

The Forms of Address in English and German Contemporary Literature

University of Tampere

Department of English

Pro Gradu Thesis

Spring 2005

Sari Kaarina Leppänen

Tiivistelmä

Tutkimuksen tarkoituksena oli selvittää miten englannin- ja saksankielisessä nykykirjallisuudessa käytetään puhuttelua, eroavatko kielet toisistaan ja onko sääntöjen laatiminen puhuttelulle ylipäättään mahdollista. Tarkastelin lähinnä nimien ja titteleiden käyttöä sekä puhuttelupronominien käyttöä.

Teoriassa keskityin valottamaan puhuttelua sekä lingvistikseen että yhteiskuntatieteellisestä näkökulmasta. Puhutteluun liittyy olennaisesti puhujan sosiaalinen tausta, puhujien väliset suhteet sekä puhetilanne. Puhuttelun teoria perustuu seuraaviin sosiolingvistisiin käsitteisiin: puhujien välinen valtasuhde, sosiaalinen välimatka, kielen vaihtelu puhetilanteen ja puhujan tunnetilojen mukaan. Tutkielmassa pyrin valottamaan näiden tekijöiden vaikutusta puhuttelumuodon valintaan. Tärkeä aspekti on myös kohteliaisuus ja miten se heijastuu puhutteluun.

Tutkimusaineistona olen käyttänyt englannin- ja saksankielisiä nykyromaaneja. Kaikissa romaaneissa kieli on nykyaikaista ja myös tapahtumat ovat sijoitettu nykyaikaan. Englanninkieliset romaanit ovat kummatkin amerikkalaisten kirjailijoiden kirjoittamia. Aineiston materiaalissa eriarvoinen puhuttelu on yleisempää kuin mitä teoriassa oletetaan. Erityisesti englanninkielisessä aineistossa puhuttelu osoittautuu hyvin usein eriarvoiseksi ja hierarkkisia suhteita heijastuu enemmän kieleen kuin teorian pohjalta olisi voinut olettaa. Puhuttelu saksankielisessä kirjallisuudessa oli säännönmukaisempaa ja puhuttelumuodot muuttuivat huomattavasti harvemmin kuin englanninkielisessä puhuttelussa. Uudehko puhuttelumuoto, jossa käytetään etunimeä ja kohteliaasta puhuttelupronominia "Sie" näyttää aineiston perusteella yleistyneen.

Contents

1.....	Introduction	2
2.1.....	Forms of Address: Definition	3
2.2.....	Marked/Unmarked Forms	4
3.1.....	Social Sciences: Social Psychological View on Addressing	5
3.2.....	Sociolinguistic View	7
4.1.....	Studies on Addressing: Politeness, Power and Solidarity	8
4.2.....	Situation and Social Roles	12
4.3.....	Language and Social Structure	15
5.1.....	Addressing in American English and German: Forms of Address in American English	18
5.2.....	Forms of address in German	23
6.1.....	Study on Addressing in English and German Literature: Forms of Addressing in Literature	29
6.2.....	Patricia Cornwell: Black Notice	30
6.3.....	Fairstein: The Dead House	39
6.4.....	On the English novels	51
6.5.....	Lea Wolf: Kalt ist der Schlaf	56
6.6.....	Nicole Drawer: Allein mit deinem Mörder	61
6.7.....	On the German Novels	67
7.....	Comparing Addressing in English and German Novels	69
8.....	Bibliography	72

1. Introduction

In this Pro Gradu I have studied addressing in English and German. I chose this topic because it has always fascinated me how it is possible to express many different attitudes, roles, hierarchy or even personality only by using a specific address form. This is the case in both English and German. As a teacher I have been confronted with questions about a proper address form many times. As many times I have found the questions very difficult to answer. When choosing an address form, whether in English or German, so many factors should be taken into consideration. These are for example the situation, the status, role and/ or rank of the interlocutor etc. Sometimes it has also been difficult for the students to understand how to be polite in English as there is no specific polite form in the language as there is in German. Is it possible to create any rules for choosing the address form? This was the first question I wanted to find an answer to. The other question was how do English and German differ from each other?

First I have found some definitions for address forms. Then I will shortly discuss viewpoints on addressing in social sciences, social psychology and sociology. I think it is important to handle these topics too because addressing always happens between at least two people. To understand communication it is crucial to understand something about social psychology and sociology. Address forms seem to follow some norms and these norms have evolved in certain societies. This is the fact that makes it very difficult to create any generic rules for addressing in any language. Thus, understanding linguistics is not enough when studying communication but the surrounding society must always be taken into consideration. In the fourth part I have looked some basic studies made on addressing and the rules that have been made for choosing the address form in American English and German.

In the last part I have studied the address forms used in four novels, two in English and two in German. Both English novels are American. All the novels are detective stories and

written between 1999 and 2003. I chose this genre because there are usually many characters, different status roles and a lot of dialogue in detective stories. In addition, in detective stories there are also many different attitudes and moods represented and relationships change depending on the suspects etc. One of the criteria for choosing detective stories was that in the novels people usually do not know previously know each other. This means that they have to create the norms for address forms within their new society. First I present the English novels and how the main characters address people and what are the address forms they receive. After this I have considered the addressing in both English novels. The German novels are studied in the same way. Last, I have discussed the differences between the two languages.

2.1 Forms of address: Definition

As described in Quirk et al. (1985, 773-775), there are two terms used: *address* and *vocative*. Address can be defined as one of the elements belonging to the class of vocatives. Then, a vocative is usually a noun phrase “denoting the one or more persons to whom the sentence is addressed. It is either a *call*, drawing the attention of the person(s) addressed, or an *address*, expressing the speaker’s relationship or attitude to the person(s) addressed”. I will, as this differentiation is not necessary for the purposes of this study and, for the sake of simplicity, use the term *address* for both the call and the address, throughout the study.

Quirk et al. (1985, 773-775), list the possible forms of address. They may be

- (1) A name: First name (David), last name (Caldwell), full name, with or without a title (Sarah Peterson, Mrs Johnson, Dr Turner), or a nickname or pet name (Ginger).
- (2) Standard appellatives: Usually without modification and include terms for family relationships (‘mother’, ‘son’), titles of respect (‘madam’, ‘ma’am’, ‘sir’) and markers of status (‘professor’, ‘doctor’).

- (3) Terms of occupations: ('waiter', 'nurse', 'officer'). These can be used in addressing only when s/he is functioning in that role. Markers of status (above), however, can be used at all times.
- (4) An epithet: expresses evaluation. Favourable address forms include such epithets as 'darling', 'dear'. Unfavourable address forms can be such as 'coward' or 'idiot'.
- (5) A general noun: Often used in a more specialized sense ('brother', 'girl', 'man'). Most of these nouns are considered familiar and informal.
- (6) The personal pronoun 'you': Used in sentences as: 'you, why haven't you finished yet?' This is, however, an impolite form of address.
- (7) A nominal clause: For example, 'Whoever said that', 'whoever you are', 'what's your name'.
- (8) Finally, all forms above can be expanded by adding various modifiers or appositive elements. Consequently, we have address forms such as 'my dear Mrs Johnson', 'old man', 'you with the red hair'.

It must be noticed that address forms can belong to more than one set. Thus, 'son' can be used to mark family relationships or it can be used to mark superiority. Similarly, 'father' can act as a kin title or as a status marker (in the church).

2.2 Marked / Unmarked forms

Kohz divides (1984, 26-29) the address forms into a) marked / unmarked b) normal and c) natural address forms. The address form has to be compared to other address forms to find out whether it is marked or unmarked. It is no use comparing address forms which belong to the same category, for example FN Peter to FN Mark. However, it is worth comparing Peter to Peterchen. The first address form consists of one element whereas Peterchen consists of the basic element FN and diminutive suffix -chen. Therefore, it is a complex form. Unmarked forms are those the listener expects to hear and marked forms are those that express emotion and cause a reaction, whether positive or negative,

in the listener. Thus, unmarked elements are usually more frequent, more semantically general, are used in neutral contexts, and have a short and simple expression. Marked forms are in opposition to unmarked forms on these parameters.

When deciding whether the address form is normal or not, the situation has to be taken into consideration. The analyst must consider how often the address form is used in different situations. Kohz categorises (1984, 32-34) the situations or settings into three: i) speech community in general ii) certain social context, for example work place, iii) interaction between certain interlocutors. The relationship between the interlocutors is important and when analysing the markedness of the address form. The analyst must consider the social distance, group membership etc. between the interlocutors. Further, the situation and also the intentions of the speaker are determining factors when deciding if the address form is used to show respect/disrespect or intimacy/distance between the interlocutors.

According to Kohz (1984, 34), the most important factors when deciding whether the address forms is natural or not, are grammatical and semantic properties of an address form as well as the relationship between the interlocutors. Only those address forms, which express or create a relationship between the interlocutors, are natural. Forms, which have no alternative, such as English 'you', are not natural.

3.1 Social sciences: Social psychological View on Addressing

In order to understand mutual understanding, communicative interaction, strategies of persuasion etc. we need social psychology, sociology and psychology as well as pragmatics and other methods.

Speech act is a social or interpersonal act that takes place when an utterance is made, for example, a performative and constative statements. A performative speech act causes

some kind of action whereas a constative statement states that something is or is not so. Van Dijk (1981, 292-5) divides speech acts into 6 categories according to their functionality. The first is 1) social cognition, such as opinions, attitudes and norms. 2) emotions, such as anger, love, hate. These first two categories belong to the cognitive psychology. The third category is 3) personality, such as aggressive, friendly, authoritarian 4) interaction types, such as formal, informal. Categories 3 and 4 are central problem areas in social psychology. The category five is 5) participant category, such as status, role, power and 6) context category, such as public, private, familiar. These last two categories belong mainly to sociology. When we are interacting, we try to keep our face, to protect our ego and also conform to social norms, values and keep up our own status. These aims are the reasons behind for example boasting, insulting or defending. Social psychology studies the strategies we use when interacting with others. For example, if we are angry, we can nevertheless ask the interlocutor in a nice way to keep quiet. We do this because we probably expect a better result when we are polite, we want to avoid sounding too authoritarian or our social status is lower than the interlocutor's.

According to Giles, Scherer&Taylor (1979, 360) speech markers can be a) linguistic b) extralinguistic or c) paralinguistic. An extralinguistic speech marker refers to something outside language, but which is relevant to the utterance. Paralinguistic cues are non-verbal, such as body language, intonation or stress. A linguistic cue can occur due to the personality of the interlocutor, his/her position in the social structure etc. They can also occur due to the relationship between the interlocutors or the situation in which the utterance takes place. Giles, Scherer&Taylor (1979, 343-353) argue that we use the speech markers in order to state our attitudes, beliefs, values and intentions. With the help of speech markers we can predict the strategies of other people. We can also use them to help us to find the right category for the interlocutor and to define his/her social position in the structure.

There are social psychological theories on how people categorise themselves. One of these is *outgroup homogeneity theory* (Scollon&Scollon 1995, 107). According to this theory we see other groups as being more homogenous than our own ingroup. Because we see other groups as more homogenous, we are able to judge them more quickly and as a group unlike our own ingroup. The other theory is called *social identity theory* (Gardner, MacIntyre&Lalonde 1995). This theory claims that we build our own identity by categorising other people so that we differ positively from them. This also includes categorising our own group positively compared to other groups. People use these categories when they are establishing an impression on other people.

3.2 Sociolinguistic View

Sociolinguistics studies language in relation to social factors. For example, it is interested in the relationship between language and region, language and peer group pressure, language and the age, sex, social class, and so on. Bell argues (1976, 23) that the majority of social linguistics feel that they are linguistics who are trying to find regularity and correspondence between linguistic and social structure. In addition, they also try to find a more appropriate description of a language. According to Bell (1976, 24) sociolinguistics takes a sample of a language at a certain time. When they study the choices made by the interlocutors, they use extralinguistic criteria, i.e. cues outside the language. Sociolinguistics also use units such as age, sex, socioeconomic class, status etc. when studying the language and linguistic choices used by a certain social group. Bell argues (1976, 26-28) that the linguistic choices within a certain group and between groups can be described in terms of individual or group dynamics. *Microsociolinguistics* focuses on the differences between individuals and thus, cognitive psychology as well as social psychology must be taken into consideration. *Macrosociolinguistics* studies interaction between groups and is more concerned with

sociology than psychology. First, sociolinguistics had mainly a linguistic approach. However, the *sociology of language* has the goal to unify the linguistic and social structures (Bell 1976, 28).

Further, it aims at uniting linguistics and human sciences. Chomsky (1965, 3) argues:

Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener ... [and not with] such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance.

According to Bell (1976, 29-30) some sociolinguistics point out that the competence of the ideal speaker-listener is only a part of the language use. The goal for the linguistics should be to define the *communicative competence* of the speaker-listener, i.e. the knowledge of what is grammatically correct as well as what is socially acceptable.

4.1 Studies on Addressing : Politeness, Power and Solidarity

In every society there are norms according to which we decide whether the behaviour of people is polite or impolite. In many cultures, at least in the western world, address forms can be used as a sign of respect/disrespect to the addressee. The same address form can express respect, disrespect, solidarity and social distance according to the situation, personal relationships between the interlocutors, etc. The forms we use when addressing or referring to someone reveal a great deal of the perception we have of ourselves in relation to others, not only at a social level but also at a personal one. In the following I briefly summarize studies made on politeness, power and solidarity.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987,1-2) politeness helps the interlocutors to exclude aggression and thus, politeness makes communication between potentially aggressive parties possible. They list three strategies of politeness. All the strategies are tied to sociological factors. Specifically important is the relationship between speaker and addressee as well as the potential offensiveness of the message. Other important sociological factors are (Brown&Levinson 1987, 15) (i) relative power of addressee over speaker, (ii) the social distance between speaker and

hearer, (iii) the ranking of the imposition involved in doing the face-threatening act. “Face” consists of two aspects, (a) negative face, i.e. claim to territories, personal preserves and rights to non-distraction, (b) positive face, i.e. the positive self-image or personality claimed by interlocutors. Brown and Levinson argue (1987, 61), that we invest emotionally in our face and so we can lose it, maintain it, or enhance it. Nevertheless, the face must constantly be kept in mind in interaction.

The first strategy of politeness is positive politeness, which implies expression of solidarity. Positive politeness can be realized as follows (Brown&Levinson 1987, 80):

- (1) Got the time, mate?
- (2) Mind if I smoke?
- (3) Hey, got change for a quarter?

Brown and Levinson argue (1987, 82), that when there is no significant social distance or power differences between interlocutors, address forms are more familiar, whereas when power differences are greater and the ranking of the imposition high, the address form tends to be more polite. Brown and Levinson point out (1987, 102), that positive-politeness strategy imply that the interlocutors share wants, even between strangers who perceive themselves as somehow similar. For the same reason, positive-politeness utterances are used when correcting a face-threatening act, and also as a social accelerator, where speaker wants to indicate his/her willingness to “come closer” to hearer. Cameron claims (1997, 98) that in the US the emphasis is on positive-politeness which is used to signal warmth and friendliness. She compares American English to British English and argues (1997, 99), that American positive-politeness is not always correctly interpreted in the UK. In fact, positive-politeness of the Americans is often misinterpreted as ‘demeaning’ rather than ‘friendly’. However, British working-class politeness is more similar to the American politeness (e.g. addressing with solidary terms as ‘mate’ and ‘love’ rather than ‘sir’ and ‘madam’). She regrets the way how employees use first names in the UK when speaking to their customers nowadays. According to Cameron (1997, 98) a lot of ‘customer care-speak’ originates from the US, intending

to signal intimacy and to personalise the service. Nevertheless, this intimacy is paradoxical as there – in most cases- is no intimacy between a bank clerk and a customer.

The second strategy of politeness is negative-politeness, which implies expression of restraint. Examples of this strategy can be (Brown&Levinson 1987, 80):

- (1) Excuse me, would you by any chance have the time?
- (2) Excuse me sir, would it be all right if I smoke?
- (3) Look, I'm terribly sorry to bother you but would there be any chance of your lending me just enough money to get a railway ticket to get home? I must have dropped my purse and I just don't know what to do.

Brown and Levinson argue (1987, 129-30), that utterances of negative politeness are addressed to the addressee's negative face, the addressee's want to have his/her freedom of action. When positive-politeness expresses familiarity and joking behaviour, is negative-politeness expressing respect. In western cultures, politeness is mainly negative-politeness.

Laver has also studied politeness and points out (1981, 289-304), that polite behaviour includes linguistic routines and these routines are used to reduce the risk of face threats. The routines are tied to a politeness norm, which the speaker can either obey or violate. If speaker chooses to obey the norm, s/he implies that s/he acknowledges the social status of his/her listener and the social distance between the interlocutors. However, if speaker violates the norm, s/he signals a wish to negotiate a change in the relationship between the participants.

Brown and Gilman argue (1960, 255), that in a relationship between two persons, one person has control over the behaviour of the other. Power is always nonreciprocal, as well as the power semantic too; the superior addresses the inferior with a T form (symbol for the familiar pronoun) and receive V (the polite form). Between equals, however, the addressing is reciprocal. Brown and Gilman list (1960, 256) various bases for power: physical strength, wealth, age, sex, institutionalized role, etc. can be qualifications for superiority. According to Brown and Gilman (1960, 258), solidarity is the name given to a set of relations that are symmetrical, such as 'attended the same school', 'have the same parents', or 'practice the same profession'. Consequently, the addressing between solidary interlocutors is reciprocal. It is suggested that the reciprocal solidarity

has risen with social mobility and egalitarian ideology, which created a distaste for direct expressions of power differences.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987, 110), when a switch between codes occurs, we normally change from negative politeness into positive politeness, indicating in-group membership and domestic values. Thus, when a face-threatening act requires correcting, we might use positive-politeness. However, a switch into negative-politeness may signal a face-threatening act accompanied with negative politeness. It may also signal a withdrawal of positive-politeness and encode anger and firmness. However, Brown&Gilman point out (1960, 270-271), that in addition to pronouns of address, there are a large number of expressions indicating power differences. The use of proper names and titles often follows an unequal power pattern, for example between customer and waiter, teacher and student or employer and employee. Brown and Gilman (1960, 276-280) also discuss the pronouns of address as expressions of transient attitudes. As long as the choice shows obedience to the group norm, it simply implies the speaker's membership in that group. A violation in the choice can be interpreted as a change in the speaker's attitude or emotion, that is, the speaker views, for a moment, his/her relationship to the person addressed in a different way and also wishes to express it. Brown and Gilman (1960, 277) distinguish two kinds of expressive meanings of violating the politeness norm: (1) Deviation from the power norms implying that the speaker regards the relationship as different in terms of power from what it usually is, and (2) breaking the norms of solidarity, means that the speaker views the degree of intimacy or similarity between the participants as a greater or lesser than usual. However, according to Brown&Gilman (1960, 279-280), a momentary violation of the norm does not only express a momentary shift in the speaker's attitude, but also implies a great deal about his/her character in general. Thus, the violation of the norms of address reflects the temporary feelings of the speaker. Further, violations of the norms of the address forms are often consistent with violations of norms in other areas of behaviour.

4.2 Situation and Social Roles

Linguistic variations depend partly on the social situation, or context, in which the speech act takes place. Different social situations and different purposes of the interlocutors require the use of certain kind of language which may be appropriate in some situations but not in others. Social roles are essential for understanding the choice of linguistic variations: we take up different "roles" in different situations. This idea of roles does not refer to acting, but to the expectations about our behaviour. These expectations are connected to our position in the social structure. In the following I discuss some thoughts on how situations and different roles of the participants have an influence on the linguistic choices of the participants.

Hymes points out (1974, 45-51) that it is not enough to understand the grammar of a certain language to fully understand the message. In addition to the grammar, the interlocutors must be aware of the norms in the society which regulate interaction. Hymes talks about a 'speech community' and when studying these communities he starts from the social group and then examines the linguistic forms used in the community. Different forms mark, for example, personal abilities, roles, contexts, beliefs, values, attitudes etc.

When we speak, we are able to choose the linguistic forms from a range of possibilities. Bell calls (1976, 110-113) this a 'bundle of codes' and argues that the situation mostly determines which codes are chosen. The situation as well as the role relations also determine the switch of codes. In most cultures certain situations, roles and role relations require certain codes.

The situation is an important factor when we choose address forms. According to Pieper (1984, 15-16) sociocultural, biological and actual linguistic realisation are the determining factors when we are choosing the proper address form. The age and sex of the interlocutors belong to the biological factor and the situation to the sociocultural one. Pieper claims (1984, 22), that when analysing address forms, we should examine the following variables: ritual, formal, spontaneous and forced forms. These variables effect on which address form is chosen. In addition,

intention of the speaker should also be taken into consideration. The analyst should state the relations between the sociocultural, biological and linguistic realisation. The situation is not alone determining which address form will be chosen but the sex of the interlocutors as well as their roles in the given situation are factors that contribute to the choice of the address form.

Brown and Fraser (1979, 34) studied speech acts as a marker of situation. According to them there are always three concepts in a situation: 1) setting, 2) participants and 3) purpose. Setting and participants together form the 'scene'. There are different activity types, such as chatting or lecturing. These types determine the purposes the speaker chooses. The speakers can have different purposes, i.e. what they are going to do. 'Maxi purposes' act as a guideline in a situation, such as 'visiting the doctor'. 'Mini purposes' are for example requests or promises. There is also a third purpose, an 'unprefixed purpose' which is also called a 'subject matter'. A Subject matter means the contents of the purpose. According to Brown and Fraser (1979, 43) the subject matter can be defined in terms of salience, emotionality, technicality etc.

The physical setting does not determine the language we use. For example, builders use different language when working in a church than a priest. However, the physical setting can determine the situation in other ways. For example, the distance between the interlocutors is greater in a lecture hall than in a cocktail party. Brown and Fraser also point out (1979, 44-45) that the time of a day may determine the language we use, for example we do not say 'good night' if it is 9.00 a.m. Other people can also influence on the language: for example the presence of children may determine the language among adults.

Brown and Fraser claim (1979, 50), that the scene can vary from informal to formal and that the language, including the address forms, varies in accordance with these variables. The address forms are chosen in accordance with the situation: We may use a different address form when talking to someone in a formal meeting than what we use at home, when addressing the same person. The codes, however, can be switched and so the change in the addressing can create a new

situation. For example, if we change from informal into formal address form, we may imply there has been a change in the relationship between interlocutors. By using a more formal address form, the interlocutor can signal a greater social distance between the speaker and the addressee than before. Of course, a more formal address form can also signal respect.

We are able to do interpretations about people by studying the speech and linguistic forms they use. The language used can reveal about the interlocutor's personality or about the individual as a member of a group. Interpersonal relations and social roles determine which address forms are used in the speech. According to Brown and Fraser (1979, 50-53), nonreciprocal addressing between the interlocutors represents unequal power relations between the interlocutors. The change in the codes, however, probably represents a change in the personal relations. Roles and the relations between the roles can be seen in the setting and purpose. For example, a doctor is most likely to use a different language when speaking to a patient in a hospital than to his/her child at home. However, this is more true with occupational roles than for example with kinship roles.

Spence claims (2002, 345), that doctors are differently approached when they use the title 'Dr'. When the title is used, people also tend to form presumptions about the doctor's background, education, political point of view, etc. Spence quitted using the title and says that: "It frees me from all the appalling social preconceptions that people often make and I find that I don't have to live the role of 'a doctor'". He also argues that if the doctors stopped using the title, people would see the doctors as more humane and would have less unrealistic expectations. Cooper, however, points out (2000, 1566), that patients should address the doctors with TLN instead of FN. According to Cooper, social distance helps when working with the patients. She comments on friendliness and choosing the address forms:

All the patients may know my name is Carol, but only half a dozen or so actually call me that. These people appear to have little in common. They are of varying ages and different backgrounds, and none of them is over-familiar. In fact, there are many other patients who are far friendlier and more physical than the first-name users...

Cameron states (1997, 98) that companies try to regulate the addressing between their customers and employees. The reason for this is that every employee is seen representing the company and its image. However, this may cause problems in intercultural communication as many cultures see the concepts 'social class' or 'politeness' differently.

Gumperz (1966, 36) divides interaction into 1) personal and 2) transactional linguistic interaction. Personal interaction occurs in primary groups and the language tends to be informal. In transactional interaction, such as the bank, the language tends to be formal. In a transactional interaction the participants '...in a sense suspend their individuality and act by virtue of their status... as salesmen, customers, banktellers, physicians, rather than as Ton Hansen or Inger Stensen' (Gumperz 1966, 35).

4.3 Language and social structure

Each address form can express solidarity/distance or respect/disrespect depending on the situation where it is performed. The social structure of the society plays an important role when analysing the address forms. If the society lays weight on hierarchy, if it is maternal or paternal etc, it also reflects to the language usage in the society. To understand the structure, we have to understand the units that form the entity. In the following, I will examine the concepts of social structure, groups, relationships and interaction within a group and between groups.

Brown and Levinson studied (1979, 295) social structure, groups, social relationships, interaction and language usage and also how these components effect on each other.

Anthropologists describe a structure in terms of a *weak* and *strong concept*. In the weak concept, units, or parts of the structure are examined as individuals. Each unit has an influence on each other and together they form the structure. In the strong concept, the structure is examined as an entity. Parts of the structure are important in their role in the whole structure and how they contribute to its

functionality. Brown and Levinson stress (1979, 295) the importance of this role. According to them it is essential to understand the roles of the units in a structure if we want to understand communication. Further, to understand the social meaning of a linguistic term, we need to understand the social structure in which the term has been uttered. Levinson studied (1977) the usage of address pronouns in a Tamil village and concluded that speech is dependent on the structure. In the Tamil village, for example, the address pronoun is chosen according to very complicated rules. One of the deciding factor was caste hierarchy. In order to do any conclusions about the proper choice of the address forms, the analyst had to understand the social structure of the village first.

Group membership plays an important role in social interactions. Deutsch defines (1968, 265) a group as ‘an entity that consists of interacting people who are aware of being bound together in terms of mutually linked interests’. This definition follows the weak concept of a structure where each unit of the group functions alone but is aware of the group. Brown and Levinson argue (1979, 299), that in the strong concept of a structure, each unit in a group is important only when it is compared to a unit like size. They name large groups, such as ethnic groups and social classes as examples and state that these groups communicate differently due to different behaviour norms which regulate the communication in each group.

Different groups have different *linguistic repertoires* (Gumperz 1972, 20). Brown and Levinson quote (1979) a Javanese case study by Geertz (1969) as an example of different linguistic repertoires. In Java, there is a complicated system of addressee and referent honorifics which express, for example, power differences. In western languages, German has the address pronouns whereas in English the distinction between familiar and formal forms is difficult as both the familiar pronoun and the polite one are the same.

Bell divides (1976, 102-103) the relationships into 1) primary and 2) secondary relationships. Primary relationships consist of relatively small groups, the relationships have lasted

long, the participants share the same goals, attitudes, values and they know each other well. The relationships express solidarity. Secondary relationships have not lasted long and the social distance between the members is greater than in the primary relationships. The size of the group is also bigger than in the primary relationships and these relationships express more power than solidarity. Krech et. al. (1962, 102) also name a third relationship, which he calls a 'reference group'. This is the group the speaker wishes to belong to and adopts its norms and values.

According to Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar (1994), a *deixis* is 'the process of indicating time and place in relation to the utterance, or the features of the language collectively that do this'. *Deictic* is 'a word...that has the function of relating the utterance to its extralinguistic context (time, place, etc.)'. The four demonstrative determiners and pronouns are the prime deictics, ... and the personal pronouns...'. Brown and Levinson (1979, 311) argue that *social deixis* 'refer to the ways in which linguistic elements can refer to certain aspects of the communicative event in which those elements are used'. Address forms and address pronouns are one example of these social deixis which can also reveal a great deal about the relationship between the interlocutors. Some address forms, for example, can be used only in a very specific situations: *Your Honor* for the judge in court.

When communicating, we give hints about our group memberships. When analysing the speech, we may be able to conclude that the speaker is a member of the 'working class'. According to Brown and Levinson (1979, 313-316) it is also possible to draw conclusions whether the interlocutors are members of the same ingroup. If the members are from the same ingroup, their relationship is tend to be defined by individual characteristics, such as personality and sex. However, if the interlocutors are from different groups, their relationship is defined by their group membership. People can belong to several groups and then the choice of the group is made or negotiated in accordance with the situation.

If the norms guide us to use the polite pronoun but we choose to use the familiar pronoun, we can do this intentionally or unintentionally. According to Brown and Levinson (1979, 325-326), we can do this intentionally so that it seems to be unintentional or so that it also seems to be intentional. The choose of a familiar pronoun in the example is mostly taken as intentional and is also meant to be seen as intentional. So, by using the familiar pronoun, we are able to signal our attitude or mood in the given situation.

5.1 Addressing in American English and German: Forms of Address in American English

A pioneering study in the field of address forms is by Brown and Ford (1961), which also discusses the norms of addressing in American English. Brown and Ford used four kinds of data in their analysis: usage in modern American plays, actual usage in a Boston business firm, recorded usage in a Midwest town and reported usage of business executives.

According to Brown and Ford (1961, 236) the most common used address forms in the American English are mutual FN (first name) or mutual TLN (title+last name). The rules on addressing focus on these two forms. There are three possible ways of using the address forms: 1) reciprocal FN, 2) reciprocal TLN and 3) nonreciprocal usage, where the other one uses FN and the other TLN. The most common address form is reciprocal FN. However, reciprocal TLN is used between adults who do not know each other. Reciprocal FN implies a closer relationship as well as lesser social distance than the reciprocal TLN. Nevertheless, among young people, the reciprocal FN is more common than among older interlocutors. The reciprocal FN is also the probable choice when the interlocutors share wants, values, occupation etc. or if they are in frequent contact with each other. If there is a significant difference in the age of the interlocutors, 15 years or more, the younger interlocutor addresses the older with TLN and receives FN. If the interlocutors differ in power relationship, for example in the interaction between the employer and employee, the more

powerful interlocutor addresses the person with less power with FN and receives TLN. Brown and Ford claim (1961, 236), that nonreciprocal addressing also occur with kinship titles. The members of the ascending generation, for example aunts and uncles, are addressed with the kinship title but the nephews and nieces receive FN. Cameron divides (1997, 97) the usage of FN into two categories: 1) to signal intimacy and 2) to indicate subservience. When the FN signals intimacy, it is used reciprocally whereas when it is used to signal subservience, its usage is nonreciprocal. Cameron explains (1997, 98) the nonreciprocal usage of the FN in terms of social distance. If the social distance between the speaker and the listener is great and the addressing is nonreciprocal, the person receiving the FN is being demeaned.

Sometimes titles are also used without names. According to Brown and Ford (1961, 237) in this case the title is generally used like TLN. The usage can be reciprocal, for example between newly introduced adults, or nonreciprocal between interlocutors with differences in power or/and status. TLN is more intimate and less formal than T. It can be used, for example, between adults who do not know each other's names. The form ma'am is mostly heard from young men to mature women.

A person can also be addressed by his/her last name alone (LN). According to Brown and Ford (1961, 237), this usually occurs with polysyllabic FNs which have no familiar abbreviations. LN is either a monosyllable or easily transformed monosyllable. In this case, LN is merely substituting FN and thus, can be analysed as FN. If the LN is not the unmarked address form for the addressee, it can be analysed to signal a lesser social distance between the interlocutors than TLN. Brown and Ford add (1961, 238), that we can use more than one name when addressing someone, for example FN, LN, a nickname etc. These multiple names (MN) imply a close, intimate relationship with no significant social distance.

To conclude, Brown&Ford (1961, 241) describe the intimacy and the proper address form beginning with the most formal address form moving towards the more intimate: T-TLN-LN-

FN-MN. Title alone is presented as the most formal address form whereas multiple naming is the most intimate one. Just like in Europe in general, the nonreciprocal use has much declined in English. However, if a person of lower status moves too fast to the reciprocation of FN a superior may step back from his/her use of FN to TLN. Brown&Ford argue (1961, 241), that the person of lower status should not use the more familiar form of address than the person of higher status. The possible backstep by the superior puts the subordinate in the position from which s/he will usually withdraw to the propriety of TLN. Due to this, with a good sized inequality of status the use of FN by the higher does not justify reciprocation from the lower. The superior is entitled to the initiation of mutual FN. In case of uncertainty, the speaker can avoid using any kind of personal name and do with the uncommitted *you*.

Ervin-Tripp (1969) carried out a research concerning forms of address in American English, in which she suggests a structure of rules that adult western American academics follow. This structure is represented by different paths, which the speaker goes through in his/her mind when choosing the proper address form. For example, when making a choice between FN and LN as the proper address form to someone, the decision processes in the speaker's mind could include the following questions: (1) Is the addressee an adult or a child? (2) Is the situation status-marked (e.g. a courtroom) (3) Is there a kinship-relation between the speaker and the addressee? (4) What is the addressee's rank? (5) What is his identity (Judge, Doctor, etc)? Ervin-Tripp (1973, cited in Bell 1976, 94) suggests two types of rule – *alternation* and *co-occurrence*. Alternation rules control the choice of linguistic elements from the total repertoire of the user. Such elements can be such items as *sir*, *professor*, *Fred*, etc. which form the address system of the language. Co-occurrence rules regulate the consistent choice of forms which reinforce a chosen alternative, i.e. the choice of the address form *professor* implies later uses, not only the same terms but orders modified into requests, lexical items and so forth.

According to Ervin-Tripp (1969, 226-8), “no-naming” occurs in American English when addressing a child whose name is not known. Address without using a name is also possible if there is no address form available, and again, the name of the addressee is unknown. Ervin-Tripp points out (1969, 227-229), that in American English the use of FN is common. Moreover, there is no distinction in address between equals or subordinates (within a working group) since both receive FN. First-naming is thus the dominant selector among colleagues and social acquaintances, meaning that FN is the normal form of address among Americans. Age difference is only significant when there is a difference of a full generation.

Ervin-Tripp (1969, 227-228) calls situations where titles are used, *status-marked situations*. These are settings such as courtroom, the army, Congress, etc, where status is clearly specified, speech style rigidly prescribed and the form of address for each person derived from his social identity; for example, *Your honour, Sir, Mr President*. American English also prefers title + LN (TLN) with certain occupations as courtesy titles. Ervin-Tripp (1969, 228) lists some occupations and titles used with them:

Cardinal	Your excellency
U.S. President	Mr President
Priest	Father + LN
Physician	Doctor + LN
Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.	Doctor + LN
Professor	Professor + LN
Adult, etc.	Mister/Mrs/Miss + LN

If the LN is unknown and there is no lone title, the addressee is “no-named” by the set of rules:

Father + Ø -> Father.

As well as Brown&Ford, Ervin-Tripp argues (1969, 229), that the selectors are not identical for kin and non-kin. *Ascending generation* receives title. This implies, that a first cousin is called by FN, whereas an aunt of the same age receives a kin title. However, FN may also be given (e.g. Aunt Louise). Nevertheless, within a family, there are also other markers that effects the address form used, such as patrilineal v. matrilineal, and near v. distant. Ervin-Tripp points out

(1969, 229), that “whenever the address forms for an individual person’s relatives are studied, this proves to be the case”. In addition to Ervin-Tripp’s model, Bell adds (1976, 96) the feature ‘desire to avoid naming’. He places this directly after the first possible choice, name known/unknown. If the speaker chooses this path, s/he avoids naming, i.e usage of names or titles, and prefers the term ‘you’. The speaker can, however, first avoid naming but later move to using them, according to Ervin-Tripp’s different paths. Bell points out (1976, 99), that these rules are not universals. In fact, different societies and groups within the same society are likely to adopt different systems. Thus, address forms, which are markers of social relationships, can only form a homogeneous system within a homogeneous social group.

Wolfson and Manes (1979, 79-92) discuss the differences in American address forms according to the addressee’s sex. In general, address forms to men are more respectful than those to women. According to the analysis, which was carried out in different encounters with service personnel, men were most often addressed with the respectful ‘sir’ and sometimes without any particular address term, whereas women were similarly addressed without any address term, but far less than men with the respectful form ‘ma’am’. The most striking difference was the common use of different terms of endearment, such as ‘honey’ or ‘dear’. The fact that women can be addressed by disrespectful terms where respect is shown to men reflects our perception of women and their status in the society. This is, however, criticized by Smith (1985, 44), who argues that these address forms to women indicate more likely degrees of solidarity than degrees of status.

5.2 Forms of Address in German

According to Pieper (1984, 12-13) there are three determinants deciding on the proper address form: sex, age and social factors. When deciding on the proper pronominal address form, age is the first factor in some situations. In nominal addressing, gender determines, whether Herr (Mr.) or

Frau (Mrs.) is used. However, in most situations, social status of the interlocutors determines the address form. Pieper does not include titles in addressing but calls it a description rather than addressing. However, in this paper, I will include titles into addressing.

In German, there are two pronouns of address in the singular, derived from the Latin singular tu and the plural vos. The plural was first used only to the emperor as a form of respect, but later it began to be used as the singular address form also to other power figures, such as kings, priests, masters and parents. Consequently, there are now two pronouns of address for one person, both having different connotations. The factors that determine the choice between the familiar form (T) and the more polite one (V) are closely associated with power and solidarity. According to Brown&Gilman (1960, 255-8), power is always nonreciprocal. It can be based on physical strength, wealth, age, sex, institutionalized role etc. Thus, different forms of address were needed in the European societies of medieval times: The superior addresses the inferior with T form and receives V. Between equals, then, the address usage was reciprocal. Gradually, ‘solidarity factor’ began to influence the choice of address pronouns. Solidarity is the name given to a set of relations that are symmetrical, such as ‘attended the same school’, ‘practice the same profession’. The use of T being more probable when the speakers feel that there is quite a great degree of similarity or intimacy between them, and the V form becoming more probable as the feeling of solidarity declines. According to Brown and Gilman (1960, 269), in most European languages, the solidarity factor has now won over the power factor, and pronoun usage is generally reciprocal.

Immediately, when you are confronted with another, there is a problem in German: whether to use T or V pronoun. It is considered impolite to address someone with T pronoun without reciprocal agreement between the interlocutors (Luoto 1993, 101). Germans use T pronoun only after a long friendship. Especially older people prefer using V pronoun, even if they have known each other for a long time. In fact, T pronoun is only possible between family members, students, children and close friends. Further, groups with common interest (societies, clubs, sporting

teams, soldiers) have always used T pronoun in addressing (Petzold 1995, F-1). According to Tiittula (1993, 103-4), different languages express social distance in different ways. The relationship between interlocutors, their age and social factors have an influence on which pronoun is used in addressing. Thus, in German, T pronoun is more common among young people and V pronoun is chosen when there is a difference in status roles (for example employer-employee) or in age. Tiittula argues (1993, 104), that in general, T pronoun in German requires rather strong closeness between the interlocutors. Without this sense of social closeness, T pronoun can be a sign of the higher status of the other speaker or even of disregard for the other person. The same argument is presented by Faerch&Kasper (1989, 230-231). According to them, the preference of one form over the other depends more on the personal relationship between the speakers, or on the interactional norms established at a particular institutions. For example, at some university departments, teachers and students address each other with T but not at others. Similarly, even within the same department, some teachers prefer T while others use V.

Social hierarchy is important when choosing the address form in German. The higher the interlocutor is situated in the hierarchy, the more s/he is bound to use V pronoun in addressing. According to Lenk (1995, 26) people from working class and soldiers use practically always T pronoun when addressing each other. However, people from academic circles as well as officers use rather V than T pronoun. However, there are differences between occupations. Lenk argues (1995, 26), that professors and doctors use V pronoun longer when addressing each other than assistants and teachers. Engineers, however, are quicker to move from V to T.

In addition to social hierarchy, age is also an important factor when choosing the address form in German. When the pupils reach the age 16-17 in school, the teachers start addressing them with a V pronoun instead of the former T. When students graduate from university, they often change the address pronoun from T to V when talking to each other (Besch 1996, 61). An asymmetric addressing is rare nowadays. It still exists in adult-child conversation. The adults use a

T pronoun to children but children use a V pronoun when addressing non-familiar adults. Already children of 6-7 years are expected to have learnt to use the V pronoun. Further, older people usually choose the V pronoun more often than the T. Tiittula (1993, 104) quotes a German interviewee who comments on T/V pronouns:

Ja is altersabhängig, und man kann, wenn man das will, sicherlich jeden duzen oder diese Art und Weise vergewaltigen... Auch in Deutschland ist das sehr (---) wohl fast alle Leute unter dreißig, die sich privat treffen, duzen sich von alleine. Zwischen dreißig vierzig gibt es so nen Graubereich, darüber ist das dann etwas formeller.

Yes, it depends on the age. You can use T pronoun to anyone and by doing it hurt him/her. In Germany, almost everyone under thirty years of old, who meet privately, use T pronoun. Between thirty and forty years of old there is a grey area. Later, you are a bit more formal.

Nevertheless, situation has a very important role when choosing the right address form. The more formal the situation, the more formal the address form is needed. The T pronoun is often a sign of personal sympathy, for example, the longer the friendship has lasted, the more frequently T pronoun is used. The V pronoun can, in fact, also show antipathy towards the interlocutor. It can act as a shelter against the other, for example, when arguing with someone. The V pronoun, in general, has the function of showing the social distance between interlocutors who do not yet know each other very well (Lenk 1995, 29-30). Tiittula (1993, 104) quotes a speaker of German:

...Ich selber bin kein Freund des Duzens, weil ich damit auch etwas verbinde. Wenn ich jemanden duze, dann dokumentiere ich damit, daß ich ein engeres Verhältnis zu ihm habe, als wenn ich jemanden sieze... Der Deutsche würde da eher dazu neigen zu glauben, er sei schon ein etwas engerer Freund oder Geschäftspartner und ware dann eventuell mal enttäuscht, wenn es trotz des Du gegen die Wand läuft.

I am not a friend of T pronoun. When using T pronoun to someone you also state that you have a close relationship with him/her. With V pronoun this is not the case. A German would believe (when using T pronoun) that the relationship is very close and would then be disappointed when things do not go well anyway.

Tiittula concludes (1993, 106), that Germans interpret the T pronoun to reflect close friendship between the speakers. When using the T pronoun, it is possible to discuss many things that are not possible topics when using the V pronoun. In other words, the T pronoun means a step towards more private and informal relationship for Germans. Besch points out (1996, 14-16), that change from the former V to the familiar T requires sensitivity in German. The rules, who can offer the T

instead of the former V, are strict and must be followed. The older person or/and the person of higher status can offer T to the other. Germans even have a semi-official ritual where this new address pronoun is announced and celebrated. This is called 'Brüderschaft' (brotherhood) where the interlocutors of new address form have a drink together. Reasons for changing the address form to familiar T are various: long relationship, change of status in social hierarchy, sympathy, love, etc.

Zimmer (1986, 55-59) presents a two dimensioned model of address forms in German: Convention A and B. In convention A, T form signals confidence and trust in the relationship whereas V form acts as a sign of lack of confidence in the relationship and at least minimal respect for the addressee. In convention B, however, T is the standard address form and signals solidarity without class differences. It is commonly used in groups where participants share a sense of solidarity. V pronoun then, acts as a signal for social distance or even as insult. In a situation where all speakers use T pronoun to each other, V pronoun can be a very effective way of showing social distance. Zimmer (1986, 57) gives an example from a sociological seminar in the University of Frankfurt, where one professor addresses the other:

"Herr Professor Habermas, können Sie mal formulieren, was für Sie heute abend so wichtig ist, daß Sie hier jetzt nicht über das Institut reden können?"

"Mr. Dr. Habermas, could you please let us know, what is so important for you this evening, that you cannot discuss the institute now?"

According to convention A, the use of titles would act as a sign of respect. In this case, however, the use of titles (herr, professor) is interpreted according to convention B and they signal rather social distance than respect. According to Zimmer (1986, 58-9), it is because of these two conventions why the choice of a proper address form is so complicated in German. The interlocutors can never be quite certain if the address form chosen by the other signals solidarity, intimacy, social distance or politeness.

Names are practically always used when addressing someone in German. Names are used to get attention but also to show politeness, to help changing the topic and to keep the floor. If

the name of the interlocutor is forgotten or it is not remembered correctly, a German speaker has the feeling that s/he is not considered as important enough and feels offended (Tiittula 1993, 107-108). In German, the choice between FN and LN in address forms depends on whether the interlocutors use T or V pronouns in conversation. If T (*du*) is used, FN is the proper address form. With V pronoun (*Sie*), LN is used:

“Hallo, Thomas”, “Guten Morgen, Stefan!” (T > FN)

”Guten Tag, Frau Müller!”, ”Guten Abend, Herr Wolf!” (V>TLN)

(Lenk 1995, 24)

According to Lewis (1996, 107), the use of V pronoun fits in well with the expectation of obedience and reinforces the hierarchical nature of the communication in Germany.

The Germans find it very impolite, if the person is addressed only with LN without a title (Herr/Frau). It is, however, possible to address someone with FN and still use the V pronoun. This is a so called “*Zwischenform*” (Besch 1996, 130). *Zwischenform* is used for example in universities between professors and students: “Guten Tag, Peter! Was haben Sie zu fragen?” In history, the address forms *Herr/Frau/Fräulein* were mainly used for nobles in German. Nowadays, they have become common in everyday conversation. In fact, practically everyone in German is called a Herr/Frau/Fräulein. These titles are used before LN (Herr Schmidt), before FN+LN (Herr Andreas Schmidt) and before another title(s) (Herr Professor Schmidt). The title Frau is used in the same way when addressing a female. These days, the title Fräulein has a negative tone (Besch 1996, 106-108.) According to a questionnaire, the title has following connotations: old fashioned, chauvinist, diminishing. It is considered an address form for a female who is not yet a full woman. Further, there is no similar address form *Herrlein/Männlein* for men (Besch 1996, 45).

When T pronoun is used in conversation, FN usually follows. V pronoun is normally followed with TLN. When titles Herr/Frau are used, LN can be left out. Tiittula argues (1993, 108), that in most situations titles Herr/Frau are enough in conversation. However, if the interlocutor is a

doctor, the title must be used. In fact, the title Dr. in German is considered as an essential part in a person's name. According to Besch (1996, 17), the Germans can use even three titles after another: "Guten Tag, Herr Professor Dr. Peter Wolf!" (Besch 1996, 87). Foreign businessmen are instructed to use surnames only and show respect for the titles when negotiating with the Germans. This is not a sign of stiffness or distance but of respect. Further, Germans are said not to be casual about friendships. In fact, they do not wish to become immediately familiar with strangers (Lewis 1996, 211-4). The use of a title is not considered exaggerating in German. On the contrary, titles are common, polite and natural in everyday conversation. However, there is a new trend nowadays, especially in northern Germany, whereby address without titles is preferred. However, when communicating in official functions or offices, titles must still be used. For example, the German diplomats need to be highly skilled in using titles because the protocol how to use address forms in official functions is very strict, both in conversation as well as in written form. The German Ministry of Interior, Bundesministerium des Innern, has published a brochure where the proper address forms for certain occupations are listed. According to this list (quoted in Besch 1996, 17-18) the following titles must be used:

Kardinal + Eminenz
Papst + Eure Heiligkeit/Heiliger Vater
Rektor/Präsident der Hochschule + Herr Rektor/ Herr Präsident

However, the political representatives of the country have no special titles:

Bundespräsident + Herr Bundespräsident
Bundeskanzler + Herr Bundeskanzler

Besch argues (1996, 18) that the more democratically elected the position of the addressee is, the more informal address form can be used.

Kin titles are mainly used for parents and grandparents. According to Besch (1996, 70) mother and father and their variables are the normal kin titles used by children in German. However, aunts and uncles are usually addressed by FN. In the questionnaire (Besch 1996, 70) 48% of the interviewees said they use FN when addressing their aunt/uncle. 45% said they use the

combination of a title + FN. Parents-in-law are not addressed with a kin title. 90% of the respondents said they use T pronoun and FN when addressing their parents-in-law.

6.1 Study on addressing in English and German literature: Forms of addressing in literature

In the following I will discuss addressing in four detective stories, two in English and two in German. When quoting the German novels I present both the original text in German as well as the informal translation into English. In this study I have concentrated on the address forms the main character or the two main characters in each novel use and the address forms they receive. I will first start by presenting the main characters and what the common address forms between them are, i.e. what are the normal, unmarked address forms. To make the addressing more obvious, I have collected the address forms used by the main characters and the forms they receive, into a table. I will also discuss the possible reasons for these particular address forms, i.e. power relations, individual characteristics, attitudes etc. I will also present the situations where a deviation from a normal, unmarked address form occur. Further, if a switch in address forms occurs, I will analyse the purpose and possible effect of the switch, i.e. signs of respect/disrespect, social distance, face-threatening etc. Last, I will summarise the use of address forms and compare the English and German use of them. I will not consider the possible effect of the writers' stylistic choices in the paper. I have chosen novels that are recently written. Both English novels are written by an American author. All detective stories are written between 1999 and 2004. Thus, the setting and the language in each novel is modern.

6.2 Patricia Cornwell: Black Notice

The two main characters are Dr Kay Scarpetta, Richmond's Chief Medical Examiner and Richmond police captain Pete Marino. Scarpetta functions as a narrative in the novel but the story contains a lot of dialogue between characters. Throughout the whole novel they use the same address form for each other. Scarpetta uses LN (Marino) for Pete Marino and Marino uses "Doc" for Scarpetta. Scarpetta is mainly addressed with TLN in her office. All her employees address her by using TLN but Scarpetta addresses them with FN. This occurs both with other doctors as well as with Scarpetta's secretary and other employees in the office, such as cleaning ladies and clerks. Addressing between Scarpetta and her superior, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, is reciprocal: both receive FN. As a chief medical examiner Scarpetta constantly works with the police. She is addressed with the title of respect "ma'am" or more familiar "doc" by the officers. Detective Anderson, however, avoids using any address form and uses the personal pronoun "you". Scarpetta addresses the police officers as well as detective Anderson with TLN, FN or avoids using any addressing and refers to the addressee with personal pronoun "you". The head of the police, Chief Bray, mainly addresses Scarpetta with TLN and also receives TLN from Scarpetta. This relationship is difficult and can be seen in varying address forms, which I will discuss in more detail later. Very few characters address Scarpetta with FN. In addition to her superior, these are Scarpetta's close friend Senator Lord and her colleague Dr Graham Worth. An Interpol agent Jay Talley addresses Scarpetta with FN but only after their relationship changes from professional into intimate. Scarpetta addresses her mother with only Kin title and her sister with FN. Both address Scarpetta with personal pronoun "you". Scarpetta's niece, Lucy, addresses her with Kin title + FN and receives FN from Scarpetta. Scarpetta addresses Lucy's colleague and lover with FN but receives TLN.

Marino addresses Scarpetta's secretary Rose with MN (Sweetheart, honey, FN) and also receives MN (T, TLN) from her. Marino often works with Scarpetta in her office and addresses Scarpetta's assistant Chuck Ruffin with FN or with an epithet and receives mostly LN. Marino receives T from Chief Bray but addresses her with an incorrect TLN or personal pronoun "you". Detective Anderson addresses Marino mainly with LN and also receives LN. In some situations Marino addresses Anderson with an epithet, which I will discuss later. Marino addresses police officers with LN and receives either FN or T. Marino addresses Jay Talley with the personal pronoun "you" and receives TLN. Scarpetta's niece Lucy addresses Marino with LN and receives FN.

In the following tables I summarize the address forms Scarpetta and Marino receive and the address forms they use when addressing the other main characters. When deciding whether the addressing is reciprocal or nonreciprocal, I have used the rule given by Brown and Ford in their study (1961). According to the study the most formal address form is T alone moving towards the more intimate MN: T-TLN-LN-FN-MN. In my Study, however, I have not always stated varying address forms as MN. The criterion for MN in my study is, that the interlocutors use multiple names to signal intimacy, closeness and ingroup membership. If varying addressing is used in some other function (i.e. to signal a change in the mood or attitude, to show respect etc.), I have stated the address forms separately. If the interlocutors use different address forms with each other, I have stated the addressing nonreciprocal.

Scarpetta

Addressee	Marino	Employees	Police officers	Friends	Bray
Receives	LN	FN	you, LN	FN	TLN
Addresses	Doc	TLN	Ma'am, Doc	FN	TLN, FN
Reciprocal/Non Reciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Reciprocal	Reciprocal, Nonreciprocal

Addressee	Relatives	Superior	Anderson	Agent Talley
Receives	Kin title + FN, you	FN	TLN	TLN, FN
Addresses	FN, T	FN	you	TLN, FN
Reciprocal / Non-Reciprocal	Reciprocal, nonreciprocal	Reciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Reciprocal, nonreciprocal

Marino

Addressee	Scarpetta	Police officers	Bray	Anderson	Jay Talley
Receives	Doc	FN, LN, T	TLN	epithet, LN	you
Addresses	LN	FN, LN, T	T	LN	TLN
Reciprocal/Non-Reciprocal	nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal,	nonreciprocal	Reciprocal, nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal

Addressee	Chuck Ruffin	Rose
Receives	epithet, FN	Sweetheart, honey, FN
Addresses	LN, you	T, TLN
Reciprocal / Non-Reciprocal	Nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal

The most common address forms in Cornwell's novel are FN and TLN as also Brown and Ford argued in their study. However, LN is commonly used alone and non-reciprocal addressing is frequent when addressing Dr Kay Scarpetta. I have considered the addressing between Marino and Scarpetta nonreciprocal. However, the function of LN can be considered similar to FN even though Marino's first name (Pete) is not polysyllabic and neither is his last name monosyllabic. "Doc" can also be seen equal with FN. It is only used by characters whose relationship with Scarpetta is close. The addressing between Scarpetta and Anderson is considered nonreciprocal. Anderson, by

choosing not to use TLN, is sending a message about their relationship and similarly deviating from the normal respectful address form TLN. The same occurs with Marino and Talley with Marino not using TLN.

The nonreciprocal addressing between Scarpetta and her employees are most probably due to power relations. Even though Scarpetta has worked with some of her employees for a very long time she still receives TLN: “Rose had worked for me since I had been appointed chief medical examiner, which meant she had been running my life for most of my career” (Cornwell 1999, 13). Their relationship is close and also informal as Scarpetta visits her secretary also at her home and has done this for a long time. The nonreciprocal addressing occurs also between Scarpetta and other doctors who work for her in her office. In the following Dr Fielding, deputy chief, is discussing with Scarpetta about difficulties in the office:

Scarpetta: “Jack..I need you to be as honest as you’ve ever been with me”.

Fielding: “Okay, to lay it all out, Dr Scarpetta..the word is that you’ve embarrassed Wagner with this chat stuff you’re doing on the internet” (ibid. 109-110)

The relationship between Scarpetta and Fielding is, however, close:

Scarpetta: “Jack, why didn’t you just ask me about it?...”

Fielding: “It’s not a reflection of people not caring or feeling estranged. If anything, we care so much I guess we got overprotective” (ibid. 110-111)

The very personal topics of conversation, such as personal grieve or divorce, do not change the addressing into reciprocal but it remains nonreciprocal throughout the novel.

The relationship between Chief Bray, detective Anderson and Scarpetta is distant and even hostile. They meet occasionally at crime scenes. Both Bray and Anderson have newly started at Richmond police and have not known Scarpetta before. However, they both know Scarpetta’s status as a chief medical examiner and constantly try to undermine it. Both Bray and Anderson receive TLN from Scarpetta. She does not change TLN even in case of negotiation where Bray tries to address Scarpetta with FN. Bray addresses Scarpetta mainly with TLN. Because of the bad relationship she also addresses Scarpetta with FN which I will study more later. Anderson never

addresses Scarpetta directly with any proper noun but always uses the personal pronoun “you”. This can be seen as a deviation from the normal address form and choosing not to be polite or respectful. The attitude and nature of the relationship between Anderson and Scarpetta is described already when they meet for the very first time:

“Detective Anderson, I presume,” I said. “Rene Anderson. The one and only. And you must be the doc I’ve heard so much about,” she said with the arrogance I associated with most people who didn’t know what the hell they were doing (Cornwell 1999, 18).

Scarpetta addresses the police officers at crime scenes with TLN or FN and receives the polite “ma’am” or more informal “doc”. In the table I have stated this addressing nonreciprocal. However, the addressing can be seen as reciprocal so that if Scarpetta uses TLN she receives “ma’am” and with FN she receives “doc”.

“How are you, Al”? I said to deputy chief Carson. He’d been around as long as I had. He was a gentle, quiet man who had grown up on a farm. “Hangin’in, Doc,” he said (Cornwell 1999, 33).

Sometimes the officers first address Scarpetta with the familiar “doc” but change into “ma’am” to show respect:

“What the hell do you think you’re doing?” I said to him in a hard tone he had never heard from me. “Getting her temp, Doc,” Ham said. “Did you swab her before inserting the thermometer? In the event she was sodomized?” I demanded in the same angry voice as Marino made his way around me and stared at the body. Ham hesitated. “No, ma’am, I didn’t” (Cornwell 1999, 210).

Scarpetta also meets with an Interpol agent Jay Talley. First they use reciprocal TLN but as their relationship changes from professional into personal the address forms change through negotiation. This will be analyzed later.

Scarpetta addresses only her friends, relatives and her superior with FN. I also count Marino into this category due to their close and long relationship. Senator Lord is introduced in the beginning of the novel. First they knew each other through work but through Scarpetta’s relationship with an FBI agent they have later become friends. In the beginning of the novel Senator Lord has come to bring a letter to Scarpetta from Benton who has been killed in the earlier novel:

Senator Lord and I had grown up in Miami and had gone to school in the same archdiocese, although I had attended St. Brendan’s High school only one year and long after he was there. Yet that somewhat removed crossing of paths was a sign of what would come. When he was the district attorney, I was

working for the Dade County Medical Examiner's Office and often testified in his cases (Cornwell 1999, 2).

The relationship between Lord and Scarpetta can be described as a primary relationship (Bell 1976, 102-3). Their addressing can also be described according to Brown and Gilman (1960, 258) as solidary addressing between equals due to their similar background. Scarpetta also addresses Dr Graham Worth, a colleague who is not working for her, reciprocally with FN. Similarly, Scarpetta and her superior, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, use FN reciprocally. Their relationship is described only briefly in the novel:

He was a psychiatrist with a law degree, and oversaw person-service agencies such as mental health, substance abuse, social services and Medicare. He had been on the faculty of the Medical College of Virginia, or MCV, before his appointment to a cabinet-level position, and I'd always respected him enormously and knew he respected me, too (Cornwell 1999, 136).

As Scarpetta has a law degree too, in addition to the medical education, they can also be seen as solidar interlocutors, belonging to the same ingroup.

Scarpetta speaks to her mother once in the novel and addresses her with kin title (mother) or chooses not to use any address form at all. Scarpetta addresses her sister with FN. She receives FN from both her mother and sister. Lucy, her niece, Scarpetta addresses with FN but receives kin title (aunt) + FN. This is similar to what Brown and Ford (1969,229) argued about ascending generations receiving the title.

Marino addresses the police officers with FN, LN and T and receives FN, LN or T. Here, FN and LN have to be considered as equal – they are both used in an informal manner to show solidarity: “How you doin’, Eggleston?” “Same-o, same-o, Pete” (Cornwell 1999, 208). T is used mainly when Marino has taken a role of a supervisor – even when this happens without real authority. Thus, when interlocutors accept each others’ roles they claim, the address forms follow the roles:

“Go”, Marino said. “Captain, I can’t leave without my radio.” “I just gave you my permission.” No one dared remind Marino that he had been suspended. Jenkins and Cooper left in a hurry (Cornwell 1999, 377).

Marino and Anderson do not show any solidarity in their speech. They address each other mainly with LN, without titles. LN is not, however, used to show solidarity or belonging to same ingroup. Titles are left out because both feel they are somehow not deserved. Both want to claim the title “detective”. Because of Anderson this title has been taken from Marino. By not using the title Marino shows disrespect and by using only LN, Anderson claims she is more powerful in the relationship. The hostility between them is clear when they negotiate the address forms. I will study this later.

Marino has a disrespectful relationship with Scarpetta’s dishonest assistant, Chuck Ruffin. He mainly addresses him with a disrespectful epithet. Ruffin addresses Marino with LN or with personal pronoun “you”. The chief of police, Bray, and Marino meet often. Because of her status, Bray expects a respectful TLN. Marino addresses her with TLN but against the protocol. In this way he manages to show his disrespect towards the chief who has taken the title “detective” from him:

“Deputy Chief Bray, it’s Marino,” he said in the voice of someone dying of a terrible scourge. “Really sorry to bug you at home.” He was answered with silence, having instantly and deliberately irritated his direct supervisor by addressing her as “Deputy Chief.” According to protocol, deputy chiefs were always addressed as “Chief,” while the chief himself was called “Colonel” (Cornwell 1999, 54).

Here, the wrong address form is definitely what Brown and Levinson (1979, 325-326) calls “communicative sign which is not only intended but is intended to be seen as intended.” Marino chooses not to obey the social norm and does not acknowledge the status of his listener.

Another person Marino does not like is Jay Talley. He chooses not to use any title with him. However, he always receives TLN from Talley. Marino does not feel comfortable around Talley. They are abroad and Marino does not have any authority as a police officer. Jay Talley is young, handsome, well educated and powerful. Marino tries to prove him a spoilt young privileged boy but fails:

“How’d you end up over here anyway?” Marino wouldn’t relent. “My father’s French, my mother American. I spent most of my childhood in Paris, then my family moved to Los Angeles.” “Then what?” “Law school, didn’t like it, ended up with ATF.” “For how long?” Marino continued his interrogation. “I’ve been an agent about five years.” “Yeah? And how much of that’s been over here?” Marino was getting more belligerent with each question. “Two years.” “That’s kind of cushy. Three

years on the street, then you end up over here drinking wine and hanging out in this big glass castle with all these hot-shit people.” “I’ve been extremely fortunate.” Talley’s graciousness carried a sting. “You’re absolutely right. I suppose it helps somewhat that I speak four languages and have travelled extensively. I also got into computers and international studies at Harvard.” “I’m hitting the john.” Marino abruptly got up (Cornwell 1999, 310).

This conversation reveals a lot about Marino’s character. He is not familiar with situations when he is not in control as an officer. He is a police officer and when not functioning in that role he is uncertain about himself. After this conversation he still refuses to use any title with Talley but stops questioning him.

Marino seems to have a close and friendly relationship with Scarpetta’s secretary Rose. He addresses her with MN (sweetheart, honey) or FN. However, he always receives a more formal T or TLN from Rose. As Rose does not get offended or claim any other address form from Marino, I would argue her way of using titles with everyone is just a way to be polite:

Marino walked over and put his arm around her. “Sweetheart, you can’t blame a guy for wanting to snatch your body,” he sweetly said in her ear. ... “I’m tired, Captain,” Rose muttered (Cornwell 1999, 76).

There are occasions where negotiations over address forms occur in the novel. The first significant argument over proper address form is between Marino and Anderson:

“Marino, you’re not needed here,” Anderson said to him. “In fact, I don’t think you want anyone to know you even thought about coming here.” “It’s *Captain* to you.” He blew out his words on gusts of cigarette smoke. “You might want to watch your smart-ass mouth because I outrank you, babe.” ... “I don’t believe we call female officers *babe* anymore,” Anderson said (Cornwell 1999, 23).

First, Anderson offends Marino by referring him losing his status as a detective. Marino demands the title and further deliberately shows his disrespect by using the epithet “babe”. This is a face-threatening act against Anderson. Her status as a detective is higher than Marino’s as a captain. Marino’s utterance is not positive-politeness strategy. He does not perceive himself as similar to Anderson. In fact, he does not have any respect for her at all and he uses an epithet as an address form to show his attitude. Anderson wants to keep her face and claims a more respectful addressing. However, after this conversation Marino leaves the scene without correcting his face-threatening act.

Marino uses an epithet constantly when addressing Chuck Ruffin, Scarpetta's assistant. I consider the modifier "boy" as an epithet as it clearly expresses evaluation:

"No, that ain't what I'm thinking, Chuckie-boy." "The name's Chuck." "Depends on who's talking to you. So here's the daily double, Chuckie-boy..." (Cornwell 1999, 92).

Marino threatens Chuck's negative face on purpose and continues doing that even though Chuck claims a more respectful address form FN. Marino is by using the demeaning address form showing Chuck his power and attitude towards him. These violations of the norms as well as the addressing of Bray against the protocol are consistent with Marino's behaviour in general. He does not behave respectfully or politely towards anyone if he does not truly respect him/her – social norms or protocols do not mean anything to him.

Scarpetta has normally no problems with address forms. She receives the polite TLN and addresses her employees, friends and relatives with FN and other people with TLN. However, with chief Bray she occasionally has to negotiate the proper address form:

"Certainly with your continents of experience, you can tolerate someone new and do a little mentoring, Kay?" "There's no cure for someone who doesn't care." "I suspect you've been listening to Marino. According to him, no one is skilled, schooled or cares enough to do what he does." I'd had it with her. I adjusted my position to take full advantage of the shift in the wind. I stepped closed to her because I was going to rub her nose in a little dose of reality. "Don't ever do this to me again, Chief Bray," I said. "Don't you ever call me or anyone in my office to a scene and then saddle us with some fuckup who can't be bothered collecting evidence. And don't call me *Kay*" (Cornwell 1999, 40-41)

Another violation by Bray occurs later in the novel. Every time Bray wants to show her power and status she addresses Scarpetta with FN. She does not want to show intimacy but subservience which can also be seen from Scarpetta's reactions:

"Chief Bray here," it began. "So nice to run into you at Buckhead's. I have a few policy and procedural issues to discuss with you. Managing crime scenes and evidence, and so on. I've been meaning to discuss them with you, Kay." The sound of my first name coming out of her mouth infuriated me (Cornwell 1999, 156).

In the third negotiation Bray uses FN again to show her status and subservience towards Scarpetta.

To claim distance and respect, Scarpetta also violates the social norms and uses TLN "Deputy Chief" instead of the proper "Chief" against the protocol:

"The crime scene belongs to us, Kay," she said. "I understand you haven't had to work things that way in the past – probably not the entire time you've been here or maybe anywhere. That's what I was talking about when I mentioned..." "Deputy Chief Bray," I said, "the law of Virginia states that the

medical examiner shall take charge of the body. The body is my jurisdiction.” ... “You have just cut this lady’s heart out evidentially, Deputy Chief Bray” (Cornwell 1999, 217).

In all negotiations between Bray and Scarpetta the showing of disrespect is mainly expressed by using address forms. Otherwise the conversation is polite and formal.

Another kind of negotiation occurs between Jay Talley and Scarpetta. Scarpetta travels with Marino to France to investigate the murders with Interpol agent Talley. Scarpetta and Talley spend some time together discussing the case. First they address each other with reciprocal TLN. To show his changing attitude and to claim intimacy, Talley chooses to use FN. Scarpetta does not get offended, however, she prefers using TLN herself to Talley.

“I’ve been a servant to the law, to the principles of science and medicine, for half my life,” I went on. “The only thing you’ve done for half your life, Agent Talley, is make it through adolescence in that Ivy League of yours” ... “Kay, we would never say that. Senator Lord would never say that. Please trust us” (Cornwell 1999, 317).

However, when Scarpetta is ready to show intimacy and personal feelings, she changes into reciprocal FN with Talley. This change happens just before their relationship becomes intimate:

“You paid for this trip, didn’t you, Jay?” (Cornwell 1999, 341)

6.3 Fairstein: The Dead House

There are also two main characters in Fairstein’s novel, assistant district attorney Alexandra Cooper and detective Mike Chapman. Cooper is the narrative voice in the novel but it also contains many dialogues between several characters. They are both in their mid 30’s. Cooper and Chapman use MN reciprocally when addressing each other. The setting is very often in academic surroundings where Cooper and Chapman meet with professors and some faculty clerks. Cooper addresses all the professors mainly with a T (Sir, Professor) and receives TLN (Ms Cooper). At the end of the novel she addresses one of the professors with TLN instead of the T and receives a FN. There is also professor Nan Rothchild, who receives FN from Cooper and who also addresses Cooper with the FN. Cooper addresses the general counsel, Sylvia Foot, of King’s College with a FN. She receives

TLN from Foote but she changes the address form into the FN. Their addressing is first nonreciprocal but soon changes into reciprocal. Cooper addresses her fiancée reciprocally with MN. Cooper also receives MN from her closest friend, Joan Stafford, but uses no address form when talking to her in the novel. Other detectives address Cooper mostly with the FN and also receive a FN. Occasionally the detectives address Cooper with TLN and also receive TLN. In court Cooper addresses the judge with T (your honor) and receives TLN. However, when they are speaking off the record, Cooper receives FN from the judge. There are also two doctors in the novel. Cooper receives TLN from Dr Hoppins but does not address him with any proper noun. Cooper also receives TLN from Dr Sandie Herron who almost immediately starts addressing Cooper with the FN after asking for her permission. Cooper, however, addresses Dr Herron with a T. Cooper addresses grandfather Lockhart with a T and receives MN. The executive assistant district attorney Bart Frankel is addressed with the FN and Cooper also receives the FN.

Mike Chapman addresses the professors in the university with TLN (Mr + LN) but also with a T or a general noun (buddy, pal). However, one of the professors receives MN (ma'am, FN). The general counsel, Ms Foote, receives TLN and a FN from Chapman but she addresses him with TLN. The best friend of Cooper, Joan Stafford, addresses Chapman with both TLN and a FN and also receives both forms as well as MN from Chapman. Other detectives address Chapman with a FN, a LN, TLN or MN and they receive a FN, TLN and MN. Chapman addresses Jake, Cooper's boyfriend, with FN but is not addressed with any proper noun by him in the novel. Chapman addresses Bart Frankel with TLN and receives a FN and a T from him. Even though Chapman often uses familiar address forms or does not use titles, his behaviour is accepted by his interlocutors. The violations of the norms happen when he is interrogating people and is not happy with their answers.

Alexandra Cooper

Addressee	Mike Chapman	Sylvia Foote	Jake	Joan Stafford
addresses	MN	TLN, FN	MN	MN
receives	MN	FN	MN	You
reciprocal/ nonreciprocal	reciprocal	reciprocal/non- reciprocal	reciprocal	nonreciprocal

addressee	Peterson	McKinney	Wallace
addresses	FN	FN	TLN, FN
receives	FN	FN	TLN
reciprocal/non- reciprocal	reciprocal	nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal

addressee	Tony Parisi	Dr Hoppins	Dr Herron	Judge
addresses	TLN	TLN	TLN, FN	TLN, FN
receives	FN	You	T	T
reciprocal/ non- reciprocal	nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal

addressee	Shreve	Lavery	Grandfather Lockhart
addresses	FN, TLN, Young Lady	TLN	MN
receives	TLN, T	T	T
reciprocal/ non-reciprocal	nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal

addressee	Bart Frankel	Nan Rothschild	Recantati	Thomas Grenier
addresses	FN	FN	You	TLN, TT
receives	FN	FN	T	TLN, T
reciprocal/non-reciprocal	reciprocal	reciprocal	nonreciprocal	reciprocal

Mike Chapman

addressee	Tony Parisi	Peterson	Wallace	McKinney
addresses	MN	FN, LN	TLN	-
receives	MN	MN	TLN, FN	FN, Buddy
reciprocal/ non-reciprocal	reciprocal	nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal

addressee	Shreve	Lavery	Recantati
addresses	TLN, T	TLN, T	T, TLN
receives	T	TLN	T, TLN, pal
reciprocal/non-reciprocal	nonreciprocal	reciprocal/non-reciprocal	reciprocal/non-reciprocal

addressee	Grandfather Lockhart	Dr Hoppins	Nan Rothschild	Sylvia Foote
addresses	MN	T	T	T, TLN
receives	TLN	Doc	Ma'am, FN	TLN, FN
reciprocal/ non-reciprocal	nonreciprocal	reciprocal	nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal

addressee	Jake	Joan Stafford	Bart Frankel
addresses	-	TLN, FN	FN, T
receives	FN	TLN, MN	TLN
reciprocal/non-reciprocal	nonreciprocal	reciprocal	nonreciprocal

Cooper and Chapman have been friends for a long time and their relationship is close. This relationship is described in the beginning of the novel:

“I had known Chapman for more than ten years, and accepted the fact that he was no more likely to change his ways than I was able to explain the nature of our friendship, intensely close and completely trusting, despite the vast differences in our backgrounds.” (Fairstein 2003, 15)

This can also be seen in their reciprocal addressing with MN. Chapman calls Cooper with address forms such as ‘kid’, ‘blondie’ and ‘coop’. Most of the time Cooper addresses Chapman with FN. Sometimes when she wants to show her attitude she uses other forms, such as TLN: “This is all about *you*, Mr Chapman. I tensed and fidgeted as we neared the driveway.” (Fairstein 2003, 100).

Cooper addresses her fiancée with reciprocal MN. Cooper works as an assistant district attorney in New York. They work together with Chapman trying to solve the murder of a college professor. Cooper and Chapman interact frequently with college professors and other staff. The situation is almost always an interview or interrogation when Cooper and Chapman are on duty and talk to the professors of the college. The professors are: Dr Lockhart, Dr Lavery, Dr Rothschild,

Dr Shreve, Dr Recantati and Dr Grenier. Lockhart is shortly described in the novel: “The sandy-haired man who opened the door to us looked no older than Mike. He had fine, chiselled features and an athletic build” (Fairstein 2003, 286).

Thomas Grenier, the biology professor, receives both a T and TLN (Professor Grenier). He addresses only Cooper, not Chapman, and with TLN. He is being interviewed by Cooper and Chapman in the premises of the college. However, he once uses a marked address form ‘Madame Prosecutor’ which is used to show the change in his mood or attitude:

““We’re into entitlements now, are we, Madame Prosecutor? Look, everyone’s out there on that island digging around for a particular reason. Are you going to be the one to decide someone is more or less selfish than I am, more or less altruistic? Let’s not be ridiculous.”” (Fairstein 2003, 367).

The unmarked address form is Ms Cooper. To stress the change in his mood, he changes the address form into more polite and formal one.

Winston Shreve receives a T and TLN from Cooper. He addresses Cooper with TLN, a FN and ‘young lady’. This relationship is complicated as Shreve appears to be the murderer at the end of the novel. First, when Cooper and Chapman are making questions to Shreve just as to other professors, the address form he receives is T (Professor). He addresses both Chapman and Cooper with a T or TLN (Ms Cooper, Detective). At the end of the novel the situation and relationship between Cooper and Shreve changes when Shreve kidnaps Cooper. Shreve still receives TLN but instead of Professor, he is addressed with title Mr (Mr Shreve). Shreve addresses Cooper with a FN, TLN or ‘young lady’. The first time he uses FN is when he is trying to calm Cooper down: “I’m not going to hurt you, Alex. I’ve brought you here because I need your help tonight. I’m not a killer.” (Fairstein 2003, 435). Later, when Shreve is not trying to comfort Cooper but to threaten her, he uses TLN:

“We’ll see whether that helps things, Ms Cooper. Then, when I come back, I want you to think about how cooperative you’re going to be about helping me find the diamonds that are buried on the island.” (Fairstein 2003, 453).

Only when Shreve is losing the control over his prisoner, he changes from polite and formal TLN into 'young lady': "Don't be stupid, young lady. You've got nowhere to go." (Fairstein 2003, 485). Thus, the addressing varies in different situations. If Shreve wants to express a mood (a threat or comfort) he does this by changing the address form. In order to comfort his hostage, he address her with FN and if his intention is to threaten her (i.e. highlight his own power) he uses the address form TLN. His other speech does not vary in politeness.

Nan Rothschild is Cooper's friend and a professor at the college. Cooper and Rothschild address each other with a FN. Joan Stafford is also described as one of Cooper's closest friends. She does not receive any proper address form from Cooper but addresses her with MN (kiddo, Alex).

Sylvia Foote, the general counsel of King's College, is addressed with a FN by Cooper. Foote first addresses Cooper with TLN but quite soon changes into a FN without any negotiation. The addressing between Cooper and Foote is nonreciprocal for a while so that Cooper receives TLN and Foote a FN:

"As you know, Sylvia, I'd been working with Lola Dakota on the case against Ivan for almost two years..." "I know what your area of expertise is, Miss Cooper." (Fairstein 2003, 50)

The nonreciprocal addressing this way occurs even though Foote is more than 15 years older than Cooper: "Foote was in her late sixties – humourless, rigid, and entirely protective of the administration's concerns" (Fairstein 2003, 43). The change of address form takes place without any negotiation. Foote changes the address form and after that, receiving no disagreement, remains using a FN:

"Foote broke in to relieve the president. Chapman's directness didn't make her happy. "Alex, for the moment, since Lola had personal contact with you, can't we just discuss this one-on-one?" (Fairstein 2003, 52)

In this situation Foote is trying to appeal to Cooper in order to protect the president of the university. By using a FN instead of earlier TLN she signals sympathy between them and even stresses how they belong to the same ingroup whereas Chapman is new and does not. Cooper does

not show any reaction towards the changed address form. Thus, Foote addresses her with a FN after this incident.

Cooper and Chapman also go to speak with Lockhart's grandfather. Both Cooper and Chapman receive MN from the old man. He uses address forms such as 'young man', 'young lady', 'my boy', and 'missy':

"Some of them had to work as caretakers in the other hospitals and asylums," I offered, still chilled by that startling fact. "But most of them, missy, were doing hard labor" (Fairstein 2003, 308).

Cooper addresses Orlyn Lockhart with a T (sir). This nonreciprocal addressing is approved by both interlocutors, most probably because of the vast age difference.

Cooper mainly works outside her office. However, she still meets with her colleagues and detectives. The detectives who help Cooper and Chapman are: Mercer Wallace, Peterson and Tony Parisi. Wallace is described as one of Cooper's dearest friends. He has also been Chapman's partner before getting injured at work. Wallace addresses Cooper with TLN and a FN and receives an address form once, TLN: "'For you, Detective Wallace,'" I said, passing a wrapped package to him." (Fairstein 2003, 281). The situation is informal, a christmas party. Even though the address form is normally considered very formal and used only when on duty, in this situation it is used to show solidarity.

Cooper addresses detective Parisi with a FN and receives TLN: "Tony, I appreciate your feelings for Bart..." "Look, you got no jurisdiction here, Miss Cooper..." (Fairstein 2003, 317). This may result from power relations or difference in status as Cooper outranks the police detective. Further, Parisi and Cooper do not work in the same premises. There is also one lieutenant in the novel, Peterson. Cooper and Chapman meet him at the police station. Peterson addresses Cooper with a FN (Alexandra, Alex). Cooper does not address Peterson in the novel. Peterson is described as a veteran detective who is running the Homicide Squad. He is also liked by his men and the police officers trust him. Thus, it is likely that Cooper and Chapman have frequently met him when working at investigations. Cooper addresses the deputy chief of the trial division, Pat

McKinney with a FN and also receives a FN. However, their relationship is not very close or friendly:

“I tried not to let my intense dislike for McKinney, who was deputy chief of the trial division and one of the supervisors to whom I answered, affect my response” (Fairstein 2003, 37)

Characters who work closely together (in the police) use mostly a FN reciprocally in the novel.

Personal sympathy effects the addressing only between characters who do not work under same division in the police. However, if the characters are close friends also outside the department, the address forms vary.

Cooper and Chapman meet Bart Frankel during the investigation of the murder.

Chapman asks if Cooper knows Frankel and what he is like. Cooper answers:

“I’ve only met him once, when Sinnelesi sent a delegation to talk about helping them stage this shooting of Lola... Frankel came to our office to try to get me to change my mind...I heard he’s a law school buddy of Sinnelesi’s, so he’s probably the same age. About fifty. They were at NYU together. Frankel started with the Brooklyn district attorney, right out of school –“ (Fairstein 2003, 229).

Despite the age difference of more than 15 years and the fact that they have only met once before, both, Cooper and Frankel, address each other with a FN. This is typical of Frankel as he also addresses Chapman with FN even though they have not met before. A FN can also signal that all interlocutors have a feeling of belonging to the same ingroup and sharing common wants.

Cooper appears few times in a court in the novel. She addresses the judge with a T (Judge, Your honor, Sir). The judge addresses Cooper with TLN or with a FN:

“Ms Cooper, Mr Abramson – have you each had an opportunity to examine the recommendations made by the review board?” “Yes, Your Honor,” we answered at the same time. (Fairstein 2003, 124).

However, once the judge wants to speak with Cooper off-the-record and then he uses a FN:

““We’re off-the-record here, understand?” I stood up to object. Vexter was most pernicious when he could clean up the official language of his hearings. His finger pointed back at me, telling me not to dare to stop him. “Look, Alex. You got a retard here who doesn’t mind a roll in the hay...”” (Fairstein 2003, 269).

All the titles (Judge, Your Honor, Sir) are accepted by the judge as well as the address forms TLN or a FN by Cooper.

Cooper and Chapman talk to two doctors, Dr Hoppins and Dr Herron, who are witnesses in the trials. Hoppins addresses Cooper with TLN. Cooper does not address Hoppins with

any proper noun. Dr Sandie Herron first addresses Cooper with TLN but soon asks for permission to use a FN:

““Don’t worry, I’ve had a copy of Tina’s chart made for you. All of the meds are listed in that. The problem... may I call you Alex? The problem is that her speech and language are particularly immature...”” (Fairstein 2003, 263).

In her answer Cooper does not react to the negotiation of the address form. She remains using a T: “Have you ever testified at a preliminary hearing, Doctor?” (Fairstein 2003, 263) Herron moves to using FN without any reaction by the hearer: “One thing you need to understand, Alex, is that Tina exhibits an unusual preoccupation with sex.” (Fairstein 2003, 263-264) After this Cooper does not address Herron with any proper address form but Herron constantly uses a FN. However, Cooper does not show any disagreement with the address form she receives.

Jake and Chapman speak only shortly in the novel. Jake receives a FN from Chapman but uses no address form when speaking to Chapman.

Chapman addresses Lavery with TLN (Mr Lavery) and receives both a T and TLN.

There is a short negotiation of a proper address form between Chapman and Lavery:

Chapman: “Bart’s out of the picture, Mr Lavery. For the time –“

Lavery: “It’s *Doctor* Lavery.”

Chapman: “You got a stethoscope, a prescription pad, and a licence to practice medicine, then I’ll call you ‘doctor’. Every other ‘ologist’ who writes a dissertation on some useless theoretical load of crap is just plain old ‘mister’ to me. (Fairstein 2003, 328).

After this conversation Cooper starts speaking: ““Professor...” I tried to start anew.”” And Lavery reacts: “Ah, the diplomat in the team” (Fairstein 2003, 328.) After this episode Chapman uses no longer any address form when speaking to Lavery. However, he receives both a T and TLN. Cooper constantly uses the T ‘Professor’. The conversation is situated in Lavery’s home where Cooper and Chapman drive to interview the professor. Lavery is not feeling comfortable with Chapman: “Lavery’s expression gave nothing away, but he seemed too smart to trust the situation. Or the cop who was giving him the once-over.” (Fairstein 2003, 327). To claim respect he wants to negotiate a more respectful address form than ‘Mr Lavery’. The first one to speak after the claim is Cooper, who uses the address form ‘professor’. She is doing the questioning for a long time and the situation

calms down. However, Chapman is not changing the address form into 'Dr Lavery' as claimed. Instead, he chooses not to use any address form at all. Lavery seems to be satisfied with the situation as he no longer claims any address form and answers the questions both by Cooper and Chapman.

Chapman addresses Recantati with a T, TLN and with 'pal'. Chapman receives both a T and TLN. Chapman addresses Recantati mostly with polite a T or TLN. In the situation when he is not given the direct answer he wants to hear, his address form changes:

““Recantati opened his mouth to speak but Chapman wouldn't be interrupted. “There's been more drugs used in some of these halls than Keith Richards and Puff Daddy have seen in their combined lifetimes. This isn't the time to hide behind your cap and gown, pal.”” (Fairstein 2003, 52)

After this the president is addressed with TLN or a T by both Cooper and Chapman. However, Recantati is told to be upset by Chapman's directness.

Chapman is introduced to Rothschild, Cooper's close friend, for the first time. He addresses her with 'Ma'am': “Could I trouble you for a television, ma'am?” (Fairstein 2003, 151). Very soon, without negotiation, Chapman changes his address form into a FN: “I'm toast, blondie. I can never beat her on this feminist trivia, Nan. Probably right up your alley, too.” (Fairstein 2003, 152). Rothschild addresses Chapman with a proper address form (T) only once: “I think it's always the case, Detective, that some are more alien than others...” (Fairstein 2003, 156). The situation is informal, at Rothschild's home. However, Cooper and Chapman are on duty, trying to get some further information on the murder from Nan Rothschild.

Chapman is doing most of the interviewing when talking to Professor Lockhart's old father. Chapman uses TLN (Mr Lockhart):

Orlyn Lockhart: “This is the stuff of legends, now, son...”

Chapman: “I realize they had the run of the penitentiary, Mr Lockhart” (Fairstein 2003, 307)

The address forms Orlyn Lockhart uses would most probably be considered marked if uttered by someone younger. However, neither Cooper nor Chapman expresses any disagreement concerning the addressing.

Chapman addresses his former partner Wallace with TLN and a FN and receives TLN. However, their relationship is informal and also they use the polite address forms more likely to show solidarity than power: ““... You allowed to drink yet, Detective Wallace, or does it still pour out through that mean-looking exit wound in you back? He headed back to the bar to fix a club soda for Mercer.” (Fairstein 2003, 72). Parisi and Chapman address each other with MN (LN, pal, baby, FN) reciprocally. Parisi, Cooper and Chapman meet only when they are on duty. However, their status as police detectives is equal and MN is used reciprocally to show solidarity and same ingroup. Chapman addresses Peterson with MN and receives a FN and a LN. This nonreciprocal addressing does not, however, show disrespect, status difference or negative mood. Both interlocutors are friends and the difference in address forms are mainly due to differences in characters. Chapman addresses McKinney with either a FN or MN ‘buddy’. He receives no address form from McKinney in the novel. Their relationship is friendly and they belong to the same ingroup as police detectives. Thus, all address forms from MN to TLN seem to be possible and no negotiation of the addressing occurs between the detectives in the novel.

Chapman and Frankel meet for the first time. Chapman addresses Frankel with TLN but receives a FN:

“You wanna come up for air, Mr Frankel, or you wanna just babble on?” “Sorry, Mike. It’s Mike, isn’t it? Exactly what can I help you with?” (Fairstein 2003, 232).

Chapman does not believe Frankel and he gets more arrogant with his questions. However, he remains using the polite address form TLN. At the end of the interview Frankel changes from the FN into a T when addressing Chapman, to show his power:

“You know, Detective, I’m the executive assistant district attorney for this county. You blow here like you’re auditioning for a bit part as a wise guy on *The Sopranos*...” (Fairstein 2003, 236).

Frankel’s face is threatened and he is trying to save it by claiming respect because of his title. His rank is obviously higher than Chapman’s as a detective. He is first using a positive politeness

strategy, claiming solidarity, by using the informal FN. When his face is threatened by the arrogant detective he changes his strategy from positive into negative, claiming superiority.

It is not directly mentioned in the novel if Chapman and Stafford have previously met but due to the addressing they use, it is obvious that they have. Stafford speaks to Chapman on the phone:

“Can I interest you in a brandy, Detective Chapman?”
 “Who’s -?”
 “Surely a flic as brilliant as you should be able to – “
 “Mademoiselle Stafford! Your place or mine?” (Fairstein 2003, 116).

Later they change the address forms into the FN or MN:

“...you’ve probably seen ‘em bare, Joanie...”
 “Neither one’s that appealing, Mike...” (Fairstein 2003, 116).

The title ‘detective’ is used although Chapman is not on duty at the moment. The title ‘mademoiselle’ is also usually considered as highly formal and polite. However, here it is used between friends and in an informal situation to stress a close relationship between speakers.

Chapman talks to one doctor in the novel. He addresses Dr Hoppins with ‘doc’ and receives a T:

““Ms Cooper? May I have a word with you?” Hoppins asked. “Some other time, doc,” Mike said as he prodded me toward the door, away from here. “It has to do with King’s College, Detective. You both might want to hear it.” (Fairstein 2003, 131).

‘Doc’ can be considered as more informal than T but Hoppins does not claim any other address form nor does she show any disapproval. Thus, the conversation continues flawlessly.

6.4 On the English novels

Scarpetta receives more formal address forms from her staff and Marino than Cooper from her staff, colleagues or Chapman. Both, however, use mainly a FN when talking to their staff. For Marino, Scarpetta uses a LN and receives ‘Doc’ whereas Cooper addresses Chapman reciprocally with MN. I would argue this difference is mainly due to the scene: Scarpetta works with doctors and scientists

and Cooper with police officers or detectives. Among professionals of higher status the address forms are more formal than among police officers or detectives.

Scarpetta does not meet with many people she does not formally know in the novel. One of them is Talley who she first addresses reciprocally with formal TLN. Cooper works often in university premises and talks to the professors. She mainly addresses them with polite and a formal T or TLN and receives TLN. However, with the general council Foote, Cooper soon starts using the informal FN interchangeably. Scarpetta uses a reciprocal FN only with her close friends, relatives, superior and Talley after their relationship changes into intimate.

Scarpetta's addressing is generally more formal than Cooper's. This may, of course, be due to authors' different way of style but most probably also due to different scenes and roles in the novels. Cooper works with the police. They share the same threats and dangers in their work and they consider themselves as equal. Thus, the addressing among different officers at crime scenes is solidary. Scarpetta also occurs at crime scenes. However, she is not one of the officers but a doctor who mainly works independently, apart from the police department. Only few police officers, who have known Scarpetta for many years, may occasionally use more informal addressing 'doc' with Scarpetta.

Both Scarpetta and Cooper often use nonreciprocal addressing. However, in case of Scarpetta, she is the one receiving the more formal address form whereas Cooper is the one receiving the more informal one. Cooper mostly receives TLN from the professors she talks to but addresses them with more formal T. Scarpetta receives TLN from almost everyone in the novel but often addresses the others, for example her staff, with a FN.

Marino addresses other police officers with a FN or LN or T and receives a FN, TLN or T depending on the situation. In most cases the FN and LN seem to be equal address forms. The usage of LN is never considered as impolite, demeaning or too informal among the police officers. Chapman addresses other police officers generally reciprocally with MN. Occasionally he uses a

FN (with McKinney) or TLN (with Wallace). These different address forms derive from the personal, close relationship between the men. In both novels the address forms between the police officers vary and there are no negotiations about addressing between the policemen.

Marino meets one person in the novel who is completely a new acquaintance to him, Talley. Marino dislikes Talley but unlike usually, he does not insult him by using an improper addressing. However, he refuses using any title in addressing although he receives the polite TLN from Talley. Chapman addresses the professors at the university mainly with TLN instead of T even though the addressee impresses his wish to receive a T. These violations reveal the nature of the characters: they are both tough policemen who work hard to find the criminals. They do not always play by the rules, especially what comes to correct addressing and politeness. These violations signal to the interlocutors that they should be aware with these men.

Within colleagues in the police department the dominant address form seems to be a FN or LN. In this case the LN is merely a substitute for the FN. However, in some situations TLN is used nonreciprocally with FN even though the interlocutors are very close friends also outside work. Scarpetta works with doctors. Their addressing is nonreciprocal so that the superior receives TLN and the employees a FN. In an well educated surroundings the address forms tend to be more formal and nonreciprocal addressing occurs frequently. Within lower educated, such as the policemen, addressing is more informal and more reciprocal. In both novels the more educated characters (Scarpetta, Cooper) use more polite and formal address forms than their lower educated partners (Marino, Chapman). Scarpetta receives more polite and formal addressing than Cooper which I have argued to be due to the scene. Scarpetta is a doctor, not considered as a member of the ingroup with the police, whereas Cooper is considered to be one of the policemen. This is also the case when Cooper is talking to the professors at the university. Thus, a FN and TLN are the most common address forms as Brown&Ford also argued (1961, 234-235). However, a reciprocal FN is not the most common address form in *Black Notice*. In this novel, the most common address form is

reciprocal TLN. The more academic the scene, the more formal the addressing tends to be. A mutual FN is only possible with close friends, relatives and when the relationship is intimate. In *Dead House*, the scene being less academic, the addressing is also more informal, such as within the policemen and when talking to the professors, the addressing is more formal. Shared values, occupation or frequent contact do not necessarily lead to a reciprocal FN. Scarpetta addresses other doctors in her office with a FN and receives TLN. Frequent contact with Cooper and Professors do not change the nonreciprocal addressing with a T / TLN. However, Cooper, Chapman and Wallace use nonreciprocal addressing even though their relationship is described to be very close. In *Dead House* the addressing between close friends seems to follow no generic rules but they are different in each case and the norms are different within each interlocutor couple.

In both novels there are several cases of negotiating the acceptable address form. Scarpetta's relationship with Chief Bray is hostile. Chief Bray violates the conventional address form TLN and addresses Scarpetta with a FN, to stress her status and disrespect. Marino negotiates the proper address form with detective Anderson and Chuck Ruffin. Anderson addresses Marino with LN but he utters his want to be addressed with a T. However, Marino later addresses Anderson with 'babe' who immediately shows her disapproval. Marino also offends Chuck Ruffin by addressing him with demeaning 'Chuckie-boy'. Ruffin claims a FN but still receives 'Chuckie-boy' from Marino. Chapman negotiates the proper address form with university professor Lavery. Chapman addresses him with TLN 'Mr Lavery'. However, Lavery claims the title 'Doctor', which Chapman refuses to use. Thus, the reasons for negotiating the address form is always the wish to receive a more respectful address form by the receiver. The reason to use an improper address form is to insult and to stress one's own superiority or power in the given situation.

There are also several cases of changing the address form. A police officer first addresses Scarpetta with 'doc' but when he wants to show his respect, he changes the address form into the more respectful and formal 'ma'am'. Scarpetta offends Chief Bray when she address her

with 'Deputy Chief' against the protocol. This is the only time Scarpetta violates the norms in the novel. A change also occurs when the relationship between Scarpetta and Agent Talley changes from official into intimate. The former TLN by Scarpetta changes into a reciprocal FN. There is also a change of address forms between Cooper and professor Shreve. When Shreve wants to calm Cooper down, he addresses her with a FN but when his intention is to threaten her, he uses the more distant TLN. The addressing between Foote and Cooper also changes. First they use a FN and TLN nonreciprocally but then, without any negotiation, Foote addresses Cooper with a FN. This is probably due to the situation: Foote wants to create a trusting and loyal relationship between the police and the university clerk and especially between Foote and Cooper who are constantly in touch and have to solve many contradictions between professors and the police. In court, the judge addresses Cooper with TLN when they are speaking officially. However, when they speak, still in court, off the record, he addresses Cooper with a familiar FN. There is also a change in address form with Frankel and Chapman. First, Frankel addresses Chapman with a FN but when he wants to claim respect and mark his higher status, he changes the address form into the formal T 'Detective'.

In both novels the reason for violating the norms of addressing is to show disrespect towards the interlocutor. When a switch from formal into informal it usually signals that the relationship between the interlocutors becomes closer. However, if the relationship is not friendly (Bray and Scarpetta), the usage of the FN signals subservience and disrespect towards the interlocutor. A switch from informal into formal can also mark respect or disrespect depending on the situation. However, it can also mark a change in the attitude: the previous friendly FN is switch into the formal and distant T or TLN to signal negative reaction. Negotiations occur when the other interlocutor claims a more respectful address form. However, changes in addressing occur also without negotiation.

6.5 Lea Wolf: Kalt ist der Schlaf

In Wolf's novel there are two main characters investigating the missing of a businessman in a small German town. The other investigator is called Julia Labouche, a newly hired police commander in the district and the other is her employee, detective Karl Ostermann. Compared to other two previous novels, in this one only Labouche addresses the suspects or interviewees. Karl Ostermann is almost always at the scene but does not address people. He only addresses Labouche and one police officer in the novel.

First Labouche addresses Ostermann with TLN and uses the formal pronoun "Sie". I will later use the form D/S, D for informal "du" and S for formal "Sie". I will not use the more common T/V in order to avoid mixing the T for 'title' and T for the address pronoun. Once she also uses only a LN with the S pronoun. Ostermann addresses his boss also with TLN. However, in the beginning he first uses a wrong name which is corrected by Labouche. Ostermann also uses the formal S pronoun. Later in the novel Labouche, however, proposes the familiar address form FN and the pronoun D. This is accepted by Ostermann. This is the only time switch of address forms from formal to informal occurs in this novel. The only time Ostermann addresses other than Labouche is in a pub when meeting a colleague. Ostermann uses a FN and receives no address form.

Labouche and Ostermann mainly work in the company where the missing person, Jens Engel, worked, "Global Diagnostics". Labouche addresses all the employees in the company with formal TLN and the S pronoun. She also receives TLN and S. Only once she is addressed with address form "junge Frau" (young woman). Two employees do not address Labouche with any noun but use only the polite pronoun S.

At work, in the police department, Labouche is mainly addressed with TLN and the S pronoun by her staff. Few times she is addressed with a TT (title+title) "Frau Hauptkomissarin" or

“Verehrte Frau Kollegin”. Only her boss, Kondrad Weimar, uses mainly the combination of the FN and the formal S pronoun. However, when he is upset he uses the formal address form TLN together with the S pronoun. Labouche addresses her colleagues and staff with formal TLN and the S pronoun and sometimes with T “Polizeimeister”.

Labouche has just moved to town and therefore has no close friends there. However, his father lives in the town and she is also visited by her close friend Rico Gabriel. Labouche addresses his father with kin title “Papa” and receives FN. Rico addresses Labouche with MN and receives FN + D pronoun. Labouche also visits Ostermann’s family once in the novel. She addresses Ostermann’s son with FN and receives TLN +S. She also speaks with Ostermann’s wife and addresses her with TLN+V and receives TLN +S.

Addressee	Ostermann	Kondrad Weimar	Adi Leonhardt	Heinz Ott
Addresses	TLN+S FN+D LN+S	TLN+S FN + S	epithet+TLN+S epithet+TT	T+S TLN+S
Receives	TLN+S FN+D	TT + S TLN+S FN+S	TLN+S	T+S TLN+S
Reciprocal/ Nonreciprocal	Reciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Reciprocal	Reciprocal

Adressee	Elvira Klein	Katja Sonn-berger	Heinrich Wellert	Herr Apitz
Addresses	- +S	TLN+S	TLN+S	- + S, Junge Frau
Receives	TLN+S	TLN+S	TLN+S	- +S
Reciprocal/ Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Reciprocal	Reciprocal	Reciprocal

Addressee	Father	Rico Gabriel	Oliver Ostermann	Mrs Ostermann
Addresses	FN+D	MN+D	TLN+S	TLN+S
Receives	Kin title+D	FN+D	FN+D	TLN+S
Reciprocal/ Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Reciprocal

In the beginning of the novel Labouche moves from Frankfurt to Philippsberg. She has got a new job as a police commander. In her first case she gets a partner to help her in the investigation, Karl Ostermann. Labouche does not like Ostermann very much. Actually, she finds him a typical police officer in a small town. Labouche also describes her partner having annoying habits:

“Ostermann kratzte sich am Ohr, eine für ihn typische Geste, die Julia schon jetzt nervte” (Wolf 2003, 50). (Ostermann scratched his ear, a typical gesture of his, which already annoyed Julia)

Labouche and Ostermann start addressing each other with TLN + S. Ostermann first uses a wrong name, Busch, instead of Labouche but he is immediately corrected by Labouche:

“Guten Morgen, Frau Busch.” ... “Labouche, Herr Ostermann. Der Name ist französischen Ursprungs...” (Wolf 2003, 43). (Good morning, Ms Busch... “Labouche, Mr Ostermann. The name has an French origin...)

As Tiittula (1993, 107-108) argued, forgetting the name of an interlocutor is considered impolite in German. Here, Labouche finds it necessary to immediately correct the speaker. At the end of the novel Labouche invites Ostermann to a pub for a pint. In the pub she proposes that they start using a FN + D instead of formal addressing:

“Prost, Karl. Ich schlage vor, wir duzen uns. Ist doch so üblich unter guten Kollegen und unter guten Partnern sowieso” (Wolf 2003, 259). (Cheers, Karl. I propose wir use “you” interchangeably. It is popular among good colleagues as well as among good partners).

Here, the situation is semi-formal as Besch denotes (1996, 14-16). Labouche, as Ostermann’s superior, is of higher status and offers the more informal addressing to Ostermann. He accepts the offer and they have a drink to celebrate the change. In this case the change of address form mainly denotes sympathy and to some degree change of Labouche’s attitude towards Ostermann as the relationship between the two has not lasted very long. Labouche also once addresses Ostermann with only a LN. According to Besch (1996, 130) this is considered impolite in German. However, the situation and context is friendly. Labouche visits Ostermann in his house

and they discuss the case. Ostermann realizes a very important detail, which helps them to advance in their investigation. Labouche reacts to this: “Ostermann, Sie sind ein Schatz!” (Wolf 2003, 200) (Ostermann, you are a treasure!) Thus, in this case, LN is a degree more informal than TLN but not as informal as a FN, which has not yet been negotiated as a reciprocal address form.

Kondrad Weimar is Labouche’s supervisor. Labouche addresses him with TLN+S throughout the novel. Once she uses TT+S (Mr Chief Commander) to show her reaction towards a commanding tone in her supervisor’s voice. Weimar, however, mainly address Labouche with address form Besch calls “Zwischenform” (Besch 1996, 130). This means addressing with a FN but using formal S pronoun: “Julia, kann ich Sie einen Moment sprechen?” (Wolf 2003,99). (Julia, can I talk to You for a moment?) Weimar uses the formal TLN+S only when he wants to mark his disagreement or negative attitude: “Frau Labouche!” Irritiert über die förmliche Anrede, drehte sie sich um. (Wolf 2003, 40.) (“Ms Labouche!” Annoyed by the formal addressing, she turned around). Usually this kind of a change in address forms occur interchangeably, functioning to mark change in attitude:

“Julia, kommen Sie bitte in mein Büro?” “Ich bin eigentlich schon auf dem Sprung, Herr Weimar” ... “Frau Labouche, dies ist keine Bitte.” ... “Sehr wohl, Herr Polizeidirektor...” (Wolf 2003, 134). (“Julia, could You come to my office, please.” “Actually, I was already on my way to go, Mr Weimar.” (Ms Labouche, I’m not asking” ... “Very well, Mr Chief Commander...”

Both interlocutors change from an unmarked addressing into a marked one to stress the change in their mood.

Adi Leonhardt is Labouche’s colleague. He has romantic feelings towards Labouche who does not know it. Probably these feelings are also one reason for unusual address forms which Leonhardt occasionally uses when addressing Labouche: “Guten Tag, meine liebe Frau Labouche!” (Wolf 2003, 277.) (Good day, my beloved Ms Labouche!) “Tja, verehrte Frau Kollegin” (Wolf 2003, 277). (Hmm, honoured Ms Colleague). However, this is not considered too intimate or rude by Labouche, probably because Leonhardt is generally held unconventional and the unusual addressing mainly characterizes his personality. Labouche always addresses Leonhardt with formal

TLN+V. This is also accepted by Leonhardt.

Heinz Ott is a police officer on duty. He is called by Labouche to pick her up and drive her to see one suspect. Labouche first addresses the officer with a T and the S pronoun. Later, when they drive to the scene, the officer introduces himself and they go to interview the suspect together. When they leave the scene, Labouche addresses Ott with TLN (Herr Ott). When the police officer is on duty, it seems to be acceptable to use only T when addressing. However, as soon as the name is known, TLN becomes the first choice for address form.

Klein, Sonnberger, Kolaski, Apitz and Wellert all work for Global Diagnostics. Klein and Sonnberger are both assistants, Apitz is a system administrator, Wellert works as a plant supervisor and Kolaski is one of the managers. Despite the differences in status, they are all addressed with TLN+S by Labouche. Apitz is the only one who receives no address form but only the S pronoun. Labouche also receives TLN+S from all the employees, except for Ms Klein and Apitz, who do not use any address form but only the polite pronoun S. Apitz mainly addresses Labouche with S pronoun but once also with 'junge Frau'. This unusual address form has also been explained in the novel: “„junge Frau“... schertzte er, obwohl er nur wenige Jahre älter als Julia sein konnte””(Wolf 2003, 303). (young woman...he said, although he could only be few years older than Julia). Addressing with “junge Frau” is commonly used only by older people to younger people. In this case, however, Labouche does not get offended or reacts in any way to the unconventional addressing. Later in the novel her feelings towards Apitz are explained in more detail when Labouche is asked if she has met anyone special in Philippsberg:

““Obwohl, ich hab da so einen Computerexperten kennen gelernt.” Sie kicherte... Tristan Apitz heißt er. Na ja, warten wir’s ab””(Wolf 2003, 315). (I met a computer expert there...She laughed... His name is Tristan Apitz. Well, we’ll see)

The address forms to the personnel do not change even if the situation or attitude among interlocutors is hostile or threatening.

Labouche addresses her father with a kin title + D pronoun and receives a FN + D.

She addresses her best friend Rico Gabriel with a FN + D but receives MN + D. This is sometimes slightly disapproved by Labouche:

“Hallo Jule”... “...Ich bin seit sieben im Dienst. Außerdem sollst du mich nicht Jule nennen” (Wolf 2003, 108). (“Hi Jule”... I have been working since seven o’clock. Anyway, you should not call me Jule”)

Labouche is only annoyed by the informal address form when she is on duty. At crime scenes she is usually the one in charge and informal addressing, even by her close friend, is not accepted when they are working. All other times she does not show any disapproval towards informal addressing.

Ostermann’s wife receives TLN + S from Labouche. Mrs Ostermann also addresses Labouche with reciprocal TLN + S. Ostermann’s teenage son Oliver, however, receives a FN + S from Labouche. Oliver addresses Labouche with nonreciprocal TLN + S.

6.6 Nicole Drawer: Allein mit deinem Mörder

The main characters in this novel are Johanna Jensen and Markus. Jensen is a psychologist who works at the police and Markus is her close friend and a police detective. There is a serial killer in Hamburg and Jensen is asked to help the police in profiling the killer. As Jensen is the narrative voice in the novel and she does most of the talking with other people, I present only the address forms she uses and receives.

Jensen is addressed with MN + T by her friends and relatives. She addresses them with only D pronoun, FN + D or Kin title. Jensen’s supervisor Diekmann addresses her with a T + S, a FN + D or a FN +D. Diekmann is addressed with TLN + S, a FN + D or an epithet. The secretary and a technician are addressed with a FN + S by Jensen. She receives a FN + S from her secretary and the polite S pronoun without any noun by the technician. The both doctors in the novel are addressed with TTLN (title+title+last name) or TT, both with the S pronoun. Jensen

receives TTLN/TLN/TT + S from Reuschel and only the S pronoun from Breutigam. Jensen addresses the victims' relatives both reciprocally with TLN + S. Susanne Gebauer addresses Jensen with familiar MN + D and receives only the polite S pronoun. Sylvia Marquardt receives TLN + S and a FN + S from Jensen and she addresses her with TLN + S and a FN + S.

Johanna Jensen:

Addressee	Markus	Stefan	Mutter	Flo
Addresses	MN+D	MN+D	MN+D	MN+D
Receives	- +D	- +D	Kin Title+D	FN+D
Reciprocal/ Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal	nonreciprocal

Addressee	Diekmann	Herr Henschke Frau Beckmann	Jutta	Reiner Hahn
Addresses	T + S FN+S FN+D	TLN+S	FN+S	- +S
Receives	Epithet+S TLN+S FN+D	TLN+S	FN+S	FN+S
Reciprocal/ Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal, Reciprocal	Reciprocal	Reciprocal	Nonreciprocal

Addressee	Dr Reuschel	Joachim Wille	Dr Breutigam
Addresses	TTLN+S TLN + S TT + S	FN+S FN+D	- +S
Receives	TTLN + S TT+S	FN+S FN+D	TTLN+S TT+S
Reciprocal/ Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal Reciprocal	Reciprocal	Nonreciprocal

Addressee	Susanne Gebauer	Sylvia Marquardt
Addresses	MN+D	- +S FN+S
Receives	- +S	TLN+S FN+S
Reciprocal/Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal	Nonreciprocal, reciprocal

Jensen addresses Markus with no address form + D and Markus addresses Jensen with MN + D. Their relationship started many years ago when Markus needed Jensen's professional help. They also meet outside work. The nonreciprocal addressing merely expresses the differences in characters than any difference in power or status differences.

Jensen addresses Markus' boyfriend Florian with a FN+D and receives MN+D. They are also close friends: "Flo war sogar etwas wie Jensens 'beste Freundin' geworden" (Drawer 2003, 59) (Flo had become something like Jensen's best girlfriend) The difference in address forms is also due to differences in characters since Jensen and Flo are constantly described as very close in the novel.

Stefan is Jensen's boyfriend. They have a difficult relationship and Jensen is already in the beginning of the novel thinking of ending it. Stefan addresses Jensen with MN+D and receives no address form +D.

Jensen has also a very difficult relationship with her mother. She addresses her with a kin title +D and receives MN+D (FN, mein Kind). The address forms stay the same even if the moods of the interlocutors change from friendly into angry.

Diekmann is Jensen's superior. They meet for the first time at the beginning of the novel. Diekmann does not like psychologists and treats Jensen sometimes arrogantly. The unmarked address form from Diekmann to Jensen is a FN+S: "Erzählen Sie von dieser Frau, Jensen" (Drawer 2003, 337). (Tell me about this woman, Jensen). When he stresses his bad mood or anger with Jensen, he changes into a more polite address form: "Sie sind ein Versager, Doktor" (Drawer 2003,

288) (You let us down, Doctor). Sometimes, when Jensen and Diekmann have an argument, they even use epithets such as Idiot and Schwein (pig) but always with polite pronoun S: “Wissen Sie, was Sie sind? Sie sind ein Schwein!” (Drawer 2003, 54) (Do You know what you are? You are a pig!) All in all the relationship between these two characters is very complicated. On the other hand they dislike each other but on the other hand they find each other very attractive. Only on the last page of the novel they become closer each other:

““ Ich weiß, wir hatten keinen guten Start. Lassen Sie uns noch einmal von vorne beginnen... Mein Name ist Sven”. “Jensen sah ihn an und ergriff seine Hand. “Ich bin Johanna””. (Drawer 2003, 382) (I know, we didn't have a very good start. Let us begin all over again... My name is Sven. Jensen looked at him and took his hand. I'm Johanna.)

Again, the switch from the more polite and formal address form into the more informal one happens through a formal gesture (shaking of hands).

Jutta is Jensen's secretary. They address each other reciprocally with a FN+S. Rainer Hahn is a technician who comes to Jensen's home to follow her incoming phone calls. Jensen addresses Hahn with a FN+S and receives no address form +S. They have not met before and Hahn prefers being on his own rather than talking to others in the house. Using a FN instead of the more polite and formal TLN shows solidarity and sympathy between the interlocutors. The whole situation is very stressful and they are all working together to find the killer.

Mr Henschke and Ms Beckmann are two of the victims' relatives who Jensen interviews during the investigation. Both receive the polite and formal TLN+S and they also address Jensen with TLN+S. They meet only twice in the novel and the address forms do not change.

Dr Reuschel is a pathologist in Hamburg and he helps the police to find out what kind of gift the killer is using. Jensen talks to him a few times in the novel. Jensen addresses him mainly with TTLN+S (Herr Doktor Reuschel) and once with TT (Herr Professor). Dr Reuschel addresses Jensen with TTLN+S (Frau Dr Jensen), TLN (Frau Jensen) and TT (Frau Kollegin). When they first meet they both use TTLN+S: ““Frau Doktor Jensen?” “Herr Professor Reuschel. Nett, das Sie Zeit

für mich haben.”” (Drawer 2003, 143) (Ms Dr Jensen? Mr Professor Reuschel. How nice that you had time for me.) But when they meet for the second time Dr Reuschel’s address forms vary: “Frau Kollegin” (Drawer 2003, 188). (Ms Colleague) and “Ich werde sofort eine entsprechende Untersuchung veranlassen, Frau Jensen. Wo kann ich Sie erreichen?” (Drawer 2003, 189) (I will run a test immediately, Ms Jensen. Where can I find You?) However, the topics of the conversation, situation or attitude do not change. Both Jensen and Dr Reuschel have a doctor title. However, they could have seen each other as equal and belonging to the same ingroup and use a more informal addressing. As they meet for the first time and there is a high status of the title Dr in Germany, they use TTLN when they meet for the very first time. They use the polite forms every time they speak. Jensen does not show any negative or positive reaction towards the address form TLN without the Dr title. This could be because of their age difference (Reuschel is told to be in his 60’s), Jensen’s personality or the situation. TLN occurs only at the end of a long discussion when they have discovered something significant together and thus, become closer.

Jensen also talks to another doctor in the novel, Dr Breutigam. He is a psychologist and does not use any address form but only the polite pronoun V when addressing Jensen. His addressing does not change even when he is very upset: “Das wird Konsequenzen haben, das verspreche ich Ihnen” (Drawer 2003, 225) (You have not heard the last of me, I promise you). Jensen uses the polite TT (Herr Doktor)+S and TTLN (Herr Dr Breutigam)+S every time she talks to Dr Breutigam. They are both psychologists and definitely belong to the same ingroup in that case. However, Jensen also belongs to the police who forces Dr Breutigam to break the confidentiality between him and his former patient. Also, the title Dr is considered as a part of a person’s name in Germany and Jensen and Dr Breutigam only meet when on duty. However, Jensen does not receive Dr title. I would argue the reason for this is that she is considered as one of the police officers because she works for the police. It can also be author’s choice to bring out Jensen’s character as a little naïve, unconfident and weak woman.

Joachim Wille is a friend of Markus' and Florian's. Jensen meets him when she is having dinner at Markus' and Florian's. They first address each other with FN+S. They do not know each other but the situation is informal and they both know Markus and Florian. Joachim is the first who starts using FN+D and again, this does not happen without an explanation in the novel:

“Man war im Laufe des Abends zum 'du' übergegangen, und Jensen, die in solchen Angelegenheiten eher zurückhaltend war, hatte nichts dagegen einzuwenden gehabt.” (Drawer 2003, 159) (The man had changed into the informal 'you' during the evening. Jensen was usually a conservative in such situations but this time she had nothing against that.)

This time the switch from a more formal address form into more informal happens without any formal gesture such as shaking hands or celebrating the new address form in some other way. The situation is informal from the beginning and they meet at a friends' house. They also have very positive feelings towards each other and later in the novel they become very close. The informal situation leads into a semi-informal addressing in the beginning and later, when the characters want to express their mutual attraction, they move into informal addressing without any negotiation. This is the only time a switch into an informal addressing occurs without negotiation in the German novels.

Sylvia Marquardt is Jensen's patient. Sylvia has murdered two men and must see a psychologist before getting sentenced. Jensen addresses her first with TLN+S and Sylvia addresses Jensen without any noun, just the pronoun V. Soon Sylvia asks Jensen to address her with FN+S. Later, she also asks if she could address Jensen reciprocally with FN+S. Jensen agrees. These characters do not feel any sympathy towards each other. The only reason they are talking to each other is that they are forced by the law. This change in addressing happens because they have to establish a situation where they can trust each other and talk about very personal topics.

Susanne Gebauer is the killer. She calls Jensen several times and at the end of the novel they also meet each other. Jensen addresses Gebauer with the polite pronoun V. She cannot use any title or name as she does not know them. Gebauer addresses Jensen with MN+D (FN, mein Kind, meine Liebe). She uses the informal T pronoun to stress her power and superiority in the

situation. She holds Markus as a captive and threatens to kill him if Jensen does not come and meet her. The address forms do not change even when they finally confront each other and Jensen recognizes Gebauer.

6.7 On the German novels

The most common address form in both German novels is TLN+S or TTLN+S. When Julia Labouche or Johanna Jensen talk to people they have not met before or have just met they both use (T)TLN+S. Labouche meets with more people outside office which causes a slightly different tables.

Both characters also address their relatives with a kin title+D and receive a FN+D or MN +D. Labouche and Jensen also address their close friends with a FN+D and receive MN+D. This is considered nonreciprocal addressing on the tables as MN is more informal than FN. I would argue, however, that in German the choice between D/S pronouns shows more about the nature of the relationship than the actual address form. If the D pronoun is used it either shows a close friendship or superiority and even disregard. This was also argued by Tiittula (1993, 104). It could also be argued that the use of MN is more common among men than women but this would need another research focusing on differences between sexes in addressing. Labouche is also very strict how her close friends address her when she is on duty: she demands a polite and formal TLN instead of MN. However, this is not the case with Jensen. Her friends use the same MN whether on duty or not. Thus, situation defines which address form should be used. This could also be explained by status. Jensen is not a supervisor but Labouche is and when on duty she considers the social distance and respect to be the defining factors that define the addressing, even within close friends.

Labouche and Jensen address their superiors at work most of the time with TLN+S. However, they both receive mostly a FN+S. This can only result from status differences. Even though Jensen is a doctor, she still receives only a FN+S from her superior at the police station. Jensen also starts addressing Joachim Wille with a FN+S and uses this address form also with her secretary and the police technician Reiner Hahn. I would say that a FN+S is becoming more common in German among people who consider themselves belonging to the same ingroup, who share common wants and want to show personal sympathy. Besch referred (1996, 130) only to universities when discussing this form of address. However, in both German novels this form is used in relationships between an employer and employee. Compared to the more informal FN+D, S pronoun signals that the relationship is not intimate or personal. It also signals politeness and respect towards the interlocutor but still, it is a degree more informal than TLN+S.

There are not so many switches of address forms, especially from formal to informal, in the German novels. Labouche offers a FN+D to the police detective who works for her and they celebrate this change with a drink. Jensen is offered a FN+D by her superior, Diekmann. They shake hands to mark this new addressing. In German novels the switch from formal into informal happens only once without negotiation or any formal gesture. This is done by Joachim Wille who this way signals Jensen his attraction and want to come closer. By accepting this new address form and changing her own addressing reciprocal, Jensen signals her mutual attraction.

When there are switches from more informal to more formal, it always signals anger or fear. Jensen argues with her superior several times in the novel and shows this mainly by switching the address form into very formal and polite or even into an epithet. This is reciprocal so that also Diekmann shows his anger mainly by using TTLN+S. These switches can be analysed according to convention B by Zimmer (1986, 55-59).

The addressing in German novels is quite consistent and every time a switch occurs it signals a significant change in the status, situation or attitude between the interlocutors. The polite

pronoun S is more common than D which is used only among close friends or to show disregard towards the addressee. Only once D is used without these signals, to address a child. Epithets are also rarely used. Twice, when Jensen is very frustrated and furious with her superior, she uses epithets. Otherwise they are not used at all. Titles are commonly used, especially if a person is a doctor. If a S pronoun is chosen, title is almost always used.

7 Comparing addressing in English and in German novels

The use of MN and a FN differ greatly between English and German. In German it is possible to use MN or a FN only when the interlocutor is an intimate or very close friend or a relative. However, it is also possible to use a FN together with the polite pronoun S when addressing a colleague or a person in an informal situation. In this case a FN+S is a degree more formal than a FN+D and signals solidarity and belonging to the same ingroup. In other cases the use of MN/FN is considered as a sign of disregard towards the addressee. In English a FN is the first choice among work colleagues in non-academic surroundings and even with people who have not known each other very long.

In English novels there is no use of double titles (TTLN) but in German novels there are several cases where this form is used. In English, T is mainly used when talking to professors and the interlocutors are not close friends or colleagues. However, between police officers a T is also a possible address form between close friends. In German, T alone is not commonly used. Once it is used when the name of a police officer is not known and once the title “doctor” is used without a name to stress a mood in the situation. TLN is common both in English and in German. However, the situations differ. Whereas in German TLN is the dominant address form between adults who are not relatives or very close friends, in English TLN is mainly used among well educated people in formal or semi-formal situations. In the English novels, the choice between

MN/FN and TLN depends on education. The more educated the interlocutors are, the more TLN is used and the less educated the interlocutors are, the more MN/FN is used. However, between police officers, TLN is also possible between close friends.

Epithets are more often used in the English than in the German novels. In the German novels there are only two cases where epithets are used. These both cases are in situations where the interlocutor using an epithet is very frustrated and angry with the addressee. In the English novels epithets are more commonly used to express evaluation and attitude and the use of epithets is more consistent and continuing. Further, the use of epithets seems to be typical of certain characters and mark their speech in situations where negative attitudes and moods are present.

Switches of address forms occur in both English and German novels. However, a switch from formal to informal addressing in German is not common and usually happens only together with some ritual, such as drink or hand shaking. In English the rules are not so strict and it is possible to switch from TLN into FN even between almost strangers, without any rituals or negotiations. In both English and German switches from more informal into more formal occur. The reason for this kind of switch is most commonly to signal social distance and superiority and change in the mood in the given situation. In some cases it also signals respect towards the interlocutor.

Negotiations of proper address forms occur more often in the English novels than in the German ones. As the choice of the proper address form is not as clear in English as it is in German, negotiations occur more frequently in English. In all cases where negotiations occur, the addressee claims a more respectful address form from the interlocutor i.e. a TLN instead of the FN or a “doctor” instead of “Mr”. In the German novels negotiations over address forms are mostly formal. The higher ranked interlocutor, normally the supervisor, offers a more informal address form to her employee. The acceptance is celebrated with a handshake or drink. Once a patient offers FN+S instead of TLN+S which is accepted by the doctor. Only once the address form is changed

into more informal without any negotiations or an offer by the interlocutor. The situation is informal and the change of an address form signals personal sympathy and attraction towards the addressee.

Nonreciprocal addressing occur in both languages. In the English novels nonreciprocal addressing is common in academic surroundings between interlocutors of unequal status, i.e. employer and employee. When the interlocutor is less educated, the address forms tend to be nonreciprocal and more inconsistent. In many cases men use MN whereas women use a FN more in addressing close friends. In the German novels addressing is more reciprocal. Nonreciprocal addressing occurs between employer and employee. In other cases friends use MN and a FN nonreciprocally or in some cases the other interlocutor does not use any proper address form, only the pronoun S. Once a FN+ D is used nonreciprocally with S to signal subservience and superiority. Normally, when nonreciprocal addressing in the German novels occur, it is immediately negotiated into reciprocal.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

- Cornwell, P. (1999) *Black Notice*. Little, Brown and Company. London
- Drawer, N. (2003) *Allein mit deinem Mörder*. Droemersch Verlagsgesellschaft Th. Kanur Nachf. München.
- Fairstein, L. (2001) *The Dead House*. Scribner. New York.
- Wolf, L (2003) *Kalt ist der Schlaf*. Ullstein Heyne List GmbH&Co. München.

Secondary Literature

- Bell, R. T. (1976) *Sociolinguistics; Goals, Approaches and Problems*. B.T. Batsford Ltd. London.
- Besch, W (1996). *Duzen, Siezen, Titulieren. Zur Anrede im Deutschen heute und gestern*. Hubert&Co., Göttingen.
- Brown, P.&Ford, M. (1961) *Address in American English*. In: (ed.) Hymes, D. (1964) *Language in Culture and Society; A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. Harper&Row Publishers. New York, Evanston, London.
- Brown, P.&Fraser, C. (1979) *Speech as a Marker of Situation* In: (eds.) Scherer, K.R.&Giles, H. (1979) *Social Markers in Speech*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Brown, P.&Gilman, A (1960) *The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity* In Giglioli, P.P. (ed.) (1972, reprinted 1976), *Language and Social Context*. Penguin. Harmondsworth.
- Brown, P.&Levinson, S.C. (1979) *Social structure, groups and interaction*. In: Scherer, K.R.& Giles, H. (eds.) (1979) *Social Markers in Speech*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Brown, P.&Levinson, S.C. (1987) *Politeness; Some Universals in Language Usage. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Cameron, D. (1997) *Are you being served?* Critical Quarterly, vol.39, issue 2. p.97-100.
- Chalker, S.&Weiner, E. (1994) (eds.) *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*. BCA.London
- Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. M.I.T. Press. Cambridge Mass.
- Cooper, C. (2000) *What do you call yours?* Lancet. 04/29/2000. Vol. 355. Issue 9214.
- Deutsch, M. (1968) *Group behaviour*. In: Sills, D. (ed.) *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. VI. New York.

- Ervin-Tripp, S.M. (1969) *Sociolinguistic Rules of Address*. In: *Sociolinguistics*. Penguin Books Inc., Baltimore.
- Ervin-Tripp, S.M (1973) *Language Acquisition and Communicative Choice*. Stanford U.P. In: Bell (1976) *Sociolinguistics; Goals, Approaches and Problems*. B.T. Batsford Ltd. London
- Faerch, C.&Kasper, G. (1989). *Internal and External Modification in Interlanguage Request Realization*. In: (Eds.) Blum-Kulka, S.&House, J.&Kasper, G. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Request and Apologies*. Ablex Publishing Corporation. Norwood. New Jersey
- Gardner, R.C.&MacIntyre, P.D.&Lalonde, R.N. (1995) *The Effects of Multiple Social Categories on Stereotyping*. In: *Journal of the Canadian Psychological Association*. October 1995, vol.27.
- Geertz, C. (1960) *The Religion of Java*. Glencoe, Ill.
- Giles, H.&Scherer, K.R.&Taylor, D.M. (1979) *Speech markers in social interaction* In: Scherer, K.R.&Giles, H. (eds.) (1979) *Social Markers in Speech*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1966) *On the Ethnology of Linguistic Change* In: Bright, W., (ed.) (1966)
- Gumperz, J.J.&Hymes, D. (1972) (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. New York.
- Hymes, D. (1974) *Foundations in Sociolinguistics; An Ethnographic Approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press. Philadelphia.
- Krech, D. et al. (1962) *Individual in Society: a textbook of social psychology*. McGraw-Hill. New York.
- Kohz, A. (1984) (ed) Winter, W. (1984) *Anredeverhalten*. Gunter Narr Verlag. Tübingen.
- Laver, J. (1981) *Linguistic Routines and Politeness in Greeting and Parting*. In: Coulmas, F. (ed.) (1981), *Conversational Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech*. Mouton Publishers. The Hague.
- Lenk, H.E.H. (1995). *Deutsche Gesprächskultur*. Yliopistopaino. Helsinki
- Lewis, R.D (1996). *When Cultures Collide; Managing Successfully across cultures*. Nicholas Brealey Publishing Limited. London
- Luoto, R. (1993). *Kansainvälinen Etikettikirja*. IS-Yhtymä Oy. Iisalmi
- Petzold, J. (1995). *Töihin Saksaan*. BrunoLange Oy. Helsinki
- Pieper, U. (1984) (ed.) Winter, W. (1984) *Anredeverhalten*. Gunter Narr Verlag. Tübingen.

- Scollon, R.&Scollon, W. (1995) *Intercultural Communication*. Blackwell Publishers Inc. Oxford.
- Smith, P.M. (1985) *Language, the sexes and society*. Basil Blackwell. Oxford.
- Spence, D. (2002) *Drop the 'Dear Doctor' here*. British Medical Journal. 8/10/2002. Vol. 325. Issue 7359.
- Tiittula, L. (1993). *Kulttuurit kohtaavat: suomalais-saksalaiset kulttuurierot talouselämän näkökulmasta*. Helsingin kauppakorkeakoulun julkaisuja D-190. Helsinki.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G, Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman. New York.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1981) *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse*. Mouton Publishers. The Hague.
- Wolfson, N.&Manes, J. (1979). 'Don't dear me!'. Reprinted in McConnell-Ginet, S. et al. (eds.) (1980). *Women and Language in Literature and Society*. Praeger Publishers. New York.
- Zimmer, D.E (1986) *Redens Arten; über Trends und Tollheiten im Neudeutschen Sprachgebrauch*. Haffmans Verlag. Zürich.