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In the present study, I will also take into consideration the diachronic and phonic character of the Algerian speech community, the ethnic and social heterogeneity of its citizens, i.e., of the region analysed.

In the second place, the choice of this topic has been made for two main purposes: the first is that to establish and maintain a close connection between interlocutors is function is to establish and maintain a close connection between interlocutors, and the second is the crucial importance of these rules in the place of address and the choice of the Algerian Arabic.

This research work intends to discuss, within a sociolinguistic framework, different address people in different situations.

Abstract
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speech acts or can address forms be combined with speech acts realizing relatively respect? Are there any preferred combinations of types of address with realizations of respect? When are different choices of address forms expressed both formally and informally through different choices of address forms? How is politeness governing any choice of address forms in Algerian Arabic? Where are the social variables informing any choice of address forms in Algerian Arabic?

Then, these questions require answers here: A/What are the social variables informing any choice of address forms in Algerian Arabic?

1987) and third their combination with specific speech acts.

politeness theories, more precisely the universal theory of Brown and Levinson (1978-83) - to whom we are relating. Second, we will consider how these forms are reflected in the forms involved in the selection of an appropriate term with which to address the person set in choice of the message form. First, we will look at the socially controlled choice of the influence of the social aspect of the relation of the speaker - hearer in the circumstances of communication theory, each factor being associated with a different function. Much of the research has been carried out with a focus on meaning or topic rather than the other social factors. But here our focus is social and we will analyze in some detail the study of discourse. Hymes (1974) suggested that any communicative use of language or speech event is...
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Chapter Three will be concerned with another phenomenon that is closely related to address studies and has much to contribute to it, namely ‘politeness’. This part will be devoted exactly to what politeness is, its major models which recognize the two macro-sociological notions of ‘power’ and ‘solidarity’ as determining factors and have come to be regarded as important tools for the analysis of politeness and social indexing through different types of address and expressing the two parameters: positive and negative politeness. The latter two strategies will be examined in different contexts with a view of focusing on in-group identity markers.

Finally, in the last chapter, we intend to deal with one kind of speech acts: thanking, with the purpose of analyzing the combination of address forms with the realization of this speech act and examining whether there are preferred combinations or free selection. This will be done through the evaluation of an utterance within a given situation, compared to a reference speech act; the test items are combinations of selected prototypical realizations of gratitude expressions with types of address.
CHAPTER ONE

Review on Address Forms

Linguistic Situation in Algeria and Literature
picture of the linguistic situation in Algeria before and after independence. On
of course his linguistic code: So, we will attempt to draw an overall
which certainly influenced in one way or another the Algerian speech community and
North African boundaries have shifted during various stages of the conquests

addresser namely as rules of forms of address. This notion of distance is linguistically reflected in the specific terms they select for the
and under what circumstances they are all used to how close or distant the listener is.
Therefore, how speakers organize what they want to say, to whom, where, when

and addressee.

physical channel and psychological connection between addresser
(5) code common to the addresser and addressee at the same time, which
be operative the message requires a (4) context refers to as a
The (3) addresser sends a (2) message to the (1) addressee. To

10 to linguistics by Jakobson (1960) put briefly as follows:

choice, A number of factors were identified in the communicational theory and adapted
accounts for differences in language use has been the subject matter of a great number
the same linguistic code show at least slight differences in its usage. Hence, what

Cumpantz here states that people who are raised in the same environment and share

signs and set off from similar ağrégates by significant differences in language usage.

characterized by regular and frequent interaction by means of a shared body of verbal
"any human ağrégate of the speech community defined by Cumpantz (1961) as, a
community in a given context. The analysis of such phonation requires the analysis
abstract system but rather a social phonation used by members of a speech

Within the sociolinguistic approach, it has been argued that language is not an

Introduction
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The linguistic impact of the Romans upon the population was important. Indeed, the people

living in urban cities, while Berber was spoken by Berbers as their official language of the elite

Berbers became part of their own identity through the use of this language. The Romans

found refuge in the wilder, rockier, and more inhospitable terrain of the country. Some

Berbers from the region's most fertile lands, forced off their land, the Berbers

colonyized Numidia or Barce, in 100 B.C., displacing Berbers to a vast number of

the Romans and Arabic. Later, under the Numidian, King Juba I and Juba 2, the Romans,

Berber, and Arabic influence on the Berbers. The North African and the massive spoke Berber in the

influence of which the Berbers. The Phoenicians colonized Africa with a purpose of using it as a

Berber world. Later, the Phoenicians colonized Africa with a purpose of using it as a

inhabitants of Africa were the Berbers, thus, North Africa including Algeria was a

different races, and this has certainly influenced its linguistic situation. The first

since prehistoric times, Algeria has always been the homeland of people from

I. Before the Arab conquest

Islam and the coming of the Arabs.

people, whose language and culture dominated most of the land until the spread of

remarkable traces on its linguistic situation. Not only this mix developed the Berber

Berber region for people moving towards Europe or the Middle East. So they let

French. The Berber coastal plain of North Africa, especially west of Tunisia served as a

different races; the Berbers, the Phoenicians, the Romans, the Turks, the Arabs and then

Since Algeria is situated on the coast, it was the homeland of many people from
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Concerned with political, social or economic conditions of Algeria (Morsani, 2005:40),

the Ottoman Empire was not really
governed by a "dey" (a Turkish governor). Indeed, the Ottomans were not really
united until the 17th century. Thus, Algeria became part of the Ottoman Empire and was
asked for the help of the Ottomans who eventually governed most of Central Maghreb.

The Christian and Muslim world threatened by the rise of Christian Europe, North Africa, 

In the late 15th century, North Africa plunged into the struggle between the
developing a written form.

One might think that the arrival of the Arabs prevented the Berbers from
using Arabic. This is not the case. It was written in the Arabic alphabet (particularly by the Shilha
people) during the 10th century. It was first written in the Thuluth alphabet, still used by the
Turkish Empire. The oldest dated inscription is from about 200 BC. Later, between about
1000 AD and 1500 AD, it was written in the Naskhi alphabet. As a written form, it
preserves the various dialects in different geographical areas. As a written form, it
continued to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
preserving their various dialects in different geographical areas. As a written form, it
continued to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
preserving their various dialects in different geographical areas. As a written form, it
continued to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeeded in
continuing to speak their language among themselves. Besides, they succeede
I. 2. The Linguistic Situation in Algeria after Independence (1962)

The leaders of the war of independence (1954-1962) compromised numerous to coexisting, nevertheless, the Algerians had an urgent need to regain their identity. After independence, Algeria was so deeply influenced linguistically and socially.
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French belonging to the Indo-European family.

Phonological, as a typical characteristic of the Arabic-speaking communities in general and diglossia, as a typical characteristic of the Arabic-speaking communities, is a linguistic phenomenon that deals with the linguistic situation in Algeria through two linguistic phenomena: Arabic varieties spoken in a number of places of the country. Accordingly, we will briefly mention some of the Arabic varieties spoken by almost all Algerians. French in addition to other languages, Arabic, spoken by virtually all Algerians, serves as the official language of Algeria, a particular socio-cultural position in the country. Classical Arabic is the official language of Algeria; however, there are many dialects of Arabic used and each one has its own characteristics.

Besides the role of the French language in the Algerian social life, the study of the evolution and associations with religion, native language, the use of Arabic began to generalize step by step since it is the progressive and progressive language. Indeed, many Algerians use Arabic more easily than French. This has led to the instruction of Classical Arabic because Classical Arabic was regarded as a valuable medium of instruction in schools, especially in primary and middle schools. However, it partially failed at the University where French remained the main medium of instruction. Furthermore, Classical Arabic was established in various domains such as administration and education. This gradual replacement of French by Classical Arabic has been considered a real threat to the Arabophone population. This was considered a natural process to be led after independence to gradually replace French with Classical Arabic. However, for centuries, the status of French as a foreign language. However, for centuries, the status of French as a foreign language.

In fact, for the Algerian Francophone, the Arabophone policy was a real 2005:43 and this goal could not be achieved without an effective language policy.

Algerian identity upon two major points which are Islam and the language of the colonizers. The first aim of the group, consisting of Algerian Islamists and political leaders, was to build the language of Arabo-Islamic identity. The second aim was to build the language of the colonizers, the language of the colonizers. The first aim was to build the language of the colonizers, the language of the colonizers.
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2. Quoted in Boulmane (2003:5).

Varieties: CA and the colloquial Arabic (Persian 1959, Fisman 1967) were confronted to a complex linguistic situation. Therefore the diglossic situation involving two Arabic on the linguistic situation of the country. The contact between two different cultures led French was imposed as the official language of Algeria, a fact which left deep impact due to the French colonialism which lasted more than one century and during which appeared (Bloomefield 1933:56) In other words, it is a linguistic phenomenon that has appeared "Blengulism" defined as the" naivie-like control of two languages".

I. 2.2. Blengulism described as the "naivie-like control of two languages"

In the Arabic speech community in a diglossia relationship, there is a third variety named "the middle language". Linguistically speaking, there is a third variety named "the middle language".

Percussion (1959) writes: "these two varieties, classical and colloquial, exist side by side. The high variety is used in formal situations and is the medium of the written ordinary conversation, purposes far is not used by any sector of the community for education and is used for most written and formal spoken as superposed variety, (......) which is learned largely by formal education, this being the first distinction "the high variety" (H) from the low variety (L). He describes the first complementary distribution, each one having specific functions. Percussion (1959) to describe a diglossia is a term that was put forward by Percussion (1959).
political realities. In particular, it went through several stages greatly linked to its social, cultural, and historical context. We would point out that the sociohistorical situation of Algeria is

It is a whole socio-cultural phenomenon (Bouhannane, 2003: 14).

Regarding the integration of foreign terms, Algerian borrowings are not individual. Rather, they are spoken vernaculars. This leads to a blend of the regional and written dialects, because they are spoken vernaculars. This fact of being oral rather than written shows the great impact that French had on Algerian Arabic, especially in this regional and local situation. In the case of Algerian borrowings, borrowings are a recurrent sociohistorical phenomenon. If

are neither phonologically, morphologically, nor syntactically adapted.

Another aspect is that when they are integrated, they are integrated on the three levels of phonology, morphology, and syntax. In the way out of this problem is to consider lexical items from one language that

singe words or phrases. Bouhannane (1986: 116) says in this respect:

"The recognition of the native language is a change in language in terms of only

than single words, whereas the latter involves a change of language involving more

switchover and borrowing. The former refers to a change of language involving more

use in everyday speech and official situations. This led to the emergence of code

Françophone. As a matter of fact, both French and Arabic were used and continue to be

use of French. It is not easy since a great number of Algerians were

the use of French, but it was not so easy since a great number of Algerians were

the sheer. This was done by the absorption process which was meant to pull an end to

achieved without the establishment of Arabic as the national and official language of

colonial position or the dominant language of education and literacy. This could not be

particularly Algeria, pursued a policy which aimed at displacing French from his

After independence, all the Maghreb countries to varying degrees, more

new situation makes the speech community both diglossic and bilingual.

Classical or colloquial is the ‘L\’one (Frisvm, n’x) for functional differentiation. That

to another diglossic situation that between French as the H, variety and Arabic, either
Some of the questions here related to address Lemurs are inspired from Brun (1988:1)

Then one year

6. Please give me in chronological order the places you have lived in for more
5. What is your family status (i.e. married, single, etc.)
4. Are you male or female?
3. How old are you?
2. Do you live in the town of your origin?
1. Where were you born?

Date:

Total number:

Informants are impossible.

Informations will be kept in strict confidence so that conclusions about the identity of the
informants which have led to your present language use. Of course: all personal
information will be kept in strict confidence. We hope that such information will help us to determine the
In this section we ask you some questions concerning your past life, as they are

a) Questions concerning the informants’ background

Please read and fill it attentively

*Repript of the questionare

were given just as the situation demanded but not included in the next report.
Introductions, explanations, and examples were added to the forms included here; they
should be regarded as the basis of a structured interview. This is why very often
informants were unable to fill it on their own. So this anonymous questionnaire
remains concerning our experience in working with this questionaire. Sometimes
The following section contains a repript of our questionaire as well as some

I. 3. Research Methodology

Forms of Address in Aghadjem Arabic: The Speech Community of Mashhadi
1. If you are a student, what schools and colleges have you attended?
2. What is your level of education?
3. If you are not a student, what jobs have you done for more than one year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the place</th>
<th>How long did you live there?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>2-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of job practised</th>
<th>Length of occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>2-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Terms of address

1- How do you address members of your family?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Modes of Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your father</td>
<td>a- Old than you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your mother</td>
<td>b- Younger than you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your brothers</td>
<td>a- Paternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your sister</td>
<td>b- Maternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your grandparents</td>
<td>a- Father's brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your mother's brother</td>
<td>b- Mother's brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your sister's sister</td>
<td>a- Father-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your parents-in-law</td>
<td>b- Mother-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How are you addressed by members of your family?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By your father</th>
<th>By your mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a- Older than you</td>
<td>a- Paternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- Younger than you</td>
<td>b- Maternal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By your grand-parents :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a- By your father's brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- By your mother's brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- By your father's sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- By your mother's sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a- By your parents-in-law :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- By your son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- By your daughter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How do you address your neighbours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger than you</td>
<td>Younger than you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same age as you</td>
<td>Same age as you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than you</td>
<td>Older than you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very young</td>
<td>Very young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very old</td>
<td>Very old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher in social status than you</td>
<td>Higher in social status than you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower in social status than you</td>
<td>Lower in social status than you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same social status as you</td>
<td>The same social status as you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justice

6. At work: How do you address colleagues Judicial Magistrates in the court of

- Inspectors
- Headmaster
- Simple Workers
- Secretaries
- Females
- Males

(Responsibilities):

Members of the administration staff
- Not in class
- Teachers: a - in class

Friends

5. At school: How do you address friends, teachers and staff?

- The same social status as you
- Lower in social status than you
- Higher in social status than you
- Very old
- Very young
- Older than you
- Same age as you
- Younger than you
- Female
- Male

4. How are you addressed by your neighbours?

Form of Address in Algeria: Arabic: The Speech Community of Maghribi
13 - When do you prefer address avoidance?

 Gestures, movements of the body?

12 - Do you use other kinds of behaviors for address (non-linguistic such as cultural/linguistic environment) (Give examples please)

No:  

Yes:

11 - In many cultures a speaker is not allowed to address certain people i.e. he must not talk to them at all. Are there any such prohibitions of address in your cultural/linguistic environment? (Please give examples)

10 - How do you address God in your dialect?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Singualur

9 - Do you use any pronouns for a direct address?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The shopkeeper

The waiter

8 - How do you address the shop-keeper?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Name unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 - In a restaurant, in a café: How do you address the waiter?
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- Older and lower in status.
- Younger and higher in status.
- Someone older than you and higher in social status (superior).
- Someone of the same age as you and equal in social status.
- Someone younger than you and lower in status.

Have been given a gift, have been done a favour, have been given a help by:

19. Imagine the following situations and provide an answer to each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>To a supporter</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>To an equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To an inferior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. When kind of terms can you associate/combine to your thanking formula?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressions</th>
<th>Gratitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a supporter</td>
<td>To an equal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What kind of expressions do you use to thank a person?

15. On what basis do you choose a gratitude expression?

14. Why and when do you thank people (circumstances and obligations)?

C (Gratitude Expressions (e.g., thanking))
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Most of them belonged to the 14-50 age range; there were only few people who were above 50 years old.

The persons interviewed had different educational backgrounds (graduate, postgraduate, primary, middle and secondary education). Very few of them were undereducated.

The use of different terms of address to perform the speech act of thanking, poisefulness are reflected in the spoken repertoire of my speech community through the pull forward by Brown and Levinson (1978-1987) namely positive and negative remarks (teachers, etc).

In the second part, informants were asked to give a taxonomy of different forms of address in an ethnographic, jobs practiced and social rank were collated.

In the first part of the questionnaire, personal information about the informants was gathered to find out the factors affecting the linguistic choice such as: age, sex, birthplace, educational background.

Collection of data
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but also through pronouns inherent in verb ending. Solliardity are not only expressed through hidden ilies, names, nicknames or no ilies at all to whom we show a certain kind of respect. In addition, they say that power and equals whose power is non-reciprocal because it is used with people of social distance, as linguistic factors. They conclude that solliardity is reciprocal since it is used between equivalents of the two pronouns selection with semantic, stylistic and psychological or well and analysis of the two pronouns selection on semantic, stylistic and psychological. Broom and Gillman correlate their the social distance that exists between the speaker and the listener whereas the second introduces the two notions of power and solliardity (1978). They mean by the first introducing the two dimensions underlying the pronoun's role in French, German, Italian semiotic dimensions underlying the pronoun's role in French, German, Italian studies the To differentiate the two pronouns function, Broom and Gillman (1990) studied the

the "vouz" pronouns, each one having a semantic implication. Thus, the French language has established an address system that includes the "tu" and plurality of power. Eventually, this extends the concept of power to other power figures. Addressed to both and accordingly, the use of "vouz" was used in response to their unific their work administratively. Therefore, the words addressed to one man were two emperors one of the east and one of the west as in Constantinople and Rome but whose evolution of the two pronouns which refer back to the Fourth Century when semantic evolution of the two pronouns is "tu" and "vouz" existing by the and Solliardity, studied the two-choice system of "tu" and "vouz" shaping by the growing core of investigations has done great work, the most relevant ones

I. 4.1. Sociolinguistic background

some variations?

Forms of address in different speech communities pertaining different on the forms of talk or address in different speech communities sharing either different or the provide an answer to the following question: On what basis do people choose their

In this field, a great deal of research has been done by a number of linguists to

I. 4. Address Forms
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Forms of address are divided into free and bound forms. The first are those which are not integrated into the syntax of a sentence whereas the second are those integrated.

Also to refer to him or her for example when saying: 'Excuse me, sir,' or 'Hey'.

These words are not only used to get the addressee's attention but also to express titles. 'These words include pronouns, names, verb endings in integrated languages. Titles...

The definition of address includes pronouns, names, verb endings in integrated languages. Titles...

Brehm (1988, 7) writes: "Address is a speaker's interpersonal reference to his/her collocutor(s)."

In many cases, based on some factors that will be discussed later, in defining such forms, surveys of addresses and noticed that the choice of forms is not made at random, but for a purpose.

A number of works have developed immune amounts of time and energy to study and analyze these

(a) Address and its analysis

Forms.

Position of those forms within the sentence with a view to give significance of those forms and what determines their presence or absence; she also studies the

Furthermore, Dickey (1996) describes the Greek forms of address dealing with

contact, silence, turn-taking, gestures, and so on.

with him. In this study, other paralinguistic features have been considered, such as eye-

contact, silence, turn-taking, gestures, and so on.

A third study is a comparison between English and Vietnamese forms of address.

Comparative study between American, Korean and Puerto Rican systems of address.

Age, rank, social class, marital status and social and familial are concerned. She also made a

search not only what those forms are, she found out that these rules change as far as

address. Where she made an attempt to know what determines the choice of rules of

The second is the pioneering work of Etting-Tipp (1967), Sociolinguistic Rules of
Suggested below by Holmes (1971:297): Rules require certain forms of address which can be rude in other settings as less recognized by English despite its importance in determining address usage. Some

The second criterion—social context (setting, audience, and topic of discourse) is

as 'them' by her children.

family name, as 'y' her first name by her colleagues, with a surname by her family and

family name; e.g., 'y' her first name by her colleagues. For example, a woman could be addressed as Mrs. X. The plus

speakers in Arabic, for example, a woman could be addressed as Mrs. X. The plus

In all languages, one person may receive different addresses from different

speakers alone but only from proprietors of the shop (Brown and Ford 1961:234).

therefore address usage is not predictable from properties of the addressor or of the

that of the speaker (age, sex, status, family, kinship, and membership of a group); also

unimportant. The first criterion does not only mean the identity of the addressor but also

person are the relationship of the speaker/addressee and the social context of the

but the first important element when we take into consideration when addressing a

proper use of terms of address is important as the configuration of verbs would

used in which circumstances as shown by Parkinson (1985:225). Knowledge of the

A form of address is governed by a set of rules that decide which forms can be

(1) Factors affecting rules of address

meaning.

meaning as lack of respect for the addresser while bound forms have little social

into the synax of a sentence. On the other hand, free forms can express a strong social
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address meaning are separate but not unrelated. Also use the first name when one is talking to the other about the third. Thus, lexical and
example: If Thumper and Friends are friends and address each other by first names they will
what the way we refer to each other is reflected in the way we address each other. For
not as an address. For example, /hammad/ (a nurse) in Arabic. A further complication is
addresses an adult. Besides, there are some words which are used only referentially but
of /ramân/which means ‘my uncle’, but is also used as a sign of respect when a young
the address usage of ‘Monsieur’. For any adult male a good example could be the use
following sentence: ‘Je connais pas ce Monsieur’ (I don’t know this man) but if refers to
lexical meaning of ‘my lord’, doesn’t correspond to the lexical meaning ‘my lord’ in the
form and the referential one. For instance, the word ‘Monsieur’ in French which has the
An important distinction must be made between the lexical usage of an address

(c) Lexical versus address meaning

law who used a formal address were not present (Mühlethaler and Harre, 1990:145). When
who addressed her mother-in-law with a familiar pronoun when two other daughters-in-
factor of audience can be of vital importance: a recent study reports the case of a woman
while at home calling him ‘teacher’, will be perceived as equally inappropriate. The
presencing a lesson and you call him /bôw/ (tad) in class, is considered disrespectful.
The same phenomenon happens in our speech communities; if your father is

equally rude:

dinner table calling him ‘your honour’, will be perceived as
calling him ‘Tom’ will be considered disrespectful, while at the
if (your brother) is sitting as he judge in a law court then

Forms of Address in Algerian Arabic: The Speech Community of Maghliba
address by both speakers. This criterion is of great importance to keep in mind for the
reciprocal address is also called symmetrical and is defined as the use of the same

*Recipient.*

familiarity, and symmetry; the former indicates intimacy but non-reciprocity shows
being addressed to T, while and last name being equivalent to A. This implies the idea of
such as English can have T / A distinctions in nominal address: address by first name
intimates and superiors, but for languages which have only one second-person pronoun
function. The first is used with intimates or inferiors and the second is used with non-
brown and gillman (1960) have made distinctions between T and A pronouns

(6) Reciprocity

with addresses of both high and low statuses.

with people of lower status. This is equally applied to the forms of address employed
with people who occupy a high status in the community; others belong to a low register associated
linguistic characteristics belong to high register because they are associated with people
lower social status when written at a lower style. In other words, there are certain
higher social status when writing at a higher style and forms associated with people of
registers: each for a particular context. They will use forms associated with people of

Speakers of a language often make distinctions between higher and lower

of language.

of speakers he is associated with. This is applied for both literary and non-literary forms
that he applies to those particular situations and particular social dimensions as he finds
within a piece of prose (an essay), therefore, he uses three different styles or registers
example, in the classroom, a student employs with his teachers in office and uses another variety when is
register is the use of different types of language in different situations. For
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Register
TRAVEL 1989:32, this applies to addresses as well as to other elements of language. Language and beliefs and needs present in the culture of its speakers (Saville-Trayner).

Linguists believe that there is a correlation between the form and content of a

(6) Address and social structures

one...

...these are the politeness seeking to minimize their difference in status from those at the top and

The sociolinguist, Wendaughen assaars (1992: 271) claimed that in a hierarchy:

...until a new form was introduced and the old one was replaced by a less polite status.

which led people to address their superiors with more and more deference. Thus the

principle about the universal human need to be addressed and to reach for - power.

Studies devoted to historical address change concluded that address change was

although Brown and Gilman did discuss this issue in their article.

subject to changes in the duration of this system to relatively short periods of time.

work has been done on the diachrony of address systems; even historical work on the

question of whether there is whether there are regularities in the way it changes. Very little

address system, like other aspects of language, may change over time but the

(7) Address change

form addresses the speakers.

meaning of a term of address in a given context depends on the way the recipient of that
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affection, solidarity, respect, or other positive emotions.

/ Positive address: It generally occurs in situations implying expressions of praise, positive, negative, and neutral statements (Dickery, 1996: 28).

The types of statements in which addresses are used, and thus their social meanings, have had to be gathered from the contexts within which they occur and be divided into.

This is not a firm enough to allow us to know how speakers would divide their address into classes, and then if is safe to begin from the term itself is usual in historical sociolinguistics.

It is said that age difference is at least two years in Korean culture to another, "I am older than the speaker and the linguistic definition of older, values from one or she is older than the speaker and the linguistic definition of older. Values from one group of addresses because in many cultures an address is heard differently if he is younger.

A study of forms of address can begin from either or two angles. One can classify

(h) Organization (choice of address)

which could not be gathered from referential usage.

Therefore, address usage provides in the culture concerned, elicits about social relations,

fact that a woman was not supposed to meet these relatives at all (Chao 1956: 230).

Other views state that address usage provides a more accurate guide to social reality.
cultural values of the society. Reliable way and one aspect that can therefore reflect those linguistic, political and
Algerian social and cultural background, and the study of address system may be a
bilingualism, and the increase in intercultural contact has greatly influenced the
This complex linguistic situation characterized by both, diaspora, and
continues to be used in spoken and written domains.
language is the first foreign language which emerged due to the French occupation and
established social support in addition to some Berber varieties. In parallel, the French
spontaneously by most Algerian citizens to express their thoughts, communica
tion and appropriate for educational purposes. On the other hand, Az is the spoken variety used
replaced by MSA (Modern Standard Arabic), the language of the nation which is more
forms: CA - the language of Kharza is considered as the most prestigious language – is
considered, Arabic is the national and official language and usually appears in its two
A) from different races. This makes it a linguistic situation quite complex with
From the diachronic study of Algerian, one may conclude that it is a melting pot

Conclusion

emotion is apparent and it may be used in the two kinds from time to time.
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hostility, contempt or similar emotions.

Neutral address: used in statements where neither positive nor negative
Address Behaviour in Algerian Arabic

CHAPTER TWO
positive self-image individuals project to the world (Goffman, 1967), is a universal
politeness put forward by Brown and Levinson (1987). They suggest that face
It is helpful to frame naming within the context of the anthropological theory of

2. 1. Names

Solidarity address terms comprising of:

In fact, the dialect under investigation has a rich selection of both deontal and

2. 1. A survey of terms of address in Algerian Arabic

In formal ones their choice is determined by the type of people with whom we interact.
reserved to old people. Those forms are more common in informal situations because
originated from matrimonial relationships and occupational titles in addition to certain terms
Maghribi – can take the form of names, kinship terms, personal pronouns, other terms

The forms of address used in the dialect investigated – the Arabic variety of

C / Attributes of the situation (for example: informal, formal, or informal)

address (for example: role, age, class)

b / Features that characterize the relationship between the speaker and the
married/single)

a / Characteristics of the person addressed (adulthood, male/female,

Address are determined by:

According to the observations, interviews, questionnaires and surveys did, forms of
mode of address is defined as the correct form of term used when we talk to somebody.
nothing the address form exchanges between any given pair of individuals. A form of a
Forms of address are best understood by examining dyadic interaction, that is by

Introduction
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behavior.

1) LTs and PTA are acts or actions used by the speaker to inherit the address and manipulate his

as PN and T/N, except in the case of people whose nicknames replace their first

F/N T/N, last name alone, Smith T/N or nicknames (Sue) which are not as widespread

Other combinations are possible, such as first name and last name (Susan Smith)

name for example, Dr. Smith (T/N).

- Address by a title such as Mr., Mrs., or Dr. followed by the last

- Address by first name for example, Susan (F/N)

name.

In English, address by name is very common; there are two principal forms of

which will be discussed later in detail.

In English it is possible to signal deference and first name to signal friendliness and closeness

We can translate the politeness framework into the area of naming involving the use

in other words: positive politeness is less polite;

contrast, attributable through binomials, interpersonal communicability and friendliness;

you, ... or ‘could you please lend me a book’ and so forth. Positive politeness by

book, one may use phrases like: ‘I kept wondering if I might borrow a book from

distance for instance, when asking a favor of someone instead of saying ‘I lend me a

and positive politeness, the first millennium faces hierarchies through the creation of social

categorized according to two types of socio-emotional orientation: negative politeness

The linguistic forms used to mitigate face threats: face threatening acts may be

aspect of face work and to deflate interpersonal conflict.

set of speech behaviors used throughout social interaction to perform an important

phenomenon in human interaction, Their cross-cultural the theory of politeness focuses on a
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P. 62
c. The relative power differentiation between interlocutors: (Prawn and
p. Social distance.

- The relation seriousness of a given face impression act (PTA).

Address, they are:

Three factors influence the use of politeness, whether in case of naming or other forms of

verba.

In addition to nicknames. In reference, first name is used followed by last name or vice

in the Western countries and used in more or less the same way as the English term "Sir".

In the Arabic countries, and used in more or less the same way as "Sallam" which has been reduced to "Sall"

SS! + T/N or F/N. 'Sal is a shortest form of CA. "Sallam" which has been reduced to "Sall"

In Latin countries, they appear such as T/N + F/N + T/N alone or colonized by a European country. Other forms appear such as T/N + F/N + T/N alone or

colonized in some parts of the Arab world, but it is not the case in Algeria since it was

grandfather in some parts of the Arab world, but it is not the case in Algeria since it was

abused. It is also used alone in reference to use of T/N alone or followed by that of his father or

Moreover, in Arabic, as in Greek, F/N is the most common form of the name to be used

was used as the equivalent of both F/N and T/N in English.

That is to say, there was nothing corresponding to the English F/N and T/N, for Greek F/N

from

Pronunciation of a word referring to the place a person came
to no standard way of giving it usually Greeks added a

If a more precise identification was necessary, there was

normal means of referring to a man was to use his name as Sokrates said:
In Greek, the system was different, each person had only one name, and the

identification (Dickey, 1996:44, 45).
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name form will be employed:

name: the more severe a face-threatening is, the greater and more polite

I - The Relative Sententious of a Face-threatening act will Influence

The procedure discussed allows us to generalize these propositions:

employ FN, the positively polite form indicative of social familiarity when speaking
employ FN, the positively polite form indicative of social familiarity when speaking

of social distance that is last name, first name / last name, first name / SS + T/N or FN, supports
distinctive asymmetry of politeness. Support strengthens employ the relative form indicative
of low in power distance and these differentiated relations are characterized by a
pairs of individuals call each other by first name. Relationships may also be described as high
symmetries use of positive politeness is predicted. With respect to forms of address,
By contrast, social familiarity diminishes the seriousness of face threats.

(Which, teacher, do we let the pupils in now?)

/ Such as: Was /Professor/ an address to Islamabad airport
(last name / first name / SS + T/N) in formal situations between strangers.

case of naming, this would imply the use of title / last name / first name of any other formal terms
individuals are predicted to exchange reciprocal levels of negative politeness. In the
For two individuals on socially distant footing when social distance is high,
particularly high degree level,

police form: Mr. President/ salihal/rathis/ when performing a speech act

Journalistic talk to the president shows that there was a tendency to switch to a more
more politeness is anticipated. In an example with respect to naming, an analysis of a
more serious imposition than a request to borrow a pen. When the face threat is greater,
interectional act suggests that for example, asking to borrow someone’s car comprises
encounter the following patterns. This importance of the Relative Sententious of a face

Apply these three factors to the influence of an address form in Arabic, we
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Imposed nicknames are of three types; they can be positive, negative, and descriptive. The name of a character, a nickname. The self-selected nickname is always positive. Our names may have been impressed by a character and may decide to adopt the nickname. We are given to both men and women, individuals can also adopt nicknames for themselves. They are usually descriptive, summarizing the individual's character or physical shape. They are usually called something with something they have done. Nicknames the person's character or appearance, or a prefix or suffix; they are connected to modification of the formal name by adding a prefix or a suffix; they are connected to the address. It is the use of an informal name for persons. It is formed by the combination of terms or forms of names. Nicknames is a universal phenomenon which pertains to the study of forms of names. (a) Nicknames.

Father's name (for example: Megrim bin Ali, Hamida, or Ali, bin Wiald, bin Famed.

From a noun phrase formed with a child, son, daughter, and the genitive of the noun or the noun: the person addressed is addressed in Moroccan but the father is (El Houdi) or (El Amin).

From adjectives built on the father's name with a patronymic ending (for example:

Address by FN is associated in Arabic as many other languages with patronymics.

Names in Arabic are employed for direct address as well as for referring to people.

Combination of the three variables:

Symmetric exchange. Thus, the selection of an address form is a dynamic exchange of naming whereas low power distances are characterized by a symmetric exchange of first names or other informal terms.

3 - High power distance relations are characterized by an asymmetrical character. Exchanged by exchange of first names or other informal terms.

Formal terms, while a socially close, familial relation will be.

2 - Speakers in a socially distant relation will exchange reciprocal
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and so on. Here are some examples of nicknames used informally between friends:

Television, the teachers themselves may give an education officer a nickname, this use of nicknames is hierarchical, that is to say, while students give their appearance.

Nineteenth-century, from rejected use of certain words or medical/therapy characters who resemble that of the addresser. Teachers for instance are characters of the addresser and those that are taken from names of famous people or characters of the addressee. These that are coined from the

Morphonologically, there are two types of nicknames: those that are coined from the

addressee, the community uses the name to refer to him/her in secret.

place, club, organization and the nation. And since these nicknames may upset the

her. Community here refers to varied institutions such as the family, school, work-

character of a person in power and/or authority. It imposes a nickname on him/

forms of behavior. If a community intends to show its discontent with the
deciding or insulting the addresser in order to disgrace him or her from certain
der their community, they are generally used for expressing disrespectful" negative nicknames."

Because of this perfect way of playing, the player for example (e.g. ball), the names may be derived from the playing

sport, particularly soccer (e.g. ball). The names may also come from activities.

communal or national significance. Those imposed nicknames are also common in

given to leaders or individuals who distinguish themselves in activities of

members of a community as a symbol of endorsement and high values; they can be

nicknames is one-sided.

The other members of the society may only refer to the names in secret, so this use of

nicknames are only used to address the addressee directly by friends or acquaintances.
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Reference to gender and a child can imply a kinship or age term according to the context.

Groups, for example, family, are kinship terms that belong to both addresses. Kinship terms and addresses by age are two distinct categories but it is necessary to discuss them together because some individuals belong to both categories and may be addressed differently by age and respect.

Ward expresses kinship and age term one of the most important categories of

2. Kinship and Age Terms

An interesting amount of time occupying this waiting room.

In our speech, one’s ability to communicate clearly because some people spend

Harvard University as a linguistic waiting room for screening up candidates. Such

address, this avoidance is described by the social psychologists Roger Brown or

name basis, so they prefer “name avoidance,” which is the omission of any form of

uncomfortable using the formal forms and they do not feel familiar enough to be on first

speakers sometimes try to avoid using any form of address because they feel

b) Name Avoidance

For someone who is darker complexion

French, “Joune,” meaning healthy

Lundia is a borrowed word from

Javanese, “Jundai”

For someone who is very slow and

when he speaks

For someone who becomes rosy

For a boy with female manners
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String to indicate biological relationships and therefore more than one kin type. The table 2.1, which follows shows some examples of how primary components are more than one kin type. are not kin types but categories which include more than one relationships and therefore culture. The terms uncle, aunt, cousin, grand-parents, particular to Arabic terminology, that people actually use to describe and address their relatives; they are specific to each or more than kin types and they vary across cultures. They are also defined as a set of names or more than kin types and they vary across cultures. They are also defined as a set of names of more than kin types and they vary across cultures. They are also defined as a set of names of kinship, whereas the others were based on descent only. The scientific study of kinship began with the publication of Lewis Henry Morgan's article published in 1870. Moregian assumed that human society had evolved through a series of stages from primitive savagery to civilization, and the saw kinship
The largest group of kinship terms consists of those used for children of one's own sex. In Arabic terminology, these words are: Male / Walid (my father), Majz / my brother, Bani / my daughter, Walda / my daughter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kin Terms</th>
<th>Kin Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife (for male)</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister (for male)</td>
<td>Fr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niece</td>
<td>Necc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephew</td>
<td>Neccw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>Csn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td>Aun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>Unc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand-mother</td>
<td>Grnd-Mth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand-father</td>
<td>Grnd-Fth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Mth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Fr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Kin Terms vs Kin Types
Daughter-in-law /visor /Kanna
Son-in-law /husb. /ni:bi:
Wife of brother-in-law /
i:l/
Sister-in-law /Jush /]
Aunt X̄ h 
Daughter-in-law /husb. ni:ba
Brother-in-law /Jusu:/ h][na /
Grandmother /3eddal /}
Grandfather /3eddal /
Aunt X̄ h /
Cousin X̄ /ni:
Brother X̄ /]<-
Son 
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generally used in English the gender of the husband's name is also possible to be followed by the referential meaning of a woman or female person to whom one is married. This term wife is used by a man to his wife and has respectively as one's home, one's husband.

The same phonological sound is used in French and English addresses. The relationship between a couple is emphasized and never for a direct person. This word husband is mainly used by wives to their husbands meaning of /ʒʌndəs/ (my husband) is a man in the sense of a male discrepancy between lexical meaning and address usage; the referential discrepancy between lexical meaning and address usage: they show a clear difference.

Man, husband, and wife are interesting. It is because they show a clear

brother, sister, [ə], fellow are more appropriate.

generation of or an unspecified generation, namely: man, husband, woman, wife, are often used as a number of K's (kin terms) for members of one's own terms are not often used; a number of K's (kin terms) for members of one's own terms are not often used. As a result, when the speaker and addressee are approximately the same age, it is appropriate.

Terms for some generation addresses

used for both kin and non-kin whether male of female, young or old.

Therefore, these two words and the previous ones are neutralized terms which can be because brothers and sisters address each other in other ways (First Names).

The addresses, brother, X's, and sister, X's, are rarely used between siblings

Phonological occurs with the other terms stated above.

father and mother, sharp, and whom are two kinship terms used to address forms of address in African Arabic: The Speech Community of Maghnia
Terms of piti in Arabic express pity or sympathy.

Who cares about that miserable woman?

/ habli inaytuna kumin jaltakhtama/ •

I have heard about that poor man who died the night of his wedding.

/ smarli hadha agarjel maskin li maa: HiJarjara/ •

In another conversation:

They told me about that miserable woman whose husband died.

/ khawli la hadi: inaytuna li ragjla mar: / •

Instance:

Which we refer as terms of piti / like: maskin / (poor), maxaynum / (miserable) for personal epithets appear also in non phrases with an evaluative adjective to

In the phrases

to and whose specific grammatical use is not unlike that of

speaker's attitude to the person or persons referred

a set of nouns whose sematic function is to express the

Crain (1981: 2:40) as,

social relation (friendship, kinship...and even appearance. This category is defined by
epithets whose distribution is conditioned by a number of factors such as age, sex,
could not be used. One characteristic of the Arabic culture is the frequent use of personal
many languages is to provide an address for situations in which names are unknown or
One of the functions performed by these addressing expressions which occur in
2. 2. Other aspects of address usage

These insults can be used alone or proceeded by a vocative / choke / in direct address.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Arabic Insults</th>
<th>English Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deelis</td>
<td>/ SHAH /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names of Deel</td>
<td>/ Zehun /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deel</td>
<td>/ Zehun /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage</td>
<td>/ SNAQ /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheep</td>
<td>/ TXIS /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>/ qib:9 /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty</td>
<td>/ XAWI /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mule</td>
<td>/ d.:9 /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkey</td>
<td>/ SHAH /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crazy-Mad</td>
<td>/ sha:b:n / or / 5a9enn:n /</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. 3. Spoken Arabic insults used in address.

- Literally equivalents in English.
- Interlocutors are seriously angry. Here in Table 2. 3 are some examples with their forms of address in Algerian Arabic: The Speech Community of Mahdia
A further use of FN, Kts and even insults is in address between siblings – brothers and sisters – whereas other more distant relatives like cousins and in-laws address each other by FN or titles as appropriate.

Therefore, the general rule of address among relatives is either FN or Kts when the addressee is older than the speaker. Parents, grand-parents, uncles and aunts always receive Kts from the younger that they address with first name. Wives and husbands make use of other terms of affection in addition to FN and other specific words as stated above. Besides, relatives of younger generations do receive Kts from their elders in addition to first names.

c) Distinctions of rank

Rank is one of the key factors that affect modes of address. It refers to the hierarchy existing within participants taking into account their social, educational background, identity, occupational status, etc. Another feature that comes into play is ‘the degree of formality’ derived from the relation between participants; this criterion has been explained in two terms ‘power’ and ‘solidarity’ (Brown & Gilman, 1960:256).

Formality can also be influenced by kinship, familiarity relationship, politeness and seriousness. It requires more sophisticated forms of address such as the correct choice of pronouns associated with verb inflections, family names titles and so on. On the other hand, ‘solidarity’ refers to the social similarity between participants related to equality in rank; the latter involves familiarity in style and intimate language. Vocabulary selection is also bound to rank differences. Therefore, once we are able to recognize the ranks of those with whom we are interacting, it is important to know how to speak to them. To encourage role-playing and a reasonable impression, proper forms of address and courtly manners are essential and need to be added to our behaviour to show respect.
Addressing an inferior, however is somehow different, it is characterized by the use of names (FN), kinship-terms (Kts), friendship terms (Fts), terms of affection, esteem and insults when appropriate.

Thus, distinctions of rank are part of our speech marked when the dyad includes someone of high or low status. When addressing superiors, power and deference should be involved but when addressing subordinates the situation is reversed and symmetry should be involved.

d) Distinctions of gender

During the last decade, many studies started to look at gender differences in language. Before that, there had been many stereotypes about the language of women, for example ‘women talk too much’ (chatters), ‘women’s language is polite’, ‘women’s talk is unimportant’, etc. Yet, empirical evidence has shed some light on these stereotypes by proving some and contradicting others.

Today, males and females make a distinction between sex and gender; sex distinction is based on biological criteria while gender is a social construction that easily varies from culture to culture and from community to community. Here is a fairly typical postmodern statement on gender by the historian Grail Bederman (1995:5):

Gender. ......is a historical, ideological process. Through that process, individuals are positioned and position themselves as men or women. Thus, I don’t see manhood as either an intrinsic essence or a collection of traits, attributes, or sex roles. Manhood. ...is a continual dynamic process.  

23 In Dickey (1996: 238)

24 Quoted in Paulston and Tucker (2003:199)
Moreover, “the year 1973 was historic for language and gender research” (Alice Fred, 1995:4). Robin Lakoff, a feminist who happened to be a linguist published “Language and Women’s Place”, the first article devoted to a discussion of language and women which inspired decades of research on the interaction of language and gender. She argues that women are given their identities in our society by virtue of their relationship with men, not vice versa (Lakoff, 1975).  

Women and men belong to different sub-cultures; each party has a distinctive sub-culture. This difference in culture is reflected into language. Evidence shows that women and men tend to discuss different topics and use language differently. Differences between men’s and women’s speech can be analysed first at the level of vocabulary as Trudgill (1974:79-80) puts forward:

The men have a great many expressions peculiar to them,
which the women understand but never pronounce themselves.
On the other hand the women have words and phrases which the
men never use, or they would be laughed to scorn.

Men then use words or expressions that women consider vulgar or inappropriate to their feminism. In the context of the Algerian society for instance, /mra ad/ (wonderful) employed by men but women employ instead /fiːbaː.b/, /fiːbjɔːb/ or /jɔːwɪ/ referring to the same word (wonderful or very beautiful). In addition, men may also say /xanziːn warqa/ which women generally reject and prefer /mraʃhiːn/ or /bXɪːr ˈɪliːhum/, meaning ‘they are rich’. Therefore, there are words and expressions that are sex-bound.

As opposed to men, women are interested in the social images which are usually reflected in language behaviour. Most of them try to use forms that approach the

---

25 Quoted in Paulston and Tucker (2003:207)
prestigious variety in order to compensate for their subordination to men (Down, 1984:180). Historically speaking, it seems that women had a secondary role in society relative to that of men. That is, women should "act like a lady" and respect those around them. This reflects the role of an inferior status expected to respect the superior.

Furthermore, it was found that women seem to give more importance to what they are saying. When communicating with other women or men, they consider the face’s wants of others by applying the appropriate polite usage of language. Another way of being polite is the appropriate amount of talk people produce in different contexts. For instance, at a party interacting with others is considered polite, while in a discussion, allowing or even encouraging others to contribute is polite. Women and men, thus, differ in the amount of talk they produce in different contexts. Men tend to be active in public and formal contexts and reticent in informal and intimate contexts (like in cafés). On the other hand, women are more active in intimate interactions but not in public and formal ones. So, women appear to pay more attention to the appropriate talk required in various contexts since this is representative of politeness; therefore they are more polite than men are (Khadawardi, 1997:11).

Another linguist Al-Wer (1997) characterizes class and gender related patterns in Arabic speaking communities in the following way:

The data from various parts of the Arab world show overwhelmingly that Arab men opt for the localized and older features (which in most cases happen to be stigmatized at some level) while Arab women favour features which have a wider regional acceptance and usage regardless of the status of these features vis-à-vis CA (Classical Arabic)


²⁶ Quoted in Milroy and Gorder (2003:103)
In the Algerian context, we observe that the same phenomenon exists i.e. women code switch more to French and even borrow French lexis, especially those having a high level of education because they consider the foreign language more prestigious in interacting. They even try to make their children learn and use French for the same purpose. Here is an example of a mother speaking to her daughters for more evidence:

/Attention les filles, rani ɣadja nsalli mattufiː w hta fhaːza/
(Your attention girls, I’m going to pray, don’t touch things)

In Arabic, women use names more freely to each other than to men (Yassin 1978:57)\(^{27}\) and women in high positions receive certain polite addresses less often than men of the same rank (Parkinson, 1985: 19)\(^{28}\)

Accordingly, specific rules of address distinguish the two sexes like: /Xuja/, /Xʷti/, /Xali/, /Xalti/, /Nammī/, /Nammmtī/. Another feature derived from sex differentiation is revealed in the pronominal system; some pronouns are men-specific and others are women-specific such as: /nta/, /ntaja/ for addressing one male person in the singular and /ntuːma/ for addressing a group of men; while /ntija/, for addressing one female person and /ntuːma/, /ntumaːn/ for addressing females and all of them are equivalents to the English pronoun ‘you’. In addition, titles are more employed to women than men even in casual conversations; for instance, when examining a woman, the doctor addresses her with the French title /madam/ (Madam) and receives /ductuːr/ (Doctor). By contrast, he uses FN, ssi+ FN, ssi+LN,…i.e. many other variants can be appropriate.

\(^{27}\) In Dickey (1996:242)
\(^{28}\) In Dickey (1996:242)
Conclusion

Languages and varieties of a language alike differ in their repertory of address in the number of variants, e.g., more than one pronoun in French (i.e. T/V distinction) referring to the English ‘you’ (one pronoun) in addition to other nominal forms like FN, T+LN in Arabic.

It is obvious that the existence of several variants, pronominal or others makes non-reciprocal usage easier and more frequent and allows a more detailed encoding of differences in age, kin relation, sex, social or occupational status. Moreover cultural norms and values can be reflected in an address system because address behaviour is the way individual speakers or groups of speakers use the repertory of address variants available to them. From a sociolinguistic point of view, address behaviour is meaningful whenever speakers have to choose from several variants those that are ‘correct’ in a given conversational context. Extra-linguistic factors then determine the selection of grammatically interchangeable forms. Thus, the variant chosen expresses social features of the dyad; address behaviour is further influenced by a speaker’s social and linguistic background (Braun, 1988:13).
CHAPTER THREE

Address System and Politeness
Introduction

In our speech community, there are many people with different ethnic and cultural backgrounds and also different ways of speaking to one another. So, they have different choices of language for signalling their ethnicity and culture. Therefore, the forms of language usage are crucial in building social relationships. These forms are employed by people to perform either formal or intimate language i.e. to express either distant or close relations with the addressees, in Brown and Gilman terminology ‘power’ and ‘solidarity’ relations (1967-1972).

In addition to social status, rank and gender, there are other norms which are of vital importance to address interlocutors. These norms (or variables) of interaction following Hymes are rules for the use of speech, which are rules applicable to the communicative event. Those rules have to do with what is considered proper or prescriptive of how people should act; they are tied to the shared values of the speech community. Following these connecting points, studies of the way people address each other in face-to-face interaction have been related to another phenomenon general to all human societies, namely ‘politeness’ that is also one of the functions carried out by language. It refers to the “behaviour which actively expresses positive concern for others as well as non-imposing distance behaviour.” (Holmes, 1995: 5). In other words, linguistic politeness is an expression of cultural values and accurate analysis involves identifying the relative importance of different social dimensions in particular cultures (Ibid. p.24).

3. 1. Politeness Realizations in Address behaviour

The study of the politeness phenomenon is closely related to address studies and has much to contribute to it. Here two types of strategy appear: “Negative Politeness” consists of efforts to avoid hindering the addressee in any way or annoying him/her by undue familiarity. It means that the speaker respects and recognizes the addressee; hence it is characterized by self-effacement, formality and restraint. On the other hand,
"Positive Politeness" is a strategy by which the speaker tries to gratify the addressee in some way. Therefore, negative politeness is the heart of respect behaviour, whereas positive politeness is the kernel of "familiar" and "joking" behaviour. One of its common forms is "the identity markers", such as address forms which explain a connection between the speaker and addressee (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 107-9)

3.1.1. The politeness principle

Here, we attempt to explain how address forms reflect power and solidarity in different theories of politeness suggested by Lakoff (1972), Leech (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1978-1987) that will be described in details later. Then, to analyze how this is reflected in our own data, i.e., in the spoken variety of Maghnia, Arabic in the extreme west of Algeria, with a view of focussing on one speech act: thanking since it is regarded as a polite speech act. In fact, early studies of address and politeness tended to deal only with one of these phenomena, so the relationship has received little attention. But in more recent years both phenomena are often mentioned, but very often one subsumed into the other.

Pragmatics views address as part of strategic politeness. Furthermore, Brown and Levinson (1987:198-204) argue that "pronouns of address and self-reference are treated as a strategy of negative politeness."

Researches focussing on the address system usually take another position; they limit their treatment of politeness to the usage of distant address forms, so the problem of polite realizations of speech acts is not covered. Both aspects of linguistic politeness are clearly distinguished by Kasper (1990:194-197). The choice of a specific address form is defined as "social-indexing" which depends upon the relationship between the participants; this is opposed to "strategic politeness" where choices are made dependent upon situational variables and intentions. Nevertheless, power relations which determine "social indexing" or address system may influence "strategic politeness" but
the latter is dependent on more factors (degree of imposition). In most languages, a high level of address calls for a large grade of politeness but the opposite is not always true.

Politeness thus, is a universal phenomenon which has been an important distinct research issue for working in academic fields. This phenomenon has a number of implications in sociolinguistics in particular because this field has experienced a shift from emphasis on speaker-identity, to focus on dyadic patterns of verbal interaction as social relationships, and from emphasis on the usage of linguistic forms to emphasis on the relation between form and complex inference.

It is with respect to that particular field of sociolinguistics that views the construction of message forms, analysed and initiated by Gumperz and Hymes, formulated by Ervin-Tripp (1972), and assumed by Bernstein (1971) as a fundamental doctrine of the 'Ethnography of speaking'. Some sociolinguists view that linguistic forms are associated with social value (Labov1972, Trudgill 1974). Others see the choice of forms as determined primarily by the social characteristics of participants and setting; the ways in which messages are hedged, made deferential and structured have become crucial areas of study under a new field called 'pragmatics', the study of systematic relation of language to context. However, the sociolinguistic concern is studying differential use of language by different speakers in different situations. It is in this way that linguists derive the slogan 'sociolinguistics should be applied pragmatics.'

Consequently, the study of language in social context consists of the study of linguistic material produced within the structure of the society, i.e. paying attention to the way social characteristics affect the structures of variation and change of the language spoken. They enter the analysis through the psychological configuration of the individual. A good example of this is the research in hand, studies of politeness strategies stressing on the state of relationship between participants themselves and reflected in the forms employed to address each other.
Politeness in linguistic pragmatics and sociolinguistics is a relatively young discipline dating back to the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. The major reason for that late appearance is that linguists who were interested in the politeness phenomenon had little or no theoretical basis to fall back on until the speech act theory appeared in the 1960’s (Austin1962, Searle 1970, 1972). The insights of speech act theory were then enriched and elaborated by researchers putting to use Erving Goffman’s notion of face and works of the language philosopher H. Paul Grice in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s.

The underlying principle of politeness is to preserve harmony by showing good intentions and consideration for the feelings of others. Every culture has developed certain mechanisms to signal that speakers are or are not attempting to be polite. Decoding intended politeness may be complicated because it can be manipulated by speakers and valued by listeners in various ways. There are some languages which require speakers to signal politeness in every utterance. The use of polite markers differs not only as far as the language variety is concerned but also from one individual to another because there are those who make use of a lot of polite markers. By operating across cultures, linguists argue that the interpretation of real politeness is difficult because what is ‘polite’, or ‘rude’ may vary from one individual to another and from one culture to another.

This study has considered the major models of politeness: those of Lakoff (1973), Leech (1983), Brown and Levinson (1978-1987). These models are different conceptualizations and formulations of the principle of politeness. Any discussion of politeness must cover these three conceptualizations in a manner that reflects their relative influence on politeness research. In fact these models cannot be understood without being grounded on the work of Grice (1975) on conversational cooperation and implicature, Goffman (1959, 1967, 1979, and 1981) on face, deference strategies and Brown and Gilman (1960:1972) on the pronouns of power and solidarity. These are the backgrounds which the present study takes as a basis.
3. 1.2 - Definitions of politeness

In spite of the many formulations of a principle of politeness, there is a divergence and lack of clarity concerning the meaning of politeness. So many concepts show up in the literature as equivalents of politeness: formality, respect, and deference, indirectness, appropriateness, etiquette and tact (Fraser, 1990; Meier1995; Thomas 1995). Moreover, there is sometimes a lot of confusion between politeness as a general notion synonymous with civility, good manners, and acceptable social behaviour and politeness as a theoretical construct, an area of academic interest. So, here are various definitions given to this criterion.

a/ Lakoff (1975:64): ...politeness is developed by societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction.29

The assumption here is that friction is undesirable and that societies develop strategies i.e. politeness to reduce that friction. Politeness is, thus a set of norms for cooperative behaviour.

b/ Leech (1980:19) defines it as:

Strategic conflict avoidance, which can be measured in terms of the degree of effort
put into avoidance of conflict situations and the establishment and maintenance of comity.30

However, avoidance of conflict is represented as a conscious effort on the part of the person being polite since it is strategic and aims to maintain courtesy.

c/ Brown and Levinson (1978/1987) view politeness as ‘a complex system for oftenening face- threatening acts.’

---

29 Quoted in Watts (2003,50)
30 Quoted in Watts (2003,50)
Brown and Levinson appear to present a superficial definition of politeness since they too, like Leech, present speakers who strategically evaluate how to avoid face-threatening.

**d/ Kasper (1990:194):** Her work is based on Brown and Levinson’s approach to politeness and maintains that “communication is seen as fundamentally dangerous and antagonistic endeavor.”³¹ ‘Polite’ is therefore a term to refer to the strategies available for interactants to defuse danger and to minimalise antagonism. Other linguists see it as ‘interpersonal supportiveness’ (Arndt and Janney, 1985:282).

**e/ Hill et al. (1986:349)** define it as: One of the constraints on human interaction, whose purpose is to consider others’ feelings, establish levels mutual comfort, and promote rapport.³²

Hill et al. see it as a set of constraints, i.e. normative and prescriptive rules on how to interact with others, and once again, the main goals are to establish mutual comfort and promote rapport.

### 3.1.3. Perspectives and models

Some politeness researchers constitute a division between the common sense notion of politeness and the theoretical pragmalinguistic notion. These are referred to as first-order and second-order politeness. Kasper (1994) defines the former as the “proper social conduct and tactful consideration of others” and the latter as “the ways in which relational function in linguistic action is expressed.”³³

Janney and Arndt (1992) make a distinction between social politeness and tact.

---

³¹ Quoted in Watts (2003:51)
³² Quoted in Watts (2003:51)
³³ Quoted in Watts (2003:206)
Social politeness provides routine strategies in social situations to “coordinate social interaction”; tact helps interlocutors “preserve face and regulate interpersonal relationships”\(^{34}\). Social politeness is interactional, group - oriented and regulative; tact is interpersonal, partner - oriented and constitutive.

A more important dichotomy that has emerged in politeness research is that between politeness as socially \textit{indexical} and politeness as \textit{strategic}. Kasper (1990:194-197) provides the following illustration: the choice of a specific address form is defined as “social indexing”. It is a result of the interpersonal relationship between participants. In strategic politeness, intentional, conscious choices are made on the basis of context and intentions.

In the same field, Brown and Gilman (1960/1972) introduced the terms of power and solidarity and how they are expressed through pronouns. Power and distance are recognized in the three models of politeness as determining factors. Moreover address forms, canonically represented by pronouns, have come to be regarded as important tools for the expression, and analysis of politeness and indexes for signaling distance or lack thereof. Although the theory is too restricted to count as a politeness theory, or a major principle of politeness – \textit{a principle of address forms’ politeness} - but not a comprehensive politeness principle .

\textbf{a) Pronouns of power and solidarity}

Roger Brown and Albert Gilman’s landmark article “Pronouns of power and solidarity” (1960/1972) is not considered as a principle of politeness but has had a far-reaching influence on most subsequent perspectives on language, and has become a starting point in sociolinguistic investigation of address forms and systems. In other words, Brown and Gilman’s central distinction between power and solidarity is taken for granted in the models developed by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Leech (1983).

\(^{34}\) Quoted in Watts (2003:24)
As perceived by Brown and Gilman (1972), ‘power’ obtains between two persons when one “is able to control the behaviour of the other”. This relationship is nonreciprocal and it can have a number of different bases: physical strength, wealth, age, or institutionalized role within the state, family, army and so on. ‘Solidarity’, on the other hand, is a relationship that is based on similarity or even sameness of salient characteristics in two (or more) persons. Such relationships are reciprocal i.e. they obtain equally for both individuals. These two parameters have also had an impact on recent development in the analysis of language in use. In fact, it is an essential component of any examination of the social deixis which is a reference to the social characteristics and distinctions between the participants in discourse. Brown and Gilman’s ‘tu /vous’ distinction is the classic example of social deixis, and more broadly of the interpersonal aspect of communication.

Thus, Brown and Gilman’s distinction between power and solidarity is confined to the 2\(^{nd}\) singular pronoun ‘tu’ for intimacy or familiarity and the 2\(^{nd}\) plural pronoun ‘vous’ for respect and deference as address forms. The usage of these pronouns is determined by a complex set of pragmatic rules and social contexts.

Linguistically speaking, to be polite is to avoid addressing people directly; this strategy was the functional background of the emergence of politeness distinctions in personal pronouns in European languages. On the other hand, in Arabic, for example, other terms as shown in my first chapter are employed for address in addition to pronouns.

In other languages, personal pronouns are not used for address at all; instead, status and kinship terms, titles, nicknames and other complex nominal expressions are employed and have different forms for referring to equals, inferiors and impolite usage.

Hence, Brown and Gilman’s (1960) pioneering work is important for its role in opening this whole field; however it cannot be regarded as a universal soci
taken up seriously. Lakoff always stressed the significance of her training as a
generative linguist for her approach to the pragmatic and social study of language. It is
therefore surprising that her 1973 article represents an attempt to set up rules of
pragmatics well-formedness as an extension to the rules of grammar. She writes:

> We should like to have some kind of pragmatic rules,
dictating whether an utterance is pragmatically well-formed
or not, and the extent to which it deviates if it does.”
(Lakoff, 1973:296)\(^{36}\)

In fact, well-formedness can be applied to the realm of sentences and not to the
realm of utterances. Utterances can be evaluated as pragmatically appropriate but hardly
as pragmatically well-formed. Nevertheless, Lakoff insists that the search for pragmatic
‘rules’ would have to be grounded in a notion of pragmatic competence. In this respect
she claims (1973:293-4) (ibid.p.59) that:

> The pragmatic content of a speech act should be taken into
account in determining its acceptability just as its syntactic
material generally has been, and its semantic material recently has
been.

From this quotation, one will gain the impression that Lakoff aimed at setting up a
model that would account for the acceptability or non-acceptability of polite utterances.

In her politeness framework, Lakoff (1973) suggests that in any conversational
situation there are “Rules of Pragmatic Competence” at play. Two simple rules of
pragmatic competence are proposed: ‘Be clear’ and ‘Be polite.’ Rule 1 (Be clear) is
really the Gricean CP which she renamed the ‘rules of conversation’. Rule 2 (Be polite)
consists of a subset of three rules, R1: don’t impose; R2 Give options; and R3: make A
(addressee) feel good –be friendly.

\(^{36}\) Quoted in Watts (2003:59)
If one’s principal aim in speaking is communication, one will attempt to be clear .... if the speaker’s principal aim is to navigate somehow ...... among the respective statuses of the participants in the discourse indicating where each stands in the speaker’s estimate, his aim will be less the achievement of clarity than an expression of politeness.”

(Lakoff, 1973: 296)\(^\text{37}\)

Being polite appears to be extremely important in most situations. The reason for this is the overriding importance of reaffirming and strengthening relationships when we are engaged in social discourse, we use the rules of politeness to make an addressee think well of us:

1) Don’t impose (principle of distance or formality)
2) Give options (principle of deference or hesitancy)
3) Make A feel good-be friendly (principle of camaderie).” (Lakoff.1973:298)\(^\text{38}\)

Lakoff’s pragmatic competence can thus be represented schematically in the figure 3.1.\(^\text{39}\) below:

\(^{37}\) Quoted in Mazid (2006:15)
\(^{38}\) Quoted in Mazid (2006:15)
\(^{39}\) In Watts (2003:60)
(Don’t Impose), through informal politeness (Give Options) to intimate politeness (Make A feel Good).

Therefore, Lakoff (1973) extends Grice’s work and argues for the necessity of both a Politeness Principle and a Cooperative Principle. She adds an interpersonal dimension to Grice’s informational framework. Accordingly, she believes that it is not enough to be informative; one has to know when to say “please” and when to say “thank you”. She desires to expand the scope of Linguistics from the limited horizon of Transformational Grammar to the broader issue of language use; as part of an attempt to make sense of what we are actually doing with language. A further attempt to elaborate models of politeness expanding and complementing Grice’s CP was developed by Leech (1983).


As with Lakoff, Leech’s approach to linguistic politeness forms part of an attempt to set up a model of what he calls ‘general pragmatics which he glosses as an account of how language is used in communication (1983:1)\(^{40}\). Unlike Lakoff, Leech does not aim at accounting for pragmatic competence. In other words, he is not concerned with creating highly precise formal rules such as those in the syntactic or semantic components of a grammar. One of his postulates is: “Semantics is rule-governed (i.e. grammatical); general pragmatics is principle-controlled (i.e. rhetorical). (Leech, 1983: 5).

Leech conceptualises ‘general pragmatics’ as “the general conditions of the communicative use of language” (1983:10). Moreover, he proposes two further pragmatic systems ‘pragmalinguistics’ and ‘socio-pragmatics’; the former accounts for the more linguistic end of pragmatics, in which particular resources which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions. The latter studies the more specific “local” conditions on language use.

\(^{40}\) Quoted in Watts (2003:63)
Furthermore, there is a pattern of circumstances in which these pay-offs would be most advantageous: the more dangerous the particular FTAs is in S’s assessment, the more he will tend to choose the higher numbered strategy (Brown and Levinson, 1987:73).

The use of the first strategy (on-record, minus redress), leaves S responsible without any means to minimize the FTAs. The use of redressive action, affords S the opportunity to placate H (to make him feel less angry) by satisfying some of his desires. The use of the second strategy (positive redressive action) allows S to satisfy a wide range of the H’s desires not necessarily related to the FTAs, while the use of the third (negative redressive action) allows speaker to satisfy the H’s want that is directly infringed by x. Finally, the fourth strategy (off-record) affords S the opportunity of escaping from the responsibility by claiming that the interpretation of x as an FTA is wrong and simultaneously allows S to avoid actually imposing the FTA on H.

3.2. Address Forms in Brown and Levinson’s Model

The selection of the linguistic politeness strategies depends on the context and the social context. Koike (1992:25) suggests that an “an act is not inherently polite or deferent, but is construed as such according to its context and the rules of conduct and expectations by that society.”

An act could be rude in one context and polite in another. Politeness is carried out linguistically in many different strategies; for example people use greetings, expressions of admiration as means of positive politeness. Moreover, they use apologies, hedges in order to satisfy the negative face of others. Agreeing with Brown and Levinson, Scollon and Scollon (1981) establish a ‘solidarity politeness’ which corresponds to Brown and

43 Quoted in Mazid (2006:24)
Levinson’s *positive politeness*, and a ‘deference politeness’, which corresponds to Brown and Levinson’s *negative politeness*.

Applications of politeness theory have generally used Brown and Levinson’s model as default option and Leech’s has been either marginalized or not mentioned at all. Lakoff’s Rules of politeness remain rather rudimentary and not fully fledged enough to be used in analyzing politeness. Brown and Levinson’s face saving model of politeness remains the most influential in the area as it provides “a systematic description of cross-linguistic politeness phenomena which is used to support an explanatory model capable of accounting for any instance of politeness.” The central claim of the model is that “broadly comparable linguistic strategies are available in each language, but that there are local cultural differences in what triggers their use.” (Grundy, 2000)\(^44\). This model has been adapted in different studies of speech acts, politeness formulas, and politeness strategies, politeness in family discourse, in language teaching, writing in business communication and so on and so forth.

Here we intend to analyse ‘power’ and ‘solidarity’ notions reflected in various forms of address -under the heading of Brown and Levinson’ politeness- in family interaction since the family unit is an integral part of society and such should form an integral part of the study of linguistics; it is also the best representative of solidarity politeness.

The intimate genre is one that has caused a great difficulty in collecting data (Mc Carthy, 1998)\(^45\). For obvious reasons, people view the family life as intensively private and so are unwilling to allow linguists analyse it. However, the study of family discourse can yield many insights into the study of politeness. (Crystal, 2000)\(^46\) claims that the home dialect is the base dialect and therefore family talk represents a base level genre that embodies critical levels of linguistic features such as politeness. These levels

\(^{44}\) Quoted in Mazid (2006:26)

\(^{45}\) Quoted in Wolfson (1988:178)

\(^{46}\) Quoted in Wolfson (1988:178)
are the minimum needed for polite interaction in society. In this analysis the levels of
politeness are addressed from two different viewpoints. The first is the use of positive
politeness strategies in the family with a focus on the in-group address forms and their
significant role in family discourse; whereas the second is a switch to the use of
negative politeness strategies in different academic situations focussing on address
behaviour required to fit the needs of the interlocutors.

The occurrence of all these linguistic realizations of both positive and negative
politeness strategies will be examined because it is so important in an area where both
language and culture overlap or more particularly where the link between language use
and acceptable behaviour comes to the surface. Blum-Kulka (1990, 1997) explores
family discourse starting from the assumption that it is essentially polite and that
politeness in this discourse is shaped by domain and culture considerations. Three
important factors determine family politeness: power, informality and affect.

3. 2. 1. Positive Politeness

According to the data examined, it was found that in family discourse positive
politeness is more prominent than negative politeness. As has been stated positive
politeness is an action aimed at building on indices of solidarity such as in-group
membership (Blum-Kulka, 1997:143)\(^{47}\). This politeness is primarily concerned with
minimizing the social distance between conversational participants. In a study of the
politeness of forms of address, Wood and Kroger (1991:147)\(^{48}\) claim that: “The
maintenance of positive face requires the achievement of closeness and common
identity.” Therefore, if solidarity and closeness are characteristics of positive politeness,
one could expect that positive politeness would be evident throughout a corpus of
family discourse. Indeed Brown and Levinson (1987:101) maintain that “the linguistic
realizations of positive politeness are in many respects simply representative of normal

\(^{47}\) Quoted in Mazid (2006: 32)

\(^{48}\) Quoted in Wolfson (1988:148)
linguistic behaviour between intimates.” They add that “in positive politeness the sphere of redress is widened .... to expression of similarity between ego’s and alter’s wants”. Besides, “positive politeness techniques are usable not only for FTA redress but in general as a kind of social accelerator, where S, in using them, indicates that he wants to ‘come closer’ to H.” (ibid. p.103).

Brown and Levinson (1987:101-129) examine the occurrence and use of the strategies that avoid threatening the addressee’s positive face. One of them is the in-group identity markers by in-group usages of address forms, of language or dialect, of jargon or slang, and of ellipsis (ibid. p.101). These criteria are devices used to convey in-group membership and an integral part of polite language use. In addition, these markers are important in defining and maintaining social relationships between participants in conversation (Wood and Kroger, 1991:145) 49.

*Use of in-group identity markers

One of the most prominent positive politeness strategies in family discourse is the use of terms of address that include the addressee with the addresser in a commonality. As has been already explained, those forms concentrate on three word classes: (1) pronouns, (2) verbs’ inflections, (3) nouns supplemented by words which are syntactically dependent on them (Braun, 1988:7). These forms are frequently employed in family discourse to show solidarity politeness. In fact, since subject pronouns are not obligatory in Arabic, familiar pronouns /nta/ (masculine ‘you’), /ntija/ (feminine ‘you’) i.e. second person singular pronouns are rarely used for a direct address but generally as referent forms. In the plural, the second person plural pronouns /ntu:ma/ or /ntuma:n/ are used for both men and women. Besides, /huwa/ (he), /hija/ (she), /hu:ma/, /huma:n/ (they) third person singular and plural referent pronouns are most of the time used to avoid repetition of a former indirect address with a noun.

The informants in our data argue that the usage of direct pronouns is only to emphasize or insist on the addressee’s role in the conversation as the following example shows:

A: /rak ʿlliya ana/ (you speak to me?)
B: /wah rani ʿlik nta/ (yes, I mean you)

Therefore, pronouns in Algerian Arabic can be represented by congruent verb forms alone (second person singular) to cover all everyday conversations. To explain the point more clearly, here is a recorded conversation between a stepmother and daughter-in-law speaking about other stepmother’s daughter.

*Extract 1:*

A: /kisbaḥtu wkiraha lamrida lju:m /
(How are you today and how is the patient today?)
B: /raha kizzan wantuma kisbaḥtu muhammad mša jaXdom/
(She is like a devil and you, how do you feel, this morning? Mohammed, has he gone to work?)
A: /wah sbah mbakkar wlabna:n mažawj galu n3i:w sßbah/
(Yes, he gets up early, and girls (your daughters) didn’t come, they said: “We’ll come in the morning.”)
B: /yadi nahdær mša zakija wan ṣu:ʃ /
(I’ll call Zakia and see what the matter is.)
B: /Ṣalb zakija matziːw wella kifaj /
/Hello Zakia ! Don’t you come?)
C: /ana rani fettrːiːg bəssah fatiha muhaːl tʃi whuwarija raha temma /
(Me, I’m on my way but Fatiha, I think she won’t come and Houaria, is she there?)
B:/ḥadik lmaxbuːna bajna maXellahaʃ tʃi bəssah huwarija wnawel ʒaw lbaːrəh/
(That miserable, is certainly not allowed to come but Houaria and Naouel came yesterday.)
The extract above shows that there is a great informality between the interlocutors involved in this conversation, the speakers are using a direct language and familiar terms to the addressee like first names; closeness is also inflected in verbs’ suffixation like /kiraха/ (how is she?), /kisbahtu/ (how do you feel this morning?); there is also a use of terms of pity /Imaxбуна/ (that miserable), /lamridа/ (the patient) in addition to a term of insult referring to a child who was ill /33аn/ (devil).

With examining another extract, other terms of address are employed in a conversation between a mother and her son of five years old.

**Extract 2:**

A: /jasи:n ru:h and mart Xalоk taʃte:k lftо:r luXто:k/
(Yassine, go to your uncle’s wife and ask her to give you lunch for your sister).

B: /tata gatlоk mama ʃti:n lftо:r luXti/.
B: (Tata, mum says give lunch for my sister)
C: /sахha tata/ (ok, tata).
‘B’ goes to the kitchen and comes back with a tray full of food and said:
B: /haki mama/ (Here it is, mum).
A: /ru:h ʃawоd saʃdi bәwlidi ʒi:blи lма /
(Go again, dearest son, to bring me water).

Here the in-group address forms used with an imperative /ru:h/ (Go) indicates that the mother considers the power between herself and her son and even the social distance between this boy and his uncle’s wife; these are represented in the Kts /tata/ (referring the uncle’s wife), and /mama/ (mum). The second request of the mother is also given in the imperative but followed by a term of endearment /saʃdi/ (my dearest) in addition to the Kt /wlidi/ (my little son) is employed in order to soften the imperative and indicate that it is not a direct order as well as expressing familiarity and respect at the same time. Thus, when used with children, the imperative structure is turned from an order into a request (Brown and Levinson, 1987:108).
Another kind of address to note in family discourse is the frequent use of terms of endearment including both nicknames and pet-names. The former are those informal, often humorous words connected to the person’s character or appearance; the latter are names used for somebody instead of the real name to show affection. Examples of these are recorded in this phone conversation below between an adult female and her niece of four years old.

**Extract 3:**

A: /alo Ꞩmr Ꞩ3u:r / (Hello, darling, Good morning!)

B: /wi tati Ꞩ3u:r / (Yes, hello, Good morning!)

A: /kiraki twahhastok bozzaf nefi:l ti, kbarji/

(How are you, I miss you ‘nfi:l ti’, you have grown older?)

B: /wi rani neqra fla kXef / (yes, I’m in the nursery school).

A: /w lolita raha tama hta hija twahhastha tsallmat tahdar wa:lu/

(And ‘Lolita’ has she learnt to speak or not yet?)

B: /jwijra haj:i naflwa:thalak/ (A little bit, she is here. I’ll pass her to you).

C: / awo tati abes/ (Hello ‘Tati’ fine).

A: /alo a:zi:n te adoralbe/ (Hello! O you most wonderful, you are sweet.)

As the extract shows, great intimacy and closeness is shown to these two girls through the terms of affection (written in italics) employed and the second person singular pronoun reflected in the verbs’ endings underlined. In contrast, the adult female is receiving a kin title /tati/ (instead of tata) referring to ‘my aunt’. By the way, children within the family are generally addressed by short informal forms of their first names; these forms are called diminutives. The latter type of address is according to Wood and Kroger (1991) “The ultimate indices of closeness and intimacy.”°°, they are used within members of the family to soften what the listener may perceive as a threat to face.

°° Quoted in Wolfson (1988: 186)
other words, they are used to soften sometimes a parental imperative. These terms seem to function as an overall endearment of the topic of conversation and stress emotional agreement between ‘S’ and ‘H’, too (Brown and Levinson, 1987:109). Examples of these diminutives recorded from a questionnaire responses as well as through observations are represented below in table 3.1.

### Table 3.1. Diminutives used for address in Algerian Arabic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of girls</th>
<th>Diminutives used for address</th>
<th>Names of boys</th>
<th>Diminutives used for address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anfel</td>
<td>/nu:la/, /fifi/</td>
<td>Mohammed</td>
<td>/mom/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaa</td>
<td>/alu:la/, /Lolita/</td>
<td>Sid Ahmed</td>
<td>/sido/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naouel</td>
<td>/nani/, /nanwila/</td>
<td>Ahmed,AbedelHamid</td>
<td>/hammi/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saliha</td>
<td>/sali/</td>
<td>Boumediéne</td>
<td>/dido/ , /diden/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besma</td>
<td>/bij/, /bisu/</td>
<td>Abderahmane</td>
<td>/abd/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amina</td>
<td>/mina/</td>
<td>Khireddine</td>
<td>/Xiro/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadjoua</td>
<td>/3i3i/</td>
<td>Zine El Abidine</td>
<td>/zini/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myriam</td>
<td>/mimi/</td>
<td>Karim</td>
<td>/krim/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zouligha</td>
<td>/zuXa/</td>
<td>Nour Eddine</td>
<td>/Nur:ri/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chahra</td>
<td>/ju:ju/, /ju:k/</td>
<td>Mostefa</td>
<td>/fafa/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souad</td>
<td>/susu/</td>
<td>Hadj</td>
<td>/hi33u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalila</td>
<td>/dala/</td>
<td>Zakariya</td>
<td>/zaki/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awatif</td>
<td>/tifa/, /tattu:fa/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahiba</td>
<td>/hiba/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaddidja</td>
<td>/Xeddu:3/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Address inversion* is another special pattern of nominal address observed in family discourse to express closeness, intimacy and solidarity. It is the use of a term, mostly Kts (which do not function as would be usual) express the addressee’s, but the speaker’s role in the dyad (Braun, 1988:12); for example, a mother addressing a child as /mama/ or
an adult male addressing his nephew as /šammi/ or /tata/ by a female adult to a child. These terms are reciprocated to the adult mother, uncle or aunt. This address inversion is not restricted to Kts but they seem to be the most frequent type within the family.

Another important feature to point out here is humour, laughter that functions to express solidarity and rapport between participants. Very often, the family members especially siblings, are engaged in ‘joking relationships’ (Hay, 2000)\(^5\) where individuals tease and insult each other. This verbal sparring is employed to develop a sense of comradeship and joviality within the group (Hay, 2000)\(^2\)

The system of address in Algerian Arabic, then, can be only explained from speakers’ constellations of different terms by interviewing informants with different social and cultural backgrounds. Certain variants are preferred by certain groups of speakers who are characterized in terms of regional dialect urban Vs rural background, age, kin relation, and so forth. To put it the other way round, each group of speakers in the speech community brings a typical inventory of address, thus, enlarging the general system of variants. Below in table 3. 2. is the test informants’ data:

**Table 3. 2. Address forms for family members.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family members</th>
<th>22 informants</th>
<th>Total : 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:/bb(^w)a/</td>
<td></td>
<td>... 68, 18%...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:/baba/</td>
<td></td>
<td>... 09, 09%...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:/papa/</td>
<td></td>
<td>... 18, 18%...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:/abi/</td>
<td></td>
<td>... 04, 54%...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:/mama/</td>
<td></td>
<td>........36, 36 %...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:/mma/</td>
<td></td>
<td>........50, 00 %...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:/jɔmma/</td>
<td></td>
<td>........13, 63 %...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) Quoted in Braun (1988: 192)  
\(^2\) Quoted in Braun (1988: 193)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 – Older brothers and sisters</th>
<th>22: ...FN..........................</th>
<th>........100, 00 %.......</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 – Younger brothers and sisters</td>
<td>12: ...FN..........................</td>
<td>........54, 55 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05: Petnames........................</td>
<td>........22, 72 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05: Diminutives....................</td>
<td>........22, 72 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Sons and daughters</td>
<td>10: ...FN..........................</td>
<td>........45, 45 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05: Nicknames......................</td>
<td>........22, 72 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07: Endearing terms...............</td>
<td>........31, 81 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Grand parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a – Grand Father</td>
<td>14 :/3addi/.......................</td>
<td>........63, 63 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01 :/bb&quot;wa/.........................</td>
<td>........04, 54 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04:/bb&quot;wa lha:3/...................</td>
<td>........18, 18 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01:/bb&quot;wa sidi/....................</td>
<td>........04, 54 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02:/3addilha:3/...................</td>
<td>........09, 09 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01:/papi/..........................</td>
<td>........04, 54 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b – Grand Mother</td>
<td>08 :/mima/.........................</td>
<td>........36, 36 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08 :/honna/.........................</td>
<td>........36, 36 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02:/mi:malha:33a/..................</td>
<td>........09, 09 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02:/mmalha:33a/....................</td>
<td>........09, 09 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01 :/mami/........................</td>
<td>........04, 54 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01 :/mma/..........................</td>
<td>........04, 54 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Uncles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a – Father’s brother</td>
<td>13:/Yammi/.........................</td>
<td>........59, 09 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/Yammi/+ FN</td>
<td>........22, 72 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05 :/i ammu/.......................</td>
<td>........18, 18 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04 :/hbi:bi/.......................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b – Mother’s brother</td>
<td>13 :/Xa:li/.......................</td>
<td>........59, 09 %.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/Xa:li/+ FN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05: /xa:lu/</td>
<td>04: /hbi:bi/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22, 72 %</td>
<td>18, 18 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8 - Aunts**

*a - Father's sister*

13: /\lammti/  
/\lammti/+ FN  
03: /\lamtu/  
06: /hbiba/  

**b - Mother's sister**

09: /xa:lti/, /xa:lti/+ FN  
06: /xa:ltu/  
04: /hbiba/  
02: /tati/  
01: /tata/  

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59, 09 %</td>
<td></td>
<td>13, 63 %</td>
<td></td>
<td>22, 72 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9 - Parents in-law**

*a - Father's in-law*

10: /bbw'a/  
04: /si:di/  
02: /\lammi/+ FN  
06: /ji: Xi/  

**b - Mother's in-law**

08: /mma/  
02: /xalti/  
04: /lahbibba/  
08: /lalla/  

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45, 45 %</td>
<td></td>
<td>18, 18 %</td>
<td></td>
<td>09, 09 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10 - Address inversion**

Kts.e.g. /bba, \lammi, mama, 3addi, \lammti, mima/  

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100, 00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
informal terms of address indicating closer and intimate relationships. These terms include: first names, verb inflections, kin terms that can be combined to FN like /sami ahmed/ or /samnu ahmed/ (my uncle Ahmed) corresponding roughly to the collocutor’s age or generation. The Kts may express the speaker’s age and sex too when used in address inversion. Furthermore, there are other terms indicating close relationships such as /saabi/ (a male friend), /zari/ (neighbour) but cannot be classified under the previous categories and in which the relationship is expressed in the terms themselves. Besides, positive politeness within the family is expressed through nicknames, pet-names, diminutives, address inversion in addition to other non-linguistic features such as joking and laughter.

Therefore, family interaction is characterized by a low politeness on the part of the speaker and this affords to be direct. This directness both maintains the intimacy of the speaker’s relationship with his/her addressee and it is family-specific way of talking (Wolfson, 1988: 193).

The previous explained strategies are generated to all situations where positive politeness holds the floor of conversation, that is to say, in all familiar, informal and intimate settings.

3. 2. 2. Negative politeness

If Wood and Kroger (1991:147) noted: “The maintenance of positive face requires the achievement of closeness and identity”\(^\text{54}\), then the maintenance of negative face requires the achievement of distance. Brown and Levinson (1987:129) place negative politeness at the heart of respect behaviour, just as they place positive politeness at the heart of intimate behaviour. They remark that “negative politeness is the most elaborate and most conventionalised set of linguistic strategies for FTA redress” (ibid.p.130). They list ten strategies for the linguistic realizations of negative

\(^{54}\) Quoted in Wolfson (1988,187)
politeness: be conventionally indirect, use of hedges, be pessimistic, minimize the imposition, give deference, apologize, Impersonalize S and H (distancing), State the FTA as a general rule (avoidance of pronouns), nominalise (use of nouns instead of verbs) and go on record like incurring a debt or as not indebting H.

In Algerian Arabic, very often in their every-day speech people define addressees as father, mother, wife, daughter and son of someone else by expressing the addressee’s relation to another person, for example, /bant əhla:ʒ/ (daughter of the pilgrim), /bant hmed/ (daughter of Ahmed), /wəld ʔli/ (son of Ali) and so on and so forth for the purpose of avoiding personal names; that is the key for ‘power politeness’ or ‘negative politeness’ reflected in address behaviour. Hence, avoiding address by first name alone is of per amount importance to express deference and respect but there are many other variants to show this criterion. For this reason, address research viewed distant address as the only or most important form of non-familiar interactions, i.e. negative politeness.

Power, respect, and deference are reflected through a variety of categories. Among them, we mention first the indirect address that seems to be restricted to a special function, i.e. establishing a first contact with a stranger – An appropriate noun is a means of expressing distance in the sense of lack of acquaintance. For this, most informants agree on /ʔaX/ (brother), /ʔuXt/ (sister), ‘ssi mohammed’ (vocative + Mohammed-FN-) even if the person’s name is not ‘Mohammed’ because it is a neutral term used to address men whose names are unknown. Even the French words ‘jeune’ (young) and ‘Monsieur’ (Sir, Mr) and ‘Madame’ (Madam, Mrs), ‘Mademoiselle’ (Miss) may turn up in an Arabic conversation for the first contact with a person whom we do not know. This kind of address is not mentioned for a long time and is sooner or later replaced by one of the normal variants which will be explained later.

It may be more interesting in this context to give a few examples of questionnaire items so that the diversity of data and its causes become more understandable. For that, we consider the following situations where there is no familiarity between participants to
analyse the forms that can be employed in address behaviour: secondary school, café, court of justice and shopping.

Since subject pronouns are not obligatory in Arabic, the plural form /ntu:ma/ (plural ‘you’) rarely functions as V pronoun in the dialectal form as opposed to the standard variety of Arabic, most of the informants deny even the possibility of marking respect with the plural pronoun /ntu:ma/ in their every day speech; they prefer to combine verbs with plural suffixes or inflections to indicate a difference in rank or status. On the other hand, pluralisation is usually used on the part of the speaker when he/she wants to indicate superiority over the addressee; this is done by the first person plural pronoun /hna/ (we) instead of /ana/ or through verb forms in the plural /mʃi:na/ (we went) rather than /mʃi:t/ (I went).

Within the repertoire of free forms of address, FN can be combined with Mr/Mrs/ variants: /sajjid, sajjida, a:nisa/ (Mr, Mrs, Miss). The latter variants can be used without names as well. Besides, FN can be added to LN.

Another way of expressing negative politeness is the use of titles either alone or with FN as has been already explained. The latter criterion generally reflects the academic education, rank, occupation of the addressee. For instance, a recorded conversation shows that a doctor uses ‘Madame’ and receives ‘Doctor’ in turn when examining a woman. Other titles may be used e.g. /usta:d/, /muhandis/,... referring to (teacher, architect,……) to addressees with high academic education or who really occupy a corresponding position. In the field of education, titles can be added to the words ‘Monsieur’ or ‘Madame’, for instance ‘Monsieur l’inspecteur’ or /sajjid lmufattij/ (Mr the inspector) and ‘/sajjid lmudi:r / (Mr the headmaster) even in informal situations i.e. in a simple debate with those people. Besides, addressing a teacher outside or inside the class does not involve any change; the most appropriate titles are /usta:d/ (masc), /usta:da/ (fem) but addressing another male superior either a headmaster or anyone else from the administration staff is more frequent with the term /ʃi:X/ for males but with
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/usta:da/ or FN for females that may also be used for an Imam responsible for religious education in a mosque.

On the other hand, in the court of justice, all lawyers, both young and old receive /usta:d/or /usta:da/ referring to /muha:mi/ and /muha:mija/ (male and female lawyers) but judges, attorneys and other judicial workers are addressed in return with more formal, standardized expressions which include: /sajjidi: arra?i:s/ (Mr the judge or president) /hadara:t assada al musta?fa:ri:n/ or /3anab almahkama almuwaqara (Your Excellency, Mr the magistrate). Therefore in this kind of situations where there is a great formality between speakers and hearers not only distant pronouns are employed but also the high variety in addition to a switch to the foreign language where the context necessitates French, regarded as a prestigious language in Algeria and usually used when a high degree of politeness is required.

In a café, for example, the waiter is addressed by his name if it is known. However if the name in unknown other terms like ‘Mohammed’, /hbi:bna/, /jarika/, /3ari:/, /Xuja/, ‘jeune’ (young), ‘la famille’(family), ‘l’artiste’(artist) are employed. Moreover, hand gestures like knocking at the table or calling him simply with hands i.e. avoidance of address term may be used but considered rude and impolite by the waiter.

Besides, with shopkeepers, basic categories are not so many: (1) fictive Kts (a-uncle terms /?ammi/, /?ammi lha:3/; b-brother terms /Xuja/); (2) FN; (3) Si+ FN or LN; (4) avoidance.

The religious titles /lha:2/ and /lha:33a/ (masc/fem pilgrim) are commonly used for addressing old people in general and otherwise with addressees who are known to have undertaken the pilgrimage to Mecca; they can also be combined to uncle or aunt terms resulting in /?ammi lha:3/ and /Xalti lha:33a/ meaning ‘uncle pilgrim’ and ‘aunt
pilgrim’. This address term //lha:j/ and //lha:33a/ is also used for the sake of respect of older people even if they have not been to Mecca yet.

Consequently, address variants reflecting deference and negative politeness are taken from the following categories (1) fictive Kts, (2) Mr-variants, (3) titles, (4) religious titles, and (5) avoidance.

It is important to note here that this diversity of data and of address behaviour was found with a very special section of the Algerian society i.e. different informants or sub-groups of speakers may have their own preferences according to their ethnic background. Heterogeneity would have been much greater if other groups of speakers had been included. Additional informants are potential sources of additional variants, differentiation, and factors. Parkinson (1982:75) points to the interdependence of speaker’s background and forms of address in Egyptian Arabic:

On one level terms of address serve to mark addressee in relation to speaker, while on another level they serve to mark speaker himself as a member of a certain sub-group in society.\(^{55}\)

Parkinson (1982:75)

Finally, the Algerian address repertoire is inhibited by the social, ethnic and linguistic characteristics of the society. Hence the Algerian repertory is rich and productive; new variants are easily formed by modifying, e.g. suffixing basic forms or to some extent by borrowing from foreign languages like /tata, tati/, from the French ‘Tante’ and / ofe:r/ ‘Chauffeur’, ..... Address behaviour may even seem inconsistent with one speaker since switching can be frequent and is enhanced by the multitude and variability of forms.

Here, the various constellations of the basic categories explained before are reproduced in a statistical way in the following table:

\(^{55}\) Quoted in Braun (1988,192)
Table 3.3. Address forms at schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>30 informants</th>
<th>Total: 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Student → Teacher</td>
<td>30: /usta:d/</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30: /usta:da/</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Student → Headmaster</td>
<td>30: /ji:X/</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Student → Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a - Male</td>
<td>10: ...FN...</td>
<td>33,33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20: /ji:X/</td>
<td>66,66 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a - Female</td>
<td>20: ...FN...</td>
<td>66,66 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10: /usta:da/</td>
<td>33,30 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>20 informants</th>
<th>Total: 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Teacher → Inspector</td>
<td>10: /ji:X/</td>
<td>50,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05: /ssajid lmufattij/</td>
<td>25,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05: Mr l’inspecteur</td>
<td>25,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Teacher → Headmaster</td>
<td>15: /ji:X/</td>
<td>75,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05: /ssajji:d lmudi:r/</td>
<td>25,00 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4. Address forms at the court of justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court of justice</th>
<th>10 informants</th>
<th>Total: 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Lawyers → Other juridical Magistrates</td>
<td>10: /sajjidi ra?i :s/</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10: /hadarat assada</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elmustafa:r:i:n/</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10: /3ana:b almahkama lmuaqqara/</td>
<td>100,00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.5. Address forms in a café.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Café</th>
<th>36 informants</th>
<th>Total : 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Waiter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a – name known</td>
<td>36: ...FN....</td>
<td>...100, 00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b – name un-known</td>
<td>15: /muhammad/</td>
<td>...41, 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01: /hibna/</td>
<td>...02, 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01: /jarika/</td>
<td>...05, 55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02: /za:ri/</td>
<td>...22, 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08: /Xuja/</td>
<td>...02, 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01: /?a jba:b/</td>
<td>...11, 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04: ‘jeune’</td>
<td>...08, 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03: ‘la famille’</td>
<td>...02, 77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01: ‘l’artiste’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.6. Address forms for shopkeepers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shop-keeper</th>
<th>25 informants</th>
<th>Total : 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a – young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10: ...FN....</td>
<td>...40, 00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15: /Xuja/</td>
<td>...60, 00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b – old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13: /lha:3/</td>
<td>...52, 00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06:/sammi/</td>
<td>...24, 00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04:/sammi lha:3/</td>
<td>...16, 00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02:/Xa:li/</td>
<td>...08, 00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

To conclude, we may point out that forms of address are specific words or phrases used to refer to the addressee and thus contain a strong element of deixis. They also function as a marker of politeness under which two kinds of address behaviour must be distinguished. The first are those associated with positive politeness that involves both familiarity and closeness, whereas the second are those associated with negative politeness that requires respect, deference, and thus formality. Therefore reciprocal use of forms of address must be distinguished from non-reciprocal use and symmetrical relationships of address forms from asymmetrical ones. Reciprocity or non-reciprocity is expressed through a large number of variants that fall into three categories: (1) Pronouns, (2) Verbs and (3) Nouns.

a- **Pronouns of address:** may have various verb suffix concordances and rarely used alone. They are divided into masculine/feminine and singular/plural

b- **Verb forms of address:** are verbs in which reference to the addressee is expressed by means of inflectional suffixes.

c- **Nouns of address:** are substantives and adjectives which designate addressees or refer to them in some other ways. This class comprises the most diverse types as mentioned before: names, kinship terms can be either used alone or combined to names, titles can be prefixed or suffixed to names, terms of occupations, etc or they can stand alone, terms of endearment that are defined by context and function rather than formal or semantic characteristics; they are to a certain context linguistic creativity and individual imagination employed in addressing small children or persons to whom the speaker feels close. Moreover, this category includes certain abstract nouns that refer to some abstract quality of the addressee and other kinds of terms for certain types of relationship like those used to address friends, neighbours or unknown addressees. All these previous categories denote different degrees of politeness and different kinds of relationships expressed to the partner in a conversational context for the purpose of performing certain kinds of speech acts as the next chapter will attempt to show.
CHAPTER FOUR

Address Forms in Speech Act Realizations
Introduction

Language is a social device employed to perform different acts named ‘speech acts’ which make up one of the compiling notions in the study of language use. In general, speech acts are acts of communication. To communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of speech act being used corresponds to the type of attitude being expressed. For example, a statement expresses a belief, a request expresses a desire, and an apology expresses regret. Speech acts have been claimed by some (Austin, 1962, Searle, 1969, 1975)\textsuperscript{56} to operate by universal pragmatic principles, and claimed by others to vary in conceptualization and verbalization across cultures and languages (Green, 1975; Wierzlicka, 1985)\textsuperscript{57}. Their modes of performance carry heavy social implicatures (Ervin Tripp, 1976) and seem to be ruled by universal principles of cooperation and politeness (Brown and Levinson, 1978; Leech, 1983).

4. 1. Speech Act Theory

Regardless of what form of language is: written or spoken, people realize that when they are involved in a communication, a number of speech acts will occur. As a matter of fact, speech act theory has been analysed by diverse philosophical perspectives: from linguistic, literary and cultural points of view in addition to their relevance in understanding child language and studies of second language acquisition. Here are the most widely debated issues and their relevance to our investigation.

4. 1. 1. Pragmatics, Speech Acts and Communication

Historically, speech act studies originate in the philosophy of language. The basic insights offered by the work of philosophers (Austin, 1962; Grice, 1957, 1975; Searle, 1969, 1975, 1979; Searle, Kiefer, and Bierwisch, 1980) are based on the

\textsuperscript{56} Quoted in Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1987,1)

\textsuperscript{57} Quoted in Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1987,1)
assumption that the units of human communication are not linguistic expressions, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts such as making a statement, asking questions, giving directions, apologizing, thanking, and so on.

One of the basic distinctions offered is between direct speech acts, where the speaker says what he or she means more than or something other than, what he or she says (Blum-Kulka, 1987:2). Some theorists like Searle (1975) link certain types of indirectness with certain forms of language. Others like Sperber and Wilson (1986) stress the pragmatics of relevance (Grice, 1975) to account for the process by which indirect meanings are encoded and decoded in content.

4.1.2. Socio-Pragmatics: Situational Variables

Leech (1983:11) distinguishes between pragmalinguistics, the linguistic end of pragmatics which refers to “the particular resources that a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions.” and sociopragmatics, the sociological interface of pragmatics, which studies the ways in which pragmatic performance is subjected to specific social conditions (Leech, 1983:11). Variations in the use of speech acts may thus be subject to the effect of social parameters, as in the case with all variations in linguistic behaviour.

Which aspects of social relations are important in determining variation in speech acts has been for many years a fruitful and fascinating subject of debate. One of the major findings that have emerged in this area is that degrees of social distance and power between participants are among the most important factors, which can in turn interact with other situational factors and might be subject to cultural variation. In discussing this subject, Ervin Tripp (1982)58 argues that children as young as two years of age are sensitive to the relative power of speaker and addressee, and the social distance between them. Young Americans, for instance, use more imperatives when

58Quoted in Blum-Kulka(1987:3)
talking to their mothers than to fathers, and give orders to siblings but request politely from strangers.

As Brown and Levinson (1978) predict, estimates of power and familiarity interact with estimates of imposition in determining choice of linguistic behaviour. Two issues in the cross – cultural investigation of various different speech acts which have been afforded particular attention are: (a) the value and function of politeness or deference in speech act realizations, and (b) the universality of politeness phenomena across languages and cultures.

4.2. Levels of Speech Acts

How language represents the world has long been, and still is, a major concern of philosophers of language. More precisely, the theory of speech acts aims to do justice to the fact that even though words (phrases, sentences) encode information, and that when people convey information, they often convey more than their words encode. Although the focus of speech act theory has been on utterances, especially those made in conversational and other face- to-face situations, the phrase ‘speech act’ should be taken as a generic term for any sort of language use oral or written. Speech acts, whatever the medium of their performance, fall under the broad category of intentional action because in attempting to express themselves, people not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words but also perform actions via those utterances. In this respect, Austin (1975) identifies three levels of action beyond the act of utterance itself. He distinguishes the act of saying something, what one does in saying, what one does by saying it and calls these respectively, the ‘locutionary’, the ‘illocutionary’ and ‘perlocutionary’ acts. The first is the basic act of utterance, or producing a meaningful linguistic expression whereas the second is produced with some kind of function in mind. For instance, one might utter ‘Can you tell me the time?’ to ask a question, but this ‘illocutionary act of asking a question is performed via the communicative force namely ‘request’, that is generally known as the illocutionary force of an utterance. Finally, we do not simply create an utterance with a function
without intending it to have an effect; this is the third dimension, the perlocutionary act (Yule, 1976:48). Of these three dimensions the most discussed is the illocutionary force. Indeed the term ‘speech act’ is generally interpreted quite narrowly to mean only the illocutionary force of an utterance. The illocutionary force is what it ‘counts as’; very often the same locutionary act or utterance can potentially have quite different illocutionary forces (Yule, 1976: 49).

4. 3. Speech acts Classification

One general classification system lists five types of general functions performed by speech acts: declarations, representatives, expressives, directives and commissives (Yule, 1976:53).

a) Declarations: they are kinds of speech acts that change the world via their utterances. For example, ‘I now pronounce you husband and wife’. These actions are, as Searle (1969, 18-19)\textsuperscript{59} says, “a very special category of speech acts”; they are performed by someone who is especially authorized to do so within some institutional framework. (Classical examples are judges’ sentencing offenders, ministers of religion christening babies, etc). As institutional rather than personal acts, they can scarcely be said to involve politeness even though sometimes politeness is not relevant to declarations as the case of a judge sentencing a person that is an unpleasant thing and may indeed be said ‘impolitely’- because they do not have an addressee in the sense that applies to personal discourse- it is rather an act by which some institutional action is performed.

b) Representatives: they are kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Statement of fact, assertions, conclusions and descriptions. In using representatives, the speaker makes words fit the world (of beliefs), for instance, ‘the earth is flat’.

\textsuperscript{59}Quoted in Leech (1983:106)
c) **Expressives:** they are kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker feels; they have the function of expressing. They express psychological states and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow. They are thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising, condoling, etc. Some of them like blaming and accusing are impolite. They can be caused by something the speaker does or the hearer does, but they are about the speaker’s experience. Examples of these are ‘I’m really sorry!’ ‘Congratulations!’ In using an expressive, the speaker makes words fit the world (of feelings).

d) **Directives:** they are kinds of speech acts that speakers use to get someone else to do something. They express what the speaker wants. They are intended to produce some effect through action by the hearer. They are commands, orders, requests, suggestions, permission, advice; they can be positive or negative but they comprise a category of illocutions in which negative politeness is important, for example, ‘Could you lend me a pen, please?’ ‘Don’t touch that’. In using a directive, the speaker attempts to make the world fit the words (via the hearer).

e) **Commissives:** they are kinds of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action; they are promises, threats, refusals, pledges, and as the example below shows, they can be performed by the speaker alone, or by the speaker as a member of a group. They tend to be performed in the interests of someone other than the speaker. For instance, I’ll be back’, ‘I’m going to get it right next time’. In using a commissive, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words. These five general functions of speech acts, with their key features are summarized in table 4.1. as follows:
Table 4.1. The five general functions of speech acts (Following Searle, 1969)\textsuperscript{60}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Act Type</th>
<th>Direction of Fit</th>
<th>S: Speaker X: Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations</td>
<td>Words change the world</td>
<td>S causes X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives</td>
<td>Make words fit the world</td>
<td>S believes X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td>Make words fit the world</td>
<td>S feels X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>Make the world fit words</td>
<td>S wants X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissives</td>
<td>Make the world fit words</td>
<td>S intends X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally it is worth making the point that, as far as Searle’s categories are concerned, negative politeness belongs pre-eminently to the directive class, while positive politeness is found pre-eminently in the commissive and expressive classes (Leech, 1983:107).

4.4. Direct and indirect speech acts

Speakers can use their language to perform various kinds of actions: making statements, asking questions, giving commands, offering wishes,.....These actions are often referred to as ‘Speech Acts’. A fairly simple structural distinction between the general types of speech acts is provided by three basic sentence patterns: declarative, interrogative, and imperative. It has been recognized that there is a relation between the three structural forms and the three communicative functions (statement, question, command /request) as shown in table 4.2.\textsuperscript{61} below:

\textsuperscript{60}In Yule (1976:55)

\textsuperscript{61}In Kroeger (2005 :197)
Table 4.2. Speech acts Vs sentence types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech act</th>
<th>Sentence type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. shows the grammatical form that would be used for expressing a given pragmatic function. When the relation between a structure and a function is direct i.e. the form of the sentence matches the purpose or the intended force of the utterance, we have ‘a direct speech act’. Some examples are given below:

**Direct speech acts.**

I don’t know if he is at home or no
Would you like to go?
Keep silent

(Statement in declarative form)
(Question in interrogative form)
(Command in imperative form)

However, speakers do not always choose the expected sentence type to express the intended function. Sometimes a speaker uses some other forms to create a desired effect. In other words, if the relationship is indirect, we have an ‘indirect speech act’. That is to say indirect speech acts are those in which there is a mismatch between the sentence type and the intended force. Thus a declarative used to make a statement is a direct speech act, but a declarative used to make a request functions as an indirect speech act. Examples on this are given here:

**Indirect speech acts**

Why don’t you close the window?
Who cares?
Don’t say you forgot my copybook!

(Command in interrogative form)
(Statement in interrogative form)
(Question in interrogative form)
Indirect speech acts are generally associated with greater politeness in English than direct speech acts. In order to be clear, we have to look at a bigger picture than just a single utterance performing a single speech act. In other words, we have to take into account the speech event that is, the activity in which participants interact via language in some conventional way to arrive at some outcome.

Let's now relate the previous illocutionary acts to the kinds of face they threaten. In doing so, Brown and Levinson (1978-1987:65-66-67) distinguishes kinds of acts threatening both positive and negative face. The first are those acts that indicate that S does not care about the addressee’s feelings, wants, etc like expressions of disapproval, criticism, contempt or ridicule, complaints, accusations, insults (S indicates that he doesn’t like H’s wants, acts and characteristics), contradictions or disagreement, expressions of violent emotions (S gives H possible reason to fear him or be embarrassed by him). Moreover, the use of address terms and other status-marked identifications in initial encounters may misidentify H in an offensive or embarrassing way, intentionally or accidentally, whereas the second kind includes those acts that primarily threaten the addressee’s (H’s) negative face want by indicating that the speaker (S) does not intend to avoid impeding H’s freedom of action. They are those acts that predicate some future act A of H, and therefore put some pressure on H to do (or refrain from doing) the act A like orders and requests, suggestions, advice, threats, warnings. They also include those acts that predict some positive future act of S toward H, and therefore put some pressure on H to accept or reject them and possibly to incur a debt like offers and promises.

In day-to-day interaction, speakers choose their strategies of talk as far as the degree of minimizing or maximizing the threat to the hearer’s face is concerned. They do so by giving rise to the four-way grid (Brown and Levinson four strategies) explained before and which offers a classification of at least some of the previously mentioned FTA.
Here in the present study, our focus falls on one speech act that has some unique aspect to be investigated and being a crucial part to build and establish social relationships; it is ‘expressing gratitude’ or ‘thanking’.\textsuperscript{62} The latter is a direct speech act by which S expresses his gratitude or acknowledgment to H; it is considered unique because people look at it as politeness behaviour and one that has a courteous or polite function (Leech1983:104). Consequently, failure in expressing gratitude can lead to negative conception toward the hearer. In fact, the problem we will address in this analysis is how dependent or independent the usage of address forms and realization of the speech act of thanking are. Beforehand, this section will give first a theoretical overview of the speech act on which the study will focus.

4.5. The Speech Act of Thanking

Expressions of gratitude/thanking in Algerian Arabic show that there are a lot of etiquettes heavily infiltrated with religious expressions associated with the name of God, ‘Allah’; for example, /barak allahuli:k/or /alla:h j3azi:k/, /3aza:ka alla:hu Xajran/ ‘May Allah reward you’ equivalent to ‘thank you’ or ‘thanks’ in English. Expressions of gratitude are one of the most frequently occurring communicative acts in human interaction and conversation in daily life. People say ‘thank you’ almost every day during their conversational routines with their family, neighbours, friends, and other relatives. This speech act represents a fairly high degree of politeness. Aijmer (1996:33) wrote that “functionally, thank you/thanks are analyzed on the speech act level, as a politeness marker and an element organizing the discourse.” According to Searle in SAT (Speech Act Theory), the speech act of thanking is defined as an expression of gratitude and appreciation. He also states later (1976:12) that “expressing gratitude is classified as an expressive speech act on the part of the speaker to the hearer whose past or future act benefits the speaker.” More clearly, most people consider that a speaker expresses gratitude because of some debts that the speaker owes to the hearer. In other words, the speaker owes a favour to the hearer, as the hearer has done something for the

\textsuperscript{62} They are used in this dissertation interchangeably.
benefit of the speaker and hence “maximizing its illocutionary force and in this way maximizing its politeness” (Leech, 1983: x). On the other hand, Brown and Levinson (1987:67) classified this act of thanking as “offensive to the S’s negative face since by doing it, he/she humbles his own face and accepts a debt.”

Consequently, the gratitude expression is one way of maintaining politeness and since address forms are crucial to the realization of politeness, we will consider different types of situations to analyse when or when not address forms are combined to the speech act of thanking.

In analysing the data collected on performance of thanks, we observed that there is a qualitative difference between the speech behaviour of status un-equals, such as teachers and students, between statuses equals such as classmates or colleagues, between people as socially distant as strangers or as familiar as family members. Those differences were labelled by Wolfson ‘the bulge’ (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1987:184); they are all based upon a large set of obligations, whether the obligation is to act or refrain from acting, or merely to carry out an act in an appropriate way.

By means of direct observation of the way in which these obligations determine the need for thanking we have attempted to examine the actual conditions which elicit thanks in every day interactions in Algerian Arabic. In constructing the empirical study, one major consideration was to examine the factors determining the choice of thanking expressions and to test whether these thanking items are necessarily combined to the feature address terms or not. The second consideration whether the judgments we had made regarding the relationship between S and H were confirmed by the choice of thanking formulas in combination to address terms. In general, our investigation revealed that thanks were given when being offered a help, a gift, and also as a response to compliments. In other words, our preliminary findings show that the basic obligations to give a ‘thank you’ are:

a- The obligation to be in someone’s debt, i.e., to feel grateful to somebody for his/her kindness and help because thanking in general, as Norick states (1978), is
the ‘acknowledgment of one’s having benefited from the actions of another person.’ For example, a man driving a car and didn’t know the right way said to a policeman:

S: /nqad nadjXLal männa / (Can I take this road?)
H: /ru:h maflif / (Go, no problem)
S: /sahit Xuja barakalla:hufi:k / (Thanks brother, may Allah reward you)

In a telephone conversation, a man said to his son of 19 years old:

S: /matmadj oddra:hêm lrobat ru:h Xallasli la knep qbol/
(Don’t give money to ‘Rabeh’ pay ‘la CNEP’ first)
H: /sahha/ (ok)
S: /sahiti alla:h jassatrak fukran/ (Thanks, God protect you, thank you)

Here the speaker is emphasizing his thank by the use of both /sahhi:t/ taken from the Algerian Arabic dialect and /fukran/taken from Modern Spoken Arabic. The same phenomenon occurs with the use of Arabic and French thanking expressions, as the examples below will show; for the purpose of expressing great acknowledgment to the hearer.

b-The obligation to express gratitude to someone when given a gift viewing ‘thanking’ as a post event, that is a reaction to another act. For example, a girl coming back from a trip to France brought some presents to her family.

S: /sbtalkum hada ‘symbolique’ rakum fi:fi:n ‘les moyens’/
(I brought something symbolic; you know the means.)
H: /kulfi jabi:n ‘merci’/ (Everything is beautiful, thanks)
S: /ha:d ssa:k ta:t bna:tak/ (This bag is for your daughters)

63 Quoted in Poynton (1990: 327)
H: /ksiti:hum alla:h jahhaf dok wajhanni:k ma:da:b ad:anja wa:l?a:Xira wa:j a ngul:lok alla:h jma3hak fiq"omarajtak / (You gave a lot, may Allah protect you, reward you,....)

These thanking expressions show that the receiver of gifts was so happy, satisfied and tried to use all kinds of thanking.

S: /a:mi:n jarabbi/ (God willing)

c-The obligation to express gratitude to someone who pays a compliment for you about your appearance, look, beauty, or good action for example:

A : /Xur3a:tlo:k jaa:bba ‘la tarte au citron’ / (it’s delicious ‘la tarte au citron’)
B: /wa:h ‘merci’ dajm an ra:ha toXra3li ha:ka/ (yes, thanks, it’s always like that)
A: /ho:ttalibiskwi ‘noir’ ja:a k jba:b/ (Even the black biscuit is delicious)
B : /ha:di ‘la recette’ ta:f ‘Danette’ (This is the recipe of ‘Danette’)
A: /faddobna:k qarriti:hum wza:di qahwitihum/
(We have caused you harm, you taught them and gave them coffee again)
B: /lla: mafiha:lu ‘avec plaisir’/ (No problem with pleasure)
A: ‘merci’ /samhi:na/ (Thanks, sorry again)
B: ‘Je vous en prie’ /alla:h jsa:hal/ (You are welcome, may Allah make it easier).

Moreover, thanks can sometimes be used ironically in response to an act that does not please the hearer; for example, a woman threw water on a man when she was cleaning the window and watered him.
A: /smahli Xuja mafftak:f/ (excuse me, I didn’t see you)
B: /sahhi:ti/ (thanks). Here the ‘thank you’ was used metaphorically to express anger and mean that the hearer was impolite in his action that does not deserve a thanking. Although these situations were very much in evidence in our observational data, there were a number of others often more subtle and sometimes difficult to describe.
*Results of the questionnaires*

The examples analysed here are drawn from spontaneous conversations between Algerian speakers of both sexes and various ages recorded in my hometown. The interactions took place in a number of contexts: for example, at home, at work, in cafés, at informal social gatherings, at formal discussions, for example in an administration, at school between either students and teachers or classmates alone. The respondents are all native speakers of Arabic who share the same dialect i.e. Algerian Arabic but belong to various ethnic groups. They were approached by the researcher in person. Some were asked once to answer the questionnaires individually but sometimes recorded in groups with no interference of the researcher. Information about the study was provided when requested by respondents. This helped ensure spontaneous interaction between informants i.e. as a researcher; I attempted not to interfere in order not to guide the informants’ responses.

My 2nd year 80 students also provided invaluable data on patterns of address in families, in various work contexts, both in class discussions of the topic and in their papers; friends and colleagues likewise provided me with more common expressions of gratitude combined to address terms, as well as opinions based on their own experiences of the claims made by other informants on the hypotheses I had formulated. And finally for more qualitative aspects of the study, the questionnaire was designed so that subjects were asked to read the item and write what they think should be the response in that particular situation. These items were intended to require a gratitude expression or thanking with distance being either plus or minus and dominance being plus, zero or minus. The relationship between the speaker and the addressee is ‘plus dominance’ if the speaker is of higher status than the addressee, ‘zero dominance’ if they are of equal status and ‘minus dominance’ if the speaker is of lower status than the addressee.

On the basis of those findings, the informants were divided into three groups; the first addressing inferiors in age and social status, the second interacting with equals in age and social rank and the third group conversing with superiors in age and social
status. Table 4.3 below represents the features of address terms in thanking formulas bearing in mind the two variables social distance and social dominance.

### Table 4.3: Gratitude Expressions in Algerian Arabic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thanking an inferior</th>
<th>Thanking an equal</th>
<th>Thanking a superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
On the basis of the previous findings, the responses data have been converted to the percentage of the total number of subjects for each item. So, table 4.4 illustrates this percentage for each category of the feature.

**Table 4.4. Percentage of address terms’ features combined to thanks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>FN</th>
<th>Kts</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Nicknames</th>
<th>Other terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To an inferior</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
<td>32.25%</td>
<td>00 %</td>
<td>3.22 %</td>
<td>6.45 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To an equal</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.48%</td>
<td>00 %</td>
<td>54.83%</td>
<td>00 %</td>
<td>6.45 %</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a superior</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.25%</td>
<td>00 %</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
<td>00 %</td>
<td>25.80 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We see then, there were a total of 31 subjects who responded, the percentage varies between 32. 25% and 54. 83% who associated their thanking expressions to address terms, more precisely to Kts. Therefore, in case which represents no or minus distance and zero dominance the speaker attempted to show more affection and closeness to the addressee by making use of Kts to relatives and address inversion to non-kins especially to children but very limited or no use of FN and titles to this category 00 %. Very few of them used some nicknames and endearing terms for more intimate relations.

In the case of plus dominance, the study shows that 61. 29% of the respondents tend to combine their thanking expressions to titles, 29. 03% to Kts, 25.80 % to other terms indicating a certain kind of relations when addressing superiors of higher social status and age or strangers for the purpose of expressing more respect and politeness. Hence, as we move from plus dominance to minus dominance (the speaker is of lower status than the addressee), we find a corresponding increase in the percentage of respondents who combine their gratitude expression to address terms. That is, when the hearer is of higher status there is a great tendency for the speaker to use formal terms of address in thanks in order to show their gratitude to the addressee. By contrast, when the hearer is lower in status than or equal to the speaker, subjects feel free to choose their thanking expressions, associating them or not to a term of address; they even code switch to the French ‘merci’ and the English ‘thanks’ when thanking their closest friends and kins since they feel in a relaxed situation. For instance, /sahhi:t/ ‘mon ami’ (thanks my friend), /ʃukran/ ‘ma chérie’ (thanks darling), ‘merci ma petite’ (thanks my little), thanks /sahbi/ (thanks my friend). Most of them argue that the use of French and English was done on purpose to show more closeness to friends and colleagues but this code-switching is avoided with elders, it can be rude and impolite especially if the hearer is illiterate.

In interviewing informants on the necessity of adding a term of address to their thanking expressions, among 54 interviewees (students, teachers, waiters, shopkeepers and others), 51(94. 44 %) confirm that the combination of thanking formulas to terms of
address is more necessary when addressing superiors than when speaking to inferiors or equals. It indicates more respect to the person addressed and emphasizes our acknowledgment and gratitude to him. For the first case, i.e., addressing an equal, we find 30: yes (55.55%) and 24: no (44.44%); it means respondents agree that it is not necessary to combine their thanks to any term of address but the addition of those terms Ks, endearing terms, FN, nicknames plays an important role in establishing certain relationships with participants being more affectionate and closer to their addressees. With inferiors we find 30: no (62.96%); this means that more than half approved the non-obligation of these combinations but 20 others (37.03%) prefer the addition of these familiar terms of address to their GE.

Thus, the greater is the distance between interlocutors, the more there is combination of terms of address to the realization of thanking. The latter criterion was also represented in table 4. 4. with the non-use of address terms in thanking formulas that is increasing as the social distance becomes minus or equal. An important point to mention is that very often terms of address are preceded by the vocative /ja/ often realized as a /?a/ when combined to a gratitude expression; these two ways are used to attract the listener when thanking him/her.

Working on thanks, we have tried to focus on the most important factors, i.e., social distance and social dominance under which sub factors, determining our choice of address terms and how dependent or independent their combination is to the realization of thanking expressions, may be grouped from the most to the least important. These are essentially, age, social relation to the addressee and his/her social responsibility or status.

According to the data gathered we found that among 60 informants, 52 stated that their combination of gratitude expressions to address terms is closely tied to the age of the person addressed, i.e., most of the time they added an address term to their thanking formulas when speaking to an older person. Besides, from 30 to 32 informants argued that in addition to age, our relation to the addressee and his social responsibility or rank are of paramount importance when giving a thank; they most of the time combine these
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gratitude expressions to a term indicating a kin relation or an occupational title. On the
other hand, the importance of the act performed, education of the interlocutors, our debt
to the person thanked and other perhaps hidden factors like the psychological state..... of
the interlocutors at the moment of conversation should not be neglected (10 informants)
because they might affect the responses; Our results of the interview concerning the
factors contributing to the choice of thanking expressions are represented in table 4.5.
below:

Table 4.5. Number of informants and determinant factors for GE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for choosing a</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relation to addressee</th>
<th>Social Responsibility</th>
<th>Other Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informants</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the bars representing those most important factors are shown on figure 4.1.
below

![Figure 4.1. Factors determining the choice of thanking expressions.](image)
Conclusion

Considering the implications of Brown and Levinson's theory and other earlier researches on speech acts grounding their link to the notion of face threat, the results above show that the speech act of thanking, viewing it an expressive act, is the manipulation of verbal material to convey information about one's emotional state bearing in mind the social relationship between the speaker and the hearer and the weight of action they are involved in.

Thanking expressions are speech acts which reveal great politeness, especially when the social distance between S and H is plus, i.e., when the hearer is greater in power, status, age and social responsibility. This criterion of plus distance is reflected in the choice of more formal thanking formulas such as /šuθran ʒaziːlan/; and even by a code switching to French phrases and words like 'merci, c'est très gentil' because both the high variety and the French language are considered as prestigious varieties to express politeness and more respect. Moreover, they are most of the time combined to a term of address by which more focus on the gratitude is expressed. On the other hand, in minus and equal distance relations thanks are used more freely not necessarily combined to a term of address.

In short, the social distance and the social dominance including age, power, responsibility, rank and status are the most important factors which determine the combination of a gratitude expression with a term of address in addition to perhaps other intentions of the speakers.
General Conclusion

At the outset of our attempt in this dissertation, we may say that we are still a long way from understanding how speakers mitigate their speech forms to express politeness in specific speech events despite the various hypotheses and theories which do indeed propose logical and experimental analysis. In fact, language is a means of communicating ideas, emotions and establishing social relationships. And language systems have within them the means of conveying politeness. So, this last phenomenon cannot be seen outside of verbal behavior; otherwise it would be a sterile exercise of merely informative nature, and thus it should be located within the very core of language.

Once a partial, if not complete command in their linguistic code known as first language acquisition is attained, children learn how, when to speak, with whom, about whom, what and where to utter their words. They also acquire that social distance is widely recognized as a central dimension of social relations in every day discourse. Another significant approach to language and social relations is based upon the ‘power’ and ‘solidarity’ parameters; the question of whether a linguistic form is used reciprocally or systematically by interactants is indeed closely connected to how close or distant the interlocutors are.

In the present study, we have shown that the notions of power and solidarity are linguistically realized by the use of different categories of address forms like verb endings, nouns, pronouns, titles,... conveyed in different speech acts by a diversity of linguistic structures and politeness strategies.

Considering the linguistic situation of Algeria being a hospitable land of people from different ethnics, we notice both its diglossic and its bilingual nature, two phenomena that are to a great extent clear in Algerian everyday speech; each one has a specific linguistic function. In this study, we have tried to explain how Algerian interlocutors choose their words to address different categories of
participants bearing in mind the two notions mentioned before. We should note that a ‘mode of address’ is the correct use of a word or a term when we address a person or talk to him/her. Forms of address then are best understood by examining dyadic interaction; they are determined by a set of variables; high among them are: a/ the seriousness of the face-threatening act, b/ the social distance between the speaker and the hearer and the relative power between interlocutors. These forms of address can take the form of pronouns inflected at the end of verbs, nouns like first and last names, or others reserved to marriage, kinship relations in addition to specific terms devoted to elders, friends and neighbours or people whose names are unknown to us. Moreover, they also take the form of titles, nicknames, endearing terms, personal epithets, terms of affection and esteem, diminutives and finally insults. Besides, address behaviour is the way people choose their repertory of address variants available to them as appropriate. This appropriateness in face-to-face interactions has been related to the universal phenomenon general to all human societies, namely ‘politeness’ since it has much to contribute to it. This underlying principle of politeness which is to show good intentions and considerations for others by making use of certain mechanisms specific to each language known as ‘social indexing’ or ‘address system’. These social markers of politeness can be classified in two kinds; firstly those indicating positive politeness which involve familiarity, closeness, intimacy and secondly those indicating negative politeness which is the heart of formality, deference and respect.

One of the major concerns of this sociolinguistic research is how those terms of address are employed to perform a specific speech act called ‘thanking’. It has been observed that thanking formulas are very often combined to terms of address as the social distance between participants is greater. They are intended to show more deference and respect and emphasize more the importance of help or
gratitude to the listener. On the other hand, the addition of terms of address to a
gratitude expression in intimate relations can be explained in terms of affection and
closeness to the person addressed. Furthermore, forms of address are combined to
thanking formulas relatively freely and unconsciously. Hence the greater is the
distance, the more is the necessity to combine address terms to a gratitude
expressions. The last point may be analysed psycho-linguistically, in terms of the
hidden factors that must be of great interest in interpreting the findings. To
conclude, we have tried to demonstrate that the very problems we find as we
analyse the data, can help us to discover the uncovered variables that may be of
great interest in deepening our understanding of the sociolinguistic patterns
discussed before.

It is hoped that the questions raised in this discussion will encourage and
would work as a basis for those interested in further sociolinguistic research to
integrate an observational methodology into the design of their studies. Very often,
our intuitions cannot provide us with a complete picture of the social conditions that
result in a speech act, in addition to the unconscious or inner capacities of every
member of a speech community.

I also wish that this study will pave the way to those who are interested
in investigating how this speech act of thanking is accompanied by a non-verbal
behaviour, like certain gestures or movements of the body asking new questions
and raising a new problematic in order to get at the conditioning factors we have
uncovered.
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