídní knihy*, a comedy by Ladislav Smoljak and Zdeněk Svěrák that takes place entirely in a classroom. The characters include the teacher (*učitel*), principal (*ředitel*), an official from the board of education (*pan zemský školní rada*), an inspector (*inspektor*) and, of course, the students (*studenti*). The plot revolves around the search for the class roll book, which the teacher has lost and believes the students have stolen. This play lends credence to the notion that, even in the simplest, most seemingly limited situation, pronouns and forms of address can indicate a great deal about the relationship of the speakers.

The final play presented here, *Výrozumění* ‘The memorandum’ by Václav Havel, takes place in the working world. Someone -- it is never clear who, simply the author of the memo -- imposes an incomprehensible artificial language on the bureaucratic establishment in which the play is set. Communication between friends and coworkers breaks down, and power struggles threaten to destroy the status quo.

Having outlined the basic plot of each film and play, we now turn to the presentation of the data gleaned from the works noted above. Again, the following is not intended to be an exhaustive account of address forms in each work, but rather a general presentation of typical patterns of address available in the three languages. We begin with mutual T situations (section 3.3), followed by mutual formal address situations (V for Russian, Czech, and communist Polish, P for Polish; section 3.4). We continue with the presentation of asymmetrical interactions followed by interactions involving shifts from one form of address to another (section 3.5).
3.3 Typical mutual T situations as represented in various creative works

In this section we give examples of mutual T interaction between characters in the twelve works we examined. These interactions include conversations between family members; friends, lovers, and others with close relationships; some coworkers. We also include here address to God, children, animals, and inanimate objects; even though T in this case is not always “mutual”, it is generally required without exception.

3.3.1 Family

One of the most common uses of mutual T involves address between family members, as in the Russian, Polish, and Czech examples below.

3.3.1.1 Russian family


The dialog above depicts speech between a mother and her young son, whereas the dialog below is a conversation between a mother and her adult son.

| Mother and son | syn: Nu i kak tebe Galja, nрависja? mat': Ty ved' na nej ženiš'sja, a ne ja. son: Well what do you [T] think about Galja- do you like her? mother: Well after all you're [T] the one who's marrying [T] her, not me. | Ironija sud'by (film) |

Regardless of age, the relationship between mother and son requires mutual T.

The next dialog represents speech between two female cousins:
| Cousins to each other | Svetlana: Tat'jan! My zabyli, u nas že est' syr. Moj v cellofane, tvoj v bumage. Tat'jana: Nesi! Svetlana: Tat'jana! We completely forgot, we have some cheese. Mine is wrapped in cellophane, yours [T] is in the paper. Tat'jana: Bring it [T]! | Tri devuški v golubom (play) |

The conversation between two cousins shows that even more distant relatives (relatives outside the immediate family) can address each other with mutual T.

The last dialog in this section is not to a family member in the traditional sense of the term, but it is appropriate that we include it in this section. The dialog involves address from Egor, the convict recently released from prison, to God in the Russian film *Kalina krasnaja*:

| to God | Egor:...Gospodi, prostia menja! Gospodi, esli možeš', ne mogu bol'še muku etu deržat'... Egor:...Lord, forgive [T] me! Lord, if you can [T], I can’t endure this torture any longer... | Kalina krasnaja (film) |

I have chosen to include God in the “family” category for a number of reasons. First, Russians (as well as Poles and Czechs) address Him as ‘our father’ R otče naš Pol ojcze nasz Cz otcé náš, as a member of the family (Matthew 6:9). We are also “children of God” (John 1:12, for example). We are made “in His image” (Genesis 1:27); thus we are like Him and He is like us. One generally uses T to address God, as the dialog above shows.

---

2 “Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God” (John 1:12).

3 “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them” (Genesis 1:27).
3.3.1.2 Polish family

Although in the excerpt below only the father uses a form of address, we can assume the young daughter would reciprocate with T. Note that she addresses him with familiar tato ‘daddy’. This film excerpt also demonstrates physical closeness between the interlocutors: the little girl runs to embrace her father as he is calling her to him.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father and daughter</th>
<th>Burski: Maryśka, ha, ha, ha! Ty!...Córeczka, chodź, chodź, chodź, chodź! Maryśia: Tato! Burski: Maryśka, ha, ha, ha! You [T]!... Little daughter, come here [T], come here [T], come here [T], come here [T]! Maryśia: Daddy!</th>
<th>they embrace</th>
<th>Człowiek z marmuru (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Brother and sister also address each other with T; the dialog comes from a scene in which a family is playing cards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>brother and sister</th>
<th>Eugenia: Dziękuję ci, Judaszu. Eugeniusz: I tak ci karta nie szła. Eugenia: Thank you [T], Judas. Eugene: Your [T] cards were no good anyway.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Tango (play)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Although the next dialog technically might not fall in the category of “family”, it is logical to include it here. In the Polish play Kartoteka, the bohater ‘hero’ has a chór starców ‘chorus of elders’ who act as his conscience and as different aspects of his personality. In this sense, they are identified as part of the hero. They consistently address him as T, and he addresses them as Vpl (the familiar Polish plural form):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hero and chorus</th>
<th>Chór starców: Rób coś, ruszaj się, myśl. On sobie leży, a czas leci. Mów coś, rób coś, posuwaj akcję, w uchu chociaż dłub!</th>
<th></th>
<th>Kartoteka (play)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Nic się nie dzieje.
Co to znaczy?
Bohater: Dajcie mi spokój.
Chór starców: Dzięki Bogu, nie śpi.
Bohater: Mówicie, że muszę coś robić? Nie
wiem...może...
Chorus of elders: Do [T] something, get a move on [T],
think [Y].

There he lies, while time flies.
Say [T] something, do [T] something,
Push [T] the action forward,
At least scratch your ear!
There is nothing happening.
What is the meaning of this?

Hero: Leave [Vpl] me alone.
Chorus of elders: Thank God, he is not asleep.
Hero: Are you saying [Vpl] I must do something? I don't
know...perhaps...

3.3.1.3 Czech family

Husband and wife use T to address each other. In this excerpt the wife is
expressing her disapproval of the plan to arrange the fake marriage between her
husband’s friend and a Russian woman:

| husband and        | Muž: Nech nás, Maruš. Máme jednání...
| wife               | Žena: Pepo, víš, co si o tom myslim.
| Muž: Klid, Maruš, nestanj se... | Husband: Leave [T] us alone, Maruš. We’re
| Husband: Leave [T] us alone, Maruš. | having a meeting...
| Wife: Pepa, you know [T] what I think about this. | Husband: Calm down, Maruš, don’t worry [T]
| Husband: Calm down, Maruš, | about it...

Below, mother and son (here, an adult son) use mutual T address, and they embrace at the
beginning of the conversation, which quickly turns less friendly when the mother asks her
son to buy new gutters for her house. However address with T remains constant despite
the change in tone:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mother and son</th>
<th>Syn: Prosim tě, mami, kde bych na to vzal ... Auto jsem prodal, veškerý úspory jsem do toho vrazil. Kde bych na to vzal?</th>
<th>they hug and kiss when they first meet</th>
<th>Kolja (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The next excerpt demonstrates, again, T use to a child from a parent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mother to son</th>
<th>Dora: Vezmi si! Poděkuji! Petřík: Děkuji.... Dora: A jez! Dora: Take [T] it! Say thank you [T]! Petřík: Thank you... Dora: So eat [T]!</th>
<th>mother bends to encourage son to take and eat apple</th>
<th>Konec velkých prázdnin (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The mother in the dialog above also bends to the child’s level to encourage him to take and eat an apple.

Evidence from the twelve films and plays suggests that address between relatives and family members is via mutual T in Russian, Polish, and Czech, regardless of the situation or the emotions or attitudes (disapproval, for instance) involved.

### 3.3.2 Friends, lovers, and others with close relationships

Mutual T appears in address between friends, lovers, and people with close relationships. We will show this in the next set of examples in each of the three languages.
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3.3.2.1 Russian close relationships

In the clip below, a dating couple uses mutual T, and by the end of the conversation, they are embracing. Their pronominal closeness is paralleled by their physical closeness:


The same is true of a different couple in the same movie; their conversation also ends with an embrace and a kiss:


Even though Ippolit does not overtly use a T form in this example, he uses the diminutive form of Nadja’s name (Naden’ka), which represents T-like behavior.

3.3.2.2 Polish close relationships

In Polish, friends address each other as T. Here Witek and Birkut, two Polish shock workers, are discussing the contribution of their bricklaying prowess:

| Friends to each other | Witek: A co ty myślisz, że na takiej budowie nie znajdzie się pięciu wariatów?... Birkut: Co ty. Vittorio? Myślisz, że je dla filmu? Ja, ty...Dla siebie, no. Witek: And what do you [T] think [T], that he | Człowiek z marmuru (film) |
Lovers and former lovers can address each other with T as well, as in the next three excerpts (one in Polish, two in Czech). The first, from Kartoteka, is a conversation between the hero and a woman he evidently used to date; she, as everyone else in the play, enters his room while he remains in bed:

| former lover and hero | Olga: *Przechodziłam i usłyszałam, że mnie wolaś...*  
Bohater: *Ja, ciebie?*  
Olga: I was passing by and heard you calling me [T]...  
Hero: Me calling you [T]? |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------|

3.3.2.3 Czech close relationships

Mutual T address between lovers is common in Czech. The couple in the first dialog is not as close as the couple in the second (as evidenced by the fact that she asks about his having been married); nevertheless, T address is appropriate:

| lovers to each other | žena: *Tys nebyl nikdy ženatej, vid?’*  
muž: Ne. Nebožtík táta mi vštěpoval:  
Jestli chceš v hudbě něčeho docílit, nežěn se. Hudba je celibát.  
žena: Celibát- nelibat.  
muž: *Ty máš škytavku nebo co...*  
woman: *You weren’t [T] ever married, right?*  
man: No. My late father beat it into my head: If you want [T] to accomplish anything in music, *don’t get married* [T]. Music is celibacy.  
woman: Celibacy- no kissing.  
man: *You [T] have [T] the hiccups or something...* | they are physically close to each other, lying in bed |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
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The couple in the following dialog has escaped together from Czechoslovakia; the woman is asking the man to lie about his marital status: he is actually married to a woman he left behind.

| lovers to each other | muž: Ty víš, že si na to nehraju, že sem i kvůli tomu chcel prýč... žena: A nakonec jsi stejně lhát musel, tchánovi i manželce, jinak bys tu teď se mnou nebyl. Tohle je práce malá lež! man: You [T] know [T] that I’m not acting, that I even wanted to leave because of it... woman: And just the same you [T] had to lie about it in the end, to your father-in-law and your wife, otherwise you wouldn’t [T] be here with me right now. After all, it’s a small lie! | they stand very close to each other | Konec velkých prázdnin (film) |

In each of the above Czech dialogs between lovers, the interlocutors are also physically close, either in bed or standing very close to each other.

### 3.3.3 Coworkers

Coworkers can address each other as T if they have a close relationship; evidence of this appears in the following Polish dialog:

| director (Burski) to production manager | Kierownik produkcji: Ja nie mogę rozpocząć, podpisz mi. Burski: No daj, to ci podpiszę. Director of production: I can’t begin, sign [T] for me. Burski: OK, give [T] it here; I’ll sign it for you [T]. | Człowiek z marmuru (film) |

### 3.3.4 Miscellaneous: children, animals, and inanimate objects

There are, of course, various other instances in which T address is appropriate. Address to young children, whether or not they are one’s own, is with T. T is also used in
circumstances in which address is not mutual by virtue of the fact that the addressee cannot talk. For example, T is the norm for address to animals and inanimate objects.

3.3.4.1 Children

When addressing any young child (not necessarily a relative), T address is appropriate, as we see in the following Czech example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult to child</th>
<th>Tak pojď. Tady nemůžeš stát takhle.</th>
<th>Adult bends down to help; he is much taller than child</th>
<th>Kolja (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note, too, that the adult bends down when he addresses the child; he decreases his own height when he tries to help the boy.

3.3.4.2 Animals

Address to an animal generally requires T in Russian, Polish, and Czech.

3.3.4.2.1 Russian animals

In the three Russian examples below, a cat, a dog, and a bird each receive T address from the speaker. In the first, a woman has been searching for a newborn kitten and finds the mother cat:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woman to cat</th>
<th>Nu čto, Elka, gde tvoy pitomec? A? Mjau!</th>
<th>Tri devuški v golubom (play)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well Elka, where is your [T] baby? Huh? Meow!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second, a (drunken) man wishes a dog “Happy New Year” and bends down to pet him:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man to dog</th>
<th>S' nastupajuščim tebe! Happy New Year to you [T]!</th>
<th>Man bends down to dog’s level when speaking to him</th>
<th>Irontija sud’by (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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In the third, a man, recently released from prison, greets a bird and even addresses it as kuma ‘godmother’, clearly a term of endearment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>man to</th>
<th>Zdorovo, kuma! Vše živé?</th>
<th>Kalina krasnaja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bird</td>
<td>Hello, godmother! You’re still alive [T]?</td>
<td>(film)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.4.2.2 Czech animals

In the Czech example, a woman addresses her puppy, whom she has been searching for, as T:


3.3.4.3 Inanimate objects

Finally, address to a personified inanimate object is with T:

3.3.4.3.1 Russian inanimate objects

In Russian, the ex-con recently released from prison addresses a birch tree as T and with two terms of endearment: nevestuška ‘bride’ and matuška ‘mother;’ both are diminutive forms as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(film)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.4.3.2 Czech inanimate objects

The driver of a car is attempting to escape to freedom from communism by running through a checkpoint at a border crossing; at the crucial moment, his car stalls. He addresses the car with T.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>driver to car</th>
<th>Jed! Jed!, vole!! Go [T]! Go [T], dude!!</th>
<th>Konec velkých prázdnin (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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3.3.5 Summary of T address

Thus, close relationships (family, including God; friends; lovers; and sometimes coworkers) generally require T address, as does address to children, animals, and inanimate objects.

The following chart summarizes the data presented above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>interlocutors</th>
<th># examples, language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>mother and son</td>
<td>2 R, 2 Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cousins</td>
<td>1 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father and daughter</td>
<td>1 Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brother and sister</td>
<td>1 Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>husband and wife</td>
<td>1 Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chorus of elders</td>
<td>1 Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God</td>
<td>1 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and intimates</td>
<td>lovers</td>
<td>2 R, 2 Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>friends</td>
<td>1 Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>former lovers</td>
<td>1 Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>coworkers</td>
<td>1 Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>cat</td>
<td>1 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dog</td>
<td>1 R, 1 Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bird</td>
<td>1 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child (not a relative)</td>
<td>1 Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tree</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>car</td>
<td>1 Cz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Typical mutual formal address (V / P) situations as represented in various creative works

The films and plays analyzed also contained numerous interactions in which each interlocutor addressed the other as V (or P), or in which symmetrical V or P address is implied (by the use of other terms of address, for instance). These situations include business transactions, highly scripted situations and official settings, and the work environment. Mutual V or P address is also generally required between new acquaintances and strangers.
3.4.1 Business transactions and scripted situations

We classify business transactions as ones in which there is some sort of service performed, the interlocutors normally do not know each other’s names, and there is no ongoing relationship or contact beyond the setting of the transaction. Business transactions are impersonal transactions; the situation requires mutual V or P address.

Scripted situations can consist of similar circumstances, such as when a defendant addresses a judge in court: the judge and defendant generally do not have a personal relationship outside the courtroom, and often names are not used at all (titles such as “your honor”, “the defendant”, “the witness” often substitute for names in courtroom proceedings).

Alternatively, the speakers in scripted situations might have a personal relationship outside of the location of their impersonal interactions, as is the case in many governmental proceedings. The scripted formality of the situation, however, requires that the speakers address each other as V or P.

3.4.1.1 Russian business transactions

Examples of business transactions found in these plays and films include, for instance, a postman trying to deliver a letter to its recipient (here, Zilov):

| postman, behind door, and man | 
|---|---|---|
| 
| golos: Počta.  
Zilov: Davajte.  
golos: Raspišites’.  
voice: Mail.  
Zilov: OK (lit. give [V]).  
voice: Sign [V]. |  
| Utinaja oxota (play) |
Mutual V is required between two people negotiating an announcement to be printed in a publication. V is required even after Irina has given her first name (unlike in Polish, where first names generally imply T address):

| client and editor | Zilov: *A zovut vas kak?*  
Irina: *Irina.*  
Sajapin: *Xorošoe (sic!) imja.*  
Zilov: *Nu i čto, Irina? Kak že vy dal 'še budete žit?*  
Irina: *Esli vy napečatae ob "javlenie...*  
Zilov: And what's your [V] name?  
Irina: Irina.  
Sajapin: Good name.  
Zilov: Well so, Irina? What next (lit. How are you [V] going to [V] go on living)?  
Irina: If you'll [V] print [V] a notice... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utinaja oxota (play)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V address is appropriate between a waiter and his customer, even when the topic of conversation extends outside the realm of the restaurant:

| customer and waiter | Egor: *Prisad 'te, požalujsta...Skažite požalujsta, ja toľko čto priexal s zolotýx priškov, i xoču vas prosit': ne mogli by my gde-nibuď organizovať nebol'soj zabeg v širinu, takoj, znaete, bardel'ero?...Kak vas zovut?*  
Mixajlyč: *Sergej Mixajlovič.*  
Egor: Mixalyč...nužen prazdnik. Ja slíškom dolgo byl na severe, *ponjali?*  
Mixajlyč: Ja, kažetsja, pridural. Vy gde ostanovils'?'  
Egor: Sit down [V], please...Please tell [V] me, I just arrived from the gold fields, and I want to ask you [V]: would it not be possible to organize a little sex party, you know [V], women... What's your [V] name?  
Mixajlyč: *Sergej Mixajlovič.*  
Egor: Mixalyč...I need a holiday. I was in the north for too long, get it [V]?  
Mixajlyč: I figured as much. Where are you [V] staying [V]? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon Egor's invitation, waiter sits down, effectively equalling their respective heights and decreasing the distance between them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalina krasnaja (film)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In this example, address remains on mutual V, but the waiter's sitting down with the customer (Egor) signals a shift in their relationship; they move from "participants in a business transaction" to "new acquaintances." However, both situations generally require V.

3.4.1.2 Polish business transactions

In Polish, formal address is normally with P; during communism, however, the "official" form of address was V, and it was used (by communists to each other) much like it is in Russian and Czech. For example, address between Mateusz Birkut, a model bricklayer, and the secretary of the official investigating his friend Vittorio is with V:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>man and secretary</th>
<th>Birkut: Może się zapytacie, czy ja też tam mogę wejść...</th>
<th>Człowiek z marmuru (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sekretarka: Tam? Ależ oczywiście. Sama się dziwię, że tak czekacie i czekacie. Proszę, towarzyszy pułkownik chętnie was przyjmie.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birkut: Could you [V] ask [V] if I could go in there too...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary: In there? But of course. I was wondering myself why you are waiting [V] and waiting [V]. Please, comrade colonel will be glad to see you [V].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to business transactions, certain settings simply demand mutual formal address. For instance, in Polish, formal address is required when giving or conducting an news interview. In this case, a man is asking the shock worker Birkut for his thoughts on an election; he is interviewing him at the polling place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer and interviewee</th>
<th>mężczyzna: Nic podobnego. Po prostu pracujemy. Tak jak pan...i wszyscy.</th>
<th>Człowiek z marmuru (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birkut: Niech pan pyta. man: Nothing of the kind. We’re simply doing our job. Just like you [P]...and everybody.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note, however, that address in this case is not with V, but with P. This could indicate that the interviewer is not a communist, or that he did not feel communist address particularly appropriate at the moment.

3.4.1.3 Czech business transactions

Several business and official transactions occur in the Czech films and dramas we examined. In *Konec velkých prázdnin*, we find mutual V address between Lydia, a concert pianist, and her agent’s assistant. They have never met:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>client and assistant</th>
<th>Asistentka: Přejet si?</th>
<th>Lydia: Dobrý den... Vý jste tu nová, že? Řekněte ji, že je tu Lydia.</th>
<th>Konec velkých prázdnin (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant: Can I help you [V]?</td>
<td>Lydia: Good day... You’re [V] new here, aren’t you? Tell [V] her that Lydia is here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In *Kolja*, we find examples of mutual V use during Louka’s interview with the secret police. They are investigating his fake marriage to a Russian woman who has escaped to West Germany. In this conversation, Louka is talking to the “good cop” Pokorný; the “bad cop” appears sometime later (see section 3.5.1.3 below on asymmetrical address):
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Louka: No.  
Pokorný: Well you can’t [V] do this to us, this,  
with the child...Well come on [Vpl], both of you.  
What’s with you [V]...This hasn’t happened  
before, I’ll tell you [V].  
Louka: You [V] don’t have [V] children?  
Pokorný: I do, but I don’t bring them to work with  
me.

In *Konec velkých prázdnin*, the doctor and his patient Dora use V to address each  
other. Dora was injured while escaping to Austria with her husband and son; her son died  
in the attempt. Dora is discussing returning to Czechoslovakia with her son’s body:

| patient and doctor | Dora: Myslíte... ne! Matka jen věří, že  
by mě zase přemluvil, a toho se bojím i  
já. Vždycky jsem se dala... a na to  
doplatil chudák Petřík, víte?  
Doktor: Když se dá přemluvit člověk tak  
silný jako vy, ale ano! vy jste velmi  
silná, jen si to odmítáte přiznat, jak jste  
si zvykla nechávat rozhodnutí jiným!  
když se dá někdo tak inteligentní i  
zkušený přemluvit, znamená to vždy, že  
měl proč.  
Dora: You think [V]...no! My mother  
just believes that he would talk me into  
something again, and I’m afraid of that  
too. I always gave in...and poor Petřík  
paid for it, you know [V]?
Doctor: If a strong a person as you [V]  
lets herself, but yes! You [V] are [V]  
very strong, you only refuse [V] to  
 risking it, as you are [V] used to leaving  
decision-making to others! If someone  
so intelligent and experienced lets  
herself be persuaded, it always means  
that there’s a reason. | she touches  
doctor on arm;  
he does not respond | *Konec velkých  
prázdnin* (film) |
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Dora, who is visibly upset, reaches out to the doctor for reassurance, both verbally and physically. She touches his arm, but he does not respond; he also refuses to give her advice as to what to do: stay in Austria or return to Czechoslovakia.

3.4.2 Coworkers

People working together can address each other with mutual formal address in Russian, Polish, and Czech:

3.4.2.1 Russian coworkers

In Utinaja oxota, a boss (Kušak) and his subordinate (Zilov) address each other as V, despite their differences in status in the corporation and the fact that the boss is furious with his underling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boss and subordinate</th>
<th>Utinaja oxota (play)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zilov: Šef, čto slučilos'?</td>
<td>Zilov: Čto v[y] govorite!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kušak: Ah, razumeetsja, vy ničego ne znaete...</td>
<td>Zilov: What's wrong, boss?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilov: Čto, zdes' est' kakie-nibud' netočnosti?</td>
<td>Kušak: Oh, of course, you [V] don't know [V] a thing...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kušak: Netočnosti?...Otično skazano! Ne dumal, čto vy takoj skromnyj. Netočnosti! Da tut splošnoe vran'ë!</td>
<td>Zilov: What, are there some inaccuracies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lož'!...</td>
<td>Kušak: Inaccuracies?...Well put! I didn't think you [V] were so modest. Inaccuracies! There are outright lies!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilov: Čto v[y] govorite!</td>
<td>Lies!...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilov: What's wrong, boss?</td>
<td>Zilov: You don't say [V]!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2.2 Polish coworkers

In Człowiek z marmuru, we once again find the mutual V address of communism between a movie director (Burski) and the communist party secretary (Jodła) during the filming of a movie about the shock worker Mateusz Birkut and his crew's outstanding bricklaying skills:
3.4.2.3 Czech coworkers

Havel’s *Vyrozumění* is set almost entirely in a bureaucratic work environment. We find mutual V address between boss and subordinate when they are discussing the appearance of a mysterious memo:

| boss and subordinate | Gross: Haničko-Hana: Prostím, kolego řediteli? Gross: Nevíte, co to je? Hana: To je velice důležité úřední vyrozumění, kolego řediteli...Asi vám to zapomněli říct. Gross: Hanička-Hana: Yes, colleague director? Gross: You don’t know [V] what this is, do you? Hana: That is a very important official memo, colleague director...They probably forgot to tell you [V]. | Vyrozumění (play) |

Notice, however, that despite their mutual V address, the boss (Gross) addresses Hana very informally by using the diminutive of her name, Hanička. Hana, by contrast, addresses Gross not by his name, but very formally by his title: kolega ředitel ‘colleague director’.

Outside the office setting, in a completely different work environment, we find mutual V address appropriate as well. The next dialog occurs between a gravedigger (Brož) and Louka, who works repainting letters on gravestones.
| gravedigger and grave painter | Brož: *Heleďte, mám pro vás tisice zakázek. Tři ve zlatě a dvě ve stříbře. Tady to máte podchycený, římský jsou oddělení a arabský jsou čísla hrobů.*
Louka: *No, to je krása. Hrobník jako vy, pane Brož, to je radost pro celé hřbitov. Dík.*
Brož: *Look [V], I have thousands of orders for you [V]. Three in gold and two in silver. Here's a list for you [V], the roman numerals are the sections and the arabic numerals are the grave numbers.*
Louka: *Wow, this is great. A gravedigger like you [V], Mr. Brož, is a joy for the whole cemetery. Thanks.* | Kolja (film) |
|---|---|---|
| Teacher and principal | Učitel: *No, pane řediteli, není to malíčkost. Skoro se váš to bojím říct.*
Ředitel: *Ale jádete, pane kolego, snad ono to nebude tak hrozně.*
Teacher: *Well, Mr. Principal, this is no small thing. I'm almost scared to tell you [V].*
Principal: *Go on [V], colleague, it probably won't be that terrible.* | Výšetřování ztráty třídní knihy (play) |

3.4.3 Distant relatives

Moving outside the world of work and other scripted situations, we note that address to distant relatives (especially in-laws) can be with mutual V.

3.4.3.1 Russian distant relatives

Although not a complete dialog, the excerpt below demonstrates that Ira, a newcomer to the dacha (where the play is set) and a distant cousin of Svetlana’s, does not feel comfortable enough to address her relative as T:
3.4.3.2 Czech distant relatives

In *Konec velkých prázdnin*, we find mutual V address between Milan and his mother-in-law, who hold no love for each other. The mother-in-law has just arrived in Austria after being notified of an accident involving her daughter and grandson while the family was escaping from Czechoslovakia. She blames Milan for the fact that her daughter Dora is in the hospital and her grandson Petřík is dead:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother-in-law and son-in-law</th>
<th>Milan: <em>Chcete nejdříve do hotelu... Tchyně: Chci rovnou k ní!</em> Milan: <strong>Do you want</strong> [V] to go to the hotel first... mother-in-law: I want to go straight to her!</th>
<th>She refuses help with suitcase; she leads the way, he walks behind</th>
<th><em>Konec velkých prázdnin</em> (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Tchyně: Bulharsko! Moře pro Petříka! že vy jste podobné šílenosti schopen, jsem věděla vždycky, jen jsem netušila, že naučíte lhát i Doru. ...A vy jste dlužen návrat nejen jí, ale hlavně svému synovi. Vy, český herce, jste mu chtěl vztit mateřský jazyk?... Vy jste totiž vrah. Vy jste je zabil oba.</em> Mother-in-law: Bulgaria! The sea for Petřík! I’ve always known that you [V] were [V] capable of such insanity, but I never dreamed that you’d teach [V] Dora to lie too...And you [V] owe [V] not only her, but mainly your son, a return home. You [V], a Czech actor, wanted to take his native language from him?...You [V] are [V] a complete enemy. You [V] killed them both.</td>
<td>He walks behind her; the situation is tense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mother-in-law and son-in-law speak only with mutual V. In addition, she walks far in front of him and refuses his help with her bags. The two consistently keep their distance (physically and linguistically) from each other.

### 3.4.4 New acquaintances

Interactions with new acquaintances demand mutual formal address in all three languages.

#### 3.4.4.1 Russian new acquaintances

In the first dialog below, Ženja is imploring Ippolit, the boyfriend of the strange woman whose apartment he found himself in in St. Petersburg, not to leave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>male and male</th>
<th>Ženja: <strong>Podoždite! Ne uezżajte! Izvinite, ja ne znaju vašego otčestva!</strong></th>
<th>Ironija sud'by (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ženja: <strong>Wait [V]! Don’t go [V]! Excuse [V] me, I don’t know your patronymic.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the polite way to address a new acquaintance is with V and first name and patronymic; however, as Ženja comments, he only knows the boyfriend’s name, and he does not want to be rude in addressing him.

Address between Ira, newcomer to her distant family’s dacha, and Nikolaj Ivanovič, whom she had just met on the train on the way to the country house, is with V. His dacha is not far from her family’s, and he drops in unexpectedly to see her; Ira’s child is sick with a fever:

| Ira and Nikolaj Ivanovič | Ira: **A, vy tot čelovek iz električky...**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nikolaj Ivanovič: <strong>A gde syn? Gladite, kakoj solidnyj! Temperatura est’?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ira: <strong>Sorok.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                           | Ira: **Ah, you’re [V] that person from the train...**
|                           | Nikolaj Ivanovič: But where’s your son? **Look [V] how strapping he is! Does he have a temperature?** |
|                           | Ira: Forty. |
|                           | **Tri devuški v golubom (play)** |
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3.4.4.2 Polish new acquaintances

In Polish, similarly, mutual P is required between new acquaintances. For instance, when Agnieszka, in her attempt to research the shock worker Birkut for her documentary, meets Michalak, the security officer who investigated Birkut’s accident at a worksite, they address each other as P. Michalak now runs a strip club, and Agnieszka interviews him there:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>female and male</th>
<th>Agnieszka: Przepraszam, czy <strong>pan</strong> dyrektor Michalak?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michalak: Tak, słucham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnieszka: Mam do <strong>pана</strong> list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michalak: A <strong>pani</strong> strip-tease czy topless?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnieszka: Excuse me, are <strong>you</strong> [P] director Michalak?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michalak: Yes, I’m listening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnieszka: I have a letter for <strong>you</strong> [P].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michalak: Do <strong>you</strong> [P] strip or go topless?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michalak obviously assumes Agnieszka has come to see him for a different purpose.

When Agnieszka finally finds Birkut’s son and wants to talk to him about his father the shock worker, she uses P with him and he reciprocates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>female and male</th>
<th>Agnieszka: <strong>Szukam</strong> pańskiego ojca.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maciek: <strong>Mojego</strong> ojca?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnieszka: <strong>Robilam</strong> film o <strong>pańskim</strong> ojcu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maciek: <strong>Pani</strong>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnieszka: I’m looking for <strong>your</strong> [P] father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maciek: My father?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnieszka: I made a film about <strong>your</strong> [P] father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maciek: <strong>You</strong> [P] did?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agnieszka eventually has an ongoing relationship with Maciek (she marries him in the sequel); however, when they first meet, they address each other with P.
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3.4.4.3 Czech new acquaintances

When Dora, having decided to stay in Austria after escaping from Czechoslovakia, finds herself in a bar having champagne with a handsome stranger, she addresses him, and he her, as V:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>female and male</th>
<th>he touches her hand and is awkward</th>
<th>Konec velkých prázdnin (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

He makes an attempt at physical intimacy by touching her hand as they are talking; however, she is clearly uncomfortable. They continue to address each other as V, even after they have “consummated” their relationship (see section 3.5.3.3 below).

3.4.5 Strangers

Address to complete strangers is generally formal (V or P).

3.4.5.1 Russian strangers

In Russian, for instance, Ženja, after drinking with his friends in the banja on New Year’s Eve, finds himself in a strange airport and, still quite drunk, tries to ascertain his location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>man and stranger at airport</th>
<th>neznakomec: Molodoj čelovek, ostorožno! Ženja: Gde ja? neznakomec: Tam že, gde i ja! Ženja: A vy gde? neznakomec: V aeroportu...Vý vstrečali Nový God v vozduxe?...Ne nado familiar’nost’!</th>
<th>Ženja is leaning on the stranger, because he is drunk, but maintains linguistic distance.</th>
<th>Ironija sud’by (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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stranger: Young man, watch out!
Ženja: Where am I?
stranger: You're where I am!
Ženja: And where are you [V]?
stranger: In the airport...Did you [V] greet [V] the New Year in the air?...We don't need this familiarity!

Ženja is leaning on the stranger; he is very drunk, yet he maintains linguistic distance by addressing the stranger as V. However, the man is clearly uncomfortable with the encroachment on his physical space and exclaims ne nado familiarnost 'we don't need this familiarity!'

When Nadja returns home and finds a strange man (the drunken Ženja, who thinks he is in his apartment in Moscow) in her bed, she tries to wake him without getting too close to him. The strangers address each other with V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>female and male strangers</th>
<th>Nadja: Vstavajte! Vy živoj ili net?...Čto vy zdes' delaete?</th>
<th>Ženja: Malo togo što vy vorvalis' ko mne v kvaritu, vy vedete sebja kak banditka!</th>
<th>She is trying to keep her distance, but wake him up</th>
<th>Ironija sudь by (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nadja: Get up [V]! Are you [V] alive or not?...What are you [V] doing [V] here?</td>
<td>Ženja: It’s not enough that you [V] burst [V] into my apartment, you’re [V] acting [V] like a gangster!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, Nadja maintains the physical and linguistic space between her and the stranger in her apartment.

3.4.5.2 Czech strangers

When Dora is asked directions by a stranger, the two use mutual V address, as the following example shows.
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female and male strangers | **Dora:** Aha! měl jste zabočit doprava o křížovatku dřív. **neznakomec:** Nejde te tím směrem?. **Dora:** Vlastně... **neznakomec:** To mám štěstí, mohu vás poprosit k sobě? **Dora:** Aha! **You** [V] should have turned right at the last intersection. **Stranger:** **You’re not going** [V] this direction are you? **Dora:** That very direction... **Stranger:** That’s great, can I offer you [V] a ride? | **Konec velkých prázdnin** (film)

### 3.4.6 Summary of V address

Thus, business transactions and other scripted situations, as well as the work environment, require mutual V (or P) between interlocutors under normal circumstances. Address with distant relatives can be with mutual formal address, and new acquaintances and complete strangers generally speak to one another with V (or P).

The chart below presents a summary of the examples examined above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>situation</th>
<th>interlocutors</th>
<th># examples, language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>business transaction</td>
<td>postman and man</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>client and editor</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>customer and waiter</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>client and assistant</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scripted situation</td>
<td>interviewer and interviewee</td>
<td>1P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interrogated and investigator</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>patient and doctor</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coworkers</td>
<td>boss and subordinate</td>
<td>1R, 1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>movie director and party secretary</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gravedigger and grave painter</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher and principal</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant relatives</td>
<td>distant cousin and distant cousin</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mother-in-law and son-in-law</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new acquaintances</td>
<td>female and male</td>
<td>2R, 2Pol, 1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strangers</td>
<td>male and male</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female and male</td>
<td>1R, 1Cz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.5 Less typical address situations as represented in various creative works

We continue our presentation of data gleaned from movies and plays by examining some of the situations involving more unusual forms of address, those in which asymmetrical or a shift in address (usually leading to asymmetry) is found. We have also included in this section examples of mutual address in unusual or unexpected circumstances (for instance, mutual T address between two strangers). The situations we survey include business transactions and scripted situations, coworkers, friends and acquaintances, strangers, and family relations.

3.5.1 Business transactions and scripted situations

We begin by examining a broad range of dialogs that fall under the general auspices of business transactions and other highly scripted situations.

3.5.1.1 Russian business transactions

In this first excerpt, from Utinaja oxota, we find a messenger boy and the hero Zilov engaged in a business transaction: the boy is delivering a funeral wreath to Zilov’s apartment (as a practical joke from Zilov’s friends). Notice that Zilov initially uses a V form to address the boy, who, at that moment, was unseen, as he had simply knocked on our hero’s apartment door. Zilov responds “Come in” using the formal imperative form, for he did not know who was on the other side of the door. Then, however, realizing that the boy is about twelve years old, Zilov begins addressing him as T. The boy, of course, addresses Zilov as V.

| man and messenger boy | Zilov: Vojdite! 
| Mal’čik: Zdravstvujte. Skažite, vy Zilov? 
| Zilov: Nu ja. 
| Mal’čik: Vam. 
| Zilov: Mne? Začem? Slušaj, paren’, ty čto-to putaeš’... 
| Mal’čik: Vy- Zilov? | Utinaja oxota (play) |
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The next situation, from *Kalina krasnaja*, is somewhat unusual in that Egor, newly released from prison in far northern Russia, addresses and is addressed by a cab driver as T.

| passenger and taxi driver | Šofer: *Rad?*  
Egor: Rad. Rad, rad. Vidiš'...esli b u menja byli 3 žizni, ja by odnu prosidel v torme..., druguju otdal by tebe, a už trećju prožil by sam, kak xoču...  
Driver: *Are you happy* [T]?  
Egor: I'm happy. Happy, happy. *You see* [T]...if I had three lives, I'd spend one in prison..., the second I'd give to you [T], and the third I'd spend the way I wanted... | *Kalina krasnaja*  
(film) |

Address between a taxi driver and his customer would normally, of course, require mutual V. This is perhaps an example of rural speech, in which the “formalities” of urban life are not required all the time.

In the dialog below, Egor, the ex-con, is trying to make a pass at a bank teller by addressing her with a diminutive and T. At the same time, he leans toward her,
decreasing the distance between them. She, however, staunchly maintains her distance from him by reprimanding him with V; when she does this, he backs away and re-establishes the appropriate distance between them (both physically and metaphorically).

| customer and bank teller | Kassírša: A vam čto?  
Egor: Lapulen’ka, a čto esli my voz ’mem i obraduemsja na paru, a?  
Čego smotriš’? Groši est’.  
Kassírša: Graždanin! Vy iut ne xamite! Vy den ’gi perevodite? Vot i perevodite.  
Teller: And what do you [V] need?  
Egor: Darling, how about we take off and enjoy some intimate pleasure? Why are you looking [T] like that? I have money.  
Teller: Citizen! You [V] are not to be rude [V] here! Are you [V] wiring [V] money? Then wire [V] it. | he leans in when he is talking; when she rebukes him, he backs away | Kalina krasnaja (film) |

3.5.1.2 Polish business transactions

Polish speakers, like Russian speakers, can adjust their forms of address to reflect changes in perceptions of their relationships (or to effect changes in their relationships).

For example, in the following excerpt from Człowiek z marmuru, Michalak, a government security officer, is investigating an accident that occurred on the work site where the shock worker Birkut’s crew was demonstrating an innovative method of bricklaying. In what was clearly an act of sabotage, Birkut’s hands were burned by acid.

| security officer and shock worker(s) | Michalak: Dobry wieczor, towarzyszu Birkut. Nie śpicie? Ja was rozumiem.  
Trudno spać po czymś takim.  
Porządnie was opatrzyli, co? Jodynką posmarowali?...Boli?  
Witek: Pewno, że boli. A wyście myśleli, że jak?...  
Michalak: A wy, jak podawaliście towarzyszowi cegłę, nie czuliście, że gorąca? | Birkut gets up, increases his height to even with Michalak, and decreases the distance between them | Człowiek z marmuru (film) |
Witek: Ja w rękawiczkach robiłem.
Michalak: W rękawiczkach. W grubych, co?
Witek: W takich sobie.
Michalak: A, w takich sobie. Dawno macie ten ischias?
Witek: Nie, to tylko tak powiedziałem, żeby się odczepili. Jakaś franca mi wyskoczyła—eczema, czy jak mówią; nie wiem.
Michalak: Eczema... Pokażcie no te rączki... Pokażcie no rączki!
Witek: No i co? Jest?
Michalak: Co wy, ludzie? Na żartach się nie znacie, czy co?
Birkut: Ty, słuchaj. Kto ty właściwie jesteś, co? Tak się włączysz za nami...
Ty, odczep się, dobrze?
Michalak: Good evening, comrade
Birkut. Not sleeping [V]? I understand you [V]. It’s hard to sleep after something like that. Did they look after you [V] OK? Did they apply iodine? ...Does it hurt?
Witek: Of course it hurts. What do you [V] think?...
Michalak: And you [V], as you were handing [V] your comrade the brick, did you not feel [V] that it was hot?
Witek: I was wearing gloves.
Michalak: Gloves. Thick ones, right?
Witek: Sort of.
Michalak: Ah, sort of thick. Have you had [V] that sciatica for long?
Witek: No, I just said that so they’d buzz off. Some kind of annoying rash popped up on me—eczema or however they say it, I don’t know.
Michalak: Eczema... Show [V] me your hands! Well show [V] me your hands!
Witek: Well! There it is!
Michalak: What’s with you [Vpl], fellas? You can’t take [Vpl] a joke, or what?
Birkut: Listen [T], you [T]. Just who
are [T] you [T]? You’re [T] always hanging around [T] us...You [T] get out [T] of here, OK?

Notice that Birkut and Witek (Birkut’s friend and coworker) address and are addressed by Michalak with the V of communism in this official-type situation. However, when Birkut becomes angry with Michalak for insinuating Witek might have committed the sabotage, he switches to T and moves from a sitting to a standing position and decreases the distance between himself and the security officer. This represents a very aggressive use of T.

In the situation presented below, a drunken and apathetic Birkut is attempting to pay for his dinner at a restaurant, a transaction that normally requires mutual P address. Birkut, however, uses only a T form, and the waiter uses a combination of P and T forms in response. Birkut adjusts his height and distance from the waiter as well.


The next dialog, from Psy, is fairly typical of real usage; here P is used to address a single person, but Vpl is used to address a group. Vpl, although by definition the
"intimate" plural and the plural equivalent of T, seems in fact to be the more generic plural. Ppl forms seem to be somewhat marked (see also section 6.2.8).

The dialog is between Wencel, a member of a commission investigating an accidental shooting of a police officer, and Franz Mauer, one of the policemen on the force:

| policeman and member(s) of commission | Wencel: Czy pan był świadkiem zdarzenia, kiedy to porucznik Żwirski użył broni palnej przeciwko jednemu z nowych oficerów, na wysypisku miejskim? | Franz: Nic mi o tym nie wiadomo. Spytajcie Ola, on będzie wiedział najlepiej, kogo ostatnio zabił... Wencel: Pan mi nie udziela rad! To pan stoi przed Komisją, a nie ja. Franz: Czasy się zmieniają, ale pan zawsze jest w Komisjach... Kobieta z Komisji: Czy jest pan gotów stać na straży porządku prawnego, odnowionej, demokratycznej Rzeczpospolitej Polski? Wencel: Were [P] you [P] a witness to the brawl when lieutenant Żwirski used a firearm against one of the new officers at the city dump? Franz: I don’t know anything about it. Ask [V? / Vpl?] Olo, he’ll know better who he killed lately... Wencel: You [P] will not give [P] me advice! You’re [P] the one standing [P] before the Commission, not me. Franz: Times change, but you’re [P] always on the Commissions... Woman from the Commission: Are [P] you [P] prepared to stand guard of law and order, of the renewed democratic Republic of Poland? |
| Psy (film) |

An official hearing would logically require mutual P address between all parties involved in the proceedings; the use of Vpl to address the commission, however, should not necessarily be perceived as an insult. As mentioned above and discussed in section 6.2.8 below, Vpl often replaces Ppl, especially in the imperative.
Another setting which requires mutual formal address is the courtroom. In the
dialog below, Birkut is supposed to be testifying against his friend Witek, who is accused
of sabotaging a bricklaying demonstration by burning Birkut’s hands with acid.

| Judge and witness | Przewodniczący sądu: I pytam, czy świadek
wiedział coś o tym zamachu.
Birkut: No pewnie. Wszystko wiedziałem, proszę
wysokiego sądu.
Przewodniczący sądu: Chwileczkę; może świadek
nie zrozumiał pytania?
Birkut: A co miałem nie zrozumieć? Przecież sąd
sę jasno wyraził. Wiem wszystko i wszystko
wiedziałem od samego początku!
Przewodniczący sądu: Jak to? On na was, a wy na
niego? Przecież to idiotyzm! Oskarżony nie mógł
wiedzieć o waszej działalności! Oskarżony uważał
was za oddanego aktywistę... Proszę świadka,
tutaj, w aktach...Zresztą mogę świadowi
przeczytać; świadek zeznaje zupełnie co innego!
Judge: And I am asking whether you [P] (lit the
witness) knew [P] something about this incident.
Birkut: Well of course. I knew everything, I beg
you [P](lit. I ask the high judge).
Judge: Just a minute; perhaps you [P] (lit. the
witness) didn’t understand [P] the question?
Birkut: What’s not to understand? After all you
[P] (lit. the judge) clearly expressed yourself [P]
(lit. himself). I know everything and knew
everything from the very beginning!...
Judge: How’s that? He’s accusing you [V], and
you [V] him? After all that’s idiocy! The accused
wasn’t able to know about your [V] actions! The
accused took you [V] for a devoted activist!...I am
asking you [P](lit. the witness), here, in the
files...Besides I can read it to you [P] (lit. to the
witness); you [P] are testifying [P] to something
entirely different! |

| Człowiek z marmuru
(film) |

Two things are worthy of note in this dialog. First, the mutual P address exchanged
between the judge and the witness does not involve *pan* but instead titles naming their
respective roles in the courtroom: *świadek* `witness` and *sąd* `the court`. Note, too, that
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the judge is addressed as the entity for which he stands (sąd), not as sędzia ‘judge’.

Further, there is a shift from P address to V address in one section of the dialog: the judge exclaims, confused, On na was, a wy na niego?... Oskarżony nie mógł wiedzieć o waszej działalności! Oskarżony uważał was za oddanego aktywistę! ‘He’s accusing you [V], and you [V] him?...The accused wasn’t able to know about your [V] actions! The accused took you [V] for a devoted activist!’ The shift from P is a break in convention and does seem to represent a change in attitude by the judge; he is in disbelief, trying to confirm an outrageous statement by the witness Birkut.

3.5.1.3 Czech business transactions

As with the Russian and Polish works we examined, the Czech films and plays offer several scenes in which norms of address in a business transaction or other official situation are violated in some way. For example, in the dialog below from Kolja, Louka is undergoing an interrogation regarding his marriage to a Russian woman who has emigrated to West Germany. In the mutual address section above, we saw an example of mutual V address between the first investigator (Pokorny) and Louka. However, when the second interrogator, Captain Novotný, becomes tired of Louka’s evasive answers, he switches from V to T, approaches him, and threatens him with prison.

| interrogated and interrogator | Kapitán Novotný: Poslechněte, milej zlatej, vy máte na svý příbuzný řádek špatnej vliv, ne? Bratr vám emigroval, žena vám emigrovala...Co? Ví jste spolu po tý svatbě moc nezíli, v tý vaší věži, co? Nikdo jí tam aspoň neviděl. Louka: Jsme spolu pár dní žili, ale nerozuměli jsme si. Ona ruský, já česky... Kapitán Novotný: Toho jste si před svatbou nevším zřejmě, že neumí česky. Louka: Všim, ale tam byly i jiný věci, v | Novotný approaches Louka, who is sitting, right before he switches to T; backs away when he returns to V | Kolja (film) |
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čem jsme se neshodli. Furt větrala například, jak byla z Sibíře zvýklá na zimy... Tak jsme si řekli, že budeme žít každé zvlášť.
Kapitán Novotný: No. Tak srandiček bylo dost a teď budeme klopit. Kolik jsi za tu šaškárnu dostal?
Louka: Zatím jsme si netykali tady.
Kapitan Novotný: My si netykáme, milej zlatej. Já ti tykám. To je rozdíl. Poněvadž muklém já tykám. A ty budeš sedět. Na něco jsem se tě ptal... Kde jste vzel peníze na toho trabanta?
Captain Novotný: Listen [V], golden boy, you [V] have [V] some kind of a bad influence on your relatives, don’t you? Your brother emigrated on you [V], your wife emigrated on you [V]...well? You didn’t live together much in that tower of yours [V] after the wedding, did you? At least no one saw her there.
Louka: We lived there together a couple of days, but we didn’t understand each other. She speaks Russian, I speak Czech...
Captain Novotný: Of course before the wedding you [V] didn’t notice that, that she didn’t speak Czech.
Louka: I noticed it, but there were other things, too, that we didn’t agree on. She always had the windows open, for instance, because she was used to the cold in Siberia...so we decided that we’d live separately.
Captain Novotný: Ok. That’s enough of that fun- now we’ll get serious. How much did you [T] get for this foolishness?
Louka: We haven’t been speaking on “ty” here.
Captain Novotný: We’re not speaking on “ty”, golden boy. I am saying “ty” to you [T]. Because I say “ty” to jailbirds. That’s the difference. And you [T] will [T] go to jail. I asked you
Eventually, the interrogator returns to V and reestablishes the distance between them.

Another situation in which mutual V address would normally be required is represented by the dialog below. The scene from *Konec velkých prázdnin* takes place in a city in Austria and involves an incident between Bobina, an attractive young woman and member of a tour group visiting from Czechoslovakia, and the leader of that tour group. The woman and the leader are arguing over whether she will be allowed access to her luggage, which is under the bus, since she has just bought souvenirs. Note that he improperly addresses her as T, while she addresses him as V. She brings this to his attention and he corrects himself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>leader and member of excursion</th>
<th>Bobina: Ale <em>helejte</em>, dyť budem na hranici vypadat jak banda pašeráků! Vedoucí: Tam já to, souduřžko, vysvětlím, tim si <em>mužeš</em> bejt jistá! Tak, souduzi, sme všiči? Bobina: No момент! Já teda vodmitám vystupovať v Budějicich na autobusáku jako náká kurva! Já si to chci strčit do kufru! Vedoucí: <em>Strč si to, kam chčeš, kufr dostaneš doma.</em> Já sem tu tvuj vedoucí! Bobina: Ale něj maj bachesť! Vedoucí: Cos to... cos to řekla? Bobina: A <em>netýkáte mi</em>, jo? Kdo myslite, že ste?... Vedoucí: To ti ešte ukážu... - to vám ešte ukážu doma! Bobina: But <em>look</em>, after all we’re gonna look like a gang of smugglers on the border! Leader: I’ll explain that there, comrade, of that <em>you can</em> be sure. So, comrades, is everyone here? Bobina: Wait just a minute! Then I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he is standing looking over her, down at her from bus when uses T; she is physically forced into bus by leader and driver; corrects himself with V as he is chasing her and she is running away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Konec velkých prázdnin</em> (film)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
refuse to get out in Budějice at the bus station like some kind of hooker. I want to stick this in my suitcase!
Leader: **Stick** [T] it where **you want** [T], **you’ll get** [T] your suitcase when we get home. I am your [T] leader!
Bobina: But not my jailer!
Leader: What... what **did you** [T] say?
Bobina: And **don’t say** „ty“ [V] to me, OK? Who **do you think** [V] you are [V]?...
Leader: I’ll show **you** [T]... I’ll show **you** [V] at home!

The “struggle” over address (T vs. V) is paralleled by a physical struggle between the leader and the young woman. In the end, she is victorious: he addresses her with the proper V form, and she gets the best of him by seeking asylum in Austria.

### 3.5.2 Coworkers

The next group of examples represents variations in address between coworkers.

Again, we begin with Russian.

#### 3.5.2.1 Russian coworkers

From *Utinaja oxota* we find an interaction between a boss (Kušak) and his subordinate (Zilov). This scene takes place at a party at Zilov’s house. Previously, at work, the two had addressed each other with mutual V. However, in this social situation, and when the conversation turns to the boss’s possible rendez-vous with a friend of Zilov’s, the boss begins addressing Zilov as T, while Zilov continues addressing the boss as V.

| Boss and subordinate | Zilov: *Ee net, no skoro pojavitsja, bud’te uvereny. V’ye zaintrigovali.*  
|                       | *Kušak: Ty dumaes’? ...*  
|                       | *Zilov: Xoču skazat’ ne zevajte.*  
|                       | *Kušak: No poslušaj, udobnoe li mne... Posudi sam, zdes’ Sajapiny, tvoja žena. Etično li ëto.*  
|                       | *Utinaja oxota* (play)  
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Zilov: Erunda. Dejstvujte smelo, ne ceremontes’...
Xvatajte byka za roga.
Kušak: Aj-aj-aj, ne znal, ne dumal, čto ty takoj
legomyslenyj. Smotri, Viktor, ty
menja...mm...razvrasčaš’.
Zilov: Davno xotelos’ sdelat’ vam čto-nibud’ prijatnoe.
Zilov: She’s not here yet, but she’ll be here soon, you can
be [V] sure [V]. You [V] made an impression [V] on
her.
Kušak: Do you [T] think [T] so? ...
Kušak: But listen [T], won’t it be awkward...Judge [T]
for yourself, the Sayapins are here, and your [T] wife. Is
it ethical?
Zilov: Nonsense. Act [V] boldly, don’t stand on
ceremony [V]. Take [V] the bull by the horns.
Kušak: Oh-oh-oh, I didn’t know, I didn’t think that you
[T] were so irresponsible. Look [T], Victor, you’re
[T]...um...corrupting [T] me.
Zilov: I’ve been wanting to do something nice for you
[V] for a long time.

Zilov, the subordinate, does not reciprocate, possibly because he feels it is inappropriate
(the boss-subordinate relationship still holds, after all) or because he simply does not
want to be on more intimate terms with his superior (he does not feel they are actually
friends).

The dialog below, from Kalina krasnaja, is a conversation between a local official
and Egor the ex-con, who has been attempting to work on the kolkhoz. They are at a
cultural center, and he notices she is standing alone. When he asks her why, she answers
him using V to ask if he has completed his assigned task. He answers sarcastically (vaše
blagorodie ‘your [V] honor’), then switches to T when he talks to her as if she is simply
a woman, not an official. He also leans slightly toward her; his use of T is not meant to
show disrespect but to emphasize that he sympathizes with her and believes in her ability
to have a good life.
Thus, changes in address between coworkers can be influenced by the environment (a party, for instance) and affect (sympathy).

### 3.5.2.2 Polish coworkers

The Polish films and dramas examined provided a wealth of examples of speech between coworkers. In the following scene from *Człowiek z marmuru*, Hanka Birkut, at this time a young woman, is attempting to leave work, for she does not want to face her ex-husband Mateusz, who has just entered the restaurant. Her boss, an older man, addresses her as T, whereas she uses P with him.
Hanka: I have to leave.
Director: Why, do you feel [T] bad?...But little daughter!
Wait an hour...

Note, too, the director's use of córeczko 'little daughter', indicating affection and potentially paternalistic feelings toward her. Asymmetrical address is also possible -- although somewhat rare today -- within the family in Polish, with a parent receiving P and child receiving T.

The next four dialogs, all from Człowiek z marmuru, involve Agnieszka, the director of the film about the bricklayer Birkut, at work in various situations and talking to various people. The first dialog is an interview with Hanka Birkut about her ex-husband. Agnieszka and Hanka’s address fluctuates between T and P forms. Initially, Hanka is extremely polite and addresses the director and her crew with P forms; however, Hanka, eventually becoming distressed over having to discuss her life with Mateusz Birkut, eases her pain with alcohol and begins using T as she confides in Agnieszka. Agnieszka reciprocates.

| director, crew, and interviewee | Hanka: Państwo z filmu, prawda? Bardzo proszę, to tutaj, to tutaj. Pani dzwoniła do mnie, tak? Bardzo mi miło. Bardzo proszę państwa, bardzo proszę...Państwo się nie gniewają, że prosiłam wycierać nogi, ale...Bardzo proszę, niech państwo siadają. ...Czy pani naprawdę chce ze mną rozmawiać? Agnieszka: Tak. Właśnie z panią. Bardzo długo pani szukałam. Hanka: Słucham państwa... Agnieszka: Pani Haniu, niechże się pani położy, proszę... Hanka: Nie wyjeżdżaj, nigdzie nie wyjeżdżaj!... Agnieszka: Strasznie...strasznie ci | When Agnieszka switches to T, she is kissing Hanka goodbye; when she asks for the address, Hanka is on the floor; Agnieszka stoops to address her, they are close and low on ground | Człowiek z marmuru (film) |
|---|---|---|
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| dziękuję...Haniu, strasznie cię 
przepraszam...Możesz mi dać adres? 
Hanka: Jaki...adres? 
Agnieszka: Twójego syna. 
Hanka: Maćka zostaw w spokoju! 
Hanka: You’re [Ppl] from the film, 
right? Please, come in, come in. You 
[P] called [P] me, didn’t you? It’s very 
nice to meet you. Please (lit. I ask you 
[Ppl]), please...don’t get mad [Ppl] 
that I asked you to wipe your feet, 
but...Please, sit down [Ppl]. Do you 
[P] really want [P] to talk with me? 
Agnieszka: Yes, with you [P] 
especially. I’ve been looking for you 
[P] a long time. 
Hanka: Please go on (lit. I am listening 
to you [Ppl])... 
Agnieszka: Miss Hanka, please lie 
down [P], please. 
Hanka: Don’t leave [T], don’t go [T] 
anywhere!... 
Agnieszka: I really...I really thank you 
[T]...Hanka, I beg you [T]...can you 
[T] give me the address? 
Hanka: What...address? 
Agnieszka: Your [T] son’s. 
Hanka: Leave [T] Maciek alone! |

The conversation below takes place at a museum; Agnieszka has brought her film crew to investigate artifacts from the 1950s in storage. She is hoping to find clues about Mateusz Birkut’s life and rise to fame. Address in this passage is of two types: the expected P between the pracownica muzeum ‘museum worker’ and Agnieszka, but Vpl from the museum worker to the film crew, which consists of two men: No, czego wy szukacie...chcialabym wiedzieć ‘Well, what are you [Vpl] looking for [Vpl]...I’d like to know’. Once again, although Ppl forms exist, Vpl is used to address the two men (or the
two men and Agnieszka). This dialog once again presents evidence that Vpl is the generic plural, and Ppl is often reserved for highly formal, scripted situations.

| museum worker, film director and crew | Pracownica muzeum: Proszę bardzo. Agnieszka: My jesteśmy z telewizji, pani wie. Dzwiono do pani. Pracownica muzeum: Tak, dyrektor uprzedził mnie; prosił żebym wam pomogła. ...O czym to ma być film właściwie, proszę pani? Dyrektor interesuje się tym bardzo. Czy pani ma jakiś scenariusz? Agnieszka: Tak.... Pracownica muzeum: No, czego wy szukacie... chciałabym wiedzieć. Museum worker: Yes? Agnieszka: We’re from the television station, you know [P]. You [P] were contacted. Museum worker: Yes, the director informed me; he asked me to help you. ...What exactly is this film supposed to be about, if you [P] please? The director is very interested in it. Do you [P] have some kind of script? Agnieszka: Yes.... Museum worker: Hey, what are you looking for [Vpl]... I’d like to know. | Człowiek z marmuru (film) |

In the next dialog, we find an example of variation in address not to one person, but to two members of the same crew. The director Agnieszka addresses her operator, an elderly man, as P, but the technik, a man of her age, as T. In this case, age and perhaps experience seem to be the crucial factors.
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building our happiness.” You must know it, Mr. Leonard.
Operator: Well I...after all that’s my work...
Agnieszka: Do you know [T] if he’s in Warsaw now?
Technician: What?...
Agnieszka: What is it, Mr. Leonard? What’s bothering you [P]?
Operator: Well...do you [P] want [P] to know, Miss
Agnieszka? It’s very difficult. I would like keep working,
you [P] understand [P].

In the final dialog involving Agnieszka at work, Agnieszka and her editor are
going over her being allowed to complete her film. She switches from P to T, and he
does as well. In addition, she pins him against a wall as she is threatening him. Note her
correction at the end of the conversation: she returns to P and backs away from him when
she pleads, Ale musisz się...Musı́ się pan ze mną porozumieć do końca! ‘But you have to
[T]...you [P] have to [P] give me a break!’ He answers her with P; the linguistic and
physical distance between them has been reestablished.
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Jodła addresses the entire band, he uses Vpl. In the singular, however, he uses pan with a 2sg (T), not 3sg (P), predicate: Grażte pan! ‘Play [T] you [P]!’

| party secretary to brass band | Jodła: Panowie, no co jest? Pospaliście się? Grać! No, grażte pan! Panowie, panowie! Chodźcie tutaj! Szybciej! Mistrzu! No, przecież trzeba grać! Szybciej!... Przecież wszyscy czekają tu na was! Jodła: Gentlemen, what is this? Have you fallen asleep [Vpl]? Play! Well, you [P] play [T]! Gentlemen! Gentlemen! Come [Vpl] here! Faster! Master! Well after all, you need to play! Faster!... After all, everybody here is waiting on you [Vpl]! | Człowiek z marmuru (film) |

The dialog below involves a switch from the T of friendship to the official Communist V. Birkut is asking to be allowed to speak at a meeting, but his friend (also the chairman of the meeting) will not allow it. Birkut and the chairman begin their conversation on mutual T as friends, but when Birkut rushes the podium, the friend orders him to stop by using official language (V). The switch from T to V is precipitated by a change in distance (Birkut’s rush to the podium, away from his friend) and accompanied by a change in the chairman’s height (he stands).

| worker and meeting chairman | Birkut: Daj przemówić... Przemówić mi daj! No, mówię do ciebie! No? Przewodniczący: Nie mam ciebie w porządku dziennym ani w wolnych wnioskach. Poza tym tu zaraz będzie kino i to podobno bardzo śmieszne... Birkut: Parę słów tylko! To bardzo ważne! Dajże mi głos, no, proszę cię! Przewodniczący: Mateusz, czyś ty dziecko? Przecież tekst nieugodny, niki nie czytał, jak ty chcesz tak wystąpić?...Towarzyszu Birkut! Ja nie udzielam wam głosu! Proszę natychmiast zjeść!... Birkut: Give [T] me the floor! Are you [T] deaf? Well? Chairman: You’re [T] not on the | The chairman stands (changes height), Birkut rushes away from his friend the chairman to the podium (changes distance) | Człowiek z marmuru (film) |
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agenda. After this there’ll be a movie and as I understand it it’s very funny...
Birkut: Just a couple of words! It’s very important! Give [T] me the floor, please
(lit. I ask you [T])!
Chairman: Matthew, were you [T] born yesterday? After all, the text hasn’t been cleared, no one has read it, how can you
[T] want [T] to make a speech like that?
...Comrade Birkut! You [V] do not have the floor! Please come down from there immediately!

In the dialog below, from Psy, we find several coworkers discussing their fate, as the shift from communism to a democracy has changed the need for a secret police force.

Notice plural address is consistently with Vpl. Most of the men (here, Stopczyk and Franz) use mutual T to address each other; however, they address a significantly older man as dziadek ‘grandfather’, a form of P address, combined with a T imperative idź ‘go [T]’. A similar form appeared above: Grajże pan ‘Play [T] you [P]’ from Człowiek z marmuru.

| Coworkers to each other | Franz: Wasze zdrowie...
|                        | Dziadek: Wam to dobrze, wy młodzi
|                        | jesteście, a ja co? Na bruk?! A gdzie ja teraz robotę znajdę, jak tylko przestuchwać umię?
|                        | Franz: W Polskich Nagraniach, idź tam Dziadek na łowę talentów.
|                        | Stopczyk: No, kończenie flaszkę i do domu. W nocy ognisko...
|                        | Olo: Dużo tego?
|                        | Stopczyk: No, ze trzy ciężarówki. Franz, piłeś najmniej, pójdź ze mną do szefa. A reszta spać, żebyście mi w nocy nie marudzili.
|                        | Franz: To your [Vpl] health...
|                        | Grandfather: It’s fine for you [Vpl], you’re [Vpl] young, but what about me?
|                        | On the street? And where will I find

| Dziadek | ‘grandfather’ is standing over group when saying this, leans in for cigarette from Franz
| Psy (film) | 165
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work now, as I only know how to interrogate?
Stopczyk: Well, finish [Vpl] the flask and let's go home. There's a fire tonight.
Olo: A big one?
Stopczyk: Well, three trucks' worth.
Franz, you've had the least to drink [T], you'll come [T] with me to see the boss. The rest of you sleep, so you [Vpl] don't dally on me tonight.

The next dialog, also from Psy, is a conversation between a superior and subordinate at work. The superior, Walenda, generally addresses Stopczyk, the subordinate, as V (or possibly, in several instances, as Vpl); after all, these men are the former secret police of the communist government, and V would likely have been the official form of address in such an organization. However, Stopczyk, the subordinate, addresses Walenda as P. Finally, in one instance, when Walenda is annoyed by Stopczyk, he switches to T as a way of threatening his interlocutor.

| boss and subordinate | Walenda: Stopczyk, co wy tam palicie?
Stopczyk: Ja? Radomskie... ale jak pan major woli, to Franz ma Camele.
Walenda: Co ty pierdolisz za uszami Stopczyk... na wysypisku, co palicie po nocach?
Stopczyk: A... ja panu powiem panie majorze, to była tajemnica...
Walenda: Stopczyk, wy wyżej wałta nie podskoczycie... Panowie mówią, że aktta palicie...
Co wy na to, Stopczyk?
Stopczyk: Nie wierzę.
Walenda: Ja też nie... co odpowiecie na ten zarzut?!
Walenda: Stopczyk, what are you [V? / Vpl?] burning [V? / Vpl?] there?
Stopczyk: Me? Radomskies...but, if you [P] like [P], Franz has Camels.
Walenda: Why are you [T] messing around [T]
Stopczyk...in the dump, what are you burning [V? / |

Psy (film)
Vpl? at night?
Stopczyk: Oh...I’ll tell you [P], sir, it was a secret...
Walenda: Stopczyk, you [V] won’t jump [V] over a
higher wall... The men are saying that you’re burning
[V? / Vpl?] files... What do you say [V] about it,
Stopczyk?
Stopczyk: I don’t believe it.
Walenda: I don’t either... how do you answer [V] to
this charge?!

Finally, the dialog below, again from Psy, occurs between officers on a stakeout. The
differences in rank are evident, as they use asymmetrical (T-P) address:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>both standing, but ‘student’ is one who brings Mauer gift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy (film)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, the apprentice (‘student’) brings his superior hot coffee in an attempt to
ingratiate himself with him.

3.5.2.3 Czech coworkers

Finally, we find several examples of asymmetrical or somewhat unusual address
forms in work situations in the Czech films and plays examined. For instance, in the
conversation below from Vyrozmění, two coworkers, one of whom (Baláš) has gained
more authority than the other, agree to asymmetrical address:
| boss and subordinate | Baláš: Kolego Gроссi-
Gross: Prosím, kolego řediteli!
Baláš: Doufám, že ten včerejšek neberete vážně, to byl jen takový tyáž. Budu ti tykat, jo?
Gross: Samozřejmě, kolego řediteli, budu rád!...
Baláš: Nechceš? (offering cigarette)
Gross: Říkal jsem, abyste byl tak laskav a vystěhoval se z mého stole! 
Baláš: Vem si! Jsou výborné--
Baláš: Mr. Gross-
Gross: Yes, Mr. Director!
Baláš: I hope you aren't taking [V] seriously what occurred yesterday. It was just a bit of a show. I'll use “ty” with you [T], ok?
Gross: Of course, Mr. Director, I’d be delighted!
Baláš: Do you want [T] one? (offering cigarette)
Gross: I was saying, would you [V] be so kind and move out of my desk!
Baláš: Take [T] one! They’re excellent-- |

There has been a coup in the structure of the company, and Gross is trying to regain his power. Baláš, however, is simply ignoring his demands.

In the following dialog between two coworkers, the switch to T accompanies a confession of attraction:

| coworkers | Marie: Mátě s sebou to své vyrozumění?
Gross: Snad nechcete—
Marie: Jsem dospělá a vím, co dělám. Dejte to sem!...
Gross: Děkuji vám, Marie. Konečně mám přiležitost dokázat, že je ve mně víc občanské statečnosti, než kolik jsem jí zatím kdy v životě uplatnil! Slibuji vám, že tentokrát už neuhnu před nicím, i kdyžch tím riskoval existenci!
Marie: Líbí se mi—
Gross: Tvoj sympatiční teprve musím zasložit! Nazdarr!
Marie: Do you have [V] the memo with you?
Gross: Surely you don’t want [V] to—
Marie: I’m an adult and I know what I’m doing. Give [V] it to me!...
Gross: Thank you [V], Marie. Now at last I have an opportunity to prove that I have more civil courage than I’ve shown so far. I promise you [V] that this time I shall not give way to anything or anybody, even at the risk of |
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my position!
Marie: I like you [T]-
Gross: First I must deserve your [T] sympathy! Bye!

Another work setting in which address forms can vary between interlocutors is the schoolroom. In the excerpt below from *Vyšetřování ztráty třídění knihy*, the teacher uses the *my* ‘we’ of inclusion and also addresses individual students as *V*. He is trying to ascertain what happened to the class roll book, which has disappeared:

| Vyšetřování ztráty třídění knihy (play) |

After the roll book is not found, the principal addresses the class, first as Vpl, then individual students, as T, as his irritation rises. He uses V, however, to address the teacher:

| principal and student; principal and teacher | Ředitel: ...Tak kdo z vás je chlap? Kdo vstane a řekne: Já to byl, pane řediteli! No Zdeňku! Tak Zdeňku, snad alespoň vstaneš? Pane kolego, jakpak to vychováváte žáky, že ani nevstanou, když s nimi mluví ředitel? Principal: ... So which one of you [Vpl] is the fellow? Who’ll stand up and say: it was me, principal! Well Zdeněk! So Zdeněk, will you maybe at least stand up [T]?
Colleague, how are you educating [V] these pupils that |
| Vyšetřování ztráty třídění knihy (play) |
they don’t even stand up when their principal is talking to
them?

3.5.3 Friends and acquaintances

The films and plays examined in this dissertation also provided examples of
unexpected forms of address between interlocutors at various levels of intimacy: friends,
new acquaintances or strangers.

3.5.3.1 Russian friends and acquaintances

First, from Ironija sud’by, we find a scene in which an elderly mother is talking to
a friend of her adult son through their apartment door. The address is asymmetrical (T
from mother to the younger man, and V from the man to the mother) and probably
motivated by the age difference between them and the fact that the woman is the mother
of a longtime friend:

| Mother and friend of son | Mat’: Tiše, čego ty kričiš’...čego ty xuliganš’?... Drug syna: Marina Dmitrievna, pomnite, čto s detstva nas učili govorit’ tol’ko pravdu? Mother: Quiet, why are you [T] shouting [T] ....why are you [T] behaving like a hooligan [T]? Son’s friend: Marina Dmitrievna, do you remember [V] that ever since childhood we were taught to only tell the truth? | she is behind the door locked with a chain, preventing him from entering apartment | Ironija sud’by (film) |

In addition, the woman is behind a door locked with a chain; she refuses to let her son’s
friend enter the apartment.

Petruševskaja’s Tri devuški v golubom makes liberal use of switches between T
and V to reflect changing relationships between interlocutors. Recall that above we saw
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an example of mutual V address between Ira and Nikolaj, who had just become
acquainted on the commuter train to the dacha. Below we find two dialogs that take place
at various stages in Ira and Nikolaj’s relationship. In the first, Nikolaj, who is married, is
clearly pursuing Ira more aggressively than she is pursuing him. He initiates the switch to
T, and although she reciprocates, they both waver between T and V. Nikolaj uses T as he
makes himself at home with Ira in her family’s dacha. He switches to V after he has
reported speech from his mother-in-law: Tešča govorit: Kakaja smelaja devuška! Gazety
prosit prjamo u mužčin! Vse obyčno, Nikolaj, vy ej ponravilis’...Vidno, govorit, ona vam
tože prigljanulas’, esli vy otdali. ‘My mother-in-law says: What a bold girl! Asking a
strange man for his newspaper, just like that! Of course, she obviously liked you [V],
Nikolaj...And it’s obvious you [V] like her too, she says, if you [V] gave [V] it back to
her’. Note that he reports that his mother-in-law addresses him with V, and he
reciprocates: Ja ej govorju: budet vam vaša „Nedelja“! ‘I say to her: You’ll get your [V]
“Nedelja” back!’

Nikolaj switches to V with Ira after he has reported the dialog with his mother-in-
law. However, Ira, when she responds with an address form, uses T, perhaps as a
warning: Ostat’ rebenka v pokoe. ‘Leave [T] the child in peace’. Nikolaj then switches
back to T, but Ira refuses his invitation to go to his house to retrieve medicine and slides
(not entirely represented in the dialog below) with V.
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Nikolaj: *Smelaja, očen' smelaja devuška! Sumasšedšaja! Ja vas ljubljub, sumasšedšaja! Pavel, u menja vopros. Gde papka?*
Ira: *Ostav' rebenka v pokoe...*
Nikolaj: *...Ja emu prinesu ešče fil'moskop ručnoj so slajdami. Dočura moja ešče mesiac budet v otsutstvi...Tešča na sobesedovanii...Budeš' smotret' slajdy. Sam snimal! O, kak ja snimaju!*
Ira: *Ničego ne polučaetsja. Ja s vami ne pojdu.*
Nikolaj: *Listen [T], Ira, is this your [T] own house?...Ira, put [T] on the kettle...My mother-in-law says: What a bold girl! Asking a strange man for his newspaper, just like that! Of course, she obviously liked you [V], Nikolaj...And it's obvious you [V] like her too, she says, if you [V] gave [V] it back to her. I say to her: You'll get your [V] "Nedelja" back! So, my mother-in-law knows what is going on with us. Why did you [V] approach [V] me? Did you [V] like me? Tell the truth.*
Ira: *What, I can't just ask to see someone's paper?*
Nikolaj: *Bold, very bold girl! Crazy! I love you [V], you crazy girl. Pavel, I have a question. Where is your daddy?*
Ira: *Leave [T] the child in peace...*
Nikolaj: *I'll bring him back my slide projector with some slides. My daughter will be away for another month yet...My mother-in-law's in conference...You [T] can have a look at the slides. I took them myself; I'm pretty good with a camera!*
Ira: *It's no use. I can't come with you [V].*

In the next dialog from *Tri devuški v golubom*, Ira and Nikolaj are breaking up.

Nikolaj has decided his wife and family should not find out about Ira. The couple begins with mutual T, but as Nikolaj is pushing Ira away emotionally, he switches to V: *Koroče govorja, vy dolžny budete otsjuda vyljet'. 'To make a long story short, you [V] are going to [V] have to [V] get the next plane out of here.' Nikolaj switches to T as the conversation becomes more heated: Ty posmotri na sebja, kto ty takaja. 'Just you [T] take a look [T] at yourself, who you [T] are.' When Nikolaj takes on a more authoritative demeanor, he returns to V: Vam na etom pljaže ne polozeno bylo sidet. U
You [V] haven’t got a pass for it.’ At the end of this conversation, he returns to the emotional T, and she reciprocates.

| man and woman | Ira: *Ja tebi* ljublju bol’še žizni. *Ty moja edinstvenaja radost!*  
Nikolaj: *Net, ty menja ne ljubiš’...Koroče govorja, vy dolžny *budete* otsjuda vyletat*.  
Ira: *Vot ona prineset v podole, togda posmotrite.*  
Nikolaj:... *Koroče govorja, čto kasaetsja ne vas. ...Vy *mešaete!* Vas zdes’ ne dolžno byt!  
Ira: *Ja takoj že čelovek, kak i oni, imeju pravo zdes’ byt.*  
Ira: *Kogda čelovek ljubit, čto ne pozor.*  
Nikolaj: *Pozor, pozor prosto! Ty končaj s etimi presledovanijami menja toboj!*  
Ira: *Ja xozi gde xoču.*  
Nikolaj: *Vam na etom pljače ne položeno bylo sied’i. U vas net propuska na nego. Glaza sliškom bol’še!*  
Ira: *Čto, uže na more net mesta?*  
Nikolaj: *Vam imenno—net.*  
Ira: *No čto že ne vaša zemlja?*  
Nikolaj: *My posmoriš, č’ja ěto zemlja.*  
Ira: *Mne zdes’ xorošo, i ja ostajus’.*  
Nikolaj: *Togda my uedem. Tak ty xočeš’? Ty čelovek?*  
Ira: *A ty ne boiš’šja, čto na dače ona menja tože uvidiš?*  
Ira: *I love you [T] more than my own life. You [T] are my only joy!*  
Nikolaj: *No, you [T] don’t love [T] me...To make a long story short, you [V] are going to [V] have to [V] get the next plane out of here.*  
Ira: *You just wait till she gets a bun in the oven, then you’ll see [V].*  
Nikolaj:...to get to the point, this doesn’t concern you [V]...  
You [V] are interfering [V]! You [V] have no right to be here!  
Ira: *I’m no different from them, and I have the right to be here.*  
Ira: When a person is in love, there’s no shame.  
Nikolaj: It’s disgraceful, absolutely shameful! I’m telling you |
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[T] to put a stop [T] to this...this dogging my footsteps.
Ira: I can go where I like.
Nikolaj: You [V] shouldn’t have been sitting on that beach anyway. You [V] haven’t got a pass for it. Sitting there goggling.
Ira: What, there isn’t room on the beach?
Nikolaj: Not for you [V] there’s not!
Ira: So, do you [V] own the place?
Nikolaj: No, but we’ll see who does!
Ira: Well, I like it here, and I’m staying.
Nikolaj: Then we’ll leave...Do you [T] want [T] that? Have you [T] no decency?
Ira: Well, aren’t you [T] afraid [T] she’ll see me at the dacha as well?

From *Ironija sud’by*, we find asymmetrical address motivated by deception:

| man to new acquaintance; woman pretending man is her boyfriend | Ženja: My, možem skazať, počti neznakomy. Pervyj raz ja uvidel Naděždu...kak vaše otčestvo?
Podruga: Ee otčestvo Vasil’evna!
Ženja: Ja uvidel Nadeždu Vasil’evnu v 11 časov večera!
Nadja: Ippolit, ne durăč’já!...Ippolit, peresťan’!...Priglasi gostej k stolu.
Ženja: We, we can say, are practically strangers. The first time I saw Nadežda... what’s your [V] patronymic?
Friend: Her patronymic is Vasil’evna!
Ženja: I saw Nadežda Vasil’evna at 11 o’clock in the evening!
Nadežda: Ippolit, don’t be silly [T]!...Ippolit, stop [T]!...Invite [T] our guests to the table. |
| she puts her arm around him, ‘slaps’ him to get him to play along; he maintains distance | *Ironija sud’by* (film) |

In the dialog above, Nadja is pretending to her friends that the strange man in her house is, in actuality, her boyfriend Ippolit. Her friend, of course, assumes Ženja’s comment about the patronymic is a joke and takes his V address as part of the joke.
well. Nadja, however, addresses him as T; generally it would not make sense, after all, to address one’s boyfriend as V.

In the dialog below, Ippolit, Nadja’s boyfriend, and Ženja, the strange man she found in her apartment, are physically fighting over Nadja. Note Ippolit’s indignation at being addressed as T, while he addresses Ženja as V. Ženja is, however, winning the fight:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>men to each other</th>
<th>Ženja: Prosi u nee proščenija!</th>
<th>physical fight, Ženja is on top of Ippolit and apparently winning</th>
<th>Ironija sud’by (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ippolit: Počemu vy govorite mne „ty“?</td>
<td>Ženja: Potomu što ty pobeždennyj!</td>
<td>Ženja: Ask [T] her forgiveness!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ženja: Ask [T] her forgiveness!</td>
<td>Ippolit: Why are you [V] saying [V] “ty” to me?</td>
<td>Ippolit: Why are you [V] saying [V] “ty” to me?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ženja: Because you [T] are vanquished!</td>
<td>Ženja: Because you [T] are vanquished!</td>
<td>Ženja: Because you [T] are vanquished!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in the dialog below the asymmetrical address is reversed: Ippolit, who is very drunk and standing, fully clothed, in Nadja’s shower, threatens Ženja as T, while Ženja, now sober, addresses him as V:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>men to each other</th>
<th>Ženja: Vy by xot šapku snjali!</th>
<th>Ironija sud’by (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ippolit: Mne i tak xorošo! A ty by už lučše molčal.</td>
<td>Ženja: You should at least take your hat off [V]!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ženja: You should at least take your hat off [V]!</td>
<td>Ippolit: I’m fine! And it’d be better for you [T] to be quiet [T].</td>
<td>Ippolit: I’m fine! And it’d be better for you [T] to be quiet [T].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reversal is likely caused by Ippolit’s “altered state” (drunkenness) and general lack of respect for not only his addressee (Ženja) but for himself as well.

In the conversation below, from Kalina krasnaja, we find that when Egor and Ljuba, his pen pal when he was in prison, first meet, she immediately begins addressing him with T forms. After all, she has been his pen pal for a long time and, even though this is their first meeting in person, they do have some sort of established friendship.
However, he addresses her first as V, then follows with T. In the same scene he wavers between V and T. He is clearly unsure of their relationship; plus, he wants to be respectful of her as a woman and not assume too much familiarity.

| man and woman | Ljuba: Nu, Georgij, rasskaži, značit, pro sebju.  
Egor: Prjamo kak na doprose. Nu, čto mne vam rasskazat'....Slušaj, davaj ujdem otsjuda...  
Ljuba: I skol'ko ž ty sidel?  
Egor: Poslednij raz? Sidel ja pjat' let.  
Ljuba: Ėto s takimi-to ručicami ty buxgalter? Daže ne verit'ja.  
Ljuba: Takimi rukami toľ'ko zamki lomat', a ne tapočki šíť'.  
Egor: Nu vy skažete!  
Ljuba: A čem dumaeš zdes' zanimat'sja? Opjat' buxgalterom?...Tapočki šíť'?  
Egor: Nado osmotret'sja....? Ty kak-to srazu v max pognala. Rabota, rabota.  
Ljuba: Well, Georgij, tell [T] me, you know, about yourself.  
Egor: Straight to it, like an interrogation. Well what should I tell you? [V]...Listen [T], let's [T] get out of here...  
Ljuba: And how long were you [T] in prison?  
Egor: The last time? Five years.  
Ljuba: And you' re [T] an accountant, with those hands? It' s hard to believe.  
Egor: It' s because I already trained them there. You know [V]: sewed and sewed slippers.  
Ljuba: With those hands you could only break locks, and not sew slippers.  
Egor: Well so you [V] say [V]!  
Ljuba: And what are you thinking [T] you' ll do here? Accounting again?...Sew slippers?  
Egor: I need to get my bearings...You [T] somehow got straight to it. Work, work. | Kalina krasnaja (film) |

When Egor meets Ljuba’s parents, again, he begins by using formal V. In the situation below, Egor addresses her father as V, but her father addresses him as T. The father, after all, understands that he is his daughter’s friend, and that he will be staying with them and,
in a sense, acting as a son (helping with chores, working on the kolkhoz). However, Egor switches to T address with the father when their discussion becomes more heated.

| men to each other | Egor: Zakuriť možno?  
| Otec: Kuri.  
| Egor: A vy? Ne želate?  
| Otec: Ja ne kurjaščij...  
| Otec: Da ja- stakanovec večnýj! U menja 18 pozvol'nyx gramot.  
| Egor: Tak čego že ty sidiš' molčiš'?  
| Otec: Molčiš'! Ty že mne slova ne daes' votknut'?  
| Egor: May I smoke?  
| Father: Yes (lit. Smoke [T]).  
| Egor: And you [V]? You don't want to [V]?  
| Father: I'm not a smoker...  
| Father: After all I'm an eternal stakhanovite! I have 18 awards.  
| Egor: Then why are you [T] sitting [T] here being quiet [T]?  
| Father: Being quiet [T]? You [T] won't let me [T] get a word in edgewise!  |

When Egor meets Ljuba's brother, the two men initially address each other with T. However, Egor perceives that the brother is treating him with disrespect since he is an ex-convict. Egor pluralizes himself and the brother: "We [prisoners] come after you [members of this family, or possibly non-prisoners]". Then he tells the brother not to worry, using V. This could also be construed as an address to the entire family in absentia, or as a sarcastic "elevation" of the brother to singular V status. Petro rectifies the situation, however, and the two men return to mutual T.

| ex-con and brother of "girlfriend" | Egor: Georgij.  
| Petro: Nu, davaj es'ce celovat'sja...  
| Egor: Na-a!..., Ja te čto, dorogu persešel, čto ty mne ruku ne soizvolil podati'?  
| Petro: Čego ty, rasselsja-to?  
| Egor: Majsja, majsja. Ja potom. Ja že iz zaklučenija... My posle vas. Ne  |

| brother in bath, separate from Egor; Egor nears him with switch to T  |

**Kalina krasnaja (film)**
bespokojtes'...
Petro: Ty pojdeš' ili net?
Egor: U men'ja spravka ob
osvoboždenii...Ja zavtra pojdu i
poluču takoj že pasport, kak u tebja!
Egor: Georgij.
Petro: Well let's [T] kiss too...
Egor: Hee-re! I'm what to you [T], I
crossed the road, that you [T] don't
even deign to offer me your hand?
Petro: What's with you [T], you've
taken your seat?
Egor: Wash [T], wash [T]. I'm later.
After all I'm just out of prison...We are
after you [V]. Don't worry [V]...
Petro: Are you [T] coming [T] or not?
Egor: I have my release papers!...
Tomorrow I'm going to get the same
passport you [T] have!

3.5.3.2 Polish friends and acquaintances

In the following dialog from Tango, Edek, the family servant, asks Eleonora, the
hero Artur's mother, if he can set the table. Eleonora initially responds with T, but then
“corrects” herself and uses P. The T address was instinctual, since it was revealed earlier
that Eleonora and Edek have been having an affair; since she does not want to reveal the
degree of their intimacy, she switches to P address:

| woman and servant | Edek: Czy można już nakrywać do stołu?
Eleonora: Jak chcesz, Edziu. (poprawia się) Niech Edward
nakrywa.
Edek: Stucham, proszę pani.
Edek: May I set the table now?
Eleonora: As you wish [T], Eddie. (corrects herself). Yes,
Edek: Yes ma'am (lit. am asking you [P]). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tango (play)</td>
<td>Tego (play)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Artur, the hero, had consistently addressed Edek, the servant, as P (or occasionally as T
as an insult) until the end of the play. By then, the relationship between Edek and Artur
has changed, and so has the way Artur addresses Edek:
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Edek seems to maintain his status as servant and continues to address Artur with P; when Artur is expressing his feelings for Edek, he switches to T.

3.5.3.3 Czech friends and acquaintances

From Kolja, the scene given below is an example of T address. What is somewhat surprising about the address form used in this situation is that a child is addressing an adult as T:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>child and adult</th>
<th>ditě: Máš doma taky nějaký zvíře?</th>
<th>Kolia (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ditě: A nějaký ditě más?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>muž: Taky ne.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ditě: A co más?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child:</td>
<td>Do you have [T] some kind of animal at home too?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man:</td>
<td>An animal? No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child:</td>
<td>And do you have [T] any children?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man:</td>
<td>No children either.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child:</td>
<td>So what do you have [T]?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This child, who is approximately five years old, is probably too young to have learned V address. Address with V has to be acquired, and this child is too small to have done it yet.

The next situation, also from Kolja, is included for the sake of illustration of the differences in V usage between Czech and Russian.
Louka, who is drunk, misunderstands the Russian Tamara's use of V. Tamara herself is attempting to speak Czech and uses an incorrect plural form of the predicate *pili* ‘drank’. The correct form of the Czech should be *Vy jste mnoho pil* ‘You [V] have [V] drunk a lot.’ The correct form of the Russian would be *Vy mnogo pili* ‘You [V or Vpl] have drunk [V or Vpl] a lot’ and could be construed as either singular or plural. Hence, Tamara thinks she is speaking only to Louka, but because she uses a plural predicate and no auxiliary, he assumes she is addressing him as well as those around him.

| man and wedding party | Louka: *Poněvadž byla by věčná škoda, když už jsme svoji...aby český muž odpíral své krásné ruské ženy, na co má nezanadá...nezadatelné právo...*  
|                       | Tamara: František, *vy mnoho pili.*  
|                       | Louka: *My mnoho pili. Jelikož my mnoho pili, já prosím hosty, aby se nyní rozešli do svých domovů, Brož například, a nechali snoubence o samotě.*  
|                       | *Protože svatební noc, přátelé, je jen jedna.*  
|                       | Louka: *Because it would be a great pity, if we our... for a Czech man to deny his beautiful Russian wife, to which she has a ves...vested right...*  
|                       | Tamara: František, *you’ve [V / Vpl] been drinking [RV / CzVpl] a lot.*  
|                       | Louka: *We’ve been drinking a lot. Since we’ve been drinking a lot, I ask the guests that they now disperse to their respective homes, Brož for instance, and leave the newlyweds alone. Because the wedding night, friends, happens only once.*  

| Man and woman | *muž: Vý už odcházíte? Počkejte ještě.*  
|              | *Dora: Nemůžu, musím už jít.*  
|              | *muž: Ne, alespoň jednu větu.*  
|              | *Dora: *Vy jste tak laskav... (she tells him she needs time after he proposes to her)*  
|              | *muž: Já vím...Vy proti mně něco máte?  
|              | *Dora: Ne, ceniš si toho, že mi nadále vykáte.*  
|              | Doctor: *Are you leaving [V] already? Stay [V]*  

| he is holding her hands;  
physical intimacy has happened, but  
linguistic (and)  
Konec velkých prázdnin  
(film)  

The dialog below from *Konec velkých prázdnin* represents an example of how linguistic intimacy does not necessarily follow physical intimacy:
Dora, who is the actor Milan’s now-estranged wife, has just met and slept with a German doctor. Even after they have been physically intimate, they continue to address each other as V, and Dora even makes the comment that she appreciates this.

In another scene from *Konec velkých prázdnin*, Václav, who is a rather simple character and has worked all his life as a gardener, begins a conversation with Milan, the famous Czech actor, on T. They have been working together in Austria at a nursery and have become friends; however, they have not, to this point, discussed a shift from V to T. When Václav begins to give advice to Milan, he wants to make sure he does not offend his worldlier friend, and he switches to V.

| gardener to actor | Václav: Je pořád v nemocnici? Tvá žena...?
| Václav: A... proč nejsi s ní?
| Milan: Chce být sama... |
| Václav: Promiňte, já vím, že se skoro neznáme, a jsem obyčejný zahradník, zatímco vy zůstáváte i v té jížmě slavný umělec, který ví o životě mnohem víc... |
| Václav: Is she still in the hospital? Your [T] wife...?
| Milan: Not as a patient anymore. She works there. |
| Václav: And...why are you not [T] with her? |
| Milan: She wants to be by herself... |
| Václav: Excuse [V] me, I know that we barely know each other, and I’m a simple gardener, whereas even in this hole you [V] remain [V] a famous artist who knows a lot more about life... |

---
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3.5.4 Strangers

Address to strangers generally requires V or P; however, we find exceptions among the data gathered from films and plays.

3.5.4.1 Russian strangers

We find instances of unexpected address forms when strangers address each other in Russian. In Kalina krasnaja, for instance, a male stranger offers Egor a seat on the hydrofoil that is carrying him away from prison and toward Ljuba’s remote village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>male stranger to male stranger</th>
<th>Nu čto xodiš’, sadis’?! Well why are you walking around [T], sit down [T]!</th>
<th>Kalina krasnaja (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This is perhaps, again, an example of rural speech, in which the “formalities” of urban life are not required all the time.

In Kalina krasnaja, Ljuba’s ex-husband Kolja and Egor address each other with mutual T, despite the fact that they are strangers to one another. Here the motive is clear: they are about to fight, and Egor even physically pushes the man toward the location of the impending altercation. This mutual T, then, is the T of aggression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men to each other</th>
<th>Egor: Davaj, davaj, šagaj. Kolja: Nu, padali kusok. Sejčas ja tebja budu bit’! Egor: Come on [T], come on [T], walk [T]! Kolja: Well, you’re dead meat. I’m going to beat you [T] right now!</th>
<th>Egor pushes him; physical aggression toward Kolja</th>
<th>Kalina krasnaja (film)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.5.4.2 Czech strangers

From Vyrozumění, the following dialog is a conversation between two strangers, but the woman (the “chairman”) insists on using T (as she does with everyone she meets in the play). She consistently uses asymmetrical address throughout the play:
male stranger
and female stranger

Helena: Ty nejší vodsad?
Gross: Naopak, jsem tu ředitel.
Helena: To seš ty? Musíš se, človeče, nějak zasadit o ten byfet, fakt! Vždyť je to hrozný, když musejí holky hůvřikam pro sváčínu! Myslí se tady vůbec na lidi?
Gross: A vy jsí—prosím—kdo?
Helena: Délám tady předsedkyni, ale můžeš mi říkat Helče—
Helena: You’re [T] not from here?
Gross: On the contrary. I’m the Managing Director.
Helena: Are [T] you [T]? Well, you must [T] do something about this snack bar, I mean it! It’s terrible that our girls have to traipse lord knows where for a snack! Does anybody think about people around here?
Gross: And who, may I ask, are [V] you [V]?
Helena: I’m the Chairman, but you can [T] call me Helča.

Vyrozumění
(play)

Her motive is not entirely clear; it seems that she simply refuses to be formal with anyone, regardless of their rank or the demands of protocol.

3.5.5 Family

The final category of situations that reveal unexpected forms of address is family encounters. Polish shows interesting and diverse forms of address between members of the same family.

When the hero of Kartoteka, generally known as bohater ‘hero’, is talking to his father, he is addressed as T, but addresses his father as P (tatuś dlubal w nosie ‘you [P] were picking [P] your nose’). Note that P address to family members is reflective of an older norm, and is generally is not with pan or pani but instead involves names of relations (ojciec ‘father’, mama ‘mother’, and so on) plus third person (P) or second person (T) predicates. In this case, the hero also uses a very familiar form of ‘father’, something closer to ‘daddy’: tatuś. Note, too, that the father’s line, Gdybyś mi powiedział: „Tatusiu, daj cukru...” ‘If you had said, “Daddy, give [T] me some sugar...”’ indicates that the father expects to be addressed with T forms, and not with P.
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father and son  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ojciec: Chce z tobą porozmawiać, łapserdaku.  
Ojciec: Dlaczego wyjedles cukier z cukierniczy?  
Bohater: To Władek.  
Ojciec: Nie kłam, opowiedz dokładnie, jak to było.  
Bohater: Coś mnie podkusiło, tatusiu. Jakiś diabeł, tatusiu!  
Ojciec: Gdybyś mi powiedział, „Tatusiu, daj cukru...”  
Bohater: A tatusi dłubal w nosie, podejrzałem tatusia...  
Ojciec: Wyrodki! Co z ciebie wyrosnie? Bóg świadkiem...  
Father: I want to talk to you [T], you little monkey.  
Hero: I'm listening.  
Father: Why **did you eat** [T] all the sugar from the sugar bowl?  
Hero: That was Władek.  
Father: Don’t **lie** [T]. **Tell** [T] me exactly how it was.  
Hero: Something tempted me, Daddy. Some devil, daddy!  
Father: If you had said, ‘Daddy, **give** [T] me some sugar...’  
Hero: But you [P] were picking [P] your nose, I spied on you [P]...  
Father: Viper! What will you [T] grow up in to? As God is my witness... |

Similarly, the hero of *Tango* (Artur) addresses his father (Stomil) as P, but is addressed by him as T. Eleonora (Stomil’s wife) addresses her husband as T, and, although not shown in the dialog below, he reciprocates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Eleonora: **Miałeś dzisiaj spać do południa. Po południu łóżko będzie zajęte.**  
Stomil: Nie mogę...A, to ty, Artur...  
**Artur: Niechże się ojciec chociaż pozapina.**  
Eleonora: **You were supposed** [T] to sleep til noon today.  
After noon the bed will be occupied.  
Stomil: I can’t sleep...Oh, it’s you [T], Artur...  
Artur: At least **button up** [P] your [P] pants. |

When the hero of *Kartoteka* addresses his uncle, he uses P (*wujek* ‘uncle’) but is addressed as T:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bohater: **Wujek!**  
**Wujek:** Byłem z pielgrzymką w klasztorze...Zajrzałem po drodze do ciebie: „wstąpił do piekli, po drodze mu było.” A co u ciebie, Stasiu?  
Bohater: **Nic, nic, wujku. Kopę lat. Nie widzieliśmy się** |

---
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| Nephew and uncle | **Eugeniusz:** Arturku, _miałbyś_ choć trochę litości dla własnej babci.  
**Młody człowiek:** A, _wujko_ też się _odzywa_?  
**Eugeniusz:** Ja się nie odzywam, tylko mówię, że nawet jeżeli Eugenia trochę się zapominała...  
**Młody człowiek (Artur):** To ja jej przypomnę. _I wujciowi_ też _przypomnę!_ Litości!  
**Eugeniusz:** Artur, _have you_ [T] no pity for your own grandmother?  
Young man: Oh, so _you’re_ [P] _talking back_ [P] again too?  
**Eugeniusz:** Not at all. I simply wanted to say that even if Eugenia may have forgotten herself a bit...  
Young man (Artur): Then I’ll remind her. And you [P] too!  
Pity! |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tango (play)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Grandson and grandmother** | **babcia:** Czego _ty_ _chcesz_ ode mnie?!!  
**Młody człowiek:** _Babcia_ dobrze wie, co mam na myśli!  
| **Tango (play)** |

We also find P address from nephew (Artur) to uncle (Eugeniusz) and T address from uncle to nephew in Tango:

The hero of Tango also addresses his grandmother as P, whereas she addresses him as T:

Note again that P address to family members involves names of relations (babcia ‘grandmother’, mama ‘mother’) plus P or T predicates. The above examples showed
evidence of P predicates only; T predicates are possible, however, and indicate a less formal means of address. The differences in P+P and P+T address were discussed above (section 2.2.2.2.1.2).

3.5.6 Summary of unusual and unexpected forms of address

The charts below summarize the types of unusual or unexpected address forms (asymmetrical address, a switch in address, mutual address with T when V is expected, and various others) that are found in the twelve works detailed above.

3.5.6.1 Switches

The first chart summarizes the switches in address that occurred in the films and plays. The speaker who initiated the switch is italicized:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.5: Switches</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>man and messenger boy</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transaction/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scripted situation</td>
<td>shock worker (s) and</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>security officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>judge and witness</td>
<td>switch to V</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interrogator and</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interrogated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>worker and official</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interviewee and director</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and crew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>director and editor</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meeting chairman and</td>
<td>switch to V</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boss and subordinate</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coworker to coworker</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends, acquaintances,</td>
<td>man to &quot;girlfriend’s&quot; father</td>
<td>switch to T;</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td>before switch was asym</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>man to &quot;girlfriend’s&quot; brother</td>
<td>switch to V</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mother and servant</td>
<td>switch to P</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gardener to actor</td>
<td>switch to V</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The switches in address forms (V to T, T to V, P to T, and so on) that appear in these films and plays generally, but not exclusively, involve a change in address from the formal (V or P) to the intimate (T) form. One exception consists of a switch from P to V in Polish (from judge to witness), which is not a shift to a more informal mode of address but rather a shift to another form of formal address. Another, also in Polish, is a shift from the T of friendship to the official (communist) V at a union meeting. Artur’s mother shifts from T to P in an attempt to not reveal her intimate relationship with the servant, Edek, in yet another example from Polish. Finally, the gardener who begins a conversation with his friend and coworker Milan, a famous Czech actor, with T, switches to V when he gives him advice about his wife.

Two Russian dialogs are worthy of note. In one, Egor has just been introduced to Ljuba’s father. The address is initially asymmetrical, with Egor receiving T from the father but addressing him as V. However, when their discussion becomes more heated, Egor switches to T and as a result the address is symmetrical. In another example, Egor has been introduced to Ljuba’s brother; they begin on mutual T, but Egor sarcastically switches to V when he thinks the brother is belittling him for being an ex-convict. The address returns to symmetrical T when Egor realizes the brother meant no harm.

3.5.6.2 Asymmetry

The table below presents a summary of the asymmetrical address patterns in the movies and plays examined. The interlocutor receiving formal address is italicized:
Table 3.6: Asymmetry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business transaction/scripted situation</td>
<td>customer and bank teller</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>customer and waiter</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leader and member of excursion</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>boss and subordinate</td>
<td>1R, 2Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policeman and apprentice</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends, acquaintances, strangers</td>
<td>woman and man</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drunk man and sober man</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man winning fight and man losing fight</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female stranger and male stranger</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mother and friend of son</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>man and servant</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td>father and son</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father (and mother), son</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uncle and nephew</td>
<td>2Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grandmother and grandson</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the uses of asymmetrical address in the chart above are motivated by a power differential in which the person having more power (or wishing to have more power) addresses his interlocutor with the familiar form but is addressed with the formal pronoun. These include T address from the shock worker to the security officer, from the excursion leader to the member asking for her suitcase, from the policeman to his apprentice, from the elderly mother to her son’s friend, from the man winning the fight to his opponent, from the young man of the house to the servant, and from various bosses to their subordinates.

Other asymmetrical situations are motivated by various factors. Asymmetrical address between family members, for instance, serves to mark differences in generations (son addresses father as P, for instance). In another situation, a man and a woman are using asymmetrical address because they are construing their relationship in different
ways: he maintains V with her because they are barely acquainted, but she is pretending, in front of her friends, that he is her boyfriend and thus addresses him with T.

In another instance, the use of asymmetrical address reflects a desire for change in a relationship. For instance, the customer addresses the bank teller as T, not out of disrespect but because he wants to get to know her; he is asking her for a date.

In still another situation, a woman uses T with everyone, regardless of rank, gender, and so on. Finally, there is one situation in which informal address seems to be motivated by the fact that the speaker using T address is drunk; his interlocutor is sober and addresses the drunken man with V. Thus, asymmetrical address can be variously motivated.

3.5.6.3 Unexpected mutual address

The chart below presents a summary of unexpected mutual address forms (that is, situations in which V is expected but T is used, and so on).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business transaction/scripted</td>
<td>passenger and taxi</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situation</td>
<td>driver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends, acquaintances,</td>
<td>male stranger to</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strangers</td>
<td>male stranger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>men to each other</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child and adult</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man and woman</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In only one of the situations given in the table above is the address more formal than expected (mutual V); the others show mutual T address when V is expected. The one mutual V situation involves the man and woman who have been physically intimate but have not yet become emotionally (or linguistically) intimate. We should note, too, that
address to a child is always with T, and address from a child to an adult should be with V.

Thus, the dialog represented in the chart is a mutual T situation that, in fact, is expected to be an asymmetrical one.

3.5.6.4 Miscellaneous variations

The final chart below summarizes miscellaneous variations in address forms that cannot be classified in any of the above three charts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business transaction/scripted situation</td>
<td>policeman and commission</td>
<td>Vpl as generic plural</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>museum worker, film director and crew</td>
<td>Vpl as generic plural</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>party secretary to brass band</td>
<td>P+T</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher and student</td>
<td>my 'we' of inclusion, then V</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>principal and student; principal and teacher</td>
<td>T; V</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>director and film crew</td>
<td>T to young man, P to old man</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coworkers to each other</td>
<td>T to young man, P+T to old man</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends, acquaintances, strangers</td>
<td>man and woman</td>
<td>fluctuates between V and T</td>
<td>3R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>man and wedding party</td>
<td>misunderstanding</td>
<td>1R / Cz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that in this table, Polish is the most widely represented language. The syntax of Polish address seems to be the complicating factor in the first two situations (policeman before the investigative commission, and the museum worker addressing the director and her film crew): as we have mentioned, although formal (Ppl) forms of plural address are available, Vpl (technically the ‘intimate’ plural) seems to be the more generic form, so
that individuals who address each other as P will address a group of those deserving P as Vpl.

Two entries in the chart show various strategies of address among coworkers: the young coworker receives T, but the old coworker receives P (or P+T, the meanings of which were discussed in 2.2.2.2.1.2). We also see P+T address from the party secretary to a member of the brass band playing at the site of a bricklaying exposition.

We find a somewhat unusual use of my ‘we’ in one of the Czech plays: the teacher, trying to gain a confession, addresses his students as ‘we’. He then switches to V when addressing individual students. The principal arrives and we find mutual V address between these coworkers, but the principal addresses individual students with a threatening T.

Finally, we find several scenes containing a great deal of fluctuation between T and V. That is, these situations cannot be classified as asymmetrical because address to and from each character varies from V to T; more than one switch is involved as well. Three of these dialogs involve fluctuation in address between a man and a woman whose relationship is changing or uncertain.

The last example of unusual address represents a syntactic difference between Russian and Czech and results in confusion on the part of the (drunken) Czech speaker as to who is being addressed: he or the entire group?

3.6 Conclusion

As our examination of the data from twelve films and plays shows, address patterns are complex, fluid, and worthy of in-depth study. Although a good deal of this chapter is devoted to mutual address (T-T, V-V, or P-P), the “unusual” uses
(asymmetrical address, shifts in address, fluctuations in address, and so on) of pronouns and their related forms will undoubtedly provide the most substantial basis for our analysis. As we detailed above, even the "unusual" forms of address have some factors in common; for instance, the interlocutor with the most power generally initiates a switch and receives the formal pronoun (V or P) in asymmetrical address. However, this is not always the case, and it is the ways in which address patterns vary from the norm that are potentially revealing as to how speakers construe their situations and encode this via their pronominal systems.

In this chapter we have taken an extensive tour of the possible forms of address available to speakers of Russian, Polish, and Czech. While films and plays are an excellent source of data for an analysis of address patterns, we acknowledge that the use of address for stylistic purposes cannot be ignored. That is, would a customer asking a bank teller on a date really risk offending her by addressing her as T? We feel the need to balance the data gleaned from works of fiction, some of which is presented in this chapter, with naturalistic data from native speakers. In the next chapter, we will present a discussion of such data, gleaned from a project specially designed to elicit information on pronominal address forms.
Chapter 4: Data from script-writing project

4.1 Introduction: The research instrument

In this chapter we describe the elicitation protocol we have devised in order to verify the data drawn from plays and films. Films and plays contain scripted imitations of natural speech; the use of artistic works in a study such as this one begs the questions: Would anyone really say that? How much of this is reflective of usage, and how much is used for artistic effect? If we are to present a cognitively, psychologically, and socially plausible picture of the way address with polite forms is motivated, we must collect authentic, unedited data elicited from native speakers.

Ideally, whatever data we could gather would reveal the possibilities of variation in address. For instance, we assume that strangers and those involved in business transactions would address each other as V in Russian and Czech or P in Polish, but is this really always the case? What if one of the speakers appears angry, or drunk? Speaker construal of a situation must play a part in the determination of address forms, and construal might create a response that varies from what the standard grammars prescribe.

We have devised a way to elicit naturalistic language (reflecting construal) in a controlled environment: we created a DVD on which there were twenty-seven short (15-45 seconds) scenes from various films (see Appendix D for the list of films from which these scenes were taken). The sound tracks of the film clips were removed. Native speakers of Russian, Polish, and Czech, respectively, were given a research instrument in
their native language and asked to watch each clip on a laptop we provided and write a corresponding dialog. The research instruments contained numbered outlines of short scripts that corresponded to numbered clips on the DVD. The respondents were given guidelines naming character roles; the volunteers were not instructed, however, as to how to interpret the clip. In several scenes, for instance, address could be to one or a small group of people. The respondent had to decide whether to use singular or plural, formal or informal address.

We present an example from the research instrument below. One clip depicts a conversation between a high school student and a teacher. The native speaker (here, of Russian) was to watch the clip and complete the following dialog:

5.
Учитель: «
Ученица: «
Учитель: «
Teacher: “
Student: “
Teacher: “

One Russian speaker completed the above section in this manner:

5.
Учитель: «Так! Вот ваши тесты. Маша! А ты не писала тест. По чему?»
Ученица: «Ви знаете, я так я здоровья, и я могла прийти в школу.»
Учитель: « Ну, что же— в следующий раз не болей.»
Teacher: “So here are your [Vpl] tests. Маšа! But you [T] didn’t take [T] the test. Why?”
Student: “You [V] know [V], I got really sick, and I wasn’t able to come to school.”
Teacher: “Well then- next time don’t get sick [T].”

Here the teacher addresses the class (also pictured in the clip) in the plural but the student with T.
In this way we elicited creative, if not completely spontaneous, language based on the way native speakers construed the situations they watched on the DVD. Fourteen Poles completed the task in Kraków, Poland, ten Czechs participated in Prague, Czech Republic, and one Russian participated at a conference in Turku, Finland. The remaining seven Russian informants were native speakers who live in and around Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

The data gleaned from these research instruments, then, consist of dialogs written by native speakers of Russian, Polish, and Czech. The charts given in Appendix C provide a summary of biographical information on those who participated in this project by watching the film clips and composing possible conversations.

Five of the eight Russian volunteers are natives of Russia, two are from modern-day Tatarstan, and one is from Ukraine. Two participants gave only partial biographical information, but all who answered the question consider themselves to be of Russian nationality. The Russian-speaking group is comprised of five males and three females.

The Russians show the most diverse distribution with respect to age. The youngest Russian speaker is 24; the oldest is 73. Three Russian volunteers are in their twenties, two are in their thirties, one is forty-five, and one is seventy-three. One participant declined to give information on his or her age. Variations in address form usage because of generation are certainly possible, especially between the youngest (age 24) and oldest (age 73) participants.

The group of native speakers of Polish consists of ten females and two males, with two participants declining to give any biographical information. Each participant was born in Poland, is of Polish nationality and speaks Polish as a native language. The
Poles are the most homogeneous group with respect to age; nine participants are in their twenties, and three are in their early thirties. The youngest member of this group is 21; he oldest is 34. Thus, we do not expect significant variation in address form usage based on generation of participants, as they are essentially of the same generation.

Each native speaker of Czech was born in what is now Czech Republic and considers himself or herself to be of Czech nationality. This group of participants consisted of six females and three males, with one speaker declining to answer the questions pertaining to biographical information. The Czechs were also a fairly homogeneous group with respect to age; the majority (six) of participants are in their twenties, two are in their thirties, and one is forty-one. The youngest Czech speaker is 21; the oldest is 41. Again, we do not expect significant variation in address usage based on age.

We did have some problems in designing and carrying out this research, and we will describe them here briefly. There were several time-consuming obstacles to overcome before I could begin collecting data. For instance, the creation of a DVD that would play on a laptop was a lengthy and expensive process. IRB (Institutional Research Board) approval for testing on human subjects had to be gained, but this yielded improvements in the design of the project.

During the data collection process, the major problem we recognized was the length of time required for the participant to complete the research instrument. While some volunteers completed the task in as little as forty-five minutes, others took up to four hours. The average time for completion was two hours. Some of the research instruments in each language group are incomplete.
Another problem with completion of the dialoggs was related to the film clips that appeared on the DVD. These segments consisted of excerpts from American, British, Russian, and Czech films (see Appendix D). Some participants suggested that “American” situations could not appropriately or realistically be narrated in their own (Slavic) language; others knew too well the clips from their country’s own film, raising the possibility that they reconstructed the original dialog from memory. Thus, there are several incomplete or (potentially) problematic questionnaires in each language, as noted in the relevant dialog charts below.

However, the opportunity to engage in fieldwork has enabled us to gather valuable data that reveals the complexities of what appears to be a simple task: choosing the appropriate form of address. As we stated earlier, analyzing films and plays certainly plays its part in this dissertation, but the experience of eliciting data from native speakers, engaging them on their own turf, so to speak, was a challenging and engaging way to obtain naturalistic linguistic data. In addition, the native speakers in each language helped a great deal in deciphering handwriting and explaining colloquialisms that appeared in the completed research instruments.

4.2 Presentation of the data

Below we will describe the twenty-seven clips and summarize the types of pronouns or address forms used in the corresponding dialoggs written by speakers of the three languages. Note that for a form of address to be present, a pronoun does not necessarily have to appear; verb forms such as Russian Čitajte! [V or Vpl] as opposed to Čitaj! [T] ‘read’ can imply address without an overt expression of the pronoun; in Polish and Czech, which are both null-subject languages, address forms very often lack explicit
expression of the pronoun. For example, in the following Polish sentence we find T address because of the 2sg present tense verb form *sukasz: Suekasz czego?* ‘Are you looking [T] for something?’ In the following Czech sentence, we find V address because of the auxiliary *jste: Tak kolego, co jste dnes zabavil* ‘So, colleague, what did you [V] confiscate today?’ Thus, as we discussed in Chapter 2, our notations T, V, and P refer not only to the pronouns of address but also to the forms with which they agree.

Each of the twenty-seven charts (one for each film segment) presents a summary of the responses given by Russian, Polish, and Czech participants. “Sym T”, “sym V”, and “sym P” refer to symmetrical use of pronouns or forms of address; that is, these headings refer to situations in which both interlocutors depicted in a given clip overtly use the same form of address (T-pattern address, V-pattern address, or P-pattern address) to address each other. “Switch” and “asymmetry” refer to a shift from one form to another by one speaker (a speaker starts using V then switches to T), or the use of one form by one speaker but another by the second (for instance, someone gives T but receives V), respectively.

In some dialogs produced by the participants in this study, only one speaker in the clip uses an address form: these are recorded in the column labeled “One address pattern”. Occasionally, no pronoun or form of address is used; the number of these responses are recorded in the “No address pattern” column. For each of these categories, an actual number (“#”) of responses is given, followed by the percentage value (“%”).

The totals (both real and percentage values) for each dialog in each language are given in the second-to-last columns. It should also be noted that not every respondent completed every dialog; hence, the “#” value in the “total” column might vary slightly.
from table to table and will be marked with an asterisk (*) if one or more respondents did not complete the dialog.

The last column records the presence of some sort of relevant movement, gesture, or other physical action on the part of the characters in the film clips. The significance of physical movement will be discussed in the next chapter. Finally, below each chart the most common response for each language is noted.

4.2.1 Husband / wife

The first clip depicts a husband and wife having a conversation in the kitchen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 1 husband / wife</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 1 Most common address pattern</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without exception, T is the address pattern married couples use to address each other, according to the dialogs written by Russians, Poles, and Czechs. Even though in half of the Russian cases and 20-30% of the Polish and Czech examples only one address pattern (T) was used, we can assume that, if the other speaker were to use an address form, it would have been T. This is not an assumption we can make in every case, however, as we will see in later examples. Sample dialogs in each language are as follows:

R
*Muž: Opjat’ ceny rastu, bezobrazie kakoe-to.*
*Žena: Da ludno tebe, uspokojša.*
*Muž: Vot ty vsedga tak, ničego tebja ne interesuet. V gazete-to pravdu pišut.*
*Žena: Vot tebe zavtrak. Oj čert, ja včera zablya mame pozvoniť.*
Husband: Prices are rising again, its some kind of disgrace
Wife: OK (lit. OK to you [T]), calm down [T].
Husband: You’re [T] always like this, nothing interests you [T]. They write the truth in the newspaper.
Wife: Here’s your [T] breakfast. Oh shoot, I forgot to call mama yesterday.

Pol
mąż: Moja droga, świat się zmienie.
żona: Ależ kochanie, proszę, obiad.
mąż: Bądź poważna, nie można tego tak lekko traktować!
żona: Jede skarbie, nie denerwuj się.
mąż: Polityka to poważna sprawa.
żona: Jesteś, bo wystygne.
Husband: My dear, the world is changing.
Wife: My love, here, lunch.
Husband: Be [T] serious, you can’t treat this so lightly!
Wife: Eat [T], my treasure, don’t get upset [T].
Husband: Politics is serious business.
Wife: Eat [T], or else it will get cold.

Cz
Manżel: Podivej se, co zase pišou v novinách.
Manżelka: Co zase?
Manżel: No zase o vládě, o tom, jak se tam dohodujou.
Manżelka: To je hrozný.
Manżel: No podivej. Oni jsou úplně neschopný! Jen si vymejšlejí nesmysly. Normální člověk musí pracovat jako já a oni nemusejí skoro nic!
Husband: Look [T] what’s in the newspaper again.
Wife: What again?
Husband: Yet again about the government, about how they settle things?
Wife: That’s terrible.
Husband: Yeah look [T]. They’re completely incompetent! They just make up nonsense. A normal person has to work like I do and they don’t have to do hardly anything!
Wife: You’re [T] right. Here’s your (lit. I ask you [T] here you have [T]) food. Eat [T].

4.2.2 Mother / adult son

The second clip depicts a woman approximately seventy years old and her adult son having a conversation over dinner.
Again, the overwhelming majority of Russians, Poles, and Czechs created conversations in which both mother and son address each other as T. The two examples in which only one address pattern was used again involved T, and it can be assumed that mutual (symmetrical) T would have been the result if the other party had used address with a pronominal or related form.

R

Syn: Čto ty sdelala?
Mat': Paposila sosedka, čtoby on mne kupil nový škaf.
Syn: Da začem on tebe. Čto, u tebja deneg tak mnogo? Mne že pridetsja za vse èto platît'.
Mat': Da kak tebe ne stydno? V dome vse razvalivaetsja. Na rodnuju mat' deneg žaleeš'?
Byl by živ vnoj otec, on by tebe vpravil mozgi. I voobšče, u menja svoix sbereženij xvaetaet.
Syn: Ty, mama, sovsom iz uma vyžila.
Son: What have you [T] done?
Mother: I asked our neighbor to buy me a new wardrobe.
Son: What do you [T] need it for? What, do you [T] have that much money? I’ll have to pay for all that.
Mother: Shame on you [T]! Everything in the house is falling apart. You’d begrudge [T] your own mother money? If your [T] father was alive, he’d set your [T] brains right.
And anyway, I have enough savings.
Son: Mama, you’ve [T] become completely senile.

Pol

syn: Mamo, prosîlem! Nie umawiaj mnie z córkami twoich znajomych!
mata: Ale to bardzo porządna dziewczyna. Trochê młodsza od ciebie.
syn: Nawet mi o tym nie mów. Sam się zajmę swoim życiem.
mata: Zajmujesz się, zajmujesz i co z niego masz. A ja chcę dla ciebie dobrze.
syn: No to opowiedz mi o niej. Ale niczego nie gwarantuję.
son: Mama, I asked you! Don’t set me up [T] with your [T] friends’ daughters!
mother: But this is a really nice girl. A little younger than you [T].
son: Don’t even talk [T] to me about this. I’ll take care of my own life.
mother: You’re taking care [T] of it, you’re taking care [T] of it and what do you have [T]. I just want good things for you [T].
son: OK tell [T] me about her. But I can’t guarantee anything.

Cz
Syn: To jsem ti matko unavený.
Matka: To je tím, že moc pracuješ. Měl by si si najít ženskou.
Syn: Ženskou?
Matka: No jistě, pořád tady nebudu, kdo se o tebe postará až umrnu?
Syn: Já myslím mami, že tady budeš dál než já. Na ženskou nemám čas.
Son: You know, mother, I’m tired and you [T] should care.
Mother: That’s because you work [T] a lot. You [T] should find yourself a woman.
Son: A woman?
Mother: Of course, I won’t always be here, who’ll look after you [T] when I die?
Son: Mama, I think you’ll be [T] here longer than I will. I don’t have time for a woman.

4.2.3 Brother / sister

The third film shows a teenage brother and sister picking on each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 3 brother / sister</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1T</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2T</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2T</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 3</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common address pattern</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, for each of the three languages, T is the address pattern used to address family members (as it was above with husband-wife and mother-son). The majority of respondents wrote dialogs with symmetrical T address, and there is no reason to assume that the dialogs with only one address pattern (here, always T) would not be symmetrical if the other speaker had used an address form.

R
Sestra: Nu čto, opjat’ iščes’ pivu? Ne tam iščes’.
Brat: Da razve možet byt’ pivu v etom dome... tol’ko sok... Slušaj, a s kem čto ty včera na večerinke tak milo xixikala. Po-moemu, on nastojaščij idiot...

202
Sestra: Nu, vo-pervyx bratec, éto ne tvogo uma delo. A esli by ty znal, òto u èetogo idiota papa-vice-prezident neftjanoj kompanii, ty by izmenil svoe mnënie o nem...
Brat: A mne- do lampoèki, kio u nego papa, ili djadjja, ili tetja...Dostan 'mne piva!
Sestra: Nu, esli ty budeš 'posluènym bratecm...
Sister: Well what’s this, you’re looking [T] for beer again? You’re not looking [T] in the right place.
Brother: Could there really be beer in this house... only juice...Listen [T], who was that you [T] were giggling with so sweetly at the party yesterday? I think he’s a real idiot...
Sister: Well first of all, brother dear, it’s none of your [T] business. And if you [T] knew that that idiot’s father is the vice president of an oil company, you [T] would change your opinion of him.
Brother: I don’t care who his father is, or his uncle, or his aunt...Get [T] me some beer!
Sister: Well, if you [T] will be [T] a nice brother dear...

Pol
siostra: Szukasz czegoś?
brat: Chcialem się czegoś napić, ale jest tylko sok. No trudno.
siostra: Wiesz, że ojciec się już dowiedział, że zawaliłeś egzamin.
brat: Nawet wiem, od kogo.
siostra: Musiałam mu powiedzieć! Jak długo chciałś to ukrywać?
brat: Dopóki nie wyjdę. Napisalbym mu w liście, że rzuacam studiø.
siostra: Nie rozumiem cię. Ty jesteś potwornie nieodpowiedzialny.
brat: To moja sprawa.
siostra: Jak chcesz.
Sister: Are you looking [T] for something?
Brother: I wanted something to drink but there’s only juice. It’s hard.
Sister: You know [T], father already found out that you failed [T] your test.
Brother: I even know from whom.
Sister: I had to tell him! How long did you want [T] to hide it?
Brother: Until I leave. I would have written him a letter that I’m quitting school.
Sister: I don’t understand you [T]. You [T] are horribly irresponsible.
Brother: That’s my business.
Sister: Whatever you want [T].

Cz
Sestra: Dobrze, kde jseš? Potrzebuje s tebou mluvit.
Bratr: Tady. Hledám nèco k jìdlu.
Sestra: Hele, nech to jìdlo. Vìdycky když s tebou potrebuje mluvit nemàš èas. Tak mè jednou mnìjej.
Bratr: Co potrebuješ? Jà nevim, co poùád řeèiš?
Sestra: Já jsem s toho ùejì úplnì mìno. Poùád mè pràdi pùtom nemà pravdu.
Bratr: No, copak ti zase udìlal?
Sestra: Pùedstav si, že mi ðek, že ješ tehdì jednou poùlu úpatné fìkturu, že mè vyhodi!
Bratr: No to nad ne. Taková bibost.
Sestra: Jèo. Jà přece za to nemùži...
Sister: OK, where are you [T]? I need to talk to you [T].
Brother: Here. I’m looking for something to eat.
Sister: Hey, forget the food. Every time I need to talk to you [T], you don’t have [T] time. So for once pay attention [T] to me.
Brother: What do you need [T]? I don’t know—what are you constantly bothering with [T]?
Sister: My boss is really driving me crazy. He’s always attacking me and he’s wrong about it.
Brother: Well so what did he do to you [T] this time?
Sister: Imagine [T], he told me that if I send out an incorrect bill one more time, he’s going to fire me!
Brother: No way. That’s so stupid.
Sister: Yeah. It’s not my fault after all…

4.2.4 Mother / young son

The fourth clip, which depicts a mother talking to her young (10 year old) son, yielded expected results: T was the consistent address pattern of choice for speakers of all three languages. For reasons of space, the sym V and sym P columns have been eliminated, as no respondent used either of these forms in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 4 mother / son (child)</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>5T</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9T</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9T/Vpl</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that the majority of respondents constructed dialogs in which only one address pattern (always T) was used: this reflects the situation that appears in the film, in which the mother is talking to her son who is being punished by holding a bar of soap in his mouth¹. Thus, his opportunities for interaction were somewhat limited.

¹ Most Americans would recognize this as visual representation of “washing one’s mouth out with soap”, a common (if dated) punishment for children who have been caught using bad language. Not one of the Slavic informants, however, interpreted this situation as a punishment.
R
Mat': Ľto čto za nový sposob umývať sa?
Syn: Ja...xotel by...sdelat' dezinfekciu rta.
Mat': Dezinfekciu? I díja čego?
Syn: Vidiš 'li...ja...proboval kuríť...
Mat': Nu togda tebe dejstvité ho nužna dezinfekcija.
Mother: What, is this some kind of new way to wash up?
Son: I...would like...to disinfect my mouth.
Mother: Disinfect? What for?
Son: You see [T]...I...tried smoking...
Mother: Well, then you [T] really do need disinfection.

Pol
matka: No, zobaczmy, jaką masz temperaturę
syn: Brzuch mnie boli.
matka: Co jeszcze?
syn: Głowa.
matka: Głowa? No to zobaczmy...
Mother: Well, let's see what kind of temperature you have [T].
Son: My stomach hurts.
Mother: What else?
Son: My head.
Mother: Your head? Well let's see...

Cz
Matka: Co to máš v té puse!
Syn: No, to je pomůčka, abych si natrénovať výslovnost Ź.
Matka: Tak mi to předvedť!
Syn: R,R,R zatím to nejde, mami!
Matka: Tak trénuj dál!
Mother: What's that you have [T] in your mouth?
Son: It's an aid to practice the pronunciation of Ź.
Mother: Well do [T] it for me!
Syn: R, R, R right now it's not working, mama!
Mother: Then keep practicing [T]!

4.2.5 Teacher / student

Clip five, which depicts a conversation between a standing teacher and a seated student during a typical high school class, represents the first situation in which there is some disagreement as to the appropriate means of address. Due to space limitations, the
sym $T$ column has been eliminated from this table, since no symmetrical $T$ situations were found in the data for this clip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip5 teacher/student</th>
<th>sym $V$</th>
<th>sym $P$</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym ($A$)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1Vpl/T</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1Vpl/V</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1T</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1V</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2Vpl/T</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2A: Vpl/T/P</td>
<td>14, 25</td>
<td>2P</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2V</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2Vpl/V</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3Vpl</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 5</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common address pattern</td>
<td>A: V to teacher, T to student</td>
<td>A: P to teacher, T to student</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the choice of words for ‘teacher’ (R učitel’, Pol nauczyciel, Cz učitel) and ‘student’ (R učenica, Pol uczennica, Cz studentka) included on the research instrument make it clear that this is a high school, not university, situation. Twenty-five percent of Russian participants suggested that this situation demands asymmetrical address: that is, the teacher speaks to the student using $T$, but the student responds to the teacher with $V$, as in the dialog below:

**Učitel’:** Tak! Vot vaši testy. Maša! A ty ne pisala test. Počemu?
**Učenica:** Vý znáte, ja tak síl' no zabolela, i ne mogla přijít v školu.
**Učitel’:** Nu, čto že—v sledujúcšij raz ne bolej.
Teacher: So here are your [Vpl] tests. Maša! But you [T] didn’t take the test. Why?
Student: ‘You [V] know [V], I got really sick, and I wasn’t able to come to school.
Teacher: Well then—next time don’t get sick [T].

Twenty-five percent of respondents managed to create dialogs in which no
pronominal form was used.

The remaining fifty percent used only one address pattern in their response: one
participant (noted 1Vpl / T in the chart) had the teacher address the class with Vpl (Kak
vy dumaete, začem Kolumb poplyl v Ameriku? ‘What do you [Vpl] think [Vpl], why did
Columbus sail to America?’), but then has him address the single student as T (Nu,
dechočka, ty daleko pojdeš? ‘Well, dear, you’ll [T] go [T] far’). This seems to imply
asymmetrical address, as it is unlikely that the student would address the teacher as T in
turn; however, we cannot be completely sure of this. Similarly, the entry labeled 1T in the
chart above is the result of another dialog in which the teacher addresses the student as T
(Xorošo. Otvečaj. ‘Fine. Answer[T].’) Again, it is likely the student would not address
the teacher as T, but this assumption is not evident from this particular dialog.

Another participant produced a dialog (labeled 1Vpl / V) in which the teacher
addresses the students collectively first (Segodnja s vami my napišem test po projdennom
na prošlom uroke teme ‘Today we (lit. we along with you [Vpl]) are going to take a test
on the subject of the last lesson’) and is addressed by a student as V (U menja k vam
vopros… ‘I have a question for you [V]…’). Similarly, the entry noted 1V reflects yet
another dialog with the same question from the student to the teacher: U menja k vam
vopros… ‘I have a question for you [V]…’ Thus, it is unclear in both of these
conversations whether the teacher would use T or V to address a single student, but we
do know that the student uses V to address the teacher.
Overall, then, these statistics suggest that asymmetrical address is the most common address form in the high school classroom in Russian. Twenty-five percent wrote dialogs with overt V-T address, and twenty-five percent more wrote dialogs implying V-T address (that is, the teacher addresses the student as T). Twenty-five percent wrote dialogs which did not exclude asymmetrical address (that is, the student addresses the teacher as V, but there is no indication of how the teacher addresses the student), and the remaining twenty-five percent wrote dialogs with no address forms.

Poles have a different option for the classroom: instead of V, they would potentially use P. Indeed, one participant created a dialog in which the teacher and student address each other with P. One wrote a conversation that reflects asymmetrical address: the teacher receives P but gives T to the student. Two informants constructed even more detailed asymmetrical situations in which the teacher addresses the class with Vpl and an individual as T, but himself receives P. For instance:

*Nauczyciel:* Rozwiązamy sobie dziś sympatyczny i łatwy teść, który specjalnie dla was przygotowywałem całą noc...zobaczmy...
*Uczennica:* Panie profesorze! Proszę sobie przypomnieć, że nic **pan nie zapowiadał**, a już na pewno ja przysięgam, nic takiego sobie nie przypominam.
*Nauczyciel:* Nie **dyshkjuy**, Molly, rozdaję kartki.

Teacher: Today we’re going to take a nice and easy little test which I was preparing especially for you [Vpl] all night...let’s see...
Student: Sir! Please remember, **you** [P] didn’t tell [P] us anything about it, I swear for sure, I don’t recall anything like that.
Teacher: No discussion (**lit. do not discuss** [T]), Molly, I’m giving out the papers.

Several participants wrote dialogs in which only one speaker uses an address form. These include four in which the teacher addresses the student as T, and two in which he addresses the class as Vpl and the individual as T. The student does not use an address form in any of these dialogs, but would most likely not address the teacher with
T; thus, asymmetrical address (P to teacher by student, T to student by teacher) is implied here.

Two respondents had the teacher address the student as P. We can assume the student would, in turn, address the teacher as P as well. Thus, symmetrical P address is implied in these dialogs, but is not overtly expressed. Finally, two participants constructed dialogs with no address forms given.

In summary, we find that, like the Russian participants, the Polish native speakers overwhelmingly (64.5%) prefer to construe the classroom situation (either overtly or implicitly) as an asymmetrical one, one in which students receive T but give P to their teacher. Only in 21.25% of the cases did the Polish participants write dialogs in which students and teachers address each other mutually as P.

The Czech statistics, however, reveal a slightly different situation. Two participants (twenty percent) constructed conversations in which both teacher and student address and are addressed by V. One Czech participant construed the situation as one requiring asymmetrical address, whereby the teacher addresses the student with T and the student addresses the teacher as V.

The remaining Czech dialogs were written with just one speaker per dialog using an address pattern. Two conversations (labeled 2V above) contain examples of V address from the teacher to the student: *Kdybyste to aspoň dobře opsal*! ‘If you [V] had at least copied it well!’ and *Nevymýšlejte si Nováková a píšte!* ‘Don’t make things up [V], Nováková, just write [V]!’ Notice that these dialogs imply symmetrical V address; the only possible asymmetry in the classroom is the teacher giving T to a student while
receiving V from the student; the reverse is highly unlikely. Thus, if a teacher addresses a student with V, we can assume the student addresses the teacher as V as well.

Two participants wrote dialogs in which the teacher addresses the class as a group with Vpl, then responds to a student with V after she complains about taking a test:

_Učitel: Napišeme si test. Doplňte jméno, třídu._
_Studentka: Byla jsem mimo, přijela teta, mluvili jeden přes druhého, vyšla jsem..._ 
_Učitel: To vás nemůže omluvit, takže napišeme._
Teacher: Let’s take the test. Fill in [Vpl] your name, class...
Student: I was out, my aunt came, we got to talking, I left...
Teacher: That won’t excuse you [V], so let’s write.

_Učitel: Mili studenti, teď si napišeme test, který ověří vaše znalosti z minulé hodiny. Studentka: Pane učiteli, mohli bychom test psát na začátku hodiny a konec hodiny věnovat nové látce? Já osobně se totiž na začátku hodiny mnohem lépe soustředím._
_Učitel: Vidím, že ani na začátku hodiny se moc nesoustředíte._
Teacher: Dear students, right now we’re going to take a test that will test your [Vpl] knowledge from the last class.
Student: Sir, could we take the test at the beginning of class and dedicate the end of class to new material? I personally concentrate much better at the beginning of class.
Teacher: I see that you don’t even concentrate [V] much at the beginning of class.

Thus, again, from these conversations we can assume that symmetrical V address exists in this class: it is highly unlikely, if not impossible, that a student addressed as V by her teacher would in turn address the teacher as anything but V.

Finally, three conversations contain only instances of the teacher addressing the class as a whole (Vpl). No indication is given in these dialogs as to how a single student would be addressed, or how the student would address her teacher.

From the data gathered from Czech native speakers we can conclude that mutual V address is the norm in the Czech classroom (or at least in their Czech classrooms). After all, the majority (60%) of respondents constructed dialogs in which symmetrical V address is overt (2 sym V) or implied (2V and 2Vpl / V).
4.2.6 Professor / professor

Clip six shows two professors talking to each other at the end of a lecture. The No address pattern column has been eliminated for reasons of space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 6 professor / professor</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch (S) or asym(A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS: V&gt;T</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1P</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>IS: V&gt;T</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 6</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common address pattern</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>P or T</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of the Russian respondents construed the situation as one requiring mutual T, and still another participant wrote a dialog in which only one professor uses a form of address (T). Although we cannot be sure what address pattern the other professor would have used, this is likely also a mutual T situation; the professors are of approximately the same age and there is no reason present in the film to believe one has any power or influence over the other.

Twenty-five percent wrote the dialog so that one of the professors addressed the other as V; from this is it not clear, of course, how the other professor would address the first, although it is likely that if one of these interlocutors begins on V, the other would reciprocate.

211
Another Russian participant construed the situation as one involving a switch from V to T:

*Professor 1:* Petr! Možno vas zaderžat' na minutku?
*Professor 2:* Da konečno! A čto u tebja za problema?
*Professor 1:* Da vot, nikak ne mogu opredelit' vozраст ètogo kresta.
*Professor 2:* Interesno! A otkuda u tebja on?
*Professor 1:* Mne ego svjaščennik dal na soxranenie.
*Professor 2:* Ja dumaju, čto ego sdelali v Vizantii v 10-m veke.
*Professor 1:* Da. Ty požalui prav.
*Professor 2:* Peter! Can I keep you [V] for just a minute?
*Professor 2:* Of course! What's your [T] problem?
*Professor 1:* This is the thing, I can't for the life of me determine the age of this cross.
*Professor 2:* Interesting! Where did you [T] get it?
*Professor 1:* A priest gave it to me for safekeeping.
*Professor 2:* I think that it was made in Byzantium in the 10th century.
*Professor 1:* Yes, you're [T] probably right.

However, this switch does not seem to be motivated. After all, the first professor calls the second by his first name, which suggests T, rather than by name and patronymic, which implies V². Since both consistently use T throughout the rest of the conversation, it seems possible that the author made an error in consistency. Regardless, this dialog is an example of how fluid and dynamic variation in address is. The writer easily could have construed the situation as one in which either T or V would have been appropriate.

Polish represents a compromise between Russian and Czech, as we will see below. Exactly six Polish native speakers had the professors address each other as P, and exactly six had them address each other as T. Similarly, one Pole, having only one professor use a form of address, chose P, while another chose T. Thus, the Polish participants were equally divided as to the address pattern that would be used in this situation. Examples with both P and T are as follows:

---

² Others have offered possible motivations for this address pattern: Lawrence Feinberg suggests that perhaps the temporary use of V is motivated by the (polite) request imposed by Professor 1 on Professor 2. James Nollett further suggests that, once Professor 2 responds with T (thus “accepting” the imposition), Professor 1 might be considered rude if he did not reciprocate with T.
Professor 1: Mam nadzieję że ma pan to o co prosiłem...
Professor 2: Mam nawet więcej niż się pan spodziewa...
Professor 1: To naprawdę piękne!
Professor 2: Tak...ostemnasty wiek! Nie chce pan wiedzieć skąd to mam?
Professor 1: Nie wiem, ale ma pan wielkie znajomości!
Professor 2: Niech pana nie interesują moje znajomości tylko wywiązanie się z naszej umowy!
Professor 1: Tak...jutro...
Professor 1: I hope that you [P] have [P] what I asked about...
Professor 2: I have even more than you [P] hoped [P]...
Professor 1: It's really beautiful!
Professor 2: Yes...eighteenth century! Don't you [P] want [P] to know where I got it?
Professor 1: I don't know, but you [P] are [P] very knowledgeable!
Professor 2: Don't let my knowledge interest you [P], only the fulfillment of our agreement.
Professor 1: Yes...tomorrow...

Professor 1: Masz? Znalazłeś?
Professor 2: Tak. Popatrz.
Professor 1: Piękny. Naprawdę piękny. Co zamierzasz z nim zrobić?
Professor 2: Może ty się tym zajmiesz.
Professor 1: Piękny.
Professor 2: Umieść go w uczelnianym muzeum.
Professor 1: Pewnie że tak.
Professor 1: Do you have [T] it? Did you find [T] it?
Professor 2: Yes. Look [T].
Professor 1: Beautiful. Really beautiful. What do you plan [T] to do with it?
Professor 2: Maybe you'll be interested [T] in it.
Professor 1: Beautiful.
Professor 2: Put it in the university museum.
Professor 1: Yes, certainly.

We can conclude from this data that, depending on the closeness of the professors, either form of address, T or P, would be appropriate.

In contrast to the Russian participants, the Czech native speakers seem to prefer mutual V for the interaction between these two professors. Thirty percent wrote conversations in which each professor addresses the other as V. For example:

Professor 1: Kolego, mam to!
Professor 2: Ukażte!
Professor 1: Podívejte se na to!
Professor 2: Hm, je to nádherna!
Professor 1: Taky si myslím.
Professor 2: Moc, moc pěkný!
Professor 1: Nechte si to, už s tím nechci mít nic společného.
Professor 1: Colleague, I have it!
Professor 2: Show [V] me!
Professor 1: Look [V] at it!
Professor 2: Hm, it’s exquisite!
Professor 1: I think so too.
Professor 2: Very, very pretty!
Professor 1: Keep [V] it, I don’t want to have anything to do with it anymore.

One participant wrote a dialog that involves a switch from V to T, after starting on symmetrical V:

Professor 1: Tak kolego, co jste dnes zabavil?
Professor 2: Pojďte se podívat.
Professor 1: Tenhle kříž?
Professor 2: Jo, jedna studentka ho měla na krku. Představ si.
Professor 1: To snad ani není možné. Vždyť to váží přes kilo.
Professor 2: Dnešní mládež je trénovaná.
Professor 1: To musím ukázat doma manželce.
Professor 1: So colleague, what did you [V] confiscate today?
Professor 2: Come [V] take a look.
Professor 1: This cross?
Professor 2: Yeah, a student had it around her neck. Imagine [T].
Professor 1: I daresay that’s not even possible! After all, it weighs more than a kilo.
Professor 2: Today’s youth works out.
Professor 1: I have to show this to my wife at home.

There are two things worthy of note in this dialog. First, the only part of the predicate that can indicate form of address (T or V) in the Czech past tense is the auxiliary jste, which is second person plural in form. The 1-participle zabavil

‘confiscated’ is masculine singular in form and thus does not show any type of honorific marking. This reflects an idiosyncrasy of Czech syntax and represents one way in which the syntax of address differs from Russian.

The other construction worthy of note is the use of Professor 2’s imperative představ ‘imagine’, which is a T form (the V form would be představte). Since the
previous statements made by the professors were on V, we might assume this is simply an inconsistency of the author. After all, mutual T address would certainly be possible between these two colleagues; it happens that this scriptwriter did not choose to start that way.

Another forty percent of the Czech respondents wrote dialogs in which only one professor uses a form of address, V. Again, V use by one professor most likely means the other would reciprocate.

Only one volunteer felt mutual T was appropriate, and another had only one professor using a form of address, T. Thus, the preferred address pattern for professors, according to the Czechs surveyed, is V.

4.2.7 Secretary / businessman

Clip 7 shows a standing businessman talking to a seated secretary. For reasons of space, the sym T column has been eliminated, since no examples of that kind were found among the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 7 secretary / businessman</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5V 62.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Businessman is standing, secretary is seated; he smiles and does not stay focused on her; she gestures him to move and he does; she does not look directly at him; her eyes are downcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>4A 28.5</td>
<td>5P 36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>5V 50 2T 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In 37.5% of the Russian conversations, the businessman and secretary use mutual V forms of address. In the other five dialogs (62.5%), only one pronominal form, always V, is given or implied. In three of the conversations, the secretary addresses the businessman as V, as in the example below:

Sekretarša: Sergej Petrovič, nà počemu vy vse eščë xodite s takim obleslým čemodanom?
Biznesmen: Da ladm, Varen'ka, mne pora idí.
Sekretarša: Nu idite, idite, esli ne xodite slušat' moix sovetov.
Biznesmen: Do zavtra.
Secretary: Sergej Petrovič, why are you [V] still carrying [V] that worn-out suitcase?
Businessman: Ok, Varen’ka, it’s time for me to go.
Secretary: Well go [V], go[V], if you don’t want [V] to listen to my advice.
Businessman: ‘Til tomorrow.

Note here, however, the secretary’s use of name and patronymic (Sergej Petrovič) to address the businessman, in contrast to the businessman’s use of a diminutive first name to the secretary (Varen’ka). This implies asymmetrical (T-V) address, although the address form is not explicitly given here.

In the remaining two dialogs, the businessman addresses the secretary with V. For example:

Sekretarša: Da zanjata ona.
Biznesmen: Nu a ja poprobuju postuču. Ili vy, Aljuša, pozvonite.
Sekretarša: Zvoni ni zvoni, obzvonilas’.
Biznesmen: Nu ja poprobuju zajti.
Secretary: She’s busy.
Businessman: We’ll I’ll just try and knock. Or you[V], Aljuša, call [V] her.
Secretary: One can call all one wants to, I called all around.
Businessman: Well, I’ll try to go in person.

Here the participant has the secretary addressed by the businessman as V, to which she responds with a non-referential T form (see section 2.1.2) not directed at her interlocutor:

Zvoni ni zvoni, obzvonilas’ ‘One can call all one wants to, I called all around’. Thus, the
evidence suggests that in Russian, the preferred form of address between a secretary and
a businessman is mutual V.

The Polish participants constructed dialogs with similar results. 28.5% of native
speakers of Polish had the secretary and businessman address each other mutually with P.
Another 28.5% thought asymmetrical address would be appropriate; in each of these
conversations, the businessman addresses the secretary as T, and she addresses him as P,
as in the dialog below:

Sekretarka: Zabrał pan wszystko? A te umowy które leżą na biurku, niepotrzebne?
Biznesmen: A, właśnie! Co ja bym bez ciebie zrobił?
Sekretarka: Ummm.
Biznesmen: Dziękuję.
Secretary: Did you [P] get [P] everything? And those contracts that are lying on the desk,
you don’t need them?
Businessman: Oh, of course! What would I do without you [T]?
Secretary: Ummm.
Businessman: Thank you.

36% of the respondents created dialogs in which only one speaker used an address
form. In four of the dialogs, the secretary addresses the businessman as P, as in the
example below:

Sekretarka: Był pan umówiony?
Biznesmen: Pan prezes czeka już na mnie.
Sekretarka: No, to proszę wejść. Tędy.
Biznesmen: Dziękuję.
Secretary: Did you [P] have [P] an appointment?
Businessman: The president is already waiting on me.
Secretary: Well then please go in. This way.
Businessman: Thank you.

In one the businessman addresses the secretary as P.

Sekretarka: Czy mogę prosić o wolne jutro?
Biznesmen: Przecież wychodzi pani wcześniej.
Sekretarka: Tak, ale jutro mam sprawy do załatwienia.
Biznesmen: Dobrze.
Secretary: Can I have the day off tomorrow?
Secretary: Yes, but tomorrow I have a matter to settle.
Businessman: OK.

Finally, one volunteer constructed a dialog in which no address forms were used at all. Thus, P seems to be the expected address pattern for address between a boss or businessman and secretary at work; there seems to be some variation as to whether P-address is symmetrical or asymmetrical, with the businessman receiving P from a secretary but giving T to her.

In Czech, we find results similar to those in both Russian and Polish. In three of the conversations, the secretary and businessman address each other mutually with V. In five, however, only one speaker in the dialog provides polite forms of address. In all five of these cases, the secretary uses V to the businessman. For instance:

*Sekretářka: Můžete jít dál, pan ředitel vás očekává.*
*Podnikatel: Ale Janičko, co ten úřední tón?*
*Sekretářka: To víte, práce.*
*Podnikatel: Jistě. Tak hezký vikend.*

Secretary: You can [V] go in, the director is expecting you [V].
Businessman: But Janička, why the official tone?
Secretary: You know [V], work.
Businessman: Of course. Have a good weekend.

The businessman’s use of the secretary’s first name Janička suggests a familiarity that would normally demand T address; he appears put off by her use of V.

In the remaining two dialogs constructed by native speakers, the secretary addresses the businessman as T:

*Sekretářka: Máš všechno sbaleno?*
*Podnikatel: Jistě.*
*Sekretářka: Tak už jdi.*
*Podnikatel: Sbohem.*

Secretary: Do you have [T] everything packed up?
Businessman: Of course.
Secretary: Well, go [T] then.
Businessman: Goodbye.

Dialogs such as the one above suggest that address between a boss or businessman and a secretary depends on how close the relationship is; the etiquette in the work environment, which often requires mutual V address, can be ignored when the relationship between coworkers is close or extends beyond the professional.

4.2.8 Woman behind counter / customer

The eighth clip depicts a customer at a dry cleaning establishment asking the woman behind the counter for his suit. Sym T and sym V have been eliminated for reasons of space; no patterns of these types were found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 8</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>woman behind counter / customer</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5V</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8P</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5V</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 8</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common address pattern</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several of the Russian, Polish, and Czech respondents (37.5%, 22%, and 50%, respectively) wrote dialogs in which no form of address was used at all. Of the five Russians who had one speaker use an address form, all of them had the woman behind the counter address the customer as V:

*Priemščica:* U vas četo?
*Klient:* Pal' to. Serogo cveta.
*Priemščica:* Minutočku.
*Woman behind counter:* What do you [V] have?
Woman behind counter: Just a minute.

Since this is nothing more than a scripted business transaction, and the film clip shows no evidence that the customer and the woman behind the counter have any relationship outside the transaction, the appropriate form of address is, as we expect, V.

However, the Poles responded in somewhat unexpected ways. Two volunteers wrote dialogs in which symmetrical P was used: the woman and the customer addressed each other with P. One constructed a conversation with asymmetrical address, which is not what we anticipate in this context:

*Expedientka:* Dzień dobry, co mogę dla pana zrobić?
*Klient:* Odnaleźdź mój garnitur.
*Expedientka:* Już się robi.
Woman behind counter: Good day, what can I do for you [P]?
Woman behind counter: Consider it done.

In this example, the woman addresses her customer as P, which is what one would expect in this type of situation (a business transaction). What is unexpected is the T form of the imperative he uses to address her. This asymmetry, however, might be explained by the fact that the imperative is the grammatical form that reflects address in this case. The Polish imperative seems to vary a great deal in form, and may not be bound as strictly by the rules of politeness as other forms (for instance, nonpast and past tenses). Discussion of the problems with the Polish imperative will follow in Chapter 6 (see section 6.2.8).

In eight of the responses, only one speaker in the dialog used any address form at all, and it was always P:

*Expedientka:* Co podać? Ma pan paragon?
*Klient:* Tak, proszę.
*Expedientka:* Aha...Już szukam...
Woman behind counter: What can I get you? Do you [P] have [P] your ticket?
Customer: Yes, here.
Woman behind counter: Aha...I'll look for it...

Finally, in three of the conversations, no address form is used at all. The transaction is brief and clearly scripted; therefore, little dialog is required to accomplish the task at hand.

Thus, P seems to be the form of address favored in this type of situation. The imperative might serve as an exception to this rule and will be discussed in Chapter 6 (section 6.2.8).

In Czech we also expect formal address, and, indeed, the Czech participants who chose an address form chose V, even though in each dialog only one speaker uses it to address the other, as was the case in Russian. For instance:

_Zaměstnankyně čistírny: Co si přejete, pane?
Zákazník: Uniformu.
Zaměstnankyně čistírny: Jisté.
Woman behind the counter in a dry cleaners: Can I help you (lit. what do you wish [V]), sir?
Customer: A uniform.
Woman behind the counter in a dry cleaners: Of course.

4.2.9 Man / prostitute(s)

Russian, Polish, and Czech, then, require formal address in most business transactions. However, the next clip depicts an atypical business situation: film nine shows two prostitutes, one foregrounded and one backgrounded, and a very drunk man in a car trying to pick them up. Only the foremost prostitute speaks, but it is unclear whether the man is talking to only one or both of the prostitutes. There is potential for ambiguity, but some respondents have made unambiguous interpretations. Again, for reasons of space, the sym P column has been removed, since no examples of this type were found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 9</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common address pattern</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Russian, Polish, and Czech dialogs that derive from this segment showed a wide variety of interpretations.

One Russian native speaker had the man and prostitute speak to each other with mutual T, and had the man address both women with Vpl as well (labeled 1(Vpl) under sym T in the chart above):

**Mužčina:** Nu stoite vy, a tolku-to?
**Prostitutka:** A ty nas ne voz'mez'?
**Mužčina:** Esčě čežo ne xvatalo, ja i bez vas mogu obojitis'.
**Prostitutka:** Nu esli možeš', to provalivaj otsjuda. Ty nam klientov razgonjaes'.
**Mužčina:** Ty molči. <k drugoj> A voobšče, možet byti ja zavtra pridu.

Man: Well you [Vpl] are standing [Vpl] and what’s the point?  
Prostitute: And you're [T] not going to take [T] us?
Man: That'd be the last straw...I can manage even without you [Vpl].  
Prostitute: Well if you can [T], then get out [T] of here! You [T] are running off [T] our clients.
Man: You [T] shut up [T]. <to the other girl> And anyway, maybe I’ll come back tomorrow.

One Russian participant has the man and the prostitute speaking to each other with mutual V:
Mužčina: Ej, devuška, xotite vypit?
Prostitutka: Net, spasibo. Odnoj vypivkoj ne otdelaetes’.
Mužčina: A možet byt vse že dogovorimsja.
Prostitutka: Voi eto drugoj razgovor.
Mužčina: Skol’ko?!
Man: Hey, girl, do you want [V] a drink?
Prostitute: No, thank you. You won’t get your way [V] with just a drink.
Man: Well maybe we can come to an agreement anyway.
Prostitute: Well that’s a different question.
Man: How much?!

In this conversation, we know the man is addressing just the one prostitute because he
addresses her as dëvuška ‘girl’ in the singular, and follows the noun of address with a V
form: xotite ‘want’. She also addresses him as V; this is unambiguous, as there is clearly
only one man for her to speak to in the film clip.

Four Russians wrote dialogs with only one speaker using an address form. In two
of these, the prostitute addresses her potential client as T, as in the following example:

Mužčina: Privet devočki!
Prostitutka: Privet maččik! Xočeš’ porazveč’sja?
Mužčina: Da! A skolko eto budet stoit?
Prostitutka: $50 v čas, $100 za noć’.
Mužčina: Otično.
Man: Hi girls!
Prostitute: Hi fella! Do you want [T] to have a good time?
Man: Yes! But how much will it cost?
Prostitute: $50 an hour, $100 for the night.
Man: Excellent.

In another, the prostitute addresses the man as T, and he speaks to her with V
forms, but it is unclear whether he is using V or Vpl.

Mužčina: Čto, biznes ne idet?
Prostitutka: Tebe kakoe delo?
Mužčina: A ja, možet, o vas bespokojuš’. Kto že ešče o vas budet dumat?
Prostitutka: Ostan’.
Mužčina: Ja čto xoču, to i delaju. Ja že ne pristaju k vam. Sižu sebe v ètom limuzine
spokojno, nikomu ne mešaju.
Man: What, business is bad?
Prostitute: What’s it to you [T]?
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Man: Maybe I’m worried about you [V? / Vpl?] Who else is going to think about you [V? / Vpl?]?
Prostitute: Leave (?me?us) alone [T].
Man: I do what I want. I’m not bothering you [V? / Vpl?]. I’m just calmly sitting in my limousine, not bothering anybody.

In another dialog, the man speaks to the prostitute with V, and it is clear he is only talking to one person:

Mužčina: A vy, skázte-ka mne, golubuška, čemu raven kvadratnyj koren’ iz 758?
Prostitutka: 18.65.
Mužčina: To-to ja vižu, lico znakomoe...V kakom-že eto godu vy mne ekzamen sdavali po vysšej matematike.
Prostitutka: Dva goda nazad.
Mužčina: A ved’ točno! Kak vremja letit.
Man: And you [V], tell [V] me, my pigeon, what’s the square root of 758?
Prostitute: 18.65
Man: I see it, your face is familiar...At some point you [V] took [V] an exam in higher mathematics from me.
Prostitute: Two years ago.
Man: Yes, exactly! How time flies.

Finally, two Russian respondents constructed dialogs with no forms of address included.

Thus, there seems to be disagreement on the appropriate form of address for this situation. Although solicitation of a prostitute is a business transaction, it is not a typical example of a business transaction, as what is being solicited is a certain amount of immediate intimacy. V is possible in this situation (after all, the interlocutors are strangers and it is, again, a business transaction), but most of the Russian participants seemed to think T would be the more likely form of address.

The Polish results are fairly straightforward. Overall, the respondents generally preferred T as the form of address between man and prostitute. Four participants constructed dialogs in which both speakers use T. One volunteer wrote a dialog with asymmetrical, or perhaps simply mixed, address:
Mężczyzna: Dzień dobry paniom! Czy któraś z szanownych pan chce napić się ze mną szampana w mojej limuzynie? Wlasnie wygrałem w kasynie i jestem najbogatszym człowiekiem w Las Vegas!
Prostitute: I najbardziej pijanim! Zjeżdżaj pan! Nie zawracaj nam głowy!
Mężczyzna: Nie wierzycie mi! Jestem szczęśliwy! Mam wielki dom z basenem i tysiąc służących! I trzysta samochodów! Nie prawda Joe? Mój kierowca paniom powie wszystko! A wszystko to dzięki głupiemu Joe!!!! Co za kretyn!
Prostitute: Acha... już ci wierzę. Zjeżdżaj! Kolejny napity palancie!
Mężczyzna: Och te kobiety...
Man: Good day ladies! Would one of you honorable ladies [Ppl] like to drink champagne with me in my limousine? I just won at the casino and I'm the richest person in Las Vegas!
Prostitute: And the drunkest! You [P] get out [T] of here! Don't bother [T] us!
Man: You don't believe [Vpl] me! I'm happy! I have a big house with a pool and a thousand servants! And three hundred cars! Isn't that right, Joe? My driver will tell you [Ppl] everything! And everything is thanks to stupid Joe!!!! What a moron!
Prostitute: Aha... Now I believe you [T]. Get out [T] of here. Next drunk jerk!
Man: Oh these women...

Notice in this dialog the mix of P forms and T imperatives. As mentioned above, the Polish imperative form seems the most flexible of all the forms; very often T is used when P is expected, and Vpl is used when Ppl is expected.

The other dialogs are generally of the sort below:

Mężczyzna: No, małenka, chcesz się zabawić?
Prostitute: Pewnie, że tak, kochanie.
Mężczyzna: To wskakuj sliczniočko.
Prostitute: Ale nas jest dwie.
Mężczyzna: Tym lepiej. Chodźcie już, szkoda czasu.
Man: Well, little lady, do you want [T] to have a good time?
Prostitute: Of course, love.
Man: Well hop in [T], sweetie.
Prostitute: But there are two of us.
Man: All the better. Come on [Vpl], there's not much time.

That is, four respondents wrote dialogs in which one speaker uses T, and four others wrote dialogs in which the prostitute uses T to the man, and he responds with Vpl to both the prostitutes.
Thus, among the Polish native speakers surveyed, the overwhelming choice for address between man and prostitute is T.

The Czechs responded in a similar manner. Five volunteers wrote dialogs in which the man and the prostitute exchanged mutual T, but two had them exchanging mutual V. Examples of each are given below:

*Muž* : Tak za kolik, holubičko?
Prostitutka: Pro tebe, jako obvykle!
*Muž* : Tak jsem?
Prostitutka: Ale jindy, až budeš fit!
*Muž* : Já jsem fit, to budeš koukat!
Man: So how much, my little pigeon?
Prostitute: For you [T], same as always!
Man: So, let’s go?
Prostitute: But another time, when you’re [T] in better shape.
Man: I’m in good shape, you’ll [T] see that!

*Muž* : Připijím na vaší krásu, slečno.
Prostitutka: Asi jste pěkné opilý.
*Muž* : To ano, proto se mi zdáte tak krásná. Nic ve zlým.
Prostitutka: Zato vy jste opičák.
*Muž* : Obě jste krásné, dámy, jedna krásnější než druhá.
Man: I drink to your [V] beauty, miss.
Prostitute: You’re [V] probably nice and drunk.
Man: Why yes, that’s why you seem [V] so beautiful to me. No offense.
Prostitute: But then, you’re [V] an ape.
Man: You’re [Vpl] both beautiful, ladies, one more beautiful than the next.

In addition, three respondents created dialogs in which the prostitute addressed the man as T, and he addressed the prostitutes in the plural (Vpl).
4.2.10 Waiter / customer

From the prostitute clip we return to a depiction of a more typical transaction. In clip ten, participants see a seated male customer talking to a standing female waiter\(^3\). The symmetric \( T \) column has been deleted for reasons of space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 10</th>
<th>sym ( V )</th>
<th>sym ( P )</th>
<th>Switch(( S )) or asym ( A )</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( R )</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>( 3V ) 37.5</td>
<td>1 12.5</td>
<td>8 100</td>
<td>Female waiter standing, male customer sitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>3 23</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8P 61</td>
<td>13* 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>6 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3V 30</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This type of interaction generally requires polite address between interlocutors, and indeed, the Russian participants constructed dialogs in which only \( V \) is used. Four (50\%) of these contained symmetrical \( V \) address, whereby the customer and waiter address each other with overt \( V \) forms. Three dialogs contain address by only one speaker. In two of them the waiter addresses the customer as \( V \):

- **Gost’ restorana:** Spasibo, obed byl očen’ vkusnyj.
- **Oficjantka:** A čto vam ponravilos’ bol’še vsego?
- **Gost’ restorana:** Bijsteks byl očen’ mjagkij i sočnyj.
- **Oficjantka:** Přízodite eště. Vsego xorošego.

Customer: Thanks, lunch was very tasty.
Waitress: And what did you [\( V \)] like most of all?
Customer: The steak was very tender and juicy.
Waitress: Come [\( V \)] again. Goodbye.

---

\(^3\) It was only after all the data had been gathered that I realized I had created scripts with an error: on each research instrument, in Russian and Polish (the Czech word is ambiguous), I provided masculine forms for “waiter”, when obviously I should have provided words for “waitress”. The respondents unanimously interpreted the waitress as female, despite my linguistic blunder.
Although the address in some of the dialogs is one-sided, as in the example above, the use of V implies symmetrical V; we see in this clip a representation of an impersonal business transaction between strangers. In addition, half of the Russian respondents wrote their dialogs using symmetrical V, thus suggesting that had the other speaker used a pronoun or related form in these three dialogs, it would have been V.

In Polish, the formal address pattern (P) is generally preferred, but two informants offered alternatives. One constructed a dialog in which asymmetry appears:

Klient w restauracji: Mogę prosić rachunek. Załuję pieniędzy, które muszę za to zapłacić. 
Kelner: Proszę, proszę...mógi pan wybrać inną restaurację?
Klient w restauracji: Podobasz mi się! Przyszedłem tu dla ciebie! Co robisz po pracy?
Kelner: Placi pan kartą czy gotówką?
Customer: Can I have the check? It’s a waste of money to pay for this.
Waitress: Please, please... could [P] you [P] have chosen another restaurant?
Customer: I like you [T]! I came here for you [T]! What are you doing [T] after work?
Waitress: Are you [P] paying [P] with a credit card or cash?

In this dialog, the waiter maintains the professional relationship by using only P, while the customer addresses her as T as he is making a pass at her.

Another Polish respondent wrote a dialog in which the customer addresses the waiter as T, but she uses no form of address in return. Otherwise, the Polish participants preferred P for the interaction between waiter and customer, as in the dialog below:

Klient w restauracji: Ile placzę?
Kelner: 5,20 proszę
Klient w restauracji: Co pani robi wieczorem?
Customer: How much?
Waitress: 5.20 please.
Customer: What are you [P] doing [P] this evening?
Waitress: I’m working. 5.20 please.
The Czech participants also overwhelmingly prefer V for the interaction between customer and waiter. 60% of the respondents wrote dialogs in which both use V to address each other:

Zákazník: Konečně jste tady.
Vrchní: Co byste si dal? Palačinky, toust nebo vajička?
Zákazník: Nešla byste se mnou na kafe?
Vrchní: Možná.
Customer: Finally you’re [V] here.
Waitress: What would you [V] like? Pancakes, toast or eggs?
Customer: Would you [V] have coffee with me?
Waitress: Maybe.

Forty percent wrote dialogs in which one speaker uses V. Again, we can assume that address would most likely be symmetrical V had the other interlocutor spoken.

Finally, one participant created a dialog in which no address forms were used. Thus, V is the preferred form for address between customer and waiter in Czech.

4.2.11 Male stranger / female stranger

Clip eleven depicts not a business transaction, but two strangers, a man and a woman, sitting some distance away from each other on a park bench, waiting for a bus.

The No address pattern column has been removed for reasons of space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 11 stranger / stranger</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4V 50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1A 8</td>
<td>8P 61</td>
<td>13* 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2T</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6V 67</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She sits far from him on a bench; initially they address each other with direct eye contact; the woman then keeps her head bent, attempting to read her book while they "interact"
In a situation involving conversation between strangers, we expect the use of the formal pronoun or related form. Indeed, half of the Russian respondents created dialogs in which symmetrical V was used, and the other half wrote dialogs in which V was used by only one speaker, which implies symmetrical V address. The first dialog below has an example of symmetrical address, and represents an example of a participant too familiar with the film from which the excerpt was taken:

**Neznakomec:** Zdravstvujte.  
**Neznakomka:** Zdravstvujte.  
**Neznakomec:** Ugoščajte’.  
**Neznakomka:** Net, spasibo.  
**Neznakomec:** A ja ljublju šokolad. Moja mama govorila, čto vsja žizn’ kak korobka šokolada: nikogda ne znaeš’ čego ožiđat’. Xorošie u vas krossovki.  
**Neznakomka:** Spasibo.  
**Neznakomec:** Po krossovkam možno rasskazat’ o čeloveke.  
Male stranger: Hello (lit. Be well[V]).  
Female stranger: Hello (lit. Be well[V]).  
Male stranger (offers a box of candy): Help yourself [V].  
Female stranger: No thank you.  
Male stranger: I love chocolate. My mama used to say that life is like a box of chocolates: you never know what to expect. You [V] have nice tennis shoes.  
Female stranger: Thank you.  
Male stranger: You can tell a lot about a person by their shoes.

Of course, the original movie is in English and does not contain any instances of polite address, so it is the construal of the situation by the Russian scriptwriter which determines the address form used. The next dialog contains use of an address form by only one of the interlocutors:

**Neznakomec:** Interesnaja kniga? Čto vy čitaete?  
**Neznakomka:** (Ne otečaet)  
**Neznakomec:** Voz’mite konfetu. Očen’ vkusnaja.  
**Neznakomka:** (Ne reagiruet)  
**Neznakomec:** Vy medsestra?
Neznakomka: Da, a čto?
Neznakomec: Póčemu vy ne xotite pogovoríť so mnoj?
Male stranger: Interesting book? What are you [V] reading [V]?
Female stranger: (Doesn’t answer)
Female stranger: (Doesn’t react)
Male stranger: Are you [V] a nurse?
Female stranger: Yes, why?
Male stranger: Why don’t you [V] want [V] to talk to me?

Although the female stranger never responds with a form of address (in fact, she hardly responds at all), it is likely that this is, again, actually a symmetrical V situation.

Like the Russian respondents, the Polish participants seemed to feel that mutual formal address would be the most acceptable in this situation. Nine Polish participants wrote dialogs in which either both speakers use P (8%) or one speaker uses P, thus implying symmetrical P address (61%). For example:

Nieznajomy: Przepraszam! Dzień dobry!
Nieznajoma: Dzień dobry.
Nieznajomy: Może się pani poczęstuję?
Nieznajoma: Dziękuję.
Nieznajomy: Są bardzo smaczne.
Nieznajoma: Dziękuję, nie mam ochoty na słodycze.
Nieznajomy: Nie ma sprawy. Ma pani ladne buty. Do biegania- jak moje.
Male stranger: Excuse me! Good day!
Female stranger: Good day.
Male stranger: Would you [P] like to help yourself [P]?
Female stranger: Thank you.
Male stranger: They’re very tasty.
Female stranger: Thank you, I don’t feel like anything sweet.

However, one respondent wrote a dialog with asymmetrical address:

Nieznajomy: Co pani czyta? Ciekawe?
Nieznajoma: Tak.
Nieznajomy: Może się pani poczęstuję? Są smaczne.
Nieznajoma: Nie, dziękuję.
Nieznajomy: Ma pani takie czyściutkie buciki
Nieznajoma: Proszę mi daj spokój.
Nieznajomy: A moje są takie ublocone.
Male stranger: What are you reading? Interesting?
Female stranger: Yes.
Male stranger: Maybe you'd [P] like to help yourself [P]? They're tasty.
Female stranger: No, thank you.
Male stranger: You [P] have [P] such clean little shoes!
Female stranger: Please leave [T] me alone.
Male stranger: But mine are so muddy.

Notice that the T form the woman uses is the imperative *daj* 'give'; again Polish imperatives do not seem to operate by the same “rules” as other forms when it comes to address (this will be discussed in 6.2.8). Also, the T form here could be motivated by the fact that she is trying to get rid of the strange person talking to her; the use of T might express assertiveness⁴.

Finally, three informants created dialogs in which T was used by one or both speakers:

*Nieznajomy: Cześć, mam dzisiaj urodziny.*
*Nieznajoma: Wszystkiego najlepszego.*
*Nieznajomy: Może się poczęstujesz?*
*Nieznajoma: Dziękuję.*
*Nieznajomy: Masz ładne buty.*
*Nieznajoma: Zwyczajne.*
*Nieznajomy: Czyste.*
Male stranger: Hi, it's my birthday today.
Female stranger: All the best!
Male stranger: Maybe you'd like to help yourself [T]?
Female stranger: Thank you.
Male stranger: You have [T] nice shoes.
Female stranger: They're just ordinary.
Male stranger: They're clean.

Thus, although P is the preferred form of address between strangers, T also seems to be acceptable to some respondents.

⁴ This use of T might also represent the way a person would talk to a child or retarded person; the clip depicting two strangers is from the movie Forrest Gump.
The Czech participants prefer V for the interaction between two strangers. Three volunteers wrote dialogs in which both speakers use V, and six wrote dialogs in which V is used by only one speaker, as in the dialog below:

neznámá: Ano, hezké.
neznámý: Vy si čtete, že. Nechcete bonbon?
neznámá: Ne, děkuji.
neznámý: Koukám, že máte čisté boty.
neznámá: Ano.
neznámý: To já ne, šel jsem v dešti, tak je mám špinavé.
female stranger: It’s not raining anymore, huh. Nice weather.
male stranger: Yes, nice.
male stranger: You’re [V] reading [V], huh? Don’t you want [V] a candy?
female stranger: No thanks.
male stranger: I see that your [V] shoes are clean.
female stranger: Yes.
male stranger: Mine aren’t, I was walking in the rain, so mine are dirty.

Again, the use of V by one speaker implies, in this situation, symmetrical V. Although only one of the strangers uses an address form, there is no apparent reason for the other to use anything but V if he / she were to reply.

4.2.12 Policeman / man (men)

In the twelfth clip we see a policeman talking to a young man who is standing next to another young man; thus, the policeman could address one or both of them.

Again, plural address is not particularly interesting for Russian and Czech, but it is for Polish. The sym V and sym P columns have been deleted; no examples of these types of address were found among the data for this situation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 12 policeman /man</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>Switch($) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4Vpl</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1V</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6**</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1T</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>1S:P&gt;T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4T/Vpl</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3P/Vpl</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2Vpl</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1P+2pl</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3Vpl</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1V</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1Vpl/V</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 12 Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common address pattern</td>
<td>V or T, Vpl</td>
<td>T, Vpl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only six of the eight Russians surveyed completed the twelfth task, and none of them constructed a dialog in which both the young man and the policeman address each other with a pronominal or related form. In four dialogs, the policeman uses Vpl to address both young men. In one, the policeman clearly addresses the one young man as V:

*Milicjoner:* Graždanin! *Pred"javite udostoverenie!*
*Mužičina:* A čto takogo ja sdelal?*
*Milicjoner:* Vý naruššete obščestvennyj porjadok!*
*Mužičina:* I kak že ja ego naruša?*
*Milicjoner:* Vý pojaviliš v obščestvennom meste v nepriččnom vide!*
*Mužičina:* Ja imeju pravo odevaššja kak xoču!*
*Milicjoner:* Xvatit sporit! *Projdite za mnoj!*

Policeman: Citizen! Show [V] me your identification!
Man: And just what did I do?
Policeman: You [V] are disturbing [V] the public peace.
Man: And exactly how am I doing that?
Policeman: You’re [V] in a public place in indecent attire!
Man: I have the right to dress as I want!
Policeman: Enough arguing! Follow [V] me!

In another, the policeman addresses the young man as T:

*Milicjoner:* Rabota klevaja...a čto ty dumaeš’? Na formu vse smotrat. Forma vsex čeloveka delat. Včera s takoj devaxoj poznakomilsja.
Mużecina: Nu čto, prošlo na rabote?
Milicioner: A gde že ešče?
Policeman: The job is cool... but what do you [T] think [T]? Everybody looks at the uniform. The uniform makes the man. Yesterday I met this chick.
Man: What, it happened at work?
Policeman: Where else?

It is important to notice the difference in tone of these two dialogs. In the first, the policeman is making an arrest and is addressing the young man as a stranger involved in this particular transaction; thus, V is the appropriate form of address. Although the address is one-sided (only the policeman uses an address form), symmetrical V address is certainly implied, as the young man should not address his arresting officer as T. In the second dialog, the policeman and the young man are talking as friends, outside of the context of the work of a policeman. Thus, it is a logical construal that they are speaking on T.

The Polish participants wrote dialogs using a wide variety of address forms. Most often, T address is involved. For example, in one, the policeman switches from P to T when addressing the young man:

policjant: Mówi pan, że nie jechal szybko?
mężczyzna: No pewnie!
policjant: To dlaczego radar pokazał co innego?
mężczyzna: Może się zepsuł.
policjant: Może go naprawisz?
mężczyzna: Ja go nie zmastrowałem.
policjant: Jeśli chcesz udowodnić, że nie jechal szybko, nie masz wyboru.
Policeman: Are you [P] saying [P] that you weren’t speeding?
Man: Exactly!
Policeman: Then why did the radar show something else?
Man: Maybe it’s broken.
Policeman: Maybe you’ll fix [T] it?
Man: I didn’t mess it up.
Policeman: If you want [T] to prove that you weren’t speeding [T], you don’t have [T] a choice.
In two others, asymmetrical address is used. The policeman is consistently addressed formally as P, but the young men are addressed informally (with T to one and Vpl to both):

policjant: I co idioce, złapalem was.
mężczyzna: Tak, ma pan nas.
policjant: I dlaczego się śmiejesz?
mężczyzna: A bo tu bardzo fałnie.
policjant: Za chwile nie będzie ci do śmiechu.
mężczyzna: Tak? A dlaczego?
policjant: Zaczekaj chwile a przekonasz się.
Policeman: So idiots, I caught you [Vpl].
Policeman: And why are you laughing [T]?
Man: Because it’s really cool here.
Policeman: In a minute you [T] won’t be laughing.
Man: Yeah? And why is that?
Policeman: Wait [T] a minute and you’ll see [T].

Four participants constructed dialogs in which only T and Vpl address appear. For instance:

policjant: Co chłopy...Chcieliście zobaczyć jak wygląda posterunek...
mężczyzna: Tak! cha cha! Mój brat strasznie chciał zobaczyć jak wygląda miejsce gdzie pracują panowie w takich dziwnych czapkach!
policjant: Dziwnych czapkach...Nie naśmiewajcie się z pracy policji!! Jak śmiesz?!
mężczyzna: Nie śmieję byśmy się śmiać! My bardzo szanujemy ....
policjant: Więc...
mężczyzna: Mój brat chciałby wstąpić do policji i służyć krajowi!
policjant: A to co innego. Chłopy zapamiętajcie-ojczyzna na pierwszym miejscu!
Policeman: What boys...Did you want [Vpl] to see what the police station looks like?
Man: Yes! Ha ha! My brother wanted terribly to see what the place where men in such strange hats work looks like!
Policeman: Strange hats...Don’t deride [Vpl] the work of the police! How dare you [T]!?
Man: We wouldn’t dare laugh! We really respect...
Policeman: So...
Man: My brother would like to become a policeman and serve his country!
Policeman: Well that’s something else. Remember [Vpl] boys- put your homeland first!

Three participants wrote dialogs in which P and Vpl are used, as in the example below:
policjant: Szukam samochodu: biały polonez, sielczony z boku.

mężczyzna: Ale dlaczego przychodzi pan z tym do nas?
policjant: Znany się nie od dawno.
mężczyzna: Ale, panie władzo.
policjant: Pamiętajcie, że jeśli to powtórzyc, nie będę mógł znowu przymknąć na to oka.
mężczyzna: Rozumiemy, ale...
policjant: No, pamiętajcie o konsekwencjach...
policeman: I'm looking for a car: a white Polonaise, dented on the side.
Man: But why are you [P] coming [P] to us with this?
Policeman: Because we've known each other since before today.
Man: But sir.
Policeman: Remember [Vpl] that if this happens again, I won't be able to close my eyes to it.
Man: We understand, but...
Policeman: Well, remember [Vpl] the consequences...

In two others, the policeman is the only speaker to use a form of address, and in both he addresses the young men together as Vpl.

Finally, we find one instance of P + Vpl when the policeman addresses the men together: Co państwo tu robicie? What are you [Ppl] doing [Vpl] here?

The Polish results are fairly complicated. Clearly, in the plural, Vpl address is preferred over Ppl; even when Ppl appears, it is in combination with a Vpl predicate. Address in the singular is not as clear, as informants construed the situation in various ways: as men who are friends with the policeman and speaking with T, as the policeman being aggressive and therefore speaking with T, or as a stranger and policeman speaking with P. These results once again reinforce the notion that address is flexible and highly subjective.

The Czechs, however, responded with less variety than the Poles. One Czech respondent wrote a dialog in which both the policeman and the young man address each other with symmetrical T:

policista: Proč vás sem přivezli?
muž: To já nevím.
policista: No tak, s pravdou ven.
muž: Ale já fakt nevím.
policista: Však ty si vzpomeneš hajzliku.
muž: No počkej! Mně nebudeš říkat hajzliku.
policista: Budeš sedět, až zčernáš.
Policeman: Why did they bring you [Vpl] here?
Man: I don’t know.
Policeman: So out with the truth.
Man: But I really don’t know.
Police: But you’re [T] gonna remember [T], asshole.
Man: Wait [T]! You won’t be [T] calling me an asshole.
Police: You’re gonna [T] do time until you turn black [T].

Note the aggressiveness on the part of both speakers in this dialog.

The remainder of Czech participants constructed conversations in which only one speaker used a form of address or neither speaker used a pronominal or related form. Of the respondents who had one speaker use an address form, three involved use of Vpl from the police officer to the two young men. In another, the young man addresses the policeman as V, and the policeman addresses the young men together as Vpl:

Policista: Co vy dva, vypadá to, že máte dobrou náladu.
Muž: Hihihí, jak to víte?
Policista: Vidíš, jak se pořád híháte a vypadáte divně.
Muž: Zrovna jsme viděli bezvě stock v kině.
Policista: Opravdu? Ale kina jsou už 3 hodiny zavřená.
Muž: Fakt? To jste teda chytrý.
Policista: Aby ne, když jsem polda.
Policeman: Hey you two, it looks like you’re [Vpl] in a good mood.
Man: Hee hee hee, how do you know [V]?
Policeman: I see how you keep giggling [Vpl] and you look [Vpl] strange.
Man: We just saw an awesome movie at the theater.
Policeman: Really? But the cinemas have been closed for 3 hours already.
Man: Oh yeah? You’re [V] smart then.
Policeman: Of course I am. I’m a cop.

Lastly, one respondent wrote a dialog in which only one speaker uses V, in this case, the policeman to the young man:

Policista: Jel jste moc rychle!
Muž: Ne, ne!
Policista: Ale ano! Napařím vám pokutu.
Muž: To není možné!
Policista: Měřili jsme rychlost.
Muž: Vždyť jsem jež na kole!
Policista: A mě se zdálo, že jste jež na mopedu.
Policeman: You were [V] going too fast!
Man: No, no!
Policeman: Oh but yes! I’m gonna give you [V] a ticket.
Man: That’s impossible!
Policeman: We clocked you.
Man: But I was riding my bike!
Policeman: It seemed to me that you were [V] riding a moped.

Overall, then, Czechs prefer V for the conversation between the man and the policeman.

4.2.13 Sergeant / private

The next clip, the thirteenth, shows an interaction between another man and an authority figure: here we see a sergeant addressing a private in the army in a very aggressive way; there is very little distance between them, and the private is at attention while he is (it appears) being berated by his superior. For reasons of space, the sym P column has been eliminated from the chart; no examples of mutual P address were found for this clip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 13 sergeant / private</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Sergeant draws near and is screaming in private’s face; sergeant makes eye contact, but private must stare straight ahead; only sergeant is allowed other movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1S:V&gt;T</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3T</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1S:V&gt;T</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7V</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 13</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common address pattern</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>V/T</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address in the military is generally very highly scripted, and there are numerous rules and regulations regarding use of pronouns, names, ranks, and so on.

The Russian volunteers generally interpreted this situation as one involving T address from the irate sergeant to the private; in three dialogs, the private does not respond with a form of address. For example:

Seržant: Ne smet razgovarivat v stroju. Govoriš tol’ko po moej komande! Ponjal?
Rjadovoj: Tak točno.
Seržant: Zdes’ komanduju paradom⁵ ja, i tol’ko ja. Malejšee oslušanie- budeš’ otpravljen v štрафnoj batal’on.
Sergeant: You are not allowed to talk at attention. Only talk on my orders! Understood?
Private: Yes sir!
Sergeant: Here I and only I am in charge. The least little disobedience- you’ll be [T] sent to the brig.

Seržant: Kakoe pravilo no.1 v armii?
Rjadovoj: Slušaš’ i delaš tak, kak skazal moj seržant.
Seržant: Ty čertovski umen, rjadovoj. U menja ešče ne bylo takogo umnogo rjadovogo za vse vremja v armii.
Sergeant: What’s the no.1 rule in the army?
Private: To listen and do what my sergeant says.
Sergeant: You’re [T] awfully smart, private. I’ve never had such a smart private in all my time in the army.

Only one volunteer created a dialog with symmetrical T address between sergeant and private. Another, however, wrote a script involving a shift in means of address from V>T:

Seržant: Tvoju mat’, gde takix berut. Ivanov, vy začem sjuda prišli?
Rjadovoj: V armii služiš.

⁵ Thanks to Eleonora Magomedova for pointing out that this is a quote from a famous novel, Dvenadcat stulev 'The twelve chairs' by Il’f and Petrov. By using this phrase, the sergeant reveals himself to be highly educated; of course, the quote also tells us the author of the dialog (a participant in our research project) is highly educated.
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Sergeant: Dammit, where do they get these guys. Ivanov, why did you[V] come[V] here?
Private: To serve in the army.
Sergeant: Then serve. Yesterday because of you[T] the general almost wrote a report. What were you[T] doing[T] at your post? One more time and I'll see you in the brig.

The shifts in this dialog merit our attention. The first instance of a form of address might appear to be T: tvouj mat' ‘dammit (lit. 'your[T] mother'). However, this is actually a non-referential T use of a possessive adjective (see section 2.1.2). Tvoju mat' ‘dammit’ is the last half of a well-known obscene phrase; the actual offensive word has been left out in this case. Thus, the sergeant's true address to the private begins in the next sentence with V: Ivanov, vy začem sjuda prišli? ‘Ivanov, why did you[V] come[V] here’? After private Ivanov responds, the sergeant switches to T in order to berate him:
Včera iz-za tebja general čut' raport ne napisal. Ty na postu čem zanimalsja? ‘Yesterday because of you[T] the general almost wrote up a report. What were you[T] doing[T] at your post?’

Two respondents created dialogs in which the sergeant addresses the private with V, but the private does not respond with a pronominal or related form, as in the conversation below:

Seržant: Rjadovoj Ivanov!
Rjadovoj: Ja!
Seržant: Počemu vy opozdali na sbor?
Sergeant: Private Ivanov!
Private: Here!
Sergeant: Why were you[V] late[V] for muster?

Finally, one participant wrote a dialog in which neither speaker used a pronominal or related form of address.
Polish address in the military is unusual in that V (as opposed to P) is the standard form. Many of the Poles surveyed knew this and wrote dialogs in which the sergeant addresses the private as V. For instance:

**Sierżant:** Szeregowy X, co wy właściwie sobie myślicie do cholery? Ja mam was uczyć porządku.
**Żołnierz:** Tak jest, panie sierżancie.
**Sierżant:** Porządek musi być! Zrozumiano? Jak się wam nie podoba, to możecie jeszcze lepsze rzeczy zrobić!
**Sergeant:** Private X, what exactly are you [V] thinking [V] dammit? I should teach you [V] order!
**Soldier:** Yes sergeant!
**Sergeant:** There must be order! Understood? If you [V] don’t like that, then you can [V] do better things!

Others had him simply address the private as T:

**Sierżant:** Żołnierz! Jak stoisz?
**Żołnierz:** Na baczność, panie sierżancie.
**Sierżant:** Żołnierz! Nie pyskj!
**Sergeant:** Soldier! How are you standing [T]?
**Soldier:** At attention, sergeant.
**Sergeant:** Soldier! Don’t shoot your mouth off [T]!

One respondent wrote a dialog involving a switch from V>T:

**Sierżant:** Co to ma znaczyć, Forest? Znowu nie wykonaliście porannej toalety! Ty śmierdzisz!
**Żołnierz:** Sir! Czysciłem kible szczoteczką i przesiękłem.
**Sierżant:** Do łazienki! Marsz! Wykonać rozkaz!
**Sergeant:** What is this supposed to mean, Forest? Again you didn’t take [V] your morning shower! You [T] stink [T]!
**Soldier:** Sir! I cleaned the toilets with a toothbrush and I soaked up the smell!
**Sergeant:** To the shower! March! Carry out my order!

Finally, three participants wrote dialogs in which no form of address was used. Overall, however, many of the Polish respondents prefered V address from sergeant to private.

In contrast to the Russians, but like the Poles, the Czech participants overwhelmingly preferred V for the interaction between sergeant and private. One Czech wrote a dialog in which symmetrical V is used:
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Sergeant: V americké armádě je pořádek! A kdo velí v americké armádě?
Svobodník: Vy pane a prezident.
Sergeant: Velím já! Památujte si to!
Sergeant: There's order in the United States army! And who is in charge in the United States army?
Private: You [V], sir, and the president.
Sergeant: I am in charge! Remember [V] that!

As in both Russian and Polish, one participant composed a conversation which involves a switch from V>T:

Sergeant: Vojine, tak vy nevěte, kdy je večerka? To jsem vás dost málo cvičil.
Svobodník: Ano seržánte, potřebuji zvláštní lekci.
Sergeant: No to se těš. Poteče z tebe krev.
Sergeant: Soldier, so you [V] don't know [V] when lights out is? I haven't trained you [V] enough.
Private: Yes sergeant, I need a special lesson.
Sergeant: Look forward [T] to it. Your [T] blood is going to flow.

In this case, the sergeant begins by speaking to the private with V; as he begins to threaten him, he diminishes the private to T (No to se těš. Poteče z tebe krev. ‘Look forward [T] to it. Your [T] blood is going to flow.’)

The remainder of the Czech participants constructed dialogs in which only the sergeant uses an address form, and it is always V, as in the example below:

Sergeant: Svobodníku! Opakujte po mně! Jsem špatný voják!
Svobodník: Jsem špatný voják, pane!
Sergeant: Jste velmi špatný voják a pochybuji, že se to někdy zlepší. Pohov!
Sergeant: Private! Repeat [V] after me! I am a bad soldier!
Private: I am a bad soldier, sir!
Sergeant: You are [V] a very bad soldier and I doubt that it'll ever get better. At ease!

The sergeant’s use of V certainly implies symmetrical address, as it is virtually impossible that the private would address the sergeant as T while being addressed as V.

Thus, the Czechs in this study overwhelmingly prefer V for address between sergeant and private.
4.2.14 Superior / subordinate

The fourteenth film excerpt shows another scene involving aggression; a boss is berating a subordinate. The sym T and sym P column have been deleted for reasons of space; no evidence of these types of address was found among the data for this clip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 14</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1S: V&gt;T</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6V</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3P</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5V</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One Russian respondent constructed a conversation in which the boss and subordinate exchange V; another wrote a dialog involving a shift from V>T:

Načal’nik: Ivanov, vy by vstavili v plan to, čto prosil professor. A to nam ot nego dostanetsja. Menja uže vyzyvali k direktoru.
Podčinennyj: Oj, ja ne znal, čto podvergaju vas opasnosti.
Podčinennyj: Da-da, konečno.

Boss: Ivanov, you [V] were supposed to put [V] what the professor asked into the plan. Or else we’ll catch it from him. They’ve already called me in to the director.
Subordinate: Oh, I didn’t know that I was endangering you [V].
Boss: Make a note of it [T]. Please do not let me down [T].
Subordinate: Yes, yes, of course.

---

6 It was, again, only after all the data had been gathered that I realized I had created scripts with an error: on each research instrument, in each language, I provided masculine forms for the word for “boss”. The superior in the film clip is, in fact, female, although she appears male. Thus, due to my error and her masculine appearance, some volunteers treat her (linguistically) as female, and some treat her as male.
The boss and subordinate are on mutual V at the beginning of the conversation, but as she warns him not to let her down, the imperative switches to the T form: Vot učti.

Pozalujsta, ne podvodite menja. ‘Make a note of it [T]. Please do not let me down [T].’

The remaining six Russians wrote scripts in which only one speaker used a form of address. In every case, the situation involved the boss speaking to the subordinate with V, as in the dialog below:

Načal’nik: Nu, tak kak že polučaetsja, vy daže ne znaete, kto prezident SSHA... A ved Amerika-èto sejčas družesvennaja nam strana...
Podčinennyy: Da, kažetsja, Clinton...
Načal’nik: Klintona davno ušee sniali. Vse igral na saksofone...doigralsja...kak i vy.
Boss: Well, because it turns out that you [V] don’t even know [V] who the president of the United States is...and after all America is now our friend...
Subordinate: Yes, it seems, Clinton...
Boss: They got rid of Clinton long ago. He was always playing on the saxophone...he’s played out his last...like you [V].

Thus, this dialog and the others like it imply symmetrical V address; if asymmetrical address were present in this situation, it would be most likely to consist of T from the boss to the subordinate, and V from the subordinate to the boss. However, since the boss consistently gives V, we can assume she would receive V as well.

Most Polish participants (43%) also preferred the formal (P) form of address in this situation. Each of these six dialogs has address by only one speaker; however, symmetrical P is implied by the use of P by either speaker. There were two dialogs in which asymmetrical address was used, and both involved T from boss to subordinate, and P from subordinate to boss. Note that the boss in the first dialog below is construed as male (mogłem ‘I [masc] was able to’; also pan [P masc]):

Szef: Długo w to nie mogłem uwieryżyć Jarku.
Podwładny: Tak przyznaję się to ja ukradłem pieniądze.
Szef: Byles ostatnią osobą którą bym podejrzewał.
Podwładny: Ja wszystko wytłumaczę, to nie tak jak pan myśli.
Boss: For a long time I wasn’t able to believe it, Jarek.
Subordinate: So I confess, it was me who stole the money.
Boss: You were [T] the last person who I would have suspected.
Subordinate: I’ll explain everything, it’s not like you [P] think [P].

Another three dialogs involved only T address:

Szef: Przyznaj się, to ty zgubiles te dokumenty!!!
Podwładny: Tak to ja.
Szef: Zwalniam cię!
Podwładny: Ależ szefie!!!
Boss: Confess [T], it’s you [T] who lost [T] these documents!!!
Subordinate: Yes, it was me.
Boss: I’m firing you [T]!
Subordinate: But boss!!!

Thus, although P is the preferred form of address between boss and subordinate, other forms are also possible.

The Czech participants responded in a similar manner to the Russian and Polish participants in this project. Two Czechs wrote dialogs involving symmetrical V use between the boss and the subordinate; for example:

Nadřízený: Pane Nováku! Je mi lito, musím Vás propustit.
Podřízený: Ale to nemůžete.
Nadřízený: Bohužel, jinak to nejde.
Podřízený: Ale co bude s mojí rodinou...
Boss: Mr. Novák! I’m sorry, I have to let you [V] go.
Subordinate: But you can’t [V].
Boss: Unfortunately, there is no other way.
Subordinate: But what will happen to my family...

Five other Czech volunteers wrote dialogs in which one speaker uses a form of address.

In each of these dialogs, the boss addresses the subordinate with V, as in the example below:

Nadřízený: Jak jste to mohl udělat, po kolika letech v naší firmě?
Podřízený: Co jsem udělal?
Nadřízený: Máš tady důkazy proti vám.
Podřízený: Jaké důkazy?
Boss: How could you [V] do this after all these years in our firm?
Subordinate: What did I do?
Boss: I have proof here against you [V].
Subordinate: What kind of proof?

This, again, implies symmetrical V address, for the subordinate receiving V from the boss would likely not address the boss as anything but V.

Finally, two Czechs constructed dialogs in which no forms of address were used. Thus, the preference among Czechs is for V between a boss and subordinate.

4.2.15 Male coworker / female coworker

As in clip fourteen, clip fifteen shows a scene from the workplace: two coworkers⁷, managers of a factory, are walking through the plant floor. Due to space limitations, the sym P column has been deleted, as we found no example of this type of address.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip15 coworker / coworker</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym(A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2V 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5 8 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6T 43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.5 14 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>IV 11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56   9* 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Again, I mistakenly used the male form for both coworkers in the script on the research instrument; however, in this film clip it is obvious that one coworker is male and one is female. Thus, the participant was made to decide which coworker was ‘coworker1’ and which was ‘coworker2’. In certain dialogs the volunteer makes the distinction obvious, as he or she provides a name or other gender-specific form of address. In others, however, it is unclear whether the woman is ‘coworker1’ or ‘coworker2’.

---

²⁴⁷
Three Russians wrote a dialog containing no pronominal or related forms of address. Of the five remaining respondents, one construed the relationship between coworkers as familiar and thus requiring symmetrical T:

Kollega1: Ty kuda napravljaeš'sja?
Kollega2: Načal'nik vyzval na kover.
Kollega1: I tebja tože?
Kollega2: Da, a ja ne znal, čto ty tože k nemu.
Coworker1: Where are you [T] headed [T]?
Coworker2: The boss called me on the carpet.
Coworker1: You [T] too?
Coworker2: Yes, but I didn’t know you [T] were also going to see him.

Notice that in this dialog, the coworkers are approximately of the same status at work; they are both reporting to some superior. In the clip itself they are pictured talking in a friendly but professional manner. However, symmetrical V could also appear here, and in fact does: another Russian volunteer wrote a conversation in which these coworkers exchange mutual V.

One participant constructed a dialog that contains asymmetrical address:

Kollega1: Zdravstvujte, Lizočka!
Kollega2: Nu ja potom i govorju, davaj izmenim nagruzku.
Kollega1: Ja ne dumaju, čto v etom problema.
Kollega2: Nu a čto delat'? Nado kak-to razbiral'sja.
Coworker1: Hello (lit. be well [V]) Lizočka!
Coworker2: Well, and then, I'm saying, let's [T] change the workload.
Coworker1: I don’t think there’s a problem with it.
Coworker2: Well what should we do? We have to figure it out somehow.

Note in this dialog that the only words that might convey politeness are imperatives: Zdravstvujte ‘be well’ [V] and Davaj ‘let’s’[T]. Both are highly formulaic, but as imperatives can reflect differences in T and V. We cannot know if the author truly intended to make the T-V distinction here or was simply inconsistent in the use of these
(again, highly formulaic) constructions. Regardless, this dialog reinforces the fact that address is a dynamic phenomenon.

The two remaining conversations contain examples of address forms used by one speaker only, and in all cases V is the form chosen. The script below is an illustration:

Kollega1: Nu, čto rešili, kto budet vystupat?
Kollega2: Da ja vse podgotovil.
Kollega1: Xorošо, idemte, posmotrim, čto tam.
Coworker1: Well what did you decide [V], who will speak?
Coworker2: I’ve prepared everything.
Coworker1: Good, let’s go [V], we’ll see what’s there.

Note here the use of colloquial idemte ‘let’s go’, which consists of 1pl idem + -te, the 2pl imperative ending. Thus, the T form of this expression would simply be idem, and the V form idemte.

Overall, the group of Russian participants seems to prefer V for coworkers at work, but T is certainly not ruled out.

The Polish participants, however, seemed to feel that T is completely appropriate for coworkers. Four volunteers wrote dialogs with no address patterns, but of the ten remaining, four wrote scenes with symmetrical T and six with one speaker using T. An example of symmetrical T between coworkers is given below:

kolega1: Cześć. Jak się masz?
kolega2: Oh, daj spokój! Mam dość. Te ciągle opóźnieńia w dostawach! Nie mam na nic czasu. Muszę myśleć ciągle o wszystkim i wszystkich...
kolega1: W takim razie daj się skusić na kolację...
kolega2: Roman, ty ciągle o jednym...hm?
Coworker1: Hi. How are you [T]?
Coworker2: Oh, leave [T] me alone! I’ve had enough. These constant delays in delivery! I don’t have time for anything. I have to constantly think about everything and everyone...
Coworker1: In that case let [T] me entice you to dinner...
Coworker2: Roman, you’re [T] always about the same thing...hm?
The Czechs, like the Poles, seem to have construed this situation as one involving T. It should also be noted that fully half (five) of the respondents wrote dialogs in which no address forms appear. Of the remaining four participants, one wrote a dialog with symmetrical T with no evidence as to gender of speaker given:

*Spolupracovník1*: Co řikáš tomu novému nařízení?
*Spolupracovník2*: Já ti nevím.
*Spolupracovník1*: No co se dá dělat.
*Spolupracovník2*: Nemá cenu protestovat.

Coworker1: What do you say [T] to this new regulation?
Coworker2: I don’t even know, and you [T] should care about it.
Coworker1: Well what can be done.
Coworker2: There’s no point in protesting.

Two others wrote dialogs in which one or the other coworker used T, and one wrote a dialog in which one coworker uses V. Note that Coworker2 is definitely female, as Coworker1 addresses her as kolegyně ‘colleague [fem]’:

*Spolupracovník1*: Pojďte, kolegyně, něco vám ukážu.
*Spolupracovník2*: Doufám, že to není nic zlého.
*Spolupracovník1*: Pojďte, tady u mašin to není. A vůbec, je tu hrozný hluk.
*Spolupracovník2*: Jak tady můžou pracovat?

Coworker1: Come on [V], colleague, I’ll show you [V] something.
Coworker2: I hope it’s nothing bad.
Coworker1: Come on [V], it’s not here near the machines. And anyway, there’s terrible noise here.
Coworker2: How can they work here?

Thus, while V is certainly possible for address between coworkers, T is also perfectly acceptable and even preferred when the relationship is a close one.

### 4.2.16 Man praying

The next four clips (16-20) depict monologues, situations in which a speaker is speaking to someone or something that cannot or does not usually speak back. In clip sixteen, for instance, a man is clearly praying, gesturing and looking upwards while speaking.
Although one Russian and one Polish participant constructed a monologue in which no address form is used, the overwhelming majority of others wrote prayers using T to address God. This is the standard means of address to God and is thus the expected response from the Russians, Poles, and Czechs surveyed. Below are examples of address to God in Russian, Polish, and Czech:

**R**

Čelovek (obraščajuščija k Bogu): Gospodi! Nu esli Ty est', počemu Ty na menja ne obraščaš' vnimanje? Nu čem ja xuže drugix, čtoby tak žit'? Nu otliknis' ili daj o sebe znač kak-nibud'!

Person (speaking to God): Lord! Well if You [T] exist, why don't You [T] pay [T] attention to me? Well how am I worse than others that I have to live like this? Well respond [T] or somehow let [T] me know you exist!

**Pol**

Mężczyzna modlący się do Boga: Panie, jeśli tam jest, nie pozostawaj obojętny ma mnie. Słyszysz mnie! Wołam do ciebie, byś wysłuchał mojej prośby. Na darmo!

Man praying to God: Lord, if you [T] exist, don't remain [T] indifferent to me. You hear [T] me! I'm calling to you [T], so that you [T] would hear my request. For nothing!

**Cz**

Modlící se muž: Bože, co mám dělat? Jak to, že je na světě taková nespravedlivost! Vidiš to Bože? Prosim vyslyš mě! Slyšis mě?

Praying man: God, what should I do? How is it that there is such unfairness in the world! Do you see [T] it, God? Please hear [T] me! Do you hear [T] me?
4.2.17 Farmer’s wife to pig

Each participant wrote a script to accompany clip seventeen in which a farmer’s wife talks to her pig as T.

| Clip 17 | sym T | sym V | sym P | Switch(S) or asym(A) | One address pattern | No address pattern | Total | Physical element?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>farmer’s wife to pig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>woman looking down at pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>13T 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>9T 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each script had address forms in it, and without exception the familiar (T) form was used. This, too, is the norm for speaking to animals; thus, these results are not unexpected.

R
Fermerša (obraščajuščajilka k svin’ e): Ax ty moja xorošaj xrjuška. Idi sjuda, smotri čto ja tebe prinesla. Es, es, popravljajša.
Farmer’s wife (talking to a pig): Ah you [T] my good little oinker. Come [T] here, see [T] what I brought you [T]. Eat [T], eat [T], get fattened up [T]!

Pol
Zona rolnika mówi do prosiaka: Jedd, jedz, żebyš był tłuciutki. Wcinaj i rośnię, szyneczko na święta. Rośnię i na zdrowie.
Farmer’s wife speaking to pig: Eat [T], Eat [T], so that you’ll [T] be fat. Gobble it up [T] and grow [T], ham for the holidays. Grow [T] for health too.

Cz
farmer’s wife talking to pig: Here’s your [T] food František, eat [T] so you can fatten up [T] a little, and when you’re [T] big, we’ll polish you [T] off. Eat [T].

4.2.18 Man to dog

Clip eighteen shows a man talking to a small dog.
Once again, the participants were asked to create a script based on a human addressing an animal. Those who wrote a “conversation” containing address forms chose, as was expected, T as the proper form for addressing a dog.

R
Mužčina (obraščajuščija k sobake): Nu čto, ustala moja malen’kaja? Sejčas papočka voz met tebja na ruki. Da, ja znaju, žarko tebe. Pojdem skoree domoj!
Man (talking to dog): What, are you tired my little one? Now papa will pick you [T] up. Yes, I know you’re [T] hot. Let’s go right home!

Pol
Mężczyzna mówi do psa: No, i gdzie jest twoja pańcia? Zostawila cię. Teraz wujek się toby zajmie.
Man talking to dog: Well, and where is your [T] mistress? She left you [T]. Now uncle will look after you [T].

Cz
Muž mluví k psovi: Tak ty nepůjdeš dál, jo? Tak to pejskovi domluvime, to mu musime domluvit.
Man talking to dog: So you [T] won’t go [T] any farther, huh? So we have to give the doggie a pep talk, we have to give him a pep talk.

4.2.19 Girl to vampire

In clip nineteen, a girl is confronting a vampire. While this is a highly unusual and unlikely situation, we felt it would be an interesting task to find out how native speakers of other languages would construe a situation involving a nonhuman being that looks like a human (a vampire, a ghost, and so on).
Although the overwhelming majority of respondents felt T would be the appropriate form of address (presumably because of the vampire’s nonhuman status), it is worthy of note that one Russian participant and three Czech volunteers wrote a script with V address to the vampire. Below are examples in the various languages:

R
Devuška (obraščajuščajasja k vampiru): Opjať ty za staroe...opjať krov’ soseš’ u proxožix. Nu pogodi, sejčas pozovu ja ravvina, a našlet na tebja prokljatija.
Girl (talking to a vampire): Again you’ve [T] fallen back into your old ways...once again you’re sucking [T] the blood of passers-by. Well just wait [T], I’m going to call a rabbi right now and he’ll inflict a curse on you [T].

Devuška (obraščajuščajasja k vampiru): Mister Smit! A ja ved’znaju, kto vy takoj na samom dele.
Girl (talking to vampire): Mister Smith! After all I know who you [V] really are.

Pol
Dziewczyna mówi do vampira: Co myślisz, że ktoś się ciebie boi?
Girl talking to vampire: What do you think [T], that someone is afraid of you [T]?

Cz
Divka mluvici k upirovi: Upire! Co to vlečes? Snad jsme si něco slišeli, ne?
Girl speaking to vampire: Vampire! What are you lugging [T]? After all we had a deal, right?

Divka mluvici k upirovi: Co se tu takhle potulujete, vždyť vás každý uvidí. To jsem si nemyslela, že tak špatně strašíte.
Girl speaking to vampire: Why are you hanging around [V] here like that, after all everybody can see you [V]. I didn’t have any idea that you’re [V] that bad of a spook!

4.2.20 Master of Ceremonies to audience

Clip twenty is the last of the “monologue” scenes. In this film, a Master of Ceremonies (MC) is addressing an audience before a show.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 20 MC to audience</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td># %</td>
<td>6Vpl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>5P</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2P-Vpl</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Vpl</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>6Vpl</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2Vpl</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>8**</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this film clip, most of the Russians and Czechs, of course, had the MC address the audience with Vpl and some noun of address:

R
Konferans’e: A sejčas, gospoda, poprošu zatušiti sigarety, sosredotočīt’sja i predstavit, čto vy okazalīs’ utrom v derevene.
MC: And now, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to put out your cigarettes, concentrate and imagine, that you [V] have found [V] yourself in the country in the morning...

Cz
Konferenciér: Dobrý večer dám y a pánove! Dnešní večer bude skvělý! Přivítám skupinu „Šoumení“.
MC: Good evening ladies and gentlemen! This evening is going to be splendid! Welcome [V] the group “The Showmen”.

This film depicting an MC talking to an audience was actually intended specifically for the Polish participants, who have at their disposal a number of plural pronouns and related forms with varying degrees of politeness. And they did not
disappoint: six Poles had the MC use only P forms when addressing the audience. For instance,

Konferansjer mówi do publiczności: Witam państwa na naszym show. Witam bardzo bardzo serdecznie i zapraszam do zabawy!

MC speaking to audience: I welcome you [Ppl] to our show. I welcome you very very heartily and I invite you to the show!

Others had the MC use a mix of Ppl and Vpl forms:

Konferansjer mówi do publiczności: Wow! Drodzy, szanowni Państwo! Przed Państwem gwiazda estrady! Wciąg dla was błyszczy. A oto...sami zobaczcie i powitajcie! Brawa!

MC speaking to audience: Wow! Dear, respected ladies and gentlemen! Before you [Ppl] is a star of the stage! Always shining for you [Vpl]. But here... see [Vpl] for yourself and welcome [Vpl] him! Bravo!

Still others used strictly V forms:

Konferansjer mówi do publiczności: Dziękuję, dziękuję. Szanowni państwo, za chwilę zobaczycie. Tak. Wszyscy, przed wami gwiazda wieczoru...

MC speaking to audience: Respected ladies and gentleman, in a moment you will see [Vpl]. Yes. Everyone, before you [Vpl] is the star of the evening...

These examples suggest that not only imperative forms but also plural forms tend to be flexible and vary between Ppl and Vpl.

4.2.21 Man / woman fighting

Starting with the next clip, we return to actual conversations between two or more speakers. Clip twenty-one depicts a man and woman arguing, then physically fighting.

---

8 Państwo ‘ladies and gentlemen’ is a syntactically singular collective; it is designated [Ppl] in this dissertation because it always governs a plural predicate.

9 Państwo ‘ladies and gentlemen’ is in the vocative here; we do not consider vocatives or names and titles in this dissertation.
The Russian participants generally preferred symmetrical T for this scene, as in:

*Mužčina: Tanja! Pjat' rublej *odolži* požalujst*a.*
*Ženščina: Opjat' vodku pil?*
*Mužčina: Net! Ni kapli vo rtu ne bylo!*
*Ženščina: Ja uže vižu! P'janica!*
*Mužčina: Tanja! Požalujst*a! Ja skoro vernu!*
*Ženščina: Ty mne uže sto rublej dolžen!*
*Mužčina: Ja obeščaju! Ja odam!*
*Ženščina: Znaju ja tebja. *Ubritaja!*

Man: Tanja! Lenc [T] me five rubles please.
Woman: You were drinking vodka again?
Man: No! There wasn’t a drop in my mouth!
Woman: I see! Drunk!
Man: Tanja! Please! I’ll give it back soon!
Woman: You [T] already owe me a hundred rubles!
Man: I promise! I’ll give it back!
Woman: I know you [T]. Beat it [T]!

The use of T between the two speakers, of course, suggests they are already acquainted before the dialog begins. This is supported by the text of dialog itself and the fact that
they are fighting. However, one Russian participant wrote a dialog in which there is
asymmetry, with the man addressing the woman politely with V because he wants money
from her, and the woman addressing the man with T because she wants to get rid of him
and is angry with him. The man begins Izvinite, êto opjat’ ja. Ja znaju, êto ne vernul
dolg. No odolžite mne ešče tri rublia. S poluchi ja vse vernu. ‘Excuse me [V], it’s me
again. I know that I haven’t repaid you. But lend [V] me three more rubles. I’ll repay
everything when I get paid.’ The woman responds, Ved ja že tebe govorila, čtoby ty
bol’še zdes’ ne pojavil’sja. ‘After all, I’ve told you [T] and told you [T] not to come here
anymore.’

The Poles unanimously viewed this situation as one requiring T between the man
and the woman. 100% of respondents constructed dialogs in this way, one of which is the
eexample below:

mężczyzna: Witaj kotku, wróciłem.
mężczyzna: Ale coś ty. Tylko kilka szklanceli z Jankiem.
kobieta: Wyynos się stąd!
mężczyzna: Ej nie tak szybko.
kobieta: Wyynos się, nie chce cię znać!
mężczyzna: Ty suko, co ty sobie wyobrażasz?
kobieta: Przestań, nie bij.

Man: Greetings [T], kitten, I’m back.
Woman: Greetings [T]? Let me smell your breath [T], you stink [T] of vodka!
Man: What are you [T] talking about. Only a few little glasses with Janek.
Woman: Get out [T] of here!
Man: Hey, not so fast.
Woman: Get out [T] of here; I don’t want to have anything to do with you [T].
Man: You [T] bitch, what are you [T] thinking [T]?
Woman: Stop [T], don’t hit [T].
muž: Jsem doma kočičko.
žena: Nějak ti to trvalo.
muž: Ale no tak, nezlob se.
žena: Fui. Z tebe to táhně.
muž: No, no. Hele přinesl jsem prachy.
žena: Strč si je někam a vypadni!
muž: Hele, ty mě vyhazovat nebudeš!
Man: I'm home, kitten.
Woman: It sure took you [T] a long time.
Man: Yeah OK, don't get mad [T]
Man: Yeah, yeah. Look I brought money.
Woman: Stick [T] it somewhere and get out [T] of here!
Man: Look, you’re [T] not gonna [T] throw me out!
Woman: Leave [T] me alone. Ow! I’ll scream!

However, one Czech construed the situation as two strangers arguing; thus, they speak on

V:

muž: Drahá pani, jsem ubohý bezdomovec.
žena: Ale táhne z vás, jako ze sudu.
muž: Jak jinak se mám zahřát, podívejte, co mám na sobě. Jsem bez peněz.
žena: Ode mně nedostanete ani haléř. Táhněte!
muž: Vy lakomá ženská!
žena: Nechte mě, padouchu, zavolám policii!
muž: Dejte mi aspoň ten župan, když jste tak lakomá!
žena: Pustete mě!
Man: Dear lady, I'm a poor homeless person.
Woman: But you [V] reck like a beer barrel.
Man: How else am I supposed to warm up, look at [V] what I have on. I don’t have any money.
Woman: You’re not going to get [V] a cent from me. Get out of here [V].
Man: You [V] stingy woman!
Woman: Leave [V] me alone, you skunk, I’ll call the police!
Man: At least give [V] me that bathrobe if you’re [V] so stingy!
Woman: Let [V] me go!

4.2.22 Woman / chauffeur

From clip twenty-one, which depicts aggression and even violence, we move to
clip twenty-two, which shows another potentially asymmetrical power situation. In this
film we see a woman sitting in the back seat of a car, talking to her chauffeur. The
woman is white, and the chauffeur is black. I deliberately chose this clip because I wanted to see if Slavs might interpret race as a factor that diminishes one of the speakers. After all, this is, once again, a business situation and should therefore, at least in theory, require mutual formal address. The sym T column has been deleted in this table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 22</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7P</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2V</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Russian participants generally prefer V for this situation; although no respondents constructed a dialog with symmetrical address, most (62.5%) had one speaker use an address form (V), as in the example below:

Ženščina: A vy uvereny, čto my priexali po adresu?
Šofer: Konečno, mem.
Ženščina: Nu ladno, togda otkrojte mne dver′.
Woman: And are you [V] sure [V] that we have come to the right address?
Chauffeur: Of course, ma'am.
Woman: Well OK, then open [V] the door for me.

However, one volunteer had the driver speak to the woman on T when he tells her, Moe delo baranku kruit′. Davaj zakančivat′ vse čto. Sejčas ja tebe dver′ otkroju. ‘My job is to turn the steering wheel. Let′s [T] stop all this. I′ll open the door for you [T] now.’

The Russian participants generally prefer V for this situation; although no respondents constructed a dialog with symmetrical address, most (62.5%) had one speaker use an address form (V), as in the example below:

Ženščina: A vy uvereny, čto my priexali po adresu?
Šofer: Konečno, mem.
Ženščina: Nu ladno, togda otkrojte mne dver′.
Woman: And are you [V] sure [V] that we have come to the right address?
Chauffeur: Of course, ma'am.
Woman: Well OK, then open [V] the door for me.

However, one volunteer had the driver speak to the woman on T when he tells her, Moe delo baranku kruit′. Davaj zakančivat′ vse čto. Sejčas ja tebe dver′ otkroju. ‘My job is to turn the steering wheel. Let′s [T] stop all this. I′ll open the door for you [T] now.’

The Russian participants generally prefer V for this situation; although no respondents constructed a dialog with symmetrical address, most (62.5%) had one speaker use an address form (V), as in the example below:

Ženščina: A vy uvereny, čto my priexali po adresu?
Šofer: Konečno, mem.
Ženščina: Nu ladno, togda otkrojte mne dver′.
Woman: And are you [V] sure [V] that we have come to the right address?
Chauffeur: Of course, ma'am.
Woman: Well OK, then open [V] the door for me.

However, one volunteer had the driver speak to the woman on T when he tells her, Moe delo baranku kruit′. Davaj zakančivat′ vse čto. Sejčas ja tebe dver′ otkroju. ‘My job is to turn the steering wheel. Let′s [T] stop all this. I′ll open the door for you [T] now.’

The Russian participants generally prefer V for this situation; although no respondents constructed a dialog with symmetrical address, most (62.5%) had one speaker use an address form (V), as in the example below:

Ženščina: A vy uvereny, čto my priexali po adresu?
Šofer: Konečno, mem.
Ženščina: Nu ladno, togda otkrojte mne dver′.
Woman: And are you [V] sure [V] that we have come to the right address?
Chauffeur: Of course, ma'am.
Woman: Well OK, then open [V] the door for me.

However, one volunteer had the driver speak to the woman on T when he tells her, Moe delo baranku kruit′. Davaj zakančivat′ vse čto. Sejčas ja tebe dver′ otkroju. ‘My job is to turn the steering wheel. Let′s [T] stop all this. I′ll open the door for you [T] now.’

The Russian participants generally prefer V for this situation; although no respondents constructed a dialog with symmetrical address, most (62.5%) had one speaker use an address form (V), as in the example below:

Ženščina: A vy uvereny, čto my priexali po adresu?
Šofer: Konečno, mem.
Ženščina: Nu ladno, togda otkrojte mne dver′.
Woman: And are you [V] sure [V] that we have come to the right address?
Chauffeur: Of course, ma'am.
Woman: Well OK, then open [V] the door for me.

However, one volunteer had the driver speak to the woman on T when he tells her, Moe delo baranku kruit′. Davaj zakančivat′ vse čto. Sejčas ja tebe dver′ otkroju. ‘My job is to turn the steering wheel. Let′s [T] stop all this. I′ll open the door for you [T] now.’
The Poles had a different take on the situation. Although most participants preferred P (one symmetrical P, in which each addresses the other with P; four in which the woman uses P to address chauffeur; and three in which he addresses the woman as P), three respondents wrote dialogs in which the woman addresses the chauffeur as T, but he addresses her as P. For instance:

kobieta: James, nie mogę wysieść tutaj, do cholery, ci dziwny ludzie mnie zobaczą. A jeśli on mnie zobaczy?
szofor: Jak sobie pani życzy, madamie. Sugerowałbym jednak, aby przestała się pani ukrywać...
kobieta: Oh, James, może masz rację! Czas z tym skończyć. Wysiadam!
Woman: James, I can’t get out here, dammit, these strange people will see me. And what if he sees me?
Chauffeur: As you [P] wish, madam. I would suggest, however, that you [P] stop hiding...
Woman: Oh, James, maybe you’re [T] right! It’s time to end this. I’m getting out!

In another dialog, the woman addresses the driver as P, but uses a 2sg [T] predicate (which is less polite than P + 3sg[P], the standard form of P address):

kobieta: Dziękuję, pan pomóż mi wysieść?
szofor: Dobrze, chociaż nic należy, to do moich obowiązków.
kobieta: Wiem, ale proszę o to.
Woman: Thank you, will you [P] help [T] me get out?
chauffeur: OK, but this isn’t my responsibility.
Woman: I know, but I’m requesting it.

What is significant about these four responses (three asymmetrical address and one P+2sg) is that Poles routinely fail to assign virility (that is, morphology that indicates the noun represents a male person) to words designating persons of other (darker) races (for instance, cygan ‘gypsy’, żyd ‘Jew’, and so on; see Janda 1999). Thus, in this case, race might indeed be a factor in the use of asymmetrical address. The issue of race and address will be revisited in Chapters 5 and 6.
Thus, although most of the Polish participants preferred P, other forms of address, especially asymmetrical address, also seem to be viable alternatives in this situation.

The majority (56%) of Czech respondents viewed this situation as one requiring symmetrical V. For example:

žena: Ježiš, ichyně, co budu dělat?
šofér: No tak vystuπte, vždyť jste doma.
žena: To je nádělení, tak mi pomozte z vozu.
Woman: Oh my, my mother-in-law, what will I do?
Chauffeur: Well get out [V], after all you’re [V] home.
Woman: This is a fine kettle of fish, help [V] me from the car.

The other respondents either wrote dialogs with no address form or with V used by one speaker only. In one of these dialogs, the chauffeur addressed the woman as V, but she did not use a form of address with him; in the other, the woman addresses the driver with V but he does not respond with any type of pronoun or related form.

Overall, most script writers preferred formal address between the woman and her chauffeur. Only the Poles suggested asymmetrical address was possible; of course, it is impossible to know at this point if that has to do with the race of the driver, but it seems possible that race was a factor.

4.2.23 Policeman / drunk women

The next clip depicts a more complicated situation than any of the previous ones. In it, a policeman is addressing two women in a convertible. They address both him and each other. The No address pattern column has been removed in this chart due to considerations of space and the fact that all examples displayed some form of address.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 23 policeman / women (drunk)</th>
<th>sym $T$</th>
<th>sym $V$</th>
<th>sym $P$</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV/T</td>
<td></td>
<td>policeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>IV/T</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7* 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(T/V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(T/V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(T/V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pl)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pl)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV/T/V</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV/T/V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>2(T)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5P/T</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4T</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1T/T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1P+Vpl</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1T/Vpl</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4Vpl/T</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1V/T</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9* 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 23 Most common address pattern</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T between women, V between woman / woman and policemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T between women, P between woman / women and policeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T between women, V between woman / women and policeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Russian dialogs that match this situation, we expect mutual $T$ between the women, because they are obviously friends and have obviously been drinking together.

We expect mutual $V$ between the policeman and the woman. It is up to the respondent, of course, to determine who actually speaks and uses forms of address; thus, we have a fragmented picture at best.

The two instances of symmetrical address appear as $V$ between the woman and policeman, as in the following example:

*milicioner: Madam, prošu vas vyjti iz mašiny.*
*p'janaja1: Da-da, konečno. No... ja ne p'janaja.*
*p'janaja2: Da-da, ona ne pila.*
*p'janaja1: Man', skaži emu- my že sovsem tezve.*
*p'janaja2: Konečno. Šeščas ja vylezu i vse emu ob 'jasnju. milicioner: Poševelivajtes', graždanočki.*
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Policeman: Madam, I’m asking you [V] to get out of the car.
Drunk woman 1: Yes, yes, of course. But...I’m not drunk.
Drunk woman 2: Yes, yes, she didn’t drink.
Drunk woman 1: Manja, tell [T] him—we’re completely sober.
Drunk woman 2: Of course. I’ll crawl out right now and explain everything to him.
Policeman: Get a move on [Vpl], ladies.

Note that this conversation also contains an instance of Vpl address from the policeman to the two women, as well as T address from woman 1 to woman 2, noted as 1(T/ Vpl) in the sym V column of the chart above.

We find two instances of asymmetrical address among the Russian scripts; in each, the policeman addresses the driver as V, but she uses a T form with him, as in the following example:

milicioner: Vaši dokumenty, požalujta. I, kažetsja, čto nemnogo p’jany...
p’janaja 1: Kto? Ėto ja p’janaja! Da kak ty razgovarivaeš, s dvojurodoj sestroj princessy Diany?
p’janaja 2: Dusja, čto etot mužik privjazalsja k tebe...Vot ja sejčas pokažu emu kak pristavat’ k ženččinam...
p’janaja 1: A čto, ty razve ne znaeš, čto mužikam nužno ot ženččin?
p’janaja 2: Vot ja sejčas vyjdu iz mašiny...
milicioner: Dany, uspokojtes’, davajte vyzovem advokata.
Policeman: Your [V] documents, please. And it seems you’re a little drunk [V]...
Drunk woman 1: Who? Me drunk? How dare you speak [T] to princess Diana’s cousin like that!
Drunk woman 2: Dusja, why is this guy bothering you [T]...I’ll show him right now how to bother women...
Drunk woman 1: What, you [T] really don’t know [T] what men need from women?
Drunk woman 2: I’ll get out of the car right now...
Policeman: Ladies, calm down [Vpl], let’s [Vpl] call an attorney.

Here the woman uses T to express outrage and, perhaps, a higher social status than the policeman, claiming to be the cousin of Princess Diana.

The remaining three dialogs contain various examples of address between the two women (always with T), address from the policeman to the woman driving (always with V), and address to both women (Vpl).
For Polish, we would expect symmetrical T address between the women, as they are clearly friends, and we would expect symmetrical P address between the policeman and the woman, as this is an official situation (he has stopped them for a traffic violation and is asking them to step out of the car). Again, there are no “complete” dialogs, ones in which both symmetrical T and symmetrical P are used. Most of the actual results do, however, imply these forms of address. It should also be noted that the policeman often avoids address forms altogether by using infinitives instead of imperatives; this usage is associated with very formal or official (P) language.

The most common response in Polish involves P / T address (5 respondents). That is, one speaker addresses someone as T, and one speaker addresses someone as P; however, because of the complexity of this situation, none of these are instances of asymmetrical address. For instance, we find two instances of T from the drunk woman to her friend, and P from the woman to policeman:

*policjant:* Dokumenty poproszę! Wysiądać.
*pijana1:* Zaraz, nie mam. momencik.
*pijana2:* Daj panu te papierki i jedziemy.
*pijana1:* Ale po co, przecież...
*pijana2:* Szybciej, niech jej pan pomoże.
*policjant:* Cholera!!!
policeman: Documents please! Step out.
drunk woman1: Right away, I don’t have them. Just a minute.
drunk woman2: Give [T] the man the papers and let’s go.
drunk woman1: But why, after all...
drunk woman2: Quick, help [P] her.
policeman: Damn!!!

In three others, we find T from woman to woman, and P from policeman to woman:

*policjant:* Proszę o prawo jazdy. Chyba przesadziła pani alkoholem.
pijana1: Raz się żyje, panie władzo.
pijana2: Napij się jeszcze, zaraz wysięgę i dam ci butelkę.
pijana1: Jak tu dobrze, zrobimy piknik
*pijana2:* Super. Pan policjant zostaje z nami.
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policjant: Proszę wstać i okazać dokumenty.
policeman: Drivers license, please. Probably you’ve [P] **overdone** [P] it with the alcohol.
drunk woman1: You only live once, sir.
drunk woman2: **Drink** [T] a little more, I’ll get out now and give you [T] the bottle.
drunk woman1: It’s so nice here, let’s have a picnic.
policeman: Please stand up and show me your papers.

Thus, from these dialogs, it is implied that address in this situation would most likely be

with T between the women and with P between the policeman and a woman or both

women. In fact, this is suggested by the other dialogs. In four dialogs, T appears as the

only address form, and it is always from one woman to the other:

*policjant: Proszę wysiąść z samochodu.*
*pijana1: Dobra, dobra, idę.*
*pijana2: Uważaj nie zabij się.*
*pijana1: Na szczęście, upadłam na policjanta.*
*pijana2: A co, taki mięciutki.*
*policjant: Koniec tego dobrego...wstawać.*
policeman: Please get out of the car.
drunk woman1: Ok, ok, I’m coming.
drunk woman2: **Careful** [T] don’t **kill** [T] yourself.
drunk woman1: Luckily, I fell on the policeman.
drunk woman2: What do we have here, so soft and sweet.
policeman: The fun is over...stand up.

In another, T is used from woman to woman, but the policeman addresses women

together with Vpl:

*policjant: Zatrzymać się, zatrzymać!*
*pijana1: O, hm, tak, panie władzo, się robi, ale...*
*pijana2: **Zostań, poczekaj**, zaraz...*
*pijana1: Ojej ty,*
*pijana2: O, kurde, nie mogę...*
*policjant: Ja **wam** zaraz pomogę!*
policeman: Stop, stop!
drunk woman1: Oh, hm, yes sir, it’s happening, but...
drunk woman2: **Stay** [T], **wait** [T], right away...
drunk woman1: Oh **you** [T]...
drunk woman2: Oh, shit, I can’t...
policeman: I’ll help **you** [Vpl] immediately!
Here the policeman uses Vpl, but, as we find in another dialog, Ppl is also acceptable:

*Panie pojdu ze mną!!! ‘You [Ppl] will come [Ppl] with me!!!’*

In yet another, the woman and the policeman do exchange symmetrical P, and the woman addresses the other woman as T:

*policjant*: Wysiądać, wysiądać, mile panie! Dokumenty proszę.
pijana1: Kochany panie władzo, może się pan z nami napije.
pijana2: Niech mi ktoś pomoże!
pijana1: Nie mam siły...
pijana2: Nie zostawiaj mnie samej.
policjant: To będzie pani kosztować.
policeman: Get out, get out, dear ladies! Papers please.
drunk woman1: Darling sir, maybe you’d [P] like to drink [P] with us.
drunk woman2: Someone help me!
drunk woman1: I don’t have the strength...
drunk woman2: Don’t leave [T] me alone.
policeman: This is going to cost you [P].

Unexpectedly, we also find T from woman to policeman:

*policjant*: Proszę wysiądać, drogie panie. Dokumenty proszę.
pijana1: Oops! Ale o co chodzi, przystojniaczku?
pijana2: Oh, Oh! ... przystojniak, może wykniesz szampane?
pijana1: Co ty, stara, zaprośmy po razcej na numerek? A w ogóle jakie dokumenty?
pijana2: Mam problemy z wyjściem z tego cholernego samochodu. To jak przestojniak? Zapomniesz o całej sprawie i idziem się bawić.
policjant: Wysiądać, wysiądać, bez padania!
policeman: Please get out, dear ladies. Papers please.
drunk woman1: Oops! But what is this about, handsome?
drunk woman2: Oh, oh! ... Handsome, maybe you’d like to sip [T] some champagne?
drunk woman1: What are you [T] doing, old girl, better yet, let’s ask him to our hotel room. And anyway what kind of papers?
drunk woman2: I’m having problems getting out of this damn car. So what do you say, handsome? You’ll forget [T] about this whole deal and we’ll go have a good time.
policeman: Get out, get out, without falling!

Earlier we encountered the T of aggression; T in this case is used for endearment, as the woman is making a pass at the policeman. Thus, T is useful on both emotive extremes.

Finally, one respondent wrote a dialog in which only the policeman uses an address form, and it alternates between Ppl and Vpl:
policjant: Co panie tu robią?
pijana1: Coś kotku.
pijana2: Zupełnie nic
pijana1: Ale pan przystojny.
pijana2: Bardzo.
policjant: Uważajcie.
drunk woman1: Something kitten.
drunk woman2: Nothing at all.
drunk woman1: My, but you’re [P] handsome.
drunk woman2: Very.
policeman: Look out [Vpl].

The first time the policeman addresses the women, he uses Ppl: Co panie tu robią? ‘What are you [Ppl] doing [Ppl] here?’ However, when he addresses them again, he uses Vpl: Uważajcie ‘Look out [Vpl].’ Once again, we see the interchange of Ppl and Vpl forms especially common with the use of the imperative.

As in Russian and Polish, for Czech we expect symmetrical T between the women and formal address between the policeman and the woman or women. And, indeed, this is generally what we find. For example, only one dialog contains an instance of symmetrical T, and it is between the two women. In addition, the policemen addresses them in the plural:

policista: Dámy, co se váš přihodilo?
opilá žena1: Trošku jsem si dala na kuráž.
opilá žena2: ...Já taky trochu bumbala.
opilá žena1: Pomoz mi vstát!
opilá žena2: Pomoz mi sednout!
policista: Kurva, ty jsou uplně taky za bílýho dne!
Policeman: Ladies, what happened to you [Vpl]?
Drunk woman1: I had a little for courage.
Drunk woman2: ...I also drank a little.
Drunk woman1: Help [T] me stand up!
Drunk woman2: Help [T] me sit down!
Policeman: Damn, they are like this in broad daylight!
Two dialogs contain examples of symmetrical V, with one also containing T address from one of the women to the other:

*policista: Madam, vystupte si prosím.*
opilá žena1: No dobře dobře, ale nevím, jestli to zvládnú.
opilá žena2: Nesmíte se na ni zlobit, je hrozně unavená.
opilá žena1: To jo, tady ve stínu se trochu prosím.
opilá žena2: Lehní si k sobě.
policista: Madam, vstávat!
policeman: Madam, get out [V] please.
drunk woman1: Ok, ok, but I don't know if I can manage it.
drunk woman2: You mustn't [V] get mad at her, she's awfully tired.
drunk woman1: Yes, I'll take a little nap here in the shade.
drunk woman2: Lie down [T].
policeman: Madam, stand up!

Four dialogs contain examples of Vpl address from the policeman to both women, and T address from one woman to the other. In one dialog the policeman addresses the driver as V, and she speaks to her friend as T:

*policista: Pojďte si dýchnut, madam.*
opilá žena1: Nic jsem nepila.
opilá žena2: Fakt nic nepila.
opilá žena1: Elizabeth budeš řídat?
opilá žena2: Jo, jen si přelezu k volantu.
policista: No, to je snad zlej sen.
policeman: Come [V] exhale, madam.
drunk woman1: I didn't drink anything.
drunk woman2: She really didn't drink anything.
drunk woman1: Elizabeth, will you [T] drive?
drunk woman2: Yes, I'll just slide over behind the wheel.
policeman: Good grief, this must be a bad dream.

Thus, even though the situation is somewhat complex, what emerges from the dialogs in all three languages is that T address is likely between the women, and V (or P) address is expected between the policeman and the woman or women.
4.2.24 Prisoner / guard

Clip twenty-four depicts a prison guard threatening a prisoner; specifically, he is holding the prisoner as if he is about to throw him off the roof of a tall building. The No pattern of address column has been deleted in this chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 24 prisoner / guard</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1T 14 7* 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>5 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4A 28.5</td>
<td>4T 28.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>2 22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3A 33.3</td>
<td>3T 33.3</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 24</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common address pattern</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A or T</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all of the Russian respondents wrote dialogs containing asymmetrical address, address with V from the prisoner to the guard, and T from the guard to the prisoner. However, in the dialog in which only one address form is present, we find the guard speaking to the prisoner with T, which suggests that asymmetrical address might be present here as well. A typical dialog is given below:

Zaključennyj: Za čto vy so mnoj tak, seržant?
Oxranik: Počemu ne rabotaš'? Posmotri, vse zaključennye rabotajut, a ty?
Zaključennyj: Tak ja starajus', no ja že skazal vraču, čto ja bolën.
Oxranik: Ja ne verju v tvoj bolezni. Idi i rabotaj.
Zaključennyj: Da ne mogu ja. Ja sejčas upadu.
Oxranik: Ty upadeš' tol'ko ne zdes', a v karcere.
Zaključennyj: Ne nado v karcere! Prošu vas.
Oxranik: Ax, ne nado. Togda rabotaj.
Zaključennyj: Xorošo, xorošo. Budu rabotat'.
prisoner: Why are you [V] like this with me, sergeant?
guard: Why aren't you working [T]? Look [T], all the prisoners are working, and you [T]? 
prisoner: I'm trying, but I told the doctor that I'm sick.
guard: I don’t believe in your [T] illnesses. Go [T] and work [T].
prisoner: But I can’t. I’ll fall down right now.
guard: You’ll [T] fall [T], only not here but into lockup.
prisoner: Not the lockup! I’m begging you [V].
guard: Ah, no cell. Then work [T].
prisoner: Ok, ok. I’ll work.

The Polish respondents, however, overwhelmingly agree T is appropriate in this situation. In 36% of the dialogues, symmetrical T is present, although in the dialogue below the guard suggests he should be addressed otherwise:

więzień: Możesz ze mną zrobić co chcesz i tak ci nic nie powiem.
strażnik: Nie mów do mnie ty, nie piliśmy razem.
więzień: Nic nie powiem, i tak beże mnie nic nie będziesz wiedzieć.
strażnik: Da się ci 5 minut.
więzień: Wsadź sobie te 5 minut wiesz gdzie...
strażnik: To są twoje ostatnie chwile.
więzień: Nic ode mnie nie wydusisz
strażnik: Zobaczmy.
więzień: Może zmienie zdanie, jak się cofniesz.
guard: Don’t speak [T] to me on ty, we haven’t drunk together.
prisoner: I won’t tell anything, and without me you won’t [Vpl] know anything.
guard: I’ll give you [T] 5 minutes.
prisoner: You know [T] where you should stick those 5 minutes...
guard: These are your [T] last moments.
prisoner: You won’t squeeze [T] anything out of me.
guard: We’ll see.
prisoner: Maybe there will be a change of mind if you step back [T].

In another 28.5% of the dialogues, asymmetrical address is present, and always with the prisoner addressed as T by the guard, and the guard addressed as P by the prisoner:

więzień: Wiem o pana problemach, finansowych
strażnik: Stul gębe albo cię zabiję
więzień: Mogę pana pomóc. Jestem księgowym znam się na tym.
strażnik: Jak to zrobić w więzieniu.
więzień: Potrzebuję dostępu do akt pana i wszystkie papiery finansowe.
strażnik: A jak wyjdzie sprawa na jaw?
więzień: Nikt się nie dowie.
strażnik: Co chcesz za to.
więzień: Nic szczególnego. Piwo dla chłopaków, spokój dla nas.
prisoner: I know about your [P] financial problems.
guard: Shut up [T] or I’ll kill you [T].
prisoner: I can help you [P]. I am an accountant, I know about these things.
guard: How will you do [T] it in prison?
prisoner: I need access to your [P] records and all your financial papers
guard: And what if this leaks out?
prisoner: No one will find out.
prisoner: Nothing special. Beer for the boys, leave us alone.

In others, only one form of address is used, and it is always the guard who is
addressing the prisoner as T:

więzień: proszę mnie puścić!
strażnik: nie wygłupiaj się, powiedz tylko
więzień: nie mogę!
strażnik: od tego zależy czy będziesz żył
więzień: nie chcę, nie mogę!
strażnik: nie wygłupiaj się! Co ci po tym.
więzień: oni są przeciw. Wszyscy, muszę.
strażnik: zastrzelę cię wcześniej.
więzień: Trudno.
prisoner: Please let me go!
guard: Don’t be stupid [T], just talk [T].
prisoner: I can’t!
guard: Your [T] life depends on this!
prisoner: I don’t want to. I can’t!
guard: Don’t be stupid [T]. Why does it matter to you [T]?
prisoner: They’re against it. All of them. I must.
guard: I’ll shoot you [T] first.
prisoner: It’s difficult.

Thus, it is impossible to speculate, considering the number of dialogs with symmetrical T
and asymmetrical address, respectively, whether T address or asymmetry is implied in
those dialogs with T used by only one speaker. In the case of Polish, it seems that both
are almost equally likely.

Finally, one respondent wrote a dialog in which the prisoner addresses the guard
as P. This might imply symmetrical P address, but more likely, given the other data, it
implies asymmetrical address.
There are no instances of address to the prisoner by any form but T; address to the guard is possible with T or P.

Most of the Czech participants feel that asymmetrical address is appropriate in this situation, as given in the dialog below:

vězeň: Jestli mé **pustíte** dolů, **budete** mít na krku vraždu.
strážce: Takovýchle nehod už tu bylo.

vězeň: A co spoluvězní jsou za svědci.
strážce: Těm nikdo neuvěří. Teď **mluv**, kde jste prokopali tu díru.

vězeň: Jestli si **mystíte**, že to řeknu, tak se šerdeně **mýlíte**...
strážce: **Mluv**, nebo tě shodím.

vězeň: Když vám to řeknu, zabijou mě spoluvězní. A radší se nechám zabit od vás.
strážce: **Máš** poslední šanci.

vězeň: Tak mé **pustíte**. Tam dole už o nicem nebudu vědět.

prisoner: If you **let** me **fall** [V], you’ll **have** [V] a murder on your hands.

guard: We’ve already had these kinds of accidents here.

prisoner: But what about the other prisoners as witnesses.

guard: Nobody’ll believe them. Now tell [T] me where you dug that hole.

prisoner: If you **think** [V] that I’m gonna tell you, then you’re sorely **mistaken** [V]...

guard: **Talk** [T], or I’ll drop you.

prisoner: If I **tell** you [V], the other prisoners will kill me. And I’d rather let myself be killed by you [V].

guard: **You** have [T] one last chance.

guard: Then **let** me **go** [V]. I won’t know about anything down there.

In each of the dialogs with asymmetrical address, the guard speaks to the prisoner on T, and the prisoner speaks to the guard on V.

However, one volunteer wrote a dialog in which there is initially asymmetrical address (T from guard to prisoner, V from prisoner to guard), but later involves a switch by the prisoner from V to T:

vězeň: **Nic vám** neřeknu.
strážce: Ještě jednou, kdo organizoval útěk?

vězeň: **Řek jsem vám**, nic nepovím.
strážce: **Jmenuj** ty další, bastardě.

vězeň: **Snažte** se zbytečně.
strážce: **Máš** 5 vteřin, jinak **tvoje** cesta půjde rovnou dolů.

vězeň: **Vyhořujete**, nemáte na to.
strážce: **Jedna, dva, tři**.
vězeň: *Trhni se nohou.*
prisoner: I won’t tell you [V] anything.
guard: One more time, who organized the escape?
prisoner: I told you [V], I won’t say anything.
guard: Name [T] the others, you bastard.
prisoner: You’re trying [V] in vain.
guard: You have [T] 5 seconds, otherwise you’re [T] going straight down.
prisoner: You are threatening [V] me, you don’t have [V] what it takes to do it.
guard: One, two, three.
prisoner: Go [T] to hell.

The prisoner shifts from V to T when he tells the guard *Trhni se nohou* ‘Go [T] to hell.’

Two respondents also created dialogs in which we see symmetrical V address:

vězeň: Radši skočím, než tu zůstat.
strážce: Vy budete poslouchat a vrátíte se do cely!

vězeň: Do tý díry nikdy!
strážce: Řek jsem, vrátíte se!

vězeň: Nikdy, žijem tam jak zvířata v kleci.
strážce: Nejste mi jinýho než zvířata.

vězeň: A co dozorci, co kradou vězniům balíky. To nejsou zvířata.
strážce: No tohle, co si to dovolujete!

vězeň: Řikám jen pravdu. Vy to víte.

prisoner: I’d rather jump than stay here.
guard: You will [V] obey and go back [V] to your cell immediately.
prisoner: To that hole- never!
guard: I said, you’ll go back [V]!

prisoner: Never, we live like animals in a cage there.
guard: You’re not [Vpl] anything but animals to me.
prisoner: And what about the wardens who steal the prisoners’ parcels. They aren’t animals.

prisoner: You’re going too far [V]!

In three others, we find that only the guard uses an address form, and it is always T. This suggests the possibility of asymmetrical address in these conversations as well; based on the Czech data already discussed, it is unlikely the prisoner would address the guard as T.

However, as we saw in a previous dialog, it can certainly happen.
Many of the Russian, Polish, and Czech respondents suggest that asymmetrical address is viable; however, the circumstances are extreme: one speaker has complete power over another, in both the physical sense (the guard is threatening to throw the prisoner off the roof) and in the sociological sense (a prisoner is the lowest-ranking member of any prison system).

4.2.25 Terrorist / hostage

Like clip twenty-four, clip twenty-five depicts a situation involving aggression: a terrorist is holding a gun to the head of a hostage. Two women, somehow associated with the hostage, appear in the film but do not speak. Due to space considerations, the No address pattern column has been omitted from this chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 25 terrorist / hostage</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>3A 43</td>
<td>1T</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>1T/Vpl 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5A 33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terrorist holds a gun; terrorist makes constant direct eye contact; hostage generally does not look directly at terrorist, and is physically under his control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-three percent of the Russian respondents suggested asymmetrical address would be appropriate in this situation. As shown in the dialog below, the person with the
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power (the terrorist) uses T but receives V, and the person without power (the hostage) uses V but receives T:

Založnik: Ja ne znaju, ja ne znaju. Vy možete menja ubiti.
Terrorist: Vreš! Ja znaju, čto ty znaeš.
Založnik: Govorju, čto ne znaju- značit ne znaju. Ubivajte!
Terrorist: Xorošo. Togda govori kogo pervogo iz nix dvoix mne ubivat?
hostage: I don’t know, I don’t know. You can [V] kill me.
terrorist: You’re lying [T]! I know that you [T] know [T]!
hostage: I’m telling you I don’t know! That means I don’t know. Kill [V] me!
terrorist: Ok. Then tell [T] me which of those two I should kill first.

Two participants also wrote dialogs containing symmetrical T address:

založnik: Ne mučaj menja tak. Skaži čega ty xočeš’. Ja vse sdelaju.
terrorist: Skaži, gde ty sprjelal vse den’gi i dragocennosti.
terrorist: Aga, ne skažes’. Togda ja ub’ju tvoju ženu i doć’.
založnik: Toi’ ko ix ne tregaj. Ja vse skažu.
terrorist: Aha, you won’t tell [T]. Then I’ll kill your [T] wife and daughter.
hostage: Just don’t touch [T] them. I’ll tell you everything.

The remaining dialogs contain address by only one speaker (in one, the terrorist to the hostage using T; in the other, the terrorist to the hostage using T, and the terrorist to the women using Vpl). These two dialogs imply either asymmetrical address or possibly symmetrical T address.

The Polish participants, however, almost unanimously wrote dialogs in which symmetrical T is used. For example:

mężczyn: Nie wiem czego chcesz.
mężczyn: z pistoletem: Gdzie jest skrytka?
mężczyn: Nie znam planów tego budynku.
mężczyn: z pistoletem: Kłamiesz, jeżeli mi nie powiesz, zginiesz. I one też.
mężczyn: Więc dobrze. Powiem wszystko.
man: I don’t know what you want [T].
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man with gun: Where is the hiding place?
man: I don't know the layout of this building.
man with gun: You're lying [T], if you don't tell [T] me, you'll die [T]. And them too.
man: Well ok. I'll tell you everything.

One, however, constructed a dialog in which symmetrical T is used, but with the addition
of pan:

mężczyzna: Nie mam nic na sumieniu i nic nie powiem.
mężczyzna z pistoletem: No i co gagatku! Dalej się nie poddasz!
mężczyzna: Tak, daj mi pan spokój.
mężczyzna z pistoletem: Chcesz w tyl głowy, czy w skronie? O, zobacz, kogo my to mamy!
żona, córka!
mężczyzna: Zostaw je w spokoju, draniu!
man: I don't have anything on my conscience and I won't tell anything.
man with gun: Well, mama's boy! You still won't give in [T].
man: Yes, leave (lit give [T] me you [P] peace) me alone.
man with gun: Do you want [T] it in the back of the head, or in the temple? Oh look [T]
who we have here! Wife, daughter!
man: Leave [T] them alone, you bastard!

The Czechs, on the other hand, responded in a wide variety of ways for this scene.

Three participants suggest symmetrical T is appropriate:

muž: Ten plánek prostě nemám.
muž s pistoli: Vzpomínej rychle chlapče. Nemáš na vybranou.
muž: Já myslím, že ty taky ne.
muž s pistoli: Než ti ustřelím hlavu, přijdou na řadu ty tvoje dvě ženský.
muž: Ty ženský nejsou moje, chytráku.
man: I simply don't have the map.
man with gun: Remember [T] it quickly, fella. You don't have [T] a choice.
man: I don't think you [T] do either.
man with gun: Before I shoot you [T] in the head, it'll be your [T] two womens' turns.
man: Those women aren't mine, smartass.

However, two others suggest symmetrical V is acceptable as well:

muž: Co chcete?
muž s pistoli: Abyste otevřel ten sejf.
muž: Neznám kód.
muž s pistoli: Jesteš si nevzpomenete, prostřelím vám makovici a mozek vám poteče po
stole. Chcete, aby to viděla vaše žena a holčička?
muž: Ne. Řeknu ten kód.
man: What do you want [V]?
man with gun: For you [V] to open that safe.
man: I don’t know the combination.
man with gun: If you don’t remember [V] it, I’ll shoot you [V] in the head and your [V] brain will flow all over the table. Do you want [V] your [V] wife and little girl to see that?
man: No. I’ll tell you the combination.

Another suggests a shift from T to V by the hostage when the terrorist “wins”:

muž: Neřeknu.
muž s pistoli: Naposled se ptám, kde je ten sejf?
muž: Můž to marný.
muž s pistoli: No tak si posvítím na támhlyty dvě.
muž: Vyhrál jste. Za Monetovým obrazem.
man: I won’t tell.
man with gun: I’m asking for the last time, where is the safe?
man: It’s no use for you [T].
man with gun: Well then I’ll aim at those two.

Finally, three respondents felt asymmetrical address is appropriate, likely because of the clear imbalance of power:

muž: Všechno vám dáms. Dejte pryč tu pistoli.
muž s pistoli: Jo. Naval mi všechno, nebo zabiju tebe i tvoji rodinu.
muž: Ano, prachy jsou v trezoru ve sklepě.
muž s pistoli: Modlí se.
man with gun: Yeah. Pony up [T] everything for me, or I’ll kill you [T] and your [T] family.
man: Ok, the money is in the safe in the basement.
man with gun: Pray [T].

In each of the conversations with asymmetrical address, the terrorist uses T to address the hostage, and the hostage addresses the terrorist with V.

Thus, the Czechs, unlike the Russians and the Poles, seem to feel asymmetrical or symmetrical T address are likely, but V is also possible. For Russian and Polish speakers,
symmetrical formal address is excluded. In Russian, asymmetrical or T address is preferred; in Polish, T is preferred.

### 4.2.26 Judge / women

In the penultimate clip, number twenty-six, we see a judge addressing two female defendants in court. Unlike the Czech and Polish volunteers, none of the Russian participants wrote dialogs in which the women address each other. Thus, all of the data for Russian refers to address between the woman or women and the judge presiding over the court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip26</th>
<th>sym T</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asymm (A)?</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>judge / women</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4V</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25p/V</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6P</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1Vpl/P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3V</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1T</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clip 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common address pattern</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one Russian, however, constructs a dialog in which both the judge and the accused woman address each other with V:

sud’ja: *I tak vy sideli za rulom avtomobilja, budući pod vozdejstvjem alkogola.*

ženščina1: *Net, Vaša čest'. My praktičeski i ne pili.*

ženščina2: *Da my ne pili- oficer k nam pridrailsja, potomu što my tak xoroko vyljadele.*

sud’ja: *Podumajte, eto Vam ne cirk.*

judge: *So you [V] were sitting [V] behind the wheel of the car while you were under the influence of alcohol.*

woman1: *No, your [V] honor. We had almost nothing to drink.*
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woman2: Yes, we weren’t drinking- the officer was harassing us because we looked so good.
judge: Think [V? / Vpl?], this isn’t a circus for you [V? / Vpl?].

More commonly, the Russian participants wrote dialogs in which only one
speaker uses a form of address (always V), such as the one given below:

suđ'ja: Podsudimaja, znaete li vy v čem vas obvinjajut?
ženščina1: Da, ja znaju, no ja ni v čem ne vinovata. Vot u menja est’ svidetel’ nica.
suđ'ja: Svidetel’ nica, čto vy možete skazať po étomu delu?
ženščina2: Ja šla po trotuaru i uslyšala, kak zagudela mašina. No kto kogo udaril i ne
videla.
suđ'ja: Kakoj že éto svidetel’? Vse fakty protiv vas, obvinjaemaja.
judge: Defendant, do you [V] know [V] what you’re [V] accused of?
women1: Yes, I know, but I’m not guilty of anything. Here I have a witness.
judge: Witness, what can you [V] say [V] about this affair?
women2: I was walking down the sidewalk and I heard a car honk. But I didn’t see who
hit whom.
judge: What kind of witness is this? All the facts are against you [V], defendant.

The remaining two dialogs contain similar V address by one speaker only, plus address
from the judge to both women with Vpl. Most likely, address by one speaker with
V implies symmetrical V address.

The Polish participants responded in a variety of ways. The most common form of
address is with P: in four dialogs, symmetrical P is used, and in another six, only one
speaker uses a form of address, and it is P. For example:

sędzia: Jak pani odeprze te zarzuty?
kobieta1: Ja mam świadka, panie sędzio.
sędzia: Mówi się wysoki sędzie. Kto to?
kobieta2: To ja, byliśmy razem tego wieczora.
sędzia: Czy ktoś to może poświadczyć?
judge: How do you [P] answer [P] to these charges?
women1: I have a witness, judge.
judge: It is High Judge. Who is it?
women2: It’s me, we were together that evening.
judge: Can anyone attest to that?

Thus, symmetrical P address between the woman and the judge is implied.
In another dialog, the judge addresses both women at the same time, and he uses Vpl, while he is addressed with P. This does not necessarily imply asymmetry, as Vpl is often used as a “generic” plural (rather than Ppl). In another, the women address each other (only) as T, and in still another, they dress each other as T but the judge as P.

Thus, P is the preferred form of address between judge and defendant. However, as we have noted, both Vpl and Ppl are acceptable and often appear interchangeable. In a dialog similar to the ones above, we find Ppl address: Panie przemysł zeznania i powiedzą wszystko od początku. Dokładnie!! ‘You [Ppl] will consider [Ppl] the evidence and tell [Ppl] everything from the beginning. Be precise!!!’

Further, in P address, nouns other than pan and pani can be used when the judge is speaking to the defendant: Pozwana ma głos ‘The defendant has (you have) [P] the floor’; oskarzona przyznaje się do winy ‘the accused pleads (you plead) [P] guilty’. Of course, this type of address is also common in courtrooms even in the United States, as well as in Congress, Parliament, and so on. In Polish, it simply a variant of P address.

The Czech participants responded in a fairly straightforward and expected manner: they favored symmetrical V between the woman and the judge, as in the dialog below:

soudce: Obžalovaná, jste si vědoma viny?
žena1: Ona za to opravdu nemůže pane soudce!
soudce: To se ukáže.
žena2: Vidíte, já to řikala. Řikám pravdu!
soudce: Ticho! Tady jste v soudní síní!
judge: Defendant, are you [V] aware of the charge?
woman1: It’s really not her fault, judge.
judge: That will be determined.
woman2: You see [V], I’ve been saying that. I’m telling the truth.
judge: Quiet! You are [V] in a courtroom here!
Three respondents created dialogs in which only one speaker uses V, thus implying symmetrical V address:

soudce: Takže vy jste to nevzala?
žena1: Ona to fakto nevzala
soudce: Teď vy
žena2: Vždyť tady Mary tam taky nebyla
soudce: Teď mluvte vy
judge: So you [V] didn’t take [V] it?
woman1: She really didn’t take it.
judge: Now you [V].
woman2: After all Mary here wasn’t there either.
judge: Now you [V] speak [V].

One volunteer constructed a conversation in which one woman addresses the other with T, but no other forms of address are used. Finally, in one dialog, we find address with either V or Vpl- it is ambiguous, unlike in the dialog given immediately above.

Overall, then, the Czechs preferred address with V between the judge and the women or woman, and T between the women only.

4.2.27 Member of parliament / prime minister

Finally, in clip 27 we see the prime minister (Tony Blair, in fact) addressing parliament, then a member of parliament responding to him. This clip could be interpreted as a public conversation between the prime minister and the MP, or as address to the entire group by both speakers. Sym T has been deleted from the chart below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip27</th>
<th>sym V</th>
<th>sym P</th>
<th>Switch(S) or asym (A)</th>
<th>One address pattern</th>
<th>No address pattern</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical element?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4?V</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7P</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1Vpl</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>3V</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8**</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2V/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1Vpl</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip 27</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common address pattern</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Russian, the most common form of address is V, which here can also be construed as Vpl:

člen parlamenta: Ja xotel sprosit’ kak vaše pravitel’stvo sobiraetsja uladit’ problemy s bezbabonicej?
prem’er-ministr: U nas est’ na eto konkretny plan, nad vnedreniem kotorogo my aktivno rabotaem.
člen parlamenta: Nu i kak u vas polučaetsja?

Member of Parliament: I wanted to ask- how does your [V? / Vpl?] government plan to fix the problems with unemployment?
Prime Minister: We have a concrete plan that we are actively working on implementing.
Member of Parliament: Well and how are you [V? / Vp]? doing with it?
Prime Minister: Not bad. Unemployment in the country for the last two months dropped by half a percent. We have a whole series of programs directed at further decreasing unemployment.

However, one participant wrote a dialog with P-like address, beginning with the following line by the Member of Parliament: Poprośu členov pravjaščej partii ne imejuščix dostup v Internet vstati’ ‘I ask the members of the ruling party (ask you [P]) who don’t have access to the Internet to stand up’.

In Polish, the overwhelming majority of respondents interpreted this scene as a conversation between two speakers and preferred P as the form of address, as in the dialog below:

posel: Panie premierze, to pan jest winny zwolnieniu 1000 pracowników we wschodnich landach.
premier: Powtarzam. Nie miałem z tym nic wspólnego. To jest nagonka na mnie, abym ustąpić.
posel: I może mają rację ci, którzy tego chcą.
premier: Czy pan myśli, że pozbawilibym pracy ludzi którzy pracują na nasz kraj...?
Member of Parliament: Mr. Prime Minister, it is you [P] who is [P] responsible for the firing of 1000 workers in the east.
Prime Minister: I repeat. I didn’t have anything to do with that. This is an attack on me so that I’ll step down.
Member of Parliament: And maybe those who want that are right.
Prime Minister: Do you [P] think [P] that I would fire people who work for our country...?

There is one dialog in which asymmetrical address appears, likely for humorous effect:

posel: Uważam że nowa ustawa nie jest dopracowana!
premier: Jeżeli pan Brown uważa że ustawa nie jest wystarczająca dobra...Bardzo proszę o zdefiniowanie kilku dziwnych słów, które był pan laskaw stworzyć...
posel: Co ty mówisz Tony...co ty wiesz.....
premier: Nie zgodzimy się kategorycznie. Nasza partia nie zgodzi się na tak niedopracowaną formę...To nie do pomyślenia!!!
Member of Parliament: I feel the new law is not worked out!
Prime Minister: If Mr. Brown feels the law falls short, fine...I ask for the definition of several strange words that you [P] were [P] kind enough to create...
Prime Minister: We absolutely cannot come to an agreement. Our party will not agree on such an incomplete model...This is unthinkable!

Finally, one respondent interpreted this scene as an address to the entire parliament and has the Prime Minister address the group with Vpl. Thus, the formality of the parliamentary setting requires P between individuals; in the plural, however, Vpl does appear to be acceptable.

The Czechs constructed dialogs in which the expected V appears, although in no instances do both speakers use it in the same dialog. For instance, in the dialog below, only the MP uses it to address the Prime Minister:

člen sněmovny: Navrhují, abychom projednali bod 821.
premiér: To není v současné situaci to nejpodstatnější.
člen sněmovny: Jak to můžete říct, pane premiére?
premiér: Za těchto okolností máme jiné povinnosti. Máme závazky vůči občanům této země!

Member of Parliament: I suggest that we discuss point 821.
Prime Minister: That isn’t the most essential in the current situation.
Member of Parliament: How can you [V] say that, Mr. Prime Minister?
Prime Minister: In these circumstances we have other duties. We have obligations to the citizens of this land!

Three similar dialogs appear among the data. There are also two instances of V address mixed with P forms as well:

člen sněmovny: Chci se pane premiéra zeptat, kdy hodlá konečně představit důkazy o terorismu Iráku?
premiér: Důkazy, a průkazné, existují. Široké veřejnosti se předložit nedají, tím byste jen nakecavával teroristům.
člen sněmovny: Jak tedy zdůvodněte, britskému lidu přípravy na válku po boku Ameriky?
premiér: Bojovat proti terorismu je naši povinností, to jistě nechce pan poslanec zpochybňovat. Jedná se o světovou bezpečnost a určitá rozhodnutí se dá ji uzavírat jen na jistých úrovních.

Member of Parliament: I want to ask the Prime Minister (you) [P], when he plans (you plan) [P] to finally present the evidence of Iraq’s terrorism?
Prime Minister: Evidence, and definitive evidence, exists. It cannot be presented it to the general public, by doing that you would [V] only give away information to terrorists.
Member of Parliament: How do you justify to the British people preparations for war as an ally of America?
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Prime Minister: It is our obligation to fight against terrorism, the MP certainly doesn’t want (you certainly don’t want) [P] to question that. It is about world safety and certain types of decisions can only be made at certain levels of government.

This type of P address, in modern Czech as in modern Russian, is very restricted and would likely be found only in parliament, the courtroom, and similar situations.

Finally, there is one instance in which the address is clearly Vpl: the Prime Minister says, Prosím, povstaňte všichni, kdo se mnou souhlasíte. ‘Everyone who agrees [V] with me, please stand [V].’

4.3 Summary

The data gleaned from this project are diverse and interesting. As we have seen, not only do the results vary from language to language, but also within each language there are often multiple options for any given situation.

4.3.1 Most common forms of address

The chart below presents a summary of the most common forms of address in the three languages for each of the film clips used in this project:
Table 4.1: Most common forms of address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip Number</th>
<th>Situation (interlocutors)</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>husband-wife</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>mother-son</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>brother-sister</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>mother-son</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>teacher-student</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>professor-professor</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T or P</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>businessman-secretary</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>customer-attendant</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>man-prostitute</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>waiter-customer</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>stranger-stranger</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>policeman-man</td>
<td>V or T, Vpl</td>
<td>T, Vpl</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sergeant-private</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T or V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>boss-subordinate</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>coworker-coworker</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>man to God</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>woman to pig</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>man to dog</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>girl to vampire</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>MC to audience</td>
<td>Vpl</td>
<td>Ppl</td>
<td>Vpl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>man-woman</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>woman-chauffeur</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>policeman-woman/women</td>
<td>T/V</td>
<td>T/P</td>
<td>T/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>prisoner-guard</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A or T</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>terrorist-hostage</td>
<td>A or T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T or A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>judge-women</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>prime minister-MP</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before beginning analysis of the data gleaned from the research instruments, I had hypothesized that Russian and Czech address would be quite similar to each other but both somewhat different from Polish. Polish, after all, has a different system of address altogether: in Polish we generally find P not V, but V in extremely limited circumstances; plural honorific forms; and so on.

In some areas, of course, Russian, Polish, and Czech address is identical or almost identical: T is used between family members (clips 1-4), friends (between the women in clip 23), and, in some situations, close coworkers (clip 15), in all three languages. T is also used, almost without exception, to address non-humans, such as God (clip 16),
animals (clips 17,18), and even vampires (clip 19). Formal address, be it V or P, is required in certain situations, such as most business transactions (clips 8,10), government proceedings (clip 27), and courtroom proceedings (clip 26). It is also generally used to address strangers (clip 11).

Russian and Czech do differ from Polish in other areas, however. The most obvious way in which they differ is in plural address. Speakers of Russian and Czech, of course, have only Vpl; they make no distinction between formal and informal address in the plural. Speakers of Polish, however, have Vpl (plural informal), Ppl (plural formal), and państwo (also Ppl), the collective which itself is neuter singular but requires (in the standard language) a 3pl [Ppl] predicate. Państwo is used to address a mixed-gender group formally. Thus, a Russian or Czech MC has only one option for addressing an audience, but a Polish MC has a multitude of address forms at his disposal, and they often combine in unusual ways (see clip 20). Russians and Czechs also seem, in some cases, to be more in agreement about asymmetrical address between particular speakers, for instance between prisoner / guard (clip 24) and terrorist / hostage (clip 25). The Polish respondents, nonetheless, suggested asymmetrical address was possible in the largest number of situations (11, with 23 total instances of asymmetry; see chart below).

However, Russian and Polish participants in this study seem to accept, even prefer, asymmetrical address in a schoolroom (clip 5), but Czechs do not. The Czechs and Poles, on the other hand, allow T address between certain coworkers, whereas Russians prefer V address (clip 15).

In some circumstances, Polish seems to be on a continuum between Russian and Czech. For instance, in the situation in which two professors are talking to each other
(clip 6), the Russian participants most commonly had the speakers address each other as T, the Czechs had them address each other as V, and the Poles had them just about equally split: half had them use T (like the Russians), and half had them use formal P (like the Czechs, with V). A similar situation occurs with the dialogs supporting the conversation between sergeant and private (clip 13) and the terrorist and hostage (clip 25). In the former, the Russians most commonly used T, the Czechs used V, and the Poles were, again, divided between T and P. In the latter, the Russians preferred asymmetry, then T, the Poles T, and the Czechs, T, then asymmetry.

What is interesting about this "address continuum" is that it seems to parallel a well-known similar continuum in the area of phonological features as well as one in case meaning (Janda 2002a). Polish often represents a dialectal\(^\text{10}\) distribution between Russian and Czech; of course, Poland is also geographically located between Russia and Czech Republic. This suggests the possibility of a dialectal distribution of the pragmatic phenomenon of address (see section 6.2.6 for more detail).

4.3.2 Most variation in address

Many of the situations for which volunteers wrote dialogs show little or no real variation in form of address. These include address to family members (T), address to animals (T), address to God (T), address to a vampire (T), address from MC to audience (Vpl or Ppl, with Polish exceptions noted), and address between a woman and a judge (V or P).

Seven situations show variation between two basic forms: the formal V / P and asymmetrical address. These include teacher-student, businessman-secretary, customer-
attendant, waiter-customer, woman-chauffeur, woman-policeman, and MP-prime minister. There were no instances of variation between only symmetrical T address and asymmetrical address.

The remaining situations show three or more variations in possible forms of address. The chart below depicts the variations in address among the three languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip</th>
<th>situation (interlocutors)</th>
<th>attested address forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>professor-professor</td>
<td>sym T, sym V/P, S (V&gt;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>man-prostitute</td>
<td>sym T, sym V, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>stranger-stranger</td>
<td>sym T, sym V/P, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>policeman-man</td>
<td>sym T, S (P&gt;T), A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sergeant-private</td>
<td>sym T, sym V, S (V&gt;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>boss-subordinate</td>
<td>sym V/P, S (V&gt;T), A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>coworker-coworker</td>
<td>sym T, sym V, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>man-woman (fighting)</td>
<td>sym T, sym V, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>prisoner-guard</td>
<td>sym T, sym V, A, S (V&gt;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>terrorist-hostage</td>
<td>sym T, sym V, A, S (T&gt;V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the situations that display the most variation, we can discern two groups: situations that are very common and simply vary; and situations that are likely less familiar to the volunteers who wrote the scripts. Of the former, we can include address between strangers and address at work (including address between professors, address between boss and subordinate, and address between coworkers). The remaining situations are likely circumstances with which the volunteers were less familiar: man-prostitute, policeman-man, sergeant-private, man-woman (physically fighting), prisoner-guard, and terrorist-hostage. Thus, the responses on these questions may or may not reflect “real” usage in these situations; however, what the responses reveal is that each participant has a meaningful system of possible address forms and he or she adapts that system to reflect his or her construal of the situation. There is no room for interpretation when a man addresses God; Russian, Polish, and Czech each have established norms by which people are supposed to pray (in each case, T). However, if one has never addressed a prostitute...
before, one might wonder: do we use V because this is a business transaction? Or T because it is (potentially) a very intimate situation? Or is asymmetrical address required because of the power dynamic present? Speaker construal of unfamiliar situations, then, is reflected in T, V, and P usage and reveals a great deal about the systems of address available to the participants in the project.

4.3.3 Asymmetry and switches

Examination of two particular phenomena, asymmetrical address and switches from one address form to another by one or both speakers, will reveal insights into which interlocutor has the most power in the relationship, and why.

4.3.3.1 Asymmetry

The first table below shows the number of asymmetrical situations that occur in the data presented above; clips not included either had no evidence of asymmetry or did not have definitive evidence of asymmetry (i.e., only one speaker used a form of address). The italicized member of the pair in the asymmetrical situation column is the addressee receiving the polite form (be it V or P):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip</th>
<th>asymmetrical situation (interlocutors)</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>teacher-student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>businessman-secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>customer-attendant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>prostitute-man</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>customer -waiter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>female stranger- male stranger</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>policeman-man</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>boss-subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>female coworker-male coworker</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>woman -man</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>woman-chauffeur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>woman -policeman</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>guard - prisoner</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>terrorist-hostage</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MP- prime minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A close examination of the table above reveals that the person with the power in a conversation often, but not always, receives the formal pronoun (V or P). For example, the prostitute, the female driver stopped for a traffic violation, and the Member of Parliament would likely be considered to be the interlocutors with less power in each relationship. However, in the situations presented above, they are the ones who receive formal address and give informal address. Reasons for this as well as a discussion of how various factors (race, gender, and so on) influence pronoun choice will be presented in Chapter 5.

4.3.3.2 Switches

The next table details the switches that occurred in the data presented above. The italicized member of each pair in the switches column indicates the interlocutor who initiated the switch. The language columns detail the change that was made for each clip (each language coincidentally displayed only one switch per clip).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip</th>
<th>Switches (interlocutors)</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>professor-professor</td>
<td>1 V&gt;T</td>
<td>1 V&gt;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>policeman-man</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 P&gt;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sergeant-private</td>
<td>1 V&gt;T</td>
<td>1 V&gt;T</td>
<td>1 V&gt;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>boss-subordinate</td>
<td>1 V&gt;T</td>
<td>1 V&gt;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>prisoner-guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 V&gt;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>hostage -terrorist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 T&gt;V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the professors switch between forms of address (Clip 6) does not necessarily tell us anything about who has the power in the relationship; the two are white males of roughly the same age. However, the switches in Clips 12-14, in each language where one occurs, are initiated by the interlocutor with the most power: the policeman in Clip 12, the sergeant in Clip 13, and the boss in Clip 14. The opposite is true in Clips 24 and 25: the interlocutor with the least power initiates these switches. In Clip 24, the prisoner tells the
guard to "Go [T] to hell" after having had a conversation with him in which he addresses the guard as V but is himself addressed as T. In Clip 25, when the hostage gives up, he elevates the terrorist from T to V status. Note that the shift in Clip 25 is the only one in the entire body of data that involves a switch from T to V; most often, the switch is from the formal to the informal.

4.4 Conclusions

Gender, race, and social position are among the factors that can influence address patterns, and a closer examination of asymmetrical address and switches will reveal which factors are relevant in certain situations, and which are "overridden" by others. Such an examination will follow in detail in the next chapter.

The cognitive motivations for the most common address patterns, as well as variations in usage in each language, will also be discussed in detail in the following chapter. As we discussed in Chapter 2, we suggest that Russians, Poles, and Czechs have developed not only their systems of address but also their notions of when to use the various forms because of the way they conceptualize space and size. Specifically, their understanding of social power and social intimacy is framed in physical terms; pronouns and their related forms are grammatical representations of various sizes and spaces. Speakers manipulate these sizes and spaces when they encounter someone they have to talk to; they also often manipulate the real space they and their interlocutor are operating in. A portion of the following chapter will be devoted to the correlation of gesture, posture, size, and space of speakers with the pronouns they choose.
Chapter 5: Analysis

5.1 Introduction

In Chapters 3 and 4 we have presented data gleaned from films, plays, and a project of our own design. In this chapter we look at two phenomena in particular, switches and asymmetry, which reveal a great deal about speakers' conceptualizations of relationships and the way these are manifested in terms of forms of address. From Chapter 3 we analyze asymmetry and switches that appear in the films and plays; we also emphasize physical elements (movement, vertical orientation of characters, distance between speakers, and so on) that accompany the dialogues excerpted, for these often support our theory that spatialization metaphors structure speakers' use of T, V, and P. From Chapter 4 (the presentation of data from our project), we analyze only those situations that involve a switch or asymmetry of some sort.

We suggest that two main factors, social power and social intimacy, motivate the use of asymmetrical address and shifts in address. Three meanings of asymmetry and switches can be distinguished: 1) Display of authority / threat; 2) Persuasion / entreaty; and 3) Flirtation / affection. Social power and social intimacy, understood in terms of UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL and NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT, interact in various ways to motivate these non-reciprocal forms of address. We explore this interaction in a thorough examination of data from Russian, Polish, and Czech.
We begin (5.2) by reviewing concepts that structure pronoun usage, based on Brown and Gilman (1960): social power and social intimacy (solidarity). In 5.3 we undertake a cognitive linguistic analysis of the meanings of asymmetrical address in Russian, Polish, and Czech, based on data from Chapters 3 and 4. In 5.4 we consider switches in address in the same framework. Section 5.5 presents the results of our analyses with regard to who has social power (who is BIG and UP, SMALL and DOWN) in asymmetrical situations and in situations involving switches, as well as the role of social intimacy (who is NEAR and IN, FAR and OUT) in asymmetry and switches.

5.2 Two factors: Social power and social intimacy

Many scholars working on politeness agree that there are two major factors influencing choice of form of address. One is what we call social power, otherwise known as the “power semantic” by Brown and Gilman (1960), “social distance” by Listen (1999) and Bruti (2000), or “social rank, power and prestige” by Helmbrecht (2003). Speakers’ conceptualization of social power, we suggest, is motivated primarily by their understanding of things that are UP / DOWN and BIG / SMALL. The other factor is what we label social intimacy (after Listen 1999), otherwise known as the “solidarity semantic” (Brown and Gilman 1960), “emotional attitude” (Bruti 2000), or “social distance” (Helmbrecht 2003). We suggest speakers’ conceptualization of social intimacy is motivated primarily by their understanding of things that are CLOSE / DISTANT (or NEAR / FAR) and IN / OUT. We refer the reader to Chapter 2 for details.

5.2.1 Social power

Social power, or the power semantic, according to Brown and Gilman (1960: 255) involves asymmetrical (or, in their terminology, nonreciprocal) address. For instance, the
superior in an interaction gives T but receives V (or, in the case of Polish, P). One speaker has power over another to the extent that “he is able to control the behavior of the other. Power is a relationship between at least two persons, and it is nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior”. Brown and Gilman suggest that there are various bases of power: physical strength [BIG person stronger than SMALL], wealth [MORE money], age [MORE years], sex, and institutionalized roles in the church, state, army, or family [HIGH STATUS]. They note further that “[s]ince the nonreciprocal power semantic only prescribes usage between superior and inferior, it calls for a social structure in which there are unique power ranks for every individual” (Brown and Gilman 1960: 256). As societies have become more democratized, so, too have their forms of address; asymmetrical address (at least between adults) is often considered unacceptable in most normal settings in Russian, Polish, and Czech. However, we do find instances of asymmetrical address in these languages, and they often, but not always, reflect a power dynamic that exists between the two speakers.

Listen (1999:4) elaborates on Brown and Gilman’s power semantic and suggests that “[i]n the realm of social relationships, dominance and submission are manifestations of social and / or political power relations”. He goes on to suggest, “of most interest for this study [of polite German address] are the metaphors from the domains of size and quantity. Sociopolitical power is equated with physical size” (Listen 1999: 4). We, of course, further contend that power is equated with verticality, as Listen’s poles of dominance and submission suggest (recall from Chapter 2 that HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE IS UP, BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE IS DOWN).

1 The insertion of metaphorical correlates is mine.
Helmbrecht (2003: 192-193) also advocates the existence of two major factors that influence address patterns: “There are two social parameters that seem to be of particular significance with respect to politeness. One involves the relative social rank, power and prestige of the individual members within a society... The relative social rank of an individual depends on variables such as age, sex, kinship relation, heritage, wealth, political power, etc. and the social roles that the individual is licensed to play”. That is, social rank (i.e., social power) does not have to do with how well two speakers know each other, but rather the influence or authority one has over the other due to the status of some factor they possess (for instance, age; MORE YEARS correlates with UP, since MORE IS UP; since RESPECT IS also UP, we show RESPECT to our elders).

5.2.2 Social intimacy

The second factor affecting choice of form of address is social intimacy. Brown and Gilman (1960: 257) suggest, referring to the historical development of address forms, that “[d]ifferences of power cause V to emerge in one direction of address [asymmetry]; differences not concerned with power cause V to emerge in both directions [symmetry, or mutual address]”. That is, mutual address, be it T or V (or P, for that matter) emerges in situations where the power semantic does not exist. Thus, all situations not concerned with power involve mutual address and belong to the solidarity, or social intimacy, scale.

Listen (1999: 4) suggests that the second factor includes personal distance and formal, non-intimate interactions, and that closeness and rejection are the poles of this scale. He explains that the “degree of emotional involvement and the possibility of mutual influences are understood in terms of proximity (a close friend, a close adviser, to keep one’s distance)” (Listen 1999: 63). We, too, suggest that CLOSENESS and
DISTANCE, as well as IN and OUT structure our understanding of intimate and non-intimate relationships.

Helmbrecht (2003: 193) notes that the “parameter of relative social distance describes the fact that people who are close relatives or friends, or who belong to the same peer groups, etc., are usually closer to each other than unrelated people who do not know each other on an every-day basis”. The power of one speaker over the other is irrelevant on this scale; interlocutors are either CLOSE or DISTANT, and are either IN or OUT of various groups with respect to each other.

5.2.3 Summary

Thus, based on the discussion of relevant metaphors in Chapter 2, we diagram social power, motivated by UP / DOWN and BIG / SMALL, as follows:

```
UP

Impersonal event: Business transaction / scripted situation
personal event: more need for respect (females, elders, etc.)
personal event: less need for respect (males, young, etc.)
animals
inanimate objects

MORE, FORMALITY, RESPECT, HAVING CONTROL OR FORCE, HIGH STATUS, IMPERSONAL

DOWN

IMPORTANT, MORE.............................................UNIMPORTANT, LESS

Impersonal event > personal event: respect > personal event: less respect > animals > inanimate objects

BIG..........................................................................SMALL

The situations in the center of each diagram (Impersonal event: Business transaction / scripted situation; personal event: need for respect [females, elders];
personal event: less need for respect [males, young]; animals; inanimate objects)
represent a scale of possible circumstances involving social power in which one might
find oneself. Impersonal events include scripted situations and business transactions that,
by the nature of the situation, require V or P address. The power involved, then, derives
not from either speaker but from the situation itself. For example, there are certain
behaviors associated with withdrawing money from a bank; these behaviors have nothing
to do with who the teller is, or how much money you have or do not have. Similarly,
withdrawing money from a bank normally requires mutual V or P address. It is part of the
behavior associated with the situation.2

Further down (or along) the scale are personal events. Speakers sometimes
interact with a person who, for reasons of their relative social power, deserves special
treatment. Linguistically this special treatment can come in the form of V or P. The
elderly, females, and other persons of higher status (for instance, a superior at work) tend
to receive this respect; the young, males, and other persons of lower status (for example,
a subordinate at work) tend not to receive this respect.

Leaving the realm of human interaction (personal events) generally means leaving
choices in address forms behind; animals and inanimate things receive T. However, the
scale is not absolute; there are instances of V address to animals in literature. Regardless,
the further UP one places one’s interlocutor on the vertical scale, the more likely V or P
address is to them. The further DOWN one places one’s interlocutor, the more likely T
address is to them. Similarly, the BIGGER (metaphorically speaking) one’s interlocutor

2 An alternative view of IMPERSONAL situations is that they impose DISTANCE on the participants in
the event. Thus, ritualized DISTANCE might motivate mutual V or P address in these scripted business
transactions.
is, the more likely he or she is to receive V or P; the SMALLER one's interlocutor is, the more likely he or she to is to receive T.

We also note that since MORE IS BIG and MORE IS UP, things that are UP and BIG are often coherent (thus, RESPECT IS BIG, HIGH STATUS IS BIG, and so on). Things that are DOWN and SMALL can be coherent (DISRESPECT IS SMALL, LOW STATUS IS SMALL, and so on).

Next, we diagram social intimacy, motivated by NEAR / FAR and IN / OUT, as shown below:

SELF........INTIMACY, SIMILARITY............NON-INTIMACY, DIFFERENCE
SELF.......God>family>lovers, friends>coworkers>distant relatives>new acquaintances>strangers
NEAR......................................................................FAR

We can also place a container on the scale and consider interlocutors IN or OUT relative to the SELF (speaker):

SELF... SIMILAR, FAMILIAR, MEMBERSHIP........DIFFERENT, UNFAMILIAR, EXCLUSION

SELF ... God>Family>lovers, friends, intimates>coworkers>distant relatives, etc.

IN......................................................................OUT

For the social intimacy diagrams, the center members (God > family > lovers, friends > coworkers > distant relatives > new acquaintances > strangers) represent a range of interlocutors with whom we have social relations of varying degrees of intimacy. God represents the entity CLOSEST to SELF (the speaker); a stranger represents an entity FAR AWAY from the SELF. The range of beings on this scale is, of course, not absolute with regard to DISTANCE from speaker; some may consider only God and family
NEAR to them; for others, CLOSENESS might extend as far as distant relatives and even new acquaintances.

The containment metaphor further elaborates the NEAR/FAR schema; by placement of a metaphorical CONTAINER along the scale, a speaker can INCLUDE or EXCLUDE others. Again, for some, only God, family, and friends are IN; everyone else is OUT and is addressed as such. Regardless, the further to the right along the above scales one goes (that is, the FARTHER OUT one moves), the more likely he or she is to receive address with V or P. The CLOSER IN someone is relative to the speaker, the more likely he or she is to receive T.

Metaphors for social distance are often coherent; that is, things that are OUT are also FAR. Things that are IN are also NEAR.

It is widely accepted, then, that there are two factors -- whatever their labels -- that influence a person's choice of address forms (T, V, or P): social power and social intimacy. We suggest that speakers' conceptualizations of power and intimacy are motivated by their understanding of verticality and size, distance and containers, respectively. Further, conceptualizations of relationships between speakers can be multiply motivated; one does not always view a relationship in only one way, just as one does not always view a relationship in the same way as one's interlocutor. Thus, people who work together might be DISTANT on the intimacy scale, but one worker might also have HIGHER STATUS (i.e., be UP) relative to the other on the power scale. Choice of form of address can be determined by one or both factors. We examine the workings of social power and intimacy, image schema metaphors, and forms of address by analyzing asymmetrical address, which theoretically occurs most often when there is a difference in
power between the speakers, and switches in address, which are theoretically temporary
and motivated by momentary circumstances (emotion, for example). We begin with a
more detailed look at asymmetry, and then follow with a discussion of switches.

5.3 Asymmetry

Asymmetrical address, as we note above in the discussion on social power, is the
situation in which one speaker receives a polite or formal address form (V or P, for
example) but uses the informal address form (T) to address the other interlocutor.
Asymmetry, as opposed to a switch, is often a more permanent means of address based
on unchanging factors (the fact that a grandmother is always older than her grandson, the
fact that the boss always has more power than a subordinate, and so on). Brown and
Gilman (1960), as we have noted, state that once polite pronominal address is established,
the solidarity semantic (that is, reciprocal address) becomes the norm in time, ousting
(original) asymmetrical address. Jucker and Taavitsainen (2003: 15) suggest the existence
of entire reciprocal and non-reciprocal address systems. In a reciprocal system, speakers
must address each other with the same form. In a non-reciprocal systems, speakers “use
different pronouns, either on the basis of their respective social statuses or on the basis of
their relative age” (Jucker and Taavitsainen 2003: 15).

Russian, Polish, and Czech frequently employ reciprocal systems: the norm
generally requires mutual address and is based on the intimacy factor (as opposed to
power). However, as we have seen in Chapters 3 and 4, asymmetrical address does exist
for speakers of these three languages. In this section we examine those instances of
asymmetry with regard to metaphorical motivation, the role of power and intimacy, and
the meaning of asymmetry to the speakers involved.
We begin with a brief review of the asymmetrical situations gleaned from Russian, Polish, and Czech films and plays. Please see Chapter 3 for a more comprehensive presentation of the data represented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business transaction/</td>
<td>customer and bank teller</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scripted situation</td>
<td>shock worker and security officer</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>customer and waiter</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leader and member of excursion</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>boss and subordinate</td>
<td>1R, 2Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policeman and apprentice</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends, acquaintances,</td>
<td>woman and man</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strangers</td>
<td>Drunk man and sober man</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man winning fight and man losing fight</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female stranger and male stranger</td>
<td>1Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mother and friend of son</td>
<td>1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>man and servant</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td>father and son</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father (and mother), son</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uncle and nephew</td>
<td>2Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grandmother and grandson</td>
<td>1Pol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Chapter 4, we presented data obtained through an original research project that involved script writing by native speakers of Russian, Polish, and Czech. Asymmetrical address was revealed to be a viable part of the linguistic system of native speakers of all three languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>teacher-student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>businessman-secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>customer-attendant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>prostitute-man</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>customer-waiter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>female stranger- male stranger</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>policeman-man</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The questions we explore with regard to this data on asymmetrical address include the following: does asymmetry always, or almost always, involve social power of one speaker over another? Put another way, what does asymmetrical address mean, and how is it motivated by speakers’ understanding of spatial relations? Does asymmetry occur more frequently in one language than another? What are the exceptions to the tendencies involving asymmetrical address, and is there a pattern that emerges within these exceptions?

5.3.1 The meanings of asymmetrical address

Upon close examination of the situations in which one speaker is addressed with V or P but addresses his interlocutor with T, we can discern three main meanings of asymmetrical address. The most common one by far is, in fact, that asymmetrical address is an expression of authority or a threat of some sort. Social power is the motivation for asymmetry in the circumstance that one speaker is imposing his will on or demanding respect from another.

The second meaning involves both power and intimacy: it emerges when one speaker is attempting to impose his will (power) on another via an attempt to establish intimacy or solidarity with the hearer (intimacy). This second meaning, which we call persuasion / entreaty, represents a compromise of sorts between the authority / threat
meaning and the third meaning, which is flirtation or affection (intimacy). A speaker can use asymmetry to establish or reinforce the fact that he or she likes another person, or wants to get to know him or her better. The chart below is a presentation of each instance of asymmetry discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, categorized according to these three meanings. Language is noted, and the italicized interlocutor is the person receiving V or P address.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display of authority / threat (power): UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL</th>
<th>Persuasion / entailment (power and intimacy): UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL and NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT</th>
<th>Flirtation / affection (intimacy): NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>leader and member of excursion (Cz)</td>
<td>customer and bank teller (R)</td>
<td>woman and man (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boss and subordinate (Pol)</td>
<td>boss and subordinate (R, Pol)</td>
<td>man and servant (Pol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policeman and apprentice (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td>customer and waiter (Pol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man winning fight and man losing fight (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>female stranger and male stranger (Cz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother and friend of son (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father and son (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father (and mother), son (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncle and nephew (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandmother and grandson (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guard and prisoner (R, Pol, Cz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrorist and hostage (R, Cz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher and student (R, Pol, Cz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman and man (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman and chauffeur (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman and policeman (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policeman and man (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boss and subordinate (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female stranger and male stranger (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were also a few situations from the data that did not fit into any of these categories as well as some examples from the project data (Chapter 4) that we do not consider here because we suspect inconsistency, not intentional asymmetry, on the part of the author. The dialogs excluded from consideration are described below.

One situation that does not fit in the chart above comes from four Polish respondents who wrote dialogs in which a businessman addresses his secretary with T, but she addresses him with P. While it is certainly true that he holds a position higher than she does, he also clearly expresses affection toward her; thus, we have a combination of power (he is her boss) and intimacy, but no element of entreaty. In these dialogs, he is not trying to ingratiate himself with her to get her to bend to his will. An example appears below (all four dialogs are very similar):

*Sekretarka: Zabral pan wszystko?* A *te umowy które leżą na biurku, niepotrzebne?*
*Biznesmen: A, właśnie! Co ja tym bez ciebie zrobił?*
*Sekretarka: Ummm.*
*Biznesmen: Dziękuję.*
*Secretary: Did you [P] get [P] everything? And those contracts that are lying on the desk, you don’t need them?*
*Businessman: Oh, of course! What would I do without you [T]?*
*Secretary: Ummm.*
*Businessman: Thank you.*

In one Russian example from Chapter 4, a woman uses a T imperative *podożdi* ‘wait’ to a policeman when he asks her to step out of her car. The policeman does not react with anger, however, which suggests the author did not intend the address as an insult. One explanation for the T imperative here might be the fact that the woman in the clip is clearly intoxicated. In fact, another instance of V-T address in Russian involves an intoxicated party: from *Ironija sud’by* we find a very drunk man (Ippolit) addressing his interlocutor as T but receiving V himself:
Ženja: Vy by xot šapku snížiti!
Ippolit: Mne i tak xorošo! A ty by už lučše molčal.
Ženja: You should at least take your hat off [V]!
Ippolit: I'm fine! But it'd be better for you [T] to be quiet [T].

Of course, Ippolit is also displaying aggression toward his interlocutor. Thus, we suggest this example is motivated by both Ippolit's altered state and by a display of power.

Finally, from Człowiek z marmuru, we find Birkut drunken and apathetic in the months after the government has essentially destroyed his life. Birkut's use of T in a situation that would usually require polite address is likely motivated by his altered state.

Note, too, that the waiter begins address with P but switches to P+T address:

Birkut: Kelner! Placę...Nie rusz!
Kelner: 59 złotych i 40 groszy.
Birkut: Masz.
Kelner: Co to jest?
Birkut: Pieniądze.
Kelner: Jakie pieniądze, panie! Siedem złotych mi pan daje? Za mało pan dałeś!
Birkut: Waiter! The bill...don't move [T]!
Waiter: 59 złoties and 40 grosches.
Birkut: There you [T] go.
Waiter: What is this?
Birkut: Money.

The waiter, who is not drunk, is angry because Birkut has not paid his bill. He switches to a form of address more familiar than P but not as familiar as pure T; we suggest his switch is related to the persuasion / entreaty category suggested above. After all, he wants to impose his will on Birkut, but he does not (linguistically) do it completely (which would mean T address and would be a full threat)^3.

Returning to the issue of drunkenness, we have reason to associate T use with intoxication on the part of the speaker. Friedrich (1966: 249) reports that historically,

^3 Switches will be discussed in section 5.4, and the specific problems of Polish address (including this example) will be further discussed in 6.2.8.
“personal derangement was signalled by the excessive use of _ty_. Many persons when drunk grew familiar with all and sundry”. Also, excessive use of _T_ was a sign of “more permanent [mental] disorganization”, such as hysteria or insanity (Friedrich 1966: 249).

“The onset of hysteria was signalled by a neutralization or cancelling out…of the distinction that set off the two pronouns from each other” (Friedrich 1966: 249). Further, the “exclusive use of the informal pronoun often symbolized an outlook on man and society characteristic of the insane, the senile, hermits, and extreme revolutionaries, notably terrorists” (Friedrich 1966: 250). We suggest that _T_ use in these two examples might be motivated by the altered state of the speakers, and therefore we exclude them from further consideration.

Another example from Russian involves address from a female coworker to a male coworker:

_Kollega1_: **Zdravstvujte, Lizočka!**
_Kollega2_: _Nu ja potom i govorju, davaj izmenim nagruzku._
_Kollega1_: _Ja ne dumaju, čto v ētom problema._
_Kollega2_: _Nu a čto delat? Nado kak-to razbriatsja._
Coworker1: Hello (lit. be well [V]) Lizočka!
Coworker2: Well, and then, I’m saying, let’s [T] change the workload.
Coworker1: I don’t think there’s a problem with it.
Coworker2: Well what should we do? We have to figure it out somehow.

We note, as we did in Chapter 4, that the only words that might convey politeness in this example are the highly formulaic imperatives _Zdravstvujte_ ‘be well’ [V] and _Davaj_ ‘let’s’[T]. We cannot know if the author truly intended to make the T-V distinction here, or if he or she was simply inconsistent in the use of these (again, highly formulaic) constructions. For this reason, we will not discuss this example further.

Finally, there are several Polish examples from which we do not draw conclusions. First, we find asymmetrical address between an MP and the prime minister:
Premier: Jeżeli pan Brown uważa że ustawa nie jest wystarczająca dobra... Bardzo proszę o zdefiniowanie kilku dziwnych słów, które był pan laskaw stworzyć...

Posel: Co ty mówisz Tony...co ty wiesz....

Prime Minister: If Mr. Brown feels the law falls short, fine... I ask for the definition of several strange words that you [P] were [P] kind enough to create...


We suspect that the use of T here is for humorous effect. Since humorous address is well beyond the scope of this project, we exclude this example from our analysis.

We will pass over two other Polish situations without further discussion in this section. One is a conversation between a dry cleaning attendant and her customer; the other is an exchange between a prostitute and a potential client. These two examples will be treated in the section below describing the difficulties in delimiting forms of address in Polish (see 6.2.8).

The table below summarizes the exceptions noted and the situations excluded from consideration, and why.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Included elsewhere</th>
<th>language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>businessman and secretary</td>
<td>power and affection without entreaty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman and policeman</td>
<td>questionable motivation because of drunkenness, inconsistency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drunk man and sober man</td>
<td>questionable motivation because of drunkenness</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man and waiter</td>
<td>questionable motivation because of drunkenness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female coworker and male coworker</td>
<td>formulaic language, inconsistency?</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP and prime minister</td>
<td>humor?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>customer and</td>
<td>see section 6.2.8 on difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We do note, however, that what most of the situations in the "excluded" category have in common is that the speaker using T lacks any sense of boundary; the businessman, for instance, is "too friendly" toward his secretary, but she does not reciprocate. Drunkenness (and insanity) often eliminates a person's sense of decorum, freeing them from the requirements of sober (sane) society. Humor, too, can "go too far". We certainly acknowledge that these are all phenomena involving space and boundaries (or the lack thereof); however, these few examples are tangential to the model we propose involving threats, entreaties, and affection.

The remaining examples of asymmetrical address more or less fit the patterns of threat-entreaty-affection. Let us first examine asymmetrical address in detail in each language.

5.3.1.1 Russian asymmetry

The chart below presents a summary of asymmetry in the Russian data we have gathered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.5: Russian asymmetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display of authority / threat (power): UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man winning fight and man losing fight (physical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrorist and hostage (physical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guard and prisoner (physical, status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher and student (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother and friend of son (will)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.3.1.1 Display of authority / threat in Russian

The speaker receiving V and giving T is italicized and placed first in this and in all charts in this section. The reader will immediately notice that we classify the majority of asymmetrical interactions as ones involving the power semantic. That is, UP and BIG motivate V address, and DOWN and SMALL motivate T address. Intimacy, or lack thereof, has little or nothing to do with address patterns in these examples.

Let us examine precisely how the concepts UP and BIG, DOWN and SMALL function to reinforce social power relations through analysis of the situations presented in the first column in the table above. The information given in parentheses in the first column describes the source of the power: physical force, social status, or lack of power but desire to impose will forcefully. Please note that almost all of the examples we cite were presented in detail in Chapters 3 and 4; therefore, in this chapter we often present only relevant excerpts, rather than entire exchanges.

The first dialog takes place between a man clearly winning a physical fight and a man clearly losing a fight.

Ženja: Prosi u nee proščenija!
Ippolit: Počemu vy govorite mne „ty“?
Ženja: Potomu što ty pobeždennyj!
Ženja: Ask [T] her forgiveness!
Ippolit: Why are you [V] saying [V] “ty” to me?
Ženja: Because you [T] are vanquished!

Ženja feels he is entitled to use T with Ippolit because he is winning the physical fight he is having with him (BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE IS DOWN, and at
this point Ippolit is certainly SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE, hence T). In this scene from *Ironija sud’by*, Ženja is also physically on top of Ippolit as he addresses him with T. Ippolit, however, maintains V address to Ženja, likely not as an acknowledgement of Ženja’s dominance over him, but because he is construing the relationship as one with a new acquaintance (OUT and FAR). The motivation for asymmetry, however, lies purely in the power dynamic, even if Ippolit does not accept it.

Another example of physical power motivating asymmetrical address involves address between a hostage and a terrorist, which was a scene depicted in the script-writing project (clip 25). Although this is a highly unusual situation, the majority of volunteers construed this relationship as one in which the terrorist receives V but addresses his hostage with T:

*Založnik: Ja ne znaju, ja ne znaju. Vy možete menja ubiti.*
*Terrorist: Vreš! Ja znaju, čto ty znaeš.*
*Založnik: Govorju, čto ne znaju- značit ne znaju. Ubivajte!*
*Terrorist: Xorošo. Togda govori kogo pervogo iz nix dvoix mne ubivat?*

hostage: I don’t know, I don’t know. **You can** [V] kill me.
terrorist: **You’re lying** [T]! I know that **you** [T] **know** [T]!

hostage: I’m telling you I don’t know! That means I don’t know. **Kill** [V] me!
terrorist: Ok. Then **tell** [T] me which of those two I should kill first.

It is also worth noting that in the film clip on which this script is based, the terrorist is physically above the hostage and is threatening him with a pistol. The terrorist addresses the hostage with T because the hostage is SUBJECT TO FORCE, UNIMPORTANT, and NON-THREATENING (DOWN and SMALL); the terrorist receives V from the hostage because he HAS CONTROL and is IMPORTANT to him, as the terrorist holds the life of hostage in his hands. That is, the aggressor is UP with respect to the victim (who is DOWN).
In the next two dialogs, asymmetrical address is an expression of the power of one speaker over the other not solely because of the physical power of the speaker receiving V, but because of the social roles, or positions, that the speakers occupy. According to the majority of participants in the script-writing project detailed in Chapter 4, another place where asymmetrical address is common is prison (clip 24). A prison guard will receive V (because he HAS CONTROL over the prisoner, demands RESPECT, can be THREATENING to the prisoner, and so on) whereas a prisoner will receive T. Prisoners are, after all, SUBJECT TO CONTROL by the guard and are often shown DISRESPECT. Through T address guards can reinforce the notion that prisoners are UNIMPORTANT and that they are NOT THREATENED by them. In short, in the prison system, guards are UP and BIG and prisoners are DOWN and SMALL:

Oxrannik: Ty upadeš' tol'ko ne zdes', a v karcere.
Zaključennyj: Ne nado v karcere! Prošu vas.
Oxrannik: Ax, ne nado. Togda rabotaj.

Guard: You'll [T] fall [T], only not here but into lockup.
Prisoner: Not the lockup! I'm begging you [V].
Guard: Ah, no cell. Then work [T].

In addition, the prison clip features a THREAT of physical violence by the guard. The two are positioned in such a way that suggests the guard might throw the prisoner off the roof of a building at any second. Thus, the guard has the linguistic as well as the physical upper hand in the situation depicted in the film.

The next example is less extreme than the one above, as the conversation is between a teacher and his student and was written to correspond with clip 5 on the research instrument. However, status is the key to understanding asymmetrical address in the classroom:
Teacher: So here are your [Vpl] tests. Maša! But you [T] didn’t take the test. Why?
Student: You [V] know [V], I got really sick, and I wasn’t able to come to school.
Teacher: Well then- next time don’t get sick [T].

A teacher in the classroom has MORE power, has CONTROL OVER, demands
RESPECT from his or her students; that is, on the social power scale, a teacher is UP
relative to any student. Students, on the other hand, have LESS or NO POWER, are
SUBJECT TO CONTROL by the teacher, and are required to SHOW RESPECT toward
him or her. They are DOWN relative to a teacher. Thus, the classroom is a logical (and
very common) place to find asymmetrical address.

The conversation below demonstrates not (only) physical force but the force of
the will; an elderly woman is addressing a male friend of her adult son and refusing to let
him enter her apartment:

Mat': Tiše, čego ty kričiš'...čego ty xuliganis'?...
Drug syna: Marina Dmitrievna, pomnite, čto s detstva nas učili govorit' tol'ko pravdu?
Mother: Quiet, why are you [T] shouting [T] ....why are you [T] behaving like a
hooligan [T]?
Son’s friend: Marina Dmitrievna, do you remember [V] that ever since childhood we
were taught to only tell the truth?

The fact that she uses T with the young man and he addresses her with V is likely
motivated by her age (OLD is MORE YEARS, and MORE IS UP; YOUNG is FEWER
YEARS and LESS IS DOWN) and the fact that she is the mother of his friend and, as a
child, he had to respect her rules (RESPECT IS UP, HAVING CONTROL IS UP,
BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL IS DOWN). In addition, in this scene from Ironija
sud’by, this woman has all the power: she is behind a door locked with a chain,
preventing the man from entering the apartment. She alone controls his access to her
living space and her son, who is inside.

In the next example we move away from physical force. When a policeman stops
a driver he suspects has been drinking, he addresses her with V. However, she is
indignant and, claiming to be Princess Diana’s cousin, addresses the officer with T:

milicioner: Vaši dokumenty, požalujša. I, kažeš, čto nemnogo p’jany...
p’janaja: Kto? Ėto ja p’janaja! Da kak ty razgovarívayš, s dvojurodnoj sestroj
princessy Diany?
Policeman: Your [V] documents, please. And it seems you’re a little drunk [V]...
Drunk woman: Who? It’s me who’s drunk! How dare you speak [T] to princess Diana’s
cousin like that!

The woman clearly views herself as worthy of RESPECT and having HIGH STATUS
(which are both UP) because of her claim to be royalty; she sees herself as IMPORTANT
(which is BIG) and the officer as UNIMPORTANT (SMALL), NOT WORTHY OF
RESPECT and having LOW STATUS relative to her (both of which are DOWN). She
expresses her position in society by diminishing the policeman’s.

Another example of the force of the will appears when woman trying to get rid of
a man asking for money addresses him with T to emphasize that he is SUBJECT TO
HER CONTROL (i.e., DOWN). She refuses to give him any money and wants him to
leave:

Mužčina: Izvinite, ėto opjet ja. Ja znaju, čto ne vernul dolg. No odolžite mne ešče tri
rubļja. S polučki ja vse vernu.
Ženčina: Ved ja že tebe govorila, čtoby ty bol še zdes’ ne pojavil’sja.
Man: Excuse me [V], it’s me again. I know that I haven’t repaid you. But lend [V] me
three more rubles. I’ll repay everything when I get paid.
Woman: After all, I’ve told you [T] and told you [T] not to come here anymore.
The man, of course, uses V, perhaps because they do not know each other well (are OUT and FAR) or because he wants to flatter her (reinforce that she is UP and BIG relative to himself) in hopes that he will persuade her to get the money.

This dialog supports clip 21; the clip clearly depicts an argument and then physical aggression on the part of the man toward the woman. It is important to note that the woman does not have the physical power to keep the man out of her house; her best attempt at keeping him in his place is through T address.

We see, then, that the asymmetrical address most commonly appears in order for one speaker to assert his / her authority over another, or to threaten his / her interlocutor. Within this broad meaning, though, we can further discern three types of threats and assertions of power: one derived from real physical power (man winning a fight, terrorist, prison guard), one derived from social power because of status or role (prison guard, teacher), and one derived from an attempt to assert power that one wants to have (but may not really have; for example, the mother keeping the man out of her apartment, the woman talking to the policeman, and the woman fighting with the man asking for money). In each of these circumstances, however, speakers' conceptualization of the power relationship, whatever it may be, is understood in terms of things UP / DOWN and BIG / SMALL, and this fact is reflected in the way speakers use forms of address.

We now turn to two examples of asymmetry in the form of persuasion or an entreaty to one's interlocutor. Persuasion is power plus affection, or intimacy with an ulterior motive.
5.3.1.2 Persuasion / entreaty in Russian

Our first example in the persuasion / entreaty category, which is a compromise between full power and full intimacy, is taken from Russian (Kalina krasnaja). Egor, being new in town and having no friends, tries to befriend people he meets via business transactions by immediately assuming an intimacy that does not exist. In this situation, Egor makes a (rather rude) pass at the bank teller by combining social power and intimacy:

Kassirša: A vam čto?
Egor: Lapuleń'ka, a čto esli my voz'mem i obraduemsja na paru, a? Čego smotriš'?
Groši est'.
Kassirša: Graždanin! Vy tut ne xamite! Vy den'gi perevodite? Vot i perevodite.
Teller: And what do you [V] need?
Egor: Darling, how about we take off and enjoy some intimate pleasure? Why are you looking [T] like that? I have money.
Teller: Citizen! You [V] are not to be rude [V] here! Are you [V] wiring [V] money?
Then wire [V] it.

The teller properly maintain’s Egor’s size (BIG) and orientation (UP), which the situation (an IMPERSONAL business transaction) dictates, by addressing him with V; he, however, DIMINISHES her and attempts to FORCE her to be CLOSE to him by addressing her with T. He begins the conversation by assuming a familiarity (CLOSENESS) that does not exist, and her anger results from her resolve that the appropriate address (V) must be maintained.

His use of T to the woman is accompanied by a physical decrease in the distance between him and the bank teller he is addressing. Egor leans toward teller when he is talking; when she rebukes him, he backs away, re-establishing the distance between them.
Another example of this use of T as a "softer" expression of power (power + affection or intimacy, or affection with a motive) is found in Utinaja Oxota. Kušak is Zilov's superior at work, but the two are having a conversation at a party at Zilov's house. In this social situation, and when the conversation turns to the boss's possible rendez-vous with a female friend of Zilov's, the boss begins addressing Zilov as T, while Zilov continues addressing the boss as V.

Zilov: Ee net, no skoro pojavit'sja, bud'te uvereny. Vy ee zaintrigovali.
Kušak: Ty dumaeš'?
Zilov: She's not here yet, but she'll be here soon, you can be[V] sure[V]. You[V] made an impression[V] on her.
Kušak: Do you[T] think[T] so?

There could be several motivations for the asymmetrical address here, including the fact that the boss wants to be friends with a (girl)friend of Zilov's and therefore makes himself CLOSER to Zilov by means of T. However, Kušak is still Zilov's boss (UP), so Zilov may not feel is not his place to initiate or reciprocate use of T, even in a social situation such as this one.

We have seen two examples of a less common type of asymmetrical address: that which does contain a power dynamic (UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL) but whose force is mitigated by affection and intimacy (NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT). These situations occur when one speaker has a motive, such as a customer or boss wanting a date. Of course, if one's interlocutor does not accept the nod toward intimacy (T address), one does risk offense.

5.3.1.1.3 Flirtation / affection in Russian

The one example that is motivated purely by the concepts NEAR / FAR and IN / OUT appears in Ironija sud'by. In this exchange, Nadja is pretending, unbeknownst to
her new acquaintance Ženja and in front of her friends, that he is her boyfriend Ippolit. She addresses Ženja with T (INTIMATE IS NEAR, FAMILIAR IS NEAR), while he continues to address her as V (NON-INTIMACY IS FAR, UNFAMILIAR IS FAR; after all, they have, in fact, just become acquainted).

Ženja: My, možem skazať, počti neznakomy. Pervyj raz ja uvidel Nadeždu...kak vaše otčestvo?
Nadja: Ippolit, ne durač’sja!...Ippolit, perestan’y!...Priglasi gosiej k stolu.
Ženja: We, we can say, are practically strangers. The first time I saw Nadežda... what’s your [V] patronymic?
Nadja: Ippolit, don’t be silly [T]!...Ippolit, stop [T]!...Invite [T] our guests to the table.

Nadja addresses Ženja in this way simply to fool her friends into believing she is more intimate with this man than she really is; they know she has a boyfriend named Ippolit, and they have come to meet him. Rather than explaining why this stranger (and not the real Ippolit) is in her apartment, she chooses to simply assign Ženja the role, complete with the NEAR and IN form T that would normally accompany such a relationship.

In Russian, then, we find examples of all three meanings of asymmetrical address. The one example of the affection type is somewhat atypical, as we shall see when we compare it to examples in Polish and Czech, because it involves deception. The most common use of asymmetrical address in Russian is to assert one’s authority over or to threaten one’s interlocutor; that is, asymmetrical address is used most often to emphasize a power differential between one speaker and another and is understood in terms of UP and BIG (for the powerful) and DOWN and SMALL (for the less powerful).

We turn now to an examination of asymmetrical address in Polish.

5.3.1.2 Polish asymmetrical address

As in Russian, asymmetrical address in Polish is mainly motivated by the power dynamic (UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL). Polish has the most instances of asymmetrical
address of the three languages; thus, our data suggest that Polish has a more established system of non-reciprocal address and that asymmetry is more common than in Russian and Czech (which we examine below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.6: Polish asymmetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display of authority / threat (power): UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guard and prisoner (physical, status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boss and subordinate (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policeman and apprentice (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher and student (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policeman and man (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father and son (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father (and mother), son (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncle and nephew (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandmother and grandson (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman and chauffeur (race?, status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female stranger and male stranger (will)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1.2.1 Assertion of authority / threat in Polish

The first example of the most common meaning of asymmetry in Polish is a conversation between a prisoner and a prison guard (based on clip 24). It is also the only example in which the speaker receiving P derives his power, at least partially, from physical force:

więzień: Wiem o pana problemach finansowych.
strażnik: Stul gęże albo cię zabiję.
prisoner: I know about your [P] financial problems.
guard: Slow down [T] or I'll kill you [T].
The dynamic in this dialog is similar to that in Russian detailed above; the guard is UP relative to the prisoner, who is UNIMPORTANT, SUBJECT TO CONTROL, NOT WORTHY OF RESPECT in the eyes of the guard, and so on -- all factors conceptualized in terms of DOWN and SMALL (T). The THREAT of physical violence also looms in this scene, as the guard is about to throw the prisoner off the roof of a building.

With the exception of the conversation between two strangers (see below), the remaining dialogs involve power derived from the status of one speaker relative to the other. Let us examine a conversation between a boss (Walenda) and subordinate (Stopczyk) which is quite complicated. We find asymmetrical address plus a shift; we categorize this conversation as asymmetrical, though, because the shift does not result in symmetry but in an even greater disparity in power as indicated through address.

\textit{Walenda: Stopczyk, co wy tam policie?}
\textit{Stopczyk: Ja? Radomskie... ale jak pan major woli, to Franz ma Camele.}
\textit{Walenda: Co ty pierdolisz za uszami Stopczyk... na wysypisku, co policie po nocach?}
\textit{Stopczyk: A... ja panu powiem panie majorze, to była tajemnica...}
\textit{Walenda: Stopczyk, wy wyjej wała nie podskoczyć... Panowie mówią, że akta policie... Co wy na to, Stopczyk?}
\textit{Stopczyk: Nie wierzę.}
\textit{Walenda: Ja też nie... co odpowiednie na ten zarzut?!}
\textit{Walenda: Stopczyk, what are you [V? / Vpl?] burning [V? / Vpl?] there?}
\textit{Stopczyk: Me? Radomskies...but, if you [P] like [P], Franz has Camels.}
\textit{Walenda: Why are you [T] messing around [T] Stopczyk...in the dump, what are you burning [V? / Vpl?] at night?}
\textit{Stopczyk: Oh...I’ll tell you [P], sir, it was a secret...}
\textit{Walenda: Stopczyk, you [V] won’t jump [V] over a higher wall... The men are saying that you’re burning [V? / Vpl?] files... What do you say [V] about it, Stopczyk?}
\textit{Stopczyk: I don’t believe it.}
\textit{Walenda: I don’t either... how do you answer [V] to this charge?!}

The conversation takes place at an informal hearing in which Stopczyk’s boss is inquiring about the suspected secret burning of police files. The first asymmetry is P-V address; Walenda gives V but receives P. We concede that V in this context could
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possibly be construed as Vpl (that is, address to Stopczyk referring literally to him and the group he works with); however, Walenda asks Stopczyk (and only Stopczyk), Co wy na to, Stopczyk? ‘What do you say [V] about it, Stopczyk?’ It is clear that the boss is using the V of communist Polish, as the events in this film take place immediately after the fall of communism in that country. P is the politest form of address, in this case expressing DISTANCE UP and size (BIG), as the addressee has HIGH STATUS in the organization and HAS CONTROL over Stopczyk to some extent. V is BIG and CLOSE (i.e., not as DISTANT as P).

Walenda further talks DOWN to Stopczyk by shifting from V to T: Co ty pierdolisz za uszami Stopczyk... ‘Why are you [T] messing around [T] Stopczyk...’ Walenda’s impatience is evident when he makes it clear via T address that he HAS CONTROL in this situation; T address is a THREAT to Stopczyk that he had better take the questioning seriously.

There are two other instances of asymmetrical boss / subordinate address, both with the boss giving T but receiving P. The V address used in the example above is, again, a product of communist address norms and is generally no longer used in modern Polish.

*Szef: Byłeś ostatnią osobą którą bym podejrzewał.*
*Podwładny: Ja wszystko wylumaczę, to nie tak jak pan myśli.*
Boss: You were [T] the last person whom I would have suspected.
Subordinate: I’ll explain everything, it’s not like you [P] think [P].

Student: Franz? Panie poruczniku?! Kawę panu przyniosłem... panie poruczniku?! Kawa stygnie... mnie pan porucznik przestraszył.
Franz: Co się tak drzesz?
Franz: Why are you shouting [T] like that?
The first example was part of the script-writing project (clip 14) completed by Russians, Poles, and Czechs. Due to my mistakenly labeling the female boss as male, as well as her very masculine appearance, the author of this script has interpreted both interlocutors as male. The superior in this clip is clearly unhappy with the subordinate and is berating him for some reason.

In the second example, the apprentice (“student”), perhaps in an attempt to ingratiate himself to his superior, brings him a cup of coffee. In both of these situations HIGH STATUS IS UP, RESPECT IS UP, IMPORTANT IS BIG; thus, the superiors receive P. T address to the subordinates reflects the fact that they are of LOWER STATUS and are LESS IMPORTANT (DOWN and SMALL). In the first, T address also reinforces the fact that the subordinate IS SUBJECT TO CONTROL by his boss, who is unhappy with his work.

Similarly, a teacher has CONTROL OVER, HIGHER STATUS THAN, his students (clip 5):

Uczennica: Panie profesorze! Proszę sobie przypomnieć, że nic pan nie zapowiadał, a już na pewno ja przysięgam, nic takiego sobie nie przypominam.
Nauczyciel: Nie dyskutuj. Molly, rozdaję kartki.
Student: Sir! Please remember, you [P] didn’t tell [P] us anything about it, I swear for sure, I don’t recall anything like that.
Teacher: No discussion (lit. do not discuss [T]), Molly, I’m giving out the papers.

The power semantic, then, motivates P-T address in the classroom. It also motivates asymmetrical address between a police officer and a young man he suspects has done something wrong (clip 12):

policjant: I co idioce, złapalem was. 
pongeźna: Tak, ma pan nas.
policjant: I dlaczego się śmiejesz?
pongoose: A bo tu bardzo fajnie.
policjant: Za chwilę nie będzie ci do śmiechu.
mężczyzna: Tak? A dlaczego?
policjant: Zaczekaj chwile a przekonasz się.
Policeman: So idiots, I caught you [Vpl].
Policeman: And why are you laughing [T]?
Man: Because it’s really cool here.
Policeman: In a minute you [T] won’t be laughing.
Man: Yeah? And why is that?
Policeman: Wait [T] a minute and you’ll see [T].

The policeman first addresses the young man and his friend together with Vpl: złapalem was ‘I caught you [Vpl]’. The policeman receives P (he is UP and BIG) but addresses the man with T (who is DOWN and SMALL); note especially the THREAT the policeman makes in the last half of the conversation. T address reinforces that the policeman is THREATENING to the man, but that the reverse is not true.

Unlike in modern Russian and Czech, in modern Polish formal / polite address can be found within the immediate family as well as to more distant relatives. While P address to one’s father and mother is a rather old-fashioned convention⁴, it was still viable well into the twentieth century. Each of the examples below demonstrates P address from a YOUNG member of the family to an OLDER one (father, uncle, and grandmother). The first two dialogs are from Karoteka, the third is from Tango:

Bohater: A tatuś dubal w nosie, podejrzałem tatusia...
Ojciec: Wyroku! Co z ciebie wyrośnie? Bóg świadkiem...
Hero: But you [P] were picking [P] your nose, I spied on you [P]...
Father: Viper! What will you [T] grow up in to? As God as my witness...

Wujek: Byłem z pielgrzymką w klasztorze...Zajrzałem po drodze do ciebie: „wstąpił do piekiel, po drodze mu było.” A co u ciebie, Stasia?
Bohater: Nic, nic, wujku. Kopę lat. Nie widzieliśmy się dwadzieścia pięć lat, wujku!.
Uncle: I was on a pilgrimage to a monastery... I stopped by to see you [T] on the way: ‘He descended into Hell, because it was on his way.’ And how are things with you [T], Stasia?

⁴ Gerald Stone notes, “It has been suggested to me by some informants that the non-reciprocal usage reflects a general conservatism on the part of the families that use it” (Stone 1981a: 62).
Hero: So-so, uncle. So many years. We haven’t seen each other for twenty-five years, uncle! I’m sure your feet ache. Must be a hundred kilometers. Do sit down.

Osoba na razie zwana babcią: Czego ty chcesz ode mnie?!
Młody człowiek: Babcia dobrze wie, co mam na myśli!
Person temporarily known as grandma: What do you want from me?!
Young man: You know very well what I want.

P address from the young man in each of these cases is motivated by the HIGH STATUS each of his interlocutors holds in the family structure. They are each older (have MORE YEARS) than he; each has HIGHER STATUS in the family by virtue of their experience. When the hero was younger, he was always SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE by them. Even though children grow up, family roles do not change.

Of course, P address in this case is not with pan/pani but is instead with names of family roles: tatuś ‘daddy’, wujek ‘uncle’, babcia ‘grandmother’. We also note that the use of T to address a son, nephew, and grandson, respectively, reflects not so much his LOWER STATUS or AGE (FEWER YEARS), but the norm that family members address each other with T (INTIMACY IS CLOSENESS, SIMILARITY IS CLOSE and IN, FAMILIAR IS IN, MEMBERSHIP IS IN). Family address is now most commonly gauged on the scale of intimacy (NEAR/FAR, IN/OUT); the hero in this play chooses an older norm of address in which power -- social status in the family (UP/DOWN, BIG/SMALL) -- was the motivation for address to one’s elders.

Let us now examine one instance of asymmetrical address unique to the Polish respondents in the script-writing project: we find asymmetrical address between a woman and her chauffeur, based on clip 22. Three respondents wrote dialogs similar to the one below:
kobieta: James, nie mogę wysieść tutaj, do cholery, ci dziwni ludzie mnie zobaczą. A jeśli on mnie zobaczy?
szafer: Jak sobie pani życzy, madamie. Sugerowaćbym jednak, aby przestała się pani ukrywać...
kobieta: Oh, James, ma pro masz rację! Czas z tym skończyć. Wysiadam!
Woman: James, I can’t get out here, dammit, these strange people will see me. And what if he sees me?
Chauffeur: As you [P] wish, madam. I would suggest, however, that you [P] stop hiding...
Woman: Oh, James, maybe you’re [T] right! It’s time to end this. I’m getting out!

A fourth respondent had the woman address the driver as pan, but with a T predicate, which is less polite than complete P address:

kobieta: Dziękuję, pan pomóż mi wysieść?
Woman: Thank you, will you [P] help [T] me get out?

This asymmetrical address might very well be motivated purely by the respondents’ interpretation in which the woman is construed as rich (MORE MONEY) and therefore powerful, and the driver as her employee. We could then understand this in terms similar to the boss / subordinate situations described above.

However, as we noted in Chapter 4, there is another factor in this particular clip that we must consider: race. The woman is white, and her driver is black. There is evidence to suggest that Poles treat persons of color in a linguistically different way than they do Caucasians. In her article on virility, Janda (1999: 209) points out that in Polish certain endings are used “to distinguish humans like the SELF [in this context, Polish men] from humans not like the SELF, and to make finer distinctions within the category of humans not like the SELF, pragmatically promoting some to higher (honorific) status and demoting others to the status of non-viriles”. Nouns naming members of racial and ethnic groups, those in some way DISTANCED from the SELF (“male Pole”) -- for example, Murzyn ‘Negro’, Żyd ‘Jew’, and cygan ‘gypsy’-- are among the ones commonly
"demoted" to non-virile status (Janda 1999: 210). Others receiving the non-virile ending include "males who are small, young, or marginalized" (Janda 1999: 210).

There are two other clips (13 and 11) that show a black and white person interacting: one depicts an exchange between a white private and a black sergeant; the other, a conversation between a black female and white male, obviously strangers. In 13, the sergeant is clearly in charge and has the power (is BIG, UP) in the given situation. No Polish respondents created a dialog in which asymmetrical address occurs for this clip, although one did write a scenario in which the sergeant switches from V to T (switches are discussed below). In 11, there are no social power roles apparent, but one volunteer did write asymmetrical address that indicates the (black) woman has the power in the situation.

Thus, we cannot be sure that asymmetrical address between the woman and the driver is motivated by Poles' understanding of the situation as superior / subordinate, white / black, or Poles' translation of what they believe are American attitudes toward people with dark skin. Of course, further research would be needed to investigate whether variance in honorific address follows the same pattern as virility, but we suggest it as a possibility.

Finally, in a scene between two strangers at a bus stop (based on clip 11), it is not fixed roles with their HIGH or LOW STATUSES that motivate asymmetrical address, but rather the emphatic desire of one speaker to impose her will on the other:

_Nieznajomy: Ma pani takie czyściutkie buciki
Nieznajoma: Proszę mi dać spokój._
Male stranger: **You [P] have [P]** such clean little shoes!
Female stranger: Please **leave [T]** me alone.
The use of T here is motivated by the speaker's will to make the man SUBJECT TO CONTROL; that is, she wants him to leave her alone, and her use of T suggests that she is very serious about it.

Another explanation can be found for the use of T in this situation. However, we do not elaborate here; please see section 6.2.8 in the next chapter.

The majority of Polish examples in the authority/threat category involve asymmetrical address that reflects the status of the interlocutor receiving P. Only one example involves physical force; however, the guard-prisoner relationship is also one with rigidly fixed roles. Further, only one speaker uses asymmetrical address to impose her will without physical force or status to back her up.

5.3.1.2.2 Persuasion/entreaty in Polish

We find one example of the persuasion/entreaty type of asymmetrical address.

In it, Hanka, a young girl working in a restaurant, is trying to ask her boss if she can leave work:

_Hanka:_ Dyrektorze, _ja bardzo pana proszę_...
_Dyrektor:_ No?
_Hanka:_ Ja _muszę wyjść._
_Dyrektor:_ A _co, że się czujesz?... Ale córeczko! Za godzinę..._  
_Hanka:_ Director, I beg _you [P]..._  
_Director:_ Well?...  
_Hanka:_ I have to leave.  
_Director:_ Why, _do you feel [T] bad?...But little daughter! Wait an hour..._

The director receives P from Hanka; after all, he does have authority over her. However, his use of T to Hanka is partially motivated by her status (which is relatively LOW) but also by his clear affection for her: he addresses her with the diminutive form of...

---

As we indicated in Chapter 4, the woman might also be using T here to treat her interlocutor as a child. If the respondent recognized this clip from _Forrest Gump_, he or she might have construed the situation in such a way that reflects language to a mentally disabled person or a person considered childlike.
‘daughter’ córeczka as he is trying to convince her to finish her shift and stay another hour. His T to her, then, is also NEAR (INTIMACY) and IN (FAMILIAR).

5.3.1.2.3 Flirtation / affection in Polish

Lastly, we have two examples of asymmetrical address motivated by IN / OUT and NEAR / FAR. Edek, the servant of the family in Tango, addresses his employer (Artur) as P, but when Artur decides he likes him, he addresses Edek as T, an expression of affection:

Edek: Pan się o coś pytał, panie Artku?
Artur: Edek, ja cię lubię. Zawsze cię lubilem.
Edek: Did you [P] ask [P] me something, Mr. Artur?
Artur: Edek, I like you [T]. I’ve always liked you [T].

We should note that Artur rarely addresses Edek prior to the end of the play, but the rest of the family generally addresses the servant with P, despite their differences in social rank (for example, the grandmother tells Edek: Panie Edku, niech mu pan podpowie ‘Mr. Edek, prompt [P] him’).

Finally, in what would normally be an IMPERSONAL (UP, BIG, OUT, FAR) mutual P situation, we find a male customer making a pass at a waitress (clip 10):

Klient w restauracji: Mogę prosić rachunek. Załóżę pieniądze, które muszę za to zapłacić.
Kelner: Proszę, proszę...mógli pan wybrać inną restaurację?
Klient w restauracji: Podobasz mi się! Przyszedłem tu dla ciebie! Co robisz po pracy?
Kelner: Placi pan kartą czy gotówką?
Customer: Can I have the check? I regret the money I have to pay for this.
Waitress: Please, please... could [P] you [P] have chosen another restaurant?
Customer: I like you [T]! I came here for you [T]! What are you doing [T] after work?
Waitress: Are you [P] paying [P] with a credit card or cash?

The waitress maintains P address, but the customer switches completely to the intimacy scale by addressing her as if she is CLOSE and they are on INTIMATE terms. He even overtly states his feelings for her and reinforces them by using T forms: Podobasz mi się!
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Przyszliem tu dla ciebie! 'I like you [T]! I came here for you [T]!' The waitress does not seem to take offense; she simply ignores his pass and maintains her DISTANCE and the norms of this FORMAL, IMPERSONAL (UP, BIG and FAR OUT) transaction.

In Polish, then, as in Russian, the majority of conversations involving asymmetrical address are motivated by the physical power, social power, or will (desire for power) of one speaker over another. Persuasion / entreaty and flirtation / affection are also possible meanings of asymmetry, although they are less common.

We now turn to an examination of Czech asymmetry.

5.3.1.3 Czech asymmetrical address

We find the smallest total number of asymmetrical situations in Czech, despite having the longest film in our analysis (Konec velkých prázdnin, 6 hours) and second highest number of participants in our script-writing project (10). Our data suggests, then, that Czech speakers are the least likely to employ asymmetrical address. Let us examine the four instances asymmetrical address that appear in the Czech data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.7: Czech asymmetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Display of authority / threat (power):</strong> UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persuasion / entreaty (power and intimacy):</strong> UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL and NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flirtation / affection (intimacy):</strong> NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrorist and hostage (physical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guard and prisoner (physical, status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher and student (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leader and member of excursion (status)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.3.1.3.1 Display of authority / threat in Czech

The first asymmetrical exchange reflects power derived mainly from physical strength and takes place between a terrorist and a hostage (here, noted ‘man with pistol’ and ‘man’).

*muž: Všechno vám dám. Dejte pryč tu pistoli.*
*muž s pistoli: Jo. Naval mi všechno, nebo zabiju tebe i tvoué rodinu.*
*man with pistol: Yeah. Pony up [T] everything for me, or I’ll kill you [T] and your [T] family.*

This dialog is based on clip 25 from the script-writing project; three Czechs wrote dialogs with asymmetrical address. Only one is presented here as an example, for all three are essentially the same. As mentioned in the discussion on Russian asymmetry, the terrorist is pictured physically above the hostage, whom he is holding down with a gun to his head. The Russian and Czech motivations are essentially the same: the terrorist addresses the hostage with T because he is SUBJECT TO FORCE, UNIMPORTANT, and NON-THREATENING (DOWN and SMALL); the man with the gun receives V from the hostage because he HAS CONTROL over him and is IMPORTANT to him at that moment. Use of T by the victim would be a very dangerous move, a linguistic attack on a person who clearly has all the power in this situation. Thus, the hostage must treat his captor with RESPECT and tread very carefully in the way in which he addresses him. Unquestionably, the aggressor is UP with respect to the victim, who is DOWN.

We move on to situations involving social power. The first involves both physical aggression and rigidly defined social roles. Three Czech participants in our research project suggested a prison guard can address a prisoner as T while receiving V from him:

*strážce: Těm nikdo neuvěří. Ten mluv, kde jste prokopali tu díru.*
*vězeň: Jestli si myslíte, že to řeknu, tak se šerédně myšlete...*
strážce: *Mluv, nebo ti šodím.*
vězeň: *Když vám to řeknu, zabijou mě spolu vězní. A radši se nechám zabit od vás.*
strážce: *Máš poslední šanci.*
guard: Nobody’ll believe them. Now tell [T] me where you dug that hole.
prisoner: If you think [V] that I’m gonna tell you, then you’re sorely mistaken [V]...
guard: Talk [T], or I’ll drop you.
prisoner: If I tell you [V], the other prisoners will kill me. And I’d rather let myself be killed by you [V].
guard: You have [T] one last chance.

We find another situation in which status is important, but physical aggression is not. As we have seen in both Russian and Polish, a teacher (clip 5) can address a student with T while receiving V from her. However, only one Czech respondent suggests asymmetry of this type is appropriate:

*Studentka:* *No prosím, já jsem se nemohla pořádně připravit. Víte opravdu babička je nemocná a já jsem se o ní musela starat. Přišel to určitě bude lepší.*
*Učitel:* *No moc si nevyvyníšte.*
Student: Please, I wasn’t able to study well enough. You know [V] really my grandmother is sick and I had to look after her. Next time it’ll be better for sure.
Teacher: Don’t make things up [T] so much.

In the two examples above, the guard and teacher are UP with respect to the prisoner and student, respectively, who are DOWN. The guard and teacher HAVE CONTROL of the relationship and situation, they have HIGH STATUS in the institutions in which they work, and they are IMPORTANT in these institutions. Prisoners and students, by contrast, ARE SUBJECT TO CONTROL, have LOW STATUS and are LESS IMPORTANT or UNIMPORTANT in the hierarchy of prison and school structure. In addition, the prison clip features a THREAT of physical violence by the guard. The two are positioned in such a way that suggests the guard might throw the prisoner off the roof of a building at any second.

The next situation also reflects power derived not from brute force but from the role of the person giving T but receiving V: a group leader. This dialog, from *Konec*
velkých prázdnin, is an argument between an excursion leader and a female member of
the tour group. Bobina wants to put some lacy underthings she has just bought into her
suitcase, which is already under the bus. The group leader is refusing to grant her access:

Bobina: Ale helete, dyť budem na hranici vypadat jak banda pašeráků!
Vedoucí: Tam já to, souduřko, vysvětlím, tim si mužeš bejí jistá! Tak, souduřzi, sme
všici?
Bobina: No moment! Já teda vodmitám vystupovat v Budějicích na
autobusáku jako řákná kurva! Já si to chci strčet do kufru!
Vedoucí: Srč si to, kam chceš, kufř dostaneš doma. Já sem tu tvý vedoucí!
Bobina: Ale něj můj bachař!
Vedoucí: Cos to... cos to řekla?
Bobina: A netykejte mi, jo? Kdo myslíte, že ste...?
Vedoucí: To ti ešte ukázú... - to vám ešte ukázú doma!
Bobina: But look [V], after all we're gonna look like a gang of smugglers on the border!
Leader: I'll explain that there, comrade, of that you can [T] be sure. So, comrades, is
everyone here?
Bobina: Wait just a minute! Then I refuse to get out in Budějice at the bus station like
some kind of hooker. I want to stick this in my suitcase!
Leader: Stick [T] it where you want [T], you'll get [T] your suitcase when we get home.
I am your [T] leader!
Bobina: But not my jailer!
Leader: What... what did you [T] say?
Bobina: And don't say „ty“ [V] to me, OK? Who do you think [V] you are [V]?...
Leader: I'll show you [T]... I'll show you [V] at home!

Note that this conversation also contains a switch which ultimately leads to symmetrical
V-V address (switches will be dealt with below, in section 5.4); however, the dialog
began with the leader using T to and receiving V from Bobina. Therefore, we chose to
classify it as asymmetry.

The group leader is asserting his authority by using T to Bobina; he diminishes
her (BEING SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE IS DOWN, UNIMPORTANT IS
SMALL and NON-THREATENING IS SMALL) in order to reinforce the fact that he is
in charge (HAVING CONTROL IS UP, IMPORTANT IS BIG). He is also
THREATENING (BIG) toward her.
However, Bobina stands up for herself and challenges him on his use of T. She clearly does not accept his assertion of power, linguistically or otherwise. This fact is reinforced by the physical actions of the characters in this scene. When the conversation begins, Bobina is outside the bus, and the leader is standing on the bus looking down at her when he uses T. Then she is physically and aggressively forced into bus by the leader and driver. What she lacks in physical power, she makes up for in cunning and linguistic power. When she insists on mutual (V) address, the leader corrects himself, but Bobina simultaneously runs away from him out of the back exit of the bus, thus getting the better of him. She ends up running all the way to the police station and asking for asylum in Austria.

As in Russian and Polish, asymmetrical address in Czech is motivated mainly by power of various sorts. We find examples of physical power and status, but none involving the aggressive use of T as a threat to impose one’s will on another with nothing else—force or status—to back it up.

5.3.1.3.2 Flirtation / affection in Czech

Although we found no instances of asymmetrical address motivated by UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL and NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT (persuasion / entreaty), we do find one motivated mainly by NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT (flirtation / affection):

_Helena: To seš ty? Musíš se, čoveče, nějak zasadit o ten hyjot, fak! Vždyť je to hrozný, když musejí holky bůhvíkam pro svačinu! Myslíš se tady vůbec na lidi?
Gross: A vy jste -- prosím -- kdo?
Helena: Dělám tady předsedkyni, ale můžete mi říkat Helčo --
Helena: Is that [T] you [T]? Well, you must [T] do something about this snack bar, I mean it! It’s terrible that our girls have to traipse lord knows where for a snack! Does anybody think about people around here?
Gross: And who, may I ask, are [V] you [V]?
Helena: I’m the Chairman, but you can [T] call me Helča._
Helena, a character from Havel’s Vyrozumění, claims to be a “chairman” (of what, even she does not know). She addresses everyone, regardless of rank or position in the company, as T. She is very FAMILIAR and affectionate with everyone she encounters. She generally does not seem to have a motive for this affection, nor does she use T to assert her authority or threaten others in any way. Thus, her T address seems to be motivated by the concepts NEAR (she treats everyone as if she is CLOSE to them) and IN (they are, after all, MEMBERS OF the same company).

Czech has the fewest examples of asymmetrical address of all types. We suggest asymmetry is less common than in Polish and Russian.

5.3.2 Summary and conclusions: asymmetrical address

We have examined motivations for all the conversations involving asymmetrical address gathered from films, plays, and the research project described in Chapter 4. The charts below present a summary of each meaning of asymmetrical address. The percentages in parentheses represent the number of respondents who chose asymmetrical address, as opposed to mutual address or some sort of shift in address, during the script-writing project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>man winning fight and man losing fight</td>
<td>guard and prisoner (28.5%)</td>
<td>terrorist-hostage (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrorist and hostage (43%)</td>
<td>boss and subordinate (14%)</td>
<td>guard and prisoner (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guard and prisoner (86%)</td>
<td>policeman and apprentice</td>
<td>teacher and student (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher and student (25%)</td>
<td>teacher and student (21.25%)</td>
<td>teacher and member of excursion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother and friend of son</td>
<td>policeman and man (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman and policeman (14.3%)</td>
<td>father and son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman and man (12.5%)</td>
<td>uncle and nephew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grandmother and grandson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asymmetrical address as a display of authority or a threat is certainly the most common type in each of the three languages. If we exclude the film and play excerpts momentarily and notice what the respondents felt would be appropriate given various situations, we see that Polish has the most variety of situations involving non-reciprocal address of this type (6). Czech has the least (3). However, the highest percentage of participants agreeing on asymmetrical address appears in Russian, with 86% of respondents suggesting asymmetrical address is appropriate between a guard and prisoner. The next highest percentage also appears in Russian, with 43% writing dialogs involving asymmetrical address between a terrorist and hostage. A third of Czech respondents agreed on asymmetry in each of the above situations as well. The overall agreement of Polish respondents on asymmetrical address in a given situation is much lower, with the highest being 28.5% in agreement that asymmetry is appropriate in prison.

We note, too, that there are certain situations with which we expect respondents to be familiar: school and work, for instance. The participants in our research may not be as familiar with address in prison, or in a hostage situation, or even between a woman and her chauffeur. Even if asymmetry is not something speakers use in everyday life, it is clear that the respondents know (consciously or unconsciously) a great deal about the power dynamic in language and relationships, and that they know how to manipulate forms of address (via metaphoric size and space) to reflect changes in status, desire, and
so on. Obviously writers of screenplays use asymmetry as a technique to reinforce relationships between characters; as we have seen, writers (and possibly actors) also (perhaps unwittingly) manipulate physical space as they are manipulating metaphoric space via forms of address.

With regard to the less common meanings of asymmetry, we summarize them in the charts below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>customer and bank teller</td>
<td>boss and subordinate</td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boss and subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>woman and man</td>
<td>man and servant</td>
<td>female stranger and male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>customer and waitress (8%)</td>
<td>stranger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the majority of situations described in these charts are drawn from films or plays; only one (customer and waitress, in Polish) appears in the data obtained from native speakers. That only one participant used asymmetry does suggest that, although asymmetrical address can be used to attempt to persuade an interlocutor, or simply to show affection to him or her, these are not the most widely recognized meanings of this mode of address. The one Polish example from our project does suggest that this meaning is available to speakers; however, it is possible that the instances of asymmetrical address as persuasion or affection are more likely to be found in creative works, where language is needed to develop character and drive plot in a short amount of time. But there is no doubt that the primary meaning of asymmetry (display of authority / threat) is a viable form of address for native speakers of each of the languages.
5.4 Switches (retractability)

Another phenomenon related to asymmetrical address is switches in address forms. Switches are related to asymmetry in that once a switch in address form occurs, the situation has most often become asymmetrical; in addition, switches, like asymmetrical address, are most often motivated by the power dynamic. For instance, if two speakers are addressing each other with mutual V and one suddenly shifts to T, asymmetry, whether temporary or permanent, results. The less common situation is the one in which asymmetry (V-T, for example) is present initially, then one speaker switches to another form of address (T) and symmetry (T-T) results.

Jucker and Taavitsainen (2003: 14-15) discuss the issue of switches, which they label retractability (see also Mazzon 1995). Essentially, retractability is the possibility to shift from, for example, V to T within the same exchange. Switches, then, are usually temporary shifts that occur suddenly and without acknowledgement of permission to change form of address.

Jucker and Taavitsainen (2003: 14) note that, for instance, Modern German has a non-retractable system of address, meaning that shifts are usually permanent and generally “occur at very specific moments in the lives of those involved and are often accompanied by a ritual. Momentary switches in such systems are rare. They may occur if a speaker uses V for somebody from whom she usually uses T because of a very formal situation such as a formal business meeting or an interview in a public situation (radio or television)”. They concede, however, that what appears to be a non-retractable system to one analyst might be considered retractable by another.
Brown and Gilman (1960: 273) contend that temporary switches in pronominal address forms are often "expressions of transient attitudes". They further assert that switches often take the form of the V of admiration or the T of contempt (Brown and Gilman 1960: 274-276). We contend, however, that switches are motivated by the same concepts of power and intimacy semantics that motivate asymmetrical address.

We are also not concerned with the classification of Russian, Polish, or Czech as retractable or non-retractable. It is evident from the data examined in Chapters 3 and 4 that switches do occur in all three languages. What we examine in the data below is metaphorical motivations for switches, how social power and intimacy interact when a switch occurs, and what switches mean to the speakers who experience (or initiate) them.

We begin with a brief review of the switches that occur in the data gathered from films and plays; see Chapter 3 for a more detailed presentation. Each situation in the table below is labeled according to interlocutors, the direction the switch occurs, and language in which the example is found. The speaker who initiates the switch is italicized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business transaction/</td>
<td>man and messenger boy</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scripted situation</td>
<td>shock worker(s) and security</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>judge and witness</td>
<td>switch to V</td>
<td>Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interrogator and interrogated</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>worker and official</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interviewee and director and</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>crew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>director and editor</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meeting chairman and worker</td>
<td>switch to V</td>
<td>Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boss and subordinate</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>Cz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coworker and coworker</td>
<td>switch to T</td>
<td>Cz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
friends, acquaintances, strangers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>man and “girlfriend’s”</th>
<th>switch to T; before switch was asym address</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>father</td>
<td>man and “girlfriend’s”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother</td>
<td></td>
<td>switch to V</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother and servant</td>
<td></td>
<td>switch to P</td>
<td>Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardener to actor</td>
<td></td>
<td>switch to V</td>
<td>Cz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Chapter 4, we found that Russians, Poles, and Czechs felt switches were appropriate in certain situations. In the chart below, the character in the film clip who initiates the switch is italicized, and the direction of the switch is labeled under each language column:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>professor-professor</td>
<td>V&gt;T</td>
<td></td>
<td>V&gt;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>policeman-man</td>
<td></td>
<td>P&gt;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sergeant-private</td>
<td>V&gt;T</td>
<td>V&gt;T</td>
<td>V&gt;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>boss-subordinate</td>
<td>V&gt;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>prisoner-guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V&gt;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>hostage-terrorist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T&gt;V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 10 | 3 | 2 | 4 |

5.4.1 The meanings of switches in address

Switches in address are generally understood to affect only temporarily address with pronouns and their related forms. In this section we explore this very question: are switches, in fact, temporary? What are the meanings of shifts in address forms? Do switches, like asymmetrical address, most often involve some sort of power? How does speakers’ understanding of spatial relations contribute to or reflect shifts in forms of address?

First we explore the question: what do switches generally mean? Given that asymmetry and switches are related phenomena, it should not come as a great surprise
that we can classify switches in generally the same way as asymmetrical address: as a
display of authority or a threat, as an attempt to persuade, and as flirtation or a display of
affection. However, as we shall see, shifts in address appear to be somewhat more
complex than asymmetrical address.

The chart below details the switches that appear in the data described in Chapters
3 and 4. The situations are presented in no particular order; language is noted, and the
italicized member of the pair is the speaker who initiates the switch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display of authority / threat (power): UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL</th>
<th>Persuasion / entreaty (power and intimacy): UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL and NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT</th>
<th>Flirtation / affection, or lack of (intimacy): NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>man and messenger boy (R)</td>
<td>judge and witness (Pol)</td>
<td>worker and official (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shock worker (s) and security officer (Pol)</td>
<td>interviewee and director and crew (Pol)</td>
<td>man and “girlfriend’s” father (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrogator and interrogated (Cz)</td>
<td></td>
<td>mother and servant (Pol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>director and editor (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td>female coworker and male coworker (Cz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting chairman and worker (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man and “girlfriend’s” brother (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardener and actor (Cz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boss and subordinate (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sergeant and private (R, Pol, Cz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prisoner and guard (Cz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostage and terrorist (Cz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policeman and man (Pol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We exclude only two examples from our original data from analysis in this
section. One is from Russian, the other from Czech; both were dialogs written in support
of clip 6, which depicts a conversation between two male professors.

Professor 1: Petr! Možno vas zaderžat’ na minutku?
Professor 2: Da konečno! A čto u tebja za problema?
Professor 1: Da vot, nikak ne mogu opredeliti' vozrast etogo kresta.
Professor 2: Interesno! A otkuda u tebja on?
Professor 1: Mne ego cvapecnik dal na soxranenie.
Professor 2: Ja dumaju, cto ego sdelali v Vizantii v 10-m veke.
Professor 1: Da. Ty pozhaluj prav.
Professor 1: Peter! Can I keep you [V] for just a minute?
Professor 2: Of course! What's your [T] problem?
Professor 1: This is the thing, I can't for the life of me determine the age of this cross.
Professor 2: Interesting! Where did you [T] get it?
Professor 1: A priest gave it to me for safekeeping.
Professor 2: I think that it was made in Byzantium in the 10th century.
Professor 1: Yes, you're [T] probably right.

The use of first name Petr in this Russian example suggests T (V address generally requires first name and patronymic). Except for the initial use of V, both professors use T address. We can see no motivation for a switch and suspect inconsistency on the part of the author.

A similar situation arises in a corresponding Czech example:

Professor1: Tak kolego, co jste dnes zabavil?
Professor2: Pojde se podivat.
Professor1: Tenhle křiž?
Professor2: Jo, jedna studentka ho měla na krku. Představ si.
Professor1: So colleague, what did you [V] confiscate today?
Professor2: Come [V] take a look.
Professor1: This cross?
Professor2: Yeah, a student had it around her neck. Imagine [T].

The professors initially address each other with mutual V. Suddenly, professor2 uses a T form of the imperative: představ si 'imagine'. This switch seems to be unmotivated.

Unfortunately, no other forms of address appear in the rest of the exchange; since we, again, suspect inconsistency on the part of the author, we do not include this example in our analysis.

---

As we noted in Chapter 4, others have offered possible motivations for this address pattern: Lawrence Feinberg suggests that perhaps the temporary use of V is motivated by the nature of the imposition on Professor 2 by Professor 1. James Noblit further suggests that, once Professor 2 responds with T (thus “accepting” the imposition), Professor 1 might be considered rude if he did not reciprocate with T.
The remaining conversations, however, can indeed be categorized according to meaning and motivation. We suggest that switches have generally the same meanings as asymmetrical address, except that they are often motivated by more momentary circumstances such as heightened emotion. This is not always the case, however, as we shall see.

5.4.1.1 Switches in Russian

The first thing we notice is that there are fewer switches (6) among our Russian data than asymmetrical situations (10). However, consistent with our analysis of asymmetry, switches are primarily motivated by UP / DOWN and BIG / SMALL (power).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.14: Russian switches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Display of authority / threat (power): UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>man</em> and messenger boy (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>man</em> and “girlfriend’s” brother (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>boss</em> and subordinate (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sergeant</em> and private (status)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.1.1.1 Display of authority / threat in Russian

The first switch we examine appears in _Utinaja oxota_ and is motivated by LESS (FEWER YEARS) IS DOWN:

_Zilov: Vojdite! Mal'čik: Zdravstvujte. Skažite, vy Zilov?_ 
_Zilov: Come in [V]! Boy: Hello [V]. Say [V], are you [V] Zilov?
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Zilov: That’s me.
Boy: For you [V].
Zilov: For me? What for? Listen [T], kid. You [T] must have made [T] a mistake...

The dialog begins when Zilov, an adult, acknowledges a knock on his door and asks the unknown person to come in, using V. He switches to T when he sees that the person is a young delivery boy. Here the switch and resulting asymmetrical address seems to be motivated by the difference in ages of the two interlocutors; this factor, in this situation, overrides the fact that they are engaged in a business transaction (which normally requires mutual V). T address to children and teenagers is the norm in modern Russian; again, FEWER YEARS (LESS) IS DOWN. Thus, in this case, the switch would be a permanent move toward asymmetry, not a temporary one.

The next example, which is a conversation between Egor the ex-convict, newly released from prison, and his penpal-girlfriend’s brother, is somewhat unusual in that the switch is from T-T to T-V, with Egor occupying the diminished role relative to Petro.

The shift in address forms is only temporary:

Egor: Na-a!... Ja te čto, dorogu perešel, čto ty mne ruku ne soizvolil podat’?
Petro: Čego ty, rasselsja-to?
Egor: Mojsja, mojsja. Ja potom. Ja že iz zaklučenija... My posle vas. Ne bespokojtes’...
Petro: Ty pojdeš’ ili net?
Egor: U menja spravka ob osvoboždenii!...Ja zavtra pojdou i poluču takoj že pasport, kak u tebja!
Egor: Hee-re! I’m what to you [T], I crossed the road, that you [T] don’t even deign to offer me your hand?
Petro: What’s with you [T], you’ve taken your seat?
Egor: Wash [T], wash [T]. I’ll go later. After all I’m just out of prison... We go after you [V]. Don’t worry [V]...
Petro: Are you [T] coming [T] or not?
Egor: I have my release papers!... Tomorrow I’m going to get the same passport you [T] have!

As we noted in Chapter 3, Egor feels that the brother is treating him with disrespect, not linguistically, but by a refusal to shake his hand. As a result, and in an indignant tone,
Egor pluralizes himself and the brother: "We [prisoners] come after you [someone worthy of RESPECT, members of this family, or possibly non-prisoners]". Although we cannot be entirely sure if the address is with V or Vpl, we do suggest that the imperative form he uses to address the brother, Ne bespokojtes'... 'Don't worry [V]' can certainly be seen as a sarcastic "elevation" of the brother to singular V status (UP, BIG). When he switches to V he suggests what he thinks Petro believes or might want to hear: that he has HIGHER STATUS than Egor, that he is IMPORTANT and WORTHY OF RESPECT and that, by contrast, Egor is only T-worthy (NOT WORTHY OF RESPECT, UNIMPORTANT, LOW STATUS) because he has been in prison.

Petro rectifies the situation, however, when he invites Egor to join him in the main room of the banja (bathhouse) and the two men return to mutual T. The physical actions of these characters parallel their linguistic ones; the brother is in the bath alone, separate from Egor, when Egor uses V address. Egor switches back to T after Petro invites him to join him and he enters the sauna.

Another interesting question, though, is why two men who are newly acquainted use mutual T and not mutual V to address each other from the beginning? We suspect the norms of address are different the further speakers get from urban areas; since the action of this movie (and therefore this scene) takes place in a small remote northern village in Russia, it is possible that the FORMALITIES of standard Russian do not always appear in the language of speakers from this region. Unfortunately, dialectal variations in address are well beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Next, we find a switch motivated by an assertion of authority in a dialog between a superior and subordinate based on clip 14:

---

7 Kess and Juričić (1978) confirm that differences in rural vs. urban forms of address exist in Slovene.
Načal’nik: Ivanov, vy by vstavili v plan to, čto prosil profesor. A to nam ot nego dostanetsja. Menja uže vzyvali k direktoru.
Podchinennyj: Oj, ja ne znal, čto podvergaju vas opasnosti.
Podchinennyj: Da-da, konečno.
Boss: Ivanov, you [V] were supposed to put [V] what the professor asked into the plan. Or else we’ll catch it from him. They’ve already called me in to the director.
Subordinate: Oh, I didn’t know that I was endangering you [V].
Boss: Make a note of it [T]. Please do not let me down [T].
Subordinate: Yes, yes, of course.

The boss and subordinate are on mutual V at the beginning of the conversation, but as she warns him not to let her down, her imperatives switch to the T form: Vot učti. Požalujsta, ne podvodi menja. ‘Make a note of it [T]. Please do not let me down [T]’. The subordinate is LOWERED and MADE SMALL via T address as the boss reinforces the fact that the underling is SUBJECT TO CONTROL.

Finally, a sergeant berating a private (clip 13) switches from V to T to reinforce the fact that he is SUBJECT TO CONTROL, UNIMPORTANT, and has LOW STATUS relative to himself and higher-ranking officers:

Seržant: Tvoju mat’, gde takix berut. Ivanov, vy začem sjuda prišli?
Sergeant: Dammit, where do they get these guys. Ivanov, why did you [V] come [V] here?
Private: To serve in the army.
Sergeant: Then serve. Yesterday because of you [T] the general almost wrote a report. What were you [T] doing [T] at your post? One more time and I’ll see you in the brig.

Most of the Russian switches involve a shift from V to T and result in asymmetrical address, at least temporarily. The one exception is the sarcastic T to V shift, the inflating of Petro’s worth linguistically, even though Egor, the speaker, does not believe he actually deserves it. This particular situation is different from any in our

---

8 Note non-referential T here.
asymmetrical analysis in that we find a display of authority forced on the speaker who is actually UP and BIG relative to the other; by contrast, each instance of asymmetry involves a speaker who has power (or wants power) diminishing his interlocutor. In this case, Egor forces V on Petro while maintaining his T-ness (DOWN position and SMALL size, relatively).

5.4.1.1.2 Flirtation / affection in Russian

We do not find examples of a switch that falls into the category of persuasion / entreaty, but we do find two that can be categorized as flirtation / affection. The first is a conversation between Egor, the ex-convict, and Lidija, his all-business superior:

_Egor: Čego v odinočestve?
Lidija Viktorovna: S”ezdili v Sosnovku?
Egor: Tak točno, vaše blagorodie, v Sosnovku s”ezdil, brigadira privez.
Lidija Viktorovna: K pustoj golove ruku ne prikladyvajut.
Egor: Why are you alone?
Lidija Viktorovna: Have you gone [V] to Sosnovka?
Egor: Yes ma’am, your [V] honor, I’ve been to Sosnovka, brought back the team leader. Lidija: A fool shouldn’t salute.

Egor’s switch to T is not intended as a threat or an insult; he is attempting to empathize with his superior and talk to her as if they are friends. Once again, Egor is attempting to find or create intimacy in an official situation; in this conversation, he is not even making a pass at the woman. He is simply expressing empathy via T address (INTIMACY IS NEAR, FAMILIAR IS IN).

The second example again involves Egor; this time he is addressing his penpal-girlfriend’s father. The father addresses him as T (YOUNG IS DOWN), but Egor begins
address with the father as V (OLD IS UP, UNFAMILIAR IS OUT, NON-INTIMACY IS FAR) Thus, the conversation begins with asymmetry:

_Egor:_ Zakurić možno?
_Otec:_ Kuri.
_Egor:_ A vy? Ne čelaete?
_Otec:_ Ja ne kurjaščij...
_Egor:_ May I smoke?
_Father:_ Yes (lit. Smoke [T]).
_Egor:_ And you [V]? You don’t want to [V]? 
_Father:_ I’m not a smoker...

The exchange becomes more heated as Egor and the old man begin talking about work:

_Otec:_ Da ja- staxanovec večnij! U menja 18 poxval’nyx gramot.
_Egor:_ Tak čego že ty sidiš’ molčič? 
_Otec:_ Molčič’s! Ty že mne slova ne daeš’ volknut’!
_Father:_ After all I’m an eternal stakhanovite! I have 18 awards.
_Egor:_ Then why are you [T] sitting [T] here being quiet [T]?
_Father:_ Being quiet [T]? You [T] won’t let me [T] get a word in edgewise!

In a burst of emotion, Egor switches from V to T in an attempt to simultaneously chide and express solidarity with the old man; he scolds him for not bragging about his work accomplishments. He admonishes him, but only because he admires him and likes him and his work ethic. Egor’s use of T is, in effect, his saying “I am a worker like you, I support you, you should be proud of your achievements”, and so on. After all, SIMILARITY IS NEAR and IN, FAMILIAR IS IN, MEMBERSHIP IS IN, and Egor wants to be like this man and, likely, to be a part of his family.

We note that the two instances of switches expressing affection come from Egor, who is somewhat of a sociopath. That is not to say that affection is not a viable meaning for switches in address; more data is needed to make a more substantial conclusion as to whether this type of switch is common or if it is characteristic of dialectal (or simply this character’s) speech.
The main meaning of switches in Russian is associated with power, but the examples we have seen suggest that switches in forms can also signal affection and intimacy.

5.4.1.2 Switches in Polish

We now turn to shifts in address forms in the Polish data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display of authority / threat (power): UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL</th>
<th>Persuasion / entreaty (power and intimacy): UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL and NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT</th>
<th>Flirtation / affection (intimacy): NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meeting chairman and worker (status)</td>
<td>judge and witness</td>
<td>mother and servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sergeant and private (status)</td>
<td>interviewee and director and crew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policeman and man (status)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shock worker (s) and security officer (will)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>director and editor (will)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.1.2.1 Display of authority / threat in Polish

In the first scene we examine, from *Człowiek z marmuru*, we find a switch from the intimate T of friendship to the official V of communism. The worker Birkut is attempting, at the last minute, to speak at a union meeting in support of a friend who has been arrested by the authorities. He appeals to the chairman, who is also a close friend, with T and the friend reciprocates (INTIMACY IS NEAR, SIMILAR IS NEAR and IN, FAMILIAR IS IN, PERSONAL IS DOWN):

*Birkut:* Daj przemówić... Przemówić mi daj! No, mówię do ciebie! No?
*Przewodniczący:* Nie mam ciebie w porządku dziennym ani w wolnych wnioskach. Poza tym tu zaraz będzie kino i to podobno bardzo śmieszne.
*Birkut:* Pare słów tylko! To bardzo ważne! Dajże mi głos, no, proszę cię!
*Przewodniczący:* Mateusz, czyś ty dziecko? Przecież tekst nieugodniony, nikt nie czytał, jak ty chcesz tak wystąpić?
*Birkut:* Give [T] me the floor! Are you [T] deaf? Well?
*Chairman:* You’re [T] not on the agenda. After this there’ll be a movie and as I understand it it’s very funny.
Birkut: Just a couple of words! It's very important! Give [T] me the floor, please (lit. I ask you [T]!).
Chairman: Matthew, were you [T] born yesterday? After all, the text hasn't been cleared, no one has read it, how can you [T] want [T] to make a speech like that?

When he is denied access to the podium, Birkut rushes away from his friend and toward the microphone. At this point, his friend the chairman addresses him in a FORMAL, IMPERSONAL way (with the V of communism; UP and BIG), emphasizing that he is not addressing Birkut as his friend but in his capacity as the chairman of the meeting:

Przewodniczący: Towarzyszu Birkut! Ja nie udzielam waszego głosu! Proszę natychmiast zejść!
Chairman: Comrade Birkut! You [V] do not have the floor! Please come down from there immediately!

Note, too, that T address had been accompanied by Birkut's first name, Mateusz; when the switch to V occurs, the chairman uses the communist Towarzysz Birkut 'Comrade Birkut' to further emphasize that the shift not only in language but in relationship has been made.

The next two dialogs in this section are products of the script-writing project. The first dialog supports the film clip (13) depicting a sergeant and private. Address in the Polish military is generally with V (Stone 1981a: 63).

Sierżant: Co to ma znaczyć, Forest? Znowu nie wykonałeś porannej toalety! Ty śmiertelnie!
Sergeant: What is this supposed to mean, Forest? Again you didn't take [V] your morning shower! You [T] stink [T]!

When the sergeant insults the private, he shifts from V to T (DISRESPECT IS DOWN).

A policeman confronting a suspect initially addresses him with P but switches to T to reinforce his power when the suspect starts arguing with him (clip 12):

policjant: Mówi pan, że nie jechał szybko?
mężczyzna: No pewnie!
policjant: To dlaczego radar pokazał coś innego?
mężczyzna: Może się zepsuł.
policjant: Może go naprawisz?
mężczyzna: Ja go nie zmaszowalem.
policjant: Jeśli chcesz udowodzić, że nie jechales szybko, nie masz wyboru.
Policeman: Are you [P] saying [P] that you weren’t speeding?
Man: Exactly!
Policeman: Then why did the radar show something else?
Man: Maybe it’s broken.
Policeman: Maybe you’ll fix [T] it?
Man: I didn’t mess it up.
Policeman: If you want [T] to prove that you weren’t speeding [T], you don’t have [T] a choice.

The suspect is made to understand he is SUBJECT TO CONTROL by the officer and that the officer is NOT THREATENED by him (DOWN and SMALL).

The last two examples are from *Człowiek z marmuru* and are examples of speakers with no real power attempting to impose their will on someone else. The first is an exchange between the shock workers Mateusz Birkut and his friend Witek and the security officer (Michalak) who is investigating an accident that occurred during a bricklaying demonstration (see also 3.5.1.2). The exchange begins with mutual communist V address between the security officer and one of the workers:

Michalak: Dobry wieczór, towarzyszu Birkut. Nie śpicie? Ja was rozumiem. Trudno spać po czymś takim. Porządnie was opatrzyli, co? Jodynkę posmarowali?...Boli?
Witek: Pewno, że boli. A wyście myśleli, że jak?...
Michalak: A wy, jak podawaliście towarzyszowi cegłę, nie czuliście, że gorąca?
Witek: Ja w rękawiczkach robilem.
Michalak: W rękawiczkach. W grubych, co?
Witek: W takich sobie.
Michalak: A, w takich sobie. Dawno macie ten ischias?
Witek: Nie, to tylko tak powiedziałem, żeby się odczepili. Jakaś franca mi wyskoczyła— egzema, czy jak mówią; nie wiem.
Michalak: Egzema...Pokażcie no te rączki.... Pokażcie no rączki!
Witek: No i co? Jest?
Michalak: Good evening, comrade Birkut. Not sleeping [V]? I understand you [V]. It’s hard to sleep after something like that. Did they look after you [V] OK? Did they apply iodine?...Does it hurt?
Witek: Of course it hurts. What did you [V] think...
Michalak: And you [V], as you were handing [V] your comrade the brick, did you not feel [V] that it was hot?
Witek: I was wearing gloves.
Michalak: Gloves. Thick ones, right?
Witek: Sort of.
Michalak: Ah, sort of thick. Have you had [V] that sciatica for long?
Witek: No, I just said that so they’d buzz off. Some kind of annoying rash popped up on me—eczema or whatever they call it, I don’t know.
Michalak: Eczema... Show [V] me your hands! Well show [V] me your hands!
Witek: Well? Is it there?

The above is an example of a typical IMPERSONAL interaction (BIG, UP): a security officer is interviewing two workers; the workers are friends and have a prior relationship, but they have no prior relationship with the security officer. Following the convention of the times, the security officer (a communist) addresses Birkut and Witek (also communists) individually as V.

Michalak the security officer addresses the two together as Vpl:

Michalak: Co wy, ludzie? Na żartach się nie znacie, czy co?
Michalak: What’s with you [Vpl], fellas? You can’t take [Vpl] a joke, or what?

In this case, Birkut and Witek are together literally MORE (BIGGER) than Michalak;

Vpl (again, because they are communists) is the logical form of address.

The drama begins when Birkut has had enough of the security officer’s accusations. Despite the fact that the security officer has the political and social power, Birkut asserts his desire to be left alone:

Birkut: Ty, słuchaj. Kto ty właściwie jesteś, co? Tak się włóczysz za nami... Ty, odczep się, dobrze?

Although in this entire scene he has not used an address form with Michalak, we can assume that Birkut would normally address him as V; after all, Michalak addresses Birkut
initially with V, and Witek, who is essentially of the same status as Birkut, uses V consistently with the security officer.

Birkut reduces his interlocutor Michalak to a CONTROLLABLE size; by diminishing him from V to T he indicates that he is not at all THREATENED by him. T is, after all, SMALL; Birkut, as V, is BIGGER than T and is a possible THREAT to anyone addressed by T. Birkut attempts to impose his will on Michalak by making him SMALL and DOWN. This means Michalak is shown DISRESPECT, is SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE, has LOW STATUS, is UNIMPORTANT and NON-THREATENING. To this extent he has more in common with people and things at the LOW and SMALL end of the social power scale (persons who do not merit respect, children, animals, and inanimate objects).

At the same time as the switch in address form occurs, Birkut, who had previously been seated on his bed in the train car, rises to a standing position so that he and Michalak are (literally) of the same size; Michalak, who had been standing the entire time, can no longer look down on him. Further, Birkut draws near to Michalak, diminishing the space between them. Birkut’s physical actions also suggest that he is not threatened by the security officer and that he will not stand for his insinuations. Shortly after the switch to T, Michalak leaves the two workers alone.

We find a similar use of threatening T in a dialog from the same movie, this time between Agnieszka, who is trying to make the controversial movie about Birkut, and her editor, who has told her she is out of time and money. The exchange begins on mutual P:

Redaktor: Niech pani zmontuje—ja wiem?—dwie wstawki do Magazynu, do Dziennika...
Agnieszka: Co?...Co mi pan tu opowiadę? Przecież pan nigdy w życiu nie widział lepszego materiału! Ja wszystko postawiłam na jedną kartą: na ten film!
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Redaktor: I bardzo dobrze! Ale ja nie! Ja mam codziennie dwa programy telewizyjne—siedem razy w tygodniu! Ja nie mogę pozwolić sobie na to, żeby mnie mój klient, mój odbiorca, mój widz zaczął lekceważyć!
Agnieszka: A teraz pana szanuje?
Redaktor: Dwa tygodnie na montaż i udźwiękowienie.
Editor: Put together [P]—do I know?—two entries in the magazine, in the daily...
Editor: Very good! But I didn’t! I have two television programs a day, seven times a week! I can’t allow myself to be scorned by my client, my customer, my spectator!
Agnieszka: And does he respect you [P] now?
Editor: Two weeks for editing and sound.

At this point, Agnieszka, enraged, physically approaches the editor, pins him to the wall, and addresses him with a threatening T:

Agnieszka: Ty, słuchaj! Ja muszę zrobić ten film! A ty musisz mi na to pozwolić!
Rozumiesz?
Redaktor: A co robię cały czas? Dalem materiały, sprzęt, pieniądze! Za czyje pieniądze to robisz? Za społeczne! A ja za nie odpowiadam!
Agnieszka: Listen [T], you [T]! I have to make this film! And you [T] have to [T] let me! Understand [T]?
Editor: And what do I do the whole time? I gave you materials, equipment, money! Whose money are you doing [T] this with? The public’s! But I’m responsible for it!

Agnieszka is attempting to make her editor SUBJECT TO HER CONTROL and let him know that she is NOT THREATENED by him. The editor, however, is not intimidated and reciprocates with T, reinforcing the fact that he really is IN CONTROL, is also NOT THREATENED by Agnieszka, and that she must answer to him. Agnieszka, realizing that she has gotten nowhere with her linguistic and physical aggression, switches back to P and releases the editor from his position against the wall:

Agnieszka: Ale musisz się...Musisz się pan ze mną porozumieć do końca!
Redaktor: Bardzo proszę. Proszę zostawić materiały w redakcji i oddać kamerę. Pani nam już nie jest więcej potrzebna.
Agnieszka: But you have to [T]...you [P] have to [P] give me a break!
Editor: Please. Please leave the materials with in editing and turn in your camera. We no longer need you [P].
The switches we have examined, then, are most often in the direction DOWN and SMALL: we find two P to T switches, two V to T switches but also one from T to V. We see that the assertion of authority can work both ways, from V / P to T but also from T to V, and can be initiated by a speaker with no real power. We now examine two switches with a different meaning: persuasion and entreaty.

5.4.1.2.2 Persuasion / entreaty in Polish

One dialog which can be classified as an attempt at persuasion or an entreaty contains a switch from P to V in an official, highly scripted situation: the courtroom. The judge and Birkut are initially using mutual P address; however, address in this case involves not pan ‘sir’ but sąd ‘court’ and świadek ‘witness’.

Przewodniczący sądu: Chwileczkę; może świadek nie zrozumiał pytania?
Birkut: A co miałem nie zrozumieć? Przecież sąd się jasno wyraził. Wiem wszystko i wszystko wiedziałem od samego początku!...
Przewodniczący sądu: Jak to? On na was, a wy na niego? Przecież to idiotyzm! Oskarżony nie mógł wiedzieć o waszej działalności! Oskarżony uważał was za oddanego aktwistę!...Proszę świadka, tutaj, w aktach...Zresztą mogę świadkowi przeczytać; świadek zeznaże zupełnie co innego!
Judge: Just a moment; maybe you [P] didn’t understand [P] the question?
Birkut: What’s not to understand? After all you [P] (lit. the court) clearly expressed yourself [P] (lit. himself). I know everything and knew everything from the very beginning!...
Judge: How’s that? He’s accusing you [V], and you [V] him? After all that’s idiocy! The accused wasn’t able to know about your [V] actions! The accused took you [V] for a devoted activist!...I am asking you [P] (lit. witness), here, in the files...Besides I can read it to you [P] (lit. witness); you [P] are testifying [P] to something entirely different!

The judge initially addresses Birkut with P, as courtroom etiquette dictates (even English incorporates third person address in situations such as this one: in court we use expressions like “Will the witness approach the bench” rather than “Will you approach the bench”). However, when Birkut refuses to testify against his friend, the judge expresses his consternation and pleas for Birkut to comply by bringing him CLOSE
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(using V as opposed to P). Birkut is still treated with RESPECT, however, as the judge uses the pronoun of communist camaraderie: V.

In the case presented here, the judge shifts from addressing the witness as FAR, OUT, DISTANT IN AN UP DIRECTION and BIG (P), because of the scripted IMPERSONAL nature of the courtroom, to CLOSER and IN (V) when he makes the appeal to the witness to keep his testimony straight. He brings the witness IN by making him second person for his PERSONAL emotional appeal; however, the judge continues to show RESPECT by keeping Birkut BIG and UP. He eliminates the DISTANT form of address (P) and replaces it with the CLOSE (and BIG and UP) form to make his appeal to the witness. The judge promptly shifts back to official IMPERSONAL mode (P address) and resumes the hearing.

Another example of the persuasion / entreaty type of shift is a conversation between Agnieszka, the film director, and Hanka, whom she is interviewing because she is Birkut’s ex-wife. Agnieszka and her film crew have just arrived at Hanka’s house. Address begins with mutual P, since the situation is a FORMAL interview (UP) and the group is newly acquainted (DISTANT, OUT):

_Hanka: Państwo z filmu, prawda? Bardzo proszę, to tutaj, to tutaj. Pani dzwoniła do mnie, tak? Bardzo mi miło. Bardzo proszę państwa, bardzo proszę...Państwo się nie gniewają, że prosiłam wycierać nogi, ale...Bardzo proszę, niech państwo siadają._
...Czy pani naprawdę chce ze mną rozmawiać?
_Agnieszka: Tak. Właśnie z panią. Bardzo długo pani szukałam._
_Hanka: Słucham państwa._
_Hanka: You’re [Ppl] from the film, right? Please, come in, come in. You [P] called [P] me, didn’t you? It’s very nice to meet you. Please (lit. I ask you [Ppl]), please...don’t get mad [Ppl] that I asked you to wipe your feet, but...Please, sit down [Ppl]. Do you [P] really want [P] to talk with me?
_Agnieszka: Yes, with you [P] especially. I’ve been looking for you [P] a long time._
_Hanka: Please go on (lit. I am listening to you [Ppl])._
After many emotional hours, Hanka is visibly upset and has begun drinking. Agnieszka asks her to lie down and prepares to leave, but Hanka does not want to be alone.

Agnieszka: Pani Haniu, niechże się pani położy, proszę...
Hanka: Nie wyjeżdżaj, nigdzie nie wyjeżdżaj!
Agnieszka: Miss Hanka, please lie down [P], please.
Hanka: Don’t leave [T], don’t go [T] anywhere!

Hanka’s switch to T is motivated by her emotional state and, possibly, intoxication. She appeals to Agnieszka as if they are CLOSE (INTIMACY IS CLOSENESS, FAMILIAR IS IN). She wants Agnieszka to stay; thus, T is also reflective of her desire to make Agnieszka SUBJECT TO HER CONTROL. Agnieszka sympathizes with Hanka and reciprocates T, but not without her own motive:

Agnieszka: Strasznie...strasznie ci dziękuję...Haniu, strasznie cię przepraszam...Możesz mi dać adres?
Hanka: Jaki...adres?
Agnieszka: Twojego syna.
Hanka: Maćka zostaw w spokoju!
Agnieszka: I really...I really thank you [T]...Hanka, I beg you [T]...can you [T] give me the address?
Hanka: What...address?
Agnieszka: Your [T] son’s.
Hanka: Leave [T] Maciek alone!

Agnieszka’s use of T, then, reciprocates the emotional CLOSENESS they have formed, but is also motivated by her desire for information and attempting to make Hanka SUBJECT TO CONTROL, albeit in an affectionate way.

5.4.1.2.3 Flirtation / affection in Polish

Finally, there is one example of a switch that involves purely affection and intimacy (or lack thereof):

Edek: Czy można już nakrywać do stołu?
Edek: May I set the table now?

Eleonora, the mother of the main character in Tango, has been having an affair with the family's servant Edek. However, she does not want to reveal the INTIMATE (CLOSE) nature of their relationship to the family; thus, she initially addresses Edek as T, because they are in reality lovers. She corrects herself, though, to create the façade that there is DISTANCE between them and that they have a NON-INTIMATE (NOT CLOSE) relationship.

As in Russian, Polish shifts in address are mainly motivated by the desire on the part of one speaker to assert authority or to threaten the other. Three of the speakers to initiate a switch did so to assert their status: the meeting chairman switched from T to V to emphasize his role as chairman, which, as the shift suggests, has nothing to do with friendship. The sergeant and policeman each made a switch from V to T and P to T, respectively, to emphasize their own power and diminish that of their interlocutor. Two speakers, the shock worker and the film director, shift to T in an attempt to exert their will, despite the fact that in reality they are the ones with less power in the situation.

We find two examples of the entreaty-type shift. The judge shifts from the impersonal P of courtroom address to the more personal, but not condescending, V. A woman being interviewed shifts from the formal P of interviews to the T of friendship in an attempt to convince Agnieszka to stay with her. Agnieszka reciprocates in an attempt to glean information from her subject. Finally, we have one example of a shift from T to P as a conscious denial of closeness with the hearer.

We now examine switches found in the Czech data.
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5.4.1.3 Switches in Czech

Our last group of switches consists of five situations concerning power and one involving affection. The former can further be divided into one involving physical power, one involving physical force as well as social status, and three involving status only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.16: Czech switches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display of authority / threat (power): UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostage and terrorist (physical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrogator and interrogated (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardener and actor (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sergeant and private (status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prisoner and guard (will)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We begin our examination with an analysis of switches categorized as displays of authority or threats.

5.4.1.3.1 Display of authority / threat in Czech

There are five dialogs in which switches in address are displays of authority or threats. The first is an example of a switch in address which occurs in the less common direction: T to V. When a hostage gives in to his captor, he acquiesces by switching from T to V (clip 25):

muž: Neřeknu.
muž s pistoli: Naposled se ptám, kde je ten sejf?
muž: Máš to marné.
muž s pistoli: No tak si posvítím na támhle dvě.
muž: Vyhral jste. Za Monetovým obrazem.
man: I won’t tell.
man with gun: I’m asking for the last time, where is the safe?
man: It’s no use for you [T].
man with gun: Well then I’ll aim at those two.
The victim, in his switch to V, concedes that the man with the gun is UP and BIG relative to himself; the terrorist HAS CONTROL and FORCES the man to comply by THREATENING the women in the room. The hostage thus admits that he is SUBJECT TO CONTROL and is NOT A THREAT to a man holding a weapon (that he, as a hostage, is DOWN and SMALL).

The switches in the next three examples are based on the relative status, as opposed to physical power, of one speaker over another. In the first, a communist official (Kapitán Novotný) and the subject of his investigation (Louka) exchange mutual V address, as this is purely an IMPERSONAL official situation and the two have no prior relationship. Although in this excerpt Louka does not explicitly use a V form, he does note later in the conversation Zatím jsme si netykal tady ‘We haven’t been speaking on “ty” here’. Thus, he implies use of mutual V.


_Louka:_ Jsme spolu pár dní žili, ale nerozuměli jsme si. Ona ruský, já česky…

_Kapitán Novotný:_ Toho jste si před svatbou nevším zřejmě, že neumí česky.

_Louka:_ Všim, ale tam byly jiné věci, v čem jsme se neshodli. Furt větrala například, jak byla z Sibiře zvyklá na zimy…Tak jsme si řekli, že budeme žít každej zvlášť.

_Captain Novotný:_ Listen [V], golden boy, _you [V] have [V] some kind of a bad influence on your relatives, don’t you? Your brother emigrated on _you [V], your wife emigrated on you [V]…well? You didn’t live together much in that tower of _yours [V] after the wedding, did you? At least no one saw her there._

_Louka:_ We lived there together a couple of days, but we didn’t understand each other. She speaks Russian, I speak Czech…

_Captain Novotný:_ Of course before the wedding _you [V]_ didn’t notice that, that she didn’t speak Czech.

_Louka:_ I noticed it, but there were other things, too, that we didn’t agree on. She always had the windows open, for instance, because she was used to the cold in Siberia…so we decided that we’d live separately.

The investigator quickly becomes frustrated with Louka’s answers and switches to T when he threatens him with prison:
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Kapitán Novotný: No. Tak srandíček bylo dost a teď budeme klopit. Kolik jsi za tu šaškářmu dostal?
Louka: Zatím jsme si netykalí tady.
Kapitán Novotný: My si netykáme, milej zlatej. Já ti tykám. To je rozdíl. Poněvadž muklúm já tykám. A ty budeš sedět. Na něco jsem se tě ptal... Kde jste vzal peníze na toho trabanta?
Captain Novotný: Ok. That's enough of that fun- now we'll get serious. How much did you get for this foolishness?
Louka: We haven't been speaking on “ty” here.
Captain Novotný: We’re not speaking on “ty”, golden boy. I am saying “ty” to you [T]. Because I say “ty” to jailbirds. That’s the difference. And you will go to jail. I asked you a question.... Where did you get the money for that Trabant?

Novotný moves Louka DOWN (showing him DISRESPECT, reinforcing that he is SUBJECT TO CONTROL OR FORCE and has LOW STATUS) and makes him SMALL (reinforcing that he is UNIMPORTANT and NON-THREATENING to the investigator). There is no change in degree of intimacy; thus, movement is solely along the power scale. By moving one’s interlocutor DOWN and making him or her SMALL, one suggests that the hearer is NOT WORTHY OF RESPECT or is only worthy of being treated like a child or an animal.

It is important to note further the postures of both interlocutors. Throughout the interview, the investigator is standing, whereas Louka is sitting. Thus, even before the shift in address occurs, Novotný has established physical dominance over Louka. He is taller (BIGGER and UP) relative to Louka, and he must look DOWN to speak to Louka. When Novotný threatens Louka, he bends down and draws very near to his subject.

The investigator does return to V after he threatens Louka with T:

Kapitán Novotný: Kde jste vzal peníze na toho trabanta?
Captain Novotný: Where did you get the money for that Trabant?

We note, too, that when V is re-established, so, too, is the physical distance between the interlocutors.
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Another conversation contains not a threat, but an assertion of the hearer’s (not the speaker’s) HIGHER STATUS and the speaker’s hesitancy to give advice to him. The interlocutors are a famous Czech actor, Milan, and a gardener, Václav, both of whom have escaped from Czechoslovakia and are working as gardeners near Vienna. The exchange begins on mutual T, since the two are now coworkers (MEMBERS of the same workplace, hold SIMILAR jobs) and are becoming friends (are relatively CLOSE).

Václav: Je pořád v nemocnici? Tvá žena...?
Václav: A... proč nejsi s ní?...
Milan: Chce být sama...
Václav: Is she still in the hospital? Your [T] wife...?
Milan: Not as a patient anymore. She works there.
Václav: And...why are you not [T] with her?...
Milan: She wants to be by herself...

Václav, upon hearing this, wants to comment and offer his advice, but he does not want to offend Milan in any way. Thus, he both DISTANCES himself and DIMinishES himself by making Milan BIG and ELEVATING him to V:

Václav: Promiňte, já vím, že se skoro neznáme, a jsem obyčejný zahradník, zatímco vy zůstáváte i v té jené slavný umělec, který víc o životě mnohem víc... ale po takovém nešťastí bych svou Lídu nenechal samotnou, i kdyby po mně házela kameny.
Václav: Excuse [V] me, I know that we barely know each other, and I’m a simple gardener, whereas even in this hole you [V] remain [V] a famous artist who knows a lot more about life...but after that kind of an accident I wouldn’t leave my Lida alone, even if she throw stones at me.

We do find a threat, however, in the dialog between a sergeant and private (clip 13):

Seržant: Vojine, tak vy neváte, kdy je večerka? To jsem vás dost málo cvičil.
Svobodník: Ano seržantie, potřebuji zvěšné lekci.
Seržant: No to se těš. Poteče z tebe krev.
Sergeant: Soldier, so you [V] don’t know [V] when lights out is? Then I haven’t trained you [V] enough.
Private: Yes sergeant, I need a special lesson.
Sergeant: Look forward [T] to it. Your [T] blood is going to flow.
The THREAT of physical violence is accompanied by the switch to T; the sergeant reinforces that he HAS CONTROL over the private (is UP) and is a THREAT (BIG) to him by making the soldier SMALL and DOWN.

In the scene described below, between a prisoner and guard (clip 24), the speakers begin with asymmetrical V (V from prisoner to guard, T from guard to prisoner) but the prisoner fights back with T at the end of their exchange:

vězeň: Nic vám neřeknu.
strážce: Ještě jednou, kdo organizoval útěk?
vězeň: Řek jsem vám, nic nepovím.
strážce: Jmenuj ty další, bastardě.
vězeň: Snažte se zbytečně.
strážce: Máš 5 vteřin, jinak tvoje cesta půjde rovnou do lů.
vězeň: Vyhrožujete, nemáte na to.
strážce: Jedna, dva, tři.
vězeň: Trhni se nohou.

prisoner: I won’t tell you [V] anything.
guard: One more time, who organized the escape?
prisoner: I told you [V], I won’t say anything.
guard: Name [T] the others, you bastard.
prisoner: You’re trying [V] in vain.
guard: You have [T] 5 seconds, otherwise you’re [T] going straight down.
prisoner: You are threatening [V] me, you don’t have [V] what it takes to do it.
guard: One, two, three.
prisoner: Go [T] to hell.

We have already seen the power differential between guard and prisoner in other examples in this chapter. However, generally it is the guard who maintains the linguistic (as well as real, of course) power by addressing the prisoner as DOWN and SMALL. In this case, the prisoner switches to T when he tells the guard Trhni se nohou ‘Go [T] to hell’. In doing this he is essentially DIMINISHING the guard to his own size, indicating that he is NOT THREATENED by him, and that he is NOT SUBJECT TO HIS CONTROL, even though in reality he is. The V to T switch, then, is performed by the speaker with little or no power.
Three switches influenced by the power dynamic, then, are the most common type of switch (V to T, by the prisoner, sergeant, and interrogator); what is interesting about this grouping is that the prisoner does not have real power, but the sergeant and interrogator certainly do. The other two switches are of the less common type, from T to V (by the hostage and gardener, respectively).

5.4.1.3.2 Flirtation / affection in Czech

The last scene in which a switch occurs, taken from Havel’s Vyrozumění, we classify as one involving flirtation / affection; once the switch is initiated, both parties immediately agree to it in an expression of mutual attraction:

*Marie:* Jsem dospělá a vím, co dělám. *Déjte* to sem!...
*Gross:* Děkuji vám, Marie. Konečně mám přiležitost dokázat, že je ve mně víc občanské statečnosti, než kolik jsem jí zatím kdy v životě uplatnil! Slibuji vám, že tentokráte už neuhlnu před ničím, i kdybych tím riskoval existenci!

*Marie:* Líbíš se mi—
*Gross:* Tvoj sympatií si teprve musím zasloužit! Nazdar!
*Marie:* I’m an adult and I know what I’m doing. *Give* [V] it to me!...
*Gross:* Thank you [V], Marie. Now at last I have an opportunity to prove that I have more civil courage than I’ve shown so far. I promise you [V] that this time I shall not give way to anything or anybody, even at the risk of my position!
*Marie:* I like you [T]-
*Gross:* First I must deserve your [T] sympathy! Bye!

The pair begins with mutual V address, because they are coworkers but have had no real social relationship. Marie switches to T when she confesses that she likes Gross. T reinforces that she would like to be CLOSER to him, and he reciprocates. This is likely a permanent switch, paralleling a permanent change in their relationship (from OUT to IN, FAR to NEAR).

As in Russian and Polish, the greatest number of switches in Czech are motivated by power. We find among the Czech data two examples involving the physical power of the speaker making the switch, and three involving the status of the speaker initiating the
shift in address forms. No examples of the persuasion / entreaty type were found, and only one of the flirtation / affection type was found.

5.4.2 Summary and conclusions: switches

We have now completed an examination of motivations for all the conversations involving switches in address forms gathered from films, plays, and our research project. The charts below present a summary of the meanings of switches. The italicized member of the pair indicates the speaker who initiated the switch; the direction of the switch is given in parentheses. In addition, the percentages given represent the number of respondents who constructed a dialog containing a switch, as opposed to mutual address or asymmetry, during the script-writing project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>man and messenger boy (V&gt;T)</td>
<td><em>meeting chairman</em> and worker (T&gt;V)</td>
<td><em>hostage</em> and terrorist (11%; T&gt;V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man and “girlfriend’s” brother (T&gt;V&gt;T)</td>
<td><em>sergeant</em> and private (7%; V&gt;T)</td>
<td><em>interrogator</em> and interrogated (V&gt;T&gt;V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boss and subordinate (12.5%; V&gt;T)</td>
<td><em>policeman</em> and man (8%; P&gt;T)</td>
<td><em>gardener</em> and actor (T&gt;V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sergeant and private (12.5%; V&gt;T)</td>
<td><em>shock worker</em> (s) and security officer (V&gt;T)</td>
<td><em>sergeant</em> and private (11%; V&gt;T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>director</em> and editor (P&gt;T&gt;P)</td>
<td><em>prisoner</em> and guard (11%; V&gt;T)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unquestionably, switches most often represent power of some sort. In addition, it does appear that switches can be temporary changes in address form; we have noted in the chart above when a shift back to the original form is included in the dialog. Unfortunately, much of our data does not continue long enough to confirm that a switch represents a temporary phenomenon for the most part.
Overall, the most common form of shift is from V to T (UP, BIG to DOWN, SMALL). This shift occurs eight times in the data from the three languages. The second most common shift is from T to V (DOWN, SMALL to UP, BIG), which occurs four times. We find P to T twice (DISTANCE IN AN UP DIRECTION, BIG to DISTANCE IN A DOWN DIRECTION, SMALL), but T to P never appears in our data.

Excluding the film and play excerpts, which we concede might contain switches for dramatic purposes, we note which situations Russians, Poles, and Czechs consider viable with regard to switches in forms of address. We see that Czech has the greatest variety of situations involving non-reciprocal address of this type (3). Russian and Polish participants each wrote two situations with a shift. The overall percentages of participants agreeing on address in any particular situation are very low, generally indicating that only one participant per clip considered a switch in address appropriate.

As in our discussion of asymmetrical address, we note again that there are certain situations with which we expect respondents to be familiar and certain ones with which they may not be as familiar. The situations which contain shifts are essentially the same ones in which asymmetry can appear: terrorist and hostage, prisoner and guard, boss and subordinate. In addition, respondents in all three languages suggest shifts can appear in address between a sergeant and private (although none wrote a dialog with asymmetry between them).

Once again, it is clear that the respondents know how to manipulate forms of address (via metaphoric size and space) to reflect changes in status, desire, and so on. Professional writers also use switches as a technique to reinforce relationships between
characters; as we have seen, they also (again, perhaps unwittingly) manipulate physical space as they are manipulating metaphoric space via shifts in forms of address.

The less common meanings of shifts are summarized in the two charts below:

Table 5.18: Switches as persuasion / entreaty (power and intimacy): UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL and NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>judge and witness</td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interviewee and director and crew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.19: Switches as flirtation / affection (intimacy): NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>worker and official</td>
<td>mother and servant</td>
<td>female coworker and male coworker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man and “girlfriend’s” father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the situations described in these charts are drawn from films or plays. The use of scripted data does suggest that certainly persuasion / entreaty and flirtation / affection are not the most widely recognized meanings of switches, and that the instances of switches in address as persuasion or affection are more likely to be found in creative works. Although the primary meaning of switches (display of authority / threat) is available to Russians, Poles, and Czechs, switches in general do seem to be less viable than asymmetry.

5.5 Conclusion

We suggest that the two related phenomena we have analyzed -- asymmetry and shifts -- are motivated by speakers’ conceptualizations of relationships in terms of size and spatial relations. We have also seen that the most common meaning of both asymmetrical address and switches in address is related to a speaker’s authority over or a threat to another person. Russian seems to be the least willing to accept the expression of
power via shifts and asymmetry; the West Slavic languages, Polish and Czech, seem to be more capable in this regard.

Asymmetrical address appears to be a more common phenomenon, but switches in address appear to be somewhat more complex than asymmetry. To prove this point, let us examine displays of authority / threats with regard to asymmetry and shifts. In the asymmetrical address situations we examined, the majority of the time the person with the real power was addressed with P or V, and the person with no or less power, with T. However, this was not always the case. In the following two Russian situations the recipient of V does not have the power: the woman (receives V) talking to the policeman (receives T), and the woman (receives V) in a fight with a man (receives T). In the Polish conversation between a male stranger (receives T) and a female stranger (receives P), the situation is more complicated; he, of course, is physically more powerful, but she, as a female, does have a status advantage. However, she is also black. Race, if viewed as a marker of status, might be a consideration for some participants, as we mentioned above.

In every other instance, the person receiving the BIG, UP form of address (V or P) also had the real power in the situtation, be it because of physical force or social status, and made this contrast known by addressing the other person with T. With shifts, more variety is possible. In the following situations, the individuals listed have the real power but do not initiate the switch that appears in their conversation: Petro (receives V), Agnieszka’s editor (receives T), a terrorist (receives V), Milan the actor (receives V), a prison guard (receives T), and the communist security officer (receives T). Thus, speakers with less power initiate many of the switches we find in our data. In addition,
some of these speakers with less power threaten their interlocutor with $T$ (for instance, Agnieszka threatens her editor; a prisoner threatens a guard; Birkut threatens a security officer), and some acknowledge their lower status by shifting their interlocutor to $V$ (for example, Václav switches to $V$ with his friend Milan, the hostage switches to $V$ with the terrorist).

Asymmetry and shifts are related phenomena; asymmetry appears to be somewhat more common, but shifts in address are more complex and can typically flow from either direction on the power scale. We suggest both are motivated by the ways in which speakers of Russian, Polish, and Czech conceptualize and categorize relationships in terms of size and spatial orientation. Manipulation of conceptual space is reflected in the manipulation of forms of address by speakers of each of these languages.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1 Review

Research for this dissertation began with one question: Why did people address each other only with ты in Old Russian? Out of curiosity about a historical fact grew an exploration of language, sociology, and cognition which, we hope, has shed light on how three cultures understand relationships and in turn translate this understanding into language by means of pronouns and their related forms of address.

From the extensive data gathered, the majority of which provide examples of “expected” forms of address, we chose two phenomena, asymmetrical address and switches, to illustrate speakers’ conceptualization of relationships in terms of spatial relations (UP / DOWN, BIG / SMALL, NEAR / FAR, IN / OUT). We have also seen that the most common meaning of both asymmetrical address and switches in address is related to a speaker’s authority over or a threat to another person; that is, the concepts UP / DOWN and BIG / SMALL motivate the majority of both types of address. Physical evidence from films supports our assertion that spatial relations are not only a plausible model of forms of address, but provide very real structure at a fundamental, conceptual level for speakers’ understanding of relationships.¹

¹ Further psycholinguistic evidence to support this claim might be obtained through experiments involving role-playing (would actors change their physical space when an asymmetry or switch in address forms occurs in a script?) or manipulation of models (would consultants posture dolls in such a way as to reflect variations in address forms?).
At least preliminarily, there does seem to be evidence to suggest that Polish is most capable of asymmetry and switches in forms of address. Of the two, asymmetrical address appears to be a more common phenomenon, but shifts in address appear to be more complex and more flexible than asymmetry. With shifts, more variety in who has real power and who expresses linguistic power appears to be possible.

The data gathered from films, plays, and the script-writing project provide a plethora of additional research opportunities that are, unfortunately, beyond the scope of this dissertation\(^2\). We detail some of these possibilities in the next section.

### 6.2 Possibilities for further research

Probably the most common type of address in all three languages is mutual address. Most of the time, when speakers interact, they do so by both using P or V, or both using T, depending on the situation. The asymmetrical address and switches we discuss are exceptions to the norm of mutual address, but they are important exceptions and reveal a great deal about the manipulation of space in construal of relationships between interlocutors\(^3\). There are a great deal of other variations, however, that do occur and would provide for interesting analysis from a variety of angles.

#### 6.2.1 Unexpected mutual address

One possibility for further analysis is mutual address in unexpected situations; that is, we found several instances of mutual T address when mutual V is expected (for instance, between a taxi driver and passenger, and between strangers; see section 3.5 for details). Brown and Gilman (1960) also commented on this trend away from formal

---

\(^2\) An obvious opportunity for further research is to adapt the script-writing project to other (including non-Slavic) languages.

\(^3\) James Noblett has pointed out that this topic also has Theory of Mind (TOM) implications.
address, suggesting that informal forms are used more than they were in the past and will continued to be used more in the future.

However, address varies from urban to rural settings; T address is likely more common in rural settings as we find in Kalina krasnaja, which provides several examples of unexpected mutual T address. In addition, dialectal variations within each language might account for some of the address forms we are unable to account for at the present. Dialectal variation in address within each language is certainly a topic that needs further research.

6.2.2 My ‘we’ of solidarity

In our data, we found a few instances of address with my ‘we’ to indicate solidarity or inclusion of the hearer and speaker. The excerpt below from Vyšetřování ztráty třídní knihy represents a teacher talking to a student, trying to get him to reveal information about a missing roll book:


The my ‘we’ of solidarity also occurs in Russian and Polish. In Russian, for instance, we have T and V variants of a very common 1pl verb form: pojdem [T], pojdemte [V] ‘Let’s go’. Russian has constructions such as my s vami ‘you and I (lit. we with you)’, and so does Polish: my z ojciem ‘father and I (lit. we with father)’. Czech has this type of construction as well, although it almost always omits the nominative my ‘we’ pronoun: jdem s vámi do vašeho auta ‘we’ll go [with you] to your car’. These forms express the solidarity of speaker and hearer through my ‘we’ (or 1pl verb, in the case of Czech). This expression of solidarity through plurality did not occur enough in the data to pursue it in
detail in this project; nonetheless, it is an important part of the overall picture of meanings of forms of address in Russian, Polish, and Czech.

6.2.3 Avoidance of address

Complete avoidance of T, P, or V forms also occurs in our data, especially in Polish. This most commonly occurred in dialogues written to accompany the conversation between a policeman and two drunken women in a car. In each, the policeman initially avoids a form of address by using an infinitive as an imperative (a strategy also used in Russian and Czech, but not in any substantial way in our data). The infinitives are boldfaced in the four Polish examples taken from the research instruments:

*policjant: Dokumenty poproszę! Wysiedać.*
policeman: Documents please! Step out.

*policjant: Proszę wstać i okazać dokumenty.*
policeman: Please stand up and show me your papers.

*policjant: Proszę wysiąść z samochodu.*
policeman: Please get out of the car.

*policjant: Zatrzymać się, zatrzymać!*
policeman: Stop, stop!

Infinitive use is also common for Russian dog commands: *Siđit* ‘Sit’! *Leżat* ‘Lie down’!, and for commands on signs. For example, *Ne prislioniat sja* ‘No leaning’ is found on subway doors, and even *Ne kurit* ‘No smoking’ is increasingly seen in many places.

In Russian and Polish recipes, we find infinitives in the instructions: (R)

*Prigotovit* drożževoe testo židkoy konsistencii i *dat* perebrodit’ pri 28-32 S v tečenje 2-3 časov. *Prepare* yeast dough of thin consistency and *let* it rise at 28-32 C over the course of 2-3 hours.’ (Pol) *Zamarynować* krewetki w misce przykrytej plastikowym *przykryciem, umieścić* w lodówce na 8 godzin *Marinate* shrimp in a bowl covered with
plastic wrap; place in refrigerator for 8 hours.’ There are, of course, always exceptions: in other completely IMPERSONAL situations in Polish, such as instructions to airline passengers on Lot (the national airline of Poland), address can be with T: Siedząc w fotelu miej pas zapięty. Kamizelka ratunkowa jest pod twoim fotelem. ‘Keep [T] seatbelt fastened while seated. Lifejacket is under your [T] seat.’

Czech can use the infinitive in instructions, as we see on a website offering tongue-in-check advice on how to catch carp: Sednout si na volnou vodu. Najít místo kudy kapři projíždí a za použití většího množství krmení kapry zastavit a udržet co možná nejdéle ‘Sit down by running water. Find a place where carp swim by and by using a large quantity of feed, stop and keep them as long as possible.’ But note Czech recipes use my ‘we’: Rozehřejeme máslo, přidáme na kostičky pokrájené vepřové maso, očištěného, osoleného bažanta a opečeme po všech stranách.... ‘We’ll melt the butter, we’ll add the cubed pork, the cleaned, salted pheasant and we’ll roast it on all sides.’

In a quick survey of search engines (Google, Seznam, Onet, Rambler), it appears that this type of impersonal infinitive use is more typical of Russian and Polish, and that Czech tends to prefer my forms or other forms of address for giving instructions. An in-depth study would be useful in revealing if this is actually the case, and also might shed light on how true forms of address (T,V,P) interact with infinitives in “public” language (such as on signs, in cookbooks, and so on).

6.2.4 Fluctuations in address

Another phenomenon that was frequent in our data from Petruševskaja’s Tri devuški v golubom is fluctuation in address. As we noted in Chapter 3, speakers in this
play will switch between T and V, sometimes several times in a single conversation, as in
the excerpt below:

Nikolaj: Vy pošljačka! I vy poterjali sebja. Ty posmotri na sebja, kto ty takaja. Stydno
skazat.
Ira: Kogda čelovek ljubit, èto ne pozor.
Nikolaj: Pozor, pozor prosto! Ty končaj s ètimi presledovanijami menja toboj!
Ira: Ja xožu gde xožu.
Nikolaj: Vam na ètom plažae ne položeno bylo siedt’. U vas net propuska na nego. Glaza
sliškom bol’šie!
at yourself, who you [T] are. I’m ashamed even to say it.
Ira: When a person is in love, there’s no shame.
Nikolaj: It’s disgraceful, absolutely shameful! I’m telling you [T] to stop [T] persecuting
me!
Ira: I can go where I like.
Nikolaj: You [V] shouldn’t have been sitting on that beach anyway. You [V] haven’t got
a pass for it. Sitting there goggling.

The fluctuations in address forms are reflections of, in this case, Nikolaj’s
attempts to DISTANCE Ira from him (V) and also to CONTROL (T) her. Address of this
type occurs not just in one scene, but throughout the play. Thus, we felt an analysis of
address in discrete scenes would not be as effective as one that takes into account the
entire play and follows address patterns from the beginning to the end. The switches and
asymmetries in this play are very much inextricable from each other, unlike the rather
isolated instances of switches and asymmetry in the other plays and films we examined.

6.2.5 Status

We introduced the concept of status in 5.2.3 by noting that certain people deserve
special linguistic treatment. That is, particular inherent personal characteristics (such as
race, gender, and age) can increase -- or diminish -- the status of one’s interlocutor.

Elders, females, and (especially in Polish and Czech) Caucasians tend to have higher
status and receive V / P forms, whereas the young, males, and persons of color tend to have lower status and receive T forms.

The issue of social status and language may be further examined from the perspective of evolutionary psychology; specifically, one might incorporate dominance theory into an analysis of the type presented in Chapter 5. "Dominance theory predicts that human reasoning will be strongly influenced by rank" (Buss 1999: 357). One might explore the ways high-ranking as opposed to low-ranking individuals use gesture, posture, eye contact, facial expression, and tone of voice to parallel and reinforce linguistic forms. Chapter 5 touches on such research, but the relationship between dominant behaviors and linguistic dominance (as well as submissive behaviors and linguistic submission) should be explored much more thoroughly.

Below we briefly discuss further opportunities for research on the relationship between status (especially with regard to race, gender, and age) and address forms.

6.2.5.1 Race

The issue of race and forms of address in Slavic languages has, to my knowledge, rarely, if ever, been examined in detail. As we discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, there is a possibility that race might have an influence on address, especially in Polish. One way we might understand how peoples with dark skin are treated linguistically would be to examine translations of American literature in Russian, Polish, and Czech. Novels by authors such as William Faulkner might be particularly fruitful not only in yielding translations of southern dialects (African-American as opposed to white speech) but also in revealing how P, V, and T address work to establish or reinforce relationships.
Recall the newspaper article (7 May 1998) discussing P address in a Czech translation of *The sound and the fury*. In this Czech translation, the speakers of African-American Vernacular English address the whites with *on 'he'* and *oni 'they'* , nonstandard forms of P address in twentieth-century Czech. Further examination of this translation would doubtless yield valuable data on address as perceived by the Czechs who are translating it. Assuming these translators knew something about English dialect and race relations in the South, this Czech interpretation would certainly be a topic worth exploring. Comparisons of translations of *The sound and the fury*, or a similar novel, into Russian, Polish, and Czech would yield an interesting linguistic perspective on the race issue.

6.2.5.2 Gender

The issue of gender is doubtless an important one with respect to power and forms of address; in our analysis, we discovered that the person with the real power in the conversation is not always the one who initiates a switch or even receives the UP and BIG pronoun (V or P). Women tend to be UP with regard to STATUS, at least linguistically, although men are of course UP with regard to PHYSICAL FORCE. In some circumstances it is simply not clear who has the real power in the situation, and an analysis of which gender initiates switches or receives V / P most often in asymmetrical address would reveal a great deal about the true linguistic status of women and men.

Nonetheless, we hesitate to state conclusions about the issue of gender with regards to asymmetrical address and switches. Although we might draw conclusions

---

4 Why are women UP with regard to STATUS? We suggest that the HIGH STATUS of women (reflected by the [over-]use of V / P forms to females) parallels the common cultural phenomenon of “placing women on a pedestal”. The elevation of women (linguistically or otherwise) by men is actually an assertion of dominance, a marginalization of women as something DIFFERENT to be revered, respected, protected, and so on.
based on the data drawn from films and plays, as always, we must take into consideration the dramatic purpose of the form of address used. A much better source of data is potentially the script-writing project. However, as I noted in Chapter 4, it was only after all the data had been gathered that I realized that some scripts contained errors in the naming of interlocutors: on each research instrument, I provided masculine forms for “waiter”, “boss” and “coworker”, even though each of these was female. In the boss-subordinate clip, the woman has a very masculine appearance, and several volunteers construed her linguistically as male. In the coworker scene, the instrument simply provided coworker1 and coworker2, both masculine forms. Thus, even if the respondent ignored my blunder, it was not always evident which coworker the participant intended to be female. Gender, then, could not be taken into account.

In order to focus on gender specifically, one might design a project similar to the one in the present study. Instead of random clips depicting a wide variety of situations, though, the DVD could contain ten clips of men and women in various situations, and perhaps one or two of men talking to men and women talking to women as controls. In such a study, the participant’s construal of relationship might be reflected in a clearer way through pronoun use; with appropriate labeling of speakers on the research instrument, there would be no question as to gender or who initiated a switch or asymmetry, if any occur.

6.2.5.3 Age

Finally, age is potentially a determining factor in address form usage. As we mentioned above, the tendency in Russian, Polish, and Czech (as well as in many other languages) is to use the polite form (V or P) to address a person significantly older than
onself, and the informal form (T) to address a young person (that is, a teenager or a child). With addressees of the same age, the form can be decided by other variables (the nature of the relationship, for example).

Address forms can also be determined by the age of the speaker; for instance, a Russian college student in her twenties might be more likely than a Russian woman in her seventies to address an acquaintance as T. In 4.1 above, we briefly discussed the distribution of the ages of the participants in our research project. In theory, we would be most likely to see variations in address due to participant age (generation) among the Russian data; the Russian volunteers’ ages ranged from 24 to 73. (The Polish and Czech participants’ ages ranged from 21 to 34 and 21 to 41, respectively.)

Our data does not reflect significant variations in address due to the age or generation of the participant. Of course, we gathered data from a relatively low number of consultants (fewer than fifteen in each language). In addition, the Russian data, in which generation might have been a determining factor, was obtained from native speakers of Russian who have been living in the United States for some time. Thus, a more accurate assessment of the role of age (and of other status-related factors) could be made by conducting the same project with a very large group of participants in the land where the language is spoken. Also, the participants’ ages would ideally vary a great deal, and native speakers of various generations would be represented.

6.2.6 Dialectal distribution of pragmatic phenomena

Another topic worthy of further study is the dialectal distribution of pragmatic phenomena. Specifically, with regard to certain situations presented on the research instrument, Polish seems to be on a continuum between Russian and Czech. As we noted
in Chapter 4, the dialogues supporting the scene in which professors are talking to each other (clip 6), the scene between a sergeant and a private (clip 13), and the scene between a terrorist and a hostage (clip 25) place Polish on a cline between Russian and Czech with regard to most common forms of address in those situations.

The facts of phonological features and their dialectal distribution across Slavic are well known among Slavists. For example, the phonological feature **palatalization** shows a clear distribution in a cline from Russian through Polish to Czech. Russian is characterized by phonemic palatalization; that is, “[a]ll nonpalatal consonants are opposed hard to soft [palatalized], except the dental affricate c” (Townsend and Janda 1996: 253). For example, we find the nonpalatalized [t] / palatalized [t’] alternation in R kot ‘cat’ [kot] / kote ‘cat (Lsg) [kot’e]’.

Polish, by contrast, has phonemic palatalization of labials and velars only: for instance, there is a contrast between pana ‘gentleman (Gsg)’ [pana] and piana ‘foam’ [p’ana] (Townsend and Janda 1996: 261). In addition, Polish has a system of palatal fricatives and affricates; “[i]n dentals palatalization ultimately produced palatals. Thus t / d / s / z / n yielded clearly corresponding palatal consonants č / dž / ś / ʑ / ň, which alternate in the same ways as R nonpalatalized-palatalized consonants do: P kot / kocie (R kot / kote)” (Townsend and Janda 1996: 263).

Czech, however, did not develop phonemic palatalization (as Russian and Polish did), nor did it develop palatal affricates and fricatives (as Polish did). Czech only preserves the hard-soft correlations t / d / n vs. t’ / d’ / ň (palatals) and r vs ř. “There are no other oppositions of paired consonants as palatal vs. non-palatal” (Townsend and Janda 1996: 269-270).
Thus, Russian has an extensive system of palatalized versus nonpalatalized consonants; Czech has no palatalized consonants, and only three palatals and ī. The consonant inventory of Polish with respect to palatalization, however, is somewhere in between Russian and Czech: Polish has palatalized vs. nonpalatalized labials and velars only, plus a system of palatal affricates and fricatives. We have chosen palatalization as an example of the distribution of phonological features in Russian, Polish, and Czech; there are others that are found along the same continuum as well.

The cline discussed above may not be limited to phonological features. In her article on case semantics, Janda (2002a) provides extensive evidence for a semantic / syntactic cline with regard to the meanings of cases in Russian, Polish, and Czech. We see an example of such a distribution when we examine nominative versus genitive usage in certain constructions (table reproduced from Janda 2002a: 364)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czech</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Today is/Tomorrow will be the fourth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Ivan is older than I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>NOM/GEN</td>
<td>GEN/NOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We do not wish to delve into the details of case semantics here; rather, we suggest that, like the widely accepted distribution of phonological features, case usage is distributed on a similar cline, with Russian and Czech in opposition, and Polish somewhere in the middle. Janda concludes:

The patterns of case contrasts, both in terms of the case meanings contrasted and their geographic distribution, are compelling. Of the 28 example sets presented... only four... fail to show a smooth West-East cline. All other case contrasts (the overwhelming majority) show a difference between Czech in the West and Russian in the East, with Polish
falling somewhere between (patterning with either Czech or Russian). This means that semantic dialect geography can be accomplished and can produce significant results. Ultimately it should be possible to add isoglosses marking alternative semantic construals to those marking phonological, morphological, and lexical alternatives in our dialectal atlases (Janda 2002a: 374).

The evidence presented in this dissertation suggests pragmatic / sociolinguistic phenomena can show a similar distribution. Preferred address forms in certain situations might also form a cline with Russian and Czech in opposition to each other, with Polish somewhere in between. The hypothesis that pragmatic phenomena might be similarly distributed could be tested by modifying the DVD script-writing project; we would suggest eliminating all situations in which mutual address is unanimously preferred (between family members, for instance) and adding situations similar to the ones most susceptible to variation (see section 4.3.2).

6.2.7 Third person address

Clip 27, which depicts the prime minister and a member of parliament speaking during a parliamentary session, reveals that in all three languages, not just Polish, third person address (what we label P usage) exits in limited circumstances. We expect P address in Polish, as in the example below:

posel: Panie premierze, to pan jest winny zwolnieniu 1000 pracowników we wschodnich landach.

premier: Czy pan myśli, że pozbawilibym pracy ludzi którzy pracują na nasz kraj...?

Member of Parliament: Mr. Prime Minister, it is you [P] who is [P] responsible for the firing of 1000 workers in the east.

Prime Minister: Do you [P] think [P] that I would fire people who work for our country...?

However, we also find a certain type of P address in both Russian and Czech under the same circumstances:
člen parlamenta: Popořu členov pravíščej partii ni imejščíx dostup v Internet vstať ‘
Member of Parliament: I ask the members of the ruling party (ask you [P]) who don’t
have access to the Internet to stand up.

Čz
člen sněmovny: Chci se pana premiéra zeptat, kdy hodlá konečně představit důkazy o
terorismu Iráku?
Member of Parliament: I want to ask the Prime Minister (ask you [P]) when he plans
(you plan [P]) to finally present evidence of Iraq’s terrorism?

Even in English, parliamentary procedure dictates third person address to some
extent. In the following statement from the chairman of a hearing of the Committee on
Armed Services, we find “The gentleman from Maryland is recognized and then the
gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Ryun” instead of “You are recognized, and then you”. Just
as in English address in Congress no doubt fluctuates between the third person of
parliamentary procedure and standard English “you”, address in the governing bodies of
Russia and Czech Republic must also fluctuate between V and third person to some
extent. Even more intriguing would be to examine parliamentary Polish and variations
between P, Ppl and Vpl.

6.2.8 Special problems pertaining to Polish

Early in the process of data analysis, we realized how complicated address in
Polish truly is. There are, first of all, many possible combinations of forms of address.

For example:

T: A može po prostu sknocijas ten film?
But maybe you simply botched [T] the film?

V (communist, dialectal): A co wyjść robili do tej porę? Pracowaliście gdzieś?
But what were you doing [V] until now? Were you working [V] somewhere?

P: Panie Mauer, co pan zrobił w sprawie kapitana Nowakowskiego?
Mr. Mauer, what did you [P] do [P] in the Captain Nowakowski affair?
P+T (nonstandard): _Za mało pan dalej!
You [P] gave [T] me too little!

Vpl: _Wy młodzi jesteś, a ja co?
You [Vpl] are [Vpl] young, but what about me?

Ppl: _Państwo się nie gniewaj, że prosilam wycierać nogi, ale...
You [Ppl] don't get mad [Ppl] that I asked you to wipe your feet, but...

Ppl+Vpl: _Mam wrażenie, że państwo coś przede mną ukrywacie.
I have the feeling that you [Ppl] are hiding [Vpl] something from me.

Not only does Polish have a system of polite address in the plural as well as the singular, the “rules” for polite address do not seem to hold in the plural; nor do they seem to apply uniformly for imperative use. The complexity of Polish data makes the task of documenting true asymmetrical address and switches in address, which we intended as the focus of this dissertation, very difficult.

Take, for instance, the following examples produced by volunteers in the script-writing project. The film clip that these dialogs support depicts a Master of Ceremonies addressing an audience; there is no further interaction between the MC and anyone in the theater. Some participants wrote dialogs with only Ppl forms, which is what we expected, as the situation is FORMAL and rather IMPERSONAL (UP and BIG). For example:

_Konferansjer mówi do publiczności: Witam państwa na naszym show. Witam bardzo bardzo serdecznie i zapraszam do zabawy!
MC speaking to audience: I welcome you [Ppl] to our show. I welcome you very very heartily and I invite you to the show!

In the example above we find address with a form of the Ppl mixed-gender collective _państwo_ ‘ladies and gentlemen’. However, other participants used a mix of Ppl and Vpl forms:

_Konferansjer mówi do publiczności: Wow! Drodzy, szanowni Państwo! Przed Państwem gwiazda estrady! Wciąż dla was błyszczy. A oto...sami zobaczcie i powitajcie! Brawa!
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MC speaking to audience: Wow! Dear, respected ladies and gentlemen! Before you [Ppl] is a star of the stage! Always shining for you [Vpl]. But here... see [Vpl] for yourself and welcome [Vpl] him! Bravo!

We have first a vocative form of the neuter collective: Państwo ‘ladies and gentlemen’.

Then we find the same noun in the instrumental: przed państwem, literally ‘before ladies and gentlemen’, translated into English, of course, as ‘before you [Ppl]’. However, the next use of a pronominal form is not a variant of państwo, but rather the genitive form of wy ‘you’: dla was ‘for you [Vpl]’. This is followed by two Vpl imperatives: A oto...sami zobaczcie i powitaście ‘But here... see [Vpl] for yourself and welcome [Vpl] him!’

Theoretically, Ppl and Vpl mean different things: Ppl (państwo) is FORMAL, IMPERSONAL, used to address a mixed-gender crowd; it is the plural equivalent of P. Vpl is supposed to be the plural equivalent T, the plural form used for INTIMATES in INFORMAL situations. However, the MC in the example above has no motivation for a shift from Ppl to Vpl. It seems, then, that the two forms might be equivalent.

Still other respondents used only Vpl forms:

Konferansjer mówi do publiczności: Dziękuję, dziękuję. Szanowni państwo, za chwilę zobaczycie. Tak. Wszyscy przed wami gwiazda wieczoru...

MC speaking to audience: Respected ladies and gentleman, in a moment you will see [Vpl]. Yes. Everyone before you [Vpl] is a star of the evening...

Even though the MC begins by using the vocative państwo, he uses a Vpl imperative and a Vpl instrumental form (przed wami 'before you')

This type of variation is not limited to the plural; among the data from the project detailed in Chapter 4, we found several variations in address. For the most part these were excluded from discussion in Chapter 5, but we present them here; most involve imperative use that does not “comply” with the form of address used otherwise. Polish imperatives, as we have noted (for instance, in sections 3.5.1.2, 4.2.8, 4.2.11, 5.3.1), tend
to take the form of T or Vpl, even when P or Ppl, respectively, has been used consistently elsewhere in the exchange.

In the first example, a customer and an attendant at a dry cleaning establishment engage in a business transaction (normally a mutual P event):

*Expedientka:* Dzień dobry, co mogę dla *pana* zrobić?
*Klient:* Odnaleźdź mój garnitur.
*Woman behind counter:* Good day, what can I do for you [P]?

The imperative\(^5\) form used is T, rather than the possible formal *Niech *pani* *odnajdzie* ‘Retrieve [P]’.

A scene in which a man is talking to a prostitute and her friend involves a variety of address forms:

*Mężczyzna:* Dzień dobry paniom! Czy któraś z szanownych pan? chce napać się ze mną szampana w mojej limuzynie? Właśnie wygrałem w kasynie i jestem najbogatszym człowiekiem w Las Vegas!
*Prostytutka:* I najbardziej pijany! Zjeżdżaj *pan*! Nie *zawracaj* nam głowy!
*Mężczyzna:* Nie wierzyć mi! Jestem szczęśliwy! Mam wielki dom z basenem i tysiąc służących! I trzysta samochodów! Nie prawda Joe? Mój kierowca paniom powie wszystko!! A wszystko to dzieki głupiemu Joe!!! Co za kretyn!
*Prostytutka:* Acha...już ci wierzę. Zjeżdżaj! Kolejny napity palancie!
*Mężczyzna:* Och te kobiety...

---

\(^5\) We further remind the reader of two examples eliminated from consideration in our analysis; both involved inconsistent imperative use, suggesting that perhaps imperatives do not always conform to the “rules” of address in any of the three languages:

*B*

*Kollega1:* Zdravstvujte, Lizočka!
*Kollega2:* Nu ja potom i govorju, davaj izmenim nagruzku.
*Coworker1:* Hello (lit. be well [V]) Lizočka!
*Coworker2:* Well I’ll do it later; I’m saying, let’s [T] change the workload.

*Cz*

*Professor1:* Tak kolego, co *jeste* dnes zabavil?
*Professor2:* Pójďte se podívat.
*Professor1:* Tehnle kříž?
*Professor2:* Jo, jedna studentka ho měla na krku. Představ si.
*Professor1:* So colleague, what did you [V] confiscate today?
*Professor2:* Come [V] take a look.
*Professor1:* This cross?
*Professor2:* Yeah, a student had it around her neck. *Imagine* [T].
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Man: Good day ladies! Would one of you honorable ladies [Ppl] like to drink champagne with me in my limousine? I just won at the casino and I’m the richest person in Las Vegas!
Prostitute: And the drunkest! You [P] get out [T] of here! Don’t bother [T] us!
Man: You don’t believe [Vpl] me! I’m lucky! I have a big house with a pool and a thousand servants! And three hundred cars! Isn’t that right, Joe? My driver will tell you [Ppl] everything! And everything is thanks to stupid Joe!!!! What a moron!
Prostitute: Aha... Now I believe you [T]. Get out [T] of here. Next drunk jerk!
Man: Oh these women...

The man begins address to both women with Ppl; however, he also addresses them as Vpl. The prostitute uses T forms fairly consistently, but she does use a P+T imperative:

Zjedzaj pan! ‘You [P] get out [T] of here!’

The following scene was included in our analysis but, the asymmetry is questionable because the imperative is the only form that appears as T.

Nieznanomi: Ma pani takie czyściutkie buciki
Nieznanoma: Proszę mi dać spokój.
Male stranger: You [P] have [P] such clean little shoes!
Female stranger: Please leave [T] me alone.

In the following, we find a V or possibly Vpl imperative with otherwise mutual P address:

Wencel: Czy pan był świadkiem zągnia, kiedy to porucznik Żwirski użył broni palnej przeciwko jednemu z nowych oficerów, na wysypisku miejskim?
Franz: Nic mi o tym nie wiadomo. Spytajcie Ola, on będzie wiedział najlepiej, kogo ostatnio zabił...
Wencel: Pan mi nie udziela rad! To pan stoi przed Komisją, a nie ja.
Franz: Czasy się zmieniają, ale pan zawsze jest w Komisjach...
Kobieta z Komisji: Czy jest pan gotów stać na strażę porządku prawnego, odnowionej, demokratycznej Rzeczpospolitej Polski?
Wencel: Were [P] you [P] a witness to the brawl when lieutenant Żwirski used a firearm against one of the new officers at the city dump?
Franz: I don’t know anything about it. Ask [V? / Vpl?] Olo, he’ll know better who he killed lately...
Franz: Times change, but you’re [P] always on the Commissions...
Woman from the Commission: Are [P] you [P] prepared to stand guard of law and order, of the renewed democratic Republic of Poland?
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Thus, imperative use appears to be very inconsistent at best. The less formal T and Vpl forms are often used, even when address is otherwise consistently with P or Ppl. The fact that similar (though not nearly as extensive) variation was also found in Russian and Czech suggests that perhaps there is something about the status or function of the imperative that is different from other forms.

We have also seen evidence that, in Polish, Vpl is a generic plural and Ppl is used only in extremely formal situations. Notice the woman in the example below uses P address in the singular, but Vpl when she addresses the entire group:

**Pracownica muzeum:** Proszę bardzo.
**Agnieszka:** My jesteśmy z telewizji, pani wie. Dzwoniłem do pani.
**Pracownica muzeum:** Tak, dyrektor uprzedzał mnie; prosił żebym wam pomogła. ...O czym to ma być film właściwie, proszę pani? Dyrektor interesuje się tym bardzo. Czy pani ma jakiś scenariusz?
**Agnieszka:** Tak...
**Pracownica muzeum:** No, czego wy szukacie... chciałabym wiedzieć.
**Museum worker:** Yes?
**Agnieszka:** We’re from the television station, you [P] know [P]. You [P] were contacted. Museum worker: Yes, the director informed me; he asked me to help you [Vpl]. ...What exactly is this film supposed to be about, if you [P] please? The director is very interested in it. Do you [P] have [P] some kind of script?
**Agnieszka:** Yes...
**Museum worker:** Hey, what are you [Vpl] looking for [Vpl]? ...I’d like to know.

Other combinations of forms of address are also common. In the following example, we find Vpl, P+T, and an infinitive used as an imperative:

**Jodła:** Panowie, no co jest? Pospaliście się? Grać! No, grajże pan! Panowie, panowie! Chodźcie tutaj! Szybciej! Mistrzu! No, przecież trzeba grać! Szybciej!... Przecież wszyscy czekają tu na was!
**Jodła:** Gentlemen, what is this? Have you fallen asleep [Vpl]? Play! Well, you [P] play [T]! Gentlemen! Gentlemen! Come [Vpl] here! Faster! Master! Well after all, you need to play! Faster!...After all, everybody here is waiting for you [Vpl]!

The P+T form grajże pan ‘play [T] you [P]’ is used as an enticement; it is not the formal language of communism (although this is a very communist setting; the speaker is
urging a brass band to keep playing to encourage the workers at a bricklaying demonstration).

Finally, we see another instance of P+T address, Vpl, and T address in the dialog below:

_Franz:_ _W Polskich Nagraniach, idź tam Dziadek na łowę talentów._
_Stopczyk:_ No, _kończnie flaszkę i do domu. W nocy ognisko..._ 
_Olo:_ _Duże tego?_ 
_Stopczyk:_ No, ze trzy ciężarówki. _Franz, piłeś najmniej, pójdźesz ze mną do szefa. A reszta spać, żebyście mi w nocy nie marudzili._ 
_Franz:_ _At Polskie Nagrania, you [P] go [T] there as a talent scout._ 
_Stopczyk:_ Well, _finish [Vpl]_ the bottle and let's go home. There's a fire tonight. 
_Olo:_ A big one? 
_Stopczyk:_ Well, three trucks' worth. _Franz, you’ve had the least to drink [T], you'll come [T]_ with me to see the boss. The rest of you sleep, _so you [Vpl]_ don't dally on me tonight._

The group of coworkers is clearly close; they address each other with mutual T and the intimate formal Vpl. The P+T is a nonstandard form “more polite” (Stone 1981a: 66 calls it a “compromise” form) than T by virtue of the use of _dziadek_ ‘grandfather’ as a form of address to the oldest member of the group.

There seem to be two tendencies that complicate the establishment of address as symmetrical, asymmetrical, or other in Polish:

1) Vpl and Ppl often seem interchangeable; if a situation requires formal address, P is frequently used in the singular, but Vpl can be used alongside or instead of Ppl. It seems that Vpl is, or is becoming, a generic plural, and that Ppl might be reserved only for very formal situations.

2) Speakers, when using both singular and plural imperatives, often shy away from P or Ppl forms and instead use T or Vpl forms, even when the rest of the address forms are consistently P or Ppl. We also note that of all the lexical categories that can show T, V, or
P address, imperatives in all three languages appear most susceptible to variation or perhaps simply inconsistency on the part of the speaker (or writer).

We acknowledge that we have not done the system of Polish address justice in this dissertation. Further study is most definitely needed not only on the issue of asymmetrical address and switches, but also on the syntax of plural address and the status of imperatives in the address systems of Polish as well as Russian and Czech.

6.2.9 The syntax of address in Russian, Polish, and Czech

One of the original intents of my research on address was to devise a way to account for the agreement issues that arise in Russian, Polish, and Czech when a speaker addresses a person in the plural or third person. Through an analysis in the framework of Head Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG), I had hoped to account for, for example, the variation in syntactic realizations of the predicates in agreement with V. For instance, in Russian the short-form adjective is syntactically plural even though the addressee is singular, as seen in the following example:

*Babuška:* *Bud’te zdorovy, Il’ja Il’ič.*
*Grandmother:* *Be*[V] *well* *[V]*, *Il’ja Il’ič.*

In Czech, however, the short-form adjective is singular, as demonstrated below:

*Neznáte tady nikoho? Můžu vám pomoci já?*
*Jste velmi těšliv.*
*You don’t know anybody here? May I help you?*
*You are* *[V]* *very kind.*

In Polish, the collective *państwo* ‘ladies and gentlemen’ also presents interesting agreement issues. In the present tense, for example, the pronoun agrees in number with the real-world addressees (that is, with ‘ladies and gentlemen’, a group of people owed honor, so the verb is plural) as in the following sentence:
Dlaczego państwo nie chcę odpowiadać na moje pytania?
Why don't you [Ppl] want [Ppl] to answer my questions?

But, as we noted above in 6.2.8, państwo can have second person agreement as well, as
this past tense example demonstrates:

Byliśmy państwo tego pewni, że nie miał dziewczyny?
Were [Vpl] you [Ppl] sure he didn't have a girl?

These are just two examples of the many permutations of agreement patterns that can
arise with third person address (in Polish as well as in nonstandard Czech).

A syntactic study of pronominal address would be a welcome addition to the
body of research done in Slavic syntax, which is small when compared to, for instance,
work done in Slavic phonology and morphology. Also, scholars working on syntactic
problems have traditionally avoided the topic of pronouns of address in many languages;
the nature of the agreement relation with respect to forms of address presents significant
challenges for those working in various formalisms.

6.3 In conclusion

The way we use language involves our perception of ourselves, our interlocutors,
and the physical world we live in. It is through cognitive and psychological processes that
we make connections between the tangible and the intangible, and this is reflected in our
language. Speakers of the three languages under consideration in this dissertation --
Russian, Polish, and Czech -- have implemented metaphorical motivations for polite
address in various ways, thus producing the systems of honorifics we have in the
languages today.

Speakers of Russian, Polish, and Czech categorize interlocutors and their
relationships with them in terms of spatial relations, which themselves are concepts
fundamental to cognition and motivate other semantic phenomena in the Slavic languages. This dissertation is an attempt to shed light on how social relations, grammar, and cognition intersect in the implementation of forms of address. In our analysis of asymmetry and switches, phenomena somewhat outside the norms of address, we hope to have revealed part of the cognitive mechanism that has produced such interesting and widely varying address systems.


### APPENDIX A: PRONOUNS AND THEIR RELATED FORMS

#### A.1 Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg [T]</td>
<td>pl, also sg formal [Vpl, V]</td>
<td>pl informal, sg formal¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>ty</td>
<td>vy</td>
<td>ty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>tebja</td>
<td>vas</td>
<td>ciebie, cię</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>tebe</td>
<td>vam</td>
<td>tobie, ci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>tebja</td>
<td>vas</td>
<td>ciebie, cię</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>toboj</td>
<td>vami</td>
<td>toboj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>tebe</td>
<td>vas</td>
<td>tobie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Polish formal pronouns of address [P, Ppl]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>pan</td>
<td>panowie</td>
<td>pani</td>
<td>panie</td>
<td>państwo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>pana</td>
<td>panów</td>
<td>pani</td>
<td>pani</td>
<td>państwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>panu</td>
<td>panom</td>
<td>pani</td>
<td>paniom</td>
<td>państwu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>pana</td>
<td>panów</td>
<td>paniq</td>
<td>panie</td>
<td>państwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>panem</td>
<td>panama</td>
<td>paniq</td>
<td>paniami</td>
<td>państwem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>panu</td>
<td>panach</td>
<td>pani</td>
<td>paniach</td>
<td>państwu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A.2 Possessive adjectives²

#### Russian possessive adjectives, nominative forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masc sg</th>
<th>fem sg</th>
<th>neut sg</th>
<th>pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>tvoj</td>
<td>tvoja</td>
<td>tvoje</td>
<td>tvoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V, Vpl</td>
<td>vaš</td>
<td>vaša</td>
<td>vaše</td>
<td>vaši</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Polish possessive adjectives, nominative forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masc sg</th>
<th>fem sg</th>
<th>neut sg</th>
<th>vir pl</th>
<th>pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>twój</td>
<td>twoja</td>
<td>twoje</td>
<td>twoi</td>
<td>twoje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V, Vpl</td>
<td>wasz</td>
<td>wasza</td>
<td>wasze</td>
<td>wasi</td>
<td>wasze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>pański</td>
<td>pańska</td>
<td>pańskie</td>
<td>pańscy</td>
<td>pańskie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Wy [V] was the singular formal pronoun of Polish communists. In our data we have examples of wy in this usage, but we note that it is not the current standard formal/polite pronoun.

² We present only the nominative forms of these adjectives here.

---
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### Czech possessive adjectives, nominative forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masc sg</th>
<th>fem sg</th>
<th>neut sg</th>
<th>masc pl</th>
<th>fem pl</th>
<th>neut pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>tvůj</td>
<td>tvá</td>
<td>tvoje</td>
<td>tví, tvoji</td>
<td>tvé, tvoje</td>
<td>tvá, tvoje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V, Vpl</td>
<td>váš</td>
<td>vaše</td>
<td>vaše</td>
<td>vaši</td>
<td>vaše</td>
<td>vaše</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A.3 Verbs

#### Russian čitat’ ‘read’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sg [T]</th>
<th>pl, sg formal [Vpl, V]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nonpast</td>
<td>čítaš</td>
<td>čítaete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>čital(a)</td>
<td>čitali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>by čital(a)</td>
<td>by čitali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>čitaj!</td>
<td>čitajte!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Polish czytać ‘read’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sg [T]</th>
<th>pl informal, sg formal [Vpl, V]</th>
<th>sg formal</th>
<th>pl formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nonpast</td>
<td>czytasz</td>
<td>czytacie</td>
<td>pan czyta</td>
<td>pani czyta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>czytałeś, czytałaś</td>
<td>czytałość, czytałość</td>
<td>pan czytał</td>
<td>pani czytała</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>czytałbyś, czytałabyś</td>
<td>czytałabyście, czytałabyście</td>
<td>pan czytałby</td>
<td>pani czytałaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>czytaj!</td>
<td>czytajcie!</td>
<td>niech pan czyta!</td>
<td>niech pani czyta!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Czech číst ‘read’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sg [T]</th>
<th>pl [Vpl]</th>
<th>sg formal [V]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nonpast</td>
<td>čteš</td>
<td>čtete</td>
<td>čtete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>četl(a) jsí</td>
<td>četl jste, četly jste</td>
<td>četl(a) jste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>četl(a) bys</td>
<td>četl byste, četly byste</td>
<td>četl(a) byste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>čtí!</td>
<td>čtěte!</td>
<td>čtěte!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C: BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH PROJECT

### For Russian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d*</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g*</th>
<th>h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Novokuzneck, Russia</td>
<td>Kazan’, Tatarstan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ul’janovsk, Russia</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Kazan’, Tatarstan</td>
<td>Moskva, Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native language</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For Polish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f*</th>
<th>g*</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td>Radom, Poland</td>
<td>Dębica, Poland</td>
<td>Kraków, Poland</td>
<td>Kielce, Poland</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brzóźno, Poland</td>
<td>Racibórz, Poland</td>
<td>Kraków, Poland</td>
<td>Kraków, Poland</td>
<td>Krynica, Poland</td>
<td>Kraków, Poland</td>
<td>Kraków, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native language</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For Czech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td>Česká Lípa, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Praha, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Příbram, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Teplice, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Brandýs nad Labem, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Praha, Czech Republic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Trutnov, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Hradec Králové, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Sušice, Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native language</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* participant chose not to give biographical information
APPENDIX D: WORKS USED IN CREATION OF DVD FOR RESEARCH PROJECT

Film:

Air Force One

The apostle

Arthur

As good as it gets

Babe

A Christmas story

Clueless

Forrest Gump

Guys and dolls

Indiana Jones: The last crusade

Kolja

Moskva slezam ne verit (Moscow doesn't believe in tears)

The Shawshank redemption

Služebnyj roman (Office Romance)

Wayne's world

Television:

Absolutely fabulous: “Poor”

British parliament on C-span

Buffy the vampire slayer: “Surprise”
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