

Acta Linguistica Hungarica, Vol. 57 (1), pp. 29–52 (2010)
DOI: 10.1556/ALing.57.2010.1.2

VARIABILITY IN HUNGARIAN ADDRESS FORMS*

ÁGNES DOMONKOSI

Department of Hungarian Language
Eszterházy Károly College
Eszterházy tér 1.
H-3300 Eger
Hungary
dagnes@ektf.hu

Abstract: This paper discusses characteristics of the variability in Hungarian address forms on the basis of questionnaire and interview data. Based on the results of her sociolinguistic study (Domonkosi 2002), the author argues that, beyond the dichotomy of T vs. V form, the Hungarian address system has a number of address variants of different social indexical value, which define the typical use and functions of the distinct variants. The analysis demonstrates that there are differences in the address of different age groups that are indicative of change in address in Hungarian. The paper also reports on intradyadic variability in address, the possible functions of switching of address and the correlation between the nature of the relationship vs. the number and type of possible address variants. The findings show that in today's Hungarian address switching between T and V form indicates a change in the quality of the relationship, that a dynamic switching back and forth between T and V forms is not usual, and that variants of nominal address forms signal emotional shades of meaning in relationships. The study also discusses possibilities of transfer of address and typical changes in the value of address forms, illustrating with empirical data how Hungarian kinship terms are used in non-literal ways.

Keywords: address forms, T and V forms, variability, social deixis, transfer of address

* I would like to thank the members of the Functional linguistics workshop of Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, for their feedback and suggestions during the writing of this paper, as well as Anna Fenyvesi for translating the paper into English.

1. Introduction: Aims and methods

Addressing the communicative partner is the linguistic means which signals the relationship between the interlocutors most directly and most verifiably for the interlocutors themselves, thereby contributing to the creation of social and interpersonal reality.

The primary aim of my earlier study, Domonkosi (2002), of the Hungarian address system was to provide—in the framework of variationist sociolinguistics—an overview of address forms occurring in typical social relations and situations. The data collection and analysis of that investigation raised important further issues to study besides providing several general conclusions. In the present paper I aim to investigate three issues concerning the variability of Hungarian address forms which my earlier sociolinguistic study brought up but which have conversation analytical and pragmatic relevance as well.

This paper aims to demonstrate—through the results of an empirical investigation—that the Hungarian system of address and its recent changes cannot be described in terms of a system based on the dichotomy of the T and V forms,¹ as a binary system, but only as one defined through several choices of address, each with its social values. In the course of the description of the system a generational differentiation of address forms has been identified, which, in turn, indicates the possibility of change in progress in the address system.² The paper also aims to show what kind of variability in address exists within specific dyads. Finally, an important goal of the paper is to discuss characteristics of usage of address-specific linguistic elements, as well as the extendibility of address form usage and possible changes in value of some address forms.

By discussing these characteristics and emphasizing the dynamic nature of the variability of address forms, I intend to complement and refine the overall picture of the Hungarian system of address, so far ap-

¹ Following Brown and Gilman's (1960) dichotomous view of address introduced in their classic paper, T stands for informal, while V for formal, official, more distanced address.

² Elements used in varying degrees of frequency in younger age groups can be indicative of change, since among the partial norms co-existing in the same society it is the group norm of the younger generation that plays an important role in shaping the language use of the next generation. In evaluating the differences between the different age groups, however, age-grading—i.e., changes correlated with a particular phase in life and repeated in successive generations—also needs to be taken into consideration.

proached from sociolinguistic (Tóth 1983; Kiss 1993; Reményi 1994; 2000; Angelusz–Tardos 1995; 2000; 2003; Sándor 1996; Beregszászi–Csernicskó 1998; Dömötör 2005) and pragmatic (Fülei-Szántó 1994; Nyomárkay 1998/1999; Szili 2000; 2003) points of view.

The empirical data for this study was collected via questionnaires and interviews between 2000 and 2002, with Hungarian major students at the Eszterházy Károly Teacher Training College acting as fieldworkers. A questionnaire containing 110 direct questions was used to elicit forms of address used by the informants. Following Braun (1988, 212–54), the first part of the questionnaire contained a table listing various members of the informant's social network (e.g., family members, neighbors, school, workplace, strangers, personnel in administrative offices, the waiter, the police officer, the doctor) differentiated by gender and relative age, asking the informant to indicate their choice of V vs. T, pronoun used, and nominal address form used towards and by the given interlocutor. The table was supplemented by questions eliciting informants' opinions regarding the stylistic value and range of usage of various address forms, as well as about what address forms they find unusual or strange in what situations.

The results of the questionnaire survey are further refined by data collected via sociolinguistic interviews: a larger group of informants filled in the questionnaires, and it is a subset of these informants that the interviews were carried out with. The interviews lasted an hour on the average and were audio recorded, and the informants were asked direct questions regarding the address forms used with interlocutors in their social networks.

In the choice of the sample of informants, I considered the population to which the results should be generalizable to be the entire population of Hungary.³ Informants were chosen to represent both genders, four age groups, three settlement types, and three levels of education ($2 \times 4 \times 3 \times 3 = 72$ cells). The four age groups were determined on the basis of the phases of linguistic socialization (10–18, 18–35, 35–55, and over 55 years of age). The three levels of education were primary, secondary, and tertiary education. Settlement types were differentiated as villages, towns, vs. cities, with cities being defined as towns of county rank (in the

³ It is important to note that the collected data can be generalized only to Hungary since several small scale studies have demonstrated that minority Hungarians outside Hungary use somewhat different forms in their systems of address (cf. Raffai 1998, 179–88; Beregszászi–Csernicskó 1998, 171–8; Göncz 1999, 146).

Hungarian administrative system, centers of the 19 counties plus 5 other large towns) and Budapest.

Eight informants per group (i.e., cell), or a total of 576 informants, were studied in the questionnaire survey, all of them filling out the questionnaires. Interviews were carried out with one person from each group, totaling 72 informants. This subset sample is, thus, able to show the differentiation of the choice of address forms by the social variables.

In my analysis I treat data from the questionnaire survey and the interviews as indicative of the speakers' view of the address system (rather than their actual usage) and the social stereotypical values attached to the various address forms (cf. Ervin-Tripp 1972, 219; Agha 2007, 282).

2. The functions of address

Address forms differ from other linguistic elements in that they always carry social meanings in addition to their primary meaning, as well as reference to the place occupied by them in the social system of relationships. The social function of variability in address is varied: variability duly signals, on the one hand, the multiplicity of social relationships, while, on the other hand, the numerous roles and emotional shades that can occur within the dynamics of one and the same relationship.

2.1. Address forms as sociolinguistic variables

As far as the function of address forms is concerned, early sociolinguistic approaches assign a definite social value to the grammatical differentiation of the 2nd person: differentiating between the two address pronouns as manifestations of power and solidarity semantics, Brown and Gilman's (1960) classic study suggests that the T forms signal closeness, solidarity, equality and intimacy, while the V forms underline distance, power, an asymmetrical relationship, and respect. Braun's (1988) overview and evaluation of research on address regards many of the works oversimplifying because they do not take combinations of ways of address into consideration but try to establish a clear-cut hierarchy between forms, disregarding the fact that they do not differ in degree but are used in very different types of relationships. In her view, classic interpretations of address forms (Brown–Gilman 1960; Brown–Ford 1961; Ervin-Tripp 1972) apply a sociolinguistic point of view, while in fact approaching

them from what she calls a “systemlinguistic” aspect, since they posit a closed system of address valid homogeneously for an entire society (Braun 1988, 18–24). In applying sociolinguistic methods consistently, however, it is important to note that speakers of different social backgrounds may relate to the various address forms differently, that is, within a community various group norms apply. Clyne et al. (2009) is a comprehensive work describing the use of English, French, German and Swedish address forms and on-going changes in these address systems, with special attention given to variation within these languages.

In my investigation I have studied address forms within the framework of sociolinguistics, aiming to take into account the critique of the sociolinguistic approach. On the one hand, I considered it important to demonstrate group norms, especially, age-based differences, and, on the other hand, during the interpretation of the results, I did not only consider forms of address, but also their typical combinations.

2.2. Address as social deixis

Variationist sociolinguistic descriptions of address can be supplemented by a pragmatic interpretation of address forms as well, due to the fact that they should always be interpreted in the context of an utterance and refer to a discourse participant—that is, they function as deictic elements. The notion of deixis proposed by Lyons (1968, 240) as encompassing person, space and time deixis was supplemented by Fillmore (1975, 76) with social deixis, a concept discussed in more detail by Levinson (1979, 206–23). Levinson (1983, 89) uses the notion of social deixis to refer to linguistic elements which refer to the social identity of the participants or the relationship between them or between one of them and a third person or phenomenon. He categorizes the differentiated 2nd person pronouns and address forms as elements of social deixis (1979, 207; 1983, 90).

The deictic role of elements referring to conversation participants is twofold: first, they mark participant roles, and, second, they also signal the nature of the relationship between the participants. That is, in Levinson’s terms, they function as means of both person and social deixis (1979, 207; 1983, 90). Verschueren (1999, 20–1) differentiates within the notion of social deixis between person and attitude deixis exactly in order to differentiate between these two functions.

Deictic expressions are interpreted in relation to the deictic center: the center of social deixis is defined by the social role of the speaker and

their status or role in society, and the social role of the addressee is interpreted in relation to these. The deictic center can be transferred to other participants of the speech situation depending on the intention of the speaker (Levinson 1983, 63–4). Lyons calls this phenomenon deictic projection, while Fillmore refers to it as a shift in point of view (Lyons 1977, 579; Fillmore 1975; Levinson 1983, 64). The transfer of deictic address can be perceived from the separation of the speaker's voice and the in-built point of view: in social deixis it is not uncommon for the speaker to relate the addressee's social position not to themselves but to another important participant of the relationship, for instance, for a husband to call his wife *anya* 'mom', using the address form in relation to their child. In such cases it is not the deictic center of the whole utterance that is transferred, only that of the depiction of the conversation partner.

In this paper I apply pragmatic and sociolinguistic approaches in the way that, in interpreting the results, I point out how transfer of point of view is influenced by various social factors, too, and, second, in interpreting ways of address I take the fact into account that switching between the different variants can carry a social meaning.

3. Forms of address in Hungarian

Address forms involve several linguistic means in Hungarian: pronouns, personal verbal and nominal (possessive) suffixes, as well as a variety of nominal forms (names, titles, honorifics, and other vocatives). In Hungarian, T vs. V is based on the dichotomy of 2nd vs. 3rd person reference to interlocutors. The verbs can reflect the T/V distinction through their personal inflection by themselves, without a subject pronoun.

In case of the T form, the pronoun is *te* (and *ti* in the plural), and all person markers used (possessive and verbal) are 2nd person as well.

V is further differentiated in Hungarian: there is a choice of pronoun (*ön* in the singular and *önök* in the plural vs. *maga* in the singular and *maguk* in the plural—each co-occurring with 3rd person possessives and verbs), as well as a choice of these vs. zero pronoun (with 3rd person) vs. the structure involving *tetszik*. This range of choices mirrors the great range of social relationships in Hungarian. In addition to these, forms such as archaic *kegyed* and *magácska*, used only towards women, can also fulfill the role of 3rd person pronominal address forms, but their use

is very limited today. The T form does not simply stand in opposition to the V form, but the various kinds of the V form are individually in opposition with T as well as with each other. Of the kinds of V, neither can be regarded as neutral and default, since all have a specific stylistic value and range of use.

One of the impetuses for change in the Hungarian system of address is exactly the fact that no neutral and general V pronoun has ever developed in Hungarian. The use of the pronoun *maga/maguk* in reference to an interlocutor dates back to the 18th century (Mátai 1999, 456). The evaluation of its use has been problematic ever since then: most likely it was never in general use by itself, without generally used nominal elements (cf. Zolnai 1897, 165; Sinor 1974, 545–52), even despite the fact that in some dialect areas it is the only V pronoun (Kiss 1993, 273).

The creation of *ön/önök* in the early 19th century was part of the search for a solution to this problem: it was formed through back-formation from *önmaga* ‘himself/herself’ and *önként* ‘voluntarily’. Traditionally *ön* is a more respectful, official and polite form than *maga* (cf. Grétsy–Kovalovszky 1985, 88).

A special place is occupied among ways of V by the phenomenon called *tetszikelés*, that is, the auxiliary verb-like use of the verb *tetszik* ‘please’ + infinitive, a construction documented since the early 18th century. *Tetszik* address can also co-occur with the use of the pronouns *ön* and *maga*. When it co-occurs with pronoun avoidance, it becomes a separate way of addressing.

The verbal and pronominal address forms can combine with different nominal forms (such as first name, last name, and titles), and the typical combinations can reflect different types of social relationship.

4. Variants and changes in address

The results of my investigation show that the T and V forms constitute distinct ways of address with pronouns and nominal forms which typically combine with them and which are used in distinct types of relationships to provide distinct social indexical values. The changes in today’s system of Hungarian address can also be described globally if it is considered not as a dichotomy between T vs. V, but as the variants of the interrelationship of the pronominal and nominal forms and their absence.

4.1. Variants and functions of the T form

The most conspicuous change in the address system is the continuous spread of the T form use at the expense of the V forms. Accordingly, as evidenced by my findings, T can also be used in various types of relationships and the different nominal forms of address create stylistic differences as well as are associated with different social indexical values.

The T form is traditionally combined with first name and nickname forms: the reciprocal use of such forms signals a close and intimate relationship as well as equality between the interlocutors.

One of the most important directions in which the use of T is spreading is into unequal but intimate relationships. One of the main starting points for the change is the family: according to my findings, mutual T within the family first occurred in urban, intellectual circles. In the over 55 age group, T used towards parents is found in 13.88% of the cases, in the 35–55 group in 61.8%, and in the 18–35 group in 90.9% of the cases. Among those under 18, V towards parents is virtually nonexistent. In this, youngest age group, even V towards grandparents occurs in only 8.33% of the cases. Within family usage T is now increasingly used with kinship terms as well as in first name + *néni/bácsi* ‘aunt/uncle’ combinations.

At the same time, intimate, solidary, but unequal relationships outside the family can also adopt T, combined in this case with honorifics and titles. The function of such combinations is the expression of respect, usually towards an older addressee of higher rank. A considerable number of my informants (63.11%) use such address combinations, which, according to opinions voiced in the interviews, are regarded as polite intermediary forms between T and V (cf. Clyne et al. 2009, 43, 155).

Another direction of change is that T is also spreading into equal but non-intimate relationships among younger speakers. The upper age limit on the use of mutual T due solely to shared membership in the same age group was earlier estimated at 24 (Guszkova 1981, 29), however, my data show that it is now in the 30–35 age range. In the age group of 18- to 35-year-olds T is chosen with unfamiliar interlocutors of the same age or younger in the street when asking for information (84.02%), when addressing a shop assistant (79.86%), or a waiter (72.22%). The T form in these cases is accompanied by a lack of nominal address forms—probably due to the fact that there are no neutral nominal address forms in

Hungarian that could be used with mutual T in the absence of knowledge of the interlocutor's first name.

This, in my view, is indicative of the development of a social indexical role of T without nominal forms in Hungarian, namely, that of solidarity (without intimacy) based on shared (young) age (cf. Paulston 1976).

That is, as evidenced by data on the co-occurrence of the T form with other forms of address, T in Hungarian is used in three main variants of address: (i) with a first name or kinship term, showing intimacy even when accompanied by a considerable difference in age; (ii) with a honorary kinship term, title or honorific, signaling intimacy together with respect and difference in rank; and (iii) with a lack of nominal forms, indexing age-based solidarity but no intimacy in the usage of those younger than 35.

4.2. Variants and functions of the V form

Changes regarding V are closely connected with the spread of T, since it is at the expense of the former that this is happening. In today's language use, V is expressed with (i) *maga*, (ii) *ön*, (iii) zero pronoun with 3rd person concord, and (iv) the construction involving *tetszik*, as mentioned above.

The variants of V are more easily perceived than those of T due to the different choices in pronouns and are, therefore, more refined and stronger than in the second person. The reason is that the average speaker connects the indexical values metonymically to the pronouns (Agha 2007, 288).

4.2.1. The functions and evaluation of *maga*

The pronoun *maga* and its various combinations have the most and greatest variety of stereotypic values associated with them among the various social groups, that is, these are the variants whose use is judged most controversial. This is well exemplified by the fact that 59.37% of the informants mentioned the negative, offensive role that the pronoun *maga* plays—the proportion is even higher (81.25%) among those under 35: most of them report that they can only imagine its use in offensive contexts, even if combined with first name or a nominal address form, and 76.04% say they never use it. The current narrowing of the use of the pronoun can be explained by the fact that since it is not considered to be

offensive only either between equal and close interlocutors or in an asymmetrical relationship when used by the more highly placed interlocutor, the younger generation do not recognize the closeness in the relationship where *maga* is motivated by it and assign offensiveness to all occurrences of it since they widely use mutual T in similar relationships.

Several rural resident informants, however, said that they do not use *ön* towards anyone in their village since *maga* is the accepted form of address. Despite this, *maga* is avoided by even those younger informants whose vernacular dialect has only *maga* in it since they use it only in their village. When they go to towns and communicate with people they are not familiar with, they avoid the use of *maga*, reacting to a very different evaluation of it outside the village. A young rural male voiced his stand in the following manner:

Csak a közvetlen környezetemben használom, falusi stílus, de abban a környezetben ez van rendben. [I only use it in my immediate environment, it's rural style, but there it is completely fine.]

Based on the results of the questionnaire and on my own observations I can venture to state that speakers reject the use of the pronoun *maga* more widely when asked to reflect on their own language use than in their actual language use, since the pronoun is very much used in non-official relationships where expressing respect is not an issue.

Maga is used mutually when combined with first name in close and equal relationships, and in asymmetrical but non-distant and non-impersonal relationships the interlocutor in the superordinate position can use it. Such use is more restricted among the under 35 generation since it is replaced by T in most close and equal relationships.

Combining the pronoun *maga* with titles/honorifics (+ last names) in situations where expression of respect and authority is emphasized is stratified strongly not only by age but also by place of residence: 41.14% of rural informants but only 9.11% of urban informants reported on such usage.

4.2.2. The functions and evaluation of *ön*

With the shrinking of the use of *maga*, however, *ön* address is being used in an ever widening range of situations: according to the results of my survey, speakers in their teens and 20s do not perceive it as overly official or excessively respectful, cold, manneristic or artificial.

Considerable differences are found in the usage of the various age groups: the younger the age group, the wider the use of *ön*, at the expense of *maga*.

Combined with first name it is used in close V relationships, especially by speakers under 35, who consider this a suitable combination to address co-workers with if V is used. Knowing the distancing nature of *ön* and the personal nature of first name address, such a combination of elements may seem unusual, but perhaps it developed exactly to soften the stiffness of the pronoun. This variant closely corresponds to the *Sie* + first name combination in contemporary German usage (Hickey 2003, 415; Clyne et al. 2009, 155) and to *vous* + first name combination in French (*ibid.*, 43, 155).

The distancing, official function of *ön* is thus softening, and, perhaps forecasting the direction of future change, fulfilling for all age groups the function of the general V pronoun.

Without nominal elements to accompany it, the pronoun *ön* is used to address unfamiliar interlocutors, where the pronoun signals politeness expressed on the part of the speaker rather than indexing the social rank or position of the addressee. The latter function of the pronoun can be, however, discerned in official written discourse (e.g., letters) and spoken discourse addressed to larger audiences on radio and television. Combined with address forms referring to rank and position, it is the most general address variant used in status-marked settings, where it is used by all age groups as a form expressing great respect. In official situations requiring increased politeness 89.06% of the informants gave this form as the suitable one.

4.2.3. The function of zero pronoun V

The lack of a general V pronoun explains the fact that V with no pronoun used became a separate variant today. A typical reason for opting for pronoun avoidance is quoted by the following secondary school educated female informant from a small town:

*Én soha nem mondom senkinek azt, hogy maga, mert valahogy az a maga az olyan pórias, olyan közönségesebb. Valahogy olyan durvának tűnik. Az ön meg már nekem túl finom. Tehát a kettő között én szépen elevickélek mind a két szó használata nélkül. [I never address anyone with *maga*, because *maga* is kind of so plebeian, kind of coarse. Somehow it feels uncouth. And then *ön* feels too genteel to me. So I flounder along between the two, without using either word.]*

4.2.4. The functions and evaluation of the *tetszik* form

The construction involving *tetszik* has become a form of address in order to refine V, and on the basis of my findings it seems that it can become a way of address independent of *maga* and *ön* address in some types of social relationships. My data show that this type of address is used differently by the various age groups and the differences are linked to the different social roles fulfilled by it.

In the usage of children and young people, the *tetszik* form is markedly separated from other ways of V: my questionnaire data show that 90.27% of the children under 14 use it as the only address form towards their teachers and unfamiliar adults, and that most of them do not use *maga* or *ön* address at all, instead avoiding address whenever possible. Address with *maga* or *ön* occurs to some extent in the usage of 14- to 16-year-olds. This form has thus become a permanent form of the expression of the inequality of the relationship between adult and child.

In addition, *tetszik* is also used in close but non-equal relationships, especially when there is a large age difference between the interlocutors: it can be regarded as general usage towards older people, averaging at a 97.04% rate of usage for all age groups. In this function it can be combined with a wide range of nominal address forms.

Among those older than 35 there is another typical use of *tetszik*, namely, it is used in the service industry, even towards interlocutors of the same age in order to express a high degree of politeness and courtesy. The usually asymmetrical use of *tetszik* often turns mutual in this situation.

According to my findings, the *tetszik* + infinitive structure characterizes various social relationships as a basic tool of politeness: first, it is the most important means of address by children towards adults, second, as a typical form of address in close but non-equal relationships with a considerable age difference between the interlocutors, and third, it expresses politeness adding an extra option to the choice of *maga* vs. *ön* address.

4.3. Tendencies of change

In address use, variation is based mostly on age: in the usage of the under 35 age group there is a higher rate of the use of T, a lower rate of the use of *maga* together with a higher rate of the use of *ön*, while *tetszik* is used in intimate and close relationships with older interlocutors.

The functions of T also change: nowadays it can express equality of rank and even respect in addition to the older function of signaling intimacy. Among the use of various V forms, the use of *maga* is on the decrease, replaced by T in personal, non-status marked settings, and by *ön* in impersonal situations and status marked settings. Zero pronoun V and *tetszik* are so often used now that they should be considered separate variants of V. The functions of *ön* use are becoming wider: in addition to marking distancing, surface relations and status marked settings, it is becoming a more generally used V pronoun.

5. Intradynamic variability in address

The function of intradynamic variability is manifold in Hungarian: it can be situation-dependent, or it can signal uncertainty, change in the quality of the relationship, or express various emotions. Within the same relationship, interlocutors use only certain types of address or a socially determined combination of the various types. However, some variability occurs in all types of relationships.

5.1. Intradynamic variability in T vs. V forms

Variable use of T vs. V (i.e., grammatically, of 2nd vs. 3rd person verb forms) constitutes variability of greater magnitude than that of variability in pronominal and/or nominal forms outlined in section 4 above. Despite the fact that the Hungarian system of address is not basically binary but involves a choice between two grammatical persons and an increased reflexivity, a large part (59.72%) of the interviewees in my study distinguish between T vs. V as a primary choice and consider the switch from one to the other as a major change.

In contemporary Hungarian language use, switching between T vs. V signals a considerable change in the quality of the relationship between the interlocutors. Switching from V to T is an act often accompanied metalinguistically, signaling that the relationship between the interlocutors is becoming more intimate and/or closer. Interviewees report that there are regularities in who can initiate switching in a relationship, and almost half of them (44.44%) referred to the (originally German) act widely used

in Hungary of “drinking brotherhood” (*Brüderschaft trinken*) as a non-linguistic meta-action that can accompany the switching of address from V to T.

Switching from T to V disrupts the solidary relationship that had existed before and emphasizes emotional and social distancing, which makes it possibly hurtful and distressing. Since this kind of switching strongly signals a negative change in the relationship, it is most likely rather rare—in fact, it was reported by two interviewees only.

Frequent emotion- and situation-dependent switching back and forth⁴ between T and V forms which expresses increasing or decreasing social distance is not usual in today’s Hungarian language use as evidenced by the data, occurring only in some specific cases: 56.94% of the interviewees did not mention cases like this at all, while the remaining accounts are of a few types of specific situations.

One of these specific situations is when interlocutors who use mutual T switch to V only in status marked settings such as during public, official or media broadcast communication. 20.83% of the interviewees reported on such usage. One young man from Budapest mentioned, for instance, that he and his young female advisor switched to using T while he was writing his BA thesis, but during the public defense of the thesis they used V with each other.

A specific case of social subordination is the teacher–student relationship, where—as evidenced by the interviews—switching between T and V uniquely serves as the expression of emotions. A high school teacher interviewee who usually uses T with students mentioned that he often switches to V with students when he wants express his anger or to discipline them. Of the interviewees of the present study, 13.88% reported on similar address behavior or when only a teacher’s ironic utterances were said with V. The fact that the freedom to switch between ways of addressing is an option available only to the teacher shows the pronounced asymmetry of the relationship. The use of switching from V to T as an expression of defenselessness was reported by only one interviewee in their description of an account of a police questioning.

⁴ Expression of emotions is the function of switching between T and V according to the analysis of dramatic dialogues by Brown and Gilman (1960), who claim that when norms of address in a given type of relationship are broken, switching to T signals anger or contempt, while switching to V expresses awe or respect. In his article on 19th century Russian pronominal address, Friedrich (1972) also reports on temporary switching in address within relationships.

Another possibility for temporary switching between T and V is afforded by playful and ironic use of V by interlocutors who normally use T. Such address behavior was reported by 37.5% of my informants. Such playful communication can develop in intimate relationships, such as between friends, spouses, and family members and is realized in the use of *maga* plus first naming.

Switching back and forth between T and V within the same dyad can, then, occur only in certain situations in today's Hungarian usage: its function can be the marking of the status of the situation, in some cases, the increase or decrease in social distance (expressed by the superordinate person), or the addition of playfulness to the communication process in close and intimate relationships.

5.2. Intradynamic variability in nominal address

The choice among variants of T and V and the combinations of these with various nominal forms produce a great range of variability for marking various shades of social relationships. In my questionnaire survey I have not explicitly asked informants about different situations involving the same interlocutors, but proportions within the data, and, especially, accounts offered during the interviews have indicated some intradynamic characteristics.

The number of nominal address forms that can be used within one and the same relationship is always dependent on the degree of closeness between the interlocutors. Equal and intimate relationships allow a wide range of nominal address forms to be used interchangeably, since the increase in the closeness and intimacy in the relationship is paralleled by the address forms that can be used (Ervin-Tripp 1972, 225). I have asked the interviewees of my study to collect all the nominal address forms in certain intimate relationships—the range of forms shows high variability indeed. Address forms used in relationships with children, siblings and friends include almost the full range of possible forms. The multiplicity of forms is well illustrated by the reaction of one of my informants who, in response to the question about how she addresses her child, said “always differently”.

The large number of address alternatives in intimate relationships is partly due to the fact that address forms characteristic of less intimate relationships can be used freely here.

The choice of less intimate forms can be motivated by the status of the situation: public address in front of an audience or in the presence of a large number of people is characterized by the use of official forms. For instance, one interviewee reported on a situation in a school where the form *igazgató úr* ‘[Mr.] principal’ is used at faculty meetings by the faculty members where otherwise in interpersonal communication teachers use mutual T and first name address with the principal.

Address forms less intimate than could be expected can express an increase in distance emotionally. Address with full name within the family typically has the function of disciplining and commanding, involving a decrease of intimacy.

Also, in intimate relationships address forms metaphorically imported from any kind of other relationship can occur jokingly or playfully: *hercegnő* ‘princess’, *nagyságos asszony* ‘your honor [given to a woman]’, *méltóságos úr* ‘your excellency’. This phenomenon also points to the feature discussed in detail below (see section 6), namely, that linguistic elements used as address forms can be expanded and transferred over into relationships which are independent of their original meanings.

The number of address forms found in intimate relationships is also increased by the phenomenon that in the most intimate and friendly relationships elements of vulgar stylistic value can also be used as address forms without causing offence. The account of a city dweller male informant in his 20s is a case in point, who reported that he and his best friend mutually call each other *hülyegyerek* ‘idiot’ [lit. ‘idiot child’] and that in his mobile phone’s address book the same designation marks the friend instead of his name. Such an address form would be hurtful and unacceptable, but in a close friendly relationship it marks closeness in a case of value changing address transfer, discussed below.

In the most intimate relationships reciprocity occurs to the utmost degree. Close friends, spouses or siblings often address each other echo-like with the exact same address form. The most frequently occurring variants between spouses (*édesem* ‘[my] sweetie’, *drágám* ‘[my] darling’; *kedvesem* ‘[my] dear’, *kicsim* ‘[my] little one’, *kicsikém* ‘[my] little one’, *kincsem* ‘my treasure’, *szívem* ‘sweetie [lit. ‘my heart’]’, *bogárka* ‘little bug’, *cica* ‘kitty’, *nyuszi* ‘bunny’, *nyuszika* ‘little bunny’) were reported by 84.7% of the informants to occur mutually.

The number and types of possible address forms are affected by hierarchy differences within relationships. The interlocutor of the higher rank can usually use different address forms than the interlocutor of lower

rank: in my data this is exemplified by address behavior by the older generation family members within the family, bosses at the workplace, and teachers in the educational system.

The average number of address forms used by an interviewee to address their own children (6.8) is more than double than the average number of forms to address parents (2.6). The asymmetry of address forms experienced at the workplace is well exemplified by the account of an interviewee: working as a cashier at a health maintenance organization she uses mutual V with the manager, whom she always addresses by his first name, but who uses a range of intimate variants towards her: *Erika* ‘Erika’, *Era* ‘Era’, *Era kisasszony* ‘Miss Era’, *Erika kisasszony* ‘Miss Erika’, *Era baba* ‘Era baby’, *szeleburdi* ‘featherbrained’, and *leányzó* ‘girlie’.

The rarer an address form is within a relationship, the more emotionally charged the interlocutors consider it to be. That is, often used forms acquire a neutral value. This is exemplified by the fact that in parent—child relationships diminutive forms of first names are used by the parents the most often (43.05%), whereas full first names and kinship terms (*kislányom* ‘[my little] daughter’, *kisfiam* ‘[my little] son’, *gyermekem* ‘my child’) can carry the expression of emotions. The stylistic value of an address form is, then, defined by the routine and usualness with which it is given rather than its linguistic form: a more rarely used element is more conspicuous and gets its stylistic value from being contrasted with more frequently used forms and in relation to them.

6. Transfer of address: an extended use of nominal address forms

Nominal elements used as address forms can also be transferred to relationships beyond their original use. According to Braun (1988, 260–1), if a word becomes a part of the address system, it loses its connection with its earlier lexical and social content. Based on this observation, Dickey (2002, 10) differentiates between lexical and address meaning.

6.1. Transfer of address involving shift of viewpoint

Nominal elements used as address forms cannot only express the viewpoint of the speaker in signaling the interlocutor; they can also express that of a third person, who often participates in joint interactions but

is not necessarily present in the given situation: spouses often address each other with forms given to parents after the birth of their children. Interpreting such address forms as social deixis, we can say that in such situations the deictic center is transferred over to the child, however, this transfer of center concerns only the address form—the child does not become the center of the utterance. Using Agha's (2007, 316) terms, who differentiates between the focus (direction) and center (starting point) of respect giving, in these cases he talks about the zero point being transferred, that is, the center is recentered (*ibid.*, 360).

The expression of the child's point of view in family situations is also indicated by what has been reported by 64.35% of the informants with children, namely, that in specific situations they address their spouse with the forms given to parents. What is more, 5.28% of informants with children named such forms as the most typically used. The use of forms such as *anya* and *apa*, *anyu* and *apu*, meaning 'mother' and 'father', respectively, between spouses is most frequent in the 35-55 age group, which is probably indicative of the importance of the parental role at this age. This phenomenon is rooted in the intention to provide a model for the children (cf. Agha 2007, 308) but cannot be explained only through it since, according to the accounts of the subjects, these forms are used also in situations where the children are not present.

A part of the elements used to address parents can be transferred to relationships outside the family as well. The perspective of the child as well as the dominance of the parental role occur in the situations in which preschool and school teachers as well as pediatricians address parents with such forms, with *anyuka* 'mom' and *apuka* 'dad' being the most frequent. Even though the informants did not report on such usage in the questionnaires, 42.24% of interviewees with children did so, many of them considering such usage offensive.

A majority (86.13%) of informants with children also reported starting to address their own parents as well as their mothers- and fathers-in-law with forms given to grandparents after the birth of their children, namely, with address forms such as *nagyi* 'grandma', *nagymama* 'grandmother', *nagyapa* 'grandfather', *tata* 'grandpa', *mama* 'grandma', and *papa* 'grandpa'.

In addition to the child's, the spouse's perspective is also often expressed in addressing the spouse's parents: 38.46% of all informants reported using forms such as *anyuka* 'mom' and *apuka* 'dad' towards

their parents-in-law, and 21.84% reported using *mama* ‘mom/grandma’ and *papa* ‘dad/grandpa’.

Most of the cited examples of the transfer of address can be considered as routine: signaling the relativity of family roles, these changes of perspective play a role in community formation through expressing a shared perspective. The transfer of address has its own social rules then: elements of address and reference used with the same perspective presuppose a community as well as contribute to forming it. If the addressee does not accept the shared perspective, the transfer of perspective can easily become hurtful and offensive. One informant objected to his brother-in-law’s use of the address form *Öcsike* ‘[little] younger brother’, while another one interpreted the address form *Mama* ‘grandma’ as used by her son-in-law’s extended family. The address of parents as *anyuka* and *apuka* outside the family (by pediatricians, teachers etc.) can be regarded as controversial because it takes the perspective of the child: this can be interpreted positively as sharing the same community, or negatively as offensive because of the narrowing of the role possibilities of the addressee.

6.2. Transfer of address as change of value and expression of emotion

When address forms occur in unusual ways, not fitting the situation they are used in, or incongruently with other social indexicals of the discourse, they signal a divergence from the usual social function, that is, through their tropical use (cf. Agha 2007) they can often take an expressive role.

The most typical cases of address forms’ change of value are intimate address forms being used in non-intimate and distance keeping situations, and distanced address forms being used in intimate situations, as well as offensive address forms being used without the intention to offend in situations of increased intimacy. Li (2006, 72–3) considers positive forms used to express negative emotions and negative forms used to express positive emotions to be metaphorical address forms.

The freedom of address in intimate relationships has been demonstrated by examples in section 4.2.1 above. These examples show that the use in intimate relationships of address forms typically used in other, more distanced relationships has a special, emotion expressing function. At the same time, if the actual situation or speech situation lacks intimacy, intimate forms of address become unambiguously hurtful and offensive.

Breaking away from the lexical and social value of address forms occurs primarily within the realm of kinship terminology (cf. Szépe 1972, 183 as well as Agha 2007, 340–86). According to my findings, a large number of direct family address forms (*anyukám* ‘[my] mom’, *apukám* ‘[my] dad’, *atyám* ‘[my] father’, *mama* ‘grandma’, *tata* ‘grandpa’, *fiam* ‘[my] son’, *gyermekem* ‘[my] child’) can be used in establishing relations even when used independently of role relations, that is, in their use the appropriateness to be address forms is more dominant than their original meaning (cf. Braun 1988, 259–61).

The use of family address forms in situations outside the family can carry typically two different stylistic values: it can be positive, expressing respect or assuming association with somebody, and it can also be negative, hurtful and offensive if used when true intimacy or association is lacking. On the basis of the interview data I conclude that the use of kinship address forms outside the family in today’s Hungarian language use functions in a value adding way only occasionally. Transfer of address functions more often negatively, in a value detractive way, which is why it can become hurtful and offensive. The respect expressing value is primarily visible in address forms used in the church (*Tiszteletes Atyám* ‘[my] Reverend Father’, *Klára nővér* ‘Sister Clare’). The function of address forms in community formation and indexing a sense of belonging can be traced in the use of address forms such as *öcsém* ‘[my] younger brother’, *bátyám* ‘[my] older brother’, and *néném* ‘[my] sister’ together with first name, however, such usage is on the decrease: in my data no informant under 35 provided any mention of it. Among the younger generation the form *tesó* ‘sibling’ is reported in some slang-like usage as an association forming term (which is used as a true kinship vocative term only very rarely).

Another possibility for value transfer among kinship terms is in situations lacking intimacy, where they become overly familiar or perhaps supercilious. Transfer of elements denoting parents (*anyukám* ‘[my] mom’, *apukám* ‘[my] dad’, *őregem* ‘[my] old man’) is characteristic of lower speech styles and intimate discourse. I have found only very scarce examples of such usage in my data—most likely because questionnaires report on informants’ idealized language use. However, interview data as well as my additional observations show that such usage is quite frequent, especially in friendly, intimate relationships as well as in less controlled service settings.

Address forms used towards grandparents can be transferred and go through a broadening of meaning when they are indeed transferred: almost all of them can be used to address unfamiliar, older people, again, with a supercilious tone. The most widely used forms in such situations are *mama* ‘grandma’, *mami* ‘grandma’, *mamikám* ‘[my] grandma’, *papa* ‘grandpa’, and *tata* ‘grandpa’. In the interviews, 44.4% of the female and 22.2% of the male informants over the age of 55 reported having been recipients of such forms in unexpected settings and in ways sometimes felt offensive. Typical settings include public transport, the market, and shops, with some informants also mentioning hospitals.

The fact that address forms are able to change their functions and value is in connection with their deictic role, since elements referring to participants of situations can go through a re-evaluation depending on relations as the context develops.

7. Conclusion

All of the phenomena discussed in this paper indicate that address forms have a specific role in creating our social and interpersonal reality. Linguistic elements referring to the interlocutor can have a social indexical value not only in themselves but can create ways of address of different values through their systematic co-occurrences as well. The results of my study show that the Hungarian address system is undergoing change: the usage of the youngest generations is likely changing the whole system. T is spreading from the expression of intimacy to that of equal rank and even respect. Of the V forms, the use of *maga* is receding and being replaced by T in personal, non-status marked settings and by *ön* in impersonal situations and status marked settings.

According to the findings of my study, in today’s Hungarian address system the switch between T and V signals a thorough change in the quality of the relationship, a dynamic switching back and forth between T and V to express emotions is unusual, and the expression of emotional shades of variants of nominal address forms is very much possible.

Change of perspective in address forms is quite frequent: usual forms carry a social deictic value, whereas non-routine usage outside the usual change of perspective in address can have the role of expressing emotions.

Such dynamic characteristics of address usage can be detected even through the data collected with a sociolinguistic approach to data collection. However, the co-occurrence of various elements, the dynamism

of switches and the address specific characteristics of meaning should be described more thoroughly through the analysis of conversations and recorded discourse.

References

- Agha, Asif 2007. *Language and social relations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Angelusz, Róbert – Róbert Tardos 1995. Megszólítások egy átalakuló világban [Address forms in a changing world]. In: *Jel-Kép* 2 (3/4): 39–52.
- Angelusz, Róbert – Róbert Tardos 2000. A megszólítási szokások generációs változása: a tegeződés térhódítása [Generational changes in patterns of address: The spreading of T form]. In: Zsolt Spéder – Pál Péter Tóth (eds): *Emberi viszonyok. Cseh-Szombathy László tiszteletére* [Human relations: Festschrift for László Cseh-Szombathy], 247–70. Andorka Rudolf Társadalomtudományi Társaság – Századvég, Budapest.
- Angelusz, Róbert – Róbert Tardos 2003. Megszólítási formák szociokulturális jellegzetességei [Sociocultural characteristics of address forms]. In: Miklós Kontra (ed.): *Nyelv és társadalom a rendszerváltás kori Magyarországon* [Language and society in Hungary at the time of the fall of communism], 297–313. Osiris Kiadó, Budapest.
- Beregszászi, Anikó – István Csernicskó 1998. A megszólítás változatai az Ungvári Állami Egyetem magyar szakos hallgatói körében [Variability in address among Hungarian major students at the Uzhhorod State University]. In: Sándor (1998, 171–8).
- Braun, Friederike 1988. *Terms of address: Patterns and usage in various languages and cultures*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin & New York.
- Brown, Roger – Marguerite Ford 1961. Address in American English. In: *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62: 375–85.
- Brown, Roger – Albert Gilman 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In: Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.): *Style in language*, 253–76. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Clyne, Michael – Catrin Norrby – Jane Warren 2009. *Language and human relations. Styles of address in contemporary language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Dickey, Eleanor 2002. *Latin forms of address*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Domonkosi, Ágnes 2002. Megszólítások és beszédpartnerre utaló elemek nyelvhasználatunkban [Address forms and elements referring to the interlocutor in Hungarian language use] (A DE Magyar Nyelvtudományi Intézetének Kiadványai 79). Debreceni Egyetem, Debrecen.
- Dömötör, Adrienne 2005. Tegezés/nemtegezés, köszönés, megszólítás a családban [T/V, greetings, and address within the family]. In: *Magyar Nyelvőr* 129: 299–318.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan 1972. On sociolinguistic rules: Alternation and co-occurrence. In: Gumperz – Hymes (1972, 213–50). 213–50.

- Fillmore, Charles 1975. Santa Cruz lectures on deixis. Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington.
- Friedrich, Paul 1972. Social context and semantic feature: The Russian pronominal usage. In: Gumperz – Hymes (1972, 270–300).
- Fülei-Szántó, Endre 1994. A verbális érintés [The verbal touch] (Linguistica. Series C, Relationes 7). MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet, Budapest.
- Göncz, Lajos 1999. A magyar nyelv Jugoszláviában (Vajdaságban) [The Hungarian language in Yugoslavia (Voivodina)]. Osiris Kiadó – Fórum Kiadó – MTA Kisebbségkutató Műhely, Budapest – Újvidék.
- Grétsy, László – Miklós Kovalovszky (eds) 1985. Nyelvművelő kézikönyv II [A handbook of language cultivation. Volume II]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Gumperz, J. John – Dell Hymes (eds) 1972. Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Guszkova, Antonyina 1981. A társadalmi kapcsolatteremtés eszközei a mai magyar nyelvben [Means of establishing social relationships in contemporary Hungarian] (Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 106). Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Hickey, Raymond 2003. The German address system: Binary and scalar at once. In: Irma Taavitsainen – Andreas H. Jucker (eds): Diachronic perspectives on address term systems, 401–25. John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.
- Kiss, Jenő 1993. Köszönés- és megszólításformák a rábaközi Mihályiban [Greetings and address forms in Mihályi, Rábaköz region]. In: Magyar Nyelvőr 117: 208–28.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1979. Pragmatics and social deixis. In: Chiarello, Christine et al. (eds): Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society, 206–23. Berkeley Linguistics Society, Berkeley CA.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Li, Zhanfang 2006. Functions of metaphorical use of address terms. In: Sino-US English Teaching 3: 69–73.
- Lyons, John 1968. Introduction to theoretical linguistics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lyons, John 1977. Semantics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mátai, Mária D. 1999. A névmások története a középmagyar kor végéig [A history of pronouns until the end of the Middle Hungarian era]. In: Magyar Nyelvőr 123: 438–64.
- Nyomárkay, István 1998/1999. A nyelvhasználat udvariassági stratégiái [Politeness strategies in language use]. In: Magyar Nyelvőr 122/123: 277–84; 145–9.
- Paulston, Christina Bratt 1976. Pronouns of address in Swedish: Social class semantics and changing system. In: Language in Society 5: 359–86.
- Raffai, Éva 1998. A megszólítás változatai Szabadkán és Szegeden [The variety of address forms in Subotica and in Szeged]. In: Sándor (1998, 179–88).
- Reményi, Andrea Ágnes 1994. Influences and values: A sociolinguistic study in the Hungarian system of address. In: Studies in Applied Linguistics 1: 85–109.

- Reményi, Andrea Ágnes 2000. Nyelvhasználat és hierarchia: munkahelyi csoportok megszólítási rendszerének diádikus elemzése [Language use and hierarchy: A dyadic study of the system of address in workplace groups]. In: Szociológiai Szemle 3: 41–59.
- Sándor, Klára (ed.) 1998. Nyelvi változó – nyelvi változás [Linguistic variables and language change]. JGYF Kiadó, Szeged.
- Sinor, Dénes 1974. A magyar nyelv udvariassági formái a két világháború közötti időben [Politeness forms in Hungarian in the period between the two world wars]. In: Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 83: 545–52.
- Sándor, Anna 1996. Koloni köszönés- és megszólításformák [Greetings and address in Kolon]. In: Magyar Nyelvőr 120: 303–18.
- Szépe, György 1972. A magyar rokonsági elnevezések néhány kérdése [Some issues of kinship terms in Hungarian]. In: Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok 8: 181–99.
- Szili, Katalin 2000. Az udvariasság elméletéről, megjelenésmódjairól a magyar nyelvben [On the theory and manifestations of politeness in Hungarian]. In: Hungarológia 2: 261–81.
- Szili, Katalin 2003. A magázás-tegezés lélektanáról [On the psychology of T and V address]. In: Mihály Hajdu–Borbála Keszler (eds): Köszöntő könyv Kiss Jenő 60. születésnapjára [Festschrift for Jenő Kiss on the occasion of his 60th birthday], 366–70. ELTE Magyar Nyelvtudományi és Finnugor Intézete–Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, Budapest.
- Tóth, Mihály 1983. Köszönések és megszólítások Bag községben [Forms of greeting and address in the village of Bag] (Magyar Csoportnyelvi Dolgozatok 20). MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet, Budapest.
- Verschueren, Jef 1999. Understanding pragmatics. Arnold, London.
- Zolnai, Gyula 1897. Ön, maga, kegyed [Hungarian V-pronouns]. In: Magyar Nyelvőr 26: 163–5.