



الاشكال الصرفية للمخاطبة في العربية الأنبارية مع الإشارة الى اللغة الانكليزية:

تحليل اجتماعي لغوي للألقاب والأسماء التشريفية

الجامعة العراقية- كلية الاداب- قسم اللغة الانكليزية

ا.م.د. جاسم محمد عباس

الملخص

تتجلى العلاقة بين اللغة والمجتمع في مجالات مختلفة من خلال استخدام اللغة. ومن هذه المجالات استخدام أشكال المخاطبة التي تُعتبر من أهم أشكال الأشكال الصرفية. تُوفر أشكال الخطاب معلومات اجتماعية لغوية مهمة حول كيفية أداء اللغة لوظائف مختلفة تتعلق بالمجتمع والثقافة. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحديد أنواع معينة من أشكال الخطاب العربية، وخاصة تلك المتعلقة بأسماء الاحترام والألقاب التي يمكن استخدامها في سياقات اجتماعية لغوية مختلفة. كما تحاول الدراسة التحقيق في أشكال أسماء الاحترام التي يستخدمها متحدثو العربية الأنبارية الذين يستقرون في محافظة الأنبار. كما تهدف إلى توضيح الوظائف التواصلية الأكثر شيوعاً لأسماء الاحترام والألقاب عند استخدامها في سياقات مختلفة. علاوة على ذلك، تسعى إلى تحديد العوامل الاجتماعية التي تؤثر على استخدام هذه الأشكال وتحكمه في المحادثات اليومية باللغة العربية الأنبارية. استخدمت الدراسة منهجاً وصفيًا نوعيًا. يمكن للمنهج النوعي إنتاج بيانات وصفية تضمنت بيانات منطوقة تم جمعها من الأشخاص والسلوك الذي يمكن ملاحظته. لجمع البيانات، تم استخدام مقابلة شبه منظمة لجمع البيانات من 36 مشاركاً من خلفيات متشابهة. تم اختيار المشاركين على أساس أربعة متغيرات وهي: العمر والجنس والخلفية التعليمية والحالة الاجتماعية. تكشف النتائج عن اختلاف استخدامات المتحدثين باللغة الأنبارية في أشكال التكريم والألقاب المختلفة في المجتمع الأنباري. ويعتمد اختلاف استخدام هذه الأشكال الصرفية بشكل رئيسي على عوامل عدة، مثل العمر والجنس والوضع الاجتماعي والوظيفي ونوع العلاقة. كما تُظهر النتائج أن لهذه الأشكال وظائف تواصلية مختلفة، بناءً على السياقات التي تُستخدم فيها.

الكلمات المفتاحية: أشكال المخاطبة، التكريم، الألقاب، العربية الأنبارية، الثقافة والمجتمع

Morphological Forms of Address in Anbari Arabic with Reference to

English: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Honorifics and Titles

Al- Iraqia University- College of Arts- Department of Englis

Asst. Prof. Dr. Jasim Mohammed Abbas

Abstract

The relationship between language and society is represented in various areas throughout language use. One of these areas is the use of forms of address which are considered as being a significant type of morphological forms. Forms of address provide important sociolinguistic information about how language can serve different functions related to society and culture. The present study aims at identifying certain types of Arabic address forms, particularly those related to honorifics and titles that could be employed in different sociolinguistic contexts. The study also tries to investigate the forms of honorifics used by Anbari speakers who settle in Anbar governorate. It also aims to clarify the most



communicative functions that honorifics and titles mostly have when they are used in different contexts. Further, it seeks to identify the social factors that affect and govern the use of these forms in daily conversations in Anbari Arabic. The study employed a qualitative descriptive method. The qualitative method can produce descriptive data which included spoken data collected from people and behavior that could be observed. For data collection, a semi-structured interview was used to collect data from 36 participants with similar backgrounds. The selection of the participants was achieved on the bases of four variables namely: age, gender, educational background and marital status. The findings reveal that Anbari speakers use different address forms represented in the different forms of honorifics and titles used in Anbari society. The various use of these morphological forms mainly depend on a number of factors such as age, gender, social and position status and type of relationship. In addition, the results show that the different forms of honorifics and titles have varied communicative functions based on the contexts in which these forms are used.

Key words: address forms, honorifics, titles, Anbari Arabic, culture and societ

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The use of language in any social interaction implies not only exchanging of information and knowledge but it reveals individuals' attitudes, feelings, culture, identities and their preference to show closeness to their addressees or remain distant from each other. In a given community, one of the fundamental issues of sociolinguistics is the social relationships that are established and shown among language users. Holmes (1992) holds the view that exploring people's ways of using language in different social relationships of that community. In the same vein, Keshavarz (2001) mentions that different speech styles are used by people in accordance with the social context they are engaged in. As a holder of an important role in social interaction, there are several important aspects that need to be considered in communicating. They are language, speakers, hearers, social culture and social relationship situation and so on.

Address forms are important features of social communication, they can provide valuable sociolinguistic information about the interlocutors, their relationship and their circumstances. Address forms can be defined as the way a speaker addresses others. Address terms are also part of complete semantic systems having to do with social relationship (Fasold, 1990). The most influential



study of address forms or terms and social relationship was proposed by Brown and Gilman. They proposed two uses of pronouns led to semantics; they are power and solidarity (Fasold, 1990). The existence of power and solidarity in speaking community will determine the address terms choice. Hence, through the use of address terms, people can identify the level of intimacy and the distance between speakers and hearers. The form of address terms is an effective and successful communication way and has been considered as a prominent indicator of relationship status. Therefore, a successful interaction depends on the appropriate use of address terms.

Accordingly, the use of specific address terms mainly depends on the interrelation between language and society. For Wardhaugh (2001), the relationship between language and society is studied by sociolinguistics to deal with language structure and identify how it is used. In sociolinguistics, social attributes such as gender, age, social and economic status can influence the way people talk or the way they use certain linguistic forms. In addition, Wardhaugh (2011) explains that the sociology of language is closely related to sociolinguistics but from another angle. The sociology of language accommodates the use of language according to the rules and social organization of a certain society. To conclude, sociolinguistics and the sociology work together and the sociolinguistic view which is the concern of the present study deals with the function of language in different social environments and also states the relationship between language use and a given community.

1.2 Language and Culture

Language has a special system which combines the basic components starting from symbols and sounds. The use of such sounds is arbitrary in that the connection between sounds and concepts is not absolute. Language users often employ words or signs to express their feelings and thoughts when communicating in different situations. Therefore, language is productive where a limited number of words can make unlimited number of utterances and sentences. Besides, language is dynamic because it could change from period to another and its change may occur in different fields including phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics. The use of language in a certain society is affected by the cultural traditions and norms employed in this or that community.

In related words, culture reflects the behavior of a particular community that is considered as a tradition which is conveyed and transmitted from generation to



another. Yule (1986) states that learning a language in a particular society is basically achieved through the process of cultural transmission. It is acquired without conscious awareness and then it could develop language users' awareness of their knowledge and culture. It could be argued that culture can develop one language or more to be a distinct medium of communication. And one of the most important features of language is its ability to be the primary means of communication in specific culture.

In every culture around the world, there are certain ways or routs to address others. In the west of Iraq, especially in the Anbar Governorate people have their own culture and way of address where there are various tribes and dialects. In Anbar people speak Arabic language which is the national language. However, the language used by people there has special dialects different from other dialects spoken, for example, in the middle, the south or the north of Iraq. Even in Anbar itself, the dialects used are various and have slight or big differences and this variety leads to a difference in the forms of address used by people there. For example, the terms of address, particularly titles and honorifics are not the same in the places near the capital, Baghdad as those terms used in the places near the borders with Syria and Jordan, in Ana and Rawa cities.

1.3 Morphological forms of address

Address forms are also known as address terms. They simply refer to the words employed by somebody in a certain speech or writing. Fasold (1990) defines address forms as "the words speakers use to designate the person they are talking to while they are talking to them". There are two main types of address terms. These are names and second person pronouns.

1.3.1 Honorifics and titles

Honorifics and titles are the main kinds of address forms. Honorifics are used to show 'honor', therefore, both 'honorific' and honorific forms' are usually used to denote this meaning (Bussmann, 1996: 520). Honorifics and titles are closely related to each other, honorifics are viewed as a grammatical reference of relative status of persons or things. For Verschueren (1992), honorifics are "language forms such as pronouns, vocative expressions, titles of address and the like, used to encode the high status of the interlocutor". On the other hand, Shibatani (1999) and Grundy (2000) declare that the term 'honorifics' stands for specific linguistic forms that are employed as signs of deference related to the addressee. However, this definition is more applicable to the addressee and does not give an overall



view in which honorifics can be given to other person than the addressee. On the contrary, Watts (2003: 274), describes honorifics as being "grammatical forms used to express the social status of the participants in the verbal interaction including levels of politeness or respect". In a different way, Agha (2007) argues that honorifics acts to give inclusive sense of 'pertaining to honor or respect' and not only to show a positive sense of honor or respect.

Based on Levinson's (1983:90) classification, honorifics are divided into two main types: referential honorifics and absolute honorifics and these divisions are also subdivided into other subdivisions as follows:

1. Referential honorifics

This type of honorifics is usually related to the social deictic information of the language (s). It could be subdivided into the following:

a. Addressee honorifics

Such forms show the direct relationship between the speaker and the address in spite the fact that it does not refer to the address directly (Brown and Levinson, 1987). They point out to the indirect reference to the addressee by giving instances to declare respect to the addressee. For example, the item 'food' in the sentence "the food is hot" states respect to the addressee indirectly. This indicates that honorific forms are sometimes expressed through the context or situation.

b. Referent honorifics

This type of honorific forms is used to state the respect in the relationship between the speaker and the addressee (the referent) which could be either a person or a thing. According to Sifianou (1992), these forms are usually used to express the speaker's respect to referred persons. Instances of such type are:

1. *The father arrived early.*

Does young brother help mother?

c. Formality levels of honorifics

These forms mainly denote the relation between the speaker or the other participants including hearers or audience and the setting or the social activity (Horn and Wards, 2006: 120)



d. Bystander honorifics

Here, the term 'bystander' refers to persons in audience role and to speakers as well. It could be argued that these forms are employed to express respect to non-addressed but present part (Horn and Ward, 2006).

2. *These **old gentlemen** are watching a new match.*

2. Absolute honorifics

According to the classification of Levinson (1983), absolute honorifics are the second type honorific forms that consist of two subdivisions as follows:

a. Authorized speakers

This form contains specific expressions employed for speakers of certain social status, such as, *Mr., Mrs., Miss., Ms., Dr.,* etc.

b. Authorized recipients

This type includes words and expressions reserved and employed for recipients, and has restrictions on the majority of titles expressing address. These expressions include, for example, *your honor, Mr., President,* etc.

On the other hand, titles refer to the use of titles to address somebody for the purpose of indicating rank or occupation. According to Shibatani (1999), titles are considered the most prevailing forms of honorifics and they are employed with names including *Mr., Miss., Mrs.,* etc. He also declares that some titles are taken from names or status as occupation which are normally used in a social group as in the case of military titles, business group or kin- terms such as, *professor, uncle, general, and so on.* Titles are defined by Martiny (1996) as being nominal forms of address which are used to show the nature of relation between the interlocutors. Hence, in the social relation between the addressers and the addressees reflects the first name and the last name reflect titles. This is due to the fact that in the former emphasis is usually placed upon the relation whereas in the latter the addressee is the focus of interest. For this reason, titles are considered as those forms which reveal respect to the addressee (Dickey, 1997).

According to Gramely and Patzold (1992), titles are grouped into three main types. They are as follows:

1. Generic Titles



This type can be identified as "generalized variations of title categories" and it is also known as "M- forms titles", for instance: Mr., Mrs., Miss., mam, and Sir. Such type of titles cannot be used alone without a name except for "sir" and "mam" (Wardhaugh, 1986).

2. Kinship Titles

Titles of this type are frequently employed to address people who are connected to the speaker by family ties. Examples of kinship titles are: **father, mother, grandfather, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, etc.** (Brown and ford, 1961). Cheal (2008) points out that kinship, in all societies, is featured by a set of relationship terms. Kinship is established by birth and marriage and both can bind individual in kinship relationship.

a. Teknonyms

One of the title forms that show politeness and respect within family members and known people is the use of teknonyms. A teknonym can be defined by Mandende (2009) as "a practice whereby parents at the birth of their child cease to be known by their former personal names and are known as ' father of ' (child name) and ' mother of ' (child's name)". Here, the father and mother might be referred to by the teknonym or name of the child once a child is being introduced to the other members of the family. According to Mandende (Ibid), the use of teknonyms normally state respect when it is used to address the parents or grandparents of the child.

b. Nicknames

Nicknames are defined by De Klerk and Bosch (1997) as impermanent, informal form of address. Such address forms are shaped to be not fixed or universally known. These forms are used in social situations to bear social features and can reflect the relation's formality between dyads. In addition, they are widely used between family members, relatives and known people. It could be argued that nicknames are taken from the bearer's personal and physical features. Therefore, these forms are important in showing the positive and negative attitude of the speaker towards the bearer's nickname including the personal or physical features possessed by the bearer. For example, a person whose name is Smith he may be addressed by adding another word to his name to distinguish him from other people who are Smith. Hence, 'tall Smith' may be the normal nickname that he is known with.



3. Occupational Titles

These titles are usually derived from the addressee's occupation. This means that these titles are honorifically related to job or social position. Instances of this type of titles are: *doctor, teacher, professor, waiter, etc.* (Wardhaugh, 1986).

1.4 Rationale of the Present Study

The present study offers two main rationales for the use of honorifics and titles as being forms of address. These rationales are due to:

1. The study of honorifics and titles is of big importance since honorifics and titles are considered as main forms of address. Their use is usually related to manners of social status. This means that one should show respect to whom he/she is speaking. And employing honorifics or titles is normally associated with non-linguistic effects such as, culture, gender, age, and others. As Keating (1998) declares, the use of honorifics or titles mainly indicates one's respect and show social relationships tied between different people. In addition, Ide and Lakoff (2005) state that honorifics are employed to express politeness and then the proper use of these forms can lead to suitable harmonious relations among individuals in a certain social situation.

2. In addition, the study seeks to provide those who are studying or specialist in the English language an insight of how the use of morphological forms of address like honorifics and titles can be effective in suitable and polite social interaction since the correct use of honorifics and titles can serve different functions including giving respect, formality, dignity, grace, and good manners. On the other hand, honorifics can express other functions, for example, they can produce impolite intentions like contempt or standoffish and others. They could be used as being "polite on the surface but actually contemptuous" (Hasegawn, 2006). Therefore, honorifics and titles should be employed on the basis of social interaction convictions and politeness strategies.

2. Statement of the Problem

The relationship between language and both society and culture is very close in that variations in individual languages can accordingly occur with the cultural practices of different speech societies. These variations are viewed clearly in the usage of address which is regarded as a universal phenomenon. It could be argued that the factors which influence the use of address forms may have little or big variations in different languages. In each specific language, speakers can



creatively employ various aspects of address in certain cultural context. The process of choosing a specific address form requires having ethno-pragmatic knowledge that could govern the use of specific address forms or terms. Address usage takes into consideration the local cultural norms and competence of which address form is suitable and best employed in a given culture. So, this can cause difficulties and problems since not all speakers have previous knowledge of the way they can follow to access to local forms.

The most common way to address people is to call a person using his/ her name. In this respect, there are different ways to address others, however, it is not easy to select the right and most appropriate terms of address in a certain society. Various forms of address are employed according to a society rules, and speakers may find difficult to determine which terms should be used unless speakers understand the actual rules of address. In each community there are different groups of people which have their own considerations to these rules of address system. The rules of address system generally include social class, gender, age, profession, marital status, respect or politeness and other related aspects. As the main concern of this study is the use of honorifics and titles as forms of address, it could be argued that forms of titles and honorifics vary from speaker to another, and even different forms could be used to address the same person by different speakers or by the same speaker at different situations. All that depend on a number of factors including personal status, age, gender and so on.

The aim of the present research is to identify the forms of honorifics and titles as being address forms which used by the speakers in Anbari Arabic society. As the forms of address reflect the features of the social context of culture, the study aims to show and clarify the social address terms used by Anbari people to indicate the relationship between society and language in this society. As Keshavars (2001) points out, studying the complexity of social relationship among speakers in a given society and showing the relationship between language and society assist sociolinguist understand how these relationships are build.

3. Purpose of the Study

The present study aims to achieve the following objectives:

- 1) To find out the morphological forms of honorifics and titles as types of address which are used by Anbari Arabic speakers.



2) To identify the communicative functions of honorifics and titles used by Anbari Arabic speakers.

3) To reveal the social factors that determine the variation in the use of honorifics and titles in Anbar.

4. Research Questions

1) Which morphological forms of honorifics and titles are used by Anbari Arabic speakers?

2) What are the communicative functions of honorifics and titles as types of address?

3) What are the social factors that determine the variation in the use of honorifics and titles by Anbari Arabic speakers?

5. Methodology

The present study is a descriptive research where a quantitative research is used. The study seeks to find out objective facts through conducting a research design suitable for a qualitative type. Christensen (2011) argues that a qualitative research approach is interpretive; the data in a qualitative research usually include words and other non-numerical data. According to Liamputtong (2009), a qualitative study focuses on meaning and interpretation of data. In a similar way, a qualitative inquiry for Creswell (2009) is viewed as being "a means of exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem".

5.1 Sample of the Study

The sample of the present study included Iraqi participants chosen in terms of age, gender, marital status, level of education and occupation. In the present study the number of the sample was limited to only 36 respondents, 16 male participants and 20 female participants. Such limitation in the respondents' number was to meet the requirements and the notion of data limitation. Hence, when the researcher is satisfied that the selected participants are enough to be interviewed to be suitable for address usage and that no new data are being generated, no new subjects will be recruited to participants in the study (Matthews and Ross, 2010). The participants of the study were students in Falluja University selected from different departments. The selection of the participants



was according to certain considerations such as, same age, monolingual speakers of Anbari, unmarried, and the same level of education.

5.2 Instruments

The present study typically conducted an interview which represents a research data technique carried out with the definite purpose of collecting data by means of the spoken word employing a planned series of questions. Therefore, the present study used semi- structured interviews as a data collection method. A semi-structured interview as a data collection method is also known as an in-depth interview (Marshal and Rossman, 2006; Mattews and Ross, 2010). The purpose of the in-depth interview is to understand the participants' thoughts, perceptions, feelings and experiences. The semi- structured interview consisted questions ranging from those questions which focused on how to address family members, close persons and relatives up to questions related to addressing familiar people and those people who are unfamiliar. Following such a way, the interview's questions were answered by the participants, and then the researcher had the opportunity to be informed about the feelings of experiences of the participants, At last, rich information could be elicited from the informants' points of view in their own words.

5.2.1 Data Collection Procedure

The data collected in this study were qualitative data since they were collected by means of a semi- structured interview. First, a pilot interview was conducted among 15 participants. The main purpose was to make sure that the questions of interview were understandable and the order of questions was clear and reasonable. After that, the researcher made it sure that interaction between the interviewer and interviewees was free and that there was a good chance for the clarification of the relevant questions in the interview. Further, all the selected participants and participated in the interview were willing to participate. They were selected from the total sample of the study. They were informed that they can answer freely and their answers would be of a great importance for the present study since these responses can give the researcher the required data to achieve the objectives and to answer the research questions. The participants were interviewed one by another and each participant was given 15 minutes to answer the questions of the interview

5.3 Analysis



For the purpose of analyzing the data collected via the semi-structured interview, the researcher used a thematic analysis in which themes were employed to underlie the forms of address (honorifics and titles) used by Anbari Arabic speakers. Adopting such type of analysis, five steps of the analysis were followed which ranged from specific to the general. These steps included multiple levels (Creswell, 2009). In the first step, organizing, storing, classifying the raw data were accomplished. In the second step, a general sense of the ideas stated by the interviewee was made and then possible implications could be done. The third step of the analysis involved detailed analysis by making coding of the organized data. The fourth step included the integration and summery of the data where those data were packed in the form of an organizational scheme of tables, diagrams and figures. The final step contained an interpretation and understanding of the data (Ibid., 2009). Thus, comparisons of the findings were given and the objectives of the study also were achieved.

a. Honorifics and titles used to address family members

When addressing family members (the small family), as shown in table (1), the results indicated that 52.8 % of the participants used the kinship term 'yaba' (my father), 33.3 % used 'baba' (my father) to address their fathers. Whereas 11.1% used the term 'hajji' (pilgrim) and 2.8 % used a tecknonym. In addressing mother, 58.3 % of the participants used the kinship term 'yumma' (my mother), 30.6 % used the term 'mama' (my mother), 8.3 % used 'hajjiya' (pilgrim) and 2.8 % used a tecknonym term. It is clear that the majority of the participants (male and female) used the forms 'yaba' and 'yumma' to address their fathers and mothers. The use of these forms of address may be found or heard only in the west of Iraq, particularly in Anbar governorate.

When addressing the elder brother, half of the participants (50 %) used the first name of the elder brother, for example, Ahmed, Ali, Saad, and so on. The use of tecknonyms was the second term respectively used by the participants, for example, they use a tecknonym such as 'abu Zaid' (father of Zaid) and so on. Some participants (13.9 %) used a nickname to address their elder brother. When they address their younger brother, (47.2 %) of the participants used his first name, while (52.8 %) used a nickname. When addressing the elder sister, (58.3 %) of the respondents used her first name, whereas a nickname was used by (19.5 %), and a teknonym was used by (22.2 %). In the case of addressing their younger sister, (52.8 %) of the participants used the first name, and (47.2 %) used a nickname.



Table (1) Honorifics and titles used to address family members

Addressee	Term	Male	Female	Total	Freq.
Father	Baba	3	9	12	33.3 %
	Yaba	9	10	19	52.8 %
	Hajji	3	1	4	11.1 %
	Teknonym	1	0	1	2.8 %
Mother	Mama	2	9	11	30.6 %
	Yumma	10	11	21	58.3 %
	Hajjiya	2	1	3	8.3 %
	Teknonym	1	0	1	2.8 %
Elder brother	First name	8	10	18	50 %
	Nickname	2	3	5	13.9 %
	Teknonym	6	7	13	36.1 %
Younger brother	First name	9	8	17	47.2 %
	Nickname	7	12	19	52.8 %
Elder sister	First name	9	11	21	58.3 %
	Nickname	3	4	7	19.5 %
	Teknonym	3	5	8	22.2 %
Younger sister	First name	10	9	19	52.8 %
	Nickname	6	11	17	47.2 %

b. Addressing grandfather and grandmothers

As shown in table (2), the participants (83.3 %) used the term 'jeddi' (my grandfather), and (5.6 %) used 'hajji' (pilgrim), whereas the term 'yaba' (my father) was used by (8.3 %) of the participants, the term 'nickname' was used by (2.8 %). When addressing grandmother, the majority of the participants (77.8 %) used the term 'jedda' (my grandmother), and the term 'hajjiya' (pilgrim) was used by (8.3 %) of the participants, they (8.3 %) used the term 'yumma' (my mother) and a nickname was used by (5.6 %).



Table (2) Honorifics and titles used to address grandfathers, grandmothers, uncles and aunts

Addressee	Term	Male	Femal e	Tota	Freq.
Grandfather	Jeddi	14	16	30	83.3 %
	Hajji	1	1	2	5.6 %
	Yaba	1	2	3	8.3 %
	Nickname	0	1	1	2.8 %
Grandmother	Jedda	12	14	28	77.8 %
	Hajjiya	2	1	3	8.3 %
	Yumma	1	2	3	8.3 %
	Nickname	1	1	2	5.6 %
Paternal uncle/ Maternal uncle	Ammi/ Khali	13	16	29	80.6 %
	First name	2	1	3	8.3 %
	Teknonym	1	1	2	5.6 %
	Nickname	1	1	2	5.6 %
Paternal aunt/ Maternal aunt	Amma/ Khala	10	14	24	66.7 %
	First name	2	3	5	13.9 %
	Teknonym	3	1	4	11.1 %
	Nickname	1	2	3	8.3 %

c.

Addressing paternal and maternal uncles and aunts

According to the results shown in table (2), the majority of the participants (80.6 %) reported that they use the term 'ammi/ khali' (my uncle) to address their paternal and maternal uncles, whereas only (8.3 %) used the first name to address their paternal and maternal uncles, a teknonym was used by (5.6 %) of the participants, and a nickname was also used by (5.6 %) in addressing their uncles. When addressing paternal and maternal aunts, most of the participants (66.7 %) stated that they use the term 'amma/ khala' (aunt), while (13.9 %) of the participants answered they use the first name to address their aunts. In addition, a



teknonym was used by (11.1 %) of the respondents and a nickname was used by (8.3 %).

d. Addressing elder and younger relatives

Moreover, the results in table (3) indicate that elder, same age and younger relatives are usually addressed via different forms of honorifics and titles. When addressing elder male relatives, the highest number of the participants (44.4 %) used the term 'ammi/ khali' (my uncle), and they (30.6 %) used teknonyms, while the term 'hajji' (pilgrim) was used by (16.7 %) of the participants. Some participants (8.3 %) used the first name. When addressing same age and younger male relatives, the majority of the participants (80.6 %) used the first name, and (11.1 %) used nicknames. only (8.3 %) of the participants used teknonyms. When addressing elder female relatives, the participants (44.5 %) used the term 'amma/ khala' (my aunt), and they (33.3 %) used teknonyms, the term 'hajjiya' (pilgrim) was used by (11.1 %). And the first name was used by (11.1 %) of the participants. When the participants address same age and younger female relatives, the majority of the participants (77.8 %) used the first name, while (13.9 %) used nicknames, and teknonyms were used by (8.3 %).

Table (3) Honorifics and titles used to address elder and younger relatives

Addressee	Term	Male	Femal e	Tota	Freq.
Elder relatives (Male)	Teknonym	8	3	11	30.6 %
	Ammi/ Khali	6	10	16	44.4 %
	Hajji	2	4	6	16.7 %
	First name	2	1	3	8.3 %
Same age and younger relatives (Male)	First name	12	17	29	80.6 %
	Nickname	3	1	4	11.1 %
	Teknonym	1	2	3	8.3 %
Elder relatives	Amma/ Khala	7	9	16	44.5 %



(Female)	Teknonym	6	6	12	33.3 %
	Hajjiya	2	2	4	11.1 %
	First name	1	3	4	11.1 %
Same age and younger relatives (Female)	First name	12	14	28	77.8 %
	Nickname	3	2	5	13.9 %
	Teknonym	1	2	3	8.3 %

e. Addressing neighbors

According to the results in table (4), elder male neighbors were addressed using the term 'ammi/ khali' by (66.7 %) of the participants, the nick name 'hajji' was used by (16.7 %), teknonyms were used by (8.3 %), while first name was by (8.3 %) of the participants. When addressing same age and younger male neighbors, the participants (80.6 %) used the first name, and teknonyms were used by (11.1 %), whereas nicknames were used by (8.3 %). In the case of elder female neighbors, the term 'amma/ khala' (my aunt) was used by (36.1 %), and the term 'hajjiya' was used by (30.6 %), teknonyms was used by (22.2 %), and then the first name was used by (11.1 %) of the participants. In addition, when addressing same age and younger female neighbors, the participants (61.1 %) used the first name and (33.3 %) of them used nicknames while teknonyms were used by (5.6 %).

Table (4) Honorifics and titles used to address neighbors and familiar people

Addressee	Term	Male	Femal e	Tota	Freq.
Elder neighbors and familiar people	Teknonym	3	0	3	8.3 %
	Ammi/ Khali	9	15	24	66.7 %
	Hajji	3	3	6	16.7 %



(Male)	First name	1	2	3	8.3 %
Same age and younger neighbors and familiar people (Male)	First name	13	16	29	80.6 %
	Nickname	1	2	3	8.3 %
	Teknonym	2	2	4	11.1 %
Elder neighbors and familiar people (Female)	Amma/ Khala	5	8	13	36.1 %
	Teknonym	4	4	8	22.2 %
	Hajjiya	6	5	11	30.6 %
	First name	1	3	4	11.1 %
Same age and younger neighbors and familiar people (Female)	First name	10	12	22	61.1 %
	Nickname	5	7	12	33.3 %
	Teknonym	1	1	2	5.6 %

f. Addressing unfamiliar people

Table (5) shows that the participants (38.9 %) usually address elder unfamiliar male people by using the term 'hajji' and (33.3 %) of the participants used the term 'ammi/ khali', while the term 'ustath' was used by (19.5 %), and the term 'akhoya' was used by only (8.3 %) of the participants. When addressing same age and younger male unfamiliar people, the term 'akhoya' (my brother) was used by (36.1 %) of the participants, the participants (25 %) also used the term 'abu-elshabab' (father of youth), and the same number of the participants (25 %) used the term 'yewalad' (young boy), while the term 'sadiqi' (my friend) was used by (13.9 %). When addressing elder unfamiliar female people, half of the



participants (50 %) used the term 'amma/ khala', the term 'hajjiya' was used by (36.1 %), and the term 'sit' (mistress) was used by (13.9 %) of the participants. When addressing same and younger unfamiliar female people, the participants (66.6 %) used the term 'yabnaya' (girl), and the term 'binti' (my daughter) was used by (16.7), while the term 'ukhti' (my sister) was used by (16.7 %) of the participants.

Table (5) Honorifics and titles used to address unfamiliar people

Addressee	Term	Male	Femal e	Tota	Freq.
Elder unfamiliar people (Male)	Ammi/ Kha li	5	7	12	33.3 %
	Hajji	6	8	14	38.9 %
	Akhoya	2	1	3	8.3 %
	Ustath (ma ster)	3	4	7	19.5 %
Same age and younger unfamiliar people (Male)	Abu- elsh aba b	6	3	9	25 %
	Yewalad	4	5	9	25 %
	Akhoya	2	11	13	36.1 %
	Sadiqi	5	0	5	13.9 %
Elder unfamiliar people (Female)	Amma/ Kha la	6	12	18	50 %
	Sit (ma stre ss)	3	2	6	13.9 %



	Hajjiya	7	6	13	36.1 %
Same age and younger unfamiliar people (Female)	Yebnaya	8	16	24	66.6 %
	Binti	3	3	6	16.7 %
	Ukhti	5	1	6	16.7 %

g. Addressing university instructors

When addressing male doctors and masters, the participants (47.3 %) reported that they usually use the term 'doctor' to address academic instructors, and they (27.7 %) used the term 'ustath' (master), while the term 'doctor with first name' was used by (13.9 %) of the participants, and the term 'ustath with the first name' was used by (11.1 %). When addressing female doctors and masters, the term 'doctor' was used by (38.9 %) of the participants, and 'doctor with the first name' was used by (16.7 %), while the participants (19.4 %) used the term 'sit' and (25 %) of them used the term 'sit with the first name'.

Table (6) Honorifics and titles used to address university instructors

Addressee	Term	Male	Female	Total	Freq.
Doctors and masters (Male)	Doctor	7	10	17	47.3 %
	Doctor + first name	3	2	5	13.9 %
	Ustath (master)	4	6	10	27.7 %
	Ustath + first name	2	2	4	11.1 %
Doctors and masters (Female)	Doctor	7	7	14	38.9 %
	Doctor + first name	1	5	6	16.7 %
	Sit	5	2	7	19.4 %
	Sit + first name	3	6	9	25 %



6. Findings and Discussion

The present study aims to investigate the different honorifics and titles as being forms of address which are used by Anbari speakers of Arabic. In addition, the study tries to identify the communicative functions of honorifics and titles and to reveal the social factors that determine the variation in the use of honorifics and titles used by Anbari Arabic speakers. A semi-structured interview was employed to collect the data and a thematic analysis was adopted to analyze the different honorifics and titles. Hence, three main findings are recognized and discussed in accordance with the three objectives of the study.

6.1 Honorifics and titles used by speakers in Anbari society

According to the results of the present study, it has been found that Anbari speakers use different address forms represented in the different forms of honorifics and titles used in Anbari society. Within family members, the study finds that speakers there usually use more the kinship terms "yaba" and "yumma" to address their fathers and mothers. In addition, first names, nicknames and teknonyms are used among brothers and sisters. In this respect, it could be stated that first names are used more followed by nicknames and then teknonyms. The choice of one term more than another depends on the relations between family members themselves. Thus, it could be said that first name and teknonyms are used more in addressing elder brothers and sisters, while first names in addition to nicknames are used in addressing younger brothers and sisters.

Moreover, paternal or maternal, uncles, aunts and grandparents are usually addressed by kinship, such as "ammi", "khali", "amma", "khala", "jeddi", "jedda" respectively. In very few cases, the first name could be used, particularly with younger uncles and aunts. The first name is more used when a husband addresses his wife or when a wife addresses her husband. In a few cases teknonyms are used, for example, the use of 'abu fulan' (father of someone) or 'um fulan' (mother of someone) when a husband and a wife are addressing each other.

In addressing neighbors and familiar people, age and type of relation are the main factors that determine the appropriate choice of certain term. Therefore, kinship terms are usually used to address elder neighbors and familiar people, whereas first names and teknonyms are frequently used to address same age and younger neighbors and familiar people. Additionally, the kinship term "ammi/ amma", "khali/ khala" and "hajji/ hajjiya" are usually used to address strangers.



On the other hand, terms like "ukhoya/ ukhti" or "sadiqi" are more used to address younger strange or unfamiliar people.

Finally, different forms of honorifics and titles are used in the academic context. Certain academic terms, such as "doctor", "master" "ustath", and "sit" are frequently used to address a president of university, a dean of college and instructors.

6.2 Communicative functions of honorifics and titles used by Anbari speakers

The findings of the present study reveal that there are different forms of honorifics and titles used by Anbari speakers in different contexts. Certain address forms are mainly used to address superiors like kinship terms, general titles, professional titles, honorifics and teknonyms. On the other hand, first names, nicknames and referential terms are more used between equals or between those who have some sort of intimacy. Such terms show solidarity and intimacy.

Furthermore, it is found in certain contexts, that some forms cannot be frequently used. For instance, first names or nicknames are not used to address others since the social context requires certain formal forms of address. In these cases, speakers tend to choose certain address forms such as kinship terms, titles, teknonyms to show upwards. On the other hand, they use first names of endearment to express downward.

6.3 Factors that determine variation of honorifics and titles forms in Anbari society

The most effective factors that determine the various use of honorifics and titles are age, gender, social status, level of relationship, and educational status. A speaker takes into consideration the address's age when he/ she addresses others. In Anbari society, age is respect in when one is addressing others. The other important factors are the type of relation, the type of relation between interlocutors affects the choice of specific terms of address. In addition, when addressing people who have a high position or a good social status, kinship terms and some academic terms are normally used. The gender of the address has also an impact on how the address is addressed. Females are usually addressed with "ukhti" (my sister) while males could be addressed by different terms.

Conclusion and Suggestions



The main purpose of the present study is to find out the morphological forms of honorifics and titles used by Anbari Arabic speakers and to identify the communicative functions of these forms and social factors that determine such use. The results and findings of the present study indicate that the Anbari speakers use different forms of honorifics and titles to interact with each other. The study has three objectives and three research questions that have been answered in accordance with the analysis of the collected data. Accordingly, the present study reveals that the results indicate that morphological forms of honorifics and titles used by Anbari speakers are numerous varying from the use of kinship terms to the use of first names. In this respect, it could be argued that these forms are various which include the use of first names, kinship terms, teknonyms, and nicknames. Some terms show high respect represented in the use of certain terms like "doctor", "ustath" and some teknonyms, other forms of address show intimacy and endearment represented in the use of nicknames or even the first names. While other terms indicate some sort of neutral relationship between the addresser and addressee when using terms such as "akhoya" or "ukhti" and "ammi" or "khali".

In addition, the study further indicates that there are social factors that determine the use the different forms of honorifics and titles. These social factors mainly include age, gender, social status, educational status and the type of relationship. The factor 'age' plays an important role in deciding the type of address form that should be chose to address others whether they are elder, same or younger than the addresser. Besides, social status is so important to determine the most appropriate term to be used. Gender is one of the most effective factors in Anbari society since this society pays more attention to the type of terms used to address femals in particular. For example, speakers there usually tend to use terms like "ukhti" or "binti" to address same age or younger females and they use more terms like "amma" or "khala" to alder females. In addressing males, speakers have some freedom to choose suitable terms. Another factor that determines the use of certain address for is the type of relationship between people. For example, speakers always use kinship terms with family member in addition to some nicknames and teknonyms. However, they use first names or some teknonyms with neighbors and unfamiliar people.

Recommendations for Further Research

The main concern of the present study is to give findings on the morphological forms of honorifics and titles used by Anbari Arabic speakers. Despite of the fact



that there were previous studies that have been conducted in the area of the use of address forms in certain contexts. This field deserves much more investigating since it states socio- cultural and pragmatic norms and values. The present study is limited to the use of honorifics and titles in Anbari society. Based on the findings and the conclusions of the study, it is suggested that further studies can be conducted to investigate the use of these address forms in another Iraqi or Arabic dialect. In addition, it is suggested that honorifics could also be conducted in other contexts such as forensic context and so on.

References

- Agha, A. (2007). *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R. and Ford, M. (1961). Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62, 375- 385.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bussmann, H. (1996). *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. Routledge: British Library.
- Cheal, D. (2008). *Families in Today's World. A Comparison Approach*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and Mixed Approaches*. 3rd. Los angeles, London, New delhi and Singapore: Sage.
- De Klerk, V. and Bosch, B. (1997). "Nicknames of English adolescents in South Africa. *In Names*". Vol, 45. 101-118.
- Dickney, E. (1997). "Forms of address and Terms of Reference". In *Linguistics*: 33, 255- 274.
- Fasold, R. W. (1990). *The Sociolinguistics of Language: Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Language in Society*. Blackwell.
- Gramley, S. and Patzold, K. (1992). *A Survey of Modern English*. England: Clays Ltd.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.



- Hasegawn, H. (2006). "Embedded soliloquy and effective stances in Japanese". In S, Suzuki, eds.). *Emotive communication in Japanese*. Amsterdam: JOHN Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
- Horn, L. R. and Ward, G. (2006). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. New Jersey: Willey Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Ide, S. and Lakoff, R. (2005). *Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic politeness*. North America: John Benjamins B.V.
- Keating, E. (1998). *Power Sharing: Language, Gender, and social space in Pohnpei Micronesia*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Keshavarz, M. H. (2001). The role of social context, intimacy, and distance in the choice of forms of address. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2011 (148). Doi: 10. 1515/ ijsl. 2001. 015
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mandende, I. P. (2009). 'A Study of Tshivenda Personal Name'. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Pretoria: *University of South Africa*.
- Martiny, T. (1996). "Forms of address in French and Dutch: A sociopragmatic approach". In *Language Sciences*. Vol. 18. No. 3, 365- 775.
- Shibatani, M. (1999). "Honorifics". In Brown, k. and Miller, J. (eds.). *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Oxford Clarendon Press.
- Verschueren, Jef. (1992). *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2011). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (1986). *The Study of Language*. Aitchison, Jean.