

THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF THE TERM HONORIFICS IN ENGLISH

Mastanova Nazirakhon Shukrullo qizi,
Teacher, the Department of foreign Language and Literature,
National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Annotation:

The term "honorifics" refers to certain grammatical constructions utilized as nods of respect to the addressee. The researchers find a flaw in this definition since it requires honorifics to be sent solely to an addressee, which is inconsistent with the types that will be made clearer later. This article describes theoretical analysis of the term honorifics in English.

Keywords: term, honorifics, addressee, addresser, theoretical analysis.

Honorifics are "a linguistic encoding of relative social standing between participants and persons or things alluded to in the communicative events," according to Brown and Levinson. Given this, the speaker can ascertain their relationship by examining certain elements of speech occurrences, such as the speaker, setting, addressee, and so forth. The terms Mr., Mrs., Miss, your honor, your Excellency, Dr., lady, etc. are examples of honorifics.

While "honorifics" and "honorific forms" can both be used to express this meaning, the word "honorific" is derived from the Latin word "honorificus," which means "showing honor."

Honorifics can also signify flattery, sarcasm, disguised violence, and other things in addition to respect or deference. Honorific expressions can therefore be employed in unpleasant as well as polite contexts. Not only do persons of lesser position employ honorific expressions to address those of greater status, but also the inverse.

On the other hand, honorifics can be used to bridge the (vertical) gap between two people by a person of higher position and a person of lower status.

It is important to point to the kinds of linguistic expressions that represent the forms of honorifics. In fact, determining the parts of speech that can indicate elevation and respect is different from one language to another.

However, honorifics can be used in several forms before, after, with or without the name of the addressee. Generally speaking, they are considered restricted compared to common speech.

Many studies have shown that pronouns and a person's social characteristics are closely related. The use of these pronouns can reveal one's social standing, social preferences, and general rapport with the listener.

Shibatani claims that honorific elaboration is frequently sparked by pronouns, particularly those referring to the addressee in the second person. According to him, these pronouns include "you" in the plural, "they," and "we" when they are employed to refer to a single addressee or a third-person object in order to show respect. Also, when pronouns are used with nouns like "your honor," "your majesty," etc., they are utilized as honorifics. This situation is known by some researchers as "pronominal phrases".

In that it demonstrates that addressing another individual by title alone will nearly always reveal ranks or occupations, titles are seen as one type of address form. Shibatani asserts that the dignified titles used with names, such as Mr., Miss, Mrs., etc., are the most widely used honorifics.

Additionally, he asserts that some titles are derived from names and serve as status designations for jobs within a social group, such as military titles, business group names, or even kin-terms like professor, uncle, general, etc.

In any case, titles are divided into the following types for Gramely and Patzold:

1. Symbolic Titles

They are described as "generalized versions of title categories," commonly referred to as "M-forms titles," such as Mr., Mrs., and sir. With the exception of "sir" and "mam," all titles cannot be used without a name.

1. Family Titles

Those who are related to the speaker by blood are usually addressed with these titles. There are several examples of kinship titles, such as mother, father, grandpa, brother, and uncle.

2. Occupational Titles The addressee's occupation is considered to have inspired these titles. In other words, the honorific of these titles refers to a person's occupation or societal status; examples are doctor, teacher, professor, waiter, etc.

Honorifics' primary purpose is to convey reverence. Thus, social standing is frequently a factor in their utilization. To put it another way, one must decide to whom or about whom he or she is speaking—is it a peer, superior, or inferior? Honorific usage, however, is typically correlated with extralinguistic factors including culture, gender, and others.

In other words, when honorifics are used appropriately in accordance with societal conventions, a person will be perceived as being a kind person. In fact, their perspective runs counter to the conventional wisdom that prohibits persons of lower position from using honorifics to refer to those of higher status.

Although they acknowledge that this point of view is accurate, they also acknowledge that those in high positions who conduct in a dignified and elegant manner tend to favor high language forms when speaking to one another or to those who are beneath them.

According to Kadar and Mills, who concur with Suzuki, honorifics can also serve other purposes and convey different meanings, such as irony, scorn, adoration, and "nice hypocrisy" or "ugly politeness." Honorifics are really considered to be a "strong contextualization cue" for sarcasm, rage, insult, and humor when used in relation to subordinates or peers of a higher standing.

Honorifics have a variety of objectives and have multiple meanings, according to Agha, who also calls them "a very leaky thing." These reasons include control and dominance, irony, flattery, sarcasm, masking aggressiveness, and other desired social actions.

According to Brown and Levinson, honorifics provide a clear picture of the relationship between language structure, politeness, and social characteristics in general. They show that there are three primary ways honorifics can be examined, including: categorizing honorifics as deference, which is one of the counterproductive politeness tactics. Honorific systems, according to and, relies on negative politeness strategies among high status members and positive politeness strategies among lower status members.

Honorifics are often discussed as an example of personalization. To illustrate the connection between honorifics and politeness, the researchers will however highlight specific features of politeness.

Yet, a lot of academics attempt to focus on the goal of politeness through their definitions. For instance, Lakoff defines politeness as behaviors that are established in a society in order to lessen conflict during interpersonal interactions.

According to Leech, politeness is a behavior used to create and sustain goodwill and easy communication among the participants. Cook offers a similar definition, stating that politeness is a collection of social norms intended to highlight effective communication abilities.

It appears reasonable to analyze the key pragmatic theories that relate to the use and purpose of honorific forms in English as this study primarily focuses on honorifics at the pragmatic level.

Searle develops this idea in connection to the instructions and "requests" in his latest addition to the theory of indirect communication. According to him, a single statement can have two interpretations. One interpretation is closer to the word's linguistic meaning, but the other interpretation is closer to the speaker's intended meaning. It makes sense to go into detail about the study because it focuses on requests. As a result, a request is a statement that expresses the speaker's wish or desire to compel the listener to do something.

Reiter acknowledges that the structure of requests consists of two parts: the main request, or "head act," and the ancillary components. The head act is the portion of the utterance that performs the function of requesting and can be understood without the help of other parts of the sentence. The peripheral parts that serve to weaken or exacerbate the main requests typically follow or precede them. According to this perspective, Brown concurs that honorifics convey politeness and adds that there are a few elements that influence their use. For him, utilizing honorifics might reflect a formal setting or the desire to avoid upsetting the addressee rather than necessarily implying that the recipient is of greater standing than the speaker.

Yet, there are many variables that affect the use of honorifics, including power, distance, formality, age, and gender. The context-meaning or intended meaning associated with the usage of honorifics is influenced by power.

One of the elements that interacts with power disparities is age. Age, for instance, impacts who is respected and by whom within a family. For instance, a nephew may refer to his aunt as "aunt" rather than by her first name because she is older than he is. Yet, compared to age and/or power, gender has less of an impact on the use of honorifics.

As a result, this study will not take gender into account. The most crucial consideration is formality, according to which the social or situational context dictates whether or not to employ an honorific.

In truth, deferential forms of politeness like honorifics can be used to convey formality; in these situations, all honorific forms are distinguished. In situations like conferences, weddings, TV news, and ceremonies, for instance, utilizing honorific forms does not always imply that the addressee is/are socially superior.

Instead, it conveys that the setting is formal. Setting and intent are two factors that establish a context, and it is believed that using honorifics displays the speaker's desire to preserve the addressee's reputation and foster civility as well as their education and authority.

List of Used Literature

1. Brown, P., and Levinson, S. "Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena". In E. N. Goody (eds), Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press . 2009.
2. Reiter, R. Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Auruguay: A Contrastive Study of Requests and Apologies. Amesterdam:John Benjamins Publishing. Company .2007.
3. Searle'J.R. Expressions and Meaning:Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts .Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 1995.
4. Shibatani, M. "Honorifics." In Brown,K. and Miller, J.(eds.) Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 2000.