

# Social Address Terms in Chinese and Their Greek Equivalents: Exploring Different Cultural Norms\*

Sen Chen<sup>1,2</sup>

(1. Shanghai International Studies University, China;

2. Confucius Institute at Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece)

**Abstract:** Social address terms show the vivid and flowing aspects of languages. Different languages have different social address systems, which reflect differences in cultural backgrounds. This article selects eight groups of social address terms in Chinese and their equivalents in Greek, examines the differences between them and then explores the social norms and cultural factors behind these differences from a sociolinguistic perspective. This research contributes to the exploration of cross-cultural communication between the two languages and has positive significance in the fields of trans-language practices, education and teaching.

**Key words:** social address terms, Chinese, Greek, norms

## 1. Introduction: Social Address Terms

It is common knowledge that language changes. Different languages or language varieties usually reflect different cultural and cognitive conceptualizations. As one of the most vivid forms of language life, the use of address terms is part and parcel of everyday communication. Although there is research concerning the comparison of Chinese and English address terms, to our knowledge, there are no comparative studies regarding Chinese and Greek. This article attempts to compare such common terms within the context of Chinese and Greek, while exploring some of the possible reasons for the differences that seem to arise between these languages from a social linguistic perspective with some references to some cognitive linguistic concepts. As the teaching and learning of Chinese in Greek-speaking considered to refer to a static phenomenon including terms that are stored in our memory, with a certain degree of stability, while address terms are dynamic lexical phenomena in use, with a certain degree of flexibility (Cao, 2005).

Mo (2008) thinks that appellation terms express people involved in all types of social relations. On the other hand, address terms are used in verbal communication, where the speaker and the addressee directly address each other. Address terms are not necessarily used in a face-to-face communication, nor do they necessarily indicate a specific relationship that holds between the speaker and the addressee, such as the term “laoshi” “老师” (= teacher). According to Mo (2008), appellation terms and address terms have semantic and pragmatic links and differences.

---

\* This paper was completed under the advice and guidance of Professor Roula Tsokolidou in Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece. The writer wishes to express his great appreciation for her aid received.

Sen Chen, Master of Teaching Chinese to Speakers of Other Languages: Shanghai International Studies University, China; Confucius Institute at Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece; research areas: applied linguistic and TCSOL; E-mail: [chen.sen@hotmail.com](mailto:chen.sen@hotmail.com).

Appellation terms are semantic categories expressing social relations and roles, their referential function being that of belonging to an abstract vocabulary, unrelated to specific people in the real world, while address terms are contextualized and individualized units and the specific relationship with the referent or addressee has a pragmatic meaning (Mo, 2008, p. 22). As we mentioned above, the terms that express social relations and social roles (such as professions) in appellation terms are called non-universal social appellations, while those that cannot express these characteristics are called general social address terms, which means terms that are widely used in society to express general respect. It can minimize identity, age, occupation and status.

Wu (2015) thinks “appellation terms” include address terms and he examines the evolution of some common social appellations in Chinese. He selected to research the use of terms such as “tongzhi/shifu/xiansheng/xiaojie/nyushi/nanshi/ laoshi/ da ge/da jie/da ye/da ma/tongxue/laoban/shuaige/meinü/gemenr/ayi/shushu/xiao huozi” (for the original Chinese words and transcripts please see the appendix table below). Finally, the trends and characteristics of the Chinese appellation system such as “generalization of kinship appellation”, “generalization of specific appellation”, “restart of abandoned appellation” and “enhancement of de-identification” are drawn. Zheng (2009) uses the “Common Appellative Word” to define the “Widely-used Social Address Terms” (cited in Wu, 2015). It is believed that general social appellation terms refer to appellation terms that are widely used in society without strictly referring to the age, occupation, or social status of the person being addressed. She pointed out the characteristics of “generalization”, “deficiency” and “dissipation” in the Chinese general appellation system. She examined the evolution of terms such as “xiaojie”, “xiansheng”, “tongzhi”, “shifu”, “taitai”, “laoshi”, “a yi”, “shushu” and “laoban”. Lu (1992), following the definition of Zwicky (1974), used the term “vocatives” to refer to the above-mentioned address terms. This term includes “calls or summonses” and “addresses”. The pragmatic characteristics of addressing are limited by the degree of the formality of the specific communicative occasion and the degree of intimacy between the interlocutors. He believes that speech acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987) used alone can implement other speech acts. Zhuang (1988) exemplified English address terms, such as “Brother/Man/Son/Girl/Lady/Guys/Buddy/Mate/Partner” and other words. In addition to the names of people, they are specifically divided into: relation terms such as “dad”, professional terms such as “Doctor”, titles such as “Professor”, honorifics such as “Sir”, general nouns such as “Guys”, qualitative terms such as “my darling/you coward”, pronouns such as “you” etc. Obviously, these categories correspond to specific contexts and occasions and some could be considered impolite, such as the use of “you”.

Combining the above research, we think that appellation terms are the terms used to express various social relations between interlocutors and the social roles. On the other hand, address terms refer to the names used by people to greet each other in face to face interactions. In this paper we will focus on certain address terms in Chinese and we will explore their literal and communicative Greek equivalents. The differences that arise will be discussed from a sociocultural perspective with references to concepts that we consider useful from a variety of disciplines.

As we mentioned above, address forms are closely associated with polite language use (Brown & Levinson, 1987), which, despite its universal value, is closely linked with cultural norms. The norms of interaction and interpretation (Hymes, 1974) in every society or even social group may have interesting and noticeable differences that affect communication.

### 1.1 Related Theoretical Background

In order to comprehend and analyze Chinese address terms, we can draw upon cognitive linguistic theories, psycholinguistic theories or sociolinguistic theories.

Qi (2011) chooses appellations such as “shifu/tongzhi/laoshi/laoban/da jie/ xiansheng/xiaojie/ meinü/ shuaige” and uses the prototype theory from cognitive linguistics to explain the semantic fission phenomenon of these appellations. Zhang (2010) basically agrees with the views and definitions of Mo (2008), namely that appellation terms are “linguistic expressions used to express people’s identities in various social relationships” and address terms are “the forms of language expressions used by the speaker to address himself, the addressees, and other direct or indirect verbal participants in the verbal communication behavior.” He uses Langaker’s theory of the Principle of Cognitive Reference Point, Austin’s Speech Act theory and Leech’s Politeness Principle to explain the characteristics of Chinese address terms. This is a similar research framework to the prototype theory mentioned above. Speech act theory (Brown & Levinson, 1978) aims to answer the question of how language is used for “action” instead of for “reference”. Speech acts are usually divided into “locutionary acts”, “illocutionary acts” and “perlocutionary acts”. Within the framework of speech act theory, the hypothesis of face-threatening acts is an important one when it comes to address terms. Face-threatening acts are liable to threaten one’s interlocutor’s positive face even if the acts are not directly threatening as an expression of an accusation or a disapproval. A request or a promise could also be a face-threatening act, given the specific context and the relationship of the interlocutors. This is an issue that needs further research and analysis in the future.

Using this framework to explain the use of appellation or address terms, we can get many pragmatic features of these terms. Wang & Chen (2008) believe that the changes in the meaning of words such as *laoxiao* “老小” (= old and young) are mainly the result of metonymic thinking under the Principle of prominence. “From a cognitive perspective, people tend to pay more attention to most prominent things”. Li (1996) uses the “markedness and code selection theory” (also known as “Negotiation theory”) proposed by Myers-Scotton to explain the rules underlying the use of Chinese address terms. Based on Grice (1975), Myers-Scotton (1983) presented a model which explains variation in linguistic code choice. The model relies on the premise that participants in conversation interpret all code choices in terms of a natural theory of markedness. Speakers recognize choices as either unmarked or marked in reference to the norms of their speech community (Myers-Scotton, 1983). Similar to the Negotiation theory, Li Mingjie (2000) based on the “Schema Theory” established a set of “Address’ Form Schema” and a detailed analysis of three types of appellation modes: feature-driven, identity-driven and semantic-driven mode. This kind of schema is a kind of “semantic schema”. When demonstrating the function of appellation schema, the author puts forward two types, “realistic schema” and “imagination schema”.

Li Jingwei (1999) uses code-switching theory to explain the characteristics of the use of Chinese address terms. Code refers to the symbol system that people use to communicate. Code switching refers to the switch from one code to another in the process of communication. Code-switching is a very large and dynamic area of study that we cannot expand on in this paper. Shao Jingmin (2009) studied the historical background and usage of the appellation “*mei nü*” (= beautiful lady) through a literature survey and explained it from the absence of the appellation system and the psychological characteristics of language users as a starting point.

According to Lerner (2003), address forms are sequence initiating actions, so they have special importance in communication. Address forms in the beginning of an interaction function as a means to establish or confirm the availability of the interlocutor to participate in the given communicative act. Moreover, as we discussed earlier, such terms are related to issues of politeness, face-saving, social norms, all very crucial pragmatic concepts that cannot be neglected when teaching and learning any language. As Leech (1983) proposed, when observing politeness norms the researcher should always take account of the relationship between the speaker and the hearer or the participants in an interaction and the nature of the interaction in which they are involved.

## 1.2. The Research Scope of This Article

To sum up, the research scope of this article is to study the address terms which are widely applicable to people which do not strictly distinguish the addressee's age, occupation, identity, etc. and are mostly used in social occasions. They are generally respectful terms and are often used in unfamiliar situations, which can be used for both face-to-face and back addressing, such as “xiaojie” and “a yi”. These address terms do not refer to:

- 1) occupations, such as “Doctor” or “Rector”.
- 2) terms used for relatives, such as “Dad”.
- 3) names, such as “Donald John Trump”.

## 2. Chinese Social Address Terms

Based on Wu (2015), Zheng (2009), Ji (2000), Qi (2011), etc., we selected nine groups of social address terms in Chinese and described their usage through examples.

### 2.1 The Use of 师傅 Shifu (= master) and 老板 Laoban (= boss)

Shifu is a respectful addressing term, suitable for people with professional skills, usually male, such as taxi drivers, workers, cleaners, etc.

师傅，麻烦到前面那个商场。“shifu, mafan dao qianmian na ge shangchang.” (= “Shifu, please go to the mall in front”.)

The equivalent of shifu can also be found in Greek and it is the word “μάστορας” mastoras (related to ‘master’) whose actual meaning is a handy man, used to refer to men. In this sense Greek is closer to Chinese than English. This word in Greek would be used only to refer to men who are doing some kind of labour and it is not expected to be used in general contexts. An example of its could be the following: Μάστορα, πόσο θα κοστίζει αυτό; “mastora poso tha kostisi afto?” (= Mastora how much is this going to cost?)

The original meaning of “laoban” is “boss”. It was originally used to refer to the leader of a certain enterprise or company, but the current usage has been generalized a lot, and it can be used to refer to any person doing business, even if he/she is a shoe repairer or the owner of a small shop. Anyone who runs a small restaurant can be called a “laoban” according to the addresser's intention. This is also in line with the cognitive interpretation of “negotiation principle” (Myers-Scotton, 1983) and the “cooperative principle” (Grice, 1975, p. 45).

This term in Greek is “afendiko” (= boss) and its use appears to have some affinity to the Chinese “laoban” in specific contexts. For instance, the example “afendiko pos pai i doulia?” (=Boss how is work going?) could be used by the boss towards the employees without necessarily having a sarcastic undertone.

However, it is interesting to note that because Greek is an inflectional language and we have a marked grammatical gender requirement, many such terms tend to be used to refer to male interlocutors more so than in Chinese which does not mark gender.

### 2.2 The Use of 先生 Xiansheng (= Mr) and 小姐 Xiao Jie (= Miss)

“Xiansheng” in contemporary Chinese is equivalent to “Sir” or “Mr” in English, but this word is not a new word, it already existed in ancient Chinese. During the Ming and Qing Dynasties, people called older and educated men “xiansheng”, and it was also used for male teachers, scholars and bachelors. Later, the term evolved to include account management, street artists, and doctors. In short, its more common meaning is an adult male who is good at a certain field or has a skill.

“Xiansheng” in contemporary Chinese expresses great respect for others. It can be used in a wide range of situations, regardless of the age, occupation, marital status, social status, etc. of the addressee. It is interesting to note that because the meaning of “respect” appears to override issues of gender, people sometimes also use “xiansheng” to refer to very outstanding and great women.

The Greek equivalent of “xiansheng” would be “kirios” which can be used either by itself to address all adult men of all ages or it can be followed by the surname or even the first name of the addressee, if it is known. This in Greek is the most generalized term of address for adult men. If used as a noun it can mean “gentleman” as in “ine poli kirios” (= He is really a gentleman).

The term “xiaojie” came into being during the Song and Yuan dynasties and gradually settled in the Ming and Qing dynasties, referring to unmarried young women. In modern Chinese, “madam” and “lady”, which are similar to English, are generally used to refer to young women and convey respect. Related to it are the more popular “nüshi” which is a neutral way to refer to all adult women and “taitai” which is used to refer to married women, like the English “Mrs”.

In the case of “xiaojie” which traditionally refers to unmarried women, Greek, traditionally, seems to follow suit. The term “despinis” (= Miss) has been used to refer to young unmarried women, while ‘kiria’ (Mrs), until recently, was used to refer to married women of all ages. However, since the awareness of sexism in language arose (Tsokalidou, 1996) “kiria” is now used to refer to all adult women, very much like “kirios” for men. So in this case, when explaining the use of “xiaojie” and “taitai” in Greek, it is best to connect both of them with “kiria” as a general term used to politely address all women, with or without a name after it.

### 2.3 The Use of 老师 Laoshi (= Teacher)

The original meaning of “laoshi” is “teacher”, but in recent years it has become very generalized and can be used to refer to almost all people who work in the education system, as well as some people who seem to have a certain status, even if their line of work has nothing to do with education. According to Hou (2014) the appellation “laoshi” is such an adaptable title that will not cause any offence wherever it is used.

In Greek the equivalent terms of “laoshi” *daskale* (masculine form) or *daskala* (feminine form) (= teacher) would not be used in a generic way for people who are not teachers or our own schoolmates. However, it is interesting to note that the term “*daskale*”/“*daskala*” when used to address one involved in education is considered a positive one, perhaps in a similar light to the Chinese “laoshi”. This is a very interesting use of address that requires further study in both languages.

### 2.4 The Use of 大哥 Da Ge (= Elder Brother) and 大姐 Da Jie (Elder Sister)

These two address terms are used to address people slightly older than the addresser and belong to the generalization of the kinship appellation. They can be used for both face-to-face and back calling, expressing respect and closeness.

These two Chinese terms may have some Greek equivalents but they do not seem to be used in a similar manner. Specifically in Greek we use the terms “*palikari*” (=young man with connotations of bravery) and ‘*kopela*’ or ‘*kopelia*’ (young woman with connotations of youth)

### 2.5 The Use of 大爷 Da Ye (= Elder Uncle) and 大妈 Da Ma (= Elder Aunt)

These two terms are used to refer to men and women who are slightly older than their parents but younger than their parents. The addressers are usually middle-aged adults. They are also a generalization of the kinship appellation,

which have the meaning of respect and closeness.

In terms of the Greek language these two address terms do not seem to have equivalents in the Greek language but only their equivalents for “grandpa” and “grandma”, i.e., “papous” and “giagia”. However, it is interesting to note that in Greek even when referring to older people who may be of the age of our own grandparents, we would not address an older man or women as “papou” or “giagia”, unless we know them. For older men and women we would either use “kirios” or “kiria” (Mr or Ms) or ‘thios’ (=uncle)/ “thia” = (auntie) for greater intimacy.

This is an interesting difference from Chinese, in which the age factor seems to be more important and less stigmatized than in Greek and other western languages.

## 2.6 The Use of 叔叔 Shushu(= Uncle)/阿姨 Ayi (=Aunt)

These two address terms are used to address men and women who are similar to or slightly younger than their parents but roughly their parents’ peer. They can be used with the surname, occupation, or individually, expressing respect and closeness. It can also be used for self-reference. For example, a 30-year-old man can call himself “uncle” when he faces a six-year-old child.

Like we said in the previous section, in Greek it is possible to use the equivalent terms for “shushu” and “ayi”, i.e., “thios” (= uncle) and “thia” (= auntie) when intimacy exists with the older addressee. However, in rural areas, where people are more familiar with neighbours etc the terms can be used more generally than in city contexts.

## 2.7 The Use of 哥们儿 Gemenr (= Friends)

“Gemenr” are similar to the English “brother”, which is used to refer to men who are of an equivalent age, expressing an informal and relaxed atmosphere and the intentions expressed are more sincere. They can be used among young, middle-aged and old men, not only to refer to one another, but also for self-reference and they are generally used more often in northern China. In addition to being used alone, it can also be used in combination with other words to express more complex meanings, such as “lao gemenr” (= old brothers), “hao gemenr” (= good brothers), and “qin gemenr” (real brothers).

In Greek, the equivalent of “gemenr” is probably the loan from English “bro” or “brother” which are used among young men and male teenagers to express solidarity. The word for friend, φίλος ‘file’, is also often used for the same purpose, usually among young men and male teenagers.

## 2.8 The Use of 小伙子 Xiao Huozi/小姑娘 Xiao Guniang/老人家 Laoren Jia (= Young Man/Young Girl/Elderly)

The users of “xiao huozi/xiao guniang” are generally middle-aged and elderly. It is used to refer to male/female adolescents or youths younger than the addressers, expressing closeness. The scope of application of “xiao guniang” is slightly wider and it can also be used to refer to children. Conversely, the users of “laoren jia” are generally young and middle-aged people. They are used to refer to the elderly who are much older than the addressers. With these terms, the addressers do not distinguish people in terms of gender, occupation or status.

These address terms do not have equivalents in Greek.

In addition to the above eight groups of address terms used alone, there are also situations in which they are used in combination, such as “hushi ayi” (= nurse aunt), “jingcha shushu” (= police uncle), “nongmin bobo” (farmer uncle) and so on. Other similar address terms include 爷爷 “yeye” (= grandfather), “nainai” (= grandmother), “bofu” (= elder uncle), 伯母 “bomu” (elder aunt), etc. “yeye” and “nainai” are used to address men and women roughly of the same age as the addresser’s grandparents to express respect and intimacy. These can be discussed on another

occasion.

### 3. A Short Review of Greek Address and Honorific Terms

Since this paper focuses on the use of specific Chinese address terms and their equivalents in Greek, it is useful to comment on some issues concerning Greek address and honorific terms. The study of Greek honorific terms has occupied several researchers in social linguistic research in Greek. One of the most well-known Greek social linguists, Makri-Tsilipakou (2012) makes very interesting comments about the flexibility and changeability of such terms according to the interaction and the specific communicative act that makes the categorization of such terms inevitably a very fluid process. Moreover, Sifianou (1992) discusses the different endearment and kinship terms used in Greek, mainly those that can be found in encounters among friends expressing affection. She proposes that the terms “kirie” (= Mr), “kiria” (= Mrs) and “despinis” (= Miss) followed by the surname or the positional title, especially for those in high socially esteemed professions, are the most generic ones.

In this paper, we chose to focus on the Greek equivalent address terms of the Chinese address terms discussed, where such equivalents existed, based on the instinct of the Greek native speakers.

### 4. Attempting a Culturally Relevant Understanding

From the preceding analysis there seem to be differences between the use of Chinese and Greek address terms that bring up a number of questions and may lead to a number of possible interpretations. According to previous research that compared Chinese address terms to other languages, such as English (Qin, 2008, Zhou, 1998), great differences exist between the two languages because of the distant cultural tradition and social background. Kroger et al (1984) further compared the usage of terms of address in Korean, Greek and Chinese, which revealed substantial cross-cultural consistency. The fact that kinship terms, such as “shushu” or “ayi”, as discussed earlier, are extended to non-family members in Chinese is something that would not be encountered in English. However, comparing Chinese to Greek, such a practice may not be as common but it definitely is not unknown within the context of Greek address terms. Perhaps this may show that the two languages and cultures are closer than Chinese and English in terms of the importance they give to relatives and family.

On the other hand, like in English, the factor of age does not seem to be the most prominent one when selecting an address term in Greek, whereas in Chinese this seems to be the case. Perhaps this has to do with the fact that respect to elders is a much more prominent element of the Chinese culture than Western cultures, Greek included.

Explaining cross-lingually and cross-culturally the fluid world of everyday communication words like address terms is an interesting challenge. From this small analysis we find that Greek and Chinese differ but probably less so when Chinese and English are compared. Perhaps some similarities have to do with the history of the societies, as they are both old and have long traditions. On the other hand, they are different as Greek has inflections, grammatical gender which is linked to social gender, Greek society is more Westernized if not a full member of the “western” culture which proposes a different social hierarchy in social relations, perhaps attaching less importance to age and more to social status or gender.

On the whole, the use of Chinese social address terms presents four main characteristics: “generalization of kinship”, “prominence of age signs”, “prominence of intimacy” and “prominence of respect”. In address terms, “respect” does not necessarily involve “intimacy”, and “intimacy” does not necessarily reflect “respect”. For example, the term “Brother” in English reflects intimacy, but there is less respect. “Xiansheng” in Chinese reflects

great respect and formality, but not so much intimacy. We hold the view that “intimacy” and “respect” are two significant internal driving forces of Chinese general social address terms.

As a part of a language, address term systems inevitably have systemic characteristics and the various members of the system have a trade-off relationship. The basic function of address terms is communication. From the internal point of view of the system, if the members of the existing system cannot meet the language users’ growing and changing communication needs and the phenomenon of deficiency appears, then the terms will automatically start self-regulating in order to meet the speakers’ communicative needs. Self-regulation can be realized either through the creation of a new term or by giving an existing term a new meaning. This is the phenomenon of “semantic fission” as we mentioned earlier. Since language is a product of human conventions and considering the economic principles of language, it is not an easy task to create a new word in a short time by a language group. Therefore, we have seen a lot of semantic generalization in the Chinese address terms system. For example, the address “laoshi” is now used to address many people who are not teachers, and the generalization is very obvious. Let us assume a situation. If we meet a well-known old actor and we take a photo together, we feel honored and happy. We want to thank him. Then how do we address him in person at this time? Do we say “Xiexie xiansheng” (= Thank you sir)? Although “xiansheng” is formal and show great respect in Chinese context, it is not intimate enough. In this situation, “Xiexie laoshi” can not only show respect, but also express some intimacy. Apart from “laoshi”, in a situation like this, there seems to be no other address term that is more appropriate.

If we observe the generalization of kinship terms, the long-standing concept of family bonds in Chinese culture and changes in social life in modern times also seem to be important factors. Chinese people attach great importance to family culture. One of the notable features is the system of respect, such as 孝顺 “xiaoshun” (= filial piety) in traditional Chinese culture. Therefore, when the need to express “intimacy” and “respect” appears in the address system, the generalization of the kinship appellation is a matter of course. In addition, China’s 面子 “mianzi” (= face) culture cannot be ignored in the research of address terms. In Chinese culture, it is considered a necessary action for both parties to give each other face. This can also be understood as a two-way courtesy. The eight groups of social address terms listed in this article are all honorifics and all show respect. In contrast, social address in Greek tend to be generally respectful or neutral. In Negotiation theory, the social purpose of conversation is the negotiation of a set of obligations between the speaker and addressee (hereafter S and A). The deference maxim enjoins S to show deference in the code choice to those from whom you desire something: either S and A appear more equal, or S appears lower than A. Giles & Powesland (1975) also explain much of code selection in terms of convergence and divergence: by their code choices, Ss either bring themselves closer to As or distance themselves from As. This is a kind of self-lowering strategy. For example, when you call an ordinary small business person “laoban” (= boss), his/her status will be elevated by you, and you may get what you want more smoothly, or, in any case, have a smoother verbal communication. This is similar to the “mianzi” in Chinese culture. The original intention of the “mianzi” culture is not to maintain one’s own face. But when both parties give face to each other, then one’s own face is also saved. The Negotiation theory explains that all participants in conversation interpret all code choices as either unmarked or marked according to their congruency with RO sets in specific exchanges, following the norms of their speech community (Myer-Scotton 1983, p. 132). Therefore, we can even say that Chinese social address puts forward more “technical requirements” for the intersection strategy of both sides of the speech, while in Greek this is relatively less. In the RO set of Chinese address system, if S flouts the maxim, S creates a marked choice in a conventionalized exchange. Because such a marked choice denies the legitimacy of the expected RO set, it generally provokes an emotional response from A (Scotton 1982, p. 127). For example, if



you are 20 years old and you are addressing a 32 year old woman using “ayi” (aunt), you may get her anger and her response like “qing jiao wo jiejie!” (= Please call me sister!)

However, before we carry out a more in depth and widespread comparative study it would be immature to draw final conclusions but we can only suggest some concluding remarks.

## 5. Concluding Remarks

All human interactions are realized within an invisible, yet existent, solid, yet fragile, communicative and interactional sphere. It is interesting and it would require a special study to compare terms that express affection in the two languages, given that the Chinese culture is not known to be one that openly expresses affection, in contrast with the Greek culture in which affection is often expressed without hesitation, both linguistically and paralinguistically. From the preceding analysis, we can conclude that there is a wider range of generalized address terms in Chinese when compared to Greek. This wider range could possibly indicate an effort on the part of Chinese to cover a wider range of emotional intentions in communication than Greek, compensating for the fact that Chinese seems to be a more reserved language in expressing emotions on the whole.

From the discussion above we can conclude that using the right address form in either Chinese or Greek is an important aspect of establishing the ground for successful communication. This makes the teaching and learning of the appropriate address forms even more important within the context of L2 learning and teaching. We also know that language and culture are two sides of the same coin, so, inevitably, when teaching a language, we teach an important part of the culture in which the language is primarily used as the main means of communication. It is our conviction that the teaching of Chinese to Greek-speaking students is gradually becoming more widespread as our own statistical and qualitative information shows (Tsokalidou, Chen & Zhang, forthcoming), so the need for more comparative studies that both highlight interesting aspects of the two languages and augment the students’ understanding of linguistic and cultural similarities and differences between Chinese and Greek are needed.

## References

- Brown P. and Levinson S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cao W. (2005). “Appellation and addressing terms in contemporary Chinese”, *Journal of Jiangsu University (Social Science)*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 62–69, doi: 10.13317/cnki.jdskxb.2005.02.011.
- Eelen G. (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Giles H. and Powesland P. (1975). *Speech Style and Social Evaluation*, New York: Academic Press
- Grice H. P. (1975). “Logic and conversation”, in: Peter Cole & Jerry Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 41–58.
- Hou C. (2014). “Analysis on the generalization of the address term “teacher” in Chinese from the perspective of sociolinguistics”, *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 575–580.
- Hymes D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ji C. H. (2000). *Dictionary of Chinese Appellations*, Hebei: Hebei Education Press.
- Ju C. P. and Zhou J. B. (2018). “Retrospect and prospect of Chinese appellation research in the past 30 years”, *Journal of Changzhou Institute of Technology (Social Science Edition)*, Vol. 36, No. 3, doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1673 – 0887.2018.03.016.
- Kroger R. O., Wood L. A. and Kim U. (1984). “Are the rules of address universal?: III: Comparison of Chinese, Greek, and Korean usage”, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 273–284, doi: 10.1177/0022002184015003002.
- Li J. W. (1999). “Code-switching and the symbolic functions of addressing terms”, *Journal of PLA Foreign Language University*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 8–18.
- Li M. J. (1996). “Application rules and negotiation theory of address forms”, *Chinese Language Learning*, No. 4, pp. 57–60.
- Li M. J. (2000). “Address form schema: The cognitive pattern of address’s forms”, *Chinese Language Learning*, No. 3, pp. 10–15.

- Liang X. B. and Li Y. Z. (2006). "The enlightenment of prototype theory in foreign language teaching", *Foreign Language Education*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 67–74, doi: 10.16362/j.cnki.cn61-1023/h.2006.04.008.
- Lu W. Z. (1992). "Discussion on address forms in English and Chinese", *Foreign Languages Research*, No. 4, pp. 48–62, doi: 10.13978/j.cnki.wyyj.1992.04.009.
- Makri-Tsilipakou and Marianthi (2012). "Self-/other-correction as a measure of sociolinguistic awareness: The case address/reference", in: Z. Ghavrilidhou, E. Thomadhaki & P. Kambaki-Voughoukli (Eds.), *Selected Papers of the 10th International Conference of Greek Linguistics*, pp. 929–939, Komotini: Democritus University of Thrace, available online at: <http://www.icgl.gr/files/greek/88-929-939.pdf>.
- Mo X. Y. (2008). "Appellation terms = addressing terms? — Concept interpretation of appellation terms and addressing terms", *Foreign Language Education*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 20–24, doi: 10.16363/j.cnki.cn61-1023/h.2008.04.009.
- Myers-Scotton C. (1983). "The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice", *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, Vol. 44, pp. 115–136.
- Pavlidou T. (1994). "Contrasting German-Greek politeness and the consequences", *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 21, No. 5, pp. 487–511, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(94\)90026-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)90026-4).
- Qi S. (2011). "On semantic fission phenomena of Chinese widely-used address forms from the perspective of prototype theory", Changchun: Master's Thesis of Northeast Normal University.
- Qin X. C. (2008). "Choices in terms of address: A sociolinguistic study of Chinese and American English practices", in: Marjorie K. M. Chan & Hana Kang (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics (NACCL-20)*, Vol. 1, Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, pp. 409–421.
- Song D. S. (2001). "Schema theory and its enlightenment in foreign language teaching", *Journal of Xi'an Foreign Language University*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 75–78.
- Shao J. M. (2009). "A social linguistic survey on the controversy over 'Meinü' as an address form", *Applied Linguistic*, No. 4, pp. 71–79.
- Sifianou M. (1992). *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sifianou M. (2017). "I ennia tis evgenias sta ellinika: The concept of politeness in Greek", in: Georgakopoulos T., Pavlidou T. S., Pechlivanos M., Alexiadou A., Androutsopoulos J., Kalokairinos A., Skopeteas S. & Stathi M. K. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, Vol. 1, pp. 45–74.
- Tsokolidou R. (1996). *To Fylo Tis Glossas (The Gender of Language)*, Athens: Syndesmos Ellinidon Epistimonon.
- Tsokolidou R. and Chen, S. and Q. Zhang (forthcoming). *Introduction to the World of Chinese-Isagogi Ston Kosmo Tis Kinezikis Glossas*, Thessaloniki: Ekdoseis Zygos.
- Wang Y. L. and Chen M. (2008). "On wife-one of the three meanings of laoxiao in ancient Chinese: With a discussion about the semantic change of address terms under the principle of prominence", *Journal of Zhejiang University (Humanities and Social Science)*, Vol. 38, No. 5, pp. 186–192, doi: 10.3785/j.issn.1008-942X.2008.05.024.
- Wu C. (2015). *Research on the Evolution of Modern Chinese Widely-used Social Addressing Terms*, Inner Mongolia: Master Thesis of Inner Mongolia University.
- Zhang J. (2010). *A Study of Reference and Intention of Address in A Dream of Red Mansions from an Integrated Approach of Cognitive Linguistics and Pragmatics*, Shanghai: Doctoral Dissertation of Shanghai International Studies University.
- Zheng J. L. (2009). *The Study of Chinese Common Appellative Word*, Jinan: Master Thesis of Shandong University.
- Zhuang H. C. (1988). "Discussion on address forms in Chinese", *Foreign Languages Research*, No. 4, pp. 65–78, doi: 10.13978/j.cnki.wyyj.1988.04.013.
- Zwicky A. (1974). "Hey, what's your name", in: *The Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, University of Chicago.

Appendix Some social address terms in Chinese and their equivalents in Greek and English

Chinese characters	English transliteration	Greek-English transliteration	English Translation
师傅	shifu	Μάστορας-mastoras	Master
先生	xiansheng	Κύριος-kirie	Mr
小姐	xiaojie	Κυρία-kiria	Ms
女士	nǚshi	Κυρία-kiria	Madam
老师	laoshi	Δάσκαλε-daskale (masc) Δασκάλα-daskala (fem)	Teacher
大哥	dage	None	Elder bother
大姐	dajie	None	Elder sister
大爷	daye	None	Elder uncle
大妈	dama	None	Elder auntie
老板	laoban	Αφεντικό-afendiko	Boss
哥们儿	gemenr	Φίλε -file	Brother
阿姨	ayi	Θεία-thia	Aunt
叔叔	shushu	Θείος-thios	Uncle
小伙子	xiao huozi	None	Young man
小姑娘	xiao guniang	None	Little girl
老人家	laoren jia	None	Elderly