



VYTAUTO DIDŽIOJO UNIVERSITETAS
HUMANITARINIŲ MOKSLŲ FAKULTETAS
UŽSIENIO KALBŲ, LITERATŪROS IR VERTIMO STUDIJŲ KATEDRA

Gintarė Pavilavičiūtė

**KREIPINIAI IR ĮVARDIJIMAI KAIP VISUOMENINĖS PADĖTIES
RODIKLIAI AGATOS KRISTI IR DŽONO GRIŠEMO ROMANUOSE
„PERSKILĖS VEIDRODIS“ BEI „PELIKANO DOSJE“ BEI JŲ
LIETUVIŠKUOSE VERTIMUOSE**

Magistro baigiamasis darbas

Taikomosios anglų kalbotyros studijų programa, valstybinis kodas 621Q30002
Filologijos studijų kryptis

Vadovas (-ė): Prof. Habil. Dr. Milda Danytė _____
(parašas) (data)

Apginta doc. dr. Rūta Eidukevičienė _____
(parašas) (data)

Kaunas, 2018

**FORMS OF ADDRESS AND TERMS OF REFERENCE AS
MARKERS OF CLASS AND SOCIAL STATUS IN *THE MIRROR
CRACK'D FROM SIDE TO SIDE* (1962) BY AGATHA CHRISTIE,
THE PELICAN BRIEF (1992) BY JOHN GRISHAM, AND THEIR
TRANSLATIONS INTO LITHUANIAN**

by Gintarė Pavilavičiūtė

Department of Foreign Language, Literature and Translation Studies
Vytautas Magnus University
Master thesis
Supervisor: Prof. Habil. Dr. Milda Danytė
11 May 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SANTRAUKA

SUMMARY

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Aim and objectives of the paper.....	1
1.2 Data and method.....	2
1.3 Organisation of the paper	4
2 THEORETICAL CONCEPTS OF SOCIAL CLASS AND STATUS.....	5
3 THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO FORMS OF ADDRESS: POWER, SOLIDARITY, DISTANCE, AND POLITENESS.....	11
4 CONSIDERATIONS OF THE GOLDEN AGE CRIME FICTION AND THE THRILLER GENRES IN AGATHA CHRISTIE'S <i>THE MIRROR CRACK'D FROM SIDE TO SIDE</i> (1962) AND JOHN GRISHAM'S <i>THE PELICAN BRIEF</i> (1992).....	19
4.1 The major characteristics of Golden Age crime fiction in <i>The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side</i> (1962).....	19
4.2 The major genre characteristics of the thriller in <i>The Pelican Brief</i> (1992).....	21
5 THE SOCIAL WORLDS OF AGATHA CHRISTIE AND JOHN GRISHAM AND THEIR NOVELS <i>THE MIRROR CRACK'D FROM SIDE TO SIDE</i> (1962) AND <i>THE PELICAN BRIEF</i> (1992).....	24
5.1 The social world of Agatha Christie.....	24
5.2 The social world of Christie's <i>The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side</i> (1962).....	26
5.3 The social and legal world of John Grisham.....	33
5.4 The social world of Grisham's <i>The Pelican Brief</i> (1992).....	35
6 ANALYSIS OF FORMS OF ADDRESS AND TERMS OF REFERENCE IN AGATHA CHRISTIE'S <i>THE MIRROR CRACK'D FROM SIDE TO SIDE</i> (1962) AND ITS TRANSLATION <i>PERSKILĖS VEIDRODIS</i> (2000) BY RASA KIRVAITYTĖ	40
6.1 General tendencies in translating forms of address and terms of reference in Kirvaitytė's <i>Perskilės Veidrodis</i> (2000).....	41
6.2 Forms of address and terms of reference as markers of social status in relation to the T/V distinction in Kirvaitytė's <i>Perskilės Veidrodis</i> (2000).....	45
7 ANALYSIS OF FORMS OF ADDRESS AND TERMS OF REFERENCE IN JOHN GRISHAM'S <i>THE PELICAN BRIEF</i> (1992) AND ITS TRANSLATION <i>PELIKANO DOSJĖ</i>	

(2004) BY JONAS ČEPOŃIS.....	55
7. 1 General tendencies in translating forms of address and terms of reference in Čeponis's <i>Pelikano Dosjė</i> (2004).....	55
7.2 Forms of address and terms of reference as markers of social status in relation to the T/V distinction in Čeponis's <i>Pelikano Dosjė</i> (2004).....	58
8 CONCLUSIONS.....	68
REFERENCES.....	73
APPENDIX 1: Plot summary of Agatha Christie's <i>The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side</i> (1962).....	79
APPENDIX 2: Plot summary of John Grisham's <i>The Pelican Brief</i> (1992).....	80
APPENDIX 3: Xiaomei Yang's (2010) summary of classification of forms of address.....	81
APPENDIX 4: Forms of address in Agatha Christie (1962) and Rasa Kirvaitytė (2000).....	81
APPENDIX 5: Terms of reference in Agatha Christie (1962) and Rasa Kirvaitytė (2000).....	86
APPENDIX 6: Forms of address in John Grisham (1992) and Jonas Čeponis (2004).....	93
APPENDIX 7: Terms of reference in John Grisham (1992) and Jonas Čeponis (2004).....	98

SANTRAUKA

Baigiamojo magistro darbo tikslas – pateikti socialinių ir sociolingvistinių teorijų apie visuomenės sluoksnį ir visuomeninę padėtį bei kreipinių kaip jų rodiklių pritaikymo vertime pavyzdį per Agatos Kristi (1890-1976) Auksinio detektyvų amžiaus romano „The mirror crack’d from side to side“ (1962) („Perskilęs veidrodis“ (2000); vertė Rasa Kirvaitytė) ir Džono Grišemo (gimė 1955) trilerio „The pelican brief“ (1992) („Pelikano dosjė“ (2004); vertė Jonas Čeponis) bei jų lietuviškų vertimų analizę. Analizėje taip pat atsižvelgiama į titulus, vardus ar kitus žodžius, naudojamus veikėjams įvardinti bei jų visuomeninei padėčiai nurodyti. Kaip Auksinio detektyvų amžiaus ir trilerio pavyzdžiuose, analizuojamuose romanuose gausu realistiškų dvidešimto amžiaus vidurio Didžiojai Britanijai ir dvidešimto amžiaus pabaigos Jungtinėms Amerikos Valstijoms būdingų bendravimo normų aprašymų. Lingvistinės analizės pagrindas – šių romanų vertimai į lietuvių kalbą bei jų rašytojų sukurto įspūdžio perteikimas į šią kalbą.

Šiame darbe pristatomos pagrindinės visuomenės sluoksnio, visuomeninės padėties, kreipinių, antrojo asmens įvardžių *tu/jūs* diferenciacijos, mandagumo ir įvaizdžio sąvokos. Dėl savo svarbos analizei, taip pat pristatomi ir pagrindiniai Auksinio detektyvų amžiaus ir trilerio bruožai, pavyzdžiai iš asmeninių Kristi patirčių ir pastebėjimų apie vidurinio ir aukštesniojo visuomenės sluoksnio gyvenimo būdą bei dažnai įvairiuose interviu Grišemo akcentuojamos amerikietiškos vertybės. Skyriuje, skirtame visuomenės sluoksniui ir visuomeninei padėčiai pristatyti, remiamasi tokiais sociologais kaip Maksas Vėberis (1864-1920) ir Pierre’as Bourdieu (1930-2002) bei kitais šiuolaikiniais sociologais. Čia paaiškinamas skirtumas tarp sluoksnio bei padėties ir aptariamos tokios sąvokos kaip profesija, gyvenimo būdas bei kultūros vartojimas. Skyriuje, skirtame kreipinių teorijai pristatyti, remiamasi tokiais specialistais kaip Erving’as Goffman’as, Penelopė Brown ir Stephen’as C. Levinson’as bei kitais labiau šiuolaikiniais specialistais.

Darbo analitinė dalis pradedama romanuose aprašytos visuomenės bei veikėjų padėties nagrinėjimu, kur didelis dėmesys skiriamas visuomeniniams pokyčiams, vykstantiems Kristi romane, bei Grišemo romane aprašytam moraliniam nuosmukiui valstybinėse institucijose. Lingvistinė kreipinių ir įvardijimų analizė pradedama vertėjų pasirinkimų apžvalga ir tokių probleminių atvejų kaip praleidimas ir klaidingas vertimas nagrinėjimu. Toliau naudojamas kokybinės analizės metodas ir analizuojama kaip lietuvių kalboje kreipiniai yra derinami su antrojo asmens įvardžiais *tu/jūs* visuomeninei padėčiai nurodyti. Reikia paminėti, kad vertėjams svarbu išnagrinėti kontekstą, kuriame vyksta veikėjų pokalbis, kad kreipiniai ir įvardijimai išlaikytų originalo reikšmę ir lietuviškame vertime. Tyrimo rezultatai rodo, kad vertėjai, naudodami skirtingas vertimo strategijas, ne visada perteikia reikšmę teisingai, nes dažnai veikėjų pokalbiai lietuviškame vertime dėl pasirinktų įvardžių skamba mandagiau nei šiuose romanuose anglų kalba.

SUMMARY

With a focus on forms of address and social status, the aim of this thesis is to exemplify the application of social and sociolinguistic theories in analysing and translating interactions among characters in both the English source texts and the Lithuanian target texts of two novels. The texts under consideration are Agatha Christie's (1890-1976) Golden Age crime fiction novel *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962) and its translation by Rasa Kirvaitytė, *Perskilęs Veidrodis* (2000), and John Grisham's (b. 1955) legal thriller *The Pelican Brief* (1992) and its translation by Jonas Čeponis, *Pelikano Dosjė* (2004). This analysis takes into account not only forms of address but also terms of reference, or titles, names, and other words that are used to refer to characters, as markers of social status. As examples of Golden Age crime fiction and legal thrillers, *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* and *The Pelican Brief*, offer realistic depictions of social relations and interactions typical in middle and upper-class British society in the mid-twentieth century and American society in the late twentieth century. The focus of the linguistic analysis is on the translations of these novels into Lithuanian, examining how the effects created by the English-language writers are transferred in the target texts.

This paper presents major concepts regarding social class and status, forms of address, the distinction between the familiar (T) and polite (V) second-person pronoun, and politeness and face. Since the genres of the literary texts examined are significant for the attention they give to social realities, the major characteristics of Golden Age crime fiction and the thriller, along with examples of Christie's observations of the lifestyle of the upper-middle class, and those values that Grisham emphasises in interviews within the context of American society are discussed. The second chapter, dedicated to social class and status, draws on major sociologists in the field such as Max Weber (1864-1920) and Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002), along with contemporary ones like Tom Nesbit, Tak Wing Chan and John H. Goldthorpe, Donald J. Treiman, and Murray Millner Jr. This chapter explains the distinction between class and status and presents their major markers: occupation, lifestyle, and cultural consumption. The subsequent chapter, given to the discussion of theoretical concepts of forms of address, draws on specialists such as Roger Brown and Albert Gilman, Erving Goffman, and Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, as well as more recent ones like Keith Allan and Kate Burridge and Ronald Wardhaugh.

The analytical part begins with the examination of the social worlds of the two novels and the status of characters, keeping in mind the social changes that are depicted as taking place in Christie's novel and the moral decay of governmental institutions presented in Grisham's. The linguistic analysis begins with an overview of the tendencies shown by the two translators in rendering forms of address and terms of reference and looking at more problematic cases involving

omissions and changes. Then qualitative analysis is carried out, focusing on forms of address and their combination with the T/V pronouns in Lithuanian, and terms of reference as markers of social status. It is kept in mind that translators are required to take into account the context in which characters speak in order to render forms of address and terms of reference suitably into the target language. The results reveal that, although the Lithuanian translators use different translation strategies, the meaning of forms of address is lost in some instances where these are made more polite in the target text due to the choice of unsuitable second-person pronouns.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Mistranslations of forms of address and terms of reference in Kirvaitytė's <i>Perskilęs Veidrodis</i>	43
Table 2. Changes and additions to forms of address and terms of reference in Kirvaitytė's <i>Perskilęs Veidrodis</i>	44
Table 3. Other words used as forms of address in Grisham's <i>The Pelican Brief</i> and the Lithuanian translation.....	56
Table 4. Terms of reference and pronouns in Grisham's <i>The Pelican Brief</i> and the Lithuanian translation.....	57

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ST – source text

TT – target text

1 INTRODUCTION

Crime fiction provides a rich and often realistic depiction of specific societies, with their class structures and social relations; these narratives focus on the investigation of a crime which requires interviewing and questioning many people of different status to discover the murderer. Although thrillers, even more so than crime fiction in general, depend on the frequent use of rapid action and suspense, they are also rich in the depiction of specific societies with their norms of social relations. Legal thrillers attempt to provide a realistic representation of processes and crimes connected with the law, as well as the powerful representatives of the highest ranks of society, while Golden Age crime fiction is concerned with the representation of the upper-middle class. For this reason crime novels and thrillers offer a number of interesting examples of forms of address among their characters; they also depict the polite or rude behaviour that follows or breaks the norms of a specific society. When dealing with such texts, translators face cultural differences between the source and target cultures; they have to choose strategies that make their texts sound natural to the target readers but also produce the effects achieved by the writers of the originals.

1.1 Aim and objectives of the paper

This MA thesis analyses two crime novels by major writers, Agatha Christie (1890-1976) and John Grisham (b. 1955), and their translations into Lithuanian to examine how they represent social interaction in two particular societies, one British and the other American, at different periods of the second half of the twentieth century. Focusing on forms of address and social status, the aim of this paper is to exemplify the application of social and sociolinguistic theories in analysing and translating linguistic interactions among characters both in the source English texts and their Lithuanian translations.

The analysis of forms of address and politeness is chosen as a study field because although there is a great deal of research carried out on power relations in conversation by English specialists (Anderman 1993; Nevala 2004; Ermida 2006), there is not so much by Lithuanian ones. This is especially pertinent considering the number of English literary texts that are being translated into Lithuanian. There is some Lithuanian research in the field of translation of forms of address, politeness, and the polite and familiar second-person pronoun distinction. For example, Jurgita Vaičenonienė (2006) focuses on pronouns, especially polite and familiar second-person ones, in her study of original English advertisements and their Lithuanian translations. Neringa Dziedravičiūtė (2009) studies the translation into Lithuanian of dysphemistic forms of address and swearing in J. D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951), as well as considering some instances of the use of

second-person pronouns. In their study of parallel texts, in this case Lithuanian and English public signs, as culture-embedded units of thought, Ligija Kaminskienė and Dalia Mankauskienė (2013) also discuss politeness and second-person pronouns in address forms. Except for Dziedravičiūtė's (2009), these studies do not focus on literary translation; Dziedravičiūtė's study, like the others mentioned, does not analyse social status.

Social relations indicated by forms of address as markers of status are analysed to some extent by Milda Danytė (2016) in a study on the translation of foreignisms in multilingual crime fiction in Lithuanian. Due to the lack of research on forms of address as markers of social status in combination with second-person pronouns in Lithuanian translations, it is interesting to investigate the translation strategies chosen by Lithuanian translators and their outcomes in the target texts. Still, probably in part because of a lack of attention to power relations in social interactions in Lithuanian research, translators sometimes misinterpret social interactions, as shown in the present analysis. For this reason, this paper also aims to specify the importance of analysing the social relations in the source text in order to convey a similar meaning in the target text.

The objectives of this paper are as follows:

- 1) To present information on the theoretical concepts of class and status, forms of address, the T/V distinction, and politeness, as well as features of Golden Age crime fiction and thrillers, along with pertinent observations made by Christie and Grisham;
- 2) To indicate the status markers which Christie and Grisham emphasise in the social worlds they construct in *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962) and *The Pelican Brief* (1992) through analysis based on application of the social theories presented earlier;
- 3) To discuss the general tendencies in translating forms of address made by Rasa Kirvaitytė in her translation of Christie's crime fiction novel *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* and by Jonas Čeponis in his translation of Grisham's *The Pelican Brief*;
- 4) To analyse forms of address used in combination with T/V pronouns, as well as terms of reference, as markers of social status in Christie's *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* and Grisham's *The Pelican Brief*, as well as their translations into Lithuanian: Čeponis's *Pelikano Dosjė* (2004) and Kirvaitytė's *Perskilęs Veidrodis* (2000).

1.2 Data and method

This thesis uses both a comparative quantitative and comparative qualitative analysis of features of Christie and Grisham's English-language novels and Kirvaitytė and Čeponis's translations into Lithuanian; the focus is on linguistic means, forms of address, terms of reference used to signal equalities and inequalities in social relations, and the social status of characters, and how these are

transferred from the English source culture to the Lithuanian target culture, where the T/V distinction in particular is symmetrical. This paper focuses not only on forms of address used in dialogue but also on the terms of reference that appear, those names, titles, and words used to refer to specific characters. To make the research scope more precise, this paper looks at forms of address and terms of reference used by and for only those major and minor characters that participate in several conversations within the narratives. This thesis is concerned with Čeponis and Kirvaitytė's choice of strategies in translating forms of address and terms of references used by and for these characters, with the focus on problematic cases.

As texts under analysis, Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* and Christie's *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* provide similar numbers of different types of forms of address used for the characters. There are 73 types of forms of address in Grisham's source text and 73 in its Lithuanian translation by Čeponis, while the number of different types of forms of address in Christie's English novel is 75 and 85 in the Lithuanian version. However, the total number of forms of address in the two English-language novels does indicate greater differences. The total number of forms of address collected from Christie's English novel is 272, while there are 270 forms of address in the Lithuanian translation. On the other hand, the total number of forms of address in Grisham's novel is 398 in English and 397 in the Lithuanian translation. This difference in the total number of forms of address between the two English-language novels is the result of many different types of address being used only once in *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side*, while in Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* specific forms are often repeated.

Compared to Christie's novel, Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* is less dense in terms of reference. The number of different types in Grisham's novel is 112 in English and 120 in Lithuanian, while the number of different types in Christie's novel is 178 in English and 173 in Lithuanian. The total number of terms of reference in Grisham's novel is 728 in English and 725 in Lithuanian. In comparison, there are 802 terms of reference in Christie's English novel in total and 801 in its Lithuanian translation. Aside from omissions and other changes made by the translators, these figures also indicate that characters refer to each other often in both novels, but they tend to talk face-to-face more often in Grisham's novel. This is because many of Grisham's characters belong to the same social circles and institutions, while Christie's often do not.

Making generalisations about these tendencies requires collecting every instance of forms of address and terms of reference from every chapter in the source and target texts; this was first done manually and then rechecked for accuracy by using methods of corpus linguistics. While collecting every instance manually allows the study of the context in which these instances occur, corpus software *AntConc* has been used to retrieve the occurrences of the words from the English and

Lithuanian novels, and to compare the concordance lists of each form of address and term of reference in English and Lithuanian. This ensures that the data has been collected without any instances missing. Then a quantitative approach is applied to the data to observe the main tendencies in translation. Afterwards, a qualitative analysis has been carried out to see whether the language used by characters in high social positions agrees with their social status.

1.3 Organisation of the paper

This MA thesis consists of eight chapters. The second chapter, which is dedicated to social class and status draws on some of the most influential sociologists in the field such as Max Weber and Pierre Bourdieu, along with contemporary ones such as Tom Nesbit, Tak Wing Chan and John H. Goldthorpe, Donald J. Treiman, and Murray Millner Jr, who often consider original theories by Weber and Bourdieu about occupation, lifestyle, and cultural consumption in the contemporary context. Chapter Three, introducing the main concepts regarding forms of address, the distinction between familiar (T) and polite (V) second-person pronoun, politeness and face, draws on specialists like Roger Brown and Albert Gilman, Erving Goffman, and Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, as well as the contemporary specialists Keith Allan and Kate Burridge and Ronald Wardhaugh for their original research on and theories about linguistic aspects of social interactions.

The fourth chapter, looking at the genre characteristics of Golden Age crime fiction and the thriller, relies on the work of leading crime genre critics such as David Glover, Stephen Knight, Lee Horsley, and John Scaggs. This chapter also includes original examples of genre characteristics from the novels analysed, furnished by the author of the thesis. The fifth chapter, concerned with an analysis of Christie's and Grisham's own social worlds, as well as the social worlds represented in their novels *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* and *The Pelican Brief*, draws on Christie's *Autobiography*, which indicates her strong interest in status markers, especially those for the upper-middle class, and a number of interviews with Grisham, in which he discusses American society, in particular the place of lawyers. Their insights are beneficial for the present analysis of their novels, as they reveal information about the societies these novels represent.

The linguistic analytical part consists of two chapters that employ the social and linguistic theories discussed in the second and third chapters, as well as insights about the social positions of the characters and the societies represented in the two novels from the fourth and fifth chapters of the thesis. The sixth chapter considers Kirvaitytė's translation tendencies and the forms of address, terms of reference, and use of T/V pronouns in the Lithuanian translation as markers of social status and social relations among the characters in *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* and its

translation *Perskilęs Veidrodis*. The seventh chapter looks at the same issues in Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* and its translation into Lithuanian, *Pelikano Dosjė* by Čėponis. The last chapter provides the conclusion of the paper, which is followed by a list of references and seven appendices that include the data gathered and summaries of the novels.

2 THEORETICAL CONCEPTS OF SOCIAL CLASS AND STATUS

Social class and social status are the major means of social stratification which, according to Michael Lamport Commons, is a process concerned with 'distinctly different socioeconomic levels within society, to which groups of persons are classified when their education, culture, and/or other qualities are similar' (2008: 430). Often the two terms 'class' and 'status' are discussed together and may be used interchangeably, although for sociologists they have distinct meanings. Possibly the most influential sociologists in the field of social class and status are Max Weber (1864-1920) and Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002), whose theories are employed by many contemporary researchers. First, the relevance of Weber's and Bourdieu's ideas to the contemporary analysis of social class and status are presented. Then the distinction between class and status, and the issues that usually arise in regard to this distinction, are discussed. The influence of occupation on class and status, and the concepts of lifestyle and cultural consumption are introduced. Finally, the concept of status as purely social, detached from the economic dimension of social stratification, is considered.

Tom Nesbit (2006: 175) explains that Weber's and Bourdieu's theories of social class and social status have influenced the later use of these concepts in European and North American academic circles. This influence is so vast that, in Tak Wing Chan and John H. Goldthorpe's words, 'Weber's distinction between class and status is commonplace in materials in introductory courses and texts dealing with social stratification' (2007a: 512). Others also note that this distinction has been present in research on social stratification since the 1950s (Gane 2005: 211; Segre 2010: 219). As specialists indicate, Bourdieu's influence is not only very prominent in the field of cultural consumption and social stratification (Lizardo 2010: 311; Chan and Goldthorpe 2007b: 1095), but he is also, as Elliot B. Weininger puts it, 'routinely included in lists of leading contemporary class theorists' (Weininger 2005: 82). Weber's and Bourdieu's ideas are employed in contemporary research on topics such as social status inequality (Ridgeway 2014), the influence of social status on cultural consumption (Chan and Goldthorpe 2007b, 2010; Allaste and Bennett 2013), and social class and status in sociolinguistics (Mallinson 2007).

For contemporary researchers, however, some of Weber's specific comments on society are outdated. For example, the classes he distinguishes in *Society and Economy* (1922) are those he

observed in his own German society of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: '(1) the working class as a whole; (2) the petty bourgeoisie (3) the propertyless intelligentsia and technical specialists; and (4) those privileged through property and education' (Weber 1978: 303-304, cited in Gane 2005: 13). Grouping all working-class people together is no longer possible because, as Nesbit puts it, even though people 'fall within the same economic class' they might have 'different opportunities for acquiring work, earning income, developing skills, obtaining education and owning property' (2006: 174). The literary texts that are examined in the present research describe the very different societies of mid-twentieth century England and late-twentieth century United States of America for which some of Weber's observations have become irrelevant. Nevertheless, Weber's distinction between social class and status is still employed by many contemporary sociologists.

For Weber, the basis of social class is purely economic and refers to the production and acquisition of goods, while social status is marked by the consumption of goods and different lifestyles (Gane 2005: 217-219; Lizardo 2010: 305). Some sociologists provide their own distinction between social class and status but also credit Weber, as seen in the case of Chan and Goldthorpe:

Elaborating on Weber, we treat class positions as being ones defined by relations in labour markets and production units and, most immediately, by employment relations. [...] Again following Weber, we would regard a status order as a structure of relations of perceived, and in some degree accepted, social superiority, equality and inferiority among individuals that reflects not their personal qualities but rather the 'social honour' attaching to certain of their positional or perhaps purely ascribed attributes (e.g. 'birth' or ethnicity). (2010: 11)

For Chan and Goldthorpe, social status is regarded in terms of social relationships and attributes ascribed to a group as a whole. They discuss class in terms of economy and production, but they also note employment, which indicates that a person's specific occupation has become an important factor in the study of social class and status.

The distinction between social class and status is not always clear. Chan and Goldthorpe (2010: 13) note that the terms 'class' and 'status' tend to be used as synonyms or that they are merged into a single idea of 'socioeconomic status' by many contemporary researchers. They also indicate that in *Distinction* (1979), Bourdieu himself treats status as class and rejects Weber's view of these two concepts as separate (Chan and Goldthorpe 2010: 13; see also Weininger 2005: 84). For instance, Christine Mallinson proposes that one can 'observe and measure class by paying attention to class-related social divisions, which are constituted by norms, lifestyle, status displays, and consumption habits' (2007: 154). She treats markers of status such as lifestyle and consumption

as markers of class so that, for her, status is a sub-category of class.

On the other hand, other sociologists discuss social class and status as two distinct terms. For example, Michael Zweig emphasises that classes are ‘groups of people connected to one another, and made different from one another, by the ways they interact when producing goods and services. [...] The heart of class is not about lifestyle. It is about economics’ (2012: 09). Zweig focuses on the production of goods as the essence of class and disregards lifestyle as a marker, limiting class to economy only and thus making a clear distinction between class and status. Here Zweig, like Weber, is following Karl Marx’s (1818-1883) idea that the foundation of society is economic. According to Nesbit, in *The German Ideology* (1845) ‘Marx was using class as the foundational concept for explaining social organization in terms of understanding the ownership, means, and control of work processes and material wealth’ (Marx and Engels 1970, cited in Nesbit 2006: 173-174). For Marx, class is purely economic.

Before discussing social status, it is important to explain concepts that are often used in relation to social status, specifically, occupation, lifestyle, and cultural consumption. Occupation has already been mentioned as a marker of class and status. As Donald J. Treiman puts it, ‘although wealth and power traditionally have been important dimensions of social stratification, in the modern world two other attributes have come to assume a central role: how much education people attain, and the kind of work they do, their occupations’ (2001: 298). In the course of the twentieth century, the division of kinds of work became more numerous and more significant. While the impact of education on social status and class is discussed less, the importance of occupation is evident in other contemporary discussions on class and status. In this way, according to Chan and Goldthorpe, occupation is ‘one of the most salient positional characteristics to which status attaches in modern societies’ (2007a: 515). Others claim that occupation is not only a characteristic of social status, but also of class, which is evident in Michael Hout’s definition of social class: ‘we can think of class as how people earn their money, how much money they have, or what they do with their money’ (2008: 26). People’s class may be determined by the kind of work they do in a very specific way.

In general, Paul Lambert and Erik Bigahen feel that ‘occupations are regarded as very good markers of social experience – for instance in terms of income, lifetime income and living standards [...], and lifestyle and cultural preferences’ (2012: 13-14). For them, occupation is a marker of both class, which they discuss in economic terms, and status, because they mention lifestyle and cultural preferences. Treiman also claims that in modern society ‘the achievement of socioeconomic status [...] is determined as much by a combination of individual traits (cleverness, charm, drive, etc. – or their lack) and chance events (being in the right place at the right time [...])’ (2001: 304). Treiman

suggests that individual personality may raise one's status: for example, a very talented young lawyer will probably rise higher than one who is not so clever, while social abilities may also lead to jobs in more prestigious firms.

For some, class refers to how people earn their money and how much money they have, their economic position and occupation. Still, Hout (2008: 27) asserts that 'what people do with their money' refers more correctly to lifestyle, a major term in the analysis of social class and status, noting that it is an 'important consideration in Pierre Bourdieu's approach to class'. Sociologists explain lifestyle, which can also be found in Weber's work, as 'an individual's choices in all life domains, [...] an acquired pattern of attitudes and behaviours that is in some way consistent throughout an individual's life, or in a particular domain of life' (Allaste and Bennett 2013: 9-10). Drawing on Weber, Chan and Golthorpe relate lifestyle exclusively to social status:

For Weber, lifestyle is the most typical way through which members of different status groups, even within the purely conventional and relatively loose status orders of modern societies, seek to define their boundaries — that is, to establish cues or markers of inclusion and exclusion. (2007a: 522)

Lifestyle involves particular behaviour patterns and choices typical to those individuals that are members of status groups.

Lifestyle is a factor that determines inclusion in certain status groups; as Chan and Goldthorpe put it, lifestyle is 'a means of the symbolic communication of "distinction" and thus of expressing a form of hierarchy' (2007a: 522). In this way, lifestyle serves to differentiate between one or another status group that can have a lower or higher rank in the hierarchy of social status. A person whose lifestyle places him or her in a certain status group will have a lower or higher rank in society. Weininger explains contemporary discussions of lifestyle draw on Bourdieu's ideas expressed in *Distinction*:

For Bourdieu, in other words, the aesthetic sensibility that orients actors' everyday choices in matters of food, clothing, sports, art, and music – and which extends to things as seemingly trivial as their bodily posture – serves as a vehicle through which they *symbolize* their *social similarity* with and their *social difference* from one another. Through the minutiae of everyday consumption, in other words, each individual continuously *classifies* him or herself and, simultaneously, all others as alike or different. (2005: 98-99; emphasis in the original)

For contemporary sociologists, just as for Bourdieu, lifestyles indeed are formed by cultural consumption and taste, including behaviour at work or in the family, leisure activities, habits of dressing or eating, and other activities that relate to everyday consumption (Allaste and Bennett

2013: 12). Chan and Goldthorpe (2007b: 1103) suggest that people might also deliberately display their status through their cultural consumption, for example, by being seen at the theatre or discussing it with others. Such ‘symbolic communication of status through cultural consumption’ is, as they put it, ‘whether intentionally or not, signalling to others who they [the individuals] are, and how they should be treated’ (2007b: 1103). Through their lifestyles people express social similarity to or difference from others, thus classifying themselves as belonging to one or another status group.

Similarly, regarding status, Sandro Segre states that scholarly attention is given to ‘status groups as a social and legal category that is predicated on lifestyle, collective identity, social ranking, and exclusionary practices, rather than on economic situation’ (2010: 221). Segre asserts that status is detached from economic concerns and is purely social. This approach is evident in Murray Millner’s more general definition of status, which refers to ‘the distinctions of rank or stature attributed to a person, group, idea, or object’ (2010: 295). He explains that a person’s status depends on the expression of approval or disapproval by other members of society; nonetheless, one’s status can also be affected by a more official kind of approval or disapproval, for example, by educational diplomas or criminal records (Millner 2010: 295). Moreover, the concept of status is relational because a person is considered to have a higher or lower status compared to other people (Millner 2010: 296). Millner (2010: 296) claims that such relationships ‘form a system, arena, or field’, and that each status system has its own criteria so that one status group is distinct from another.

On the other hand, even though in modern society one’s status is often established by one’s lifestyle as well as social approval or disapproval, there are other ways that determine status. Chan and Goldthorpe state that ‘in many societies, family and lineage have been of major importance, together, say, with codes of behavior or organizational affiliations (e.g., membership in schools, clubs, etc.)’ (2007b: 1103). In the past, one’s family background or membership in specific organisations were the major means to determine one’s status and, for some well-known members of the elite, as these researchers note, it still is. However, Chan and Goldthorpe further assert that in modern society ‘the family backgrounds of individuals are not always readily known, etiquettes can rather easily be learned, and most associational memberships are open to anyone who can meet the cost’ (2007b: 1103). In modern society, an ordinary person’s family background is not so public or important, and becoming a member of an organisation is much easier so that family background and organisational affiliations have somewhat lost their importance as markers of social status. For such reasons, lifestyle and cultural consumption have grown as significant markers of status (Chan and Goldthorpe 2007b: 1103).

Writing on social status in modern society, Cecilia L. Ridgeway emphasises that status is based on how people look at a certain group; in her words, ‘status is based on widely shared beliefs about the social categories or “types” of people that are ranked by society as more esteemed and respected compared to others’ (2014: 3). In this case, the ‘types’ she refers to are status groups and their rank in society is determined by the shared beliefs held by society about the particular group. Ridgeway refers to Bourdieu, suggesting that elites ‘signal their class status superiority through sophisticated speech, clothing, and tastes in art’ (Bourdieu 1984, cited in Ridgeway 2014: 4). Here manners of speech, fashionable clothes, and interest in particular kinds of the arts are markers of or the criteria for membership in an elite status group. The sophisticated lifestyle of the elite encourages a widely shared belief about it held by society. As Millner puts it, ‘a key source of status is conforming to the norms of the group [...] expressing the right values and beliefs, and using the proper symbols’ (2010: 297). If the members of the elite do not appear more sophisticated in their lifestyle than ordinary people, they would not be viewed as elite.

In this way, in Daniel Steward’s opinion, ‘status can be conceived as a product of others’ subjective evaluations of an actor’ (2005: 824-25). Since beliefs are subjective, the evaluation of a person’s status is also subjective. The deliberate display of status can also influence the evaluation of a person. According to Chan and Goldthorpe, ‘to signal status is to lay claim to group membership: to whom one has affiliations, and from whom is one different’ (2007b: 1105). By displaying or signalling status, one claims membership in a certain status group, and if the behaviour or lifestyle displayed conforms to the beliefs held by society about this status group, one is classified as a member of this group. As Stewart asserts, ‘those whose activities conform closely to the norms of the group [...] will attain high social ranking’ (2005: 824). In this approach, status is held to depend mostly on lifestyle, not on the economic situation of a person because, as Millner puts it, the ‘income of everyone can triple [...] even though their relative status remains unchanged’ (2010: 297). One’s economic situation itself does not guarantee higher status, unless one adopts the lifestyle considered appropriate for the elite.

It is evident that Weber’s distinction between social class and status still prevails in contemporary studies of class and status, despite the fact that certain sociologists like Bourdieu reject the distinction. The concept of class is largely limited to one’s economic situation, while status is a much broader social dimension that includes one’s lifestyle, patterns of cultural and everyday consumption, and evaluation by other members of society. Through status people distinguish themselves from others, expresses similarity to or difference from other individuals or groups, thus classifying oneself and others as belonging to a certain status groups. The link between one’s status and economic situation is less significant; a person might have a low income, but a

higher status based on personality, occupation, and in some cases, lineage or lifestyle. It is true that an elite status usually requires a high income, but such an income itself is not sufficient.

3 THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO FORMS OF ADDRESS: POWER, SOLIDARITY, DISTANCE, AND POLITENESS

In a variety of ways forms of address have interested socio-linguistic researchers for several decades. Studies on this subject often focus on topics such as cultural differences (Čubajevaitė 2006, Chen 2010, Yokotani 2015) and translation (Anderman 1993, Mailhac 2000, Meister 2016), since forms of address raise issues in intercultural communication. The way one addresses someone can assert power, solidarity, or distance, and is closely related with issues in politeness theory, as is seen in Linda A. Wood and Rolf O. Kroger's (1991) analysis of politeness and forms of address, Minna Nevala's (2004) study on forms of address and terms of reference in relation to politeness in early English correspondence, and Golnaz Nanbakhs's (2012) analysis of the construction of politeness in face-to-face interaction in regard to Persian address pronouns. Although studies on politeness, much like those on forms of address, focus on cultural differences and intercultural communication (Kiyama et al 2012, Feng 2014), researchers also consider the effect of the speakers' emotional state on polite behaviour (Morse and Afifi 2015, Vergis and Terkourafi 2015).

Many recent studies on forms of address and politeness are still based on the theoretical framework provided by Roger Brown and Albert Gilman (1960), Erving Goffman (1967), and Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson (1987) (Ermida 2006, Nanbakhsh 2012, Cook 2014, Valde and Henningsen 2015). Here their theories are briefly discussed along with the notions of power, solidarity, and distance. This chapter also looks at forms of address as markers of social class and status. First, this chapter explains the distinction between the use of the polite and familiar second-person pronouns, known as the T/V distinction, after which it discusses other forms of address and the issues they raise. Then it focuses on politeness theory in relation to forms of address, introducing concepts such as *face* and *face threatening acts*.

Politeness is often discussed together with polite language, of which Richard J. Watts gives examples such as 'language which contains respectful forms of address like *sir* or *madam*', 'language that displays certain "polite" formulaic utterances like *please*, *thank you*, *excuse me* or *sorry*', or 'elegantly expressed language' (2003: 1, emphasis in the original). Watts's first example indicates that the way one addresses someone is regarded as either polite or impolite behaviour. It can also signal whether a person is trying to assert power over the addressee, establish solidarity, or create distance. In this way, polite behaviour and polite language, with the choice of forms of

address in particular, can be markers of social class and status. According to Xiaomei Yang, '[h]ow to address people appropriately needs the taking of several factors into consideration, such as the social status or rank of the other, sex, age, family relationship, occupational hierarchy, transactional status, race or degree of intimacy' (2010: 743). For her, the way a person is addressed indicates his or her status, as a person of higher status would be addressed in a more polite and formal manner. On the other hand, the way the speaker addresses someone also signals his or her own status, as asserted by sociologists like Murray Millner (2010) and Cecilia L. Ridgeway (2014). Keith Allan and Kate Burridge state that '[t]he relative status of the speaker and the hearer-or-named derives from two sources: their relative power, and the social distance between them' (2006: 133).

The T/V distinction found in many European languages is one of the major topics in discussions on forms of address. These are often based on the theoretical model presented by Brown and Gilman (1960), who focused on the T/V distinction as representing 'familiar' and 'polite' forms in European languages. The abbreviation T/V refers to the distinction of the second-person pronouns *tu-vous* in French, as Ronald Wardhaugh explains, 'where grammatically there is a "singular you" *tu* (T) and a "plural you" *vous* (V) but usage requires that you use *vous* with individuals on certain occasions' (2006: 260, emphasis in the original). According to Joanna Thornborrow, 'in many other European languages speakers have a choice between addressing someone with the informal, intimate second-person pronoun (*tu/du* in Spanish and German), or the formal, distancing second-person pronoun (*Usted/Sie*)' (2004: 163, emphasis in the original). The use of second-person pronouns indicates the closeness of the participants' relationship. Since Lithuanian also has this distinction (*tu/jūs*), the issue is very relevant for this thesis on translation into this language.

Brown and Gilman indicate that the T/V pronouns have a 'close association with two dimensions fundamental to the analysis of all social life – the dimensions of power and solidarity' (1960: 252). Drawing on Brown and Gilman, Manuela Cook explains that '[w]hilst solidarity tends to result in reciprocal T or V, power will determine a non-reciprocal interaction in which the superior says T but may expect to receive V' (2014: 17). When one person addresses another with T, but receives V, the usage of T/V is said to be asymmetrical. As Wardhaugh puts it, '[t]he asymmetric use of names and address terms is often a clear indicator of a power differential' (2006: 269). The symmetrical use of the familiar pronouns, as he indicates, shows intimacy and occurs in situations where 'two people agreed they had strong common interests, i.e., a feeling of solidarity' (Wardhaugh 2006: 261). An asymmetrical use of T/V indicates inequality and distance between the participants in an interaction; a symmetrical use indicates that the participants are of the same status or are in a close relationship.

Lithuanian also distinguishes between the plural and singular *you* as ‘familiar’ and ‘polite’ forms. Laura Čubajevaitė indicates that ‘[i]n the Lithuanian language like in some other languages (e.g. German, Spanish, French, Hindi, etc.) there is a distinction between a formal and informal way of addressing other people, that is, there are two forms of the second-person pronoun: *tu* and *jūs*’ (2006: 33-34, emphasis in the original). She, like Brown and Gilman, states that the use of these pronouns signals ‘intimacy, solidarity, respect, power and authority’ (Čubajevaitė 2006: 34). In addition to these, Vytautas Ambrazas and colleagues specify that ‘as a polite form of address to one person, the plural pronoun *jūs* “you” and the nouns *ponas* “Mister”, *ponia* “Madam”, *panelė* “Miss” are used with the 2nd person plural form of a verb’ (2006: 479). Ambrazas and colleagues (2006: 191) also list other Lithuanian pronouns such as *tamsta*, *pats*, *pati*, with *tamsta* being used less often than *jūs*, and mostly by older people. Commenting on their use, they state that ‘*[j]ūs* is used in polite reference both to one and more than one addressee. *Tamsta*, *pats*, *pati* have plural forms, therefore the singular is used in reference to one addressee and the plural is used in reference to more than one addressee’ (Ambrazas et al. 2006: 191). They add that ‘*[p]ats*, *pati* are not as formal as *jūs* or *tamsta*. They are usually used speaking to one's equals when *tu* is felt to be too rude, while *jūs* and *tamsta* are too cold or respectful.’ (Ambrazas et al. 2006: 191).

Cook proposes that, since the English *you* has no position in the T/V distinction, it should be classified as N, which stands for neutral (2014: 18). She explains that ‘[u]nlike the non-reciprocal interaction of T-V pronouns, single *you* is used reciprocally between old and young, rich and poor, monarch and citizen, and so on, thus bridging across possible social divides such as age, wealth, birth and others’ (Cook 2014: 18). While the English *you* can reduce inequality between the participants in an interaction, the T/V distinction found in other languages, according to Gunilla M. Anderman, is very useful in a number of ways, especially in literary writings:

Present day writers working in languages with a T/V distinction are therefore in possession of an invaluable tool. As the use of V is normally associated with power, a simple change to T can easily be used to signal increased subservience. And on another level such a switch may also indicate a higher degree of intimacy and emotional commitment. The introduction of V on the other hand into the interaction between interlocutors of equal standing may show precisely with whom, in a given situation, the power rests. It would also, on the level of intimacy, tell us of sudden withdrawal and feelings of remoteness. (1993: 59)

To Anderman the T/V distinction not only indicates who has power over whom but also shows the subtleties of the participants’ relationships, whether fictional or real. As for the English language, Thornborrow states that it no longer has a T/V distinction so that ‘social relations are no longer encoded in the pronoun system’ (2004: 163); however, there are other aspects of forms of address that can express social relations in this language.

A person can be addressed directly or referred to in a variety of ways, which can also be symmetric or asymmetric. According to Minna Nevala, while the use of direct address depends on the relationship between the speaker and the hearer, in choosing a term of reference ‘the speaker not only has to take into account his/her relationship with the hearer, but also has to decide how to present the referent in a situationally appropriate manner’ (2004: 2125-2126). The way one is referred to depends on one’s relative status in the group of participants involved in an interaction. For example, when introducing two persons, one can signal that one of them has a higher status and more power by making an asymmetrical introduction. As Thornborrow (2004: 161) notes, a symmetrical introduction would indicate ‘people as being of the same type and status, or belonging to the same group, for example, by using both first names as in “Jim, this is Alice”, while an asymmetrical introduction would signal that two people have a different status: for example, ‘Jim, this is Dr Jones’ (Thornborrow 2004: 161). In the second case, the person who introduces Jim and Alice refers to Alice as Dr Jones, indicating the higher status granted by her occupation. Once introduced, these people can address or refer to each other in a number of ways, depending on the social distance between them.

There are a variety of forms of address to choose from based on the relationships between speakers and listeners. Thornborrow names some of the most common, such as ‘by first name (Mary), by title and last name (Ms A, Mr B, Dr C), by some kind of deferential form (sir, ma’am)’ (2004: 162). Xiaomei Yang (2010) presents a detailed table of the most common types of forms of address (see Table 5 in Appendix 3). Yang (2010: 743) lists the following titles that are used without names: kinship and occupational titles, titles of rank, honorifics, and zero use. In Table 5 in Appendix 3, titles that do not include names, just as Allan and Burridge note in their own work, ‘identify roles or social positions; so, to some extent, they impersonalize’ (2006: 135): they signal a greater social distance between the speakers. In this case, addressing someone by name would indicate that the social distance between the speakers is less. As Wardhaugh puts it, ‘[k]nowing and using another’s first name is, of course, a sign of considerable intimacy or at least of a desire for such intimacy. Using a nickname or pet name shows an even greater intimacy’ (2006: 268). In respect to this, addressing someone using a title and last name is more personal than an address by title alone because the name is known. Zero use, according to Wardhaugh, allows ‘a choice between familiar and polite’ (2006: 270), which is probably the most neutral form of address; when it is used, it is difficult to distinguish the degree of intimacy between participants in an interaction.

The way one addresses a person can have a positive or negative effect on a relationship. If two people belong to different status groups, the superior speaker has the choice of maintaining social distance or initiating solidarity by using a more familiar form of address. According to Allan

and Burridge (2006: 139), to initiate solidarity one would have to address a person of lower status using ‘in-group markers’. These indicate that ‘[w]here the speaker and the hearer-or-named are of similar social status and there is little social distance between them, the informal in-group language found in colloquial styles is the regular mark of solidarity’ (Allan and Burridge 2006: 139). They list some examples of colloquial in-group language such as the use of first names or nicknames, as well as words like *buddy*, *mate*, *sweetheart* (Allan and Burridge 2006: 139-140). On the other hand, a person addressed by his or her first name might not feel that the speaker is trying to establish solidarity. As Wardhaugh states, ‘[w]hen someone uses your first name alone in addressing you, you may feel on occasion that that person is presuming an intimacy you do not recognize or, alternatively, is trying to assert some power over you’ (2006: 268-269). If the addressee does not recognise the initiation of solidarity or the speaker is trying to assert power, the use of in-group forms of address can have a negative impact on the participants’ relationship.

People can also use particular forms of address specifically for hostile purposes such as maintaining social distance or offending the addressee. Allan and Burridge remark that ‘[s]ocial-distance marking in forms used for naming and especially addressing can be achieved in many languages through sarcastic use of intimate terms’ (2006: 138). They also add that ‘[i]n English, the angry speaker who is inferior in status to the hearer-or-named may use title alone (*Mr*) or an inappropriately familiar term (*bud*, *mate*)’ (Allan and Burridge 2006: 138, emphasis in original). While maintaining social distance does not necessarily have a strong negative effect on the speakers’ relationship, using forms of address to deliberately offend someone does. An example of this is the insult discussed in Susan Ervin-Tripp’s (1980) study on American forms of address. She presents the choice of forms of address that a white American police officer used when addressing an African-American doctor:

‘What’s your name, boy?’
‘Dr Poussaint. I’m a physician.’
‘What’s your first name, boy?’
‘Alvin.’ (Ervin-Tripp 1980: 22)

Ervin-Tripp demonstrates how the police officer deliberately insults the doctor by disregarding his age and status by addressing him as ‘boy’, a word often used at that time by whites in addressing African-American men. As Thornborrow puts it, ‘Poussaint responds by giving his title and last name, and in doing so he indicates that he is not complying with the white policeman’s use of an address term that places him in a socially inferior position’ (2004: 163). Moreover, he emphasises that he holds a professional position by explaining that he is a doctor. However, by repeating his previously used form of address, the police officer dismisses the doctor’s claim and puts him in the

position of the inferior. Finally Poussaint accepts this racist evaluation by giving his first name.

The use of forms of address becomes more problematic in intercultural interactions because the participants usually do not share the same norms. In a study on cultural differences in Chinese and American forms of address, Yu Chen indicates that today many Americans address people by first names rather than titles such as *Mr* or *Miss*, even when they do not know them well (2010: 82). Chen states that '[i]t is not a sign of disrespect. However, this is quite counter to Chinese custom' (2010: 82). While in the United States addressing someone by a first name may be seen as a sign of trying to establish solidarity, in China this is considered to be rude. Chen concludes this study by remarking that 'one cannot expect that the literal translation of the routine expressions of his own language into another will have the same effect in the target language (2010: 84). The effect of particular forms of address used in one culture cannot be transferred into another one if they do not share the same conversational norms. This is where politeness theory comes into play because, as Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich notes, '[n]orms and their sharedness have become [...] a central aspect of politeness research' (2013: 3).

One of the fundamental concepts in politeness theory is that of *face*. The term was used by Erving Goffman in 1967: he explains that face is 'the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact' (Goffman 1967: 5). According to Miriam Meyerhoff, '[i]n Goffman's work, "face" was a personal attribute or quality that each of us works to protect or enhance' (2006: 84). Participants in an interaction can use language to protect or enhance their face. As Allan and Burridge put it, '[t]he management of social status – of power and social distance relations – involves the management of face, and consequently the management of language choice' (2006: 133). In this case, protecting one's face would require magnifying social distance and using particular forms of address that are not intimate, while enhancing one's face could be achieved by using familiar forms of address.

The management of power and social distance relations is discussed more fully in Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness. For them, 'face, the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself, [...] is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction' (Brown and Levinson 2006: 311). They discuss aspects of face as basic desires that every member of society possesses and has to satisfy (Brown and Levinson 2006: 312). Jessica Soltys and colleagues note that '[f]ace wants – the speaker's own and his or her regard for the hearer's – dictate the manner and degree of politeness employed in a given discourse' (2014: 33). If people wish to insult someone, that is, to be deliberately rude, they would choose to use the form of address that is the most impolite in this situation or which indicates an attempt to assert power, as, for example, in

addressing someone by a nickname although there is no intimacy between the speakers.

The concept of face is useful here. Brown and Levinson divide face into negative and positive. Negative face refers to ‘freedom of action and freedom from imposition’ and to ‘the want of every “competent adult member” that his actions be unimpeded by others’ (Brown and Levinson 2006: 311-312). They define positive face as ‘the positive consistent self-image or “personality” (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants’ and as ‘the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others’ (Brown and Levinson 2006: 311-312). Negative face denotes one’s wish for social distance, while positive face indicates the wish for solidarity, as Tracy Rundstrom Williams notes:

The Linguistic Politeness framework proposes that individuals are always balancing these opposing needs of being involved with others, as expressed in the solidarity politeness strategies of positive face, and having freedom of thought and movement, as expressed in the independence politeness strategies of negative face. (2005: 48)

Participants in an interaction constantly balance between the wish for social distance and feelings of solidarity, which means that, paradoxically, they have both negative and positive face.

Ron Scollon and Suzanne Wong Scollon (1995) discuss this notion of the paradox of face. They state that people have a need ‘to be involved with other participants and to show them [their] involvement’ but they also ‘need to maintain some degree of independence from other participants and to show them that [they] respect their independence’ (Scollon and Scollon 1995: 36). They further note that, while trying to attend to one’s positive face, one might ignore negative face, which could result in a conflict, since ‘emphasising one of them risks a threat to the other’ (Scollon and Scollon 1995: 38). Scollon and Scollon also refer to what Brown and Levinson call *positive politeness*, *negative politeness* and *face threatening acts* (2006: 313-317).

Brown and Levinson indicate that positive politeness is oriented towards satisfying the listener’s positive face, while negative politeness tends to satisfy his or her negative face (2006: 317). Alan W. Aldrich and Carol A. Leibiger emphasise differences between cultures: they explain that ‘[p]ositive-politeness cultures feature lower power and social distance between interactants, while negative-politeness cultures emphasize greater power and social distance between interactants’ (2009: 239). Negative politeness reflects a more formal kind of interaction, while positive politeness a more intimate one. However, as Scollon and Scollon (1995) observe, focusing too much on one’s own face might threaten the other person. As Aldrich and Leibiger put it, ‘[e]very utterance in an interaction carries with it the potential to create a threat to either the speaker’s or hearer’s negative or positive face and as such comprises a face threatening act’ (2009: 239). In terms of forms of address, if one participant tries to attend to the other’s negative face by

using the polite form of the second-person pronoun (V), but the other participant feels that they have a more intimate relationship in which using the familiar (T) form would be appropriate, the use of the polite pronoun would be a threat to the other's positive face.

As for the term *face threatening acts*, drawing on Brown and Levinson, Soltys and colleagues (2014: 34) explain that these are measured using three social factors: social distance, power, and the ranking of the imposition. They define social distance as 'a symmetrical relationship based upon the similarity between the interlocutors and form and frequency of interaction between them' (Soltys et al. 2014: 34). Social distance is closely related to solidarity in that the less social distance there is, the more intimate the participants are: it can be said that they share a feeling of solidarity. Whether the participants in an interaction are socially distant or intimate, both of them are equal, since social distance and solidarity are symmetrical. On the other hand, Soltys and colleagues define power as 'an asymmetrical relationship reflecting the real or perceived differences in authority and social standing between the interlocutors' (2014: 34). A face threatening act may occur because one participant in an interaction may not acknowledge the power the other participant has or may not perceive that person as having power. They specify that the ranking of the imposition is 'a measure of the culture-specific degree of severity of the [speech] act' (Soltys et al. 2014: 34) or the degree of interference with the participant's face wants, as Brown and Levinson indicate (2006: 321).

In these ways, the choice of particular forms of address may not only indicate the speaker's and the listener's social class and status but also indicate relations of social distance, power, and solidarity. Based on these three social factors, a form of address can be polite or impolite, at times even insulting, as it might threaten the hearer's face, positive or negative. Since the use of forms of address is governed by conversational norms typical to one or another culture, the choice of a form of address can become a face threatening act in intercultural communication. This is especially relevant in translation studies, as written discourse is a form of non-face-to-face communication. Forms of address used in the source text might not have the same effect on the target audience as it has on the source audience so that the translated text would sound unnatural to readers or is misunderstood altogether. In such cases, translators have to choose strategies that make their texts sound natural and yet create a similar effect for target readers as that achieved in the source text.

4 CONSIDERATIONS OF THE GOLDEN AGE CRIME FICTION AND THE THRILLER GENRES IN AGATHA CHRISTIE'S *THE MIRROR CRACK'D FROM SIDE TO SIDE* (1962) AND JOHN GRISHAM'S *THE PELICAN BRIEF* (1992)

This chapter is concerned with presenting the major characteristics of Golden Age crime fiction and the thriller. Golden Age crime fiction focuses on a very realistic depiction of the social world and its order, especially the upper-middle and upper classes. In the case of Agatha Christie's novels, such social realism is achieved through close observation of the actual social world of the early and mid-twentieth century. Because the thriller is a general sub-genre of detective fiction, this chapter focuses on the sub-variety of legal thrillers. These are concerned with the realistic representation of legal processes and issues connected with law. The sub-sections of this chapter discuss genre characteristics, drawing on examples found by the author of this thesis in the two novels analysed.

4.1 The major characteristics of Golden Age crime fiction in *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962)

At first the term 'Golden Age crime fiction' or 'clue-puzzle' was used to refer to crime fiction written during the inter-war period of the twentieth century; however, this term has now been extended by literary critics to a similar kind of crime fiction written since the Second World War (Knight 2003: 77; Rowland 2010: 117; Danytė 2011: 11). Moreover, as John Scaggs indicates, Agatha Christie, the most influential writer of Golden Age crime fiction, is accredited with the beginning of this sub-genre in Britain (2005: 26).

According to Lee Horsley (2005: 37), in these narratives, the crime, almost always murder, is the central plot element, even though its portrayal, as Scaggs (2005: 43) puts it, is censored and almost bloodless. This is evident in *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962), as Heather Badcock, the victim, collapses and is said to have died immediately after being poisoned (Christie 1962: 54-55); this is followed by the lengthy investigation that ends with the revelation of the murderer. Scaggs asserts that murder is seen as 'the violation of a community code of conduct [...] demanding a response in terms of the code that has been violated' (2005: 44). Crime disrupts the social order of the dominant upper-middle class; it has to be restored which, as Milda Danytė (2011: 17-18) explains, is done when the detective arrests the criminal.

The detectives, described by Horsley as 'closely identified with the privileged class' (2005: 39) and by Scaggs as 'not personally involved with any of the suspects' (2005: 47), usually, as Susan Rowland (2010: 121) notes, remain male in Golden Age crime fiction. Inspector Craddock is

a typical Golden Age detective, as he comes from Scotland Yard, the highest of police forces in England (Christie 1962: 168). He also grew up in a family with several servants and a 'nursery governess' (Christie 1962: 225), which indicates that he comes from the upper class.

Though less frequent than men, women can also be detectives, of which the leading example is Christie's investigator Miss Marple, first introduced in *Murder at the Vicarage* in 1930 (Knight 2003: 82). Miss Marple, who is the main character in the subject of this thesis, *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962), is referred to by Danytè as 'one of the elderly spinsters in the charming English village of St Mary Mead where, very unexpectedly, murder takes place' (2011: 14-15). This description also suggests a characteristic of Golden Age crime fiction of major importance to this present paper, the typical use of closed settings.

Stephen Knight (2003: 77-78) notes that it is not true that Golden Age novels are always set in a rural area, as 'more stories were set in the city than is often realised'; however, he indicates that other settings 'would still be in a sequestered area, an apartment or at most a few streets, and the archetypal setting of the English novels was a more or less secluded country house' (Knight 2003: 77-78), which is the exact setting of *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962). He states that the notion of 'sequestered areas' goes in accord with that of social enclosure (Knight 2003: 78). This is especially the case in Christie's fiction, where the focus, as Scaggs notes, is on 'upper middle-class semi-rural village communities' that 'provide the formal device of offering a closed society and a correspondingly closed circle of suspects' (2005: 48).

Knight (2003: 78) considers that it is of utmost importance that the social enclosure is defined through the killer and the victim both coming from the same social circle, with the lower class playing a minor role. In *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962), a novel from Christie's later period, the lower classes play a greater role. This novel depicts the changes in society by introducing lower-middle class characters such as Cherry Baker, Miss Marple's helper, as supporting characters who often gives crucial information about the murder of Heather Badcock to Miss Marple. This does not alter the fact that social enclosure is still a defining feature of this novel, as in Golden Age crime fiction in general. In Horsley's words, '[t]he enclosed community itself was the source of tensions, deceptions, betrayals, and death' (2005: 37). Since the crime occurs in a community, the social order is disrupted from within. Golden Age crime fiction presents crime and evil as part of a specific community.

On the whole, writers of Golden Age crime fiction favour social realism. These narratives are set in places and times that, as Danytè indicates, 'might be fictional but which are also based on real societies and periods' (2011: 17). *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962) depicts three major social spaces: the village of St Mary Mead, the adjacent estate, Gossington Hall, and a new

suburb called the Development. All of these are fictional, but they represent the industrialisation of British rural areas in the mid-twentieth century: the Development, as noted in this novel, is built on what used to be a farmer's field (Christie 1962: 11).

Much of the effect of this realism is achieved through detailed description. These novels are, as Danytė puts it, 'dense with details about villages and houses, furniture, clothing, meals, social structures and the like' (2011: 17), a feature which is discussed in more detail later in this paper. The overall emphasis on the social is also evident in other major characteristics of Golden Age crime fiction, beginning with murder functioning as a disruption of social order and ending with closed settings and social enclosure in the narratives. Social realism also appears since Christie's characters are, in Danytė's words, 'sharply defined by their use of language, choice of clothes and social mannerisms' (2011: 13). For this reason the depiction of social class and status can easily be analysed in Golden Age crime fiction.

4.2 The major genre characteristics of the thriller in *The Pelican Brief* (1992)

This sub-section considers what a thriller as a literary sub-genre is. First it provides definitions and then turns to genre characteristics that are particularly relevant to the depiction of the social class and status of the characters, the subject that is most pertinent to the topic of this paper. A thriller is a type of crime fiction, but though a sub-genre the term is still held by critics like John Scaggs (2005: 148) and Philip Simpson (2010: 187) to be rather general. Suspense is the focal point of all thrillers; J. A. Cuddon, who does consider the term meaningful, defines this as 'a state of uncertainty, anticipation and curiosity as to the outcome of a story or play, or any kind of narrative in verse or prose' (1992: 937). Suspense is the feeling that readers experience while perusing a narrative, eager to find out the outcome of events.

However, the sole term 'thriller' is not specific enough. David Glover (2003: 139) and Scaggs (2005: 108) list sub-varieties of the thriller classified by theme; Glover adds what he sees as the most prominent writer in each case, naming John Grisham for legal thrillers. This sub-variety is important for the present paper, since the novel *The Pelican Brief* (1992), which is analysed here, qualifies as a legal thriller. Indeed, its author John Grisham is described by Ken Gelder as 'the most commercially successful legal thriller novelist in the world' (2004: 105). According to Priscilla L. Walton, 'legal thrillers [are] a venue through which legal dilemmas can be examined' (2001: 23). She also provides examples of legal issues in the novels written by John Grisham, such as race relations, environmental problems, the damage to health caused by the tobacco industry, and insurance fraud (Walton 2001: 23). Milda Danytė indicates that in Grisham's legal thrillers, 'the

protagonist is not a spy or detective but a lawyer, usually a perfectly honourable one, often young and still not very experienced' (2011: 36). As a young law student at a prestigious university, the main character in *The Pelican Brief*, Darby Shaw, is the typical protagonist of a legal thriller. Furthermore, as a young woman often unable to defend herself physically, Darby is forced to run from killers; however, she remains determined to expose the President and Victor Mattiece, an oil tycoon, for their involvement in a major environmental crime in Louisiana, the home of the threatened brown pelican.

Although they focus on legal matters, legal thrillers are still a variety of the general thriller genre, which has its own specific features. Many critics such as Scaggs (2005: 107-108) and Kate Watson (2014: 4) summarise Julian Symons's comments about the thriller when discussing the genre:

[I]t does not often have a detective [...] the setting is often central to the setting and atmosphere of the story (and is inextricably bound up with the nature of the crime itself); "the social perspective of the story is often radical, and questions some aspect of society, law, or justice" (Symons 1993: 191-193, as quoted by Watson 2014: 4).

Probably the most prominent features of the thriller as described by Symons are the absence of the traditional detective, and the connection established between powerful social institutions and the criminal world. Tzvetan Todorov captures the essence of the thriller in brief by stating that 'it is around these few constants that the thriller is constituted: violence, generally sordid crime, [and] the amorality of the characters' (2013: 230). The society portrayed in such novels is usually revealed to be corrupt, with power relations, one of the markers of social class and status, playing a major role.

Despite the plot exaggerations necessary to maintain a high degree of suspense, thrillers depict a society in which the action takes place in a realistic context. As Danytè notes, thrillers 'tend to be connected to the political beliefs and concerns of the period in which they are written' (2011: 36). According to Simpson, the conflict in the thriller 'usually addresses at some subliminal level a contemporary anxiety (or more than one) facing the thriller's audience: the fear of a foreign enemy, the fear of inner-city crime, the fear of the disenfranchised drifter, and so forth' (2010: 188). To depict the threats that cause anxiety for the audience, a writer has to provide detailed descriptions of certain contemporary institutions or events that, as Danytè states, are 'often researched and fairly reliable' (2011: 37).

Thrillers often depict a society in which earlier moral and ideological values no longer mean much. Simpson states that the moral values in thrillers are usually clearly defined, 'with the individual hero embodying admirable qualities, such as loyalty, and the criminal despicable ones, such as betrayal' (2010: 188). He also adds that the threats posed in a thriller are usually very

frightening, so that the protagonists have to perform actions that go against their moral views, as they exact ‘a kind of frontier justice to resolve the threat’ (Simpsons 2010: 188). Nevertheless, although the protagonists of a thriller may be forced to act in unethical ways, they are still seen as honourable people. Furthermore, the criminals in thrillers are often not mere individuals but influential leaders of an institution or organisation that has become corrupt in a profound way. Danytė provides examples of such corruption: ‘legal institutions agree to falsify evidence, have troublesome people killed and collaborate with criminals to a much greater degree than the general public realizes’ (2011: 37). Because the criminals often collaborate with representatives of a democratically elected government, the protagonists face threats from legal authorities that should protect people.

This is the case in Grisham’s *The Pelican Brief*, in which major figures in the American presidential office are revealed to be involved in a far-reaching crime. Moreover, the same authorities hire people to eliminate Darby and thus protect themselves from being exposed. Although the law student Darby is their primary target, people that are associated with her are also killed while Darby manages to escape. Her lover Thomas Callahan’s car explodes; later, Gavin Verheek, Callahan’s friend and a lawyer, agrees to help Darby, but is killed by the hired assassin Khamel (Grisham 1992: 215). Unable to trust the government, Darby contacts Gray Grantham, an ambitious young journalist working for a major Washington newspaper (Grisham 1992: 218).

Still another feature that encourages the analysis of social status in thrillers is their depiction of sexual and emotional relationships often absent in Golden Age crime fiction, as these can also serve as markers of social status. According to Danytė, ‘[r]ather surprisingly, given the emphasis on exciting action, sexuality and even real love appear frequently in thrillers’ (2011: 38). Although such relationships do not form the central narrative in the plots of thrillers, they can be used to heighten the sense of social realism by depicting how the characters behave in private interactions as opposed to professional ones or those with members of the public. This is especially useful when analysing linguistic exchanges among characters. In *The Pelican Brief*, for example, Darby is involved in a sexual relationship with her professor at law school, Callahan, but after his death she works together with Grantham and their relationship develops romantic implications (Grisham 1992: 434).

Although, because of their dependence on more melodramatic plots, thrillers as a crime fiction genre may appear less realistic than Golden Age novels like Agatha Christie’s *The Mirror Crack’d from Side to Side* (1962), they also feature a social analysis that makes them a good source of varied linguistic interactions. The protagonists in both of these novels belong to the upper-middle class and have high status, even though Darby is still just a student. However, the Golden Age crime

fiction detective holds more power than the protagonist of the thriller; the former restores the social order after solving the crime.

5 THE SOCIAL WORLDS OF AGATHA CHRISTIE AND JOHN GRISHAM AND THEIR NOVELS *THE MIRROR CRACK'D FROM SIDE TO SIDE* (1962) AND *THE PELICAN BRIEF* (1992)

The present chapter discusses features of both the real-life societies viewed by Agatha Christie and John Grisham and the fictional societies of the two novels analysed in this paper. Christie's own experiences and observations of the upper-middle class described in *An Autobiography* (1977) are beneficial for the present analysis of social class and status in *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962), as they provide knowledge of the status markers of upper-middle class, making it easier to distinguish this from other classes depicted in the novel. Grisham, on the other hand, uses his knowledge of the legal world to create a suspenseful yet realistic story that readers would enjoy. Like his other novels, *The Pelican Brief* (1992) reflects what he sees as the moral decay of the American society of his time.

5.1 The social world of Agatha Christie

Agatha Christie's (1890-1976) crime fiction novels focus on, as John Scaggs (2005) states, the British upper-middle class, the class that Christie herself was born into (Rowland 2001: 1; Makinen 2006: 160). Milda Danytė claims that although 'Christie was a product of her social class and times, she was more tolerant of social change than many of her fellow Golden Age writers' (2011: 13). The reason for this may be that Christie experienced social change in the form of status loss in the early part of her life. As Christie (1977: 66) recounts in *An Autobiography* (1977), the 'financial affairs' of her family worsened for the first time when she was about five years old. This sub-section focuses on the life of Christie in the early period of the 1890s to the 1920s.

As Christie (1977: 17) states, she grew up in Torquay, 'then a fashionable winter resort', on the south coast of England. Her mother, Clara Boehmer, was the daughter of an officer in the Argyll Highlanders; however, after his death, she was adopted by her mother's rich sister (Christie 1977: 15). Living with her aunt, Christie's mother had 'all the so-called advantages of a comfortable home and a good education' (1977: 15). Christie's father, Frederick Miller, an American, did not work: as she notes, '[i]t was the days of independent incomes, and if you had an independent income you didn't work' (Christie 1977: 13). Christie states that her father 'spent his days at the Cricket Club, of which he was President' (1977: 13). As a child, Christie observed many elaborate dinner parties; as

she specifies, '[t]here was one big dinner party at our home every week' and her parents 'went out to dinner usually another two or three times a week' (1997: 14). Not having to work in order to earn money, Christie's family spent most of their time socialising with other members of the upper-middle class.

Christie, however, was very aware of relative levels in class and status. Although the meals her family served their guests were ample and expensive, her family was not as rich as people around it thought. She states that '[i]n contrast to most of our friends, we were not really well off. My father, as an American, was considered automatically to be "rich". All Americans were supposed to be rich. Actually he was merely comfortably off' (Christie 1997: 45). She lists status markers which her family lacked: 'we did not have a butler or a footman. We did not have a carriage and horses and a coachman. We had three servants, which was a minimum then' (1997: 45). Indeed, servants were not a luxury that only the rich could afford; the major difference, according to Christie, 'was that the rich had more' (1997: 28). Before her family's financial affairs worsened, it was mostly the small number of servants which indicated that they were not very rich.

Even though Christie's family did not have many servants, they did have certain luxurious possessions, status markers of the upper-middle class. Her mother, for instance, had quite a large amount of jewellery. Their home was decorated with oil paintings bought by Christie's father. Although, as Christie states, his 'taste in pictures was consistently bad', the furniture he bought was very good. According to her, '[h]e had a passion for antique furniture' such as 'the Sheraton desks and Chippendale chairs' (Christie 1997: 69). Christie (1997: 69) considers her family to have been collectors and refers to her own later collection of papier-mâché furniture.

Christie (1997: 99) also participated in many cultural activities that were status markers for members of the upper-middle class to prepare a young girl for a life in this class; she had music lessons and learned to play the piano. Christie had dance classes from the age of five or six, which, as she states, 'took place once a week, at something grandiosely called the Athenaeum Rooms, situated over a confectioner's shop' (Christie 1997: 101). Other high-status activities included going to the theatre.

Christie's father, as she explains, was 'a rich man's son and had taken it for granted that an assured income would always come in' (1977: 66). However, at one time the family was forced to move abroad, where the cost of living was much lower. As Christie puts it, they went to 'the South of France' and stayed temporarily at 'a fairly economical hotel' (1977: 67), thus losing status. She mentions that her home was rented to Americans, an event that has a kind of parallel in *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962), where a British country estate is bought by an American film director. After Christie's father died when she was eleven, the family suffered a stronger decline in

status. Their economic situation worsened and, as Christie indicates, ‘social occasions practically ceased’ (1997: 121).

When she was seventeen years old, Christie should have attended balls and parties in England to give her a chance to meet a suitable partner for marriage. Christie uses the common term ‘coming-out’ and states that ‘if you were well off, your mother gave a dance for you’ (1977: 170); then the girl would be invited to equivalent occasions. Because of their difficult economic situation, Christie’s mother understood that her daughter could not ‘enter society on the usual terms’ so that Christie had her ‘coming-out’ in more affordable Cairo, then a British colony, instead of London (Christie 1997: 171).

During her three months in Cairo, Christie learned to participate in the adult lifestyle of the upper-middle class. Back in England, she continued her social education through long stays at the country houses of her wealthier relatives and family friends (Christie 1977: 181). Christie’s observations of these classes and social behaviour in their large homes not only shaped her understanding of how class and status are maintained, but also became the basis for the depiction of society in her crime fiction. Although her knowledge of the upper-middle class is based on personal experience, her knowledge of village life is more superficial, as she never really lived in one, though she would have visited village shops and institutions both in Torquay and during the long visits with her relatives.

5.2 The social world of Christie’s *The Mirror Crack’d from Side to Side* (1962)

Christie’s *The Mirror Crack’d from Side to Side* specifically presents British society in transition in the second half of the twentieth century. Although society in this novel includes elements from both the old world and the new, Christie emphasises the inevitable social changes. As has been stated, her novel depicts three major social spaces: the village of St Mary Mead, the adjacent estate Gossington Hall, and a new suburb called the Development. In each of them there is a particular group of people with its social hierarchy, where each person occupies a certain position and has a specific kind of status within this space. This chapter discusses all three of the social spaces of the novel, the characters associated with them, and the change in the social world, taking into account the theoretical concepts of social class and status explained in Chapter Two.

Compared to Gossington Hall and the Development, St Mary Mead has maintained the most features of an older period. One such element is a personalised service by doctors. Doctors still come to treat their patients at their homes: for example, Miss Marple’s doctor, Dr Haydock is said to be ‘a very old friend. He had semi-retired, but came to attend certain of his old patients’ (Christie 1962: 33). In this way, St Mary Mead still retains a service that in the new elite world of Gossington

Hall is associated with wealthy Americans. Marina Gregg, a celebrated cinema star, has a personal live-in physician, Dr Maurice Gilchrist, who 'has a very big reputation. He's looked after Miss Gregg for many years now' (Christie 1962: 95).

Many residents of the village have lived here for a long time; some of them, including Miss Marple, are elderly so that they naturally maintain some of the habits of the older world. For example, people still use a specific transportation system in St Mary Mead, the taxis they call 'Inch'. This business has survived for a long period of time, though it has been owned by quite a few different people:

In days very long past, Mr. Inch had been the proprietor of two cabs, which met trains at the local station and which were also hired by the local ladies to take them 'calling', [...] In the fulness of time Inch, a cheery red-faced man of seventy odd, gave place to his son - known as 'young Inch' [...] To keep up with the times, young Inch abandoned horse vehicles for motor cars. He was not very good with machinery and in due course a certain Mr. Bardwell took over from him. The name Inch persisted. Mr. Bardwell in due course sold out to Mr. Roberts, but in the telephone book *Inch's Taxi Service* was still the official name, and the older ladies of the community continued to refer to their journeys as going somewhere 'in Inch' [...] (Christie 1962: 32)

This passage is a good example of how Christie's narrator emphasises the balance between tradition and change in this British village. Although this transportation system has existed for several generations, it cannot avoid changes, as horses and carriages have been replaced by cars. Like other elderly residents, Miss Marple herself still refers to taxis and their drivers as 'Inch', as she states: '[t]o me [...] he is Inch and always will be' (Christie 1962: 239). In this way she helps maintain this tie with the past.

The most visible feature of the old world in St Mary Mead, the houses, still remain. The major tendency is now for the well-off to move to the countryside, buy a traditional Victorian house and renovate it, but maintain its style. Because families buy the houses for their architectural quality, they only make changes that are essential to their modern lifestyles: for example, 'they just added another bathroom, and spent a good deal of money on plumbing, electric cookers, and dishwashers' (Christie 1962: 9). The changes made to the houses are minimal; nevertheless, the families who move in are of relatively higher class and status than former owners: often they have occupations such as bank managers (Christie 1962: 9).

However, Gossington Hall, a large house just outside the village, which is the second major social space in the novel, is an exception. Gossington Hall, a country estate that has 'the largest house in the neighbourhood' (Christie 1962: 77), undergoes more changes because of the sophisticated lifestyle of its new owners. A major difference between the new owners of houses in

St Mary Mead and Gossington Hall is their class and status. Earlier, the Hall belonged to Colonel Bantry and Mrs Bantry who, though not aristocracy, were rich and upper-middle class; their status was determined by the colonel's high post in the Armed Forces. After her husband's death, Mrs Bantry sold the house; eventually, the newest owners of Gossington Hall become Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd, Americans who belong to the new status group of the cinema rich, whose class and status are higher than those of the former owners because their occupation has made them both very wealthy and internationally celebrated.

Although Gossington Hall remains a Victorian house, Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd alter it so that it suits the current lifestyle of the international elite. In comparison to other new residents of St Mary Mead, who only add minor appliances such as electric cookers and dishwashers to their new homes, Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd make grandiose changes to the Hall. Mrs Bantry and Miss Marple's conversation indicates some of these:

'Bathrooms, I suppose?'

'Six new ones, I hear. And a palm court. And a pool. And what I believe they call picture windows, and they've knocked your husband's study and the library into one to make a music room.' (Christie 1962: 29)

As Miss Marple states, what was once a library and a study have been turned into a music room, which, like other luxuries such as the palm court and the pool, suggest that Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd are not only richer, but also more up-to-date than the Bantrys.

Even though Gossington Hall undergoes more significant changes than other houses in the neighbourhood of St Mary Mead, the changes occurring in the streets of the village and the rise of a new suburban area are even greater. The changes in the appearance of the streets of St Mary Mead signal that its society is entering the modern commercial world. For instance, the opening of a supermarket indicates that this transition into the modern also influences the social world of the village. The supermarket has replaced a local business: '[a]t the end of the street, however, where Mr. Toms had once had his basket shop stood a glittering new supermarket – anathema to the elderly ladies of St. Mary Mead' (Christie 1962: 9). Supermarkets usually require a staff of quite a few people, which means that more people can now be employed, get a higher income based on the type of work they do, and so raise their social class.

The Development, the third social space of the novel, represents the most significant change in the area, which is emphasised by Miss Marple's reference to it in the opening of the novel: '[b]eyond the Vicarage, there had been the stile and the field path with Farmer Giles's cattle beyond in the meadows where now–now ... The Development' (Christie 1962: 11). Both the Development

and the supermarket are elements of a new world that mark the village as being in transition. The old British village becomes more modern and suburban, yet Miss Marple, unlike other elderly ladies of St Mary Mead, is tolerant of this change. She asks herself: '[a]nd why not? [...] These things had to be. The houses were necessary, and they were very well built' (Christie 1962: 11). Unlike other elderly residents, Miss Marple actually welcomes change.

The residents of the Development signal the major change in the social world of the village, as they are the new lower-middle and upper-working classes. These people do not have a very high status, but their incomes are higher than their counterparts in the old system, as they can afford to buy new suburban houses. They are educated, but the kind of work they do rarely raises their status. Women from the Development are described as '[o]wing to the insidious snares of Hire Purchase, they were always in need of ready money, though their husbands all earned good wages; and so they came and did housework or cooking' (Christie 1962: 12). Although educated, these women take domestic work for additional income: for example, Cherry Baker, Miss Marple's new domestic, or as she calls her, 'my daily helper' (Christie 1962: 60), 'was an intelligent girl, took telephone calls correctly and was quick to spot inaccuracies in the tradesmen's books. She was not much given to turning mattresses [...]' (Christie 1962: 12). Cherry Baker is much better educated than traditional servants and is also married; she does not live with her employer and feels more independent.

One of the major changes in British society depicted in the novel is the disappearance of traditional servants. In the past, Miss Marple enjoyed the service of live-in servants such as 'Faithful Florence, for instance, that grenadier of a parlourmaid – and there had been Amy and Clara and Alice, those "nice little maids" – arriving from St. Faith's Orphanage, to be "trained," and then going on to better paid jobs elsewhere' (Christie 1962: 12). The maids trained at her home may have later gotten better jobs but they would still have been employed as live-in domestics because they had no education. These maids had more domestic skills than Cherry Baker but in comparison to her, they could not raise their status by applying for another occupation. Furthermore, in this changing society, domestic help of any kind is not easy to get. The lower-working class no longer wants to take live-in jobs.

As discussed in Chapter Two, in Donald J. Treiman's words, 'although wealth and power traditionally have been important dimensions of social stratification, in the modern world two other attributes have come to assume a central role: how much education people attain, and the kind of work they do, their occupations' (2001: 298). Christie's novel depicts a society in which these other two attributes are increasingly becoming the markers of higher social class and status. Young women like Cherry Baker now obtain education so that they would be able to attain higher status in the future, while the domestic housework they do for additional income helps them buy household

goods that are markers of suburban status such as a vacuum cleaner or a dishwasher. Unlike the traditional servants of the past, Cherry's status is not determined by the kind of work she does for additional income.

In the past, people were used to having a relatively large number of servants. As Christie recounts in *An Autobiography* (1977), '[s]ervants, of course, were not a particular luxury – it was not a case of only the rich having them; the only difference was that the rich had more' (1997: 28). The number of the servants one has can signal one's status. This is similar to Tak Wing Chan and John H. Goldthorpe's theory of signalling status through cultural consumption. As they put it, 'symbolic communication of status through cultural consumption' is 'whether intentionally or not, signalling to others who they are, and how they should be treated' (2007b: 1103). In Gossington Hall, Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd signal their status by the number and kinds of servants they have. When Mrs Bantry visits Marina Gregg, she is impressed that '[t]he door was opened with gratifying promptness by what was undeniably an Italian butler' (Christie 1962: 37). Moreover, Marina Gregg declares that they 'have an Italian cook and she makes quite a good pastry and cakes' (Christie 1962: 40). Their servants are foreigners, which adds to their prestige. Others in the village no longer have butlers but Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd are the elite and so they must have one as a marker of their class and status.

Within the text, the social space of Gossington Hall contains the most characters with high status. Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd's occupations grant them very high status. Marina Gregg is an international film star: 'not so young any more, but she'll always be a wonderful actress' (Christie 1962: 23). Her husband, Jason Rudd, according to his secretary Ella Zielinsky, is 'a genius [...] Have you seen any of the pictures he's directed' (Christie 1962: 45). Because of their occupations as a film actor and director, they belong to a new international elite whose lives are of public interest: for example, they are written about extensively in popular magazines. This is similar to Chan and Goldthorpe's comments on the public family background of the elite as a marker of status (2007b: 1103). Marina Gregg's whole life is treated by journalists as public, as Mrs Bantry states, 'I get it from the extraordinary magazines I read at my hairdresser's' (Christie 1962: 29). Marina Gregg is often the subject of gossip by people who do not know her, which is also a marker of status.

Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd also signal their high status through their expensive lifestyle and cultural consumption. This fits in with Pierre Bourdieu's theory that elites 'signal their class status superiority through sophisticated speech, clothing, and tastes in art' (Bourdieu 1984, cited in Ridgeway 2014: 4). Marina Gregg owns many expensive possessions similar to those that Christie describes that she, as a member of the upper-middle class had in the early twentieth century. When discussing her future at Gossington Hall, Marina Gregg mentions her 'lovely Georgian tea service'

(Christie 1962: 37). The home is decorated with Italian paintings: for example, '[i]n the centre was an Italian Madonna and a child' (Christie 1962: 92-93). All of these possessions are luxurious and indicate that Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd enjoy a sophisticated lifestyle; their interest in music and Italian art suggests a high level of cultural consumption, and so a high status.

Cecilia L. Ridgeway's theory of status in modern society can also be applied in this case. She emphasises that 'status is based on widely shared beliefs about the social categories or "types" of people that are ranked by society as more esteemed and respected compared to others' (2014: 3); her theory refers to stereotyping of a particular status group. An example of this is the swimming pool that Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd install at Gossington Hall, which arouses local people's attention: '[m]ost people's ideas of Hollywood stars were of sun-bathing by a pool in exotic surroundings and in exotic company' (Christie 1962: 49). The pool at the Hall is described as 'almost exactly what everyone had imagined it to be' (Christie 1962: 49) so that it corresponds with the stereotype held by others about the lifestyle of the upper class.

Although other high or relatively high-status characters, such as Ardwyck Fenn, Lola Brewster, and Margot Bence, do not live in Gossington Hall, they belong to Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd's social circle. Their general status, like Marina and Jason's, is determined by their occupations. Ardwyck Fenn is an investor, 'quite a big figure in American Television' and 'Moving Picture world' (Christie 1962: 149, 94), and 'an old friend of Marina's a good many years ago when she was married to her second husband' (Christie 1962: 94). Lola Brewster is described as a 'Moving Picture Star' from the United States (Christie 1962: 133). She 'was formerly married to Marina Gregg's second or third husband. She didn't like it when Marina Gregg took her husband away' (Christie 1962: 132). Fenn and Brewster, like Marina and Jason, are rich Americans, world-known figures, in the cinema, so their status is high.

Another significant character, Margot Bence's personal and financial status is considerably lower but her occupation raises her status. She is a highly successful photographer: '[s]he takes all the fashionable things – First Nights, Gala Performances – specializes in photographs from unusual angles' (Christie 1962: 154). She states that she has 'got some influence with studio people' (Christie 1962: 178). She belongs to a profession that, through its connection to the world of the arts, is now an elite one. Now Margot is a successful middle-class professional. Her studio, however, is 'in a cul-de-sac off the Tottenham Court Road' (Christie 1962: 164), which is not a very prestigious neighbourhood and indicates that she has not become upper-middle class in financial terms.

Jason Rudd's employees, Ella Zielinsky and Hailey Preston, also belong to the social space of Gossington Hall, but their status is lower than his. Jason refers to Ella Zielinsky as his secretary

(Christie 1962: 42), but she herself states that her 'job is to look after Miss Gregg's social life, her public and private engagements, and to supervise in some degree the running of the house' (Christie 1962: 114). Although she is concerned with some domestic affairs, Ella is not a servant, and her occupation grants her a higher status than that of the Italian butler Giuseppe and the cook Bianca. Hailey Preston's occupation is very similar to Ella Zielinsky's, 'a kind of public relations or personal assistant, or private secretary, or more likely, a mixture of all three, to Jason Rudd' (Christie 1962: 90). His status, like Ella's, is higher than that of domestics because of his occupation. Both he and Ella seem well educated and middle-class in background.

Though he does not live in the village, Chief-Inspector Dermot Craddock belongs to the social circle of St Mary Mead, as he has family ties to Miss Marple. As typical of Golden Age crime fiction, the detective, as Lee Horsley puts it, is 'closely identified with the privileged class' (2005: 39). He comes from the same class as Miss Marple, who is middle middle class and of relatively high status. Craddock, who comes from Scotland Yard (Christie 1962: 168), the highest of police forces in England, also has ties with the aristocracy because his godfather was Sir Henry Clithering (Christie 1962: 128). During the course of the narrative, his occupation grants him status because he is the leading investigator.

Heather Badcock, who is poisoned at the fête, and her husband, Arthur Badcock, live in the Development but have a higher status than other residents there such as Gladys Dixon and Cherry and Jim Baker. Arthur Badcock is 'in *Biddle & Russell*, the estate agents and valuers' (Christie 1962: 89, italics in the original). This is a good job that provides enough income to buy property. It is Heather's volunteer work, however, that raises their status enough to be invited to the private reception at the fête. As Cherry Baker explains, '[s]he'd been taken into the house because of her being the secretary of the St. John Ambulance' (Christie 1962: 58). Normally they would not be invited but Heather played an important role in organising the fête.

Since Gladys Dixon also lives in the Development, in some sense she belongs to the same social class as the Badcocks. However, she works at Gossington Hall in 'the canteen at the studios' and also helps with catering during the fête (Christie 1962: 186-187). Cherry and Jim Baker's status and class should be the same as Gladys Dixon's. Like Gladys, Cherry does domestic work to earn extra income. Jim is a kind of engineering technician, possibly working in a factory, as Cherry suggests to Miss Marple that 'Jim could fix things things for you any time—you know, plumbing or a bit of carpentry' (Christie 1962: 237). Since they can afford a new house, they are at least upper-working class; nevertheless, their lifestyle, especially cultural consumption, suggests that they have risen to lower-middle class. For example, Jim Baker enjoys classical music and knows a good deal about it (Christie 1962: 182). Their cultural consumption of traditionally higher class music signals

a change in British society, as it is no longer so easy to distinguish members of the working class from those of the middle class.

In *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side*, Christie depicts a part of British society which is in transition. Not only is the village of St Mary Mead becoming more modern and suburbanised, but the construction of its social world is rapidly changing as well. The lower class has become more divided and prosperous, as working people are able to attain education and can afford to buy property and goods. Although some minor elements of the old world still remain, one clear change for its residents is the disappearance of traditional live-in servants, and the higher status that paid domestic work now acquires. As a Golden Age crime fiction novel that is realistic, *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* provides detailed descriptions of the people belonging to different classes and having different status, which also affects their use of language in interpersonal relations.

5.3 The social and legal world of John Grisham

The American novelist John Grisham (b. 1955) is a lawyer by profession, drawing on his own experience in portraying everyday legal processes. However, as a writer, he understands what interests readers more. In an interview with Allen Pusey about the image of legal practice in popular culture, Grisham expresses his opinion on his audience's preferences: 'There are a lot of small-town lawyers who are honest and hard-working. They do their jobs and serve their community—writing wills, teaching Sunday school, serving in the local legislature. But nobody wants to read about that' (Grisham in Pusey 2011). In Grisham's views, readers want an exciting intrigue; he further adds that '[readers] want to read about the lawyer that lies to his client, steals all the money, fakes his own death and flies to Brazil. They want to read about a hard-working young lawyer who gets an offer at a law firm that on the surface is respectable, but turns out to be controlled by the mob' (Grisham in Pusey 2011). Here he asserts that the moral decay typically depicted in legal thrillers is central to the power of such novels over contemporary readers.

Since he understands his audience's preferences, his work does not so much reflect his own moral values; rather, it reveals those of the corrupt American society he lives in. As a young lawyer, Grisham demonstrated his own idealism by wanting to help ordinary people in need: 'I had a hard time saying no to people in trouble. [...] So I took a lot of cases I shouldn't've taken just because folks needed help' (Grisham in CBS 2016). At the age of twenty-eight Grisham was elected to a seat in the Mississippi State Legislature (Grisham 2010). His motive for running at that time was, as he explains, 'to try and help improve the public educational system in the state of Mississippi at the time' (Grisham in Rhem 2016). He became a lawyer and joined a political institution to advance just causes, very much like many protagonists of legal thrillers.

As a lawyer and state representative, Grisham quickly achieved high occupational status; nonetheless, this was not always the case in his earlier life. Born to a construction worker and a home-maker, as stated in the biographical section of his official homepage ('Biography' 2017), Grisham grew up in the working class as a child. Although Grisham (2010) does not dwell on the financial difficulties of his family, the fact that he started working in his early teens suggests that he needed money. The only jobs he could get were low-paying, low-status, and mostly involved physical labour.

Just like many other writers of thrillers Grisham sets his novels in contemporary American legal institutions instead of focusing on international conflicts. As Danytė puts it, 'since the demise of the Soviet Union [writers] prefer to [...] locate their villains within [...] American institutions, which they present as thoroughly corrupt, especially within the ranks of the leaders' (2012: 213). This fits in with the anxiety that American readers feel about their own society and its legal system. According to Jennifer Rubin, '[a]n intellectual revolution that began in the 1940s and 1950s has bequeathed to us our present-day legal system — hyperactive, expansionist, and ruinously expensive' (2009: 56). Her description of the legal system in the United States emphasises its corruption, though she also sees courts as places that make social change possible. Furthermore, Rubin indicates that recently powerful institutions have been punished for injustice towards the less powerful:

Previously obscure disciplines in the realm of civil litigation (tort law, environmental law, occupational-safety law) became the means whereby judges and juries were urged successfully by crusading lawyers to use their power over the pocketbooks of governments, corporations, and well-insured medical professionals to "teach a lesson" to those who had supposedly made less powerful and less protected people suffer. (Rubin 2009: 56)

The situation described by Rubin is like that of legal thrillers, where corporations and governmental institutions are corrupt and a small number of honest lawyers are the heroes that use their power to defeat injustice.

Although Grisham does not explore this issue in *The Pelican Brief*, he has criticised the legal profession. Grisham agrees that lawyers have helped to change the social and legal system in the United States, but also believes that they have often abused their positions. As he puts it, many lawyers are 'polluting their own profession' (Grisham in Pusey 2011). Pusey summarises Grisham's ideas on this issue: Grisham 'understands the pressures — of finance, of ego — that cause lawyers to take risks or outright liberties with their cases, rather than to play them straight' (2011). In general, then, Grisham is a writer concerned with moral issues, yet not so idealistic that he does not understand the many weak points of the upper level of American society.

5.4 The social world of Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* (1992)

Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* has its focus on what Donald J. Treinman (2001) discusses as two markers of social status that became major ones in the mid and late-twentieth century: education and occupation. However, this particular novel portrays an American society that is less formal than one may expect, considering that many characters belong to very prestigious institutions, such as elite universities and the federal government. The majority of the characters have high public status, including the president and his advisers, the heads of the CIA and FBI, university professors, millionaire businessmen, and journalists working for some of the most influential American newspapers. There are a small number of characters of lower status, such as a janitor working at the White House and his son, who is a police officer. Two major characters, the protagonist Darby Shaw, a law student, and Khamel, an international professional killer, have more ambiguous status. However, power relations inside and between these social status groups are distributed in a rather atypical way and often depend on personal and cross-status relationships.

The novel depicts in detail some people of great power in Washington political circles, but reveals that the person with the highest status, the President of the United States, though outwardly treated according to his rank, is actually not respected by most of the leading figures who work closely with him. This disrespect towards the President in particular is expressed bluntly when another powerful Washington figure, Denton Voyles, chief of the FBI, is the focalizer: '[i]t was a dark day for the Bureau, and he could feel the heat coming. But he'd survived five Presidents, and he could certainly outmaneuver this idiot' (Grisham 1992: 39). Although he holds the very highest post in the government, the President in this novel is shown as a person with little or no real power, since he is seen as unintelligent and manipulated by his staff. The President's lack of power is evident in relation to his Chief of Staff, Fletcher Coal, shown as more powerful than the President: '[m]any viewed him as the real boss. The mere mention of his name terrified lowly staffers' (Grisham 1992: 37). Whereas the President is considered a weak and stupid man, his chief assistant is feared; however, neither the President nor Coal are truly respected.

The interactions among the people in the government circle are more often defined by their personal relationships rather than their official status. The President, Coal, Voyles, and Bob Gminski, the head of the CIA, belong to the most powerful group and, as heads of governmental institutions, they often work together. However, their behaviour towards each other depends on their personal feelings: they know each other well, but are not friends and their relations are hostile. Coal's description as 'a guileful manipulator and a nasty henchman who had cut and clawed his way through the inner circle until he was now second in command' (Grisham 1992: 36) indicates that he is not liked by the presidential circle. Relationships between the President on one side and Voyles

and Gminski on the other are those of very strong dislike: '[the President] hated Voyles and Gminski, and they hated him' (Grisham 1992: 38). Such relations create tension and ambiguity in formal verbal exchanges: being a member of such a high social status group requires one to be polite so that forms of address like *Mr* or *Sir* (Grisham 1992: 40) are frequently used by these characters, but they are a mere formality and no longer express true respect; they are just a means of what Goffman (1967) and Brown and Levinson (1987) define as protecting one's face.

In the case of the novel, characters of lower or even very low social status can come to have power over the President, eventually helping to bring him down. As a political figure with very high status who is suspected of being involved in a crime, the President becomes the target of the media, especially Gray Grantham, a young reporter for the *Washington Post* (Grisham 1992: 400-401). At the end of the novel the President and Coal's involvement with a major crime is exposed, ruining their reputations and the President's chances of re-election. This would not have been possible if a janitor working for the Oval Office, Sarge, had not assisted Grantham with information. Often physically close to the President, Sarge 'picked up after some terribly important people who were often too busy to watch their words, especially in the presence of poor old Sarge' (Grisham 1992: 94). An 'old, partially disabled black janitor' who deliberately exaggerates his failings (Grisham 1992: 94), Sarge has a very low status because of his job, race, and low education, but gains power over the President by obtaining highly compromising information.

In the novel another social space of high status is an American private university, Tulane in New Orleans. In 'US News Report Law School Rankings' of 2017 Tulane's Law School is ranked 50 out of 145 American university law schools. This can be compared to the law school of University of Mississippi, the state university from which Grisham graduated ('Biography' 2017); this is ranked 106 ('Law School Numbers' 2017). On the official homepage of Tulane Law School, the tuition fee for the 2017-2018 academic year for a full-time student is '\$54,658 (\$50,358 tuition and \$4,300 in mandatory fees), and the budgeted amount for all other educational expenses that can be covered by financial aid (room, board, books, transportation and other) is \$22,676' (Tulane 2017). In comparison, the tuition fee at University of Mississippi for the resident of the state is \$15,882 for an academic year, while a non-resident would pay \$35,254 (Ole Miss Law 2017). Matt Leichter (2017) indicates that in 1996 the tuition fee at Tulane was \$22,076, while it was \$3,181 at the University of Mississippi. Even though the specific figures were different at the time the novel was written, Tulane has long been a very prestigious private university, which indicates that its students come from a high social class.

Tulane grants high occupational status to people that work there, of whom Professor Thomas Callahan is an example. However, in his case, his social status is actually higher than

average. Within Tulane (Grisham 1992: 13), Thomas Callahan is deeply respected by the students: '[h]e was also popular because he taught constitutional law, a most unpopular course but a required one. Due to his sheer brilliance and coolness he actually made con law interesting. No one else at Tulane could do this. [...] [T]he students fought to sit in con law under Callahan [...]' (Grisham 1992: 13). Callahan's occupation grants him high status, but he is also admired for his personal qualities, which exemplifies Treinman's theory that 'the achievement of socioeconomic status [...] is determined as much by a combination of individual traits' (2001: 304).

Although the protagonist of the novel, Darby Shaw, moves in the same social space as Callahan, her social status is lower than his because she is still a young student. Despite being financially well-off with an inheritance of a hundred thousand dollars that investments have doubled (Grisham 1992: 120), Darby's status is ambiguous: on one hand she belongs to the upper-middle class based on her financial situation, but on the other hand she is still a student. Because she is also attractive and intelligent, she is admired as a woman and liked by her peers: '[f]or two brutal years now, one of the few pleasures of law school had been to watch as she graced the halls and rooms with her long legs and baggy sweaters' (Grisham 1992: 14). Still, it is not only her personal beauty that gives Darby a special position. Indeed, she 'adhered to the law school dress code of jeans and flannel shirts' (Grisham 1992: 14), not trying to use her physical charm.

It is Darby's intelligence that wins her respect, suggesting that she will raise her status professionally in the future. This is made evident in Callahan's class, when she is the only student to know the answers:

She had saved them again. It was sort of expected of her. Number two in their class and within striking distance of number one, she could recite the facts and holdings and concurrences and dissents and majority opinions to virtually every case Callahan could spit at them. She missed nothing. The perfect little cheerleader had graduated magna cum laude with a degree in biology, and planned to graduate magna cum laude with a degree in law, and then take a nice living suing chemical companies for trashing the environment. (Grisham 1992: 17)

Given that Darby is gaining an excellent education, not only in law but also in biology, she will probably be a highly skilled lawyer in the future, which in the United States will grant her wealth and a very high occupational status.

While Darby, with her plans to fight for ecological issues, is presented as a very positive character, Victor Mattiece, an ambitious businessman who uses any means, including violence, to expand his financial empire, is the best example in the novel of the moral decay gradually destroying American society. His wealth already allows him to own estates in Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, and the Bahamas (Grisham 1992: 410). However, as an oil tycoon, he desires to gain even more profit

and power: he ‘wanted desperately to win the lawsuit and eventually harvest millions of barrels of oil from the swamplands of Terrebone Parish, Louisiana’ (Grisham 1992: 380). This project would cause major environmental damage, including destroying the home of Louisiana’s state bird, the brown pelican. To achieve his goal, Mattiece hires a professional assassin to kill two judges at the Supreme Court, Rosenberg and Jensen, who are likely to vote against his lawsuit. Darby realises this: ‘[s]omeone or some group wants a different Court, one with an absolute conservative majority. The election is next year. [The judges] could die soon, or live ten more years’ (Grisham 1992: 46). As part of his scheme, Mattiece offers the President “four point two million [dollars]” (Grisham 1992: 410) in support funding to turn a blind eye to his activities.

An interesting aspect of Mattiece’s plans is how it involves him in a cross-status relationship with an extremely professional assassin named Khamel. Although relations do exist, no direct communication between the characters occurs. Their relationship is a cross-status one, as Khamel’s status is very ambiguous. In American society it is technically very low because he is a criminal, but at the same time he is an expensive professional and works internationally, so that his status is very high among people like Mattiece. Khamel’s social status is higher than that of other professional killers because of his skill: ‘a man of many names and faces and languages, an assassin who struck quickly and left no trail, a fastidious killer who roamed the world but could never be found’ (Grisham 1992: 24). Credited with many global crimes, such as an attempt to kill the Pope (Grisham 1992: 25), Khamel is feared by the public, giving him a kind of power and celebrity.

This is very similar to Chan and Goldthorpe’s comments on the public family background of the elite as a marker of status (2007b: 1103) in that Khamel’s criminal life is partly public, which grants him fame and approval inside his own status group; Khamel is elite in criminal society. This also exemplifies Millner’s theory that although one’s status is affected by approval or disapproval of the society, it can also be affected by a more legal type of approval or disapproval, for example, by criminal records (Millner 2010: 295). While his criminal record acts as a type of approval for Khamel, they would mean disapproval for Mattiece: Mattiece’s reputation would be harmed by being involved with Khamel, although Khamel’s professional reputation would be enhanced if his involvement in the murders of the judges of the American Supreme Court were revealed.

The American Supreme Court appears in the novel mainly as a very high-status, powerful group of judges who, like the president, is not necessarily treated or act in accordance to their status. In addition, like the President, who is held to be a satirical representation of Ronald Reagan (Danytè 2012: 221), the judges are mostly depicted as eccentric figures. The aged judge Abraham Rosenberg is a liberal who fights for racial equality and the environment; those with opposing views express open hatred by picketing the court building with signs that say ‘Death to Rosenberg. Retire

Rosenberg. Cut Off the Oxygen' (Grisham 1992: 3). He becomes Mattiece's target, as Rosenberg would probably stop him from expanding his oil drilling. However, he is acknowledged to be active and intelligent, unlike the other judge, who is killed by Khamel.

This character, Glenn Jensen, who is looked down upon by other members of the Court, is much younger. Chief Justice John Runyan expresses his startlingly frank opinion about Jensen: 'he's an embarrassment. Now he thinks he's a liberal. Votes like Rosenberg half the time. Next month, he'll be a white supremacist and support segregated schools. Then he'll fall in love with the Indians and want to give them Montana. It's like having a retarded child' (Grisham 1962: 8). Jensen's current environmental stance also makes him Mattiece's target. In his private life, Jensen takes high risks: as a homosexual, he frequently attends a theatre to watch 'naked and quite active men on the screen' (Grisham 1992: 32). Drawing on Chan and Goldthorpe's (2007b: 1103) suggestion that people may also deliberately display their status through their cultural consumption to analyse Jensen's behaviour, it can be said that he openly demonstrates his unworthiness for and disregard for the type of status he holds. He refuses to admit even to himself that it is inappropriate for a person in his position: 'if he was caught or recognised, or in some awful way exposed, he would simply claim he was doing research for an obscenity case pending' (Grisham 1992: 33). He even cynically assumes that since judges are appointed to the Supreme Court for life, he could never lose his job (Grisham 1992: 34).

This depiction of high status figures running the United States indicates that often they do not live up to general expectations about the people in such positions. Like the President, who is shown as spending most of his time practising golf shots in the Oval Office (Grisham 1992: 49), other very responsible figures in the United States are satirised as childish and irresponsible. In reference to Ridgeway's (2014) theory of beliefs shared about particular social status groups by others, these characters disregard the beliefs held by lower status groups about the behaviour expected from a higher status member. They fail to follow what Millner refers to as 'a key source of status', which means 'conforming to the norms of the group [...] expressing the right values and beliefs, and using the proper symbols' (2010: 297). In this way, they simply do not behave in accordance to their status, though they do exploit the privileges granted by it.

Grisham portrays a serious decline in the moral values of those in the American government. High-status individuals are no longer necessarily worthy of respect. This makes it possible for low-status individuals to hold power over high-status ones, as in the cases of Sarge, who leaks secret information, and Khamel, a criminal outside American society, who is powerful because he can be hired to kill anyone. Darby also gradually becomes a threat to the high-status individuals like the President, Fletcher Coal, and Victor Mattiece because of her knowledge, though she has virtually no

power to punish them and has to hide to protect herself. The social world of *The Pelican Brief* unmasks the true nature of the American elite, as society is becoming more and more materialistic and corrupt.

6 ANALYSIS OF FORMS OF ADDRESS AND TERMS OF REFERENCE IN AGATHA CHRISTIE'S *THE MIRROR CRACK'D FROM SIDE TO SIDE* (1962) AND ITS TRANSLATION *PERSKILĖS VEIDRODIS* (2000) BY RASA KIRVAITYTĖ

This chapter analyses Rasa Kirvaitytė's translation of Agatha Christie's *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* in regard to the forms of address and terms of reference used by and about major and selected minor characters. Like forms of address, terms of reference signal a character's status; however, they are usually used when the character referred to is absent and so reveal whether or not the speaker recognises and accepts that character's status. The chapter focuses on forms of address, terms of reference, and the use of singular and plural second-person pronouns (T/V distinction) as markers of social status, politeness, and solidarity in the source novel's Lithuanian equivalent.

6.1 General tendencies in translating forms of address and terms of reference in Kirvaitytė's *Perskilės Veidrodis* (2000)

Once all the instances of translations of forms of address and terms of reference have been collected, it becomes possible to consider what kinds of choices the translator makes. Overall, Rasa Kirvaitytė displays faithfulness to the English text in translating almost all the occurrences: the number of forms of address and terms of reference in the Lithuanian version is similar to that for Christie's novel (see Appendices 4 and 5, Tables 6-45). The present sub-section carries out both quantitative and qualitative analyses of Rasa Kirvaitytė's choice of strategies in translating forms of address and terms of references used by and for those characters, with the focus on problematic cases. As has been said, generally, the translator is faithful to the source text, though in some cases, omission and translation mistakes occur in the target text.

The majority of occurrences in the source text have corresponding equivalents in the target text; many of them are exact translations, while others use synonymous words, which results in a greater lexical variety in the Lithuanian version. For example, Miss Marple is addressed as *Aunt Jane* seven times in the source text and as *tetule Džeine* seven times in the target text (see Table 6 in

Appendix 4). Similarly, Marina Gregg is referred to as *Marina Gregg* by other characters in conversation ninety-eight times in both English and Lithuanian texts (see Table 8 in Appendix 4). On the other hand, Miss Marple is addressed as *dear* thirteen times in the English text, but this is translated as *brangute* eleven times and, once each, as *brangioji* and *mieloji* so that the total number of occurrences is also thirteen (see Table 6 in Appendix 4). Another example is that in the source text Gladys Dixon is referred to as *that girl* by Miss Marple and Chief-Inspector Craddock twice, while in the target text this is translated as *ta mergytė* and *ta mergaitė*, each synonym occurring once and adding up to the same total number of two (see Table 32 in Appendix 5).

Even though the general figures for the Lithuanian text correspond to those of the English source text, as most forms of address or terms of reference have their equivalent in the translated text, some forms and terms replace others, which results in certain terms being more frequent in the target text than in the source text. For example, *dear* and *brangute* both occur fourteen times in their respective texts, but it should be noted that this is not because *brangute* is always translated as *dear*, as is indicated in Tables 6, 10, and 11 in Appendix 4. *Brangioji* and *mieloji* are also used to translate *dear*, as both *mieloji* and *brangioji* occur twice where *dear* is used. The target text in this case is more lexically varied, as there are three Lithuanian words used for a single English one.

However, there are instances where the source text is more lexically varied than the translation. Heather Badcock is referred to as *this woman*, *that woman*, and *the woman* in the source text (see Table 44 in Appendix 5) but only as *ta moteris* in the target text. Mrs Bantry is referred to using her last name; the family name (see Table 29 in Appendix 5) in the source text is translated as *Bentri* in the target text, even though the family name *the Bantrys* requires a plural form *Bentriai* in Lithuanian. This results in Mrs Bantry being referred to as *Bentri* in the target text more often than in the source text. This example illustrates the greater lexical variety of the source text, as well as indicating one of several mistakes made by the translator.

Although in the majority of cases a form of address or a term of reference is translated using an equivalent or a synonym, there are not only passages in which several different forms and terms are translated by using a single term, but also four instances of omission. Apart from these omissions (see examples (1)-(4) and Tables 6, 23, 27, and 44 in Appendices 4 and 5, where ‘-’ marks the omissions), the total number of other forms of address and terms of reference corresponds in the source and target texts.

(1) **ST:** *You’ve always stuck to that, **Jane*** (Christie 1962: 30)

TT: *Tu visada laikeisi šios nuomonės* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 28)

(2) **ST:** *I don’t remember his name, and an arty girl from London, who rather specialises in queer angle*

shots. **Her camera was set right up in that corner so that she could get a view of Miss Gregg receiving.** Ah, now let me think, I rather fancy that that was when Ardwyck Fenn arrived (Christie 1962: 94)

TT: Buvo pora fotografų, vienas vietinis, nepamenu jo pavardės, ir meniška mergiotė iš Londono, kurios specialybė – keistos kampinės nuotraukos. Na, palaukit, man rodos, kad tada atvyko Ardvikas Fenas (Kirvaitytė 2000: 88)

- (3) **ST:** “Well, I never!” exclaimed Heather. “So you’re Miss Marple. I’ve heard about you. You’re the one who does all the murders.”

“**Heather!** What do you—”

“Oh, you know what I mean. Not actually do murders — find out about them. That’s right, isn’t it?” Miss Marple murmured modestly that she had been mixed-up in murders once or twice (Christie 1962: 23)

TT: Na, nieko sau! - riktelėjo Hetera. - Tad jūs esate mis Marpl. Girdėjau apie jus. Jūs viena iš tų, kurie tvarkosi su žmogžudystėmis. Mis Marpl kukliai sumurmėjo, kad ji porą kartų buvo įpainiota į žmogžudystes (Kirvaitytė 2000: 21)

- (4) **ST:** *The dead woman* — her name is **Mrs Heather Badcock** — was the local secretary of this and had done most of the administrative work for the fête (Christie 1962: 78)

TT: *Velionė Hetera Bedkok* buvo vietinio asociacijos poskyrio sekretorė ir ėmėsi beveik visų organizavimo darbų (Kirvaitytė 2000: 74)

In examples (1)-(4), the forms of address, the title and the sentence in bold in the English text are omitted in Kirvaitytė’s translation. In example (4), two terms of references are merged into one and the title *Mrs* is omitted. This section does not aim to analyse the translator’s choices, only to present figures; however, it is worth noting that the English words, except for example (4), are not complicated and should not pose problems for the translator so that the strategy of omission here stands out, given Kirvaitytė’s overall faithfulness to the source text.

Despite being generally accurate in regard to forms of address and terms of reference, Kirvaitytė makes both additions to and translation mistakes in her target text, which results in minor inaccuracies. Table 1 presents mistranslations of forms of address and terms of reference, taking data from the tables found in Appendices 4 and 5:

Table 1. Mistranslations of forms of address and terms of reference in Kirvaitytė's *Perskilęs Veidrodis*.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Miss Gregg (e.g. pp. 141, 145, 149)	13	Misis Greg (pp. 136, 137, 138)	3
2	Dear, Dear (interjection) (pp. 14, 15, 204, 210)	4	Brangute, brangute (pp. 13, 14)	2
			Brangute (pp. 190, 195)	2
3	You folk over here (p. 43)	1	Jūsų žmonės (p. 40)	1
No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Miss Gregg (e.g. pp. 94, 137, 147)	25	Misis Greg (p. 129)	1
2	Miss Marina Gregg (pp. 73, 137, 255)	3	Misis Marina Greg (p. 129)	1
3	Miss Brewster (pp. 147, 148, 199)	3	Misis Briuster (p. 138)	2
4	The Bantrys (p. 246)	1	Bentri (p. 228)	1
5	Miss Lola Brewster (p. 145)	1	Misis Lola Briuster (p. 136)	1
6	Margot Bence, personality photographer (p. 199)	1	Margo Bens, asmeninė fotografė (p. 186)	1

As seen in Table 1, the most frequent mistranslation is using *misis* (Eng. Mrs) instead of *mis* for the English *Miss*, which changes the characters' marital status. This error appears inconsistently so that it hardly affects the overall accuracy of the translation: *misis Greg* occurs three times out of thirteen instances with this character, while in other cases Kirvaitytė uses *mis Greg*, which shows that *misis* is an error that was probably not intended. The same mistake appears in cases of referring to Miss Marina Gregg and Miss Lola Brewster, as *Miss* is translated as *misis*, especially often in referring to Lola Brewster.

Dear, dear is an interjection that, as stated in *Merriam Webster* online dictionary, is 'used especially to express annoyance or dismay' (2017), but it is translated here as a form of address. *You folk* is an address form used for Mrs Bantry (see Table 10 in Appendix 4) by which she is categorised as a local villager but Kirvaitytė turns it into a term of reference for the locals. Another mistranslation occurs in regard to Margot Bence's profession: *personality photographer* is translated as *asmeninė fotografė* (backtranslation: *personal photographer*), which is inaccurate, as according to the *Merriam Webster Dictionary*, 'personality' may also mean 'a person of importance, prominence, renown, or notoriety: a TV personality' (2017); Margot Bence's profession is that of a celebrity photographer.

In many other instances Kirvaitytė makes changes that cannot be considered to be mistakes, as they do not change the meaning of the source text but rather make the target text sound more vivid and more appropriate for the speakers of the target language. These changes are presented in Table 2, taking data from the tables found in Appendices 4 and 5:

Table 2. Changes and additions to forms of address and terms of reference in Kirvaitytė's *Perskilęs Veidrodis*.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Mr Fenn (e.g. pp. 159, 200, 202)	13	Ardvikai Fenai (p. 150)	1
2	Jim (pp. 182, 823)	2	Džimi (p. 171)	1
3	Old girl (p. 184)	1	Motin (p. 173)	1
4	You old jelly-bag (p. 206)	1	Tu sena karve (p. 191)	1
No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Mr Ardwyck Fenn (pp. 145, 147, 200)	3	Ardvikas Fenas (p. 187)	1
2	The girl he had married (p. 255)	1	Moterį, kurią vedė (p. 235)	1
3	Darling Marina (p. 157)	1	Marinutė (p. 148)	1
4	That old woman (p. 194)	1	Prakeikta senė (p. 182)	1
5	Gladdy (p. 184)	1	Gledisė (p. 173)	1
6	That old cat of a White Knight of hers (p. 180)	1	Sena katė mis Nait (p. 169)	1
7	Our doctor (p. 33)	1	Mūsų daktarėlis (p. 31)	1
8	Some wretched local woman (p. 169)	1	Vietinė moteris (p. 158)	1

As Table 2 indicates, the form of address *Mr Fenn* and the term of reference *Mr Ardwyck Fenn* are translated as *Ardvikai Fenai* and *Ardvikas Fenas* in some instances. Although out of context the decision to drop the title denotes rudeness, Kirvaitytė compensates by maintaining the use of the second-person plural pronoun: 'Jūs gerai ją pažįstate, Ardvikai Fenai?' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 148). The translation of *Jim* as *Džimi* is an addition that is not present in the source text; possibly the translator wants to emphasise intimacy and solidarity between the speakers. Even though in English *Jim* as a shorter form of *James* is already very informal, the Lithuanian *Džimi* is the equivalent of the English *Jimmy*, which is not used in the English novel. *Old girl* and *motin* in Lithuanian are what Wardhaugh refers to as 'pet names' (2006); Jim uses *old girl* to address his wife Cherry affectionately. *The girl he had married* is translated as *moterį, kurią vedė*, making the character seem older in the Lithuanian version.

The rude phrase *You old jelly-bag* is translated as *tu sena karve*, which is a more familiar rude metaphorical expression in Lithuanian. *Darling Marina* and *our doctor* are translated using the diminutive forms *Marinutė* and *mūsų daktarėlis*, making them sound more familiar to the Lithuanian readers; this compensates for translating the diminutive name *Gladdy* with the full name *Gledisė*. The translation of *that old cat of a White Knight of hers* and *some wretched woman* as *sena katė mis Nait* and *vietinė moteris* display meaningful omissions. In the first case, the expression is not familiar to the target audience, as it is culturally-loaded: the White Knight is a character in

Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (1998). In the case of *some wretched woman*, the term of reference is made neutral as *vietinė moteris* and does not imply any evaluation of the character made by the speaker. *That old woman* is translated as *prakeikta senė* based on the context of the reference: 'damn that old woman' (Christie 1962: 194). Even though the term of reference is changed, the meaning is rendered accurately.

The most evident tendency in translating forms of address and terms of reference is to maintain the English titles and other words that are culturally loaded, since they are more typical in that culture. As seen in Tables 6-45 in Appendices 4 and 5, Kirvaitytė maintains the use of titles such as *Miss, Mrs, Mr, Madam, Mam, and Ser* (*mis, misis, misteris, madam, mem, and seras*), and the word *lady* (*ledi*), which are not standard in Lithuanian culture. As Ambrazas and colleagues indicate, in the Lithuanian language 'as a polite form of address to one person, the plural pronoun *jūs* "you" and the nouns *ponas* "Mister", *ponia* "Madam", *panelė* "Miss" are used with the 2nd person plural form of a verb' (2006: 479). For example, based on the findings from *Dabartinės Lietuvių Kalbos Tekstynas* (2017), which includes translational and non-translational Lithuanian, in a total of 140 921 288 words *misis* occurs 108 times, while *ponia* occurs 4838 times. Although English titles do appear in Lithuanian fiction, Lithuanian titles are significantly dominant, as may be expected. This makes the target text more accurate in a cultural way since Miss Marple is unmarried but, because of her advanced age, she would be addressed or referred to in Lithuanian as *ponia* rather than *panelė*, without any reference to her marital status. By maintaining some of the English titles, Kirvaitytė achieves higher overall fidelity, which is evident throughout the translated novel.

6.2 Forms of address and terms of reference as markers of social status in relation to the T/V distinction in Kirvaitytė's *Perskilęs Veidrodis* (2000)

This sub-section discusses how the most frequent types of forms of address used in combination with T/V pronouns and terms of reference reveal the social status of the major and those minor characters who take part in dialogues. Christie's *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962) contains forms of address and terms of reference that mark the social status granted by occupation, titles that express politeness and social distance, usually indicating higher status, pet names and, finally, the use of first names, which can express either solidarity or the lower status of the addressee. Such forms of address and terms of reference are major linguistic means to denote social status and politeness in English (Watts 2003; Thornborrow 2004; Allan and Burridge 2006; Wardhaugh 2006); however, this is not the case in Lithuanian where, as Čubajevaitė (2006: 34) specifies, the use of singular and plural second-person pronouns is especially important in indicating politeness, solidarity, disrespect, or offence. This, as Cook (2014) states, can also be

expressed through their symmetrical (reciprocal) or asymmetrical (non-reciprocal) use. The novel can be used to support Donald J. Treiman's (2001: 298) assertion that occupation is one of the central 'dimensions of social stratification', as the majority of the forms of address and terms of references are connected with the characters' occupations.

In Kirvaitytė's Lithuanian translation, although many characters use titles, other forms of address, and second-person pronouns symmetrically or reciprocally, there are instances where their use is asymmetrical or non-reciprocal, which signals that one character has a higher status. This is especially the case where the relationship between the two is relatively intimate but one speaker holds more power. For example, Miss Marple is often addressed using not only titles but also pet names and her first name. She maintains social distance by using forms of address and second-person pronouns symmetrically, which expresses politeness (see examples (5)-(7)), except in two cases when she is addressed by her first name (see example (8)) and in conversations with Inspector Craddock and Cherry Baker (see examples (9)-(10)):

(5) **ST:** *'And what do you want me to do, **Miss Marple**?''*

*'I think I am correct in saying, **Mr Rudd**, that your wife had a child who was born mentally afflicted'*
(Christie 1962: 246-251)

TT: *'Ir ko **jūs** norite iš manęs, **mis Marpl**?''*

*'Manau, **misteri Radai**, aš teisi, sakydama, jog **jūsų** žmona pagimdė vaiką su psichiniais nukrypimais'*
(Kirvaitytė 2000: 228-232)

(6) **ST:** *'Well, I don't like to leave **you** too long on your own, **dear**, in case you get moped'*

*'I assure **you** I am quite happy'* (Christie 1962: 14)

TT: *'Na, nenorėčiau ilgam palikti **jūsų** vienos, **brangute**, jei kartais nusimintumėte.'*

*'Užtikrinu **jus**, esu visiškai laiminga, - atsakė **mis Marpl**'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 14)

(7) **ST:** *'**You** will have your joke, **Doctor Haydock**'*

*'**You** can't pull the wool over my eyes, **my dear lady**'* (Christie 1962: 64)

TT: *'**Jūs** vis juokaujate, **daktare Heidokai**, - pasakė ji.'*

*'**Jūs** negalite muilinti man akių, **mano brangioji ledi**'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 61)

In example (5) Miss Marple and Jason Rudd maintain social distance and recognise each other's high social status by using polite expressions, such as titles and the plural form of the second-person pronoun. In example (6), however, Miss Knight does not maintain social distance properly when she addresses Miss Marple as *brangute*, since they are not friends: Miss Marple is Miss Knight's employer, which Kirvaitytė expresses through the use of *jūs*. In example (7), Miss Marple and Doctor Haydock also address each other as *jūs*, though their relationship is much more long-standing and intimate, as Miss Marple calls him a friend (Christie 1962: 243); this is indicated by

his use of a pet name, *brangioji*, which in this case indicates solidarity. However, Doctor Haydock's profession gives him a higher social status in the community; the interactions between him and Miss Marple are often professional, as she is his patient. This is possibly why Kirvaitytė chooses a symmetrical use of the plural form of the second-person pronoun.

Miss Marple and Mrs Bantry are close friends so that the symmetrical use of first names and *tu* indicates solidarity, as seen in example (8). In example (9) and Miss Marple is addressed as *jūs* but does not reciprocate with the same pronoun.

- (8) ST: '*Jane, I believe **you** do know*' [...] *'Now then, **Dolly, you** were there'* (Christie 1962: 60-65)

TT: '***Džeine**, manau, kad **tu** žinai?*' [...] *'Na, **Dole, tu** ten buvai'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 57-62)

- (9) ST: '*Are **you** quite sure **you**'re not a secret drinker, **Aunt Jane**?*' [...] *'[...] not only to **you, my dear Dermot** – if I may call **you** so'* (Christie 1962: 220-221)

TT: '*Ar **jūs** tikra, kad nesate slapta girtuoklė, **tetule Džeine**?*' [...] *'[...] ir ne tik **tau, brangusis Demiotai**, jei leisi **tave** taip vadinti'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 204)

She and Inspector Dermot Craddock have a close relationship, as he addresses her as *tetule Džeine*, but her age grants her higher status, since it is more polite to address an elder as *jūs*. She, on the other hand, addresses him by his first name and the second-person singular pronoun, which demonstrates solidarity between them. This is an example of what Ron Scollon and Suzanne Wong Scollon (1995) refer to as the paradox of face. Craddock shows his intimacy with Miss Marple by addressing her as *tetule Džeine*, but his use of the polite second-person pronoun indicates his desire to show respect by maintaining social distance. In another relationship, Cherry Baker addresses Miss Marple by using a title and her last name and *jūs*, not only because Miss Marple is older but also because she is her employer.

In example (10), Miss Marple addresses Cherry Baker by her first name because she is her employee, has a lower status and, paradoxically, because Miss Marple likes her (Christie 1962: 11).

- (10) ST: '***Cherry**, come here a minute*' [...] *'I didn't mean to disturb **you** by singing, **Miss Marple**'* [...] *'**Your** singing is much pleasanter than the horrid noise that vacuum makes'* (Christie 1962: 206)

TT: '***Čere**, užėik pas mane minutėlei!*' [...] *'Nenorėjau **jums** trukdyti savo dainavimu, **mis Marpl**'* [...] *'**Tavo** dainos kur kas malonesnės už tą baisų siurblio ūžimą'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 191-192)

In this relationship the use of the first name signals solidarity, even though Miss Marple holds more

power. This is made evident by comparing how Miss Marple speaks to Cherry with the more formal way she addresses the older woman paid to help her, Miss Knight, to whom she never uses her first name: Miss Marple does not like Miss Knight and keeps her at a distance.

Table 25 in Appendix 5 presents the terms of references used for Miss Marple. These terms are all polite and indicate that the characters that refer to her when she is absent recognise Miss Marple's status, with some exceptions. *Džeinė Marpl* is a reference made by Mrs Bantry (Christie 1962: 78), which, just like the form of address *Džeine*, signals the solidarity between them. The majority of the references such as *mano mis Marpl*, *miela sena ledi*, *ta mūsų senutė*, or *ta mūsų miela senutė* that denote endearment through the modifying adjectives or the use of the diminutive forms, also weaken her relative status because they emphasise her age and imply her limitations.

This is especially evident when Miss Knight refers to Miss Marple as part of a stereotypical group, classifying Miss Marple along with other elderly women she has taken care of as senile and lacking intellectual ability: 'Poor old dears, they've got so little to look forward to. One must humour them. And she's a sweet old lady. Failing a little now, it's only to be expected — their faculties get dimmed' (Christie 2000: 16). *Poor old dears*, translated as *vargšės senutės*, is a generalisation which labels Miss Marple as a typical senile person lacking intellectual ability. In the novel, this is the complete opposite of the truth, as Miss Marple solves this crime as she has many earlier ones. Kirvaitytė's translation has Miss Knight express such implications by addressing Miss Marple with the plural form of the first person pronoun, which is often used with children and invalids: '[t]uoj nubėgsiu ir paruošiu jums skanų plaktą kiaušinį. **Mums** jis turi patikti, tiesa? - Nežinau, ar **jums** jis patiks, - atsakė mis Marpl. - Būčiau patenkinta, jei **jūs** pati jį išgertumėte, jei jis **jums** patinka' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 190). In the Lithuanian translation, Miss Marple objects to this lowering of her status and distances herself from Miss Knight by emphasising the second-person pronoun *jūs*.

In other cases, the relative status of police officers, like that of Doctor Haydock, depends on their profession so that the forms of address used by and for them are often defined by professional interactions between them and other speakers, as seen in examples (11) – (13):

- (11) **ST**: 'Are **you** insinuating anything in particular by that remark, **Inspector Craddock**' [...] 'I'm quite prepared to do so, **Mr Fenn** [...] It seems to have been a matter of common gossip that at the time I have just referred to, **you** were wildly in love with Marina Gregg' (Christie 1962: 161)

TT: 'Ar **jūs** šia pastaba norite pasakyti kažką labai svarbaus, **inspektoriau Kredokai**?' [...] 'Aš pasiruošęs tai padaryti, **misteri Fenai**. [...] Kiek man žinoma, vienu metu sklandė daug gandų apie tai, kad **jūs** beprotiškai įsimylėjęs Mariną Greg' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 151)

- (12) **ST**: 'That's right, **sir**'
'And after that **you** went into the house. Is that right? [...]

*'Oh well, **you** know that, **Inspector**, as well as anyone does'* (Christie 1962: 73-74)

TT: *'Teisingai, **sere**.'*

*'Paskui **jūs** nuėjote į namą, tiesa?'* [...]

*'Na, **inspektoriau**, **jūs** tai puikiai žinote'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 69)

In examples (11) and (12) both Inspectors Craddock and Cornish are addressed by their occupational title and a polite second-person plural pronoun, which they reciprocate because the situation requires it, even if the other speaker is of lower status like Arthur Badcock. An exception to this appears in another exchange when Margot Bence exclaims 'išniukštinėjai, šunsnuki', 'you nosy bastard' (Christie 1962: 175) in English, after which Craddock continues to address Margot Bence as *jūs* in a professional manner (Kirvaitytė 2000: 164). She is deliberately provocative and rude to Craddock but he continues to follow the norms of politeness. This is an example of what Brown and Levinson (1987), and Soltys and colleagues (2014) refer to as a face threatening act. By being so rude Margot Bence demonstrates that she does not accept that Craddock holds more power than her, even though he is a senior police officer.

However, in cases of speech between one officer and his subordinates or superiors, power relations have more influence on the use of forms of address and the choice of familiar or polite second-person pronouns, as seen in examples (13)-(15):

(13) **ST:** *'I take it I'm going down there, **sir**'*

*'Yes. Better get there as soon as possible, **Dermot**. Who do **you** want with you? [...]* Good luck to **you**' (Christie 1962: 79)

TT: *'Suprantu, kad aš ten vyksiu, **sere**?'*

*'Taip. Važiuok ten kuo greičiau, **Dermotai**. [...]* Sėkmės **tau**' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 75)

(14) **ST:** *'I think you'll have to banish that rosy picture from your mind, **Frank**' [...]*

'Lola Brewster is my best bet [...] You don't seem as sold on her as I am' (Christie 1962: 133-135)

TT: *'[B]ijau, kad **tau** teks išmesti iš galvos šią viliojančią mintį, **Frenkai**.' [...]*

'Įtartiniausia Lola Briuster [...] **Tu**, rodos, nelabai tiki šia versija?' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 125-127)

(15) **ST:** *'Well, **Tom**, what have **you** got for me?'* [...]

'Well, there were no such rumours going about at the studios' [...] **You** hear that sort of thing soon enough' (Christie 1962: 119-120)

TT: *'Na, **Tomai**, ką man turi? [...]* Kokių auksinių ir sidabrinių **tu** man pririnkai?' [...]

*'Na, tokie gandai studijoje nesklinda, - tarė Tomas. - **Jūs** išgirstumėte tokį dalyką pakankamai greitai'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 111-112)

In example (13), the exchange is asymmetrical, as Inspector Craddock addresses his superior, the assistant commissioner, as *sere* but is addressed by his first name and second-person pronoun singular, which indicates that his superior holds more power. In another case, although Inspector Craddock is of higher occupational status than Inspector Cornish because he represents Scotland

Yard (Christie 1962: 162), the symmetrical use of second-person singular pronoun, as seen in example (14), indicates solidarity and an equal status between the two characters. Here Craddock is showing friendliness by addressing a local officer, Cornish, by his first name, which Cornish does not reciprocate. As a result, Craddock holds more power so that the exchange is asymmetrical.

Example (15) shows an asymmetrical exchange between Craddock and his subordinate Sergeant Tiddler, also from Scotland Yard: Craddock, as an officer with a superior rank, holds more power and addresses his subordinate by his first name, to which Tiddler answers by addressing him as *jūs*, thus recognising his higher status. Aside from terms of reference such as *Chief-Inspector God Almighty Craddock*, *that Craddock man*, *Cornish*, and *the local man* (see Tables 26 and 35 in Appendix 5), characters tend to recognise and accept the inspectors' status and power in their community, which is granted by their occupation, with *Chief-Inspector God Almighty Craddock* as an exception, since here his occupational status is recognised but is used to refer to him in a derogatory way.

The choice of forms of address and terms of reference among other professionals depend on both their specific professions and personal relationships. Examples provided here include forms of address used by and for professionals such as Jason Rudd's secretary, Ella Zielinsky, and the photographer Margot Bence. They also show Ella Zielinsky's and Hailey Preston's references to their employers and other characters' references to the butler, Giuseppe, who is a servant, though the highest of the household servants in rank. Examples (16)-(19) show the way Ella Zielinski interacts with her employers and other characters:

(16) ST: 'As **you** manage to do, **Miss Zielinski**' (Christie 1962: 116)

TT: 'Kaip, pavyzdžiui, reaguojate **jūs**, **mis Zielinski**? ' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 109)

(17) ST: 'Have a cup of tea, **Ella**' (Christie 1962: 42)

TT: '**Tšgerk** puoduką arbatos, **Ela**, - pasiūlė Marina' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 39)

(18) ST: 'Don't talk about it to **Miss Gregg**, if you don't mind' (Christie 1962: 45)

TT: 'Nekalbėkite apie tai su **mis Greg**, jei galite' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 42)

(19) ST: 'Couldn't they, **Ella**? Couldn't they?' [...]

'Must **you** torture yourself like this, **Jason**? [...] He went to **Marina** about it and she said it was all right, so I gave him the day off. He'll be back sometime to-night. **You** don't mind, do you?' (Christie 1962: 196-197)

TT: '**Tu** įsitikinsi, **Ela**? Įsitikinsi?' [...]

'Ar reikia taip save kankinti, **Džeisonai**? [...] Jis nuėjo pas **Mariną**, o ši pasakė, kad viskas gerai, tad aš daviau jam laisvadienį. Grįš šį vakarą. **Jūs** neprieštaraujate?' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 183-185)

In example (16) Ella Zielinsky is addressed by the title *mis* and her last name by Inspector Craddock, whose occupation requires him to address them in a formal manner; therefore, personal relationships do not play any role here. Examples (17) and (19) indicate that Ella Zielinsky is addressed as *Ela* by her employers, whose status is higher than hers, but she also addresses Jason Rudd by his first name and refers to Marina Gregg as *Marina*, showing that even though their relationship is professional, it is also close in some ways. Ella Zielinsky accepts that Jason Rudd and Marina Gregg are of higher status and also have power over her as employers by addressing Jason as *jūs* and referring to Marina as *mis Greg* when talking to Mrs Bantry, as seen in examples (18) and (19).

Like Ella in example (16), Margot Bence is also addressed as *mis* in Lithuanian and *Miss* in English in example (20), as Craddock's occupation requires him to do so. However, Margot Bence has a close relationship with her business partner Johnny Jethroe, as their exchange of first names, use of the singular form of second-person pronouns, and a pet name in example (23) indicates.

(20) ST: *'How do you do, Miss Bence'* (Christie 1962: 168)

TT: *'Laba diena, mis Bens'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 157)

(21) ST: *'Hi – Margot'*

'Oh, it's you. What are you doing here?' [...]

'So long, darling, I won't butt in. I'm sure you and the inspector are going to talk big secrets' (Christie 1962: 167-169)

TT: *'Labas, Margo, - pasisveikino misteris Džetrojus'*

'O, tai tu. Ką čia veiki?' [...]

'Kol kas, mieloji! Aš į tai nesivelsiu. Esu tikras, kad tu su inspektoriumi šnekėsi apie dideles paslaptis' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 157)

(22) ST: *'For goodness' sake, Jane, get your behind down' [...]*

'I can't see what you want to go taking photographs of my behind for'

'It's a lovely behind, dear' (Christie 1962: 167)

TT: *'Dėl Dievo meilės, Džeine, nuleisk savo užpakali' [...]*

'Nesuprantu, kam jums mano užpakalio fotografijos, - irzliai pasakė mergina''

'Brangioji, tavo užpakalis nuostabus. Jis iš koto verčia, - pasakė fotografė' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 157)

As business partners, they are equal and express solidarity. On the other hand, as a photographer, Margot Bence is superior to the models with whom she works, as seen in example (24). Here the exchange is asymmetrical, as Margot receives *jūs*, but the model is addressed by her first name and the second-person singular pronoun, which indicates that she accepts the photographer's higher status. The model does object to Margot's reference to her bottom, but Margot turns this into a joking compliment. As Table 43 in Appendix 5 shows, very often Margot is referred to with an

emphasis on her occupation (*photographer girl, arty photographer*).

Neither Hailey Preston, Jason Rudd's secretary, nor Giuseppe, the butler, are addressed in the novel but they are referred to by other characters. As seen in Table 38 in Appendix 5, references to Hailey Preston often emphasise his appearance (*elegant Hailey Preston, willowy-looking young man*) rather than status, signalling that his status is lower. Example (25) indicates that he, like Ella Zielinsky, accepts his employer's higher status by referring to Jason Rudd with a title and last name.

(23) ST: 'You'll want to see **Mr Rudd**?' (Christie 1962: 95)

TT: 'Atrodo, Heiliui Prestonui palengvėjo, kadangi Kredokas nebeprotestavo. - Gal norite susitikti su **misteriu Radu**?' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 90)

(24) ST: 'I think I'll go up to the hall to-morrow morning on my way to work and have a word with **Mr Giuseppe** about it' (Christie 1962: 188)

TT: 'Manau, rytoj ryte pakeliui į daibą užėisiu į Gosingtoną ir pasikalbėsiu apie tai su **misteriu Džiuzepė**' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 176)

(25) ST: '**Giuseppe**? Have they found who shot him?' (Christie 1962: 216)

TT: '**Džiuzepės**? Ar jie žino, kas jį nušovė?' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 200)

Giuseppe, as seen in Table 39 in Appendix 5, is most often referred to with emphasis on his occupation and nationality (*the Italian butler; the wop*), *the wop* being a derogatory reference to Italians, as stated in *The Merriam Webster* online dictionary (2017), which suggests a low status. As example (25) illustrates, his employer Marina Gregg refers to him by his first name, expressing her superiority. Example (24), on the contrary, indicates that he is referred to as *misteris Džiuzepė* by one of the hired servants, Gladys Dixon, which signals a higher level of respect: Gladys, a naive young girl, likes him since, as she puts it, 'he's awfully handsome' (Christie 1962: 188).

The highest social status in the novel is held by the wealthy Americans, Jason Rudd, Marina Gregg, Lola Brewster, and Ardwyck Fenn. Their high status is granted by their occupations, the wealth that comes from them, and as celebrated public figures. In their cases, forms of address and terms of reference vary according to their relationships with each other and the social distance perceived to be between them and other characters, as examples (26)-(30) display:

(26) ST: 'You haven't told me yet, **Miss Gregg**, why you should think anyone wanted to kill you' (Christie 1962: 141)

TT: 'Jūs dar nepasakėte man, **mis Greg**, kodėl manote, kad kažkas nori jus nužudyti' (Kirvaitytė 2000: 132)

(27) ST: 'She hadn't any money, **Miss Briuster**' (Christie 1962: 158)

TT: *'Ji neturėjo pinigų, mis Briuster'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 149)

(28) ST: *'I'm quite prepared to do so, Mr Fenn'* (Christie 1962: 161)

TT: *'Aš pasiruošęs tai padaryti, misteris Fenai'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 151)

(29) ST: *'Ardwyck Fenn was an old flame of Marina's whom she had not seen for years. Lola Brewster was once married to Marina Gregg's third husband'* (Christie 1962: 134)

TT: *'Ardvikas Fenas - sena Marinos meilė, ji jo nematė jau daugelį metų. Lola Briuster kažkada buvo trečio Marinos Greg vyro žmona'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 126)

(30) ST: *'I don't believe Marina Gregg is a nymphomaniac'* (Christie 1962: 29)

TT: *'Netikiu, kad Marina Greg yra nimfomanė'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 27)

When addressing people in the cinema world, other characters maintain a social distance by using polite forms of address, such as the use of a title and a last name, as seen in examples (26)-(28). In references to them (see examples (29) and (30)), their full or only first names tend to be used, which suggests that characters perceive the social distance in such cases as small because the cinema rich are well-known public figures. Their personal lives are exposed to everyone, making even ordinary people feel they are closer to these public figures than they actually are.

Choices of forms of address and terms of reference among the wealthy American cinema people depend on their personal relationships and the solidarity they share by working in the same field, as examples (31)-(35) show.

(31) ST: *'Will you, Jinx? Will you see that nothing happens to me? [...]*
'Don't take too many, for God's sake, Marina' (Christie 1962: 217-218)

TT: *'Tikrai, Džinksai? Ar prižiūrėsi, kad nieko man neatsitiktų? [...]*
'Dėl Dievo, Marina, negerk tiek daug' (Kirvaitytė 202)

(32) ST: *'The idea that Lola would suddenly, after a long period of friendliness, come to England, and arrive at our house all prepared to poison my wife's drink – why the whole idea's absurd'* (Christie 1962: 148)

TT: *'Ir apskritai mintis, kad Lola po daugelio draugystės metų galėtų atvažiuoti į Angliją ir ateiti į mūsų namus, ketindama įpilti nuodų į mano žmonos kokteilį - žinote, ši mintis visai absurdiška'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 139)

(33) ST: *'But darling Marina was delighted to see me'* (Christie 1962: 157)

TT: *'Bet Marinutė džiaugėsi, mane matydama'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 149)

(34) ST: *'Well, perhaps you've got something there. Marina, I suppose, had a feeling for stability'* (Christie 1962: 159)

TT: *'Na, gal čia jūs ir teisus. Manau, Marina savotiškai žiūri į stabilumą'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 150)

(35) **ST:** *'If you think that I looked up and saw **Ardwyck** and was frightened of him, it's nonsense'* (Christie 1962: 149)

TT: *'Jei manote, kad pakėlusi akis ir pamačiusi **Ardviką**, aš išsigandau, tai yra nesąmonė'* (Kirvaitytė 2000: 149)

In example (31), the exchange between Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd is a symmetrical one and shows solidarity within the intimate relationship they share as husband and wife. Their closeness is especially evident in her use of the nickname *Džinksai*. Another example of solidarity within marriage is that of Cherry and Jim Baker, who address each other by a pet name or the first name: ““You may have something there, **my girl**.” “D’you like it here, **Jim**?”” (Christie 1962: 183). Similarly, when others refer to Lola Brewster and Ardwyck Fenn, Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd, or vice versa, the use of first names signals familiarity, as seen in examples (32)-(35), and especially in example (33), where the translator has Lola refer to Marina with the diminutive *Marinutė*. *Marinutė* also transmits the emotional flavour in the English phrase *darling*. As friends and colleagues they are on a first-name basis, which indicates a lesser social distance between them.

As this analysis has demonstrated, Agatha Christie’s *The Mirror Crack’d from Side to Side*, as is usual of Golden Age crime fiction, demonstrates the social realism typical to this genre. In this novel, as Milda Danytė puts it, characters are ‘sharply defined by their use of language, choice of clothes and social mannerisms’ (2011: 13). Because the focus in this paper is on a higher class, their use of address and references to other characters are those of high social distance and politeness. As one may expect from the members of a higher status group, they, as stated by Pierre Bourdieu (1984), signal their status through sophisticated speech, except where intimacy and solidarity influence the exchanges. Occupations and age define the social status of a character, which influences the forms of address, terms of references, and the type of second-person pronouns used in the Lithuanian translation. These mark the character’s status, as the level of social distance expressed through address, reference, or a second-person pronoun indicates the character’s position in his or her society. The use of polite forms of address and terms of reference signal that British society of the second half of the twentieth century is a culture of negative politeness, which as Aldrich and Leibiger (2009) assert, emphasises greater power and social distance between the speakers.

7 ANALYSIS OF FORMS OF ADDRESS AND TERMS OF REFERENCE IN JOHN GRISHAM'S *THE PELICAN BRIEF* (1992) AND ITS TRANSLATION *PELIKANO DOSJĖ* (2004) BY JONAS ČEAPONIS

This chapter analyses the second text considered for this thesis: it examines Jonas Čeponis's translation of John Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* in regard to forms of address and terms of reference used by and about major and some minor characters. The chapter focuses on forms of address, terms of reference, and the use of second-person singular and plural pronouns (the T/V distinction) as markers of social status, politeness, and solidarity in the Lithuanian equivalent of the source novel.

7.1 General tendencies in translating forms of address and terms of reference in Čeponis's *Pelikano Dosjė* (2004)

Like Kirvaitytė, Čeponis displays overall faithfulness to the English novel in translating almost all the occurrences: the number of forms of address and terms of reference is similar to that in Grisham's novel (see Appendices 6 and 7, Tables 46-105). However, unlike Kirvaitytė, he tends to avoid using synonymous words when translating forms of address, which makes his Lithuanian version slightly less linguistically varied, but more faithful to the English source text and prevents misrepresentation of a character's status expressed in speech.

When translating forms of address and terms of references, Čeponis uses synonymous words only for Darby Shaw. As seen in Table 46 in Appendix 6, Darby is addressed as *Ma'am* six times, which is translated *Mem* and *panele* three times each. *Mem* is not frequently found in the Lithuanian language, as the finding from *Dabartinės Lietuvių Kalbos Tekstynas* (2017) indicates. In a total of 140 921 288 words, *Mem* occurs 48 times, while *panele* is found 747 times. Clearly, *panelė* is more commonly used for women of Darby's age and status in Lithuania. Similarly, *dear* occurs three times in the source text, which is translated as *mieloji* twice and *brangute* once. These words both express endearment in all cases. However, in case of Darby, Čeponis also translates two different types as the same (see Table 46 in Appendix 6): *Lady* and *Miss* are both translated as *panelė*, which results in less lexical variety in the Lithuanian target text.

There is an instance where Čeponis omits a form of address. Grisham's sentence 'oh, listen, Smith, she knows exactly what she's doing' (1992: 313) is translated as 'o, ji gerai žino, ką daro' (Čeponis 2004: 253). Here, the phrase 'listen, Smith' is omitted; the reason for this is unclear as all other instances of *Smith* are translated (see Table 53 in Appendix 6). Other than this, Čeponis's

translation of forms of address is very close to the original, as it does not include any other omissions, any synonymous words or mistranslations.

Overall, forms of address are translated quite literally, without paraphrasing or changing their meaning. The reason is that most of them are names; furthermore, Grisham does not use very culture-specific words as forms of address. Čeponis translates the colloquial forms of address, which Allan and Burridge define as ‘in-group markers’ (2006: 139) when they signal solidarity, by their Lithuanian equivalents, as is shown in Table 3:

Table 3. Other words used as forms of address in Grisham’s *The Pelican Brief* and the Lithuanian translation

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Son (pp. 85, 219, 275)	3	Sūnau (pp. 73, 179, 222)	3
2	Baby (pp. 91, 355)	2	Mažyte (p. 78)	1
			Vaikuti (p. 287)	1
3	Asshole (p. 85)	1	Šikniau (p. 73)	1
4	Big boy (p. 99)	1	Viršininke (p. 85)	1
5	Buddy (p. 103)	1	Drauguži (p. 88)	1
6	Fellas (p. 96)	1	Vyručiai (p. 83)	1
7	Hotshot (p. 320)	1	Didysis žurnaliste (p. 259)	1
8	Kid (p. 375)	1	Vaikuti (p. 303)	1
9	My dear (p. 335)	1	Brangioji (p. 271)	1
10	My friend (p. 95)	1	Drauguži (p. 81)	1
11	Pal (p. 76)	1	Bičiuli (p. 66)	1
12	You clowns (p. 350)	1	Jūs, klounai (p. 284)	1
13	You guys (p. 96)	1	Vyručiai (p. 83)	1

All of these forms of address are typical in American speech; they have equivalents in Lithuanian that are used in the same manner. The majority of them refer to friendship and are used for endearment, except for *asshole* and *you clowns*, which are hostile. The only form of address that is translated by trying to explain it is *hotshot* which, according to *The Merriam-Webster Dictionary* means ‘a person with a high level of knowledge or skill in a field’ (2017). It is not used to refer to journalists only, but because in this exchange *hotshot* is used to address Gray Grantham, a journalist, its translation as *didysis žurnaliste* is appropriate, as *didysis* is often used jokingly about a skillful person.

Although Čeponis tends to translate terms of references more loosely than forms of address, he still remains very faithful to the English source text. It is true that omission and replacement by

pronouns are occasional strategies when translating terms of reference. Examples (36) and (37) provide Grisham's original English text and Čeponis's translation where omission occurs, though it must be stated that no other examples of this kind of omission were found:

(36) **ST:** 'Okay, okay. Where's Sarge?'
'*Sarge is not feeling well*' (Grisham 1992: 154)

TT: 'Gerai, gerai. Kur Seržas?'
'*Ne itin gerai jaučiasi*' (Čeponis 2004: 129)

(37) **ST:** 'We've got photos and a summary *for the President's review*' (Grisham 1992: 114)

TT: 'Mes turime fotografijas ir suvestinę' (Čeponis 2004: 97)

In example (36) Sarge may have been omitted to avoid repetition and make the dialogue sound more fluent; however, example (37) presents omission of not only the terms of reference, but also other words, which makes the Lithuanian target text less specific for no apparent reason, as this instance does not pose any particular challenge in translation.

Omission of terms of reference with pronouns used as a replacement or *vice versa* occur more often than omission on its own. Table 4 presents terms of reference in *The Pelican Brief* and its Lithuanian translation that are replaced by pronouns, as well as pronouns replaced by proper names or other words.

Table 4. Terms of reference and pronouns in Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* and the Lithuanian translation

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	He (pp. 9, 53)	2	Jensenas (p. 13)	1
			Rozenbergas (p. 47)	1
3	Him (pp. 18, 53)	2	Jensenas (p. 47)	1
			Rozenbergas (p. 20)	1
5	Morgan (p. 342)	1	Jis (p. 278)	1
6	The girl (p. 75)	1	Ta (p. 65)	1
7	Voyles (p. 292)	1	Šis (p. 237)	1

Here pronouns and proper names replace the original terms of reference either to avoid repetition or to make the text clearer. For example, in the first case, where *he* is replaced with *Rozenbergas*, the Lithuanian text becomes clearer to the reader: 'I understand he's dead' (Grisham 1992: 53) is translated as 'suprantu, kad Rozenbergas negyvas' (Čeponis 2004: 47). This helps readers to follow the action more easily, as in the two paragraphs before this sentence Rosenberg is not mentioned;

the paragraphs discuss another character, Ferguson. Čeponis's replacement of the pronoun with the character's name prevents confusion.

There are instances in which Čeponis omits titles or occupational titles before a character's last name or adds information that is not present in Grisham's original English text. *Chief Runyan* is translated as *Ranjanas* (see Table 89 in Appenix 7), while *Mr Coal* becomes simply *Koulas* more than once (see Table 99 in Appenix 7). Omission of a title may suggest disrespect by the speaker in the Lithuanian text though it is not intended in the original English novel. In cases of forms of address, omission of a title may not change the meaning of the exchange if a polite second-person pronoun is used; however, in case of terms of reference, the use of pronouns does not have any effect. Because the name *Koulas* (Čeponis 2004: 332) is used by characters that dislike him, the use of a title in the English source text does not imply sincere politeness and its omission in Lithuanian does not change the meaning. *Ranjanas* is used by a student answering questions about a legal case (Čeponis 2004: 332), which suggests that Chief Runyan is not the subject of the exchange; therefore, omission of his occupational title does not mean disrespect.

Aside from one instance of an apparent mistranslation, Čeponis displays overall faithfulness to Grisham's English novel, avoiding omission as much as possible and altering terms of references only to make following the text easier. As seen in Table 81 in Appendix 7, the only mistake is *Rėjus Grenthemas* instead of *Grėjus Grenthemas*; given that this occurs only once, it is probably a printing error. Compared to Kirvaitytė's translation of *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* by Christie, Čeponis is even more faithful to the English source text and makes fewer translation mistakes than Kirvaitytė, who frequently mistranslates titles such as *Miss* as *Misis*. Often Čeponis uses titles that are more familiar to the target audience: for example, *Miss* or *Lady* are translated as *panelė*, which is contrary to Kirvaitytė's work in *Perskilęs veidrodis*, where English titles are maintained. As a result, the translation of Christie's novel preserves cultural aspects of speech from the source text, while the translation of Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* focuses on making the target text more localised.

7.2 Forms of address and terms of reference as markers of social status in relation to the T/V distinction in Čeponis's *Pelikano Dosjė* (2004)

This sub-section discusses the most frequent types of forms of address and terms of reference used in combination with T/V pronouns in the American novel; both of these reveal the social status of major and those minor characters who take part in dialogues. Like Christie's *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side*, Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* contains forms of address and terms of reference that mark the social status granted by occupation, titles that express politeness and social distance,

usually indicating higher status for one participant, pet names and, finally, the use of first names. However, set in a different society at a different period of time from Christie's novel, Grisham's portrays a decay of politeness in social exchanges, and an increase in underlying meanings, as very often characters use the polite forms required for their status groups, but are actually being rude.

As has been explained, although forms of address and terms of reference are among the major linguistic means to denote social status and politeness in English, this is not the case in Lithuanian, where the use of second-person singular and plural pronouns also indicates politeness, solidarity, disrespect, or offence. This, as Cook (2014) states, can also be expressed through their symmetrical (reciprocal) or asymmetrical (non-reciprocal) use. Čeponis, on the other hand, tends to use second-person plural pronouns even if the exchange is between people who are in a personal relationship or between those who are being deliberately rude to each other. This is not the case in all instances, as Čeponis also recognises solidarity in exchanges between some characters, but he maintains formality in exchanges between characters in high positions, sometimes unnecessarily.

In exchanges between characters of different social status, Čeponis tends to use the second-person plural pronoun, indicating social distance between these characters. This is often reciprocal; for example, exchanges between Darby Shaw or other students and Professor Callahan within the university setting are very formal, as seen in examples (38) and (39):

(38) **ST:** 'Now, **Ms. Shaw**, why is Rosenberg sympathetic to Nash? [...] Do **you** agree with him?'
(Grisham 1992: 19)

TT: 'Taigi, **panele Šo**, kodėl Rozenbergas prijaucia Nešui? [...] **Jūs** sutinkate su juo?'
(Čeponis 2004: 22)

(39) **ST:** 'Something against Rosenberg, **Mr. Sallinger?**' [...] 'Oh no, **sir**' [...] 'Are **you** suggesting Justice Rosenberg is senile?' [...] 'He's crazy as hell, and **you** know it' (Grisham 1992: 16-21)

TT: '**Turite** ką nors prieš Rozenbergą, **pone Selindžeri?**' [...] 'O ne, **sere**' [...] '**Norite** pasakyti, kad teisėjas Rozenbergas nuseno?' [...] 'Jis visai nukvakęs, ir **jūs** tai žinote' (Čeponis 2004: 19-23)

Here Callahan, speaking as a professor with his class, addresses Darby Shaw as *panele Šo*, or *Miss Shaw* in English, and uses the second-person plural pronoun *jūs*. This indicates social distance and politeness, as Darby's status is lower in the university than his. Darby, on the other hand, avoids any forms of address or the use of pronouns, which is her strategy to establish social distance. In an exchange with another student, Callahan addresses him in the same way as he addresses Darby, but the student uses a different strategy to maintain social distance and politeness. He reciprocally

addresses the professor as *sere*, or *sir* in English, and uses a second-person plural pronoun, making the exchange symmetrical.

Even though the use of second-person pronouns in the translation of this novel is often symmetrical or reciprocal, there are instances where their use is asymmetrical or non-reciprocal, which signals that one character has a higher status. This is evident in an exchange between Judge Abraham Rosenberg and his senior law clerk Jason Kline, who are looking out the window at demonstrators in front of the Supreme Court (see example (40)).

- (40) **ST:** *'I'm sure **they** do' [...]*
*'See **any** of those signs?'* (Grisham 1992: 2 – 3)

TT: *'Be abejo, jiems ir **patinkate**, – linktelėjo Klainas'*
*'Ar **matai** kokius nors iš tų plakatų?'* (Čeponis 2004: 8)

In this exchange between Rosenberg and Kline, pronouns of address are not used; Kline avoids using a pronoun through a different construction, while Rosenberg's response is very informal without the pronoun. This indicates that Rosenberg feels solidarity towards Kline. The verbs employed by Kline in the Lithuanian translation are in the second-personal plural form, which indicates politeness in Lithuanian. Rosenberg responds with a first-person singular verb. This indicates that Kline accepts Rosenberg's high status granted by his occupation as a Supreme Court justice and old age. The exchange is asymmetrical, but this does not mean that Rosenberg is trying to demonstrate power over Kline. Rather, he is strengthening solidarity, as Kline takes care of Rosenberg at work (Grisham 1992: 4).

Similarly, there are many exchanges of solidarity between the journalist Gray Grantham and people he works with, indicating that their relationships are often personal, as well as professional. When speaking with his editor at *Washington Post*, Smith Keen, Grantham uses second-person singular pronouns, which Keen reciprocates. Moreover, they are on a first-name basis, indicating their closeness, as seen in example (41):

- (41) **ST:** *'Okay. What is it?'*
*'It's big, **Smith**.'*
*'I know it's big. **You** shut the damned door, so I know it's big. [...]* Yes, **son**, *that's big. But how do **you** know?'* [...]
*'I don't have a story yet, **Smith**, but she's talking to me. **Read** this'* (Grisham 1992: 219)

TT: *'Gerai, kas per reikalas?'*
*'Stambus, **Smitai**.'*
*'Žinau, kad stambus. **Tu** uždarei tas sumautas duris. [...]* Taip, **sūnau**, *tai stambu. Bet iš kur **tu** žinai?'* [...]
*'Aš dar neturiu medžiagos, **Smitai**, bet ji kalbasi su manimi. **Perskaityk** tai.'* (Čeponis 2004: 179)

Here the exchange is symmetrical, indicating solidarity between the characters. However, Keen addresses Grantham as *sūnau*, or *son* in English, which signals that Keen sees Grantham as inferior because of his young age. In this case Grisham may have meant for these exchanges to be more formal, with the use of first names to mark solidarity, but still maintain distance; however, Grantham uses the imperative *read this* towards Smith, which shows that the social distance between them is not that great. To transfer this in the Lithuanian target text, Čeponis could have used second-person plural pronouns to express respect and distance in combination with the use of first names as markers of solidarity. Although this exchange takes place in Keen's office away from other staff, it sounds very informal in Lithuanian.

On the other hand, when speaking with others in the office of the *Washington Post*, different kinds of exchanges take place. In conversations with the executive editor, Jackson Feldman, and the managing editor, Howard Krauthammer, Grantham and these characters, like Smith Keen, are on a first-name basis; however, in the Lithuanian translation, they address each other using polite second-person plural pronouns and verbs. During these exchanges Keen is present; these staff exchanges are ones of solidarity (see example (42)):

- (42) ST: 'But they're digging, **Gray**'
 'You want me to stop them?' [...]
 'That's a pretty damned good story, wouldn't **you** say, **Gray**?'
 'You're using her, aren't you?' [...]
 'You guys are assuming a hell of a lot' [...]
 'You'd better move fast, **Grantham**' (Grisham 1992: 289-291)

TT: 'Bet jie kapsto, **Grėjau**, - pasakė Kynas.
 Norite, kad juos sustabdyčiau?' [...]
 Tai velniškai gera istorija, ar **jums** taip neatrodo, **Grėjau**? ' [...]
 'Tu ja naudojies, tiesa? - paklausė Kynas' [...]
 'Jūs, **vyručiai**, spėjate labai daug' [...]
 'Patariu paskubėti, **Grenthemai**, - perspėjo Feldmanas' (Čeponis 2004: 235-236)

Here Čeponis has Grantham addressed in a variety of ways: by his first name and his last name, as well as one of these in combination with plural and singular second-person pronouns. Grantham responds with second-person plural pronouns because he addresses all three characters as a group; therefore, it is difficult to say whether the exchanges are symmetrical or asymmetrical, as this could be Grantham's strategy to maintain social distance. He addresses his colleagues as a group as *vyručiai* (*guys* in the English original), which indicates a feeling of solidarity among them. Because Keen addresses Grantham with a second-person singular pronoun while Feldman uses a plural one, Grantham and Keen's relationship is evidently closer than Grantham and Feldman's. The final form of address is Grantham's last name which, based on the fact that Grantham has refused to follow the

editors' orders, indicates that the senior editors are trying to distance themselves from Grantham and assert their power as his superiors in rank.

Exchanges between Grantham and other characters outside work are based on their personal relationships; however, most of his relationships still revolve around his work as a journalist. When speaking to Cleve, a policeman, and his father Sarge, the janitor who gives him information on the presidential circle, Grantham uses different forms of address and second-person pronouns, as seen in examples (43) and (44). With Craft, a photographer he hires to get more information and who is an old friend from the *Washington Post* (Grisham 1992: 150), Grantham expresses solidarity (see example (45)):

(43) ST: 'What time is it, **Cleve**? [...]

You know, for a reporter **you can** ask the dumbest questions. [...]

Will **you** be there? [...]

Have a nice day, **Grantham**' (Grisham 1992: 92-93)

TT: 'Kuri valanda, **Klivai**? [...]

Žinai, tu reporteris, tačiau **gebi** žiebtį kvailus klausimus. [...]

Tu būsi ten? [...]

Geros dienos, **Grenthemai**' (Čeponis 2004: 79-80)

(44) ST: 'Sorry I'm late'

'No problem, **my friend**. Good to see **you**' (Grisham 1992: 95)

TT: '**Atleiskite**, kad vėluoju, - atsiprašė jis.

Nieko tokio, **drauguži**. Malonu **jus** matyti. - Seržo balsas buvo gergždžiantis' (Čeponis 2004: 81)

(45) ST: 'Did **you** talk to him?' [...]

'Keep trying'

'I'm really tired of this, **Grantham**. I've--'

'**You**'re getting paid, aren't you? (Grisham 1992: 288)

TT: '**Kalbėjaisi** su juo?' [...]

'Toliau **bandyk**'

'Aš jau pavargau, **Grenthemai**. Aš jau...'

'**Tau** už tai mokama, ar ne?' (Čeponis 2004: 234)

When Grantham speaks with Cleve in example (43), both characters use second-person singular pronouns in Lithuanian, but Grantham addresses Cleve by his first name, while Cleve addresses him by his last name. This, however, does not indicate disrespect on either side or asymmetrical power relations, as the same occurs between Grantham and Croft, an old friend, in example (45). In these cases, addressing Grantham by his last name is a marker of friendship, especially given that Cleve jokes about asking stupid questions, which Grantham does not find disrespectful. Example (44) shows a different type of exchange, a more formal one in Lithuanian, where both characters maintain social distance by using second-person plural pronouns and verbs. Grantham and Sarge are

not personally close; however, in the source text they both use informal language, which indicates solidarity between them. Sarge's professional status is much lower than Grantham's, but because he is older and gives him information, Grantham treats him with respect. Sarge recognises Grantham's higher social status, which he accepts by addressing him as *jūs*, though also trying to establish solidarity by addressing him with the pet name *drauguži*, or *my friend* in English.

In comparison to these exchanges, where personal relationships influence spoken interactions, there are instances where Čeponis uses formality in his translation even though the relationships are personal, which is especially the case with Darby Shaw. Her exchanges with Thomas Callahan outside the university are informal because they are lovers, as seen in example (46). However, over the course of events, when Darby becomes very friendly with Gavin Verheek, Callahan's friend and a lawyer, and Gray Grantham, the exchanges between them are made more formal in Čeponis's translation (see examples (47) and (48)):

- (46) **ST:** *'Thomas, you're a professor' [...]*
'I'll flunk you in con law if you don't cut classes and get drunk with me' (Grisham 1992: 47)

TT: *'Tomai, tu dėstytojas' [...]*
'Sukirsiu tave iš konstitucinės teisės, jeigu nepraleisi pratybų ir negerai su manimi'
 (Čeponis 2004: 44)

- (47) **ST:** *'That's pretty weak, Gavin. You've been at the office for almost four hours, and you have nothing' [...]* *'Darby! Listen to me. Whatever you do, keep in touch with me, okay?'*
 (Grisham 1992: 148-149)

TT: *'Nieką gero, Gevinai. Buvote įstaigoje beveik keturias valandas ir nieko nepešėte. [...]*
'Darbe! Klausykite. Kad ir ką darytumėte, palaikykite su manimi ryšį, gerai?'
 (Čeponis 2004: 125)

- (48) **ST:** *'Gray, come here, please. [...] Watch him carefully' [...]*
'What're you saying, Darby?' (Grisham 1992: 394)

TT: *'Grėjau, prašau ateiti čionai. [...] Stebėkite jį atidžiai' [...]*
'Ką norite pasakyti, Darbe?' (Čeponis 2004: 318-319)

As expected in exchanges between people in a close romantic relationship, Darby and Callahan are on a first-name basis and use second-person singular pronouns in Lithuanian, as seen in example (46). Darby and Gavin are not in an intimate relationship, but they are on a first-name basis and communicate in an informal context. They become close when Gavin tries to help Darby by making the legal brief she wrote public and, later, to escape assassins, so that their exchanges in Čeponis's translation seem too formal with the use of polite pronouns and verbs, as seen in example (47). This sounds unnatural to the reader because these characters are not only unrestricted by their occupational positions, but also share a recent and highly traumatising experience, the death of

Gavin's oldest friend and Darby's lover, Callahan; they are also trying to uncover the truth about the murders together. This brings them close to each other, so that their exchanges are made unnecessarily formal in the Lithuanian translation.

The same problem occurs when Čeponis is translating exchanges between Grantham and Darby, as seen in example (48). They are also on a first-name basis, indicating growing intimacy between them. Darby also feels she can use imperatives when she addresses Grantham, which indicates that they are close. Moreover, before the exchange in example (48) they are said to be holding hands (Grisham 1992: 392), which indicates that they are becoming romantically involved. Considering the intimacy between them, their exchanges in Lithuanian sound unnatural, even more so than the exchanges between Gavin and Darby. Čeponis creates what Scollon and Scollon (1995) refer to as 'the paradox of face': although exchanges between Darby and Gavin or Grantham are those of solidarity and closeness in the source text, Čeponis's use of the second-person plural pronoun indicates distance, which is no longer present at this stage in the English narrative. Čeponis acknowledges the intimacy between Grantham and Darby only at the very end of the novel, when Darby invites Grantham to stay with her, as seen in example (49):

- (49) **ST:** *'I've missed **you** [...] How long will **you** stay?'*
*'I don't know. A couple of weeks. Maybe a year. It's up to **you**'* (Grisham 1992: 436)
- TT:** *'Pasiilgau **tavęs**, [...] Kiek **pabūsi**? - paklausė ji.*
*'Nežinau. Porą savaitių. O gal metus. **Tau** spręsti.* (Čeponis 2004: 351)

By the end of the novel Darby has invited Grantham to live with her on a Caribbean island, which becomes evident before this exchange, though Čeponis switches to the use of second-person singular pronouns only in the last chapter. This creates a sudden jump from formality to informality, even though in the English source text, this shift from allies to intimate friends takes place more gradually with their decision to use first names.

Another and possibly most important instance in which Čeponis fails to transfer the original meaning appears in the exchanges among characters in very high positions. While one would expect people in high positions to be very formally polite, as required by their high status, Grisham portrays these people satirically, so that their language very often does not coincide with their status. Although these characters continue to use polite titles, their language is often extremely rude and even vulgar, as seen in examples (50)-(52):

- (50) **ST:** *'Come on! Are **you** serious, **Mr. President!**' [...]*
*'Check it out, **Bob.**'* (Grisham 1992: 41)
- TT:** *'**Liaukitės!** Neįau **jūs** rimtai, **pone prezidentė?!'** [...]*

'Patikrinkite tai, Bobai' (Čeponis 2004: 39)

- (51) **ST:** *'Director, did you know Jensen was hanging around such places?' [...]*
'We have neither the authority nor the desire, Mr. Coal, to divulge such information' (Grisham 1992: 40-41)

TT: *'Direktoriau, ar jūs žinojote, kad Jensenas šlaistėsi po tokias vietas?' [...]*
'Mes neturime nei noro, nei galios atskleisti tokią informaciją, pone Koulai' (Čeponis 2004: 38)

- (52) **ST:** *'It's five-thirty, Chief. Voyles and Gminski are waiting'*
'Let them wait. [...] I'll take Voyles with me, but I'll keep his mouth shut. Make him stand behind me. [...] Networks'll carry it live, don't you think?' (Grisham 1992: 50)

TT: *'Penkios trisdešimt, šefe. Voilzas ir Gminskis laukia'*
'Tegul sau laukia. [...] Pasiimsiu kartu Voilzą, bet neduosiu jam išsižioti. Priversiu stovėti greta manęs. [...] Žiniasklaida transliuos tai tiesiogiai, kaip manote?' (Čeponis 2004: 45)

These examples are from exchanges among the President of the United States, his chief of staff, Fletcher Coal, the head of the FBI, Denton F. Voyles, and the head of the CIA, Bob Gminski. Examples (50) and (52) show that the President often addresses his inferiors by their first names, which indicates that his status is the highest, but also that he likes to emphasise this so that he is rather disrespectful towards them. Example (52) indicates his dislike of Voyles in his plans to humiliate him. Phrases such as 'neduosiu išsižioti' or 'priversiu stovėti' seen in example (52), show how he enjoys imagining his power over Voyles. The President himself is addressed politely with a title in example (50), while in example (52) he is addressed as *šefe*, or *chief* in English, which also expresses his superiority. Čeponis chooses to use the second-person plural pronouns and verbs to make these exchanges sound formal to reflect these characters' high status, irregardless of them often being rude.

The relations between Fletcher Coal and Denton Voyles are openly hostile; their social interactions are dictated by what Soltys and colleagues define as 'face wants' (2014: 33), which in these cases are simply to insult one another. As seen in examples (53) and (54), they insult and accuse each other and are deliberately rude.

- (53) **ST:** *'In fact, I was here when you were running around in dirty diapers, Mr. Coal' [...]*
'I think you've had leaks yourself' [...]
'It's confidential, Denton. You have my word' (Grisham 1992: 55)

TT: *'Is tiesų, lankiausi čia, kai jūs dar lakstėte su nešvariais vystyklais, pone Koulai' [...]*
'Man regis, nutekėdavo ir iš jūsų paties' [...]
'Tai konfidencialu, Dentonai. Duodu žodį.' (Čeponis 2004: 49)

- (54) **ST:** *'You're an idiot, Coal! [...]* It doesn't work that way, son' [...]
'You bust your ass to make sure these names are kept out of the papers until they're nominated'

[...] *'Listen, asshole, you want them checked out, you do it yourself'* (Grisham 1992: 85)

TT: *'Jūs idiotas, Koulai. [...] Šitaip nepavyks, sūnau' [...]*

Persiplėškite subinė, bet pasirūpinkite, kad tos pavardės nepatektų į laikraščius, kol nebus patvirtintos. [...]

Klausykite, šikniau, jei norite, kad jie būtų patikrinti, imkitės to pats' (Čeponis 2004: 73)

Their language not only does not coincide with their high social status: it is highly informal, with terms like *idiot* and *asshole* being used. These characters deliberately try to make each other feel inferior and assert their power; therefore, these exchanges are not supposed to be formal. Čeponis, on the other hand, faithfully translates all the rude forms of address, but does not use matching second-person singular pronouns and verbs, failing to represent the degeneration of their relations at this point in the narrative.

Beside expressing disrespect openly when addressing each other, Coal and the President are referred to in disrespectful words, which indicates that others do not accept their superior status. This is seen in examples (55) and (56), where Voyles refers to the President and Coal:

(55) ST: *'Meanwhile, idiot and Coal over there know nothing about the investigation'* (Grisham 1992: 236)

TT: *'Tuo tarpu tenai tas idiotas ir Koulas nieko nežino apie tyrimą'* (Čeponis 2004: 192)

(56) ST: *'Your hatchet man Coal has done a number on me with the press [...] You get that pit bull off my ass'* (Grisham 1992: 144)

TT: *'Jūsų parankinis Koulas iškrėtė man šunybę [...] Jūs atšauksite tą pitbulį nuo mano subinės'* (Čeponis 2004: 121)

In example (55) Voyles is speaking to deputy director K. O. Lewis, who is his subordinate and does not often work with the President. He shows solidarity with Lewis when he uses *idiot* in English and *tas idiotas* in Lithuanian without naming the President directly; he knows that Lewis shares Voyles's dislike for the President and will understand that *tas idiotas* is a reference to him. This indicates that for some time already Voyles and other people in his office have been refusing to accept the President's status and using derogatory terms about him and his staff. In example (56), Voyles speaks with the President; he specifically refers to the President's chief of staff using insulting and vulgar words like *ass* in English and *subinė* in Lithuanian, which show disrespect to both the President and Coal.

Other characters sometimes referred to disrespectfully are Gray Grantham and Darby Shaw, mostly by those involved in the central crime. As people working to expose the crime, Gray and Darby are a threat to those in high positions, since the truth would ruin their reputation and status.

For this reason Gray and Darby are sometimes referred to in a rude manner, as seen in examples (57) and (58):

(57) ST: '*An **eager-beaver law student** at Tulane wrote this damned thing*' (Grisham 1992: 116)

TT: '*Ši sumautą dalyką parašė viena **stropuolė studentė** iš Tuleino*' (Čeponis 2004: 99)

(58) ST: '*Our friend Grantham has been quiet*' (Grisham 1992: 248)

TT: '*Mūsų **draugužis Granthemas** tyli*' (Čeponis 2004: 202)

Examples (57) and (58) come from exchanges between Coal and the President. They are instances of what Allan and Burridge consider as '[s]ocial distance marking in forms used for naming and especially addressing [...] achieved in many languages through sarcastic use of intimate terms' (2006: 138). In example (57) Coal sarcastically refers to Darby as *stropuolė studentė* or *eager-beaver law student* in English to indicate that she is a nuisance, thus trying to reduce her authority. In example (58) the President refers to Grantham sarcastically, calling him a friend, though they are not close. There is also an instance where Grantham is referred to as *šunsnukis* or *son of a bitch* in English, (see Table 81 in Appendix 7) by a lawyer Marty Velmano, whom Grantham exposes as being involved in the crime (Grisham 1992: 406). This term of reference is the most hostile one used for Grantham.

On the contrary, there are instances where terms of reference express affection, closeness, and friendship between the characters. As seen in example (59), Darby is referred to with pet names that connote pity. In examples (60)-(62) Gavin Verheek, Denton Voyles, and Thomas Callahan are referred to in ways that indicate solidarity and closeness.

(59) ST: '***Poor kid** [...] She's a scared **kid***' (Grisham 1992: 160)

TT: '***Vargšėlė** [...] **Mažytė**, išsigandusi*' (Čeponis 2004: 133-134)

(60) ST: '*I promise you'll personally meet my boss, **the Honorable F. Denton Voyles***' (Grisham 1992: 212)

TT: '*Pažadau, rytoj jūs pati susitiksite su mano bosu, **garbiuoju F. Dentonu Voilzu***' (Čeponis 2004: 174)

(61) ST: '*Then **my friend Gavin** got himself killed*' (Grisham 1992: 414)

TT: '*Paskui buvo nužudytas **mano draugas Gevinas***' (Čeponis 2004: 335)

(62) ST: '***The great Thomas Callahan**, he of the disposable women, has fallen hard [...] We're talking about **Peter Pan** here, **Cool Hand Callahan**, the man with the monthly version of the world's most gorgeous woman*' (Grisham 1992: 101-102)

TT: '***Didysis Tomas Kalahanas**, profesionalas nusikratyti moterų, giliai įklimpęs.*

[...] *Kalbamės čia apie Piterį Peną, Šaltakraujį Kalahaną, žmogų, kas mėnesį galintį papasakoti apie vis kitą nuostabiausią pasaulio moterį* (Čeponis 2004: 87)

Although in example (59) *poor kid* and *scared kid* and the diminutives *vargšėlė* and *mažytė* in Lithuanian express pity, they also refer to youth, which gives Darby a lower status. In example (60) and (61) Gavin Verheek and Denton Voyles refer to each other; these terms of reference indicate a close relationship between them and a high level of respect. In example (62) Gavin refers to Callahan using many humorous terms, which denote solidarity and a close relationship between the two men who, in fact, have been friends for years. Other than these, terms of reference in *The Pelican Brief* are rather neutral: there are titles such as *Mr* or *Miss*, occupational titles, or the use of first and last names (see Tables 76-105 in Appendix 7).

In the original English text Grisham shows that informal language is not necessarily rude, while formal language does not always indicate politeness. However, much like the British society of the mid-twentieth century, the American society of the late-twentieth century is also a culture of what Aldrich and Leibiger (2009) define as ‘negative politeness’. By favouring formality expressed through the use of the second-person plural pronoun, Čeponis misrepresents relations among characters in high positions, making them more polite than they should be. He also tends to make some intimate exchanges unnecessarily formal. Although faithful to the English source text in terms of translating all of the occurrences of forms of address and terms of reference, Čeponis loses faithfulness to part of the meaning of the original exchanges.

8 CONCLUSIONS

Christie’s *The Mirror Crack’d from Side to Side* and Grisham’s *The Pelican Brief* reflect two societies, with social interactions and norms typical to the time periods in which the novels were written. Both of these novels focus on a society that is changing which, in turn, has an impact on social interactions. Whereas in *The Pelican Brief* various titles are just a formality that does not imply much respect, in Christie’s novel the abundance of titles used when addressing or even referring to a character indicates the status and class-consciousness of British society, as well as the strictness of the norms of social exchanges. Translating the novel almost half a century later, Kirvaitytė faces the task of not only making the Lithuanian version sound natural to the reader but also depicting earlier British society in a way that has the same effect as Christie’s depiction. Although Čeponis translates Grisham’s novel a decade later, he has a challenge as well: that of transferring the same satirical atmosphere present in Grisham’s original English novel into Lithuanian.

As a Golden Age crime fiction novel, Christie's *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* is very realistic in describing the social world and its changes in the social spaces of St Mary Mead, Gossington Hall, and the Development. The narrative represents a part of British society transitioning into greater modernity, focusing on the rise of new suburbs, changes in commerce, and the disappearance of traditional live-in servants with the consequences this has on the members of the older world. For example, Miss Marple is now taken care of by Miss Knight who is not a servant and belongs to the middle class, while Cherry, who takes a job as a domestic on a daily basis, links Miss Marple to the new working class. Normally, Golden Age crime fiction concentrates on the life of the upper-middle or upper classes, disregarding the servants as major characters; however, characters who do different kinds of domestic work play a significant role in this novel, emphasising the change in the society and the rise of the upper-working and lower-middle classes.

Similarly, as a legal thriller Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* is very realistic in describing the social and legal elite of the United States, as well as the people who belong to these high circles of power. It represents the elite of American society in a satirical way, focusing on its behaviour and language as contradicting its high status; the novel depicts a changing society with consequent shifts in formality and politeness. Unlike those depicted in Christie's Golden Age novel *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side*, the norms of social exchanges are less strict here; however, Grisham's representation of the speech used by the people in the highest ranks of society, such as the President of the United States and the heads of the CIA and FBI, reveals that instead of using the sophisticated and formal language expected of such high-status groups, they often exchange highly vulgar terms.

In *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side*, as sociologists find is the case in contemporary society, occupation is the major marker of social class and status. Lifestyle and cultural consumption are also markers of class and status but they depend on one's income: one can afford a more expensive lifestyle if one's income is high enough. Characters such as Marina Gregg and Jason Rudd, celebrities in the international elite, occupy a high position in the cinema world, which grants them high status and provides enough income for their expensive lifestyle. The novel also emphasises the rise of the working classes so that borderline characters such as Cherry and Jim Baker have relatively high income, which allows them to buy a new house and household goods that are markers of suburban status. Because of their income, these characters can enjoy more expensive lifestyles than within the grasp of upper-working and lower-middle classes in the past.

In *The Pelican Brief*, on the other hand, the main markers of social status are occupation and education. The novel is set in the late twentieth century, when cultural consumption does not play a

major role as a marker of social status. Christie's novel depicts the late 1950s and indicates that lower classes now indulge in cultural activities as well, so that it is not surprising that Grisham's representation of the early 1990s does not focus on cultural consumption to signal status in the society, as interest in culture is no longer so closely tied to class. What makes the society in Grisham's novel different from the one in Christie's is the change in power relations. In Christie's novel, those with high status have power over those with low status, while in Grisham's novel a character with a very low status, for example, Sarge, the janitor, may have power over the character of the highest status, the President of the United States, because he is sophisticated enough to use possibilities to access important information. The protagonist of the novel, Darby, is still a beginning law student when she puts together facts that eventually bring down major businessmen and politicians.

Unlike in *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side*, in which the level of politeness, respect and power corresponds with the form of address used, there is a distinction between true and untrue politeness, formality, respect, and power in the society of *The Pelican Brief*. Often, especially among people in the highest ranks, social exchanges are rude and disrespectful, even though they superficially appear to be formal, since polite forms of address are retained; in such cases formality and politeness are actually used as a means to express disrespect. Because such disrespect is aimed at those with the most power in society, these people's right to power is questioned. Moreover, formality no longer signals politeness in this social circle, whereas informal exchanges are not necessarily rude. Often personality has a great deal of influence on how others treat people regardless of their status.

Overall, Christie and Grisham focus on different aspects of social change. Christie is very interested in how an old British rural society moves into a more modern period, with many people still clutching to their old habits, attitudes, and norms, especially in speech, as the abundant use of titles indicates. Grisham, on the other hand, turns his attention to the moral decay that comes from rapid change in American life with its influence on social interactions and, consequently, the language used in them. The most evident gap between the societies depicted in the two novels is that governmental institutions like the police in Christie's novel restore order, while in Grisham's novel they actually disrupt it. Police officers in Christie's novel are seen as having high status and acting responsibly, while in Grisham's novel even higher-status people abuse their position and feel little responsibility to their society.

When it comes to transferring this in the Lithuanian target texts, the translators, Kirvaitytė and Čeponis, choose different approaches. Except for a few mistranslations and omissions, Kirvaitytė's translation is generally faithful to the original English novel, especially in regard to

forms of address and terms of reference that include using English titles such as *Mr*, *Mrs*, and *Miss* that are phonetically adapted in Lithuanian. Although this choice has a foreignising effect on the reader, Kirvaitytė, except for a few mistranslations, achieves a high level of accuracy when indicating a character's marital status, which is very important in the case of Miss Marple, who is unmarried but because of her age would be addressed as *ponia* in Lithuanian. In this way she succeeds in representing the strictness of British social norms and the characters' wish to keep to these.

Despite several omissions and a printing error, Jonas Čeponis remains faithful to the English source text in translating almost all of the occurrences of forms of address and terms of reference. Unlike Rasa Kirvaitytė in her translation of Christie's novel, Čeponis shifts his attention from the source culture to the target culture, as he uses the strategy of localisation when translating titles such as *Mem* into *panelė*; Čeponis avoids making his translation foreignising. However, when titles are absent, Kirvaitytė avoids foreignisation as well. She makes changes to forms of address or terms of reference that do not include titles so that they sound appropriately similar to those used in the target culture: for example, the insult *you old jelly bag* is translated by the vivid and appropriate Lithuanian phrase *tu sena karve*.

When translating exchanges between characters, translators face another difficulty, the T/V distinction. Since the distinction between familiar (T) and polite (V) second-person pronouns does not exist in English, titles are frequently used to express social distance, but that is not always the case in Lithuanian, as the T/V distinction is present in the language. The use of titles often indicates to the translators whether a familiar or polite second-person pronoun should be used, which works for Kirvaitytė, but poses a problem to Čeponis. For Kirvaitytė, the status and class-consciousness of British society, as well as the characters' age and occupational status have to be taken into account in order to achieve the same effect as in the original novel. Maintaining social distance, except in exchanges between spouses and friends, and practising polite behaviour are significant elements in social practises depicted in the English novel, which Kirvaitytė successfully transfers into her Lithuanian version.

Čeponis, however, faces a problem when combining forms of address with the T/V second-person pronouns. Because this distinction does not exist in the English language, the translator has to make decisions based on the characters' behaviour, the overall language, the situation, and the forms of address used in an exchange. Čeponis's translation is often too polite when the exchange in the original is much more clearly intimate or rude because of his tendency to favour the polite second-person plural pronoun *jūs*. This, in turn, creates a paradox of face and fails to represent the use of polite forms by the characters to express disrespect, so that Grisham's satirical depiction of

American society in that period of time is not so clear to the Lithuanian target audience. Moreover, these overly polite exchanges in hostile situations may sound awkward to the target reader, which also makes the target text sound unnatural. For reasons like this, it is important for the translator to thoroughly analyse the social world of the novel that is being translated so that social interactions are not misinterpreted in the target text.

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, Alan W. and Carol A. Leibiger. 2009. Face It! Reference Work and Politeness Theory Go Hand in Hand. Paper presented at the conference 'ACRL Fourteenth National Conference'. Seattle, Washington, March 12 – 15, 2009. 235-246.
- Allan, Keith and Kate Burridge. 2006. *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Allaste, Airi-Alina and Andy Bennett. 2013. Lifestyles in former socialist society. In Airi-Alina Allaste (ed) *'Back in the West': Changing Lifestyles in Transforming Societies*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 9-29.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas, Geniušienė, Emma, Girdenis, Aleksas, Slizienė, Nijolė, Tekorienė, Dalija, Valeckienė, Adelė, and Elena Valiulytė. 2006. *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.
- Anderman, Gunilla M. 1993. Untranslatability: The Case of Pronouns of Address in Literature. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 1: 57-67.
- 'Biography.' 2017. In *John Grisham: America's Favourite Storyteller*. <http://www.jgrisham.com/bio/> (Accessed 12 October 2017)
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 2006. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. In Adam Jaworski and Nikolas Coupland (eds) *The Discourse Reader*. 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge, 311-324.
- Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman. 1960. The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In Thomas A. Sebeok (ed) *Style in Language*. Cambridge: MIT, 253-276.
- Carroll, Lewis. 1998. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. Chicago: Volume One.
- Chan, Tak Wing and John H. Goldthorpe. 2007a. Class and Status: The Conceptual Distinction and its Empirical Relevance. *American Sociological Review* 72: 512-532.
- Chan, Tak Wing and John H. Goldthorpe. 2007b. Social Status and Newspaper Readership. *American Journal of Sociology* 112.4: 1095-1134.
- Chan, Tak Wing and John H. Goldthorpe. 2010. Social Status and Cultural Consumption. In Tak Wing Chan (ed) *Social Status and Cultural Consumption*. New York: Cambridge, 1-28.
- Chen, Yu. 2010. Cultural Differences in Chinese and American Address Forms. *Asian Culture and History* 2.2: 82-85.
- Christie, Agatha. 1962. *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side*. London: Collins.

- Christie, Agatha. 1977. *An Autobiography*. London: Fontana.
- Christie, Agatha. 2000. *Perskilęs Veidrodis*. Translated by Rasa Kirvaitytė. Vilnius: Sirokas.
- Commons, Michael Lamport. 2008. Implications of Hierarchical Complexity for Social Stratification, Economics, and Education. *World Futures* 64: 430-435.
- Cook, Manuela. 2014. Beyond T and V – Theoretical Reflections on the Analysis of Forms of Address. *American Journal of Linguistics* 3 (1): 17-26.
- Cuddon, J. A. 1992. Suspense. In J. A. Cuddon (ed) *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. 3rd edition. New York: Penguin, 937.
- Čubajevaitė, Laura. 2006. Cultural and Linguistic Differences in Using Personal Pronouns: Case of Lithuanian as a Foreign Language. *Kalbotyra* 56 (3): 33-38.
- Dabartinės Lietuvių Kalbos Tekstynas Homepage. 2017. <http://tekstynas.vdu.lt/tekstynas/> (Accessed 12 November 2017)
- Danytė, Milda. 2011. *Introduction to the Analysis of Crime Fiction*. Kaunas: Vytautas Magnus University. http://vddb.library.lt/fedora/get/LT-eLABa-0001:B.03~2011~ISBN_978-9955-12-698-0/DS.001.1.01.BOOK (Accessed 18 October 2016)
- Danytė, Milda. 2012. Thematic Shifts in Crime Fiction: How American Thrillers Engage with Social Issues at the Turn of the Century. In Regina Rudaitytė (ed) *Literature in Society*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 208-226.
- Danytė, Milda. 2016. Analysing Multilingual Crime Fiction and its Translation: The Issue of Foreignisms. *Acta Humanitarica Universitatis Saulensis* 23: 12-25.
- ‘Dear.’ 2017. *Merriam Webster online dictionary*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dear> (Accessed 4 April 2017)
- Dziedravičiūtė, Neringa. 2009. Translation Problems for Lithuanian Translators Raised by English Dysphemistic Forms of Address: The Example of J. D. Salinger’s *The Catcher in the Rye*. In Floriana Popescu (ed) *Perspectives in Translation Studies*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars: 54-70.
- Ermida, Isabel. 2006. Linguistic Mechanisms of Power in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: Applying Politeness Theory to Orwell’s World. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 842-862.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1980. Sociolinguistic Rules of Address. In John Pride and Janet Holmes (eds) *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Feng, Lan. 2014. The Relevance Between Politeness Systems and Interpersonal Behaviour in Communication under Intercultural Backgrounds. *Cambridge Journal of China Studies* 9 (3): 65-72.
- Gane, Nicholas. 2005. Max Weber as Social Theorist: ‘Class, Status, Party’. *European Journal of Social Theory* 8.2: 211-226.

- Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, Pilar. 2013. Introduction: Face, Identity and Im/politeness. Looking Backward, Moving forward: From Goffman to Practice Theory. *Journal of Politeness Research* 9 (1): 1-33.
- Gelder, Ken. 2004. *Popular Fiction: The Logistics and Practice of the Literary Field*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Glover, David. 2003. The Thriller. In Martin Priestman (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Crime Fiction*. New York: Cambridge UP, 135-155.
- Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-face Behaviour*. London: Penguin.
- Grisham, John. 1992. *The Pelican Brief*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell.
- Grisham, John. 2004. *Pelikano dosjė*. Translated by Jonas Čėponis. Kaunas: Jotema.
- Grisham, John. 2010. Boxers, Briefs and Books. In *The New York Times*. 5 September 2010. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/06/opinion/06Grisham.html> (Accessed 12 October 2017)
- Horsley, Lee. 2005. 'Classic Detective Fiction.' In *Twentieth-Century Crime Fiction*. New York: Oxford UP, 12-66.
- 'Hotshot.' 2017. *Merriam Webster online dictionary*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hotshot> (Accessed 12 November 2017)
- Hout, Michael. 2008. How Class Works: Objective and Subjective Aspects of Class Since the 1970s. In Annette Lareau and Dalton Conley (ed) *Social Class: How Does It Work?* New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 25-65.
- 'John Grisham, Looking for a Place to Hide.' 2016. In CBS News. 23 October 2016. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/john-grisham-looking-for-a-place-to-hide/> (Accessed 12 October 2017)
- Kaminskienė, Ligija and Dalia Mankauskienė. 2013. Parallel Texts as Culture-Embedded Units of Thought. In Inesa Šeškauskienė and Jonė Grigaliūnienė (ed) *Anglistics in Lithuania: Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Aspects of Study*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars: 12-28.
- Kiyama, Sachiko, Tamaoka, Katsuo, and Masato Takiura. 2012. Applicability of Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory to a Non-Western Culture: Evidence From Japanese Facework Behaviors. *SAGE Open*: 1-15.
- Knight, Stephen. 2003. The Golden Age. In Martin Priestman (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Crime Fiction*. New York: Cambridge UP, 77-95.
- Lambert, Paul and Erik Bigahen. 2012. Stratification Research and Occupation-Based Social Classifications. In Paul Lambert, Roxanne Connelly, Robert M. Blackburn and Vernon Gayle (ed) *Social Stratification: Trends and Processes*. Burlington and Farnham: Ashgate, 13-29.

- Leichter, Matt. 2017. Law School Cost Data (1996-). In *The Last Gen X American*. <https://lawschooltuitionbubble.wordpress.com/original-research-updated/the-lstb-data/> (Accessed 30 November 2017).
- Lizardo, Omar. 2010. Culture and Stratification. In John R. Hall, Laura Grindstaff, and Ming-Cheng Lo (ed) *Handbook of Cultural Sociology*. New York and London: Routledge, 305-315.
- Mailhac, Jean-Pierre. 2000. Subtitling and Dubbing, for Better or Worse? The English Video Versions of *Gazon Maudit*. In Miriam Salama-Carr (ed) *On Translating French Literature and Film II*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 129-155.
- Makinen, Merja. 2006. *Agatha Christie: Investigating Femininity*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave.
- Makinen, Merja. 2010. Agatha Christie (1890-1976). In Charles J. Rzepka and Lee Horsley (eds) *A Companion to Crime Fiction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 415-426.
- Mallinson, Christine. 2007. Social Class, Social Status and Stratification: Revisiting Familiar Concepts in Sociolinguistics. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 13.2: 149-163.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. 1970. *The German Ideology*. Translated by Christopher John Arthur. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Meister, Lova. 2016. The T/V Dilemma: Forms of Address as a Stylistic Resource in English-Swedish Subtitling. *Perspectives* 24 (4): 527-542.
- Meyerhoff, Miriam. 2006. *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Millner, Muray Jr. 2010. Status Distinction and Boundaries. In John R. Hall, Laura Grindstaff, and Ming-Cheng Lo (ed) *Handbook of Cultural Sociology*. New York and London: Routledge, 295-304.
- Morse, Chris R. and Walid A. Afifi. 2015. I'm Not Rude, I'm Just Moody: The Impact of Affect on Politeness in Initial Interactions. *Communication Research* 4 (1): 87-106.
- Nanbakhsh, Golnaz. 2012. Moving Beyond T/V Pronouns of Power and Solidarity in Interaction: Persian Agreement Mismatch Construction. *Številka* 52: 253-266.
- Nesbit, Tom. 2006. What's the Matter with Social Class? *Adult Education Quarterly* 56.3: 171-187.
- Nevala, Minna. 2004. Accessing Politeness Axes: Forms of Address and Terms of Reference in Early English Correspondence. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 2125-2160.
- Ole Miss Law. 2017. Tuition and Financial Aid. In *The University of Mississippi School of Law*. <https://law.olemiss.edu/admissions/tuition-financial-aid/> (Accessed 5 November 2017)
- 'Personality.' 2017. *Merriam Webster online dictionary*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/personality> (Accessed 4 April 2017)
- Pusey, Allen. 2011. John Grisham on Grappling with Race, the Death Penalty; and Lawyers

- 'Polluting Their Own Profession'. In *Aba Journal*. 23 September 2011.
http://www.abajournal.com/news/article/john_grisham_awarded_inaugural_harper_lee_prize
 (Accessed 12 October 2017)
- Rhem, Diane. 2016. A Conversation With Bestselling Author John Grisham. In *Diane Rhem*. 17 November 2016. <https://dianerehm.org/shows/2016-11-17/a-conversation-with-bestselling-author-john-grisham> (Accessed 12 October 2017)
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2014. Why Status Matters for Inequality. *American Sociological Review* 79.1: 1-16.
- Rowland, Susan. 2001. *From Agatha Christie to Ruth Rendell: British Women Writers in Detective and Crime Fiction*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave.
- Rowland, Susan. 2010. The "Classical" Model of the Golden Age. In Charles J. Rzepka and Lee Horsley (eds) *A Companion to Crime Fiction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 117-128.
- Rubin, Jennifer. 2009. John Grisham's Law: The Social and Economic Impact of a Pop Novelist. *Politics and Ideas*: 56-60.
- Scaggs, John. 2005. *Crime Fiction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Scollon, Ron and Suzanne Wong Scollon. 1995. *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Segre, Sandro. 2010. Developments in Neo-Weberian Class Analysis. A Discussion and Comparison. *Società e Mutamento politico* 1.2: 219-226.
- Simpson, Philip. 2010. Noir and the Psycho Thriller. In Charles J. Rzepka and Lee Horsley (eds) *A Companion to Crime Fiction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 187-198.
- Soltys, Jessica, Terkourafi, Marina, and Napoleon Katsos. 2014. Disentangling Politeness Theory and the Strategic Speaker Approach: Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Predictions. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 11 (1): 31-56.
- Stewart, Daniel. 2005. Social Status in an Open-Source Community. *American Sociological Review* 70.5: 823-842.
- Symons, Julian. 1993. *Bloody Murder: From the Detective Story to the Crime Novel*. 3rd ed. New York: The Mysterious.
- Thornborrow, Joanna. 2004. Language and Identity. In Ishita Singh and Jean Stilwell Peccei (eds) *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 157-173.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. 2013. The Typology of Detective Fiction. In David Lodge and Nigel Wood (eds) *Modern Criticism and Theory*. 3rd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 225-233.
- Treinman, Donald J. 2001. Occupations, Stratification, and Mobility. In Judith R. Blau (ed) *The Blackwell Companion to Sociology*. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell, 297-314.
- Tulane University. 2017. Prospective Students. In *Tulane University Law School*.

- <http://www.law.tulane.edu/tlsadmissions/index.aspx?id=200> (Accessed 5 November 2017)
- ‘US News Report Law School Rankings.’ 2017. In *Law School Numbers*. <http://schools.lawschoolnumbers.com/rankings/us-news-report-law-school-rankings> (Accessed 3 November 2017)
- Valde, Kathleen S. and Mary Lynn Miller Henningsen. 2015. Facework in Responding to Unethical Communication. *International Journal of Business Communication* 52 (4): 369-403.
- Vaičėnienė, Jurgita. 2006. The Language of Advertising. *Darbai ir dienos* 45: 215-237.
- Vergis, Nikos and Marina Terkourafi. 2015. The Role of the Speaker’s Emotional State in Im/politeness Assessments. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 34 (3): 316-342.
- Walton, Priscilla L. 2001. Interrogating Judicial Bodies: Women and the Legal Thriller. *South Central Review* 18.3/4: 21-37.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. 2006. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 5th ed. Malden, Oxford, and Victoria: Blackwell.
- Watson, Kate. 2014. The Crime Thriller in Context. In Gary Hoppenstand (ed) *Critical Insights: The American Thriller*. New York: Salem, 3-18.
- Watts, Richard J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society*. Vol. 1 and 2. Berkeley: California UP.
- Weininger, Elliot B. 2005. Foundations of Pierre Bourdieu’s class analysis. In Erik Olin Wright (ed) *Approaches to Class Analysis*. New York: Cambridge, 82-119.
- Williams, Tracy Rundstrom. 2005. Linguistic Politeness in Expressing Condolences: A Case Study. In *RASK: International Journal of Languages and Linguistics*. Odense: Odense UP, 45-62.
- Wood, Linda A. and Rolf O. Kroger. 1991. Politeness and Forms of Address. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 10 (3): 145-168.
- ‘Wop’. 2017. *Merriam Webster online dictionary*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/wop> (Accessed 4 April 2017)
- Yang, Xiaomei. 2010. Address Forms of English: Rules and Variations. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1 (5): 743-745.
- Yokotani, Kenji. 2015. Japanese Young Adults’ Disrespectful Forms of address used for Fathers Predict Feelings of Rejection and Depression. *Names* 63 (2): 96-108.
- Zweig, Michael. 2012. *The Working Class Majority: America’s Best Kept Secret*. 2nd ed. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP.

APPENDIX 1: Plot summary of Agatha Christie's *The Mirror Crack'd from Side to Side* (1962)

The celebrated American actor Marina Gregg and her husband, the equally famous director Jason Rudd, buy Gossington Hall, a Victorian estate in St Mary Mead, where Mrs Bantry, Miss Marple's friend, used to live before her husband died. Soon after they move in, Marina and Jason host a fête to aid the local St John Ambulance organisation. Unexpectedly, Heather Badcock, the secretary of this organisation, dies. Just before dying, Heather tells Marina how she met her many years ago when, although sick, she managed to see her idol and get her autograph. It is later revealed that Heather's drink was poisoned with an anti-depressant called 'Calmo'.

Mrs Bantry notices the strange way Marina looks when talking to Heather and likens her to the Lady of Shalot, as if 'doom has come upon her'. After the fête, Mrs Bantry shares her observations with Miss Marple, who later tells them to Chief-Inspector Dermot Craddock, a detective from Scotland Yard. It turns out that Heather Badcock's drink was spilled and Marina handed Heather her own drink: it seems that Marina was the intended victim. The list of suspects is long, since quite a few guests have close ties with her. Among these suspects are her husband Jason, Ardwyck Fenn, a former admirer and a well-known television producer, Lola Brewster, an actor and the former wife of one of Marina's former husbands, Margot Bence, a photographer who later is revealed to be one of the three children whom Marina adopted and later abandoned, and Arthur Badcock, later revealed as Marina's first husband.

While the police is investigating Heather Badcock's case, two other people die. The first victim is Jason Rudd's secretary Ella Zielinsky, who is poisoned by cyanide in her hay-fever atomiser. The second is Marina and Jason's Italian butler Giuseppe, shot after he returns from London where he has deposited £500 into his bank account. Ella Zielinsky has been a suspect because she has been in love with Jason, while Giuseppe is also suspected for having so much money. It then comes to light that Ella and Giuseppe have both known something about how Heather Badcock was poisoned, and probably became blackmailers.

Eventually, after talking to many people, Miss Marple works out the reasons for these murders and understands that Marina herself is the murderer. Many years ago Marina was pregnant, but she somehow contracted German measles; her child was born mentally disabled and then was institutionalised. Miss Marple puts together clues to re-create the scene when Marina realised how, many years ago, Heather covered her rash with make-up. Marina's pregnancy was ruined by the woman standing in front of her, who, with great joy and pride, tells her how, though ill with German measles, she managed to get her favourite actor's autograph. Out of rage Marina poisons her own drink, makes Heather spill hers, and then gives her the poisoned one to drink. Ella Zielinsky and

Giuseppe have seen some of this and started blackmailing Marina, for which they die. At the end of the novel, Marina dies in her sleep, as she apparently overdoses on 'Calmo'; however, Miss Marple understands that her adoring husband Jason killed her to save her from prison.

APPENDIX 2: Plot summary of John Grisham's *The Pelican Brief* (1992)

Victor Mattiece, an oil-tycoon who has heavily supported the current President of the United States in his political campaign, wishes to expand his industry in New Orleans, Louisiana, the home of the brown pelican. Drilling oil in New Orleans would cause an environmental crisis; probably the Supreme Court would vote against Mattiece's lawsuit. For this reason two Supreme Court judges, Abraham Rosenberg and Glenn Jensen, who hold environmentalist views, are killed by the assassin Khamel hired by Mattiece.

A law student at Tulane, Darby Shaw prepares a legal brief about this event. Her professor and lover, Thomas Callahan, gives the brief to his friend Gavin Verheek, who is a lawyer at the FBI. The legal brief soon reaches the President and his chief of staff, Fletcher Coal, who try to keep the brief a secret since the President's involvement in an environmental crime would harm their reputations and affect the President's chances at re-election. For this reason Darby becomes the target of killers.

At first Thomas Callahan dies in a car explosion that was meant for Darby, when he gets into the car alone after an argument with her. His friend Verheek tries to help Darby; however, he is killed by Khamel before he can meet with her. Throughout the intervention of a CIA agent who kills Khamel, Darby escapes and contacts a young journalist working for the *Washington Post*, Gray Grantham. Grantham gets valuable information about the President from a janitor working in the White House. He is also contacted by a young lawyer who works in a law firm employed by Victor Mattiece. Although this lawyer is killed, Darby is able to access the information he has left. Together she and Grantham expose Mattiece and the President; Darby is now protected by the FBI and CIA. Afterwards, shaken and deeply disillusioned by the realities of American corruption, she quits her studies to spend time on a Caribbean island. Grantham enjoys a period of fame for his revealing articles, but eventually joins Darby on the island.

APPENDIX 3: Xiaomei Yang's (2010) summary of classification of forms of address

Table 5. The original summary of the types of forms of address provided by Yang (2010: 743).

1 Name	Examples
(1) full name	"A rise! <i>Horatio Fliyd Beanish</i> , do you know we are at war?"
(2) first name	"They are on your desk, <i>Robert</i> "
(3) nickname	"Jonny, there's something I have to tell you."
2 Title	Examples
(1) title concerning family relationship	"All right now, children! Outside for your walk, <i>father's</i> orders."
(2) title of occupation	" <i>Operator</i> , could you please put through a call to Copenhagen?"
(3) title of rank	"You are right, <i>captain</i> ."
(4) honorifics	" <i>Your Royal Highness</i> , twenty-four hours. They can't be blank."
(5) other titles	" <i>Oh, darling</i> ." / " <i>You dogs!</i> " / "What do you want, <i>fellow</i> ?"
3 Title plus name	<i>Doctor Smith</i>
4 No-naming or Φ .	"Good morning"

APPENDIX 4: Forms of address in Agatha Christie (1962) and Rasa Kirvaitytė (2000)¹

Table 6. Forms of address used for Miss Marple.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Dear (e.g. pp. 14, 56, 204)	13	Brangute (e.g. pp. 14, 190, 214)	11
			Brangioji (p. 194)	1
			Mieloji (p. 53)	1
2	Jane (e.g. pp. 31, 61, 151)	12	Džeine (e.g. pp. 28, 57, 142)	11
			- (p. 28)	1
3	Miss Marple (e.g. pp. 123, 224, 246)	7	Mis Marpl (e.g. pp. 115, 226, 228)	7
4	Aunt Jane (e.g. pp. 155, 219, 220, 255)	5	Tetule Džeine (pp. 146, 203, 204, 235)	5
5	Dear, dear (interjection) (pp. 14, 15, 204, 210)	4	Brangute, brangute (pp. 13, 14)	2
			Brangute (pp. 190, 195)	2
5	Madam (p. 242)	2	Madam (p. 223)	2
6	Aunty (p. 80)	1	Tetule (p. 76)	1
7	M'am (p. 210)	1	Mem (p. 195)	1

¹ If there are fewer than six occurrences, the page numbers in which all of them occur are provided. If there are six and more occurrences, the page numbers for the first three examples that show different usages are given. If the use of a form of address in all occurrences is the same, the page numbers for the first three instances are presented.

8	Miss... (p. 243)	1	Mis... (p. 224)	1
9	Missus (p. 7)	1	Ponia (p. 7)	1
10	My dear (p. 34)	1	Brangioji (p. 31)	1
11	My dear lady (p. 64)	1	Mano brangioji ledi (p. 61)	1
12	You ladies (p. 65)	1	Jūs damos (p. 61)	1

Table 7. Forms of address used for Chief-Inspector Dermot Craddock.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Chief-Inspector (e.g. pp. 94, 97, 104)	13	Vyresnysis inspektorius (e.g. pp. 88, 98, 101)	11
			Inspektorius (e.g. pp. 100, 101)	2
2	Inspector (e.g. pp. 144, 156, 161)	8	Inspektorius (e.g. pp. 135, 147, 152)	8
3	My dear boy (pp. 79, 127, 128, 219, 220, 221)	7	Mielasis (pp. 120, 203, 204, 205)	4
			Mano mielas berniuk (p. 75)	1
			Mano brangus berniuk (p. 119)	1
			Brangus berniuk (p. 119)	1
4	Inspector Craddock (pp. 127, 161, 214, 215, 225)	5	Inspektorius Kredokai (pp. 151, 153, 198, 200, 208)	5
5	Mr Craddock (pp. 107, 137, 148, 201, 225)	5	Misteri Kredokai (pp. 101, 129, 139, 188, 208)	5
6	Chief-Inspector Craddock (pp. 93, 101, 140, 163)	4	Vyresnysis inspektorius Kredokai (pp. 94, 131)	2
			Inspektorius Kredokai (pp. 88, 118)	2
7	Dermot (pp. 79, 226)	2	Dermotai (pp. 75, 209)	2
8	My dear Dermot (pp. 221, 224)	2	Brangusis Dermotai (p. 204)	1
			Mielasis Dermotai (p. 207)	1
9	Craddock (p. 215)	1	Kredokai (p. 200)	1
10	Dermot, my dear boy (p. 227)	1	Mielasis Dermotai (p. 210)	1
11	Detective-Inspector Craddock (p. 168)	1	Inspektorius Kredokai (p. 157)	1
12	My dear (p. 164)	1	Mielasis (p. 154)	1
13	Sir (p. 254)	1	Sere (p. 235)	1
14	Stranger (p. 170)	1	Nepažįstamasis (p. 159)	1
15	You nosy bastard (p. 175)	1	Šunsnuki (p. 164)	1

Table 8. Forms of address used for Marina Gregg.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Mis Gregg (e.g. pp. 141, 145, 149)	13	Mis Greg (e.g. pp. 132, 136, 140)	10
			Misis Greg (pp. 136, 137, 138)	3

2	Marina (pp. 147, 217, 218)	3	Marina (pp. 138, 201, 202)	3
3	Darling (pp. 43, 217)	2	Brangioji (pp. 35, 36, 40, 202)	4
4	Honey (p. 38)	2		

Table 9. Forms of address used for Jason Rudd.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Mr Rudd (e.g. pp. 146, 214, 247)	13	Misteri Radai (e.g. pp. 137, 199, 229)	13
2	Jason (e.g. pp. 39, 144, 148)	8	Džesonai (e.g. pp. 36, 136, 139)	8
3	Jinx (pp. 37, 217, 218)	3	Džinksai (pp. 35, 202,)	3
4	Jinx, darling (p. 143)	1	Džinksai, mielasis (p. 135)	1
5	Jinx, Jinx (p. 217)	1	Džinksai Džinksai (p. 201)	1
6	Sir (p. 248)	1	Sere (p. 229)	1

Table 10. Forms of address used for Mrs Dolly Bantry.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Mrs Bantry (e.g. pp. 44, 50, 86)	9	Misis Bentri (e.g. pp. 40, 46, 81)	9
2	Dolly (pp. 65, 67, 151, 233, 234)	5	Dole (pp. 62, 63, 142, 216, 217)	5
3	Dear (p. 60)	1	Mieloji (p. 57)	1
4	Girls (p. 53)	1	Merginos (p. 49)	1
5	You ladies (p. 65)	1	Jūs damos (p. 61)	1
6	You folk over here (p. 43)	1	Jūs žmonės (p. 40)	1

Table 11. Forms of address used for Cherry Baker.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Cherry (e.g. pp. 181, 205, 236)	13	Čere (e.g. pp. 170, 193, 220)	13
2	My dear (p. 181)	2	Brangute (p. 170)	2
3	My girl (p. 183)	1	Mergyte (p. 171)	1
4	Old girl (p. 184)	1	Motin (p. 173)	1
5	You women (p. 84)	1	Jūs moterys (p. 172)	1

Table 12. Forms of address used for Jim Baker.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Jim (pp. 182, 823)	2	Džimai (p. 171)	1
			Džimi (p. 171)	1

Table 13. Forms of address used for Gladys Dixon.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	My girl (p. 188)	1	Mergužėle (p. 176)	1

Table 14. Forms of address used for Miss Knight.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Miss Knight (pp. 226, 229)	2	Mis Nait (pp. 209, 211)	2
2	My dear Miss Knight (p. 226)	1	Mano brangioji mis Nait (p. 209)	1
3	You old jelly-bag (p. 206)	1	Tu sena karve (p. 191)	1

Table 15. Forms of address used for Doctor Haydock.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Doctor Haydock (pp. 64, 189, 193)	3	Daktare Heidokai (pp. 61, 180)	2
			Daktare (p. 177)	1
2	Doctor (pp. 33, 64, 189)	3	Daktare (pp. 31, 61, 177)	3
3	Dr Haydock (p. 232)	1	Daktaras Heidokas (p. 214)	1

Table 16. Forms of address used for Inspector Frank Cornish.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Sir (e.g. pp. 70, 73, 76)	6	Sere (e.g. pp. 66, 69, 72)	6
2	Inspector (pp. 72, 73, 74)	4	Inspektoriau (pp. 68, 69)	4
3	Frank (pp. 133, 134, 135)	3	Frenkai (pp. 125, 126, 127)	3

Table 17. Forms of address used for Sergeant William Tiddler.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Mister (p. 213)	1	Misteri (p. 198)	1
2	Tom (p. 119)	1	Tomai (p. 111)	1

Table 18. Forms of address used for Ella Zielinsky.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Ella (e.g. pp. 43, 195, 196)	7	Ela (e.g. pp. 40, 183, 184)	7
2	Miss Zielinsky (pp. 116, 118, 138, 150)	5	Mis Zielinski (pp. 109, 111, 130, 141)	5

Table 19. Forms of address used for Doctor Maurice Gilchrist.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Doctor (pp. 96, 101, 102)	5	Daktare (pp. 91, 95, 96)	5
2	Doctor Gilchrist (pp. 96, 102)	2	Daktare Gilkristai (pp. 90, 95)	2

Table 20. Forms of address used for Ardwyck Fenn.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Mr Fenn (e.g. pp. 162, 200, 202)	13	Misteri Fenai (e.g. pp. 152, 187, 188)	12
			Ardvikai Fenai (p. 150)	1

Table 21. Forms of address used for Lola Brewster.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Miss Brewster (e.g. pp. 155, 157, 158)	7	Mis Briuster (e.g. pp. 146, 147, 149)	7

Table 22. Forms of address used for Margot Bence.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Miss Bence (e.g. pp. 168, 174, 178)	7	Mis Bens (e.g. pp. 158, 163, 167)	7
2	Darling (p. 169)	1	Mieloži (p. 159)	1
3	Margot (p. 167)	1	Margo (p. 157)	1

Table 23. Forms of address used for Heather Badcock.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Heather (p. 23)	1	- (p. 21)	1

Table 24. Forms of address used for Arthur Badcock.

No	Forms of address in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Arthur (pp. 22, 24, 25, 70)	4	Artūrai (pp. 21, 23, 67)	4
2	Mr Badcock (pp. 22, 70, 72)	3	Misteri Bedkokai (pp. 21, 66, 68)	3
3	Mr... (p. 22)	1	Misteri... (p. 21)	1

APPENDIX 5: Terms of reference in Agatha Christie (1962) and Rasa Kirvaitytė (2000)²

Table 25. Terms of reference used for Miss Jane Marple.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Miss Marple (e.g. pp. 121, 123, 183)	11	Mis Marpl (e.g. pp. 113, 114, 170)	11
2	Jane Marple (pp. 83, 85)	2	Džeinė Marpl (pp. 78, 80)	2
3	The old lady (pp. 16, 120)	2	Senoji ledi (p. 15)	1
			Ta sena ledi (p. 113)	1
4	My Miss Marple (pp. 120, 180)	2	Mano mis Marpl (pp. 113, 169)	2
5	An old dame (p. 244)	1	Pagyvenusi dama (pp. 73, 226)	2
6	An old lady (p. 77)	1		
7	Dear Miss Marple (p. 205)	1	Mis Marpl (p. 191)	1
8	Old Miss Marple (p. 16)	1	Senoji mis Marpl (p. 16)	1
9	Our old dear (p. 226)	1	Ta mūsų miela senutė (p. 209)	1
10	Poor old dears (p. 16)	1	Vargšės senutės (p. 15)	1
11	Sweet old lady (p. 16)	1	Miela sena ledi (p. 15)	1
12	The old dears (p. 33)	1	Mielos senutės (p. 30)	1
13	This lady (p. 22)	1	Ši ledi (p. 21)	1
14	Your Miss Marple (p. 181)	1	Tavo mis Marpl (p. 170)	1

Table 26. Terms of reference used for Chief-Inspector Dermot Craddock.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Inspector Craddock (e.g. pp. 147, 190, 223)	6	Inspektorius Kredokas (e.g. pp. 138, 179, 216)	6
2	Chief-Inspector God Almighty Craddock (p. 194)	1	Visagalis vyresnysis inspektorius Kredokas (p. 182)	1
3	Mr Craddock (p. 143)	1	Misteris Kredokas (p. 135)	1
4	The inspector (p. 169)	1	Inspektorius (p. 159)	1
5	That Craddock man (p. 215)	1	Kredokas (p. 200)	1

Table 27. Terms of reference used for Marina Gregg.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Marina Gregg (e.g. pp. 23, 51, 78)	98	Marina Greg (e.g. pp. 21, 47, 74)	98

² If there are fewer than six occurrences, the page numbers in which all of them occur are provided. If there are six and more occurrences, the page numbers for the first three examples that show different usages are given. If the use of a term of reference in all occurrences is the same, the page numbers for the first three instances are presented.

2	Marina (e.g. pp. 45, 52, 99)	62	Marina (e.g. pp. 42, 49, 93)	62
3	Wife (e.g. pp. 39, 105, 148)	51	Žmona (e.g. pp. 37, 98, 139)	51
4	Miss Gregg (e.g. pp. 74, 94, 137, 147)	25	Mis Greg (e.g. pp. 42, 70, 87)	16
			Marina Greg (e.g. p. 70, 71, 211)	6
			Misis Greg (p. 129)	1
			- (p. 88)	1
			Žmona (p. 138)	1
5	Miss Marina Gregg (e.g. pp. 73, 137, 255)	6	Mis Marina Greg (pp. 70, 89, 90, 235)	4
			Misis Marina Greg (p. 129)	1
			Marina Greg (p. 69)	1
6	Poor Marina Gregg (pp. 51, 131)	2	Vargšėlė Marina Gregg (pp. 48, 123)	2
7	Darling Marina (p. 157)	1	Marinutė (p. 148)	1
8	Marina Gregg, the film star (p. 77)	1	Marina Greg, kino žvaigždė (p. 73)	1
9	Mrs Rudd (p. 49)	1	Misis Rad (p. 46)	1
10	Poor girl (p. 159)	1	Ta vargšė mergaitė (p. 149)	1
11	The actress (p. 251)	1	Aktorė (p. 232)	1
12	The famous Marina Gregg (p. 153)	1	Ižymioji Marina Greg (p. 144)	1
13	The girl he had married (p. 255)	1	Moteris, kurią kažkada buvo vedęs (p. 235)	1
14	The patient (p. 102)	1	Pacientė (p. 96)	1
15	That bitch (p. 157)	1	Ta kalė (p. 147)	1

Table 28. Terms of reference used for Jason Rudd.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Mr Rudd (e.g. pp. 74, 92, 118)	26	Misteris Radas (e.g. pp. 70, 87, 110)	26
2	Husband (e.g. pp. 39, 78, 146)	24	Vyras (e.g. pp. 36, 74, 137)	24
3	Jason Rudd (e.g. pp. 98, 122, 159)	17	Džeisonas Radas (e.g. pp. 92, 114, 149)	17
4	Jason (e.g. pp. 94, 103, 141)	6	Džeisonas (e.g. pp. 89, 97, 132)	6
5	Rudd (pp. 28, 120, 228)	3	Radas (pp. 26, 112, 211)	3
6	Jason Something (pp. 23, 28)	2	Kažkoks Džeisonas (pp. 21, 26)	2
7	That man (pp. 158, 221)	2	Tas žmogus (p. 205)	1
			Jis (p. 148)	1
8	Darling Jinx (p. 141)	1	Mielasis Džinksas (p. 132)	1
9	Jason Hudd (p. 28)	1	Džeisonas Hadas (p. 26)	1
10	Mr Jason Rudd (p. 243)	1	Džeisonas Radas (p. 224)	1
11	The adoring husband (p. 178)	1	Besižavintis vyras (p. 167)	1
12	The present man (p. 28)	1	Dabartinis vyras (p. 26)	1

Table 29. Terms of reference used for Mrs Dolly Bantry.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Mrs Bandry (e.g. pp. 39, 57, 196)	18	Misis Bentri (e.g. pp. 36, 54, 184)	18
2	Friend Mrs Bantry (pp. 227, 249)	3	Draugė Misis Bentri (pp. 210, 230)	3
3	Bantry (p. 196)	1	Bentri (p. 184)	1
4	Mrs... what's-her-name (p. 196)	1	Misis kaip ten ją (p. 184)	1
5	That old woman (p. 1964)	1	Prakeikta senė (p. 182)	1
6	The Bantrys (p. 246)	1	Bentri (p. 228)	1
7	Your friend (p 228)	1	Jūsų draugė (p. 211)	1

Table 30. Terms of reference used for Cherry Baker.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Cherry (pp. 57, 239, 253)	3	Čerė (pp. 54, 221, 233)	3
2	That Mrs Baker (pp. 209, 239)	2	Ta misis Beiker (pp. 195, 221)	2
3	Any of you young people (p. 206)	1	Jūsų, jaunųjų (p. 192)	1
4	My daily helper, Cherry Baker (p. 60)	1	Mano pagalbininkė Čerė Beiker (p. 57)	1
5	That young woman (p. 57)	1	Ta jauna moteris (p. 54)	1

Table 31. Terms of reference used for Jim Baker.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Jim (e.g. pp. 235 236, 237)	6	Džimas (e.g. pp. 218, 219)	6
2	Husband (p. 181)	1	Vyras (p. 170)	1

Table 32. Terms of reference used for Gladys Dixon.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Gladys (e.g. pp. 207, 212, 253)	10	Gledisė (e.g. pp. 192, 194, 233)	10
2	Gladys Dixon (pp. 185, 230, 253)	3	Gledisė Dikson (pp. 173, 213, 233)	3
3	That girl (p. 230)	2	Ta mergytė (p. 212)	1
			Ta mergaitė (p. 212)	1
4	Gladdy (p. 184)	1	Gledisė (p. 173)	1
5	Gladys something (p. 230)	1	Koks gi ten jos vardas... rodos, Gledisė (p. 212)	1
6	Miss Gladys Dixon (p.212)	1	Mis Gledisė Dikson (p. 197)	1
7	Our Gladys (p. 213)	1	Mūsų Gledisė (p. 198)	1
8	The girl (p. 230)	1	Mergytė (p. 212)	1
9	Your friend Gladys (p. 209)	1	Tavo draugė Gledisė (p. 194)	1

Table 33. Terms of reference used for Miss Knight.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Miss Knight (e.g. pp. 31, 237, 239)	9	Mis Nait (e.g. pp. 29, 220, 221)	9
2	Your Miss Knight (pp. 235, 237)	2	Jūsų mis Nait (p. 218)	1
			Mis Nait (p. 219)	1
3	Poor Miss Knight (p. 30)	1	Vargšėlė mis Nait (p. 28)	1
4	Pussy, pussy (p. 235)	1	Kis kis (p. 218)	1
5	That Knight woman (p. 30)	1	Ta moteriškė Nait (p. 28)	1
6	That Miss Knight of yours (p. 33)	1	Ta jūsų mis Nait (p. 31)	1
7	That Miss Knight (p. 181)	1	Ta mis Nait (p. 170)	1
8	That old cat of a White Knight of hers (p. 180)	1	Sena katė Nait (p. 169)	1
9	That old – Miss Knight (p. 206)	1	Ta senė – turiu galvoje mis Nait (p. 192)	1
10	This old hen (p. 233)	1	Ta sena perekšlė (p. 216)	1
11	Your dear Miss Knight (p. 220)	1	Jūsų brangioji mis Nait (p. 204)	1
12	Your dog's-body (p. 220)	1	Jūsų cerberis (p. 204)	1

Table 34. Terms of reference used for Doctor Haydock.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Dr Haydock (pp. 32, 239, 243)	4	Daktaras Heidokas (pp. 30, 221, 224)	4
2	The doctor (p. 33, 35)	2	Daktaras (p. 30, 32)	2
3	Our doctor (p. 33)	1	Mūsų daktarėlis (p. 31)	1

Table 35. Terms of reference used for Inspector Frank Cornish.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Inspector Cornish (pp. 71, 106, 168)	3	Inspektorius Kornišas (pp. 67, 100, 158)	3
2	Inspector (p. 168)	2	Inspektorius (p. 158)	2
3	Cornish (p. 79)	1	Kornišas (p. 75)	1
4	That local inspector (p. 155)	1	Tas vietinis policijos inspektorius (p. 146)	1
5	The local man (p. 79)	1	Tenykštis inspektorius (p. 75)	1

Table 36. Terms of reference used for Sergeant William Tiddler.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Tiddler (p. 79)	1	Tidleris (p. 75)	1
2	Sergeant Tiddler (p. 248)	1	Seržantas Tidleris (p. 230)	1
3	Sergeant (p. 82)	1	Seržantas (p. 78)	1

Table 37. Terms of reference used for Ella Zielinsky.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Ella (e.g. pp. 57, 216, 217)	8	Ela (e.g. pp. 52, 200, 201)	8
2	Ella Zielinsky (e.g. pp. 57, 93, 100)	6	Ela Zielinski (e.g. pp. 52, 87, 94)	7
3	Miss Zielinsky (e.g. pp. 200, 201, 253)	6	Mis Zielinski (pp. 187, 188, 233)	5
			Ela Zielinski (pp. 188)	1
4	Mr Rudd's secretary (pp. 93, 206, 211)	3	Misterio Rado sekretorė (pp. 87, 192, 196)	3
5	The secretary woman (pp. 69, 151)	2	Sekretorė (p. 65)	1
			Šita sekretorė (p. 142)	1
6	The young lady (pp. 73, 74)	2	Jauna ledi (pp. 69, 70)	2
7	Ella Zielinsky, my secretary (p. 42)	1	Ela Zielinski, mano sekretorė (p. 39)	1
7	Miss Ella Zielinsky (p. 113)	1	Mis Ela Zielinski (p. 106)	1
8	My secretary, Ella Zielinsky (p. 113)	1	Mano sekretorė Ela Zielinski (p. 106)	1
9	Poor Ella (p. 215)	1	Vargšėlė Ela (p. 200)	1
10	The secretary, Ella Zielinsky (p. 131)	1	Sekretorė Ela Zielinski (pp. 123, 128)	2
11	The secretary woman, Ella Zielinsky (p. 136)	1		
12	The black-haired robot of a secretary (p. 179)	1	Jauodaplaukė sekretorė panaši į robotą (p. 167)	1
13	That woman, Ella Zielinsky (p. 66)	1	Ta moteris [...] Ela Zielinski (p. 62)	1

Table 38. Terms of reference used for Hailey Preston.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Hailey Preston (pp. 100, 136)	2	Heilis Prestonas (pp. 94, 128)	2
2	Mr Preston (p. 104)	1	Misteris Prestonas (p. 98)	1
3	Young Hailey Preston (p. 131)	1	Jaunuolis Heilis Prestonas (p. 123)	1
4	Elegant Hailey Preston (p. 179)	1	Elegantiškasis Heilis Prestonas (p. 167)	1
5	Willow-looking young man (p. 65)	1	Lieknas jaunuolis (p. 62)	1
6	That willowy wand of a young man (p. 136)	1	Jaunasis sudžiūvėlis (p. 128)	1

Table 39. Terms of reference used for Giuseppe.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Giuseppe (e.g. pp. 135, 197, 206)	10	Džiuzepė (e.g. pp. 127, 184, 192)	10
2	Mr Giuseppe (pp. 188, 208, 209)	5	Misteris Džiuzepė (pp. 176, 193, 194)	5
3	The butler (pp. 199, 206, 211)	4	Liokajus (pp. 186, 192, 196)	4
4	The Italian butler (pp. 188, 205, 223)	3	Italas liokajus (pp. 176, 191, 206)	3

5	The butler Giuseppe (pp. 134, 135)	1	Liokajus Džiuzepė (pp. 126, 127)	2
6	The wop (p. 206)	1	Italiūkštis (p. 192)	1
7	The wops (p. 188)	1	Tie italų emigrantai (p. 176)	1
8	Giuseppe, a blackmailer (p. 254)	1	Džiuzepė, šantažuotojas (p. 234)	1

Table 40. Terms of reference used for Doctor Maurice Gilchrist.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Dr Gilchrist (pp. 95, 104, 141, 243)	4	Daktaras Gilkristas (pp. 90, 98, 132, 224)	4
2	Maurice Gilchrist (p. 95)	1	Morisas Gilkristas (p. 89)	1

Table 41. Terms of reference used for Ardwyck Fenn.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Ardwyck Fenn (e.g. pp. 94, 131, 148)	12	Ardvikas Fenas (e.g. pp. 88, 123, 139)	11
			Tas Ardvikas Fenas (p. 88)	1
2	Mr Ardwyck Fenn (pp. 145, 147, 200)	3	Misteris Ardvikas Fenas (pp. 136, 138)	2
			Ardvikas Fenas (p. 187)	1
3	American gentleman and lady (p. 75)	1	Amerikietis džentelmenas ir ledi (p. 70)	1
4	Ardwyck (p. 149)	1	Ardvikas (p. 140)	1
5	Big black man (p. 87)	1	Stambus, juodas vyras (p. 82)	1
6	Sinister strangers (p. 134)	1	Paslaptingi svetimšaliai (p. 126)	1
7	The Americans (p. 87)	1	Amerikiečiai (p. 82)	1
8	This man Ardwyck Fenn (p. 226)	1	Tas vyrukas Ardvikas Fenas (p. 209)	1

Table 42. Terms of reference used for Lola Brewster.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Lola Brewster (e.g. pp. 135, 148, 155)	8	Lola Briuster (e.g. pp. 127, 139, 145)	8
2	Miss Brewster (pp. 147, 148, 199)	3	Misis Briuster (p. 138)	2
			Mis Briuster (p. 186)	1
3	American gentleman and lady (p. 75)	1	Amerikiečiai džentelmenas ir ledi (p. 70)	1
4	Lola (p. 148)	1	Lola (p. 138)	1
5	Miss Lola Brewster (p. 145)	1	Misis Lola Briuster (p. 136)	1
6	Miss Lola Brewster, moving picture star (p. 133)	1	Mis Lola Briuster, kino žvaigždė (p. 126)	1
7	Sinister strangers (p. 134)	1	Paslaptingi svetimšaliai (p. 126)	1
8	The Americans (p. 87)	1	Amerikiečiai (p. 82)	1

Table 43. Terms of reference used for Margot Bence.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Margot (e.g. pp. 165, 166)	8	Margo (e.g. pp. 155, 156)	7
			Ji (p. 156)	1
2	Margot Bence (pp. 135, 154, 224, 226)	5	Margo Bens (pp. 127, 144, 207, 209)	5
3	Photographer girl (pp. 134, 135)	2	Fotokorespondentė (pp. 126, 127)	2
4	An arty girl (p. 94)	1	Meniška mergiotė (p. 88)	1
5	Arty photographer (p. 133)	1	Pretenzinga fotokorespondentė (p. 126)	1
6	Miss Margot Bence (p. 165)	1	Mis Margo Bens (p. 155)	1
7	Margot Bence, personality photographer (p. 199)	1	Margo Bens, asmeninė fotografė (p. 186)	1
8	Miss Bence (p. 165)	1	Mis Bens (p. 155)	1
9	This photographer girl, Margot Bence (p. 226)	1	Ta fotografė Margo Bens (p. 209)	1

Table 44. Terms of reference used for Heather Badcock.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Heather Badcock (e.g. pp. 61, 78, 104)	55	Hetera Bedkok (e.g. pp. 57, 74, 98)	55
2	Mrs Badcock (e.g. pp. 50, 67, 105)	45	Misis Bedkok (e.g. pp. 47, 63, 99)	45
3	Heather (e.g. pp. 22, 72, 187)	13	Hetera (e.g. pp. 21, 68, 175)	13
4	Wife (e.g. pp. 74, 75, 76)	11	Žmona (e.g. pp. 69, 70, 71)	11
5	Mr and Mrs Badcock (pp. 50, 226, 240)	4	Misteris ir Misis Bedkok (pp. 47, 209, 222)	4
6	This woman (pp. 61, 100, 112, 252)	4	Ta moteris (pp. 57, 94, 233)	3
			Moteris (p. 104)	1
7	A Mrs Badcock (pp. 55, 58)	2	Misis Bedkok (pp. 51, 55)	2
8	Badcock (p. 170)	2	Bedkok (p. 160)	2
9	The Badcocks (pp. 121, 133)	2	Bedkokai (pp. 113, 125)	2
10	The Badcock woman (pp. 67, 69)	2	Misis Bedkok (p. 65)	1
			Ta moteriškė (p. 63)	1
11	A perfectly strange woman (p. 251)	1	Visiškai nepažįstama moteris (p. 232)	1
12	Mrs Baddeley (p. 170)	1	Misis Bedli (p. 160)	1
13	Mrs Heather Badcock (p. 78)	1	- (p. 74)	1
14	Mrs whatever her name was (p. 160)	1	Misis kokia ten jos pavardė (p. 150)	1
15	Mrs what's-her-name (p. 179)	1	Misis... nepamenu jos pavardės (p. 167)	1
16	Poor, poor woman (p. 100)	1	Vargšė vargšė moteris (p. 93)	1
17	Some wretched local woman (p. 169)	1	Vietinė moteris (p. 158)	1
18	That poor stupid woman (p. 140)	1	Ta nelaiminga moteriškė (p. 132)	1

19	That woman (p. 109)	1	Ta moteris (p. 102)	1
20	The dead woman (p. 78)	1	Vėlionė Hetera Bedkok (p. 74)	1
21	The other woman (p. 158)	1	Ta moteris (p. 148)	1
22	The poor dear woman (p. 153)	1	Vargšėlė (p. 144)	1
23	The poor woman (p. 55)	1	Nelaiminga moteriškė (p. 52)	1
24	The woman (p. 104)	1	Ta moteris (p. 98)	1

Table 45. Terms of reference used for Arthur Badcock.

No	Terms of reference in Christie (1962)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in in Kirvaitytė (2000)	No. of occur.
1	Husband (e.g. pp. 22, 55, 59)	19	Vyras (e.g. pp. 21, 51, 56)	19
2	Arthur Badcock (e.g. pp. 128, 187, 245)	11	Artūras Bedkokas (e.g. pp. 120, 175, 227)	11
3	Mr Badcock (pp. 80, 208, 228)	4	Misteris Bedkokas (pp. 76, 194, 211)	4
4	Alfred Beadle (p. 245)	2	Alfredas Bidlas (p. 227)	2
5	An innocent man (p. 245)	2	Nekaltas žmogus (p. 227)	2
6	Arthur (p. 183)	1	Artūras (p. 172)	1
7	Poor Arthur Badcock (p. 255)	1	Vargšelis Artūras Bedkokas (p. 235)	1
8	Poor chap (p. 89)	1	Vargšelis (p. 84)	1
9	Poor Mr Badcock (p. 125)	1	Vargšelis misteris Bedkokas (p. 117)	1
10	That poor devil Badcock (p. 136)	1	Vargšelis Bedkokas (p. 128)	1

APPENDIX 6: Forms of address in John Grisham (1992) and Jonas Čeponis (2004)³

Table 46. Forms of address used for Darby Shaw.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Darby (e.g. pp. 87, 132, 177)	55	Darbe (e.g. pp. 75, 112, 146)	55
2	Ma'am (pp. 128, 306, 322, 337)	6	Mem (pp. 248, 361)	3
			Panele (pp. 108, 273)	3
3	Lady (p. 129)	4	Panele (p. 109)	4
4	Miss (pp. 128, 343)	4	Panele (pp. 108, 279)	4
5	Ms Shaw (pp. 17, 19, 352)	4	Panele Šo (pp. 20, 22, 317)	4
6	Dear (pp. 90, 214, 413)	3	Mieloji (pp. 78, 176)	2
			Brangute (p. 334)	1
7	Baby (p. 91)	1	Mažyte (p. 78)	1

³ If there are fewer than six occurrences, the page numbers in which all of them occur are provided. If there are six and more occurrences, the page numbers for the first three examples that show different usages are given. If the use of a form of address in all occurrences is the same, the page numbers for the first three instances are presented.

8	Honey (p. 232)	1	Meilute (p. 189)	1
9	Kid (p. 375)	1	Vaikuti (p. 303)	1
10	My dear (p. 335)	1	Brangioji (p. 271)	1

Table 47. Forms of address used for Thomas Callahan.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Thomas (e.g. pp. 44, 75, 126)	26	Tomai (e.g. pp. 41, 65, 106)	26
2	Sir (pp. 15, 16)	4	Sere (pp. 18, 19)	4
3	Thomas, Thomas (pp. 76, 127)	2	Tomai, Tomai (pp. 66, 107)	2
4	Pal (p. 76)	1	Bičiuli (p. 66)	1

Table 48. Forms of address used for Gavin Verheek.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Gavin (e.g. pp. 75, 134, 136)	47	Gevinai (e.g. pp. 65, 114, 115)	47
2	Sir (p. 112)	3	Sere (p. 95)	3
3	Big boy (p. 99)	1	Viršininke (p. 85)	1
4	Buddy (p. 103)	1	Drauguži (p. 88)	1
5	Mr Verheek (p. 135)	1	Pone Verhekai (p. 114)	1

Table 49. Forms of address used for Sallinger.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Mr Sallinger (e.g. pp. 18, 21, 23)	11	Pone Selindžeri (e.g. pp. 16, 18, 21)	11

Table 50. Forms of address used for Alice.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Alice (p. 176)	5	Alisa (p. 146)	5

Table 51. Forms of address used for Chen.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Mrs Chen (p. 172)	1	Ponia Čen (p. 147)	1

Table 52. Forms of address used for Gray Grantham.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Gray (e.g. pp. 220, 243, 275)	26	Grėjau (e.g. pp. 180, 198, 222)	26
2	Mr Grantham (e.g. pp. 108, 154, 189)	13	Pone Grenthemai (e.g. pp. 92, 129, 156)	13

3	Sir (e.g. pp. 286, 315, 370)	8	Sere (e.g. pp. 323, 254, 299)	8
4	Grantham (e.g. pp. 93, 154, 243)	7	Grenthemai (e.g. pp. 79, 129, 198)	7
5	Son (pp. 219, 275)	2	Sūnau (pp. 179, 222)	2
6	Baby (p. 355)	1	Vaikuti (p. 287)	1
7	Hotshot (p. 320)	1	Didysis žurnaliste (p. 259)	1
8	My freind (p. 95)	1	Drauguži (p. 81)	1
9	You guys (p. 96)	1	Vyručiai (p. 83)	1

Table 53. Forms of address used for Smith Keen.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Smith (e.g. pp. 219, 304, 311)	14	Smitai (e.g. pp. 179, 246, 253)	13
			- (p. 253)	1
2	Smith Keen (p. 387)	1	Smitai Kynai (p. 313)	1

Table 54. Forms of address used for Jackson Feldman.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Jackson (p. 331)	2	Džeksonai (pp. 316, 317)	2

Table 55. Forms of address used for Cleve.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Cleve (e.g. pp. 92, 153, 277)	6	Klivai (e.g. pp. 79, 129, 225)	6
2	Fellas (p. 96)	1	Vyručiai (p. 83)	1

Table 56. Forms of address used for Sarge.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Sarge (p. 96)	1	Seržai (p. 82)	1
2	Fellas (p. 96)	1	Vyručiai (p. 83)	1

Table 57. Forms of address used for Garcia.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Garcia (e.g. pp. 108, 186, 187)	6	Garsija (e.g. pp. 92, 154, 155)	6

Table 58. Forms of address used for F. Denton Voyles.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Denton (e.g. pp. 55, 85, 236)	10	Dentonai (e.g. pp. 49, 73, 192)	10

2	Director (e.g. pp. 39, 40, 53)	6	Direktoriau (e.g. pp. 37, 38, 48)	6
3	Gentlemen (pp. 41, 56)	2	Ponai (pp. 39, 50)	2
4	Mr Voyles (p. 399)	1	Pone Voilzai (p. 323)	1
5	Sir (p. 40)	1	Sere (p. 38)	1

Table 59. Forms of address used for Bob Gminski.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Bob (e.g. pp. 41, 51, 224)	7	Bobai (e.g. pp. 38, 46, 183)	7
2	Gentlemen (pp. 41, 56)	2	Ponai (pp. 39, 50)	2

Table 60. Forms of address used for John Runyan.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Chief (p. 5)	6	Šefe (p. 10)	6
2	Sir (p. 6)	3	Sere (p. 11)	3

Table 61. Forms of address used for K. O. Lewis.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	K. O. (pp. 146, 236)	5	K. O. (pp. 123, 192)	5
2	Mr Lewis (p. 83)	2	Pone Lujisai (p. 72)	2

Table 62. Forms of address used for Ferguson.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Ferguson (p. 32)	1	Fergiusonai (p. 31)	1

Table 63. Forms of address used for Richard Horton.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Richard (p. 301)	1	Ričardai (p. 244)	1

Table 64. Forms of address used for Glenn Jensen.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Glenn (pp. 11, 12)	2	Glenai (pp. 15, 16)	2

Table 65. Forms of address used for Ben Thurow.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Ben (pp. 62, 63)	5	Benai (pp. 55, 56)	5

Table 66. Forms of address used for the President.⁴

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Mr President (e.g. pp. 37, 41, 83)	18	Pone prezidente (e.g. pp. 36, 39, 71)	18
2	Chief (e.g. pp. 50, 71, 224)	12	Šefe (e.g. pp. 45, 62, 184)	12
3	Sir (pp. 41, 82)	3	Sere (pp. 39, 74)	3

Table 67. Forms of address used for Dick Mabry.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Dick (p. 70)	1	Dikai (p. 61)	1

Table 68. Forms of address used for Fletcher Coal.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Fletcher (pp. 71, 238, 245, 317)	5	Flečeri (pp. 62, 194, 200, 257)	5
2	Mr Coal (pp. 41, 54, 400, 401)	5	Pone Koulai (p. 38, 49, 324, 325)	5
3	Coal (pp. 85, 170, 238, 426)	4	Koulai (p. 73, 142, 194, 345)	4
4	Asshole (p. 85)	1	Šikniau (p. 73)	1
5	Sir (p. 318)	1	Sere (p. 257)	1
6	Son (p. 85)	1	Sūnau (p. 73)	1

Table 69. Forms of address used for Matthew Barr.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Barr (p. 238)	1	Barai (p. 194)	1
2	You clowns (p. 350)	1	Jūs, klounai (p. 284)	1

Table 70. Forms of address used for Victor Mattiece.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Mr Mattiece (pp. 349, 350)	2	Pone Matisai (pp. 283, 284)	2

⁴ Grisham does not give the President a name.

Table 71. Forms of address used for Marty Velmano.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Sir (pp. 405, 406)	4	Sere (pp. 327, 328)	4
2	Mr Velmano (pp. 405, 406)	3	Pone Velmanai (p. 328, 329)	3

Table 72. Forms of address used for Sims Wakefield.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Sims (p. 425)	3	Simsai (p. 343)	3

Table 73. Forms of address used for Edwin F. Sneller.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Mr Sneller (p. 27)	1	Pone Sneleri (p. 27)	1

Table 74. Forms of address used for Khamel.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Sam (p. 194)	1	Semai (p. 161)	1

Table 75. Forms of address used for Luke.

No	Forms of address in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Forms of address in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Luke (p. 194)	2	Lukai (p. 161)	2

APPENDIX 7: Terms of reference in John Grisham (1992) and Jonas Čeponis (2004)⁵

Table 76. Terms of reference used for Darby Shaw.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	The girl (eg. pp. 75, 106, 146)	28	Mergina (e.g. pp. 65, 90, 123)	27
			Ta (p. 65)	1
2	Darby (e.g. pp. 75, 100, 172)	18	Darbè (e.g. pp. 65, 87, 143)	18
3	Darby Shaw (e.g. pp. 145, 181, 219)	11	Darbè Šo (e.g. pp. 123, 150, 179)	11
4	Poor kid (pp. 160, 320)	2	Vargšėlė (p. 133)	1
			Vargšė mergina (p. 253)	1

⁵ If there are fewer than six occurrences, the page numbers in which all of them occur are provided. If there are six and more occurrences, the page numbers for the first three examples that show different usages are given. If the use of a term of reference in all occurrences is the same, the page numbers for the first three instances are presented.

5	Eager-beaver law student (p. 116)	1	Stropuolė studentė (p. 99)	1
6	Ms Shaw (p. 411)	1	Panelė Šo (p. 322)	1
7	Scared kid (p. 160)	1	Mažytė (p. 134)	1
8	This gal (p. 102)	1	Ta mergiotė (p. 87)	1

Table 77. Terms of reference used for Thomas Callahan.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Callahan (e.g. pp. 131, 145, 208)	27	Kalahanas (e.g. pp. 111, 122, 171)	27
2	Thomas (e.g. pp. 128, 148, 254)	20	Tomas (e.g. pp. 108, 125, 207)	20
3	Thomas Callahan (e.g. pp. 128, 136, 145)	9	Tomas Kalahanas (e.g. pp. 108, 115, 122)	9
4	Cool hand Callahan (p. 102)	1	Šaltakraujis Kalahanas (p. 87)	1
5	Mr Callahan (p. 413)	1	Ponas Kalahanas (p. 334)	1
6	Peter Pan (p. 102)	1	Piteris Penas (p. 87)	1
7	Professor Callahan (p. 183)	1	Dėstytojas Kalahanas (p. 152)	1
8	The great Thomas Callahan (p. 101)	1	Didysis Tomas Kalahanas (p. 87)	1

Table 78. Terms of reference used for Gavin Verheek.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Verheek (e.g. pp. 208, 209, 343)	19	Verhekas (e.g. pp. 171, 198)	19
2	Gavin (e.g. pp. 235, 237, 411)	6	Gevinas (e.g. pp. 191, 193, 333)	6
3	Gavin Verheek (p. 409)	1	Gevinas Verhekas (p. 331)	1
4	Mr Gavin Verheek (p. 408)	1	Ponas Gevinas Verhekas (p. 330)	1
5	My friend Gavin (p. 414)	1	Mano draugas Gevinas (p. 335)	1

Table 79. Terms of reference used for Alice.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	A young woman (p. 172)	1	Jauna moteris (p. 143)	1

Table 80. Terms of reference used for Chen.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Mrs Chen (p. 177)	1	Ponia Čen (p. 145)	1

Table 81. Terms of reference used for Gray Grantham.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Grantham (e.g. pp. 96, 222, 238)	18	Grenthemas (e.g. pp. 83, 182, 194)	18

2	Gray Grantham (e.g. pp. 154, 222, 367)	7	Grėjus Granthamas (e.g. pp. 142, 155, 297)	6
			Rėjus Grenthemas (p. 129)	1
3	Boy (p. 399)	3	Vaikinas (p. 323)	3
4	Son of a bitch (p. 406)	3	Šunsnukis (pp. 328, 329)	3
5	Gray (p. 417)	2	Grėjus (p. 337)	2
6	Mr Grantham (pp. 404, 416)	2	Ponas Grenthamas (pp. 326, 337)	2
7	Our friend Grantham (p. 248)	1	Mūsų draugužis Grenthemas (p. 202)	1
8	This reporter, Grantham (p. 169)	1	Tas reporteris Grenthemas (p. 141)	1

Table 82. Terms of reference used for Smith Keen.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Smith Keen (pp. 319, 320, 421)	3	Smitas Kynas (pp. 258, 259, 340)	3
2	Keen (p. 435)	1	Kynas (p. 350)	1

Table 83. Terms of reference used for Jackson Feldman.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Feldman (e.g. pp. 303, 311, 435)	10	Feldmenas (e.g. pp. 245, 252, 350)	10
2	Mr Feldman (e.g. pp. 272, 289, 290)	8	Ponas Feldmenas (e.g. pp. 220, 235)	8
3	Jackson Feldman (p. 406)	1	Džeksonas Feldmenas (p. 328)	1

Table 84. Terms of reference used for Cleve.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Cleve (pp. 92, 359)	2	Klivas (pp. 79, 291)	2

Table 85. Terms of reference used for Sarge.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Sarge (e.g. pp. 93, 154, 170)	15	Seržas (e.g. pp. 79, 129, 142)	14
			- (p. 129)	1
2	Pop (p. 96)	1	Tėtis (p. 83)	1

Table 86. Terms of reference used for Garcia.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Garcia (e.g. pp. 268, 270, 275)	29	Garsija (e.g. pp. 217, 218, 222)	29
2	Morgan (e.g. pp. 342, 390, 391)	8	Morganas (e.g. pp. 278, 315, 316)	7
			Jis (p. 278)	1

3	Curtis (pp. 352, 367, 368, 369)	5	Kertis (pp.285, 297, 298, 299)	5
4	Curtis Morgan (pp. 351, 385)	4	Kertis Morganas (pp. 285, 312)	4
5	Curtis D. Morgan (pp. 354, 377)	2	Kertis D. Morganas (pp. 287, 305)	2
6	The kid (pp. 269, 355)	2	Vaikinas (pp. 218, 287)	2
7	Mr Garcia (p. 269)	1	Ponas Garsija (p. 217)	1
8	Pal Garcia (p. 287)	1	Draugužis Garsija (p. 233)	1

Table 87. Terms of reference used for F. Denton Voyles.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Voyles (e.g. pp. 37, 50, 292)	33	Voilzas (e.g. pp. 35, 45, 66)	32
			Šis (p. 237)	1
2	Director (e.g. pp. 5, 76, 98)	15	Direktorius (e.g. pp. 11, 66, 84)	15
3	Mr Voyles (e.g. pp. 112, 240, 399)	7	Ponas Voilzas (e.g. pp. 102, 196, 323)	7
4	Director Voyles (pp. 115, 162)	2	Direktorius Voilzas (pp. 98, 136)	2
5	Honorable F. Denton Voyles (p. 212)	1	Garbusis F. Dentonas Voilzas (p. 174)	1

Table 88. Terms of reference used for Bob Gminski.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Gminski (e.g. pp. 37, 50, 414)	24	Gmisnkis (e.g. pp. 35, 45, 335)	25
2	Bob Gminski (p. 413)	1	Bobas Gminskis (p. 334)	1

Table 89. Terms of reference used for Runyan.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Chief (p. 11)	4	Šefas (p. 15)	4
2	Chief Runyan (pp. 49, 421)	2	Ranjanas (p. 22)	1
			Pirmininkas Ranjans (p. 340)	1
3	Runyan (p. 3)	2	Ranjanas (p. 9)	2

Table 90. Terms of reference used for K. O. Lewis.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Chief's clerk (pp. 11, 12)	2	Šefo stažuotojas (p. 16)	2
2	Deputy director K. O. Lewis (p. 408)	1	Direktoriaus pavaduotojas K. O. Lujisas (p. 330)	1
3	K. O. Lewis (p. 100)	1	K. O. Lujisas (p. 85)	1
4	Mr Lewis (p. 404)	1	Ponas Lujisas (p. 306)	1

Table 91. Terms of reference used for Ferguson.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Ferguson (e.g. pp. 7, 39, 52)	8	Fergusonas (e.g. pp. 12, 37, 47)	8
2	Supreme court policeman (p. 37)	1	Aukščiausiojo teismo policininkas (p. 35)	1

Table 92. Terms of reference used for Richard Horton.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Horton (pp. 37, 38, 56)	3	Hortonas (pp. 36, 51)	3
2	Attorney general Horton (p. 84)	1	Generalinis prokuroras Hortonas (p. 73)	1

Table 93. Terms of reference used for Eric East.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	East (pp. 234, 235)	2	Istas (p. 191)	2
2	Eric East (pp. 112, 234)	2	Erikas Istas (pp. 95, 190)	2
3	Special agent Eric East (p. 408)	1	Specialusis agentas Erikas Istas (p. 330)	1

Table 94. Terms of reference used for Abraham Rosenberg.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Rosenberg (e.g. pp. 3, 14, 37)	76	Rozenbergas (e.g. pp. 9, 17, 35)	76
2	Justice Rosenberg (e.g. pp. 7, 95, 368)	6	Teisėjas Rozenbergas (e.g. pp. 12, 81, 368)	6
3	The justice (pp. 39, 52)	2	Teisėjas (pp. 37, 47)	2
4	Abe (p. 62)	1	Eibas (p. 55)	1
5	Abe Rosenberg (p. 62)	1	Eibas Rozenbergas (p. 55)	1
6	Supreme court justice (p. 52)	1	Aukščiausiojo teismo narys (p. 47)	1
7	Him (p. 18)	1	Rozenbergas (p. 20)	1
8	He (p. 53)	1	Rozenbergas (p. 47)	1

Table 95. Terms of reference used for Glenn Jensen.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Jensen (e.g. pp. 8, 37, 76)	49	Jensenas (e.g. pp. 13, 35, 66)	49
2	Justice Jensen (pp. 9, 95, 368)	3	Teisėjas Jensenas (pp. 13, 81, 298)	3
3	Glenn (pp. 62, 63)	2	Glenas (p. 55)	2
4	He (p. 9)	1	Jensenas (p. 13)	1
5	Him (p. 53)	1	Jensenas (p. 47)	1
6	Poor Jensen (p. 103)	1	Vargšas Jensenas (p. 88)	1

Table 96. Terms of reference used for Ben Thurow.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Justice Thurow (p. 63)	1	Teisėjas Turovas (p. 56)	1
2	Thurow (p. 64)	1	Turovas (p. 56)	1

Table 97. Terms of reference used for the President.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	President (e.g. pp. 57, 84, 114)	48	Prezidentas (e.g. pp. 51, 73, 82)	47
			- (p. 97)	1
2	Boys in the West wing (p. 296)	1	Vaikinai iš vakarinio sparno (p. 240)	1
3	Idiot (p. 236)	1	Tas idiotas (p. 192)	1
4	The other one (p. 57)	1	Tas kitas (p. 54)	1

Table 98. Terms of reference used for Dick Mabry.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Mabry (pp. 37, 95, 245)	3	Mebris (pp. 35, 82, 200)	3

Table 99. Terms of reference used for Fletcher Coal.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Coal (e.g. pp. 57, 100, 123)	22	Koulas (e.g. pp. 51, 85, 104)	22
2	Fletcher Coal (e.g. pp. 96, 100, 140)	9	Flečeris Koulas (e.g. pp. 82, 85, 118)	9
3	Mr Coal (pp. 347, 410)	4	Ponas Koulas (p. 283)	2
			Koulas (pp. 281, 332)	2
4	Hatchet man Coal (p. 144)	1	Parankinis Koulas (p. 121)	1
5	Mr Fletcher Coal (p. 408)	1	Ponas Flečeris Koulas (p. 330)	1
6	Pit bull (p. 144)	1	Pitbulis (p. 121)	1

Table 100. Terms of reference used for Victor Mattiece.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Mattiece (e.g. pp. 241, 265, 276)	55	Matisas (e.g. pp. 196, 214, 223)	55
2	Mr Mattiece (e.g. pp. 241, 303, 401)	7	Ponas Matisas (e.g. pp. 196, 245, 325)	7
3	Victor Mattiece (e.g. pp. 264, 398, 405)	6	Viktoras Matisas (e.g. pp. 214, 322, 327)	6
4	This guy (p. 274)	1	Šis vyriokas (p. 222)	1
5	Victor (p. 294)	1	Viktoras (p. 239)	1

Table 101. Terms of reference used for Marty Velmano.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Marty Velmano (p. 404)	1	Martis Velmanas (p. 327)	1
2	Mr Velmano (p. 404)	1	Ponas Velmanas (p. 327)	1

Table 102. Terms of reference used for Sims Wakefield.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Sims (p. 424)	2	Simsas (pp. 342, 343)	2
2	Wakefield (pp. 390, 435)	2	Veikfildas (pp. 315, 351)	2

Table 103. Terms of reference used for Edwin F. Sneller.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Mr Sneller (p. 25)	2	Ponas Sneleris (p. 26)	2
2	Edwin F. Sneller (p. 25)	1	Edvinas F. Sneleris (p. 26)	1

Table 104. Terms of reference used for Khamel.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Khamel (e.g. pp. 114, 169, 412)	6	Kemelis (e.g. pp. 97, 141, 33)	6
2	Khamel, thr terrorist (p. 113)	1	Teroristas Kemelis (p. 96)	1
3	Sam (p. 23)	1	Semas (p. 24)	1
4	The great Khamel (p. 412)	1	Didysis Kemelis (p. 333)	1
5	This man (p. 52)	1	Tas žmogus (p. 47)	1
6	The terrorist Khamel (p. 188)	1	Teroristas Kemelis (p. 156)	1

Table 105. Terms of reference used for Luke.

No	Terms of reference in Grisham (1992)	No. of occur.	Terms of reference in Čeponis (2004)	No. of occur.
1	Luke (p. 23)	1	Lukas (p. 24)	1