

The Study of Changes in English Use through the Movie Dialogues in *Pride and Prejudice*

Xie Zhang (Corresponding author) & Huanqi Ji

School of Literature and Law, Sichuan Agricultural University

No. 46 Xinkang Road, Ya'an 625014, Sichuan, China

Tel: 86-835-223-8211 E-mail: joe0919@126.com

Received: June 7, 2012

Accepted: June 30, 2012

Published: July 5, 2012

doi:10.5430/elr.v1n2p1

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/elr.v1n2p1>

Abstract

Language is by no means in a static condition. It changes all the time. The close relation between language and culture makes it possible for the changes of a society to be reflected in its language. English writer Jane Austin's novel *Pride and Prejudice* has been adapted into movie twice in the year of 1940 and 2005. Characters' dialogues in the two movie versions are the subject of this research. In this thesis, characters' dialogues in the two movies are compiled into two corpora (Corpus 1940 and Corpus 2005). The relevant theories of sociolinguistics and pragmatics are employed to compare and analyze the differences in language in the 1940 version and 2005 version. The research findings offer suggestions on English language teaching and learning. Most English learners learn English for communicating and they communicate with modern English speakers, so it is important for English teachers and learners to realize that what they teach and learn should be modern language which is changing all the time, and their language teaching and learning activities should always keep pace with the constant change of language to avoid being out of date.

Keywords: Language change, Dialogue, Address Form, *Pride and Prejudice*

1. Introduction

Language never stops changing, and English is no exception. If we compare the literature of the Old English period (700-1100), the Middle English period (1100-1500) and the Modern English period (1500-present), we will find that language changes are verified fully. Why does language change? How does language change? These questions are always the topics of linguists' research and argumentation. Psycholinguist A. Meillet points out in his *Historical Linguistics and General Linguistics* that language change is the result of social change. If the society has any sudden or gradual change, language – as a social phenomenon as well as the carrier of the correspondent culture – will change accordingly.

With the rapid development of science and technology, our world is changing with the unprecedentedly fast rate, and so is language. However, for the benefit of language teaching and learning, only to know that language is changing is not enough. To know how language changes is very important even if it is difficult to grasp the changes happening at the very present time, but if we know the direction to which the language changes go, it will be much easier for us to make the correct prevision, which will facilitate the language education in some helpful way and make the language teaching and learning much more effective.

Nowadays, apart from being a gorgeous art form, movie is also a very popular way of entertainment and study. People watch English movies to enjoy themselves, to improve their listening ability, and to understand the western culture better. Meanwhile, for the sake of the development and popularity of the Internet, it is getting increasingly easy to get access to various kinds of sources such as on-line movies, movie subtitles, and movie criticisms. Therefore, it is very convenient to make research by these useful materials. In recent years, many researches have been made to study the movie subtitles, but the emphasis of most studies is put on subtitle translation or the features of subtitle itself, not much on language change. Movie dialogue is a kind of spoken language and usually spoken language changes more and faster than written language, so it would be easier to get some findings on language change by studying spoken language than written language. Hence, it would be possible to explore how language changes through movie dialogue.

If we put the unique address forms of the 1940 and 2005 versions into these six columns, we may get the following Table 4 and Table 5.

Comparing Table 4 and Table 5, we can see that almost in every column there are more address forms used in the 1940 version than those in the 2005 version. This idea is inferred from the very words selected for addressing and the attributes of the address forms.

Let's look at the first column "Title Alone". Address forms for characters that don't appear in both movies are excluded from comparison, like Doctor (there isn't such a character as "doctor" in the 2005 version). The most obviously different use of address form is the addressing for the character Lady Catherine. In the 1940 version, she is addressed as "My Lady", and in 2005, the address forms are "Ladyship" and "Your Ladyship". The use of "Ladyship" and "Your Ladyship" implies that the addressee has power over the speaker, and the use of "My Lady" also has the same implication. However, "Ladyship" and "Your Ladyship" are more formal than "My Lady", thus they show more power over the speaker than "My Lady" does.

In the second column "Title + Last Name", the use of the attributes of address forms is different in two versions. In the 1940 version, speakers express more affection when addressing addressees with the attributes of address forms such as "dear, poor, and my dear". In the 2005 version, speakers express less affection when addressing addressees, because "my dear" is the only kind of attribute speakers use when addressing addressees. Attributes of address forms can reflect speaker's attitude towards addressee, and words like "dear, poor, and my dear" show an intimate attitude of the speaker, so the more use of them is, the more solidarity there is between the speaker and addressee.

The third column is "General nouns". In the 1940 version, "my girl" is what Lady Catherine calls Elizabeth in conversation, and Ladies and gentlemen is a common term used to attract people's attention in the ball. In the 2005 version, "blossom and woman" are what Mr. Bennet calls Mrs. Bennet, and "Ma'am" is what Elizabeth calls Lady Catherine and servants call Mrs. Bennet. Therefore, the general nouns like "Ladies and gentlemen, blossom, and woman" are not very suitable for comparison, because their speakers and addressees are all different. The most comparable pair is that of "my girl" (Lady Catherine addresses Elizabeth in 1940) and "Ma'am" (Elizabeth addresses Lady Catherine in 2005). "Ma'am" is a way of addressing the queen, some women in authority, and especially women of high social class in the past. "My girl" is a way of addressing a common young woman, not a special term for a young woman of low social class. Thus it can be seen that in the 2005 version Lady Catherine has much power over Elizabeth with the use of Ma'am; while in the 1940 version it implies that the power Lady Catherine has over Elizabeth is not much with the use of "my girl". Thus, it is certain that "Ma'am" shows more power, and "my girl" shows more solidarity.

As for the fourth column "First Name", it has the similar situation of the second column. The address forms in the 1940 version in this column have more attributes "dear beautiful, dear, dear (postpositional attribute), my sweetest sweetest, my poor little". In the 2005 version, the attributes of address forms are "my, my dear, my baby". Comparing the attributes in the two versions, we can see that those in the 1940 version show more intimacy and solidarity between speaker and addressee than those in the 2005 version.

The fifth column "Multiple Names (including nicknames)" has only one entry in the 1940 version. "Dummy" is the nickname Lydia uses to call Kitty when they two are playing on the swing. Nickname is used between speakers whose relation is close and therefore bears more solidarity.

In the sixth column "Kinship Terms", the tendency that address forms in the 1940 version show more solidarity than those in the 2005 version is getting very obvious. For example, in the 1940 version, the address form for father is "dear papa", while in the 2005 version it is "father". Also in the 1940 version, the address forms for child are "children, my child, my lamb, and my sweetest child", while in the 2005 version, they are "my dears, my baby". "Dearest, sister, my darling, and my love" are the address terms used in the 1940 version to address sibling, and the corresponding term in the 2005 version is only a brother. It is easy to see that the kinship terms in the 1940 version convey more intimacy and affection than those in the 2005 version, thus showing more solidarity.

To summarize, the differences between the address forms in the 1940 version and 2005 version are: 1) In the 1940 version, address forms are used with high frequency in conversation (654 times in 1:57:26), while in the 2005 version they are used much less (292 times in 1:57:19). 2) There are more types of address forms used in the 1940 version than those in the 2005 version. 3) The address forms used in the 1940 version show more solidarity than power on the whole, while those in the 2005 version are on the contrary.

The higher frequency of the use of address form is, 1) the more complex it can make the language form to be, for there are more words that have to be used, 2) and the more polite the language seems to be. The first viewpoint is

easy to understand and as for the second viewpoint, some further explanation is needed. Address forms are used in starting a conversation, in greeting or parting, in drawing one's attention, in pleading and so on. The use of address forms in these situations expresses speakers' recognition of addressee's existence and the concern of addressee's identity, which is in accordance with the social meaning of politeness.

2.3 Interjections

Interjections are words or phrases used to express a strong feeling such as surprise, pleasure, happiness, comfort, inquiry, regret, impatience, suspicion, pain, etc. In conversation, speakers use them to express their emotion. Some interjections are uttered on purpose under the current situation, but most of them are voluntary and natural expression of the speaker's emotion. The use of interjections is another easily noticed language change in characters' dialogues of the two movies, which is shown in the following Table 6 and Table 7.

According to Table 6 and Table 7, it is easy to find that there are many more interjections used in the characters' dialogues of the old version than those of the new one. A large reduction of interjections in character dialogues also gives audience an impression that the language in the new version is more concise and simpler in form.

Generally speaking, the pragmatic functions of interjections are like the following:

1) Interjections used to express positive feelings such as "bravo", "ah", "well", "hurrah", "Aha", "hallelujah", etc.

Examples:

Bravo. That's the most unforgiving speech you've ever made. (2005) This is what Elizabeth says to her sister, Jane, when Jane finally expresses her dislike to Miss Bingley, and then Elizabeth happily expresses her agreement to Jane's dislike.

I'm so glad! Ah, will you join us in a game of cards? (1940)

Oh, well! Let's go in and break this good news to your mother. (1940)

2) Interjections used to express negative feelings such as "aw", "alack", "boo", "pooh", "hem", "oh", "why", "damn", "ugh", etc.

Examples:

Oh, no, let's not! (2005)

Why, you are too hasty. Sir! You forget that I have made no answer. Let me do so at once. (1940)

Ugh! A provincial young lady with a lively wit. Heaven preserves us! And there is that mother of hers. (1940)

3) Interjections used to attract listener's attention such as "hi", "hello", "hail", "hush", etc.

Example: Oh, hush. Not all of us can afford to be romantic. (2005)

4) Interjections used as answer and hesitation-filler. In conversation, sometimes the speaker doesn't know very well what to say or how to say, but he or she doesn't want to give up the turn, so some interjections are used here as a buffer. These interjections are called "hesitation-filler" such as "er", "well", "hmm", "uhm", "um", etc.

Examples:

Well, you, perhaps, know best about that. (1940)

At a short range, of course. And, with a light bow. Hmm!...What a bad shot. (1940)

Hum, my daughters, Mr. Collins. This is Jane. (1940)

Comparing the use of interjections in the two movies, it can be seen that there are many more interjections used in the 1940 version than those in the 2005 version. Further, considering interjection is the means from which speakers draw support to convey their emotions, feeling and attitudes. Can we say that the less use of interjections and the less support speaker needs to draw to convey their emotions, feelings or attitudes, for they express them more directly? This hypothesis could be supported by the following reasons: First, "hesitation-fillers" are almost not used in the speech of the new movie except "well", but "well" is used only nine times, compared with the 59 times in the old version. The less use of "hesitation-fillers", the less hesitating the speaker should be. Second, it should be noticed that most of the interjections are uttered at the very beginning of a speaker's talking. In this situation, interjections have the function of giving hint of speaker's attitude, that is, instead of expressing speaker's idea directly, the speaker first sends an "advance man" which is the interjection to hint his or her attitude and then begin to talk, which may make the conversation more tactful and polite.

Therefore, it can be seen from the above comparison that the speech in the movie of the 2005 version is more terse and direct than that of the 1940 version and the speech of the 1940 version is somewhat more indirect and polite.

Since two observations of language change have manifested that the dialogues in the 1940 version show more politeness than that in the 2005 version, it is necessary to see if other aspects of language change can support this viewpoint.

2.4 Politeness in Conversation

Leech's Principle of Politeness was first introduced in 1983. The maxims of Politeness Principle are often used by people in conversation. In this part, conversations in both movie versions of the same scenes are analyzed to compare which bears more politeness.

2.4.1 Comparisons of conversations set in the same scenes of two movie versions

The two movie versions are adapted from the same novel and many scenes in movies are bound to be similar or even the same for the story and theme of the two movies are the same. Therefore, comparing characters' dialogues of the same scenes in the two versions, we can easily find the language differences. Six scenes are selected out for comparison.

Scene 1. Background: When Mrs. Bennet tells Mr. Bennet that the Netherfield Park is let and asks Mr. Bennet to visit its host, Mr. Bennet declares that's unnecessary, for he has visited already.

1940:

[Mr. B] Eh? Oh, I'm sorry to hear that, my dear. If I'd known that you'll feel like this, I shouldn't have gone out of my way to make his acquaintance last week. Oh! Oh! It is very unlucky! I even gave him tickets to the Assembly Ball. And I believe he intends to make himself known to you there.

2005:

[Mr. Bennet] There's no need. I already have.

The contrast is sharp. Mr. Bennet's answer in the 2005 version is so neat, while in the 1940 version the answer indirectly and tactfully tells the fact that Mr. Bennet has already visited: have gone out of my way to make his acquaintance last week. Besides, in the 1940 version, direct address forms and interjections are both used to help expressing speaker's feeling. Other utterances, like "I'm sorry to ...", "If I'd known... I shouldn't ...", "I even...", and "I believe..." also show speaker's concern for the listener, and we can say the Tact Maxim is employed here.

Scene 2. Background: When Mr. Bingley, Mr. Darcy and Miss Bingley first goes to the local ball, they are introduced to the people there.

1940:

[Butler] Ladies and gentlemen, Miss Bingley, Mr.. Bingley and Mr. Darcy!

[Sir William] That is indeed an honor!

2005:

[man] How good of you to come.

The introduction in the 2005 version is much simpler, or it cannot even be considered as an introduction, for the new comers' names or titles are not given, so perhaps to call it a greeting is more suitable. In the 1940 version, the introduction is more formal and polite: first, everybody's attention is called and then new comers are presented to people one by one, and at last honor is expressed by the host side for their coming. If regarding the new comers' coming as an honor is a kind of approbation or compliment to them here, this way of speaking employs the maxim of approbation.

Scene 3. Background: Elizabeth goes to Mr. Bingley's house to visit her sister, Jane.

1940:

[Elizabeth] Please forgive me, Miss Bingley. I'm afraid it is a great intrusion. My uneasiness about my sister must be the excuse. Mr. Bingley, would it be possible for me to see Jane?

2005:

[Elizabeth] I'm so sorry. How is my sister?

It is very obvious that Elizabeth's speech in the 1940 version is much more polite and indirect, and the 2005 version

is very direct and simple. In the 1940 version, two address forms are used when Elizabeth speaks to the Bingleys. Utterances like “please forgive me”, “I’m afraid”, “excuse” and “would it be possible for me” are all the signs of politeness. Going to other’s house and demanding to see someone in that house may be considered as a cost to the other, but with the above polite utterances in use, we can see that the tact maxim is employed here.

Scene 2. Background: Mr. Darcy (and Mr. Wickham) invites Elizabeth to dance in the ball.

1940:

[Mr. Darcy] Now that you had been forewarned of my eagerness to dance with you, may I hope that you will do me the honor?

[Elizabeth] I’m afraid that the honor of standing up with you, Mr. Darcy, is more than I can bear. Pray, excuse me.

[Mr. Wickham] Miss Elizabeth, if you’re not engaged, will you honor me with the next dance?

[Elizabeth] I shall be very happy to dance with you!

2005:

[Mr. Darcy] May I have the next dance, Miss Elizabeth?

[Elizabeth] You may.

This situation may be a little complex but the difference in language is still easy to be noticed. Two invitations in the 1940 version are selected to compare with that in the 2005 version. In the 1940 version, the two inviters show great sincerity and respect to invite Elizabeth to dance, and both regard dancing with Elizabeth as an “honor”. Elizabeth’s answers are very polite and appropriate. Her answer to Mr. Darcy is negative, but she doesn’t directly say she wouldn’t. Instead, she says the honor of dancing with Mr. Darcy is more than she could bear, which minimizes praise of herself and shows great modesty, so we can see the modesty maxim is employed here. Elizabeth’s response to Mr. Wickham’s invitation is positive. The utterance “very happy” strengthens her agreement to dance with Mr. Wickham and makes her response more polite, and the agreement maxim is employed here. However, in the 2005 version, the invitation and response are both simple and straightforward. Inviter and invitee don’t show much willingness or excitement or pleasure to dance with each other, and the way of their speech doesn’t show much sign of politeness.

Scene 5. Background: When Elizabeth knows Charlotte is going to marry Mr. Collins and wants to dissuade.

1940:

[Elizabeth] Oh, Charlotte dear, I beg you! Postpone the marriage for a time. I’m only thinking of your happiness.

[Charlotte] Happiness, Lizzie? In marriage, happiness is just a matter of chance.

[Elizabeth] but, Charlotte! His defects of character. You know him so little.

[Charlotte] Well, ignorance is bliss, Lizzie. If one is to spend one’s life with a person, it is best to know as little as possible of his defects. After all, one would find them out soon enough.

[Elizabeth] Well, luckily it isn’t the end of the world.

2005:

[Elizabeth] Engaged?

[Charlotte] Yes.

[Elizabeth] To be married?

[Charlotte] Yes, of course, Lizzie, what other kind of engaged is there? Oh, for heaven’s sake, Lizzie, don’t look at me like that. There is no earthly reason why I shouldn’t be as happy with him as any other.

[Elizabeth] But he’s ridiculous.

[Charlotte] Oh, hush. Not all of us can afford to be romantic. I’ve been offered a comfortable home and protection. There’s a lot to be thankful for.

[Elizabeth] Charlotte...

[Charlotte] I’m 27 years old. I’ve no money and no prospects. I’m already a burden to my parents. And I’m frightened. So don’t judge me, Lizzie. Don’t you dare judge me.

This pair of dialogues is more complex. First, Elizabeth shows her shock and disagreement to Charlotte’s marriage and Charlotte gives her own understanding of this marriage: in marriage, happiness is just a matter of chance (1940);

there is no earthly reason why I shouldn't be as happy as any other (2005). It is obvious that Charlotte's answer in the 2005 version is tougher and harder than that in the 1940 version. When talking about Mr. Collin's shortcomings in the 1940 version, Elizabeth says "His defects of character" in which the sympathy maxim may be employed, while in the 2005 version Elizabeth's judgment is much more direct "he's ridiculous". And then Charlotte explains her opinion towards her future husband: ignorance is bliss ... (1940); not all of us can afford to be romantic...(2005), which also proves that the speech in the 2005 version is more straightforward.

To summarize, the characters' dialogues in the 1940 version employs more maxims to reach politeness, while in the 2005 version dialogues are obviously less polite. Politeness can lead to a result that the more polite the language is, the more complex the language form would be. This can explain why the audience feel the language in the 1940 version is more complex in form and difficult, but that in the 2005 version is simpler and easier to understand. There is other evidence supporting the viewpoint that speech in the 1940 version present more politeness than that in the 2005 version.

2.4.2 Other pragmatic aspects of politeness in conversation

The viewpoint that characters' dialogues are more polite in the 1940 version is manifested not only in the comparison of conversations in the same scenes, but also other pragmatic aspects. For example, requests, the imposition on the listener, are mitigated by being made indirectly, as question: Could you possibly pass me the salt?

There are four sentences for further illustration:

[1] Could you tell me what time the bus leaves, please?

[2] May I ask if you're married?

[3] I must warn you not to discuss this in public.

[4] We regret to inform you that the aspidistra stands are no longer obtainable.

Sentences such as [1] – [4] have, in fact, been known as hedged performatives since they may be regarded as polite mitigations of utterances such as "I warn you that ...", "We inform you that ...". The avoidance of a direct-speech utterance can be a strategy of polite obliquity: [2], for example, is a more tactful variant of "Are you married?".

In this research, it is found that the indirect inquiry structure "May (may) I ..." used in the 1940 version is three times more than that used in the 2005 version, which is another evidence supporting the idea that speech in the old version is more polite. The data are as follows:

1940:

1 Oh /1 ! [# Collins]	May I	add, & madam, that this false step of one of your daug
2 . & Miss Elizabeth,	may I	ask if everything possible is being done to recover he
3 ummy /8 . And, now,	may I	ask you a question /8 , & Mr. Darcy \$ [# D] By all mean
4 he passed this way,	may I	ask 10 \$ [# D] No /1 , & sir. She has not passed this
5 ld! Rich /1 ! [# E]	May I	ask how you have suddenly become so rich 10 , & Mr. Wic
6 Fit William. [#D]	May I	be allowed to continue your interrogations during dinn
7 B] I _i ⁻ m hungry /2.	May I	get you some food /6 , & Miss Elizabeth \$ [# E] No, th
8 & dear son-in-law!	May I	give you a hug, too /7 \$ [# L] What do you think of th
9 sun is shining /4 !	May I	go to the village /6 \$ [# K] Uhm! May I go, too /4 , &
10 age /6 \$ [# K] Uhm	May I	go, too /4 , & mama \$ [# Mrs. B] Well /1 , I suppose so
11, Miss Elizabeth,	may I	have the honor to present Mr. Darcy /10 \$ He _i ⁻ 's eager t
12 h. Ah /, & madam,	may I	have the permission to solicit a interview with your d
13 g /2, & sir. [# B]	May I	have the honor of this dance /8 , & Miss Bennet \$ [# J
14 to dance with you,	may I	hope that you will do me the honor /23 \$ [# E] I _i ⁻ m af
15 liam] Mrs. Bennet,	may I	present Mr. Bingley /5 \$ Mrs. Bennet, Mrs. Phillips, Mis
16 your daughters 1.	May I	say that their fame falls far short of the reality 12
17 line] 1Miss Eliza!	May I	warn you as a friend not to take George Wickham too se

2005:

1 vening 18 . [# Mr. Darcy] May I have the next dance /6 , & Miss Elizabeth? [#
 2 /6. [#Sir William] And may I introduce Mr. Darcy of Pemberley in Derbyshire
 3 here /4 . [/Mrs. Bennet] May I say what an immense pleasure it is to see you
 4 o idea /4 . [#Mr. Darcy] May I see you back to the village /8 ? [# Elizabeth]

In many languages, there are elaborated sets of politeness formulas (Spolsky, 2000). The most common kinds of politeness formulas are involved with greetings, which are the basic oil of social relations. To fail to greet someone who expects to be greeted signals either some unusual distraction or a desire to insult the person. Each social group has its own set of rules about who should be greeted, who should greet first and what an appropriate form of greeting is.

English greeting ranges from an informal “Hi!” through a neutral “Good morning” to a slowly disappearing formal “How do you do!” (Spolsky, 1998). Table 8 shows this range in the two versions of the movie.

From Table 8 it can be seen that the main characters described in the novel *Pride and Prejudice* are of the middle class and nobles, who are inclined to use more formal language, so the most casual form “Hi” is not used in both versions. The frequencies of the neutral forms are equal. However, the use of the most formal form “How do you do” is very different: it is used ten times in the 1940 version, but it is used only once in the 2005 version. It is apparent that in recent years “How do you do” is not often used, and this phenomenon is represented in the movie produced in the current time. Of course, it cannot be said that formal means polite, but in many situations being formal can create a polite atmosphere. For example, if a lawyer goes to meet a client and the lawyer’s dress is very professional and formal, the client may feel the lawyer is serious at this meeting and has showed enough respect to him, and then he may further feel that the lawyer is polite to him. Therefore, being formal in this sense can mean being respectful and being polite. That is why on formal occasions people talk and behave very politely and tactfully to make themselves suitable to the current situation. Hence, formal and polite are closely interrelated and mutually supportive.

3. Conclusion

Language is always changing, and the change can mostly be seen through people’s speech. Once change happens, it will soon permeate the whole society and, in turn, it will be reflected in many aspects of people’s life. Therefore, sometimes language change can be studied through other social phenomena. Movie is one of them. Among all the art forms, movie should be a very special one because it can represent people’s life on the screen more faithfully and can not only present human manners and activities directly, but also unveil human being’s psyche straightforwardly. Therefore, movie is a good channel to study language change, for the language change can be reflected and observed in movies produced in different times.

The study shows that the main language changes reflected in the two movies of *Pride and Prejudice* produced in different times are: (1) Characters’ use of English in the 1940 version is more polite and formal than that in the 2005 version, and accordingly the language form in the 1940 version is more complex; (2) Women’s way of talking has changed in their communications with men. In the 2005 version, women take more initiative in conversation than they do in the 1940 version. These are the results of the corresponding social changes such as the widespread idea of egalitarianism in nowadays society, the rapid pace of modern life and the influence of feminist movement.

To language teachers and learners, although it may be hard to grasp every change in English, to understand its changing tendency is very helpful and important, for it not only gives teachers a macro overview of the teaching language, but also gives learners the guidance to update their knowledge and avoid speaking and writing in an obsolete way. This also gives advice for the editing of English textbooks: although the classical literature should be kept in textbook, more and more new texts should be added in. That is to give learners the most current language materials and make sure what they learn should not be out of date.

References

- Aitchison, Jwan. (2001). *Language change: process or decay?* (3rd). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, R.T. (1976). *Sociolinguistics: Goals, Approaches and Problems*. London: Batsford.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Bynon, T. (1977). *Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165709>

Chao, Yuanren. (1956). *Chinese terms of address*, *Language*, 32, 217-41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/410666>

Chen Jin. (2006). Stereotype of sexist verbal language from the perspective of conversation analysis. Unpublished master's dissertation, East China Normal University, Shanghai.

Cooper, R.L. (1982). *Language Spread: Studies in Diffusion and Social Change*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Duncan, S. (1972). Some Signals and Rules for Taking Speaking Turns in Conversation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 23: 283-92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0033031>

Fasold, R.W. (1984). *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P.Cole & J. Morgan, eds. *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech acts*. London: Academic Press.

Harris, J.W. (1969). Sound change in Spanish and the theory of markedness. *Language* 45, 538-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/411438>

Henley, N. (1987). This New Species That Seeks a New Language on Sexism in Language and Language Change. In Penfield, eds. *Women and Language in Transition*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Hudson, R.A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jespersen, O (1922). *Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin*. New York: W.W.Norton.

Kramer, C. (1974). Wish-washy Mommy Talk. *Psychology Today*, 8: 82-5.

Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York city*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Leech, Geoffrey. (1983). *The principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

Loveday, L. (1982). *The sociolinguistics of learning and using a non-native language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Postal, P.M. (1968). *Aspects of phonological theory*. New York: Harper & Row.

Ren Ning. (2006). Contrastive culture and pragmatic study of address forms in English and Chinese. Unpublished master's dissertation. Xidian University, Xi'an.

Saussure, F.de. (1983). *Course in general linguistics (Roy Harris, Trans.)*. Paris: Gerald Duckworth. (Original work published in 1916)

Searle, John R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609213>

Spolsky, Bernard. (1998). *Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialog and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Table 1. The use of address forms in two versions

	Frequency	Types	Length of time
1940	654	84	1:57:26
2005	292	60	1:57:19

Table 2. The address forms used in 1940 version

Aunt Philips	Kitty *	Mr. Beck
Aunt Catherine	Ladies and gentlemen	Mr. James
Batings	Ladies *	Mrs. Bennet*
Caroline*	Lady Catherine de Bourgh	Mrs. Philips
Charles *	Lady Catherine*	Mrs. Collins
Charlotte *	Lady Lucas	My lamb
Charlotte dear	Lizzie dearest	My dear*
Children	Lizzie *	My sweetest child
Col. Fitz William*	Lydia *	My darling
Darcy*	Madam *	My love
Dear papa	Mama *	My girl
Dear Lady Lucas	Mary *	My lady
Dear son-in-law	Matthews	My sweetest sweetest Lizzie
Dear Miss Elizabeth*	Miss Elizabeth *	My poor little Lydia
Dear Charlotte*	Miss Bennet *	My dear Miss Elizabeth
Dear Mrs.. Bennet	Miss Jane	My child
Dear *	Miss Eliza	Nelly
Dear beautiful Lizzie	Miss de Bourgh*	Papa *
Dearest	Miss Mary	Poor Jane*
Doctor	Miss Bingley*	Poor Mrs. Bennet
Dummy	Miss Lydia*	Robert
Elizabeth *	Miss *	Sir William
Fitzwilliam*	Mr.. Bennet *	Sir *
Girls *	Mr.. Darcy*	Sister
Harry	Mr.. Collins*	Smith
Jane dear	Mr. Wickham *	Dear George
Jane *	Mr. Mackintosh	Wicky
Jennings	Mr. Bingley *	Kitty girl

Table 3. The address forms used in 2005 version

Betsy	Ladies *	Mr. Gardiner
Billy	Lady Catherine *	Mr. Collins*
Blossom	Ladyship	Mr. Hill
Brother	Liddy	Mr. James
Caroline *	Lizzie *	Mr. Wickham *
Charles *	Lydia *	Mrs. Bennet *
Charlotte *	Ma'am	My dear *
Colonel Fitzwilliam *	Madam *	My Lizzie
Darcy*	Mama *	My love*
Dear Miss Elizabeth*	Mary *	My dears
Dear Jane	Miss Elizabeth *	My dear Mary
Dear Charlotte *	Miss Lucas	My dear cousin
Dear *	Miss de Bourgh	My baby
Elizabeth *	Miss Bingley	My baby Lydia
Emily	Miss Lydia	My dear Mr. Bennet
Father	Miss Bennet *	Papa *
Fitzwilliam *	Miss *	Poor Jane *
Girls *	Mr. Darcy *	Sir *
Jane *	Mr. Bingley *	Woman
Kitty *	Mr. Bennet *	Your ladyship

Table 4. Unique address forms of the 1940 version in Power-Solidarity sequence

Title Alone	Title + Last Name	General Nouns	First Name	Multiple Name (nicknames)	Kinship Terms
Doctor	Dear Mrs. Bennet	My girl	Batings	Dummy	Aunt Philips
My Lady	Dear Lady Lucas	Ladies and gentlemen	Charlotte dear		Aunt Catherine
	Poor Mrs. Bennet		Dear beautiful Lizzie		Children
	Sir William		Nelly		Dear Papa
	Lady Catherine de Bourgh		Robert		Dear son-in-law
	Lady Lucas		Smith		Dearest
	Miss Jane		Dear George		My child
	Miss Eliza		Wicky		Sister
	Miss Mary		Harry		My lamb
	Mr. Mackintosh		Jane dear		My sweetest child
	Mr. Beck		Jennings		My darling
	Mr. James		Kitty girl		My love
	Mrs. Philips		Lizzie dearest		
	Mrs. Collins		My sweetest sweetest Lizzie		
	My dear Miss Elizabeth		My poor little Lydia		

Table 5. Unique address forms of the 2005 version in Power-Solidarity sequence

Title Alone	Title + Last Name	General nouns	First Name	Multiple Names (nicknames)	Kinship Terms
Ladyship	Miss Lucas	Blossom	Betsy		Brother
Your Ladyship	Miss de Bourgh	Woman	Billy		Father
	Miss Bingley	Ma'am	Dear Jane		My dears
	Miss Lydia		Emily		My dear cousin
	Mr. Gardiner		Lyddi		My baby
	Mr. Hill		My Lizzie		
	Mr. James		My dear Mary		
	My dear Mr. Bennet		My baby Lydia		

Table 6. The use of interjections in the 1940 version

Type	Frequency	Type	Frequency
Oh	194	Hmm	1
Well	59	Uh-hmm	1
Ah	43	Ugh	1
Ohh	15	Ahem	1
ahh	12	Lah	1
Why	4	Hah	1
Eh	4	Huh	1
Uhm	2		

Table 7. The use of interjections in the 2005 version

Type	Frequency	Type	Frequency
Oh	52	Bravo	1
Well	9	hush	1

Table 8. The greeting forms in the 1940 version and 2005 version

Greeting forms	Frequency (1940)	Frequency (2005)
How do you do	10	1
Good morning Good afternoon Good evening	6	6
Hi	0	0