

Displacement and inversion in address terms in Algerian Arabic

Khadija Belfarhi*

Abstract: The present paper discusses the extrapolation of address terms in Algerian Arabic. In particular, it sheds light on how inversion and displacement occur in address terms in the speech of Algerians. Inversion in the roles of the addressee-addresser marks the use of address terms in the informal use of language. Speakers invert the role of the addresser in a way to perform or mark a particular act. Displacement refers to the movements that some address terms underwent along similar settings. Examples are provided from real speech situations. The analysis is based on daily conversations recorded from different settings with the aim to collect a large number of address terms in their real occurrence. Inversion includes roles other than child-adult relation. Besides, the dominant roles in the domain of family direct inversion. The same dominant roles of mother and father resulted in a movement along other domains that can be similar or dissimilar.

Keywords: displacement, inversion, pragmatics, address terms, Algerian Arabic, domains

INTRODUCTION

The linguistic forms used to address others reflect not only the type of relationship between speakers but also presents in itself an extension in the address system along settings and domains of language use. Address terms represent a way of addressing others with respect to social norms and role relationships between speakers. Variation marks the choice of address terms especially in highly interactive linguistic codes. With dialects, address terms present patterns often revealing a kind of extrapolation between domains and settings of language use. In that, some address terms are displaced from a setting to another and engender specific uses of address with clear cut line along similar settings.

* Khadija Belfarhi (✉)

English Department, Badji Mokhtar- Annaba University LIPED, Algeria
e-mail: khadija_belfarhi@yahoo.com

Algerian Arabic presents a good case of extrapolation in address terms. In that, different forms of address are used in Algerian Arabic and every form performs a sociopragmatic function according to a variety of socially deictic functions, expressing such social relationships as power, status, and solidarity. There are social norms about their use. The peculiarity of AA lies in the variation of address terms that may seem contradictory from a general view although the native speaker knows that it makes sense to the social meaning it expresses.

The present paper presents two forms of extrapolation in address terms where roles are moved from their first level to another similar level termed here as displacement, and to an inverted role known in the literature as inversion. The corpus of study tried to collect all forms used in the speakers' language. The corpus is based on a form-to-function mapping.

ADDRESS TERMS IN ALGERIAN ARABIC

Address terms represent a way of initiating contact, attract others' attention or referring to them, open a communication, or used in utterances which perform simple acts such as requests and orders. They are set to the conditions of the speech situation:

When choosing an address form, the speaker needs to consider the nature of the relationship between him- or herself and the addressee and assess it with respect to two sometimes competing semantics – power and solidarity. Even then, the choice might vary depending on the setting, the formality of the event, and the presence of others. All these are related to first order indexical properties of address terms (DuFon 2010, 310).

Address terms fulfill two main functions namely deixis and social content. The former is the state of being directed at the addressee and the second defines the collocutors' relationship (Braun 2012, 296). Address terms are, therefore, conditioned by the role relationships between participants and the status of the setting. They reflect a complex system of role relationships (Trudgill 1983). Braun (2012) defines them as follows:

Forms of address are words and phrases used for addressing. They can be zero forms, nouns and pronouns and refer to the collocutor and thus contain a strong element of deixis. Often they designate the collocutor(s), but not necessarily so, since their lexical meaning can differ from or even contradict the addressee's characteristics (Braun 2012, 7).

When it comes to describe an emergent sociolinguistic practice in a dialectal context, address terms may take different shapes and present new forms in the address system often reflecting a use directed by the sociolinguistic variation of languages in Algeria. Like other Arabic dialects, Algerian Arabic developed as a sub-language of Classical Arabic and through time it was distinguished with its linguistic particularities and gained a high social dominance even in the formal settings. Almost all types of conversations are realized with Algerian Arabic combined with some interference from the French language to form the Algerian speech. In his book “linguistic history of Arabic” Owen (2009) identifies the following terms for the description of “Arabic”:

1. Proto-Arabic: the construction of proto-Arabic.
2. Pre-diasporic Arabic: a variety linked to proto-Arabic and based on the reconstruction of modern dialects.
3. Old Arabic: the complex of early written sources.
4. Classical Arabic: the endpoint of a development within the complex characteristics of old Arabic.
5. Modern standard Arabic: a largely standardized form of the Classical Arabic.
6. Dialect: Contemporary spoken Arabic is a mixture of a native dialect and the standard Arabic which is learned in schools and used in much of the Arabic media.

The dialect period is featured with the use of Algerian Arabic that despite the fact that it developed from CA, its use include new forms resulted from sociolinguistic practices of high complexity. Terms of address in AA are very important especially for expressing solidarity. They make use of different forms within a complex system of roles and relationships. Terms of address in AA fall into two categories of formal vs. informal situations. In the first, speakers opt for the use of terms that are driven the most from standard Arabic such as the terms “السيد” (Mr), السيدة (Mrs), “الآنسة” (Miss), “الآخت” (sister), “الآخ” (brother). In the informal situations, address terms differ both at the linguistic and soipragmatic levels. Variation occurs the most in those highly interactive settings wherein address terms are used in interpersonal relationships. This may include the following address terms: “آبآ” (my father), “آوآ” (my brother), “آتآ” (my sister), صآحبي (My friend), “آلد”/ “آلفل” (son), and others depending on the nature of the social speech situation.

There are situations which transcend the manipulations of formality and informality. In that, the address terms “Madame” and “Monsieur” are used in both the formal and informal settings (administration vs. coffee). The same thing for the terms used when addressing a small child. “طفل” and “ولد” (son) are common to the formal and informal settings. Likewise, the forms used for addressing an old man or old woman are quite similar. Slight differences, however, mark address terms used when a man addresses a woman and vice-versa. This stability in address terms indicates a general pattern of a face-to-face interaction defining a general use of language that serves very neutral and standard¹ speech acts that are defocalizing and serve general functions. In that, there are address terms which do not change despite the status of the setting.

The other type of address terms are more engaged and focalizing as the speaker aims from their use to express solidarity, affection, intimacy, glory, and sometimes to flaunt the addressee especially if he/she has kinship relationship with. It is often the case that a man addresses another man with the plural “les hommes” instead of using his name. The aim here is to praise someone’s act with the use of the plural form of a noun. The address term becomes in itself a committing act when the addressee selects one form instead of another for the aim to achieve something out of its use. The following utterances illustrate:

- (1) ā‘tini la carte ya lḥaḡa. (Give me the card, lḥaja)
- (2) Tfadal sadiki. (Take my friend)
- (3) ḡarti. (My neighbor)
- (4) Šḥabi (My friend)

In (1), the speaker addresses an old woman with “lḥaḡa” (a woman who performed the pilgrimage) which is a neutral act serving a very objective function. In (2) the act is more engaged. The use of “sadiki” brings a kind of solidarity and sympathy. When used the speaker aims from it more than addressing the speaker but it performs an act featured with the preparatory condition as the speakers know each other before. All makes the whole act engaged. A fourth condition adds to the previous ones is future commitment and can be defined as the maintaining of future relationship. The same thing can be said for

¹ Haverkate, in his work on reference and referential strategies talked about standard strategies through which speakers do not wish to explicitly focus on the way to which they assess their interactional relation with the hearer (1989, 51). The point in the present paper is at a macro level concerning a standard way of addressing neutral and defocalizing.

(3) and (4). When one addresses a woman or a man with “*ġarti/ ġari*” (my neighbor (female); my neighbor (male)), he/she reveals from the addressing a type of relationship based on solidarity and sympathy, and, therefore, performs a full act of speech which satisfies the preparatory, the sincerity and the essential conditions in addition to future commitment since the role relationship keeps on in the future. The present paper aims to show how address terms undergo a process of extrapolation by generating the use of some terms to other domains and settings yet not necessarily similar in function. It is about addressing by *inversion* and *displacement*.

Inversion in Address Terms

Inversion occurs in role relationships when speakers do not address the addressee directly with a label referring to him or herself but rather reflecting upon the addresser’s label. When speakers get enrolled in interpersonal relationships, and perform speech acts based on solidarity and sympathy, they may make use of inversion when addressing someone with whom they show sympathy.

The work of Braun on address inversion attracted recently researches’ interest in the study of the different forms of inversion in languages. In particular, the phenomenon of the disconformities between the address term and its literal meaning is taken as illogical. Braun (2012, 309) defines address inversion as “the reciprocation of a senior kinship term or a superior status term to the junior/inferior of the dyad (...). It is restricted rather with regard to its contexts: in most of the languages concerned, address inversion is used for expressing affection and authority, especially in talking to children”. Address inversion is a special pattern of nominal address. This phenomenon occurs the most with fictive kinship. In Arabic a senior male unknown for the speaker can be addressed as ‘ami (my uncle). The inversion occurs, too, in other directions like when a senior male addresses a small child with “haya ‘am’ ”. The speaker addresses the small child by reflecting on himself. “Haya ‘am’” is literally translated as “come to your uncle”. But its real meaning is “come to your uncle”. The addresser inverts his status as an uncle to the addressee to show more of affection towards the child. “‘amou” (his uncle) is extrapolated from the kinship domain to another domain where it becomes possible to address a man as “ ‘ami” (my uncle) even if he is not a real uncle. Inversion in address terms occurs in interpersonal transactions and supplement information not only on reference but also provides

information on the addressee and the type of relationship he has with the addresser as well as the type of social interaction. In this respect Parkinson (1985, 1) says that address terms: “encode much information about who the speaker believes he is, who he believes the addressee is, what he thinks their relationship is, and what he thinks he is doing by saying what he is saying”. The social meaning of inversion is set to the two aspects of intimacy/affection and difference in authority.

Address inversion is not set to logical rules as speakers may address with their own names reflecting a particular relationship. In that, the address term is not conditioned by its lexical meaning: “address inversion is a pattern where the literal meaning does not even symbolically correspond to the addressee’s status or role. What makes address inversion so satisfying is exactly the fact that the form of address in inversion may be entirely contradictory to what the addressee represents” (Parkinson 1985, 296). Researches could not formulate universal rules of address because subrules define uses in context-dependent interaction. The reciprocation principle does not hold and leads even to question the usage of address terms between confusion and decay. However, Braun’s view is more extensional and takes reciprocity in terms of the functions of affectionate intimacy and authoritative stance. Inversion does not reach high frequency and can easily remain unnoticed. For Helmig (1982), the reciprocation principle does not hold in describing inversion and reciprocation is rather partial (as cited in Jones 2011, 187).

Inversion in address terms varies in languages. It is rule-governed despite the disconformities between the address term and its meaning. Algerian Arabic presents worth studying forms of part-reciprocal use along an interactional model that brings into discussion interactions of the type brother-brother, husband-wife, wife-husband, mother-son, mother-daughter and others. Inversion occurs also in roles including the domain of friendship where affectionate intimacy brings speakers in role relationships with inverting roles between participants.

Address Inversion in Kinship

The address terms used in kinship are conditioned by power and authority as the manner a father uses for addressing his son is not similar to the manner a son uses to address his father or mother. The basic terms are “ولدي” (weldi) (my son) for a father addressing his son and “بنتي” (benti) (my daughter) for mother addressing her daughter.

This pattern kept the same since long time and the changes brought in the dialect period did not affect all the varieties of Arabic as they make a similar use of it. This can be referred to the universal aspect of these basic terms of address. Nevala (2003, 158), in her diachronic study of English address terms in English family, found that the use of “my son” and “my daughter” by fathers did not differ much from those of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Not only do these address terms keep the same use and resist to variation and change, but they also resulted in an inversion which is exclusive to the roles father-son and mother-daughter. When a mother addresses her son, the expression “baba-waldi” (my father-my son) is used. And the same expression is used when a father addresses his son. The word “baba” (baba) is added to “waldi” to emphasize an affectional act. This act is already marked in showing affection to the father. The mother then adds the word “baba” to “waldi” to emphasize a similar affection. Other examples of a mother/father addressing their sons and daughters include the following:

(5) Baba-ḥ’ya (my father-my brother) When addressing a son

(6) Maa- ḥti (my mother-my sister) When addressing a daughter

(7) Yema-la‘ziza (my mother-darling) When addressing a daughter

(8) Baba-la‘ziz (my father-darling) When addressing a son

It is frequent to notice the inversion in addressing within families and this inversion seems usual as speakers developed its use as the result of showing affection and intimacy. The same function of affection is used when adding “ḥ’ya” (my brother) to “baba”, “ḥti” (my sister) to “mä” and “la‘ziza” (darling) to “yema”. The second part of the address expression is in fact added by mothers to emphasize the affectional act, and to mean that the addressee has the same status of affection as her brother, her sister or her mother. The father also makes use of quite the same patterns when addressing a son or a daughter. What is noticed here is that the inversion is not itself the marker element in the address expression but its constituents which are displaced from uses that serve a similar function of affection. For example, in (5), “ḥ’ya” (my brother) and “baba” (my father) has nothing to do with the addressing who is a son of the mother and the father and neither their father nor their brother. The two meet in the expression “Baba- ḥ’ya” as the result of displacing the function of affection that the parents feel towards their sons and daughters. In that, it is also the case to hear a father addressing his small child with “haya baba” (come dad) and a mother

addresses her small child whether a male or female by using “haya mama” (come mom). These roles are displaced by being inverted upon the addressee with non-reciprocity to reflect a higher level of affection.

Daughters and sons also invert roles when addressing their parents:

(9) Baba- ḥ’ya (my father-my brother). When addressing a father

(10) Mä- ḥti (my mother-my sister). When addressing a mother

The reason for these inversions can be to reflect the same affectional act used by parents. And the most authoritative address terms become subject to inversion to express affection. In that, “Baba” (my father) is turned into “my father-my brother”; and “Mä” (my mother) is turned into “my mother-my sister”. They follow a fixed order starting with “Baba” (my father) and “Mä” (my mother) and not with other address terms such as “ḥ’ya” (my brother) and “ḥti” (my sister) because the main part in the inversion is the father and the mother. The latter allow for inversion instead of others because they are of an authoritative function. The reciprocation is partial because the second part’s meaning implies a displaced function of affection and not an actual kinship role.

Now, we examine the address inversion in kinship beyond the small family. An aunt may address her nephew with:

(11) Haya ‘and ḥalti/ ḥwila/ḥalt’ (come to my aunt)

(12) Haya ‘and ‘amti/‘mima/‘amt’ (come to my aunt)

The addressee addresses a small child with “ḥalti” (my aunt) to reflect her kinship role and to mean “come to your aunt”. The same thing for (13) below. The uncle, too, can make use of the same forms when addressing his or her nephew:

(13) Haya ‘and ḥali/ ḥal’ (come to my uncle)

(14) Haya ‘and ‘am’ (come to his uncle)

The difference here is with the expressions “ḥal” (his aunt) and “‘am’” (his uncle). They are used in an inverted way to mean literally “his uncle”. It seems odd to address with a possessive pronoun as the latter reflects upon an anonymous person according to what the expression means literally. The addressee wants to say “come to your uncle who is me”. This is especially used in mid-north of Algeria wherein even an aunt reflects the “her” upon the addressee as shown in the following examples:

(15) Haya ‘and ‘amti’ (come “to her” aunt)

It can be said that inversion in kinship relation is rooted in affection emerging from motherhood and fatherhood, and it is displaced in other sub uses to keep the same affectional use since speakers make use of it

for both males and females. Besides, it has a systemic way seen in the distribution of the parts-address forms. The latter are not used haphazardly.

The rules developed conventionally through time whereby speakers know that “ḥ’ya”, for example, combines with “baba” but not with “‘ami” or “ḥali” (my uncle) when a father addresses his son:

- (16) Father: winek baba ḥ’ya?
 *winek baba ‘ami?
 *winek baba ḥali?

Son: I am coming.

And that “ḥti” (my sister) combines with “mä” (my mother) and not with “ḥali” or (my aunt) “‘amti” (my aunt):

- (17) Mother: A mä ḥti
 *A mä ḥalti

However, for “la’ziza” (darling) it can combine freely with any female kinship noun since it is an adjective and the same thing for “la’ziz” (darling) with kinship male nouns, as shown below:

- (18) Mä la’ziza
 ḥti la’ziza
 ḥalti la’ziza
 ‘amti la’ziza
(19) Baba la’ziz
 ḥouya la’ziz
 ḥali la’ziz
 ‘ami la’ziz

Address Inversion in Friendship Settings

The part-form address “ḥ’ya” is extended beyond the kinship use, and has both a fraternal and religious stem. In religion, it is very common to hear the word “أخي” (aḥi) (my brother) in Standard Arabic which is rooted in the saying that “Muslims are brothers in Islam”. “Aḥi” (my brother), then, becomes used when males address each other. Through time, it was morphologically modified into “ḥ’ya”. In the centre of Algeria particularly Algiers and its outskirts, “ḥ’ya” is inverted into “ḥ” which is literally translated as his brother: ḥ’+reflexive. But its meaning keeps the same as “ḥ’ya”:

- (20) winek ya ḥ’? Where are you brother?
(21) Aji ḥ’? Come brother!

The female analogues also exist:

- (22) winek ya ḥt’ (where are you my sister)

(23) aji ḥ't'. (Come my sister)

However, the reflexive “ḥ” and “ḥt” apply just with the second singular pronoun and the inversion by means of the reflective “ ’ ” does not apply when addressing the plural:

(24) Winkom ya ḥ'awa? (Where are you brothers)

Terms like “mä” (my mother) and “baba” (my father) form an address system of a higher order that is not set to the pragmatic evaluation, and resist even to the manipulation of formality and informality by serving a general use within the domain of family. These address terms resist to the constraints of the discourse situation since the latter does not generate particular forms. In that, the variation in the discourse situation does not affect the choice of the address terms. This can be attributed to the stability in use generated in some social groupings where a higher order orients the use of language which derives from the dominant factors of motherhood, fatherhood and brotherhood which resulted in dominant address terms. The same address terms “mä” and “baba” direct inversion in the sense that they act as the main part in the inverted item and fulfill at the same time affectional and authoritative functions.

Displacement

As seen above in inversion, displacement occurs in the movement of some address terms or part-address terms. For example, the function of “ḥ'ya” (my brother) is taken up from the domain of family to the domain of friendship. In the latter, it is more frequent and dominant to use “ḥ'ya” (my brother) when interlocutors know each other since it serves a general use more or less neutral within the scope of expressing intimacy and sympathy. It is the case of taking up the function fulfilled by “ḥ'ya” (my brother) in the domain of friendship to another domain. This can be described as an extension in the function of this address term into another domain that shares much with the domain of family for the fact that participants share a brotherhood-like relationship. It is, however, more appropriate to talk about displacement in the function of the address “ḥ'ya” (my brother) from one domain to another facilitated by the existence of similar conditions of use (i.e. brotherhood), which allowed for the moving.

Displacement was first identified by Hockette as the ability to talk about what it is not currently present. This is displacement in time. What is the case here is displacement in the function of a language form from one level of use to another. It is displacement that occurs in

two domains sharing some common conditions including the brotherhood-like relation between speakers, closeness and preparatory conditions. The domain of family has the dominant mark of kinship relations including motherhood, fatherhood and brotherhood. The latter is displaced to the domain of friendship as it presents a model of interaction based on unreal relationship between speakers and this relationship is considered to be similar to the state of brotherhood for the fact that friends are close to each other by knowing each other before.

Other displacements include addressing with the terms “yema” (my mother) and “baba” (my father) which are like “ḥ’ya” (my brother) displaced from the domain of family to other domains, and through time they acquired a general function of addressing as they are used in all social situations and in all settings including both the formal and the informal. The reason of displacement is rooted in the tradition of showing high sympathy and respect to old people and to consider them in the position of parents. Another reason is religious, standing on the fact that parents, especially the mother, are emphasized for high respect and sympathy in the holy text (Quran), a reason why people, in general, look at oldies as their parents and address them in the same way they address their real parents. Here, the displacement occurred from the domain of family to other social domains. Parents are given high importance in Quran and their obedience is considered to be obedience to god. Through time, the address terms “baba” (my father) and “yema” (my mother) moved to other domains and get used to address oldies in general. This occurred, too, to the address terms “lḥaḡ” and “lḥaḡa” whereby their first use was linked to pilgrimage. A man is called “lḥaḡ” and a women is called “lḥaḡa” when he or she realizes the fifth pillar of Islam namely pigrimlage. The status of the latter is displaced and used as a way of addressing old people with the labled “lḥaḡ”/ “lḥaḡa” to give them high respect and sympathy.

However, the use of “yema” and “baba” is more common and spread than “ḥ’ya” as the latter keeps used more in the informal domains and more or less in official uses such as, for example, the court and education. It is odd, therefore, to address a policeman with “ḥ’ya”. By contrast, it happens frequently to hear a police man addressing an old woman with “yema” (my mother) and an old man with “baba” (my father). Thus, despite the status of formality, the address terms “baba” and “yema” keep a general aspect yet free from the social status.

Other Displacements

Other displacements that occurred in address terms from one level to another include the use of terms that are driven from kinship relations as well as religion. These terms are used to refer to the unknown addressee in social situations when speakers do not know each other. Consider:

(25) A: Ya M'ḥamed advancer šway. (Go on Mohamed).

(26) A: Haz ya ben'ami. (Take my cousin).

The word "M'ḥamed" refers to the prophet. People in Algeria use this name as an address term when addressing a person unknown to the addressee in a very temporal context. This is used when men address each other in fulfilling social functions of language use such as, for example, putting gasoil on cars. It can be used with orders:

(27) A: Ya M'ḥamed avancez!

(28) A: Garez ya M'ḥamed!

And it happens to use this address term to complain about something by adding a part-form address "si":

(29) A: Ya si M'ḥamed avancez!

The other word "ben'ami" is the literal translation of "my cousin". This address term is used when the addresser and addressee think they have something in common like when both descend from the same city and meet in another city, or like when they have the same ethnic belonging, or when they share a far kinship relation. The two forms of address originate in another domain and got displaced. The address term "M'ḥamed" is displaced from the religious domain to the general use serving general social functions. Likewise, the address term "ben'ami" has been displaced from the domain of family to general addressing. However, what is peculiar here is that the displacement occurred without the necessity that the target domains share similar conditions of language use; in that, the domain of religion and the domain of shopping have almost nothing in common yet the address term "M'ḥamed" is displaced from the domain of religion to the domain of shopping. The same thing IS for the address term "ben'ami" which is displaced, too, along two domains that share a few conditions of language use, and wherein speakers' goals differ greatly.

Displacement in Temporary Titles

Temporal titles are used when the context of language use is temporal, and concerns the use of some address terms which are likely to fulfill

the function they are used for within a context conditioned by time and space. As notes Hanks (2009, 121), “the aspects of discourse in the temporal or “emergent” context arise from production and reception as ongoing processes, and pertains to verbally mediated activity, interaction, copresence, temporality, in short context as a phenomenal, social, and historical activity”. The addresser addresses the addressee with a language form that is taken from another level, and since it serves a similar function, it is displaced temporarily in a particular context. Here, too, it is about extending the function of the address term to another order. This occurs the most in those social situations where both the addressee and addresser meet for a very short time and generally do just greet each other. For example, a man may address his friend as “ḥbibī” (darling) when he meets him walking. This is a temporal use since the expression is displaced from being used romantically when a woman addresses her husband as “ḥabībī” ‘my beloved’ (Erwin 2002) to another setting which shares with some aspects. It becomes used between men addressing each other just within this emergent context, using shortened forms. If the same persons meet in another setting, the expression “ḥbibī”, then, will lose sense, and other address terms will be rather used as the social situation will imply contextual factors centering on groundedness.

Temporality makes the choice of the address term fulfilling both the principles of quality and politeness. Consider:

(30) A₁: -ḥbibī (darling) -In crossing the road, A meets his friend.

-In driving, A meets his friend in another car.

-In shopping, A meets his friend in the check-out line.

(31) A₂: -āhla saḥbi (welcome my friend) -A meets the addressee in a coffee.

-A meets the addressee in the cue in the post.

-A meets the addressee in the sports hall.

In the two situations, the addressee uses different forms for addressing despite the stability of the informal situation. Here, it is the context which is temporal in (30) and continued in (31), and acts upon the choice of the address term.

Other displacements include the use of common nouns taken from Arabic and put in French but in a plural form and used to address both

a man and groups of men. It happens to hear one addressing another with “les hommes” (men) to mark a brave act. This address term is taken from Arabic “rġal” (الرجال). It is used as a mass noun referring to both the singular and the plural. But being used in dialectical Arabic, this term originates even in Classical Arabic wherein it is frequent to read it in the Quran. It is, therefore, displaced to the informal domain to mark braveness. Examples of its use include the following:

(32) Haya les hommes (Let’s go men)

When a man is addressed singularly, the word “raġel” is rather used. But, here, it is not used to mark his gender but rather to mark one of two: either to address a man who is known like when saying “haw ġa raġel” (the man comes), or to address a particular man for the aim to stress his bravery and courage in general. This happens the most in short interactions in a temporal context when one can be addressed with an utterance using the word “raġel” to maintain sympathy and solidarity. It is frequent to hear a seller addressing a man with just “eraġel” to mean “what do you want to take?” Or, to use an adjective: “raġel tayab” (good man). The use of temporal titles for addressing others does not engage speakers in any conversation, and they are used to mark short instances of speech. Besides, the context is not conditioning the use of address terms and the opposite seems true as the address term itself creates a temporal context.

Displacements in Verb Forms of Address

It is often the case to hear one addressing another with the verb “asma’ ” (listen), which acts as an address term used the most between speakers who know each other by means of kinship, friendship and role relationships. The verb “asma’ ” (listen) is displaced from the literal meaning of asking somebody to listen to what someone is saying to an address term used informally to take the attention of the hearer. When used with a direct object, the verb “asma’ ” refers to the verb “to listen”. However, when used alone, it acts as an address term because the personal pronoun is dropped. For example, in French, the personal pronoun is dropped before the verb “viens” which is considered as an address term (Braun 2012, 8). Algerian Arabic has a facultative subject pronoun, and in cases where the pronoun is used, it for the aim of emphasis:

(33) Nta asma’ (you listen)

(34) Asma’ (listen)

The address term “asma’ ” becomes a means of addressing due to its high frequent use in daily conversations. Through time, it acquired the function of an address term. However, it is worth noting that this address term is conditioned by the role relationship factor between interlocutors; in that, it is used only when speakers share intersubjectivity. It is impolite to use it in formal domains or when one addresses an old man or women.

CONCLUSION

The address system in AA is subject to high diversity manifested in inversion and displacement. In that, the social roles are pragmatically manipulated in the way that address terms are not fixed to users according to fixed roles. One may address the same person differently in the same day depending on the context which is conditioned by time and space. Forms of extrapolation emerged as the result of extension in high order address terms which generate the use of address within social domains including most importantly family and friendship. Inversion in AA is a part-reciprocal use in a systemic way that occurs not only in child-adult interaction but in higher order including other types of relationships such as father-son/daughter and mother-son/daughter. In that, female analogues occur in the same way as that of males. Displacement emerged in the movement of the kinship relations of motherhood, fatherhood and brotherhood along domains and settings of language use. The latter may share similarities which can be a reason behind displacement as it is the case with the displacement of “ḥ’ya” (my brother) from the family domain to friendship domain, as well as the displacement of the address term “ḥbibi” (darling) which was displaced from the domain of family (i.e. wife-husband) to the friendship domain (friend-friend). However, it is not a necessary condition that displacement occurs along domains that share similar conditions of language use, and wherein speakers’ goals differ greatly (example of “ben‘ami”).

REFERENCES:

- Braun, Friederike. 2012. *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Walter de Gruyter.
- DuFon, Margaret A. 2010. “The acquisition of terms of address in a second language”. In A. Trosborg (ed.). *Pragmatics across Languages and Cultures*. Walter de Gruyter, pp. 309-332.
- Erwin, Wallace M. 2002. *A Short Reference Grammar of Iraqi Arabic*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Hanks, William F. 2009. "Context, communicative". In J. L. Mey, *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. Elsevier, pp. 119-132.
- Haverkate, Henk. 1984. *Speech Acts, Speakers and Hearers: Reference and Referential Strategies in Spanish*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Jones, William J. 2011. *German Kinship Terms (750-1500): Documentation and Analysis*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Nevala, Minna. 2003. "Address and subscription formulae in English family correspondence from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century". In I. Taavitsainen & A. H. Jucker, *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. John Benjamin's Publishing, pp. 147-176.
- Parkinson, Dilworth B. 1985. *Constructing the Social Context of Communication: Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Owens, Jonathan. 2009. *A Linguistic History of Arabic*. University Oxford Press.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1983. *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.