**Honorifics (Courtesy System) as a Complex form of Social Deixis**

**ABSTRACT**

This paper analyzes one of the types of deixis — social deixis and its branch honorifics which is considered as a complex form of social deixis. The peculiarities of social deixis are its being included in the traditional types of the deixis — time, space, and person. The purpose of the research is to study the concept of social deixis in modern English, the morphological system of grammatical courtesy, honorifics. The main research mechanism of the development of social deixis in English is studied, its purposeful research is carried out, and the various features of its means of expression are revealed and systematically studied on the basis of specific linguistic material. The article deals with local and international research on this topic. The practical significance of this article is explained by the fact that the results of the work can be used in the teaching of English in the communicative aspect, as well as in the analysis of the text. Systematic studying of the various features of honorifics on the basis of specific linguistic material can be interpreted as to its novelty. The result is that honorifics are coding simple types of social information.
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1. **Introduction**

The use of social deixis and its type of honorifics is very necessary for communication. The significance of the research is explained by the fact that the results of the work can be used in the teaching of English in the communicative aspect, as well as in the analysis of the text.

The research of the social deixis is associated with the following goals and objectives:

— To consider the points of development of social deixis, to determine the ways of its expression;
— To find out honorifics and investigate its encoding simple types of social information;
— To highlight the manifestations of the development features of honorifics in English;
— Give examples and analyze the studied deictic data.

The main purpose of our research is to identify and highlight the general theoretical problems related to the concept of honorifics and their means of expression. The purpose of the research was achieved in the course of the work. Thus, the practical part of the research confirms the wide range of deictic information provided in the theoretical part.

The relevance of the topic is determined, on the one hand, by the attention paid by linguists to the study of deixis and its type honorifics, and, on the other hand, by a more in-depth study of the language system in terms of functional grammar and pragmatics.
Such an approach, which requires strict adherence to the language system, most noticeably reveals language activity in its concrete implementation. An analysis of the theoretical literature shedding light on the deixis problem confirms that much work has now been done to study, shape, and deepen this linguistic problem. The first direction of research in the deixis category is connected with the name of K. Brugman. Later, K. Buhler relied on the research of this author in the study of this category. Researchers such as R. Perkins, V. Dressler, C. Filmore, J. Lyons and others have conducted research in this area, which indicates that the view is multifaceted. As deixis is a deep and broad subject, its roots go back to the early philosophical ideas voiced in semiotics in linguistics. Social deixis and its type of honorifics are usually thought of as deictic forms of the category of politeness, which also resonate with personal deixis. Because both social and personal deixis is expressed by personal pronouns, they refer to intimate encounters due to social factors.

2. Methodology

Research methods include direct contextual analysis, cognitive-linguistic, or linguistic description. With the help of these methods, the onomasiological typology (being a universal and special phenomenon) of social deixis and its type of honorifics is clarified.

3. Discussion

The concept of "deixis" as a "linguistic sign", which was in scientific use in the early twentieth century, is already widely used in linguistics. Since that time, the words of any language have been divided into two areas according to the type of meaning and the characteristics of the functions: symbolic and index words. At the same time, both they and others must express their meaning: words of a symbolic field, words of full value, combine their semantic concretization with other words that are semantically synonymous, in terms of their lexical meaning first indicative words are full of specific content in communication.

Social deixis is referred to by some authors as deixis of text and discourse in addition to the traditional trio of deixis, person, time, and space. Social deixis refers to aspects of sentences that determine what is being said at the scene of the act of speech and some of the realities of the social situation. Not everyone agrees on the deictic dimension of social parameters of communication. Still, we agree that at least the speaker and the addressee, as well as the referent's connection, are marked in speech, which symbolically indicates the degree of social distance between the speaker and the addressee.

According to T. A. Suhair, discourse deixis describes deictic expressions which indicate prior or succeeding parts of the discourse. He points out that the words and phrases that indicate the relationship between an utterance and the prior action is a kind of commentary on the text or conversation by the speaker (Suhair, 2019). Kryk B. notes that the demonstratives 'this' and 'that' can also be used to refer to an immediately preceding or following portion of the discourse. Hence, with 'this', one of the participants knows what is being referred to, but the other does not, and with 'that', it is assumed that both the encoder and the decoder know what is being talked about (Kryk, 1985).

Social deixis is commonly used to differentiate the application forms in society. In many languages, the deictic expression is grammaticalized with the help of the person category. Public contributors have been conditioned and perceived as a social performance by the cultural side: teacher, priest, parent's role.

The concept of deixis is introduced to describe the "oriented" features of a language in relation to the place and time of a word. The so-called "personal substitution" (I, you, you, he, etc.) is just one type of language element, meaning that a typical word is defined with reference to "deformation coordinates."

Modern researchers believe that the basic specificity of deixis depends entirely on the movement of the word and that the reference comparison of verbal words and expressions changes with the change of the author of the word from one person to another.

In modern linguistics, the egocentricity of deixis stands out as the main characteristic feature. Space, time, and personal relationships are counted from the speaker's point of view. The speaker stands at the centre of the deictic field.

Example: "I shall never wish to see you again, I Shall never imagine your coming again, I shall forget you, I promise."

The typical state of the statement is egocentric: when moving from one participant to another in a speech, the "central" passages of the deixis system are used ("I" is used by each listener to express himself, and "you" is used to pointing to the listener).

Personal pronouns refer not only to the act of negotiation but also to the category of person. The common individual pronouns and the egocentric element, which is the personal pronoun of the first person, form a small closed system based on the "visual field" of language—any statement made by the speaker with reference to the listener. Personal pronouns actually replace nouns and act as language indicators in the text.

In the process of communication, the personal sphere of the speaker can be illustrated by convenient examples of the pronoun "you", which is a deictic element. First of all, let's start with the fact that the general
interpretation of the pronoun you-you is used when addressing a close person or acquaintance. The pronoun "you" is used when referring to people with high status as a formality. Indeed, sometimes the pronoun "you" is used when referring to a child, whether he or she is a relative or a stranger. In this case, it would be more effective to use the pronoun you. The literary norm in English, which is free from all kinds of rudeness and familiarity, is to address any person with the pronoun "you-you". However, sometimes the use of the pronoun "you" in such cases indicates a dangerous situation.

Example: But you, the artist, firmly believe / At the beginning and the ends. Do not sleep, do not sleep, artist, / Do not sleep. / You are an eternity hostage (Have time in captivity); What did you do for the front? Watch out for the car! You should turn to a deity, angels, spirits etc..

Social deixis is connected with the coding of social differences between participants, first of all, speaking and addressing a person.

Here are some examples: Was the chicken sold out, Sir? Yes, today I brought only two chickens. One was bought by my neighbour, and the other one was bought by Mrs White, the owner of the public phone.

In the first sentence, the speaker kindly addresses the interlocutor with the word "sir", and in the second sentence, the word "Mrs" is treated with respect for an elderly lady.

S. Levinson describes "social deixis as dealing with the encoding of social distinctions that are relative to participant roles, particularly aspects of the social relationship between speaker and addressee(s) or speaker and some referent" (Levinson, 1979). Many aspects of language usage depend on these relations. Still, these usages are only relevant to the topic of social deixis insofar as they are grammaticalized. As mentioned above, honorifics are relative ranks of speaker and addressee systematically encoded throughout, for example, the morphological system. They are exemplified by the polite singular pronoun of address in some European languages (French, Italian, Rumanian, Russian, Spanish).

3.1. Manner or behaviour as a main feature of honorifics

Manner or behaviour has been of interest to linguists as a subject of linguistic research. In the linguistic literature, manner is analyzed either in the plan of research of general strategies of behavior or in the plan of creation of specifics of expression of a positive attitude to the person on the basis of materials of personal, conversational acts in the concrete language (apology, gratitude, compliment, compassion).

The manner problem is the development of manner concepts as a linguistic phenomenon (strategy of conflict resolution and types of social indications); characteristics of manner violations; social psychological factors that determine the forms and functions of polite behaviour; types of manner and discourse; includes issues such as literary language expressions.

Adherence to the principle of manner is an important condition for establishing a relationship between the "I" and the "other", i.e. the speaker and the listener (based on respect for the personality of the interlocutor, which helps to achieve the maximum communicative effect). The meaning of the principle of manner for successful communication is often a condition for the importance of the category of the manner in the structure of social relations of people. Nowadays, this has been reflected in the study of linguistic manner theory.

Manner, by its very nature, is respect for the other person. Defining literature as a good deed emphasizes the procedural side of this situation (behavioral external plan). The outside of this is somewhat autonomous, and therefore good deeds can be matched by a low purpose and a lack of respect for the man. This internal tension has a lexical expression in English polite (polite), courteous (polite). They differ in that the first word refers to the inner aspect of behaviour, and the second to the harmony of the internal and external approach to man.

Based on the theoretical concept of P. Brown and S. Levinson (1987), there is a sense of self-respect of the public person, the individual. There are two main desires for self-esteem: 1) not to see defects in their actions; 2) to be worthy of praise (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

These desires determine the overall behavioural strategy of mitigating the threat to a person's self-esteem. A negative manner depends on giving a person freedom. In contrast, a positive manner depends on presenting unity and solidarity, including the interlocutor and other people in the group with the speaker, avoiding conflict, hierarchical structures in society, the social distance between the speaker and other people. In many cases, they understand literature as a negative manner in language.

Investigation finds out that a positive literary or manner strategy is expressed in the following ways: 1) Pay attention to human; 2) Emotional empathy; 3) Identification of interest to the listener; add the listener to a dialogue; 4) Creating an internal group identification environment, using dialects, slang; 5) Contractual tendency; 6) Avoiding disagreement; 7) Creating a "general area"; 8) Jokes; 9) Direction and desire of the listener; 10) Promise; 11) The expression of optimism in the request; 12) Activating the listener; 13) Reasoning and requesting as a basis for mutual connection and cooperation.
The index of social inequality in the following speech is the frequent use of literary expressions. Respect for the addressee is expressed in the choice and avoidance of certain topics of conversation. There are taboo topics (dear things, intimate life), verbal taboos (prohibition of informal speech for adults), situational taboos.

The expression of negative manner is to pay attention to the interlocutor or a third party in some way by lowering the speaker’s manner. Usually, bad manners are more formal than positive ones. Standard manner forms are those that do not endanger the other person and that have the ability to follow the rules of the manner in public. There are special forms and constructions (command, request, advice) that are used in a direct expression to the interlocutor. Often, manner rules do not allow the use of command forms, excluding small social distances, appeals from adults to children, and extreme cases.

A hierarchical attitude to negative literature in society is important. In the case of the upper class, the strict rules of manner are usually tightened when addressing or talking about the lower class. The up-down relationship can be age or gender (men are socially superior to women) in relation to social hierarchy.

A negative manner is also valuable in a social distance that intersects with a positive manner. Special manner is important only in relation to “others” and can indicate an unpleasant distance to loved ones.

Research shows that a negative manner strategy consists of the following freedom of movement: 1) avoidance of direct request; 2) creating pessimism in the request; 3) respect by lowering one’s position and raising one’s address; 4) not being ready to apologize; 5) generalization of requirements.

P. Brown and S. Levinson outline the following strategies: 1) direct signal; 2) remote sign, associative keys; 3) focusing; 4) increase / decrease; 5) tautology; 6) contradiction; 7) irony; 8) rhetorical questions; 9) ambiguous; 10) use of proverbs; 11) unfinished sentences (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Nevertheless, literary behaviour must be based on a person’s self-esteem. In the manner strategy, the separation corresponds to the separation in the status indicator in the individual and social strata. Status is considered in aspects of the communicative situation, which includes the price partner’s reaction, the will to self-manage.

The characteristics of two types of status price are defined: 1) personal respect or disrespect; 2) social respect or disrespect. The main feature of the status price is the dependence vector or status vector, which determines the position of the up or down. Thus, the status quo sounds like a status index that characterizes people as members of one group or another. Based on the status price, there is a reference point that matches or does not match the speaker’s status. Status price is more or less rational, and any socially significant feature can be the basis of status price. From the point of view of social status, the positive and negative comparisons of literature correspond to the comparison of personal and social distance. A positive manner is “ours”, and a negative manner is communication in “other people’s” environment. Negative politeness is oriented mainly toward partially satisfying H’s (the addressee’s) negative face, his basic claim to maintain claims of territory and self-determination (Mboudjeke, 2010). In foreign linguistics, great importance is attached to the development of the theory of manner. The principle of manner plays a more meaningful role than the principle of cooperation in many communicative situations. The principles of manner are considered as a basis of social deixis.

3.2. The role of politeness in using honorifics

While talking about social deixis, the morphological system of grammatical politeness, i.e. honorifics, is emphasized. Politeness is closely related to etiquette and socially acceptable behaviour, which ought to have been ingrained since youth. Thus, it can be assumed that most socially competent adult would instinctively show polite behaviour in any interaction. (Tan, Teon, et al., 2016). Although honorifics encode simple types of social information, they form a more complex form of deixis. In linguistics, the honorific is a grammatical and morphosyntactic form that encodes the social status of the participants (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Unlike honorific names, linguistic honours are interpreted as formalities, which include features such as social distance, respect, difference, change in a person, and courtesy.

As it is known, the courtesy system is aimed at calming the aggression between the aggressive parties and creating communication. However, some actions are rude and intimidating in their own way. These actions are considered rude.

The investigation finds out two types of rudeness: 1) congenital rudeness; 2) artificial (false) rudeness. Studies show that the effect of rude behaviour depends on three factors. Consider these factors:

1) power;
2) communication;
3) degree of exposure.

Indecent speech is used by speakers to describe their relationship with their addressees.

Consider an example: Tom, come here, just now. (Tom, come here now).

Looking through the example, it is clear that there are three types of effects:

1) to ask the surface (locational force);
2) to express the speaker’s anger towards the addressee;
3) to express a connection of power (i.e., the speaker has the right to insult the addressee) (illusionist power).

Rudeness is less important when people are socially equal. In this case, the rude actions of the speaker are not understood by the addressee as a face-scarer.

According to Y. H. Leech, the principle of politeness explains how politeness affects conversation. He defined politeness as a form of behavior that strengthens and preserves kindness. He notes that the postulate of politeness includes six postulates:

1) tact postulate — giving minimal discomfort and maximum comfort to someone else (directive and commission);
2) postulate of generosity — the creation of minimum conditions for oneself and maximum conditions for others (directive and commission);
3) the postulate of approval — an attempt to reduce the negative assessment of others and increase the positive assessment (expressive and representative);
4) postulate of simplicity — a minimum self-definition and a maximum critical approach (expressive and representative);
5) postulate of agreement — minimizing the conflict between oneself and others, maximizing the understanding between oneself and others (representative);
6) sympathetic postulates — minimizing the antipathy to themselves and others, maximizing the sympathy for themselves and others (representative) (Leech, 1969).

From all of this, it can be concluded that politeness refers to the contextual type of speech. Politeness can be defined as follows:

1) social distance between the speaker and the addressee;
2) power difference between the speaker and the addressee;
3) degree of exposure to the addressee.

It is clear from this classification that the speakers, in addition to performing the desired speech acts, intend to exert certain psychological effects on their addressees. For example, they want their apology accepted.

Thus, the main feature of the honourable system, that is, the system of courtesy, is that everyone can convey the message (message) in both honourable and familiar forms.

According to R. Brown and A. Gilman, there are three main types of honorifics, which are also divided into categories according to the status of the individuals:

1. Addressee (or speaker/listener)
2. Referent (or speaker/referent)
4. Speaker/situation (environment or condition)

The addressee expresses the social status of the person in question, regardless of what is said about him (Brown & Gilman, 1960).

Reference refers to the status of the person in question. In this type of honorifics, both the referent (the person in question) and the target (the person in the status) are the same (Brown & Gilman, 1960).

An example of this is the [t]-[v] difference that currently exists in Indo-European languages. In this case, the 2nd person pronoun "you" is chosen based on the relative social status of the person who speaks and listens both individually and in the plural (in this case, the hearer is also the referent). Surrounding honorifics do not indicate the status of the person in the conversation but the status of those nearby. These are the least active, according to which they are found in the avoidance of speech.

These honorifics were used in ancient Australia in a language called mother-in-law languages, in which a person changed his speech in other illegal or taboo places.

Type 4 refers to the environment in which the conversation takes place, while the speaker/situation honorific does not apply to any of the participants and others. A classic example of this assertion is that the highest form of language is used in formal situations, and the lowest form of language is used more casually.

3.3. The [t]-[v] difference in honorific system

A common system of honorific difference is the [t]-[v] difference. The terms [t] form and [v] form are the terms T — form and V — form, which describes the 2nd person pronouns "tu" and "vos". These terms were first introduced by R. Brown and A. Gilman (Brown & Gilman, 1960). This is due to the idea that the use of these terms is governed by "power and solidarity".

In Latin, "tu" T refers to the form, in the singular, and "vos" refers to the V-form, in the plural. "tu" is used to express informality, while "vos" is used to express politeness and formality. The [t]-[v] difference is mainly characteristic of many Indo-European languages. These languages include Brazilian-Portuguese, Polish and Russian. Take a look at the Brazilian-Portuguese language:
The informal "tu" and the informal "vos" are exactly the same as the [t]-[v] pattern, but their processing varies from region to region.

It is not used in the southern state of San Paulo, but it is used in the northern state of Maranhao. The third lexical choice is added to the honorific scheme. "Senhor" and "Senhora" (literary meaning means sir and madam) are third-person references that are also used in a direct reference. These forms are highly formal and are used when addressing high-class people. These are more common in correspondence (in government circles).

As mentioned above, there is a [t]-[v] difference in the system of honorifics in different languages. There is no honourable speech system in modern English. If someone looks at the English language of the Middle Ages, they can see that the 2nd person singular "thou" pronoun and the 2nd person plural "ye" — later "you" pronoun already made a [t]-[v] difference. "Thou" and related forms are considered obsolete and archaic. Although they are obsolete, they are often used to pronounce archaic words in speech. "Thou" is also preserved in some dialects of English, mainly in some regions of Yorkshire (Brown & Gilman, 1960). This expression can be found both among the elderly and the rural population.

The absence of such systems in European languages reflects the differences between the means and methods of social symbolization. The degree of distance may be related to a variety of factors (interpersonal and emotional therapeutic effects, status and role in cognition, as well as intuitive hierarchical differences) with psychological solidarity, strength, and subordination.

In social deixis, appeal plays a mainly deictic role. The social deictic function has elements related to the 1st and 2nd person, and these elements are what do not depend on the specific location of the utterance.

E. J. M. Quinto notes that in terms of social deixis as a separate category, President Benigno Aquino effectively uses expressions that would aid in the achievement of an advantageous position in political discourse. Specifically, his division of the deictic field between two types of relationship: first, between bosses and beloved countrymen, and corrupt officials, old politicians and thieves, helps him persuade the Filipino people in his favour and ultimately gain political leverage (Quinto, 2014).

Addressing words play an important role in defining the means of communication on the basis of unambiguousness in various fields of linguistics.

The following expressions are mainly used in the application:

Mr., Mrs., Miss + surname

"Mr." is an abbreviated form of the word mister, used in front of surnames or names.

Example: Today, Mr White, you have deserved everything.

"Mrs." — is an abbreviated form of the word mistress. This form is mainly used in front of the surnames of married women.

Example: I am not ill, Mrs Gerhardt. Just a little worried over various things.

Miss is used to referring to unmarried, single women, or rather girls.

Example: Can I help you, Miss Gerhardt? (Dreiser: "JennieGerhardt").

However, when applying to a woman, it is not known if the application form refers to the form of courtesy. The words, having been mentioned above, are in line with label rules only when used together with surnames, not alone or in names. Violation of these rules can lead to a decline in public status.

There are the following application forms in English:

1. Aristocrats nobility, application form:
   a) queen (queen, prince), king (king, ruler, king) — application form — your Majesty / Your Lightness (heroes);
   b) husband of a queen and heirs of a monarch (king's king, heirs) — application form — your Royal Highness / your Royal Lightness.

As the language developed, those rankings were replaced by "Sir" ("Mr.").

2. duke (dwarf) — application form — Your Grace — "Mr.", "Mr."

3. Marquis, Count, Viscount, Baron (Small Barrister rank) — application Form — Madam (lady), Your Lordship (lady), My Lady (lady)

   e) Baronet (Baroness — rank) — application form — "Sir" ("Mr."). Here, the word bar (surname) is followed by the surname of the baron, that is Sir + surname;

   f) The word "lady" is used when applying to baron's spouse. Lady — baron's wife's name and baron's surname are also mentioned in the word.

All these are testimony to the fact that the appeal in the social status plays a very important role.

The choice of either of the [t] or [v] pronoun is closely linked to the dimensions of power and solidarity. R. Brown and A. Gilman define power as "a relationship between at least two persons, and it is nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behaviour" (Brown & Gilman, 1960). The power semantic is similarly nonreciprocal; the superior says [t] and receives [v]. It is often said that language reveals, creates and reflects power. But where does the power come from? There are many aspects that can make someone powerful. First of all, there are physical features, e.g. strength or height. There are also aspects that strengthen someone's position within society, such as wealth or a high position in the church, state or the army. A high social rank or status
was (and still is) almost the guarantee for being respected by other people. A high level of respect made it likely that this person was addressed by the polite [v] pronoun, whereas these authorities often addressed inferiors by the [t] pronoun in the past. The use of the [v] form to address another person emphasizes the differences that exist between people, as this form of address reveals that one person is superior and the other has to subordinate. Therefore the nonreciprocal power semantic requires a society that is clearly structured, and everyone must have a unique position in the hierarchy.

Old English made use of a predominantly synthetic marking. Nouns, adjectives and pronouns were inflected to express case, number and gender. Consequently, there were different forms for the 2nd person. Pu, ²in and ²e represented the 2nd person pronouns singular in the four 60 different cases. Ge, eower and eow were the 2nd person pronouns in the plural. These forms were only used to address more than one person.

Consequently, it is important to notice that there was no polite form to address one person in Old English. Therefore the paper is concerned with the development from Middle English until today.

Middle English describes the period between 1150 and 1500. It was the period in the English language when the most drastic changes in the language system occurred. In Middle English, a change from a predominantly synthetic to a predominantly analytic structure took place, and there was a general tendency towards regularity. The total system of honorifics difference is a [t]-[v] one. [t] and [v] form terms are the [t] and [v] forms that describe the second person “tu” and “vos” pronouns. In the Latin language, “tu” refers to [t] form, that is, singular, and “vos” refers to the [v] form, which is plural, i.e., the whole is still valid. “Tu” is used for non-officially, and “vos”, on the contrary, is used to express courtesy and formalism.

In addition, the grammatical structure of the sentence can carry out the function of social deixis. The grammatical structure of the sentence takes a special place among the markers of social status. The informal appeal situation is characterized by short sentences in which either a subject or a part of the predicate is omitted. The personal use of the one-member sentences points to the achievement of a close relationship and mutual interest among the interlocutors on the subject discussed. And on the contrary, extensively formulas, numerous complicated sentences create a major distance between communicators. The duration of the conversation also affects the nature of the conversation. As a rule, self-presentation and interpretation of the problem are pronounced in an official tone.

There is always a certain similarity between the mother tongue and gestures. The parallel presence and interaction of body and speech-language in the communication act is possible when deep processes on the oral and non-verbal activity of human action are similar to all openness.

Under certain circumstances, the meaning can only be expressed by gestures.

Compare Jack: Charming day it has been, Miss Fairfax. // Gwendolen: (waves every hand nervously) Pray do not talk about the weather, Mr Worring.

Whenever people talk to/about the weather, I always feel quite certain that they mean something else. And that makes me nervous. // Jack: (wipes his forehead) I do mean something else. (Ostin, 1976).

In these sentences, Gwendolen shakes hands with anger while she is embarrassed, snatches her forehead and tells her what she is thinking, and the meaning of what they say is observed in their gestures.

Thus, the similarity between gestures and the meaning expressed in words is manifested very clearly. In fact, any element of verbal behaviour can be a source of value for the deal and profit as a linguistic element. It is known that the most important means characterizing the social status of a person is conversation. The social status of the participants of the communication is unusually important.

Communication is artificial and provocative without taking into account the social status of the participants. The social status is generated by index, that is, by demonstrative pronouns. Social status indexes are service and financial circumstances, including personal services, age limits. All of these are taken into account in the selection of appeal in terms of grammar and intonation. An important channel of expression of status relationships is non-verbal communication. The value of social status is measured by demonstrating respect and obeying the rules of courtesy. Principles of courtesy are the leading category in the occurrence of social markers.

4. Conclusion

After analyzing the social deixis and honorifics, which is considered as a complex form of the social deixis, the following conclusions of the analysis of research are described as:

Social deixis is related to the social information encoded within an utterance. Social deixis is those aspects of language structure that are anchored to the social identities of participants in the speech event or relations between them and other referents.

It is concluded that there are two basic kinds of social deixis information. They are relational social deixis and absolute social deixis. In other words, social deixis is a deictic expression that is used to distinct social status. Besides, the other conclusion is that honorifics is a complex system of social deixis. Honorifics are coding simple
types of social information. They form the more complex form of deixis. In linguistics, honorifics is a grammatical and morphosyntactic form that codifies the social status of interlocutors.

Linguists make a great sense of manner theory in foreign linguistics since the principle of manner plays a more meaningful role than the principle of cooperation in many communicative situations. The principle of manner is considered as a basis for social deixis.

The study of social deixis can be expected to throw some light on the nature of this lower bound to pragmatics. One of the things that emerge fairly clearly from the study of honorifics is that basic distinction must, in fact, be made between the meaning and usage of social deixis items.

While studying the social deixis, it is found out that the role of negative/positive behaviour is great in the occurrence of it. Such a study of the matter may, to some extent, serve for a broader, more detailed study of the text and discourse. The study of deixis as a whole can provide a theoretical basis for a more in-depth study of cognitive linguistic problems. This research can contribute to deixis theory.
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