

ABSTRACT:

Focussing on the pragmatic dimension of literary dialogue in narrative fiction, this paper analyses: a) the negotiation of power carried out by characters and the way it is relayed in the translation as signalled by forms of address; and b) the negotiation performed by the translator when dealing with the source language text’s and the target language text’s cultural and social environment in order to reproduce a power relation in the target language text. By analysing one hundred years of Robinson Crusoe translated into European Portuguese (the translations range from 189- to 1992) my contribution will attempt to reveal a possible historical development of
translational norms and the way in which the historical, cultural and social environment may influence them.

THE NEGOTIATION OF LITERARY DIALOGUE (TRANSLATION)

FORMS OF ADDRESS IN ROBINSON CRUSOE TRANSLATED INTO PORTUGUESE

1. Introduction

The dialogue in narrative fiction includes several dimensions that may be relevant for its translation. These include the poetic, linguistic and pragmatic dimensions. The translation of literary dialogue raises special problems and the pragmatic dimension appears to be especially prone to be the first to be lost or altered in translation, as stated by Ben-Shahar (1994:197).

In this paper, I propose to focus on the pragmatic dimension of translated fictional dialogue, by analysing it as a dynamic process between participants, following a statement by Hatim and Mason:

Once a written text is seen as an act of communication, negotiated between producer and receiver in the same way as conversation is, the way is open to regarding text as process rather than product, and translation as an operation performed on a living organism rather than on an artefact as lifeless as the printed word on the page appears to be. (Hatim and Mason 1990: 80)

The source language text (ST) chosen is Robinson Crusoe by Daniel Defoe (1660-1731), which was first published in London in 1719 under the title The Life and strange surprizing adventures of Robinson Crusoe, of York, Mariner, Written by Himself. I take twelve Portuguese translations of Robinson Crusoe published between 189- and 1992 as a starting point and I propose to analyse the interaction that takes place between characters – the conversation between Robinson and Friday – and also that which takes place “as a conversation” between translator and target text implied reader, as participants in “an act of communication”. I decided to focus on these two and leave out the other dyads of “as-conversation” interaction.
In order to analyse the interaction between characters, I chose to examine the choice and use of forms of address to determine how the power relation between participants is signalled. To study the interaction between translator and target text implied reader I firstly analyse the status assigned to the translator in the graphic outline of title and copyright page; and then analyse the way in which the translator relays the relation between characters as expressed in the use of forms of address. In doing this, I would like to pay special attention to the way in which the translator negotiates between different social environments, namely those implied by the ST and those belonging to the target language text culture.

In their (re)creation of the target language text’s (TT) fictional social context, the translator may negotiate between several social environments. On one hand, when analysing the fictional social context generated by the source text, they may consider the social environment of the historical period in which the ST was published (in this case 1719), or that of the historical period recreated by the ST (in this case, the second half of the seventeenth century). When considering the Target Text culture for which they are creating the TT, the translators may take into consideration the social environment of the historical period in which the target text will be published; and/or they may also consider the possibility of “flavouring/colouring” their texts by including some elements recognisable as belonging to a former historical period (either real or fictional).

I will start by stating a few taken-for-granted that have led me to undertake this sort of descriptive study. Then, after a summary of the theoretical framework put forth by Brown and Gilman in their 1960 article: "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity", I will proceed with a brief outline of modes of address in Modern English and Modern Portuguese. Finally, after presenting the hypothesis for the analysis carried out, I will conclude with some comments on its results.

1.2. Taken-for-Granted

This study proceeds from a few taken-for-granted about the relationship between language, interaction and social structure:
a) In its ideational function as defined by Halliday (1970), language both creates our view of reality and ourselves and results from it. Therefore, texts produce a context, a view on reality that relates to their social, political, cultural and historical environment.

b) In its interpersonal function, language builds the interaction that arises between participants. Verbal interaction implies both choosing a role for the addressee and the addressee (which both result from and create the micro-social environment) and negotiating a power relation with the other participant or participants, within a given social structure (the macro-social environment). The relative social status of participants will be marked linguistically by several features, among which modes of address are to be counted. Therefore, an analysis of the forms of address used by participants in a text shall reveal part of its context. The view of reality and social structure generated in and by that text is revealed by comparing the choices made with the possibilities offered by the system but rejected.

c) Different cultures display different patterns of modes of address. These patterns are therefore culture specific, and they display historical, social, regional and situational variation.

d) When trying to relay the interactional component of a text, the translator mediates between and may be influenced by different social and cultural environments: those implied by the ST and those pertaining to the target culture. The already mentioned interactional component of the ST may, in turn, be considered yet another context: the social context it generates.

e) All these taken-for-granted apply to texts in general and also to literary texts.

The main purpose of this paper is then to detect how historical, social and cultural change in the culture in and for which the TT has been established may influence the way a translator conveys and builds the social relation signalled by modes of address in a literary fictional text. In doing so, the translator will reveal his/her relation to the ST and its social and cultural environment, to the social and cultural environment of the TT, and through this to the implied reader.

2. Choice of Corpus

The corpus analysed includes all Portuguese versions of *Robinson Crusoe* listed in our National Library catalogue, irrespective of the type of Portuguese text produced. It includes direct and
indirect translations, full text translations and adaptations (either explicitly presented as such or not) involving in some cases a change of medium, i.e. from verbal to mainly visual, in the case of comic books. The heterogeneity of the corpus is a possible problem I decided to leave unsolved, in order to avoid limiting the time scope of this analysis. This enabled the descriptive study of approximately 100 years of Portuguese translations of *Robinson Crusoe* (1896-1992) as well as an attempt to delineate a possible evolution of translational norms with respect to the issue at hand (Toury 1995).

Two dialogue excerpts were chosen for this analysis. The two depict the beginning of the relationship between Robinson and Friday and the way it is negotiated. In these excerpts, Robinson Crusoe is basically testing Friday’s allegiance: to his people or to Robinson Crusoe, who saved his life.

The 12 Portuguese versions of *Robinson Crusoe* I have come up with may be organised in a cline extending from full text translations to adaptations. Therefore, the analysis applied had to be adapted to the type of clues to the interactional component of the dialogue present in the excerpts in consideration. Since in some cases the translations result from a high degree of condensation, the only possible way to determine the relationship between participants in the dialogue seemed to be the analysis of modes of address used by them.

3. Problems for the study of translation of forms of address
As mentioned by Baker, the interactional component of a text as signalled by the choice of forms of address, among other features, creates specific problems of translation:

The familiarity/deference dimension in the pronoun system is among the most fascinating aspects of grammar and the most problematic in translation. It reflects the tenor of discourse (...) and can convey a whole range of rather subtle meanings. The subtle choices involved in pronoun usage in languages which distinguish between familiar and non-familiar pronouns is further complicated by the fact that this use differs significantly from
one social group to another and that it changes all the time in a way that reflects social values and attitudes." (Baker 1992:98).

To the problems of synchronic social variation, in covariation with social values and attitudes mentioned by Baker, which in themselves raise considerable difficulties to the description of the modes of address of only one language, are added a few more resulting from diachronic and diatopic variation. Taking into consideration the “subtle choices” analysed by cross-cultural studies of forms of address, one could add further difficulties arising from:

a) Formal differences. One language may display an exclusively pronominal system and another a formally variegated system of forms of address (pronouns, nominal forms, exclusively verbal forms), i.e. in some languages the forms of address are grammatically marked, in others they are lexically marked.

b) Grammatical differences. Even when two languages have a formally similar system of forms of address these items may differ in terms of syntactical behaviour. For example, nominal forms function in Portuguese in subject position or as vocatives, whereas in English nominal forms function as vocatives only. As mentioned by Lyons (1983), V-forms in Italian and Spanish are third-person singular forms, whereas in French and Russian they are second person plural; they, therefore, display a different syntactical behaviour.

c) Frequency differences. Even if two languages display systems both formally and syntactically similar, the frequency of use of forms of address may differ as well as the meanings attached to different frequencies.

d) Different illocutionary objectives/Modes of address. The number and type of contrasts of illocutionary objectives/modes of address in each language may differ. Some language systems do not display ways of grammatically coding the difference between modes of address (e.g. English only has the pronoun of address you). Other languages portray dyadic systems, which may fall within the T/V opposition proposed by Brown and Gilman. Some are said to display tryadic systems, with an intermediary mode of address between two extremes of familiarity and politeness, others may even include a higher number of contrasts.
e) Different Components subjacent to illocutionary objectives/Modes of address. Different languages may present different components subjacent to the use and evaluation of the system of forms of address (such as topic, formality, relative age/generation, social status of participants), or they may present a common system of components which however come together differently to determine each mode of address.

f) Switching and breakthrough. The frequencies and meaning of switching between symmetrical and asymmetrical pronoun use, or between a familiar and polite mode of address, and the context in which it happens, may differ between languages; the components determining this behaviour may vary too. The same applies to breakthrough.

Last but not least, another problem may arise from trying to delineate a uniform approach applicable to the languages in consideration. This may result either in the obliteration of a few peculiarities (so as to achieve applicability to both systems) or of calqueing the system of one language upon another one. This is a problem Jakobson refers to as the "great danger of reinterpreting the data of one language from the point of view of another pattern" (1960:278).

It is not the purpose of this paper to provide solutions to all of these problems, but it is, however, important to keep them in mind when analysing the translation of forms of address.

4. The Brown and Gilman Model

For lack of a model especially designed for the study of translation of forms of address, I propose to analyse their translation, as textual clues for the interactional component of a text, based on the well-known model by Brown and Gilman (1960). Before moving any further, I will summarise what the authors call the "general semantic sequence" of the history of T and V pronouns in certain European languages.

Brown and Gilman's model is based on the fact that, contrary to English, the French, German, Italian and Spanish languages (among others) still have two singular pronouns of address. These
are familiar and polite pronouns of address linked to two dimensions, which are said to be essential for the analysis of social life: power and solidarity. The authors therefore analyse the semantics of the pronouns of address, that they explain as "covariation between the pronouns used and the objective relationships existing between speaker and addressee" (Brown and Gilman 1960:253).

Their study departs from the historical evolution of the use of Latin pronouns of address. Initially only the second person singular pronoun *tu* was used to address a single addressee. However, the second person plural pronoun *vos* started to be used to address the Roman emperor around IV AD. The use of this deferential plural form of addressing a single addressee later expanded to include other powerful people besides the emperor.

What the authors call "the non-reciprocal power semantic" (1960:255), i.e. a non-reciprocal use of pronouns of address expressing an asymmetrical power relationship, is said to have crystallised in Europe between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries. It determined the use of a polite pronoun by the less powerful to address the powerful and the use of a familiar pronoun by the powerful to address the less powerful. Among peers, the upper classes would reciprocate the polite pronoun and the lower classes the familiar one. The components subjacent to asymmetrical power relations are said to be: "physical strength, wealth, age, sex, institutionalized role in the church, the state, the army, or within the family" (Brown and Gilman 1960:255).

Brown and Gilman use the first character of the Latin pronouns *tu* and *vos* to designate familiar and polite pronouns, respectively. Combining the symmetrical and asymmetrical use of *T* and *V*, Brown and Gilman therefore propose a two-dimensional semantic model that produces four categories of address to describe this stage of equilibrium. Two power-coded categories of asymmetrical use: the *T* of condescension and the *V* of reverence; and two categories of symmetrical use: the (solidary) *T* of intimacy and the (weakly solidary or not solidary) *V* of formality.
This equilibrium changed, according to the authors, in the nineteenth century: "However, all our evidence consistently indicates that in the past century the solidarity semantic has gained supremacy" (1960:259). The interference of solidarity in power coded relations is said to have resulted, after an intermediate period of conflict, in a contemporary one-dimensional system of mutual solidary T or mutual not solidary V. Solidarity is explained in terms of a symmetrical relationship developed due to certain similarities, especially those "that make for like-mindedness or similar behaviour dispositions" (Brown and Gilman 1960:258).

In a very clear table included below (table 1), Peter Trudgill (1974:100-122) summarises the four stages in the general evolution of pronoun use sketched by Brown and Gilman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 1 S</th>
<th>Stage 2 S</th>
<th>Stage 3 S</th>
<th>Stage 4 S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>+ P → + P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>- P → - P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>+ P → - P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>- P → + P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P= Power   S = Solidarity   NS = No Solidarity

Table 1 (Trudgill 1974: 104)

Stage 1 only distinguished singular and plural pronouns; so for a single addressee the T-form applied. In Stage 2, with the introduction of the power factor, non-reciprocal usage for power-coded relationships applies: the less powerful use the polite pronoun to address the powerful, and receive a familiar pronoun in return. In Stage 3 the introduction of the solidarity factor creates
points of conflict of the two factors, which are shown in Italics. Finally, stage 4 corresponds to the current resolution of the conflict in favour of the solidarity factor, with reciprocal use of either T or V pronouns of address.

Therefore, the authors present a sequence of four stages which, though not exactly isochronous for the languages and cultures studied by them, are nevertheless said to be applicable to European languages and cultures “most nearly related to English” (Brown and Gilman 1960: 253). Their chronology is mainly based on the relationship developed between social structure, ideology and the pronoun semantics:

The non reciprocal power semantic is associated with a relatively static society in which power is distributed by birth right and is not subjected to much redistribution – the power semantic was closely tied with the feudal and manorial systems. (...) The reciprocal solidarity semantic has grown with social mobility and an equalitarian ideology. (1960:264)

Therefore, the authors stress the importance of social structure and ideology as factors determining the semantics of forms of address.

5. Brief Outline of Modes of Address in Modern English and Modern Portuguese

Keeping in mind the difficulties facing any attempt to cope with the translation of forms of address (mentioned in 3.), I will give a brief description of the systems of modes of address involved in this study, applying and when necessary adapting the model by Brown and Gilman.

In order to identify the systems of address to be outlined, one must firstly identify the periods of the evolution of both Portuguese and English corresponding a) to the ST and its social context and environment; and b) to the TT culture social environments that may intervene in the configuration of the TTs. All Portuguese translations fall within the period of the history of the Portuguese
language generally referred to as Modern Portuguese (1750 onwards), and the English ST belongs to Modern English (1660 onwards) – and so does its fictional context.

The systems of modes of address of these two languages and diachronic varieties display different degrees of complexity. The main distinction lies in the fact that in subject position English does not display any possibility of familiarity/deference contrast, which however exists in the choice of nominal forms of address as vocatives. In English in subject position the only second person pronoun used is you, and the verb does not mark any contrast either. The Portuguese language shows a familiarity/deference contrast marked primarily by the verb form and a complex familiarity/deference cline of forms of address in subject position.

5.1. The Modern English system of modes of address
The English system of modes of address does not currently display any possibility of grammatically coding different modes of address. In subject position the pronoun you is currently the only one used in speech and writing. The use of thou is circumscribed to "prayer and naïve poetry" (Brown and Gilman 1960:253), to non-standard dialects, and to the use of members of the Society of Friends (Quakers). Different modes of address are, therefore, lexically coded. Nominal forms function as vocatives and the basic choice in English will be between first name (FN) or title + last name (TLN), although other conventions are also applicable.

5.2. Evolution of pronominal forms of address in English
Historically, before the thirteenth century, only a distinction between singular and plural forms of address applied: thou-thee (singular) and ye-you (plural). By the end of the thirteenth century, ye-you was already used as polite, deferential and singular pronominal form of address. By the sixteenth century, you replaced ye in subject position in the standard and by the eighteenth century thou had disappeared from the standard, and was replaced by you (Alexander 1982; Strang 1991; Leith 1993; Pyles and Algeo 1993; Barber 1993; Baugh and Cable 1994).

5.3. The Modern European Portuguese system of modes of address
Due to its complexity the European Portuguese system is often referred to as antiquated, conservative and intricate. Carreira (1997) underlines the especially complex nature of European
Portuguese when compared to the other main national norm, Brazilian Portuguese, and to other national norms which display a much simpler system.\textsuperscript{6}

The following outline only considers items that occur in subject position to identify a single addressee. It is, therefore, a simplified version of the patterns of modes of address in Modern European Portuguese, designed solely for the purpose of the present analysis.\textsuperscript{7}

The Modern European Portuguese system of modes of address includes the use of different types of formal items: pronouns or nominal forms in subject position followed by a verb. To address a single addressee the inflected verb marks a basic difference between 2\textsuperscript{nd} person singular and 3\textsuperscript{rd} person singular forms of address, and the pronoun or nominal form in subject position may be omitted. Therefore, in this model the inflected verb is identified as signalling the major frontier in a dyadic system of familiar and polite forms of address, the use of which is expressed in a few languages by delocutive verbs such as French tutoyer/vouvoyer or German duzen/siezen, or by paraphrases such as Portuguese tratar por tu/tratar por você.

I shall refer to these familiar and polite forms of address as T and V-forms respectively, expanding the application proposed by Brown and Gilman (1960:254), who use these symbols to designate familiar and polite pronouns.

In Portuguese, the current possibilities of addressing a single addressee involve a choice between five basic alternatives (the brackets indicate the implicit form, and marked/unmarked are used in the broad sense of not-neutral/neutral):

T-Address forms:

T1. Tu + Verb marked for second person singular: \textit{Tu vais}. (marked for contrast)\textsuperscript{8}

T2. $\emptyset$ + Verb marked for second person singular: \textit{(Tu) Vais}. (unmarked)

V-Address forms:
V1. *Você* + Verb marked for third person singular: *Você vai*. (marked as less-V mode)

V2. ∅ + Verb marked for third person singular: (Nominal form/ *Você?*) *Vai*. (unmarked)

V3. Nominal Form + Verb marked for third person singular: *O Pedro/O Senhor vai*. (marked as polite not-intimate 1-5 or polite and deferential 6-16, below)

Nominal forms are said to be the most frequent forms of address in Portuguese (Lindley Cintra 1986). In subject position, they are always preceded by a definite article marking gender and number, and include different combinations, which signal various degrees of social closeness or distance. In the list below, I chose not to include reference to the definite article, because it is present in all forms of address that occur in subject position. The most common feminine forms of address are implicitly included, and they are only mentioned explicitly when no masculine correlate form of address exists.

The list below includes the most common nominal forms of address, classified in a cline from the less to the most distant. If we exclude the ones numbered 1-5 below, which do not express deference, all the other nominal forms of address do, with the most deferential numbered 16.

1. First Name: *o Pedro*.
2. Last Name: *o Queiroz*.
3. Kin/Correlate: *o tio/menino*.
4. Kin + First Name: *o tio Pedro*.
5. *Menino* + First Name: *o menino Pedro*.
6. *senhor*: *o senhor*.
7. *senhor* + First Name: *o senhor Pedro*.
8. *D.* + first Name: *a D. Maria*.
9. *senhora D.* + First Name: *a senhora D. Maria*.
10. *senhor* + Title: *o senhor doutor*.
11. *senhor* + Title + First Name: *o senhor doutor Pedro*.
12. *senhor* + Title + Last Name/s: *o senhor doutor Queiroz de Barros*.
13. Title + First Name: *o doutor Pedro*.
14. Title + Last Name/s: o doutor Queiroz de Barros.

15. Names that specifically characterise addresser/addressee relation: o patrão/meu amigo/cavalheiro ‘Boss, my friend, gentleman’ etc.

16. Vossa Excelência, Vossa Senhoria, ‘Your Excellency’ etc.

Carreira (1997:68), in a study dedicated to what the author defines as “verbal proxemics” of European Portuguese, as I see it, also uses the solidarity/power semantic dimensions. The author recovers two dimensions from Kerbrat-Orecchioni (1992): the horizontal and vertical axes. In my view, what the author refers to as the horizontal axe -- representing the degree of familiarity vs distance -- corresponds to solidarity, whereas the vertical axe corresponds to the power dimension, since the author defines it as representing hierarchies determined by social/professional/cultural status, family kinship and age (Carreira, 1997:19-20). Carreira classifies Portuguese forms of address in a cline extending from +familiar and - distant, to –familiar +distant, identifying a tryadic system. The author stresses the complexity of the Portuguese system and identifies social status as the main component determining the choice of forms of address (Carreira 1997:29).

The particular circumstances in which each of these forms of address is preferred have been thoroughly described by Carreira 1997. Given the number of symmetrical (20) and asymmetrical (theoretically 190!) pairs of address, a description of each one of them would certainly fall without the scope of this article. They will be mentioned only when analysing the actual forms used in the Portuguese translations in consideration.

The main problem in combining the description suggested by Brown and Gilman with the Portuguese system results from the fact that there seem to be more factors at stake than just power or solidarity, and more classifications possible than just T or V. The formal complexity of the Portuguese system entails subtleties of address not described by the Brown and Gilman model.
Paul Friedrich encountered a similar problem when analysing the Russian system of forms of address. On this problem the author remarked: “the correlation between pronouns and solidarity is complicated, and it is difficult to predict behaviour within an actual system in terms of a simple continuum between the *ty* of “like-mindedness” (Brown and Gilman 1960) and the *vy* of “weak solidarity.”” (Friedrich 1966:231) The author therefore proposed ten components subjacent to Russian pronominal use and evaluation. However, this more complex scheme is developed within the framework of the Brown and Gilman model for, as stated by Friedrich: “The relation of any variable in any given case to one or both of Brown and Gilman’s macro-discriminations has been left implicit.” (1966:231)

The difficulties in applying Brown and Gilman’s model to the Portuguese system of modes of address seemed to be similar, and a similar solution was adopted. I have, therefore, kept the general framework of the Brown and Gilman model and have added more specific sub-categories for the analysis of Portuguese. These sub-categories took the form of a numbered cline for familiar (T1-2) and polite forms of address (V1-3), and within nominal polite forms of address 16 possibilities were discerned (V3: 1 to 16). The different modes of address were thus connected to the actual formal system, and the higher the number of the classification the greater distance was implied. Social status, family kinship and age determine this distance. This solution managed to keep the general framework of the Brown and Gilman model, which has proven to be particularly insightful when applied to cross-cultural analysis, and namely to translation.

Another difficulty in the application of the Brown and Gilman model of pronominal usage to the Portuguese system of modes of address is formal. It results from the fact that nominal forms are necessarily present as one of the basic alternatives for V-forms of address in subject position. The V-pronoun *você* is not an acceptable pro-form for other V-forms of address. The nominal forms can be omitted in an exclusively verbal form of address but cannot be substituted by the V-pronoun *você*, because of its marked less-V nature. The disappearance of the polite second-person plural pronoun *vós* has left a gap in the system of pronouns of address, which was not filled by *você*. When the verb marked for third person singular is used alone, the nominal form is usually
inferred, though some speakers also use this structure as alternative to explicit \textit{você} + verb. The \textit{V}-forms may be classified in a cline: from the less-\textit{V}-form \textit{você} (V1), to the more-\textit{V} nominal forms in general (V3).

Therefore, since the Portuguese language does not have an exclusively pronominal system, I would say that the only Portuguese parallel for \textit{T} and \textit{V} pronoun usage as defined by Brown and Gilman (1960) are the exclusively verbal forms of address: \textit{T2} and \textit{V2}. This fact also compelled me to expand Brown and Gilman's use of the symbols \textit{T} and \textit{V}. The authors use them to describe pronouns of address only and I use them to describe forms of address in general, so as to render this model applicable to the Portuguese system.

In the analysis I shall therefore classify Portuguese forms of address as either \textit{T1-2} or \textit{V1-3}, and identify the type of nominal form of address by including the number of the above list (1-16) between brackets.

5.4. Evolution of pronominal forms of address in European Portuguese

For the purpose of this analysis, I will not attempt to outline the evolution of nominal forms of address, firstly because of the complexity of this issue, secondly because it is not essential for my analysis and thirdly because it has already been carried out elsewhere (v. Lindley Cintra 1986). However, in order to understand the forms of address of Modern European Portuguese (1750 onwards), the period which encompasses all Portuguese translations analysed, it is important to give a very brief description of the evolution of the system of pronominal forms of address. This will also contribute to identify the circumstances in which each one to them is preferred.

The singular \textit{\textsc{T}-Form} was and continues to be \textit{tu}. The singular \textit{\textsc{V}-Form} was \textit{vós} (second person plural) until the first half of the eighteenth century (in Old Portuguese, Pre-Classic and Classic Portuguese), but in Modern Portuguese its use has become very rare. As mentioned by Casanova: “The form \textit{VÔS}, however, is less and less used, and corresponds nowadays to a very restricted use.
It is very limited to certain regional usage, to pompous speeches addressed to a plural addressee and to literary speech of archaic nature, and still survives in religious speech” (Casanova 1989: 181, my translation). Its use is so restricted that Dias Ferreira, in an article dedicated to the study of modes of address in the work of the Master of Wakefield, does not mention it when identifying pronominal T and V-forms for Modern Portuguese: “Portuguese tu/você” (Dias Ferreira 1987: 11, my translation).

There is nowadays a new V-pronoun você (third person singular), which according to Lindley Cintra was first used in writing in 1666 (1986:27) and has become very frequent. The appearance and spread of você is interesting for it may explain its less-V or almost borderline nature. Historically, it is an abbreviation of an originally deferential and later degraded nominal form of address: Vossa Mercê > Vossancê > você (Lindley Cintra 1986: 27). It probably retains part of its V-character from the originally deferential nominal form of address, used for royal address (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries), then for noblemen, and later extended to other people not so highly ranked. It, thus, implies social distance, but not deference, and therefore contrasts with the T-Form: tu.

It has, however, a less-V or even close-to-T-character, which probably results from its nature of abbreviation and particularly as abbreviation of a form of address recognised as degraded since the 17th century. The use of você, where a full nominal form is expected, functions historically as well as currently as disrespectful when used by the less powerful to address the powerful.12

5.5. Brief historical background: nineteenth- and twentieth-century Portugal
At the serious risk of gross simplification, I will give a brief outline of the major tendencies of social structure and ideology of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Portugal which are considered essential to provide a basic historical framework for the study of forms of address in the corpus (189—1992).13
Nineteenth-century Portugal is characterised by "an ancien régime society only slightly embourgeoisé" (Godinho 1979: 50; my translation). From 1834 onwards a constitutional monarchy, Portugal survived nearly 50 years of political instability (involving strife between Absolutists and Constitutionalists which led to a dynastic civil war) and lived from 1847 onwards in a system of rotating governments of two political parties.

As for social structure, in the nineteenth century the population remained mainly agricultural (around 75%). The industrial revolution did not succeed both because the privilege-based agricultural structure and the profits of commerce especially with Brazil functioned as very strong obstacles to industrialisation. A timidly emerging bourgeoisie was reduced in number also because the number of cities was low: in 1864, Portugal had 19 cities, where only one tenth of the population lived. By 1900, the global rate of illiteracy was still of 80%. Only the middle class and part of the urban people had, therefore, access to the information circulating under the recent form of daily newspapers, which in the second half of the nineteenth century had become less political and more informative. For these reasons, the subject did not become a citizen.

In the twentieth century, Portugal witnessed the revolution of 1910 that put an end to the constitutional monarchy and proclaimed the first Republic (1910-1926), a very unstable parliamentary regime marked by factionalism, labour unrest and public violence. This first democratic experience came to an end with a coup in 1926, which declared a military dictatorship. In 1933, the proclamation of the new Constitution ended the military dictatorship and started another authoritarian regime to be known as “Estado Novo” (‘New State’ 1933-1974).

During the “Estado Novo”, political parties were banned, the opposition was clandestine, the censorship of the military dictatorship was not lifted, and propaganda and political imprisonment enforced "order". The regime was characterised by extreme conservatism. A few movements of political opposition did not have immediate political consequences besides exposing the growth of opposition to the authoritarian regime.
During the first eight decades of the twentieth century, the Portuguese working force changed although never at the pace of its European neighbours. In 1900, more than half of the active population was working in agriculture, by 1981 only one fifth was. The transfer of the working forces from agriculture to industry and services was slow during the first two decades of the dictatorship but intensified during the last two (Cabral 1999:331).

By 1970, industry produced 46.4% of the national product against only 19% of agriculture: Portugal was no longer an "essentially agricultural country". By 1970, 77% of the population lived in urban centres. However, there was an "urban gap" between the two main cities – Lisbon and Porto – and the rest of the country due to the almost non-existence of medium sized urban centres. The 1960 population census data reveal a highly stratified society, in which approximately 80% of the population was devoted to menial work, and what we usually identify as middle classes were hardly noticeable. Despite the rise of the figures of population attending school, in 1960 only 1% of active men had a university degree, only 5% had attended high school, 37% had not gone beyond primary school and 57% were illiterate. These figures are indicative of the consequently scarce possibilities of social mobility (Cabral 1999:331).

The slow industrialisation was, however, accompanied by an intensified polarisation of the Portuguese society. The expansion of the salary dependent middle class as well as the growing political organisation of the rural and industrial proletariat provided initial support to the overthrow of the regime. The "Estado Novo" would end in 25th April 1974 with a military revolution caused to a great extent by an opposition to the colonial war started in 1961. The Revolution was followed by the proclamation of the third Republic, which in a way brought with it the restoration of the political plurality of the first republic (1910-1926).

The fall of the dictatorship entailed a search for new ways of social, economical and political organisation. The former ideology based on "Portugalidade" and colonial expansion, family values and catholic religion -- enforced by propaganda, censorship and secret police -- gave way to another one based on the glorification of the working classes, the ideal of a society without
classes, on what was then referred as an "exemplary de-colonisation", on freedom of speech, feminism and an alteration of family relationships. The politically motivated ideal of neutralisation of hierarchies, the proclamation of freedom as number one value, supported by the influence of media provoked a major change of values.

The initial influence of the Communist party and radical leftist groups in post-revolutionary Portugal gave way to Socialist, Social Democratic Centre (conservative) and Popular Democratic (centre-right) minority and coalition governments. In 1980, with the Democratic Alliance (centre right) government constitutional reforms, Portugal entered full civilian rule. From the eighties onwards, the growing power of the media and an increasing verbalisation of all issues brought by freedom of speech also originated the decline of the interest for political issues among the youth. In 1986 Portugal became a member of the EEC. This decade proved very important for the general evolution of Portuguese society in the direction of growing openness to foreign influence, increasing support of free-market economy, general improvements in welfare, education and health. It also marked the end of a very serious economic recession.

6. Hypothesis for the Analysis of the Translation of Forms of Address
Applying the four stages of the Brown and Gilman model to the description of Robinson Crusoe, the relation depicted in the eighteenth century novel is expected to correspond to Stage 2: the non symmetrical use of the V of reverence and T of condescension. In the social and cultural environment of the novel as well as in the fictional context generated by it, the power factor determines an asymmetrical use between master and servant/slave. Thus, the interaction between Robinson Crusoe and Friday, in terms of narrative clues to their relation, is expected to be of the type represented in Table 2:
If we analyse the English text, the power relation is signalled by the use of nominal forms of address. In English the asymmetry is created by Robinson’s use of First Name to address Friday, and Friday’s use of the deferential Master to address Robinson. This precludes the analysis of their common fate as a solidarity-generating factor, and marks a social distance also present in the forms of reference used by Robinson.

The analysis of forms of address also reveals an interesting fact about the novel: it mirrors the pronominal use of its implied reader -- the novel was published in 1719 -- and not that of the historical period corresponding to its fictional context. The fictional context configures the second half of the seventeenth century for Robinson states: “I came on Shore here on the 30th of Sept. 1659” (6414). By then thou was still in use, and Robinson might have addressed Friday using this T-pronoun. However, Robinson always uses you to address Friday, and only uses thou to address his conscience and God. Only once does he use it to address Friday, and this signals a shift of register by Robinson Crusoe which corresponds to a mocking allusion to religious discourse: “Alas! Friday, (says I) thou knowest not what thou sayest!” (226) Due to its exceptional nature and primary function, this instance was not included in the analysis.

As stated above, Robinson always uses you in subject position and the first name as vocative to address Friday: “You always fight the better said I, How came you to be taken Prisoner then, Friday?” (214). Friday, in what Robinson describes as “broken Words” (218) or “broken English” (222), either uses the noun Master in subject position to address Robinson or you: “Yes, yes, says he, wish be both there, no wish Friday there, no Master there.” (226), “You do great deal much
good, says he, you teach wild Mans be good” (226) “What you send Friday away for?” (226). The asymmetrical relationship created by the use of these forms of address is outlined in table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robinson Crusoe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

The Portuguese translations range from the last decade of the nineteenth century until the last decade of the twentieth. However, it is not easy to relate the social and cultural environment of the different Portuguese translations and their implied readers to the stages suggested by Brown and Gilman (1960). Given the ideological, social and political evolution of the Portuguese society, Brown and Gilman’s identification of stage 3 – the interference of the solidarity factor in power coded relationships – with the nineteenth century may be arguable for the case in consideration. Therefore, the social and cultural environments of the Portuguese translations may in fact correspond to either Stage 3 or 4 – following Brown and Gilman’s proposals. Nevertheless, they may also correspond to power-coded explicit asymmetrical use (i.e. stage 2 as in table 2), given the historical evolution outlined above, the conservative political environment and the highly stratified society with scarce possibilities of social mobility until the mid-1970s.

Slavery was abolished in Portugal in 1869, after an initial ban to trading of slaves south of the equator in 1836. Consequently, the social relations available in the social environment of the implied reader that may adjust to the one depicted in the novel are either of the employer-employee or of the master-faithful servant type, referred to by Brown and Gilman (1960: 260). So, in the social and cultural environment of the Portuguese texts, the interpreter/implied
reader/translator can be regarded as likely to draw a parallel between the Robinson Crusoe-Friday interaction and one of the types in Table 4, following Brown and Gilman.

Table 4

In stage 3 A and 3B, the solidarity factor has already been introduced and causes tension (depicted as dotted lines) because the power factor suggests one use and the solidarity factor another. In stage 4 A and 4B, this tension has been resolved, and the solidarity factor determines a reciprocal use of either T or V.
In stage 3A, the tension in the employer-employee relation is caused by the introduction of the solidarity factor in a relation determined by the power factor. This tension is resolved in Stage 4A by making the employer shift from the power-coded T-form of condescension to the V-form of formality, suggested by the solidarity factor. In stage 4B, making the faithful servant shift from the non-solidary V-form of reverence to the solidary T-form of intimacy solves the tension in the master-faithful servant relation.

Considering the social and cultural environment of the Portuguese texts produced after 1960 (the date of publication of the Brown and Gilman article) it is also important to consider the possibility of a further evolution. This is mentioned by the authors as “the direction of current change” (1960: 261) and is extrapolated from the data provided by their informants on the pronoun use of young people as opposed to that of older people:

Once solidarity has been established as the single dimension distinguishing T from V the province of T proceeds to expand. The direction of change is increase in the number of relations defined as solidary enough to merit a mutual T and, in particular, to regard any sort of camaraderie resulting from a common task or a common fate as grounds for T. (Brown and Gilman 1960: 261)

The likelihood of perceiving this evolution in contemporary Portuguese is further reinforced by a comment in the preface to a work on modes of address by a famous Portuguese linguist. In his second edition of 1986, Lindley Cintra mentions the need to update his account of the modes of address used at the time of the first edition of 1972. The reason for this lies in “the significant changes which have occurred in the system of modes of address, related to the transformations which have been operating in the Portuguese society since 25th of April 1974 (a great expansion of the area of use of tu and você, and an even greater retraction of the use of V.Exa.)” (Lindley Cintra 1984: 7; my translation). In other words, the author refers to an expansion of the use of T and V-
pronouns and a dramatic retraction in the use of the deferential nominal form of address *Vossa Excelência*.

The political, cultural and social consequences of the transition from a dictatorship to a democracy in Portugal have left their imprint on the system of modes of address. Accordingly, we may expect stage 4B to be the most available model of forms of address for Robinson Crusoe and Friday in the social and cultural environment of Portuguese translations published after the mid-seventies. Before this, stages 2, 3 or 4 are possible.

7. Results of the Analysis

The results of the analysis are shown in Table 5. The corpus was narrowed down to 12 translations and excludes different editions of the same translation as well as two conspicuous cases of word for word copy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of version</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference To Translator</td>
<td>TP3</td>
<td>TP6</td>
<td>CP4</td>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>CP4</td>
<td>CP4</td>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>CP2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Adaptation explicitly mentioned as such  
(A): Adaptation not explicitly mentioned as such  
FT: Full-Text Translation  
TP: Title Page  
CP: Copyright Page  
N: Position in TP or CP

Table 5
If we analyse the relevance given to the translator, we notice that until 1937 the name of the translator is mentioned in the title page, and in the special case of the well-known author Pinheiro Chagas, in the 189-translation, his name is mentioned but not Defoe’s.

After 1937, the name of the translator only appears in the copyright page. In most cases of explicitly mentioned adaptation (1959 and 1980), the name of the translator is included only after the title, the author or the adapter and the illustrator. In two translations (1977 and 1984), it is not mentioned at all. Omitting their names from the title page therefore graphically signals the translators’ second rank status. This is further weakened by the position occupied in the copyright page, or even pushed to the extreme of omission.

This fact might be indicative of the translators’ *modus operandi* of submission to the source text, and to the social environments implied by it. Actually, it works the other way around: in the nineteenth century and in the first decades of the twentieth, the translator’s appearance on the title page seems to correspond to a strong allegiance towards the patterns of modes of address of the source text’s social environment (i.e. Stage 2, an asymmetrical power-coded use of forms of address). Nevertheless, the use of Stage 3 modes of address is already noticeable (i.e. tension between symmetrical and asymmetrical use of polite/familiar forms of address). As the decades go by, the translator is relegated to a graphically secondary position. However, his allegiance to the implied reader’s social environment in terms of modes of address is revealed by the use of stage 4B modes of address, i.e. reciprocal use of familiar forms of address, which are the ones more likely to be found in the implied reader’s social environment.

Table 6 outlines the forms of address used in the twelve Portuguese versions of *Robinson Crusoe* included in the corpus. Each translation is classified according to the stage of the general semantic sequence of forms of address that corresponds to the forms used by Robinson and Friday.
The corpus includes five cases of Stage 2 forms of address, indicating a clear parallel to the power coded asymmetrical relationship depicted in the source text. This may also result from the social environment of the TT, in view of the reasons explained above.

In the 189-translation, Robinson addresses Friday using the familiar verbal form of address marked for second-person singular (T2): “Como foi então que foste preso?” ('How were you then arrested?' 189-:273) and Friday replies with either an infinitive omitting subject (V2) --also including an oblique form of the third person singular pronoun: “Porque estar em colera contra Sexta-Feira? O que mim fazer contra si?” ('Why you angry with Friday? What me do against you?' 189-:281); or the use of the deferential nominal form of address Senhor: “Senhor tomar, senhor matar Sexta-Feira, não enviar Sexta-Feira para sua patria” ('Master take, Master kill Friday, no send Friday away to his home country.' 189-: 282). In the 1959 translation, Robinson uses either the explicit familiar second-person singular pronoun tu (T1) or the verb marked for second person singular (T2) to address Friday: “Não tenhas medo. Aprocoma-te! Quero salvar-te!” ('Do not
be afraid. Come closer! I want to save you!’ 1959: 117) “Mas neste caso o batido foste tu” (‘But in this case, you were the one who was defeated.’ 1959: 122-3). Friday, in turn, uses the deferential nominal form of address Amo ‘Master’ followed by an infinitive verb form (V3-15): “E porque estar Amo enfadado com Sexta-Feira?” (‘Why Master be angry at Friday?’ 1959: 128). In one 1975 (identified as 1975b) translation, Robinson again uses either the explicit familiar second-person singular pronoun tu (T1) or the verb marked for second person singular (T2) to address Friday: “Se a tua nação peleja sempre melhor do que as outras, porque foste feito prisioneiro?” (‘If your nation always fights better, why were you made prisoner?’ 1975b: 205) “Tu partirás sozinho, Sexta-Feira” (‘You will leave alone, Friday’ 1975b: 214). Friday uses the deferential nominal forms of address meu amo or Senhor ‘Master’ followed by an infinitive verb form (V3-15): “Não querer Sexta-Feira lá e meu amo cá” (‘No want Friday there and my Master here’ 1975b: 213) “Senhor ensinar eles bem” (‘Master teach they well’ 1975b: 214).

In all the above translations, the asymmetrical relationship is clearly marked by Robinson’s use of a familiar form of address marking a power-coded relationship (T1 or T2 of condescension) and Friday’s use of a deferential form of nominal address (V3-6 or 15 of reverence) which lexically marks the power difference between both participants: Senhor and Amo/meu amo ‘Master/my Master’. It is also worth pointing out that the use of the first name as a form of self-reference, as well as the use of the infinitive (instead of the correct inflected form) and of the nominal form of address not preceded by article is used throughout the corpus as a means of conveying Friday’s use of English that Robinson often calls “broken English”.

These five cases of Stage 2 forms of address include two adaptations of the 189-translation which have been published in the 1980s. Given the prestige of Pinheiro Chagas, the translator of the 189-version, I have interpreted the use of clearly power coded forms of address as a result of the negotiation between adapters whose name is not even mentioned and the prestige attached to a translation produced by a very well-known nineteenth century author. In the 1984 translation, no name is mentioned for the adaptation of this translation; in the 1989 translation, one can read in very small print that the adaptation was carried out by the “Serviços Editoriais” (the ‘editorial
department’ of the publishing house). The forms of address of the 189-translation are, therefore, kept in my opinion due to the prestige of this translation.

Interestingly enough, there are two cases of stage 3B: the 1937 and 1975 translations. In the 1937 translation – published almost forty years before the revolution -- Friday uses both the familiar T of intimacy (T1) and the polite V of reverence (V3-15: amo) to address Robinson: “Porque tu tão zangado com Sexta-Feira? Se amo ir, Sexta-Feira ir. (...) Tu matar Sexta-Feira!” (‘Why you so angry with Friday? If Master go, Friday go (...) You kill Friday!’ 1937:112) and receives the familiar verbal form of address (T2: verb marked for second person singular).

In one 1975 translation (identified as 1975a), Robinson also uses the familiar verbal form of address (T2: verb marked for second person singular): “Sexta-Feira, não disseste que querias ir para lá? (‘Friday, didn’t you say that you wanted to go there?’ 1975a: 216). Friday uses several polite forms of address when talking to Robinson: a) the less-V pronoun você (V1): “Porquê você zangado, aborrecido com Sexta-Feira?” (‘Why you angry, upset with Friday?’ 1975a: 216) b) the third-person singular verbal form of address (V2): “porquê manda Sexta-Feira casa para meu povo?” (‘Why send Friday home to my people?’ 1975a: 216); and c) a deferential nominal form of address expressive of the power relation between them (V3-15: patrão ‘boss’): “não querer Sexta-Feira lá, não patrão lá.” (‘No want Friday there, no boss there’ 1975a: 216). In two very emotional lines, Friday uses the familiar T2 form: “Porque mandas Sexta-Feira longe?” (‘Why do you send Friday far?’ 1975a: 216) and the second-person singular imperative: “Agarra, mata Sexta-Feira” (‘Grab, kill Friday!’ 1975a: 216).

I believe this use of a variety of either polite/deferential or familiar forms of address by Friday to be indicative of the tension introduced by the solidary factor in the TT’s social environment, since this is not present in the forms used in the ST.

Three adaptations published in the eighties and nineties display a radical change of the power relation depicted in the ST. In the 1988 translation Friday addresses Robinson using a familiar T1
form but, since Robinson’s speech is summarised, one does not have access to the form of address used by him. If we consider that this allows us to presume a 4B type of address, then we have three cases of solidary-coded reciprocal use of T-forms of intimacy.

In these three versions, Friday addresses Robinson always using a familiar form of address either explicitly present in the use of the pronoun *tu* or in the inflected second-person singular verb: “Porquê tu zangado com o pobre Sexta-Feira? (…) Porque queres mandá-lo embora?” ('Why you angry with poor Friday? (…) Why do you want to send him away?’ 1980: 23), “Porquê tu zangado triste com Sexta-Feira, que eu fazer?” ('Why you angry sad with Friday? What I do?’ 1988: 44) and “Gostariam de ti porque salvaste a minha vida” ('They would care for you because you have saved my life’ 1992: 27). Robinson, in turn, addresses Friday using the familiar verbal form of address marked for second person singular (T2): “Gostavas de estar na tua terra, entre os teus?” ('Would you like to be back home, among your people?’ 1980:23).

For the translations that maintain the power-coded asymmetrical use of forms of address, it is not easy to determine whether this results from closeness to the power relation of the ST or from its plausibility in the TT’s social environment. However, since the ST’s asymmetrical power relationship is the same for all translations and only the translators and their social environments change, I believe it is possible to interpret the results of this case study as indicative of the tendency to bring the text closer to the implied reader and to his social environment. This may also be corroborated by the fact that none of the translations analysed displays any attempt of historical “colouring/flavouring” by including any items that might be indicative of the social environment and context implied by the ST.

The translation of forms of address seems to have been, in the case analysed, influenced by the type of social environment of the translator and implied reader. This is especially flagrant in the case of translations published in the eighties and nineties. They radically change the power relation present in the forms of address used in the ST and obliterate the open expression of power by depicting a relation that is both symmetrical and familiar in terms of forms of address. It
seems that the “politically correct” environment influences the way of doing translations: they are
domesticated, by reflecting the implied reader's social environment in which the solidarity factor
determines the patterns of forms of address.
«I had a Mind once to try if he had any hankering Inclination to his own Country again, and having learn'd him English so well that he could answer me almost any Questions, I ask'd him whether the Nation that he belong'd to never conquer'd in Battle, at which he smil'd; and said; yes, yes, we always fight the better; that is, he meant always get the better in Fight; and so we began the following Discourse: You always fight the better said I, How came you to be taken Prisoner then, *Friday*?

*Friday*, My Nation beat much, for all that.

*Master*, How beat; if your Nation beat them, how come you be taken?

*Friday*, They more many than my Nation in the Place where me was; they take one, two, three, and me; my Nation over beat them in the yonder Place, where me no was; there my Nation take one, two, great Thousand.

*Master*, But why did not your Side recover you from the Hands of your Enemies then?

*Friday*, They run one, two, three and me, and make go in the Canoe; my Nation have no Canoe that time.

*Master*, Well, *Friday*, and What does your Nation do with the Men they take, do they carry them away, and eat them, as these did?

*Friday*, Yes, my Nation eat Mans too, eat all up.

*Master*, Where do they carry them?

*Friday*, Go to other Place where they think.

*Master*, Do they come hither?

*Friday*, Yes, yes, they come hither; come other else Place.

*Master*, Have you been here with them?

*Friday*, Yes, I been here; [points to the N.W. Side of the Island, which it seems was their Side.]

By this I understood, that my Man *Friday* had formerly been among the Savages, who us'd to come on Shore on the farther Part of the Island, on the same Man eating Occasions that he was now brought for;» (214)
Excerpt II

«Upon the whole, I was by this Time so fix’d upon my Design of going over with him to the Continent that I told him we would go and make one as big as that, and he should go home in it. He answer’d not one Word, but look’d very grave and sad: I ask’d him what was the matter with him? He ask’d me again thus; Why, you angry mad with Friday, what me done? I ask’d him what he meant; I told him I was not angry with him at all. No angry! No angry! says he, repeating the Words several Times, Why send Friday home away to my Nation? Why (says I) Friday, did you not say you wish’d you were there? Yes, yes, says he, wish be both there, no wish Friday there, no Master there. In a word, he would not think of going there without me; I go there! Friday, (says I) what shall I do there? He turned very quick upon me at this: You do great deal much good, says he, you teach wild Mans be good sober tame Mans; you tell them know God, pray God, and live new Life. Alas! Friday, (says I) thou knowest not what thou sayest, I am but an ignorant Man my self. Yes, yes, says he, you teachee me Good, you teachee them Good. No, no, Friday, (says I) you shall go without me, leave me here to live by my self, as I did before. He look’d confus’d again at that Word, and running to one of the Hatchets which he used to wear, he takes it up hastily, comes and gives it me, What must I do with this? says I to him. You take kill Friday; (says he.) What must I kill you for? Said I again. He returns very quick, What you send Friday away for? take, kill Friday, no send Friday away. This he spoke so earnestly, that I saw Tears stand in his eyes: In a Word, I so plainly discover’d the utmost Affection in him to me, and a firm Resolution in him, that I told him then, and often after, that I would never send him away from me, if he was willing to stay with me.» (206)
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The ST version of these excerpts is included in Appendix I.

In other cases, the translations are, in varying degrees, close to full translations. So, it would have been interesting to add the analysis of the interactional characteristics of the conversational exchanges between Robinson Crusoe and Friday, against the backdrop of the power relation set by the forms of address taught by the former to the latter and those actually used in the dialogue. However, given that this analysis of the conversational behaviour of participants was not applicable to the whole corpus, I decided to circumscribe this study to the analysis of modes of address.

Some, as Russian (Friedrich 1960), may portray subtleties not clarified by any of these systems but still functioning within one of these frameworks, which means that the macro-distinctions apply, but sub-distinctions must be added to the model. For other language pairs, different models may be required.

Of course, thou is still to be found in literary works produced either in historical periods prior to its disappearance from the standard or as voluntary recreations of the modes of address of such periods.

"L’évolution de la langue portugaise au Brésil vers une simplification du système de traitement, rapproche cette variété du portugais de celles de l’Angola et du Mozambique, où la tendance vers une simplification se dessine clairement. Le portugais du Portugal, par contre, plus conservateur en ce qui concerne le système des formes d’adresse, garde une gamme diversifiée, complexe et très vivante, de possibilités de modulation de la distance interlocutive. En cela, (...) il se rapproche des langues orientales avec leurs systèmes honorifiques et s’éloigne des langues européennes voisines.” (Carreira 1997: 36-7).

This does not imply unawareness of the complexity either of the issue of forms of address as referred to by Jakobson (1960:278-9) and Friedrich (1966: 214-259), or of its translation as mentioned by Lyons (1983:237-9), Hatim and Mason (1990:67) and Baker (1992:98).

I thank Prof. Leo Hickey for the suggestion of contrast instead of emphasis (v. Hickey 1995).

The actual forms thus classified, following this cline, include: [+ familiar, - distant]: tu, você, o-a, +first name; [+ familiar, + distant]: o senhor [first name / [first name] name], a senhora/ Dona + first name;[-
familiar, + distant]: o title, a senhora Dona + first name, o menino + first name, a menina + first name, o senhor + title, a senhora + title, Vossa Excelência, Vossa Senhoria.

These are namely: “the topic of discourse, the context of the speech event; then age, generation, sex and kinship status; then dialect, group membership and relative jural and political authority; and finally, emotional solidarity” (Friedrich 1966:229).

In the final section of the article, Friedrich explicitly comments this procedure as follows: “... Roger Brown’s model of power and solidarity is very valuable, but perhaps more at a comparative level, because if you say that usage in Russian was based on greater solidarity, then you have to explain what you mean by solidarity to account for it. So you end up with the ten components anyway. This is a bit like a phonemic problem in which you can have one phoneme with several allophones and several rules, or you can have two phonemes with fewer rules and allophones. Something like the latter may be much simpler for certain purposes, and that’s why I like this ten component system.” (Friedrich 1966:257-258)

This may be the reason why Carreira 1997 describes the Portuguese system of modes of address as tryadic: tu/você/o senhor. I believe the Portuguese to be a dyadic system displaying two unmarked exclusively verbal forms of address, namely the familiar unmarked form: verb marked for second person singular, and the polite unmarked form: verb marked for third person singular. The former co-occurs with the explicit subject tu + verb marked for second person singular (marked for contrast). The exclusively verbal form of polite address co-occurs with either the marked less-polite polite form of address: você + verb marked for third person singular, or the generally marked more-polite polite forms of address: Nominal form + verb marked for third person singular.

The main sources for this outline are the Dicionário de História de Portugal (Joel Serrão ed., Vols. 1-6; António Barreto and Maria Filomena Mónica, eds., Vol. 7) and História de Portugal (José Mattoso ed., 8 vols.).

Quotations from the English version of Robinson Crusoe shall be identified by page numbers. Quotations from Portuguese translations of Robinson Crusoe shall be identified by date and page numbers.