Address and Reference Terms in Lithuanian Dinner Discourse

Aušra Abraškevičiūtė

Abstract. This article aims at analyzing Lithuanian address and reference terms in family dinner context, their linguistic expressions, frequency and functions. 10 Lithuanian middle-class families were filmed during a dinner. Conversations were transcribed extensively and then analyzed. The findings fall into 6 major categories - first names and kinship names in the Vocative case, first names and kinship names with diminutive suffixes in all cases, collocations of nouns and diminutive nominals, first names with a pejorative suffix, first names with solidarity oriented endings, nicknames and endearment terms, and neutral reference terms. They have different impact on face work.

Introduction

Family dinner is becoming a common arena for applied linguistic research. It provides samples of speech that are studied for psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic and other purposes. What makes it so significant alongside other widely accepted areas for collecting speech data?

First of all, it is 'an opportunity space' (Ochs, Smith and Taylor, 1989) for many families to sound out and share things that have been absorbed during the day. Then, having in mind that two different generations meet at the dinner table, dinner can be construed as 'an intergenerationally shared social speech event' (Blum-Kulka, 1997). It serves as a socialization context in which parents pass down their knowledge of the world and societal conventions to their children. Through interaction with other family members children are trained to become competent conversational partners and mature participants in the life going on outside the family. Finally, research into family dinner talk allows us to take a closer look at something that is so intimate, affectionate and even divine, and at the same time so real and common, happening every minute all around the world.

This inspires us to choose family dinner as a unique period that presents natural data taken from the real family life context.

Theoretical background

The issue of addressing and naming practices has evoked quite a huge interest and it has been investigated in many studies. Brown and Gilman (1972) wrote about the 'tu-vous' distinction in French and corresponding address distinctions in some other languages. Wardhaugh (1986) overviewed the usage of some address terms in English and some 'exotic' languages. According to him, we can name or address people by a title, first name, last name, nickname, by some combinations of these, or nothing at all. Mutual addressing by first names indicates equality, familiarity and intimacy. Using a nickname or pet name shows an even greater intimacy. The highest degree of intimacy is supposed to occur within a family. Blum-Kulka (1997) compared naming practices in her monograph on family dinner talk. With the help of rich data she provided evidence that at dinner Israeli parents often use family nicknames rather than official names or institutionalized

nicknames, and they use a wide variety of innovative nicknames, yielding a rich repertoire of emotively coloured terms of address to their children. Moreover, she claimed that this type of naming practices draws on Eastern European origins, echoing Yiddish and Slavic sound patterns. The Jewish American and American Israeli-families only use a few nicknames (of a standard type) interchanged with conventional forms of endearment.

Furthermore, as address terms always occur in a certain context they serve a purpose. Goodwin (1990) in her study on talk among black children of Maple Street noticed that address terms could designate an addressee and/or comment on him/her. She provided examples of *skewed honorific use,* when many address terms employed were used to degrade addressees. Semantically neutral address terms might be used for emphasis to keep the rhythm and prosodic completeness. Blum-Kulka (1997) elaborated on how names and especially nicknames are used to call a child to order, reprimand, draw attention of the addressee, as prefaces to control acts and to intensify, but foremost to mitigate the impact of the control act.

However, no research into Lithuanian family dinner talk has been conducted yet. This study might be the first attempt to take a closer look at Lithuanian dinnertime and analyse some of the addressing and referring phenomena occurring in family dinner discourse. Therefore, it will try to answer how adults and children address and refer to each other, what linguistic expressions these terms take and what of them are the most common and what functions they perform.

Method

The corpus was made following the selection criteria of similar research by Ochs (1989a, 1989b, 1992a, 1992b, 1996). Ten Lithuanian lower-middle to middle class families were filmed during one dinner. Each family had at least two children, one of whom was a five–year-old sibling.

Following initial contacts by phone, the families were visited at home before the recording and were introduced with the aim of the research during a friendly chat in an informal environment, but the actual focus of the research was not mentioned.

The conversations were transcribed extensively to a simplified modification of the transcription system developed by Jefferson (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984):

:	- prolonged syllable
[	- demarcates overlapping utterances
CAPITALS	- relatively high amplitude
º º	- low volume
X	- inaudible word
(.)	- audible pause
((laughs))	- encloses description or explanation of how talk is delivered
...	- deleted sequence
gra-	- self-editing
> <	- condensed talk

The translation from Lithuanian has been kept as literal as possible, with minor modifications in order to preserve conversational style.

Findings

The findings of the study reveal quite a few terms of addressing and referring to family co-participants. Table 1 exemplifies both type and token occurrences.

Table 1. Address and reference terms in Lithuanian family dinner discourse

	N	%
Vocatives	216	48.1
Diminutives	88	19.6
Noun + diminutive nominal	20	4.5
Pejorative endings	1	0.2
Solidarity endings	3	0.7
Nicknames and endearment terms	41	9.1
Neutral reference terms	80	17.8
Total	**449**	**100.0**

As it may be seen from the table, Lithuanian families show a high preference for 'bare' first names and kinship names using such terms 66% of the time (both the category of vocatives and the one of neutral reference terms are taken into consideration). Diminutive forms are also common. They make up 24 % of all terms (here both diminutive address and reference terms and patterns with diminutive nominal forms are counted). Nicknames and endearment terms take up the third place in Lithuanian naming practices (9%). All the categories will be dealt with in separate sections except for neutral reference terms. They are considered to be neutral both in the sense of a form and meaning, therefore, they are excluded from further descriptions and discussions.

Vocatives
Vocatives observed in Lithuanian family dinner discourse fall into two major classes, one of them being kinship names, another first names. Vocatives are extensively used by all family members. Nevertheless, there can be noticed certain regularities. As a rule, kinship names are used by the children to address their parents. This way family roles - the father, the mother and the children - are cemented. First names are employed by both the children and parents. This class of vocatives serves the children as a useful device to address each other on a cooperative basis. The parents also often call their children by first names. Some

cases, though rare, when the first name is used by the parents to address each other, have also been observed. It is an evident example of byplay (or talking over heads), when the parents want to discuss something that is not intended for the ears of their children.

Kinship names included under the description are those of the father and the mother. They bear a number of varieties. In this next section we will deal with true vocatives like *tėti, tėte* or *tete* for the father and *máma* for the mother, some of them are shortened to *tet* or *mam*. Very often the vocatives of the latter group are marked by a prolonged vowel.

Family dinner discourse provides us with interesting examples of vocatives of first names as well. In some cases first names are interchangeably used together with diminutive forms (see Diminutives). Others demonstrate possibilities to derive a rich repertoire of vocatives using so called clipping technique. For instance, a child named Emilija was variously addressed by her parents and sister as *Emilija, Emile, Ema*, varying along the familiarity scale from the most formal to the most friendly end, *Ema* being the most familiar form.

In addition to a wide range of forms, vocatives perform different functions. First of all, a vocative is used to call for the attention of the addressee. Very often parents call children by their first names to distinguish between the two of them. In this case vocatives usually precede speech acts. Children in turn use vocatives to compete for the attention of their parents.

<u>**Example 1**</u>	**(Emilija 4:5, Justina 8:8)**
1 Mother:	*palauk dar dešryčių įdėsiu gerai?*
	wait I'll help you to some more little sausages O.K.?
2 Emilija:	*užte:ks*
	enough
3 Mother:	*ir man dešryčių* ((helps herself))
	and for me some little sausages
4 Emilija:	*aš vėliau*
	I later
→ 5 Justina:	*máma man įdėk*
	mother help me to some
6 Emilija:	*man įdėk*
	help me to some
7 Father:	*užtenka užtenka*
	enough it's enough
8 Mother:	*gerai dabar Justei įdėsiu*
	all right now I'll help Justė to some sausages

In the fuss of starting dinner the elder daughter is left unattended, therefore, silently but firmly, she requires some attention from her parents who seem very busy with her younger sister.

Vocatives are also used to call to order or to reprimand. Parents reprimand most often, though sometimes the elder children use this technique imitating the intonation of their parents to tell their younger brothers or sisters to behave nicely. This way they show their superiority over the youngsters.

Example 2 **(Lukas 5:2, Karolis 8:6)**

1 Mother:	*nešnekėk sėsk gražiai*	
	don't talk sit down properly	
2 Karolis:	*teta nežino kur mes mašinėles paslėpėm hmm*	
	hmm the aunt doesn't know where we have	
	hidden our little cars hm hm	
3 Lukas:	[*a:*	
	[a:h	
4 Mother:	[*oi kaip*] *negražu* (.)	
	[oh how] unkind (.)	
→5 Karolis:	*nu Lukai* (.) *nu tai yra nemandagu kai kiti*	
	valgo o tu taip stalą nustumi (.)	
	hey Lukas (.) hey it's not polite when others	
	are eating and you push away the table like	
	that	
6 Lukas:	((tastes the soup)) *ah karšta*	
	oh it's hot	

The older brother turns an accidental motion of his younger brother into a problem of importance. He uses a vocative to call the little fidget to order and then motivates his reprimand by referring to a politeness convention.

The exemplification of functions reveals that in many cases a vocative can perform several functions at a time. For instance, it may call a child to order and reprimand at the same time. Very often a vocative mitigates the speech act that precedes or follows it alongside the other function it performs. This makes studying vocatives attractive and challenging.

Diminutives

Diminutives are very frequent in Lithuanian family discourse. On the one hand, the explanation may be that a family is an intimate circle of the closest people that radiates with affection. That coincides with the semantic point of view, namely, that diminutives carry affective meaning (Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika, 1996). On the other hand, the Lithuanian language as such offers abundant possibilities to derive diminutives. This is conditioned by a high productivity of diminutive suffixes.

The data of the present study reveal a rich amount of diminutives. They are derived with the help of the feminine diminutive suffixes *-ulė*, *-utė*, *-ytė*, and *-ėlė* and the masculine diminutive suffixes *-(i)ukas*, *-utis*, and *-elis*. Moreover, diminutives examined in this section are not only used to address family members but they also turn out to be reference terms.

The distribution of diminutives shows that the parents employ diminutive forms of first names to call their children. Diminutive forms of kinship names are used by both parents not only to address their children but also to refer to each other. As for children, only elder children use first names in the diminutive form to refer to or address their younger brothers or sisters. Youngsters apparently treat their elder brothers and sisters as grown ups, therefore avoiding diminutive forms to name them.

As it has been mentioned in the previous section, diminutives are very often used interchangeably with vocatives. All manifestations follow a twofold model. In the utterance a vocative either precedes a diminutive or follows it. The latter case can with no doubt be interpreted

as a type of switch to intensify the impact of the speech act like in the following example.

Example 3 **(Kristina 5:6, Paulius 3:4)**

1 Father:	*atrodo iš visų vaikų vienas aš likau* (.)	
	((Kristina comes back)) *ar ne Kristina?*	
	seems that out of all the children I'm the only	
	one left (.) aren't I Kristina?	
2 Kristina:	*ar ne* ((keeps jumping at the table,	
	approaches the camera)) aren't you	
→3 Father:	*Kristinėle nu tu sujudini viską Kristina ateik*	
	č- klausyk mažule ar tu supranti kad taip	
	negalima daryti	
	Kristinėlė look you are shaking everything	
	Kristina come he- listen little girl do you	
	understand that it isn't allowed to do so	
→4 Mother:	*Kristinėle prašau nelakstyt ir nestriksėti tenai*	
	atsisėdi ir sėdi gražiai	
	Kristinėlė please not to run and jump around	
	there you sit down and keep sitting nicely	
5 Paulius:	*gražiai sėdi*	
	keep sitting nicely	

The father warns his daughter not to touch the camera. In Turn 3, at first he tries to approach the issue in a very delicate manner using a diminutive and the explanation of what consequences can be. Later in the same turn, when he sees that this method does not work, he employs a vocative to show that he really means what he says. The mother apparently sees the vocative as too strong or threatening to the daughter's face. That is why she, trying to soften her directive, returns to the use of a diminutive (Turn 4).

Sometimes small children seem to assume that a diminutive is the only legitimate way to name their identity. The following example is a nice illustration of this.

Example 4 **(Kristina 5:6, Paulius 3:4)**

1 Father:	*jūsų kambaryje gerai jūsų kambaryje*	
	padarysime akvariumą tiks? bet Pauliuk tu	
	žinok kasdien turėsi tą žuvytę maitinti	
	in your room OK in your room we'll put the	
	aquarium will it suit you? but Pauliukas you	
	know you'll have to feed that fish everyday	
2 Kristina:	*aš eh maitinsiu*	
	I'll eh feed	
3 Paulius:	*ne* (.) *aš ten bus* [*mano*	
	no (.) I there will be [mine	
4 Father:	[*tai*] *dabar viskas aišku* [*kad*	
	akvariumo pirkt nereikia bus aš	
	[so] now everything is clear [that	
	there's no need to buy an aquarium there will	
	be I	
5 Mother:	[*visos*	
	žuvytės bus labai storos	
	[all	
	fishes will be very fat	
6 Father:	*aš ir žuvys eis pasivaikščioti po kilimą tada*	
	ar ne kai jūs susipešit?	
	I and all the fishes will go for a walk on the	
	carpet then won't they when you scuffle	
7 Kristina:	*ne* (.) *taip taip darysim* (.) *kitą dieną aš, o*	
	kitą dieną toksai (.) *aš, kitą dieną Paulius,*	
	kitą dieną aš, kitą dieną Paulius, kitą dieną	
	aš, kitą [*dieną Paulius*	

no (.) we'll do this this way (.)one day me
and another day such a (.) me one day Paulius
another day me one day Paulius another day
me [one day Paulius

8 Father: [*Pauliau*]
ar sutinki?
                                       [Paulius]
do you agree?

→9 Paulius: ((starts crying)) *ne Paulius aš Pauliukas*
I'm not Paulius I'm Pauliukas

10 Kristina: *Pauliukas*

11 Paulius: *ma:m (.) ar greit duosi?*
Mu:m (.) will you give soon?

12 Mother: *jau jau jau tuoj vieną minutę*
already already already soon one minute

→13 Paulius: *Pauliau Pauliau Pauliau* [*Pauliau*
Paulius Paulius Paulius[Paulius

14 Kristina: [*viskas*] *filmuojasi*
((looks at the camera)) (.)
                                     [everything] is being
filmed (.)

Everything goes smoothly when the boy is called by a diminutive. He does not bother himself arguing with the sister who refers to him as Paulius, but when his father turns to him using the vocative and not a diminutive the child becomes offended (Turn 9). Moreover, Turn 13 shows that he takes the offense quite seriously: he repeats his name in the form of a vocative several times to show his discontent.

When the parents want to develop a conversation and involve the children, they refer to each other by diminutive forms of kinship names. It also concerns the situations when parents try to recruit their children to joint activities.

Example 5   **(Linas 5:7, Vilius 13:2)**

1 Linas   *praleisk*
let me go

2 Vilius: *uch*

3 Father: *Linai kas indus plaus? o kas indus plaus? ką?*
Linas who'll wash up the dishes? who'll wash up the dishes? don't you know?

4 Mother: *gal tu man sušluostysi? gerai?*
may you wipe them for me? O.K.?

5 Vilius: *Linai atsisuk*
Linas turn around

6 Father: *aš dariau omletą nenuversk kameros Lince*
I made the omelette don't overturn the camera Lincė

7 Mother: *cha cha cha cha*

→8 Father: *aš aš padariau omletą mamytė atnešė produktus o tu turi išplaut indus tada taip?*
I I made the omelette Mummy brought the products and you have to wash up the dishes then right?

9 Vilius: *sutartis*
agreement

The father enumerating the duties of every family member refers to the mother by a diminutive form (*mamytė*) reminding his sons how nice and lovely she is. Thereby, he apparently tries to convince his son to take up a job that he does not like very much.

All the discussed examples show that diminutive forms act as mitigation or persuasion devices. If a child hears a switch from a vocative to a diminutive, this is an evident signal that he or she is doing something wrong and should stop that immediately. If a parent hears a diminutive form uttered by their children, he or she knows that the children probably will ask for something. Both the children and the parents are well aware of the power of diminutives and use them extensively.

Vocatives + diminutive nominal forms
It has been observed that in family dinner discourse there occurs an original pattern. Quite often utterances contain a vocative and a diminutive form of either a noun or an adjective. Vocatives are of all the types discussed previously: true and shortened vocatives of kinship names, first name vocatives, vocatives of diminutive forms. As this pattern carries a certain function in the utterance it cannot be left without any remark.

Adjectives used in a diminutive form and occuring together with a vocative, are mainly used by the children. A diminutive form may serve to justify oneself and at the same time to minimize one's fault. The following extract exemplifies the diminutive form of an adjective as an uptaking device for a request to come.

Example 6   **(Emilija 4:5, Justina 8:8)**

1 Father: *vaikučiai ar pastebėjot kad niekas netrukdo valgyti televizorius aš turiu*
little children have you noticed that nothing disturbs us when we eat the TV I mean

2 Mother: *mh* (.)
yeah

3 Father: *ką? kaip tylu kaip gerai*
am I right? how silent how fine

→4 Emilija: *tete tu nupirksi man mažiuką televizorių?*
Daddy will you buy me a very small TV?

5 Father: *o ką tu darysi su mažiuku televizorium?*
what are you going to do with a very small TV?

6 Justina: *su dideliu*
with a big one

7 Father: *ką? po paklode žiūrėsi?*
you'll watch it under the sheet?

8 Justina: *ant mūsų reikia dviejų televizorių*
for all of us two TVs are needed

When the father hints about advantages of the dinner without TV interference the little daughter decides to secure herself by asking for a small TV. The diminutive form *mažiuką* (*very small*) indicates how little she wants from her father: just a personal TV. The bigger sister immediately supports her sister's idea about an additional TV at home.

Diminutive nouns are mostly used to mitigate the parents' directives connected with food consuming. They want their children to finish the plate, try some vegetables or use another piece of cutlery.

Example 7   **(Ugnius 5:2, Laura 6:7)**

1 Ugnius: *aš suvalgiau*
I've eaten

2 Father: [*viską jau suvalgei*
[already eaten everything

→3 Mother: [*Ugniau o bulvytės nors vieną bulvytę*
[Ugnius what about little potatoes at least one little potato

4 Father: *tu greit pavalgei*
             you've finished quickly
5 Mother: *bulvytes su šaukštuku gali* ((picks up the
             spoon)) *su šakute bus* [*labai*] *nepatogu*
             little potatoes you can with a little spoon with
             a fork it'll be [very] inconvienient
6 Ugnius: [mhm
                                   [yeah
7 Mother: *ir nukris tau visa*
             and everything will fall down

The mother wants the son to eat some potatoes, and using a diminutive form (*bulvytę*) she indicates how small the potato is for such a big man to eat it up. Moreover, she suggests that he should take a "little" spoon (*šaukštuką*; instead of *šaukštą*) and not a fork. This may be interpreted as a friendly piece of advice how not to stain the tablecloth.

It has to be mentioned that vocative-diminutive-nominal-form-patterns are accompanied by corresponding paralinguistic features. Both parents and children use higher pitch than usual when they pronounce diminutive nominal forms. This way they signal the affectivity or the smallness of the objects referred to by those forms. Speech then tends to be slower and more expressive. Thus, this pattern imparts an atmosphere of intimacy.

Pejorative endings
The Lithuanian language contains suffixes that involve not only affective but also pejorative meaning at the same time (Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika, 1996). One of them is *–iūkštis*. It occurs in one of the present families at dinner table as well.

Example 8   **(Kristina 5:6, Paulius 3:4)**

→Mother: *sakys kas mane suvalgys kodėl manęs Pauliukas
            nesuvalgė* (.)((feeds Paulius))
            will say who'll eat me why hasn't Pauliukas
            eaten me (.)
2 Father: *kas ten Kristinėle?*
            who's there Kristinėlė
3 Kristina: ° *senelė* (.) [*tavęs prašo* °
            ° grandmother (.) [asking for you °
4 Mother: [*oi nukrito*
                           [oach fallen down
5 Father: *senelė* ((stands up and leaves)) (.) *Kristina* [*nesi-*
            grandmother (.) Kristina [don't fid
→6 Mother: [*Pauliau*
                                                   [Paulius
7 Father: *nesimalk*
            don't fidget
→8 Mother: *išsižiok* (.) ° *matai čia visokie trukdžiai* ° (.)
            Pauliau ((Paulius is looking over his shoulder))
            (.) *sėsk gražiai nu Pauliūkšti* ((pulls Paulius by
            the sleeve)) *atsisėsk* (.) *atsisėsk ir pabaigiam
            valgyt tada valgysim šokoladą gerai*? ((sits
            Paulius down on the stool))
            open your mouth (.) ° you see here are all kinds
            of interference ° (.) Paulius sit down nicely hey
            Pauliūkštis sit down (.) sit down and let's finish
            eating then we'll eat chocolate won't we
9 Paulius: *VA: a* ((eats himself, laughs))
            LOO:K

Here is a nice example of how the mother tries several types of address forms. She departs from the diminutive *Pauliukas* (Turn 1) to the vocative *Pauliau* (Turn 6) and from *Pauliau* to the pejorative diminutive *Pauliūkštis* (Turn 8), aggravating the speech act.

As it can be seen, first naming forms can vary along the neutral – pejorative continuum. The form *Pauliūkšti* then may be considered as an off record strategy because at least two communicative intentions can be attributed to it, i.e. it involves 'and/or' distinction.

Solidarity oriented endings
In one family first names are marked with the suffix *-cė* that indicates team membership. This type is most common within teenage groups. In the family arena, it creates an atmosphere of solidarity. Consequently, in this study such a type is called solidarity oriented ending.

Example 9   **(Linas 5:7, Vilius 13:2)**

→1 Father: ((→L)) *sėsk normaliai o tai nukrisi po stalu
            tuoj* (.) *Lince nu sėsk normaliai o tuoj n-
            nučiuoši*
            sit down properly otherwise you'll soon fall
            under the table (.) Lincė sit down properly
            otherwise you'll soon s- slip off
2 Linas: *gerai: atsisėdau*
            all right: I've sat down
3 Father: *na dabar valgyk kol nenugriuvai* (.) *mhm tai
            dvi mergaitės patinka todėl* [*kad gali jas
            primušti*
            so now eat until you've fallen off (.) yes so
            you like the two girls because [you can beat
            them
4 Mother: [*Linai tai sėsk normaliai*]
            nes tai vėl atsidurs arbata ant X kelių (.)
                        [Linas so sit down properly]
            otherwise your tea will get on X lap again (.)

Here the father addresses his younger son using the first name with the solidarity-oriented ending *–cė* for two reasons. On the one hand, it serves as a mitigation device for his directive. On the other hand, he seems to show that they both make a team like one at school or in the yard, which have its own regulations, interests and secrets.

Endearment terms and nicknames
Lithuanian family dinner discourse presents a number of endearment terms and nicknames. An endearment term is one that carries affective meaning. Diminutives may also be considered endearment terms as diminutive suffixes carry affective meaning. Since, they have been already described in the previous sections, here we will deal with the rest of address and reference terms used to endear family members. All other pet names as well as derisory names are grouped under the heading of nicknames.

Endearment terms are used to praise a child even for a petty positive act, for instance, eating a piece of sausage. The parents usually cherish little ambitions of their children. A boy is called *šaunus vyras, šaunuolis* (*smart man*) to make him feel a grown up man. *Mažas vaikas* (*little child*) then acts as a degrading device for bad behaviour and means that the child is doing something not appropriate for a real man. It should also be pointed out that in the present material these devices were used only

for boys though it would be unfair to claim that only boys want to distinguish themselves in the family.

The data present some more address terms that indicate solidarity, like *vaikai* (*children*), *vaikučiai* (*little children*), *chebra* (*gang*). They are used to address both children at a time this way inviting them for kind of a joint activity.

Some pet names like *mažuti* (*little boy*), *mažute, mažule* (*little girl*), *smalsute* (*curious girl*), *čiauškale* (*talkative girl*) signal misbehaviour of the children and serve as hints for them to stop it. The parents can sometimes be very inventive in creating pet names.

Most nicknames occur in comparative patterns. A child is generally not directly called *paršelis* (*piglet*), *liuliukas* (*little brat*), *laukinis* (*savage*) or *čiukča* (*Chukchi*) but compared to the beings that embody these names or qualities, i.e. parents employ these nicknames not as address terms but as terms of reference like in the patern *kaip paršelis*. It has also to be noted that all the comparisons are observed in the eating context and applied to the youngest members of the families.

When addressing each other, pejorative names are used only by the children. They escalate these names as if to compete who will say the worst word in the world this way degrading their co-participant.

Example 10   **(Rokas 4:11, Dovilė 8:9)**

1	Rokas:	*M:* ((shows the tongue))
2	Dovilė:	*di di di*
3	Rokas:	*m:* ((shows the tongue again))
→4	Dovilė:	*didysis tešlagalvis* big butthead
→5	Rokas:	*kiaule* pig
6	Father:	*dieve kaip jie šneka* god how they are speaking
7	Mother:	*iš darželio tikriausiai prisineša jau sakiau* [a*uklėtojai* they probably bring all this from the kindergarten already told [the teacher
→8	Rokas:	((→D)) *kiaule* pig
9	Dovilė:	*och* oh
→10	Rokas:	*tu kiaule* you pig
11	Dovilė:	*Rokai biški paklausyk* Rokas listen a little
→12	Rokas:	*nu tu kiaule tu paršas* hey you pig you swine
13	Dovilė:	*viskas nu tu* [*X X X* that's all you [X X X
→14	Rokas:	[*tu paršas tu kiaule*] *tu VIŠTA* [you swine you pig] you HEN
→15	Dovilė:	*ROKAI BAIK* ROKAS STOP IT

It is somewhat surprising that the parents do not interfere with the escalation no matter how indignant they are with everything they hear. It is left up to the children to solve their mutual problems. The daughter is the first to surrender. At first she tries to make it up in a very diplomatic way (Turn 11). When it does not help she raises her voice and orders her brother to stop.

Alongside the friendly - pejorative scale of nicknames, Lithuanian family dinner discourse offers some local creations. Usually the context or certain associations evoke them. The child sings the song about Matilda and the father uses the name *Matilda* to call her to order. In another family the younger sister who decides to do her hair at the dinner table is called *garbanėlė* (*little curl*) by her elder sister. Sometimes the parents use local creations to call each other.

Having discussed the endearment terms and nicknames used by Lithuanian families during dinner, the following conclusion may be drawn. Endearment terms and local creations mitigate speech acts. They are also employed as parts of family jokes. Pejorative names are used to degrade the partner. Parents, however, try to avoid them. They are not employed as address terms by parents, but as terms of reference.

Concluding discussion

Certainly, it is no surprise that first and kinship naming makes up the biggest part since it is conditioned by familiarity prevailing in the family arena. Moreover, Lithuanian families use a wide variety of innovative nicknames, yielding a rich repertoire of emotively coloured terms of address. In addition, endearment terms as well as solidarity-oriented endings are met at family dinner tables. All the above-mentioned findings are used as mitigation devices.

There also occur a number of pejorative names. They usually aggravate directives. Furthermore, the study exemplifies a pejorative ending which can be interpreted as an off-record strategy because it carries both pejorative and affective meaning. Depending on the context then at least two communicative intentions can be attributed to it.

To sum it up, the present findings corroborate earlier work on facework. On one hand, Blum-Kulka's view that the atmosphere of high intimacy and informality lends itself to solidarity behaviour is supported. Moreover, the study exemplifies mitigations coded in cases of positive politeness similar to previous research by Aronsson and Thorell (1998), who documented justifications and reason-giving, first-naming, inclusive we-type address and pleading voice in the mitigations of children role-playing family. On the other hand, the study holds the view that negative politeness is characteristic of Western cultures (Brown and Levinson, 1987) as Lithuanian family members have developed quite a number of strategies.

References

1. Atkinson, J. & Heritage, J. (1984) Transcription notation. In Atkinson, J. & Heritage, J. (eds.). Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversational Analysis (pp. ix-xvi). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2. Aronsson, K. & Thorell, M. (1998) Family politics in children's play directives. In Thorell, M. Politics and alignments in children's play dialogue: play arenas and participation (pp 175-205). Linköping University.

3. Blum-Kulka, Sh. (1997) Dinner Talk. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlaum Associates.

4. Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1972) The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In Laver, J. & Hutcheson, S. (eds.). Communication in Face-to-Face Interaction. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

5. Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987) Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

6. Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika. (1996). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

7. Goodwin, M.H. (1990) He-Said -She-Said: Talk as social organization among black children. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

8. Ochs, E., Taylor, C., Rudolph, D. & Smith, R., (1989) Narrative Activity as a Medium for Theory-Building. Manuscript. Los Angeles, Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.

9. Ochs, E., Smith, R. & Taylor, C., (1989) Detective stories at dinnertime: Problem-solving through co-narration. In Cultural Dynamics (Vol.II, 2, pp 238-275).

10. Ochs, E. (1992) Stories that step into the Future. In Biber, D. & Finegan, E. (eds.). Perspectives on Register: Situating Register Variation within Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

11. Ochs, E. & Taylor, C. (1992) Family Narrative as Political Activity. In Discourse and Society (Vol. 3 (3), pp 301-340). Newbury Park: Sage.

12. Ochs, E., Pontecorvo, C. & Fasulo, H. (1996) Socializing Taste. In Ethnos (Vol. 1-2, pp 7-46) Scandinavian University Press.

13. Wardhaugh, R. (1986) An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Aušra Abraškevičiūtė

Kreipiniai ir denotatai lietuviškame diskurse už pietų stalo

Santrauka

Šis straipsnis atskleidžia, kaip šeimos nariai kreipiasi bei vadina vienas kitą pietų metu, pateikiama lingvistinė kreipinių ir denotatų išraiška, jų dažnumas bei analizuojamos jų kalbinės funkcijos. Tyrimas pagrįstas pokalbių už pietų stalo dešimtyje lietuvių šeimų analize. Šeimos buvo nufilmuotos pietaujant. Paskui pokalbiai pilnai trasnkribuoti. Gauti duomenys suskirstyti į pagrindines šešias klases. Tai vokatyvai, diminutyvai, vardažodinės diminutyvinės konstrukcijos, vardai su pejoratyvinėmis priesagomis, vardai su solidarumo reikšmę turinčiomis priesagomis, pravardės ir mažybiniai žodžiai bei neutralūs denotatai. Daugiausiai vartojami vokatyvai bei neutralūs denotatai. Diminutyvinės formos taip pat dažnos. Pravardės bei mažybiniai žodžiai užima trečią vietą. Nustatyta, kad visi jie turi didelę įtaką kalbos aktams. Vardai bei giminystę nusakantys žodžiai, galybė išgalvotų pravardžių, vardai su solidarumo reikšmę turinčiomis priesagomis bei mažybiniai žodžiai naudojami kalbos aktams sušvelninti. Pejoratyvinės pravardės sugriežtina kalbos aktus. Kartais, priklausomai nuo konteksto, žodžiui gali būti priskiriamos net dvi komunikatyvinės funkcijos, kaip tai atsitinka vardams su pejoratyvinėmis priesagomis.

The author

Aušra Abraškevičiūtė, M.A. Assistant lecturer at the Department of Social Sciences, Institute of Foreign Languages, Vilnius University. Teaches English to the students of the Faculty of Law.
Academic interests: sociolinguistics, pragmatics. Defended Master thesis on the topic of family discourse in 1998. Her academic advisor was Prof. K.Aronsson, Linkoping University, Sweden. In 1999 the work was presented at the international conference PRAGMA '99, in Tel-Aviv and Jarusalem, Israel. The author participates in a number of projects dealing with qualification development.
Address: Vilnius University, Institute of Foreign Languages, Department of Social Sciences, 9 Sauletekio str., LT-2040, Vilnius, Lithuania.
E-mail: ausra.abraskeviciute@uki.vu.lt.