

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 878

FL 003 173

AUTHOR Paulston, Christina Bratt
TITLE Language Universals and Socio-Cultural Implications
in Deviant Usage: Personal Questions in Swedish.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the 46th Annual Meeting of
the Linguistic Society of America, St. Louis,
Missouri, December 28-30, 1971
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Diachronic Linguistics; Economic Factors; Language
Patterns; Language Research; *Language Universals;
*Language Usage; *Political Influences; *Pronouns;
Semantics; Social Structure; *Sociocultural Patterns;
Sociolinguistics; Sociology; Standard Spoken Usage
IDENTIFIERS *Swedish

ABSTRACT

In this study, the author seeks to demonstrate that Swedish is unique in its avoidance of the pronouns of address, extreme in its use of impersonal questions and circumscriptives, and that such language usage is directly related to the perceived relationship of social status, as explicitly and implicitly expressed by informants. The author also attempts to demonstrate that if a language, Swedish, possesses a universal feature--personal pronouns of address--and if the speech community systematically avoids this feature under specific situations, then this language usage is indicative of cultural-political conditions in that social structure, in this case the dichotomy between social class stratification and Social Democratic ideology. Examples of ways to avoid pronoun use in the question "What do you want?" are provided, and remarks on the data solicited from informants are included. (Author/VM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

LANGUAGE UNIVERSALS AND SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS IN DEVIANT USAGE:
PERSONAL QUESTIONS IN SWEDISH

Christina Bratt Paulston
Department of General Linguistics
University of Pittsburgh

Paper presented at
Linguistic Society of America
Forty-Sixth Annual Meeting
December 28-30, 1971
St. Louis, Missouri

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Christa Bratt Paulston

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Not for quotation or duplication without permission

ED 062 878

FL 003 173

LANGUAGE UNIVERSALS AND SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS IN DEVIANT USAGE:
PERSONAL QUESTIONS IN SWEDISH

Abstract

This paper investigates the address avoidance of second person personal pronouns in Swedish in terms of language universals and the relationship between deviation from a universal linguistic feature and social structural change. The hypothesis proposed is that if a language universal exists, and if a language possesses this universal language feature but under specific conditions systematically avoids this feature with circumscriptions, then this particular language usage contains clues to the socio-cultural-economic conditions in that social structure.

The language universal examined is Hockett's "Among the deictic elements of every human language is one that denotes the speaker and one that denotes the addressee." Eleven ways of expressing "What do you want?" in Swedish, only two of which denote the addressee, are examined and the contextual conditions which tend to elicit the various forms are discussed. The assumption given to account for this address avoidance is that it reflects a stage of development from the non-reciprocal power semantic to the solidarity semantic in the terms of the Brown and Gilman study "Pronouns of Power and Solidarity"; that it reflects the dichotomy between a still highly stratified community in terms of social class and the social democratic ideology of equality which has been the dominant political ideology since 1932.

Why is it that we must have it so much more difficult than Danes and Norwegians in one of daily life's most important questions?¹

In spite of considerable effort on the part of my mentors in my linguistic training, I have never learned not to ask why a specific language behaviour occurs rather than some other.² This paper is an attempt to investigate the avoidance of the second person personal pronouns of address in Swedish from the viewpoint of language universals, deviation from a universal language feature and its relationship to social structural change as a causal variable of language behaviour. The paper only deals with surface forms and no attempt is made to arrive at rules for deriving personal pronouns from underlying deictic features.³

Social scientists are in rare agreement that language reflects the cultural values of a society or as Pieris puts it "the language of a society mirrors the situational imperatives of that society."⁴ Address systems of language especially correlate with social structure, and Lambert has suggested that "significant class differences in social behaviour can be studied through this aspect of speech."⁵ By "this aspect of speech" he refers to the tu/vous distinction in French, and languages which make this distinction--typical of most European languages--are interesting in

their obligatory coding of power relation in the choice of pronoun.

Brown and Gilman in their study "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity"⁶ point out that the interesting thing about pronouns of address which have the T/V⁷ distinction "is their close association with two dimensions fundamental to social life--the dimensions of power and solidarity." They show "that a man's consistent pronoun style gives away his class status and his political views." They discuss these matters in terms of the semantics of the pronouns of address, which they define as the covariation between the pronoun used and the objective relationship existing between speaker and addressee. The power semantic is non-reciprocal; the superior says T and receives V. The solidarity semantic is symmetrical or reciprocal; speaker and addressee exchange equal T or V forms. Solidarity introduces a second dimension into the semantic system on the level of power equivalents and it is from this two-dimensional semantic "that T derives its common definition as the pronoun of either condescension or intimacy and V its definition as the pronoun of reverence or formality." They go on to point out that the "non-reciprocal power semantic is associated with a relatively static society in which power is distributed by birthright and is not subject to much redistribution" while "the reciprocal solidarity semantic has grown with social mobility and equalitarian ideology." They believe that "the development of open societies with an equalitarian ideology acted against the non-reciprocal power semantic in favor of solidarity."⁸

Sweden would appear to be the archtypical society to reflect the theories of Brown and Gilman. She has within the last hundred years developed from a highly structured society, stratified into four Estates (until 1866) to a country today famous for its progressive social policy.

The Social Democratic party has been in power continuously since 1932 and through its programs for social, economic, and educational reforms has consistently stressed egalitarian relations among all members of society.⁹ However, in spite of the dominant political ideology, there remain "strong elements of ascription, elitism, particularism and diffuseness in the Swedish value system."¹⁰ The Swedish people is still divided into Social grupp 1, 2, and 3, an official division into social classes, first used in 1911 in connection with bicameral elections. In 1970, Social grupp 1 (the upper class) counted 7.8% of the population, Social grupp 2 (middle) 34.7%, and Social grupp 3 (working class) 57.5%.¹¹ There is much evidence to support Brown and Gilman's theories of an increase in the reciprocal solidarity semantic, but we also find a very peculiar systematic avoidance of the pronouns of address with their "linguistic compulsion" of power coding. One wonders about the significance of this avoidance, if indeed any, and how it compares to other languages. Greenberg's admonition for linguists to work "toward the formulation of a general science of human behavior"¹² leads me to speculate--and it is no more than that--on the Swedish situation in terms of language universals, "summary statements about characteristics or tendencies shared by all human speakers."¹³

Di Pietro in a paper on "The Discovery of Universals in Multilingualism" points out that "the marking of societal primes such as dominance and subordination are bound to have linguistic correlates." He posits the following universal: "If a community is socially stratified and there is variability in the language of that community, then some of the variability of language must relate to the social stratification."¹⁴

It is in light of this putative universal and of Hockett's comment that

the absence of a universal feature in a language is a typological fact of importance about that language,¹⁵ that I would like to investigate language behavior as a clue to social structure. I propose that if a universal feature of language exists, and if a certain language possesses this feature but under specific conditions systematically avoids this feature with circumscriptions, then that particular language usage is indicative of cultural-economic-political conditions in that social structure.

The language universal I wish to examine in Swedish is Hockett's Among the deictic elements of every human language is one that denotes the speaker and one that denotes the addressee.¹⁶ I suggest that the form of personal questions in Swedish, where deviant usage from a universal tendency in language is common, can be seen as a clue to the social structure in Swedish culture. It is an attempt--to put it in Fishman's words--"to provide a fuller realization that what has hitherto been viewed as merely 'free variation' around an ideal norm of language structure or usage is itself socially patterned in terms of users and uses,"¹⁷ and it bears out Labov's statement that "the major factors which support and maintain linguistic diversity appear to be cultural, even ideological."¹⁸

By personal questions I simply mean such questions as seek to elicit a response about the addressee's opinion, want, feeling, or experience as different from questions which do not directly involve the addressee's personal reaction. I have chosen this particular form of language behavior as there seems to be a universal tendency in such questions to formally denote the addressee,¹⁹ and any avoidance of such formal denotation is thus made much more noticeable. Did such a universal tendency not exist, the Swedish avoidance of second person pronouns

would not be significant or indicative of anything. If we look at Danish or Norwegian, e.g., which for all practical linguistic purposes might as well be classified as dialects of Swedish, we find the same potential patterns, such as dummy it's etc., available in the language for address avoidance, but they are not utilized. Rather, the Swedish address forms are frequently remarked on and ridiculed by Danes and Norwegians, which is to say that the deviant forms reach a cognizant level of awareness, and that in itself is significant.²⁰

David Ingram mentions that "person deictic specification is universal: Every OBJECT is by convention specified as to its role in the speech act, i.e., speaker, hearer, other."²¹ (I take it by convention means overt language forms.) Now there are Swedish questions in which there is no specification of the hearer or addressee purely by linguistic forms, i.e. the same utterance removed from its contextual situation would either be ambiguous or totally reinterpreted. Any Swede would translate När kom hon hem? as "When did she come home?" However, when I visit our family place in the country, and the neighbour looks me in the eye and utters the same phrase, I correctly understand it as "When did you come home?", and given this additional information any other Swede will promptly reinterpret the original utterance. But the specification of the hearer is here purely through the speech act and non-verbal behavior. I think it reasonable then to conclude that the Swedish address avoidance of second person pronouns may very well constitute a deviation from linguistic norms, and I have used the notion of language universals to establish such norms.

Methodologically, I have proceeded from an inductive (as a native speaker) examination of types of question forms in Swedish, from which I formed a proposition, restated as a deductive generalization about language. I then validated this proposition for Swedish with empirical information in the field.²² The empirical validation consisted of interviews with informants, and I complemented this data with note-taking of field-situations, a limited attempt in Labov's terms to use "data from the ordinary use of language by native speakers in the linguist's own society."²³ The informants were inhabitants of Stockholm and professionally educated, and I have used their speech as criterion for Standard Swedish.²⁴

Swedish possesses two second person singular pronouns of address, with the typical distinction in European languages between the familiar, du, and the formal, ni. What do you want? translates either as Vad vill du ha? or as Vad vill ni ha? depending on the familiarity of the speakers, but either way would be the standard version of the equivalence of the English sentence.

Swedish, however, can and does use other ways of eliciting response from an addressee. Below are listed 11 different ways of expressing What do you want?

- (1) Vad vill du ha? (T form)
- (2) Vad vill ni ha? (V form)
- (3) Vad vill hon ha? 'What does she want?'
- (4) Vad vill Christina (fru Paulston~ professor Paulston) ha? 'What does Christina (Mrs. Paulston~ Professor Paulston) want?'
- (5) Vad vill fröken ha? 'What does the Miss want?'
- (6) Vad vill professorn ha? 'What does the professor want?'

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| (7) Vad vill man ha? | 'What does one want?' |
| (8) Vad vill vi ha? | 'What do we want?' |
| (9) Vad får det vara? | 'What may it be?' |
| (10) Vad behagas (det)? | 'What is pleased?' |
| (11) Vad skulle det vara for någonting? | 'What should it be?' |

Du in sentence #1 is the second personal singular, customarily used amongst friends, family and close colleagues and to and by children. Du is used with the first name, although men may use du and last name to each other as a less intimate degree of relationship. Within the last ten years there has been a rapid change in the province of du, which I will discuss later.

Ni in sentence #2 is historically the second person plural. It is used to strangers, or with title and/or last name to people with whom one is not on a du-basis. There is among many people a curious reluctance to use this form of address:

NI is not yet generally accepted as a form of address like 'you' in English, but is gradually coming into use. It is always correct when speaking to a stranger or to one's inferiors. If you know the title or the name of the individual addressed, it is considered more polite to use the title or name with the third person of the verb as if speaking of the person instead of to him.²⁵

Sentences 3 through 6 exemplify the usage of the regular third person form in direct address. Hon~han "she~he" are the regular third person pronouns and its usage in direct address is rural. It is less familiar than du with which it alternates, i.e. it takes the place of the formal ni although the distribution is somewhat different from ni. Hon~han can be used either with first name (Christina); with last name, no

title to men (Karlsson); or title and last name (Herr Karlsson) in decreasing order of intimacy.

Sentence #4 exemplifies the very wide-spread usage of substituting the proper name in the slot for the pronoun of address and addressing the person in a third person form. Vad vill Christina ha? translates verbatim as What does Christina want? and is of course used to mean that, but in direct address it glosses as What do you want, Christina? Vad vill fru Paulston ha? reflects the same usage but is of course more formal, but in either case the speaker avoids choosing du or ni as the pronoun of address.

Sentences 5 and 6 are also address forms in the third person but here a title in the definite form substitutes instead of the pronoun. Fröken "the miss" and herrn "the mister" are used in the third person and with no pronoun of address; Vad vill damen ha? "What does the lady want?" is the shop clerk's standard form of address; frun "the mrs" is rarely used except in the market place. Vad vill professorn ha? "What does the professor want?" is a variant of 5 grammatically but implies knowledge of the person addressed since one must know his professional or inherited/married title. No pronoun of address is used.

The informants were unanimous in volunteering their agreement that the language usage of #5 and 6 was associated with social class (lower-middle and working class) and typical of persons in a service position, such as in a restaurant, gas station, etc.

Sentence #7, Vad vill man ha? was rejected by most informants as a possible but unlikely sentence. Swedish does use man "one" in direct address, especially to children: Får man göra så? "Are you allowed to

do that?" It is a less common form but perfectly possible to use in order to avoid choosing the du/ni distinction. Lärde ni er spanska i Peru? Lärde man sig spanska i Peru? "Did you learn Spanish in Peru?" The informants considered man to be non-standard Swedish except to children and probably a dialectal variant of hon/han in direct address.²⁶

#8, Vad vill vi ha? is similar to the usage by doctors and nurses in English to address their patients with we. It meets with the same kind of amused reaction by Swedes as evidenced by the following anecdote told by one of the informants. When his mother, who was engaged to be married, graduated from high school, she was asked by the headmaster "And when are we going to get married?" Volunteering this type of anecdote was typical of the informants, and reflects their feeling of the unnaturalness of these forms of address, a feeling which makes them aware of the patterns.

In the preceding eight sentences there has been a formal recognition of the addressee: du, ni, Christina, hon/han, fröken, professorn, man, vi, although the latter six forms avoid a direct choice between the du/ni forms. In the following three versions the language contains no direct reference to the addressee.

In #9 Vad får det vara contains an impersonal det "it" as a dummy subject. This is a common construction in Swedish: Det är serverat "Dinner is served;" Det ringer "The phone is ringing." Hur står det till? "How are you?" (cf. How goes it? from Gm Wie geht es Ihnen?). This construction is frequently used in question forms: Hur gick det i skolan i dag? "How did it go in school today?" meaning "How did you do?"

The grammatical construction of Vad behagas in sentence #10 is the most common circumscription to avoid using a personal pronoun in

direct reference. Grammatically the construction consists of question word + verb transitive or intransitive in the 3rd person passive present + dummy subject det "it" (3rd person singular neuter personal pronoun), which may be deleted. Det in this particular sentence is mostly deleted.

The following are typical examples from my field notes of pronoun address avoidance:

- (1) Vad sägs om att gå på Skansen? 'What is it said about to go to Skansen?' i.e. 'What do you say about going to Skansen?'
- (2) Vad tycks om att plocka blåbär? 'What do you think of picking blueberries?'
- (3) Hur känns det att vara hemma? 'How does it feel to be home?'
- (4) Hur många kilo behövs det? 'How many kilos do you need/want?'
- (5) Hur mås det? 'How is it felt?' i.e., 'How are you?'

This pattern is very common usage, and it is curious that one informant felt it necessary to point out that this was "careless usage" and not correct Swedish; however, no one associated this usage with social class.

#11 provides yet another way to escape choice of pronoun: a more or less complete rephrasing of the original meaning of the question. "Please pass me the mustard" becomes Får jag besvara om senapen? "May I trouble about the mustard?" "When are you getting married?" becomes När blir bröllopet? "When is the wedding?" and "What do you want?" becomes Vad skulle det vara? "What should it be?" or indeed even Vad är det till att vilja ha? "What is it to want to have?", about as silly sounding in Swedish as in English. One of the informants suggested that he would use such expressions "stylistically" and improved on När blir bröllopet? to När skall det rustas till bröllop här i huset? This change to formal

register by using rustas till bröllop 'prepare for the wedding' an old-fashioned lexical item, which my great-grandmother would have used seriously, no doubt is a stylistic use of register change for humorous effect. It is slightly selfmocking, as if the speaker were aware that he was using a cumbersome circumscription and preferred to make it clear that he was doing so deliberately by exaggerating the pattern. Again, this is typical of the amused attitude by the informants towards the various forms of address avoidance.

Swedish is certainly not unique in having impersonal question forms. How does it feel to be home? is a perfectly good English sentence. Rather it is unique in its extensive utilization of these linguistic patterns to a degree where native speakers will comment on the unnaturalness of the usage, on the ridiculous aspect of false courtliness. They will tell funny stories, such as the reputed taxidriver's comment to his drunken passenger to behave or annars fås det gås, a lame pun on gås "else it will have to be walked" or "else it will be served goose." The busdriver who is told in his rulebook that he must not address the passengers with du avoids the difficulty by asking Has det växel? "Is it had change?", and the salesman in the state liquor monopoly asks Has det legitimering?²⁷ when he needs identification. Educated Swedes find this ridiculous, but they are perfectly cognizant of the reason for it, namely to avoid a formal recognition of the addressee, to avoid the du/ni distinction.

The assumption I am proposing to account for this peculiar language custom, for this avoidance of the pronouns of address, is that this avoidance reflects a stage of development from the non-reciprocal power semantic to the solidarity semantic. It reflects the dichotomy between

a still highly stratified community in terms of social class and the Social-Democratic ideology of equality, which has been the politically dominant ideology of the country since 1932. As a corollary, if there is indeed a causal relationship between social equalitarian ideology and address avoidance of pronouns of address, then as Social-Democratic ideology permeates Swedish culture over time, this should be reflected in the language customs in an increased use of du.

Although it is exceedingly difficult to identify causal relationships between social and linguistic variables,--this is one reason that it is so seldom attempted--there exists in Sweden some evidence beyond the explicit and frequent comments by the individual informants, i.e. evidence on an institutional rather than individual level. The director of Social Styrelsen (Social Welfare Board), Bror Rexed instituted in 1968 the so-called "du-reformen" and the Medical Board followed suit. It became a matter of public official policy that all medical personnel exclusively use du as the mode of address in clinics, hospitals, etc. The explicit rationale given for this reform was the Social-Democratic ideology of equality; if all are equal then all should use du as the mode of address. As Brown and Gilman point out, such reforms have been common after social revolutions but have shown little stability in actual language use. One reason it seems successful in Sweden may well be the cumbersome alternatives.²⁸

At a visit to a factory, I found the following notice on the bulletin board: "Now we say du to each other." The factory board decided this unanimously at their committee meeting August 21, 1969." Signed by the owner of the factory, Lennart Rosén.²⁹ In an interview with Mr. Rosén, I asked him about the reasons for this decision. Well, he said, it makes

it much easier in personal relations, and then there is this constant talk of equality. Besides, it looks better, he added, if such a decision comes from the management before it becomes official law. His comments on the policy making level are illustrative of the Swedish climate: difficulty in personal relations between super- and subordinate personnel related to language usage of address, a recognition of address systems as related to ideology, and a rather pragmatic way of coping with such a situation.

I am willing to accept this as evidence of causal influence by dominant social ideology on changing language use of address, on the increased use of du. But it still only accounts for the corollary, not for the still wide-spread address avoidance. For that the only evidence I have is the actual language use of the informants, and even so it can only be inferred. But whatever the causal variable, that this usage is socially patterned in terms of users and uses is beyond doubt.

The interviews consisted of two parts. In Part I the informants were given the list of the eleven forms of "What do you want?" as listed on pages 6 and 7 and asked about the accuracy and the possible users and use of the various forms. They were simply instructed to tell me everything they could think of about the eleven forms, who used them and in what situations; I rarely asked any questions. The informants' perception of the various language behaviors was very uniform, and there was no discernable difference as to age, sex, or political ideology, which ranged from conservative to communist. The purpose of this part was primarily to confirm my own data, which I have reported above.

I also wanted to elicit the actual language use of the informants, partly to see if there was any discrepancy between their purported language

and actual language use. For Part II of the interview, I prepared a list of people in certain occupations or positions, such as a gas station attendant, a waitress, a superintendent of schools, the janitor, the cleaning woman, etc. I selected this range of people in order to elicit as many of the eleven question forms as possible. In the interview I then asked the informant questions of the type "How would you ask a gas station attendant if he had any distilled water?" "How would you ask about your cleaning woman's health?" etc. I would suggest alternate forms and ask why one would be acceptable and not another. The informants' actual language behavior did contradict some of the information volunteered in Part I, notably toward a higher degree of address avoidance than they had admitted to. It should be noted that the actual language behavior was elicited in an interview situation, and that further discrepancy might be observed in actual interaction with the speech community. However, in many situations I was able to observe such interaction, and my field notes do support the informants' data.

The hypothetical addressees divided into four groups: (1) people of lower social status who was not known by the informant, e.g. a waitress, (2) people of lower social status who was known by the informant, e.g. the cleaning woman, (3) people of equal social status, e.g. the family doctor, and (4) members of the family. This grouping resulted in the illumination of a set of behavior which had not previously been recognized. Although every single informant said at one time or another that he would avoid du or ni, especially ni, there was no avoidance whatsoever on the part of any informant to use ni to those of equal social status. Indeed, the free use of ni might be said to be a hallmark of address behavior between members of Social grupp 1, who are not on familiar terms with each other.

It is interesting that neither the informants nor I were consciously aware of this usage, and the pattern only emerged from a tabulation of the data in Part II of the interview.

The data further indicated a definite change in language behavior where the chronological (as it were) isogloss seemed to fall around those born in 1940. Where an informant did not conform with his age group, this was recognized and explained by the informant as due to his political ideology.

Most informants over thirty avoided using the du/ni distinction to those of lower social status. They would use a collective ni, (i.e., the plural) or circumscriptions, or in the case of those they knew personally, name and no pronoun as well as more circumscriptions. The few uses of ni were exclusively by male speakers. Several cases of the pattern used in #6 occurred, hovmästarn, "the maitre d"; trädgårdsmästarn, "the gardener." This is curious as all informants had previously rejected this pattern as a lower class usage. Inadvertantly, in checking out #6 I had used all titles belonging to Social grupp 1, of equal social status with the informants, such as doktorn, direktörn, professorn, etc., to whom the informants would use ni and title in the indefinite form + name. The conclusion of this I think is quite clear: merely a grammatical analysis of the question forms, as I have arranged them on page six, is insufficient to account for the usage; the relative social status of the speaker-hearer is crucial in accounting for the patterning of such usage.³⁰

Parents received du, or mamma and du while pappa received 3rd person as in #4. Cousins received du while uncle and aunts were frequently addressed by name in third person, e.g. Vad vill Tant Marika ha?

Among the informants under 30 years of age, there was much less address avoidance of the personal pronouns because of a tremendous increase in the use of du. The explanation for this use of du was always explicitly related by the informants to their socio-political ideology. Some interesting tendencies emerged although they are far from clear-cut enough to be identified as regular patterns, a lack which could be due to insufficient data, but probably is more likely due to the flux of language use in the process of change.

It seems male speakers are much more likely to use du than are female. The age and sex of the addressee are factors, with pretty young girls most likely to receive du. Whether this is fact or constitutes wishful thinking along the intimacy-semantic on the part of the male informants I had no way of ascertaining--at least that's what they said they said.

A new du usage is emerging. The old form of du + first name has always been the mode of address of intimacy. Du + last name has always existed as male usage and there now seems to be an increase of this usage. But there is also now a common use of du + no name, even if the name is known. Adding the name is felt to make the mode of address too familiar or intimate, when what is intended is an expression of equality and friendliness. It is well worth noting again that the informants were unanimous in using ni to those of equal social status with whom they were not on familiar terms. Hence, this wide-spread use of du + no name is only to those of lower social status in order, according to the informants, to express their democratic intentions. That they rarely received du as often as they used it did not seem to be a matter of conscious awareness on their part. The male informants reported that they received du + no name more frequently than did

the female informants from unknown speakers of lower social status, a practice directly opposite the informants' own. I won't even speculate on this tendency except to say that it would not be entirely unreasonable to suspect that such language behavior may indicate a social class difference in attitude toward the other sex, a difference worth investigating.

All the informants below 30, however, were unanimous in admitting to some address avoidance, especially in situations where they did not want to use ni (where the addressee was not of their own social status) and still felt that du would be an imposition, e.g. when the addressee was significantly older than themselves or when the formality of the contextual situation hardly elicited such usage, such as to be the Maitre D' in an elegant restaurant.

Within the family, there was a consistent use of du to parents, cousins, and aunts and uncles. This group of addressees probably showed the most clear-cut change in modes of address toward increased use of du and was clearly consistent with Brown and Gilman's findings. I emphasize this since I am puzzled by a remark of Lambert's that he has preliminary data from Sweden which support his Canadian findings--which are contrary to Brown and Gilman.³¹

To sum up, I have attempted to demonstrate that Swedish is unique in its avoidance of the pronouns of address, extreme in its use of impersonal questions and circumscriptives, and that this language usage is directly related to perceived relationship of social status, as explicitly and implicitly expressed by the informants. I have attempted to demonstrate that if a language, Swedish, possesses a universal feature, personal pronouns of address, and the speech community systematically avoids this

feature under specific situations, then this language usage is indicative of cultural-political conditions in that social structure, in this case the dichotomy between social class stratification and Social-Democratic ideology.

The limitations of the study are obvious but may suggest possible directions for future research. Much more attention should be paid to the correlation of language usage and age, sex, and social class of the speakers. My definition of Standard Swedish eliminated almost all social class observations. There is a saying in Sweden that the crawfish and the nobility never went further north than Dalälven; regional dialects as they intersect with social class stratification would provide more elucidating data. The most interesting study would be to compare the modes of address in the three Scandinavian countries of Norway, Denmark and Sweden as such usage relates to the different social structures of the three countries. And finally, although I discuss language change, my approach has been strictly synchronic. A diachronic study of modes of address during the last centennium should elucidate the nature and extent of Swedish social change during the twentieth century.

REFERENCES

1. Elias Wessén, Vårt svenska språk (Stockholm, Almqvist and Wiksell, 1968), p. 62. Closing statement of the section on words of address.
2. I want to express my thanks to Ulf Hannerz for his valuable insights and comments. I also owe thanks to William E. Norris and Mary Bruder for reading the manuscript with their usual thoughtful suggestions. Remaining inadequacies are entirely my own.
3. For that, see David Ingram, "The Role of Person Deixis in Underlying Semantics," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1970).
4. Ralph Pieris, "Speech and Society: A Sociological Approach to Language," American Sociological Review, Vol. 16 (1951), 501.
5. Wallace E. Lambert, "Some Current Psycholinguistic Research: The Tu-Vous and Le-La Studies," Substance and Structure of Language, ed. Joan Puhvel (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969), p. 90
6. Roger Brown and Albert Gilman, "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," Style in Language, ed. T.A. Sebeok (Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1960), pp. 253-276.
7. Brown and Gilman's symbols T and V (from Latin tu and vos) as generic designators for a familiar and a polite pronoun in any language are used in this paper.
8. Carleton T. Hodge points out in a book review of Substance and Structure of Language (op.cit.) that "solidarity" is not a very happy term for the levelling of the T/V distinction. He says it appears more to be a democratization process. Language Sciences, No. 11 (August, 1970), 28.
9. Rolland G. Paulston, Educational Change in Sweden (New York: Teachers College Press, 1968), pp. 5-6.
10. Seymour Lipset, The First New Nation: The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective. In Paulston, 5.
11. "Sociala strukturen lika efter 60 år," Svenska Dagbladet (Stockholm), August 15, 1970, p. 1.
12. Joseph H. Greenberg, ed. "Introduction," Universals of Language (Cambridge, Mass.: 1966), p. xi.
13. Greenberg, xv.
14. Robert J. Di Pietro, "The Discovery of Universals in Multilingualism," Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University ed. James E. Alatis, No. 23, 1970, pp. 16-17.
15. Charles F. Hockett, "The Problem of Universals in Language," in Greenberg, op. cit., p. 4.

16. Hockett, 21.
17. Joshua A. Fishman, ed., "Introduction," Readings in the Sociology of Language (The Hague: Mouton, 1968), p. 8.
18. William Labov, "The Place of Linguistic Research in American Society," Linguistics in the 1970's (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970, p. 55.
19. Although, it should be noted, not necessarily by pronouns. In Korean, e.g. where the pronoun may be deleted, the addressee is still denoted by the honorifics which remain within the verbal phrase.
20. I would like to quote in passing a statement of Labov's: "Though most linguistic changes begin well below the level of conscious awareness, and rise to social notice only late in their career, we find that every change in progress seems to have begun in a special sub-group of the community and spread outward -- and usually not in the highest status group." ("The Place of Linguistic Research in American Society," p. 51.) I would not be surprised if this was supported by the Swedish situation with extreme address avoidance found in the middle class, followed by the upper. It stands to reason that in a society of strong equalitarian ideology, he with the lower social status would be more sensitive to "conventional expressions of power asymmetry." But this remains a matter for future study.
21. David Ingram, "Typology and Universals of Personal Pronouns," Working Papers on Language Universals, No. 5 (May, 1971) Stanford University, p.15.
22. During a stay in Sweden in 1970.
23. Labov, 42.
24. This is standard procedure for Swedish linguists (see e.g. Claes Christian Elert, Phonologic Studies of Quantity in Swedish, (Stockholm; Almquist och Wiksell, 1964), p. 12. However, it means in fact that all the informants belonged to Social grupp 1, (upper and upper-middle class) which severely limits the significance of the findings.
25. Im. Björkhagen, Modern Swedish Grammar (Stockholm: Norstedts, 1948), p. 88. See also Wessen, op, cit. pp. 56-62. There is no doubt that Swedish address avoidance also has its roots in the historical development of modes of address.
26. I now find this questionable. At the time I accepted the informants' fairly unanimous opinion, but I have since found too many instances of man in direct address in Standard Swedish. (Again, see Wessen.) Probably its usage may be rare in the interrogative but it certainly occurs in direct address.
27. I am at a loss to explain why this deviant language behavior is found so amusing by the informants, including myself. However, I would like to suggest that patterns like Has det växel?, Skas det hämtas kräftor? may be similar to my four year old's *I winded the game for I won the

game, which also tends to amuse me by its false analogy (in this example double). Swedish possesses a multiple of verbs which can form so called s- forms for a variety of functions: passive (both transitive and intransitive verbs) reflexive, reciprocal. Some verbs have passive forms which acquire active meaning when intransitive, nässlan bränns others - the deponent verbs - have only passive form but active meaning. Probably it is incorrect to equate passive form with the s- form, but the whole matter is imperfectly understood and linguists are not in agreement. I would like to suggest that skola and hava do not normally possess s- forms in standard Swedish and that patterns like Has det växel is formed on the basis of false analogy with the very productive s- forms. See also, Gösta Holm, "Om s- passivum i svenskt talspråk" Svenskt talspråk (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1967).

28. I have no actual data on how complete the implementation of such directives has been, other than as reported by the informants. This area needs much more careful field-testing.
29. At a visit to Reymyre Glasbruk, Reymyra, Sweden, August, 1970.
30. Ulf Hannerz points out to me that all of these forms contain mästarn "the master" and that similar words like byggmästarn, verkmästarn may be acceptable by virtue of the historical development of the titles with their origin in the old guilds. However, *borgmästarn 'the mayor' was not acceptable to either of us; he would receive ni and name.
31. Lambert, 89.