1. INTRODUCTION

Ever since its publication, Brown/Gilman's (1960) article on address forms has been taken extensively as a model and prompted the path for the appearance of a large number of similar studies on a variety of speech communities (e.g. Bates/Bening 1975; Geertz 1972; Lambert/Tucker 1976; Ervin-Tripp 1972; Philipsen/Huspek 1985; Braun 1988; Mühlhäusler/Harré 1990; Sanda 1993; McGivney 1993; Dickey 1997). In their study on the pronoun of power and solidarity, Brown/Gilman dealt with the usage of the 2nd person pronoun in French, German, Italian and Spanish. One of the most prominent results of their study was that the T/V pronoun usage is constrained by two social elements: power and solidarity. These terms were originally introduced into sociolinguistics by the social psychologist Roger Brown (see Brown/Gilman 1960; Brown/Ford 1961).

According to Brown/Gilman (1960) and Brown/Ford (1961), speech has several devices for signaling power and solidarity. Among these is the use in French of the pronouns tu and vous, both meaning 'you' and both singulars, though vous is also plural. Brown/Gilman (1960) have shown that the norms for choosing between tu and vous in the singular are precisely the same as those for choosing between first name only and title plus family name in English. Tu was found to be used prototypically with close intimate, and vous to a distant superior. In both cases it has been observed that a number of social factors such as acquaintanceship, intimacy, age, and occupational status or rank are very much responsible for the choice of a particular pattern rather than the other.

In a later stage a huge number of studies relating to English or other European languages have appeared (cf. Fasold 1990; Wardhaught 1998). The bulk of these studies focused on power and solidarity and their effect on language choice. Dickey (1997: 1), for example, was aware of the bias towards English and the other European languages when he wrote that the initial concentration on standard European languages such as French, German, Spanish, and English has been superseded by an awareness of the usefulness of other languages such as Arabic, Polish, and Korean. Dickey adds that, of course, these languages are not inherently any more useful than French or German; but given that much has now been written on the address systems of a variety of European languages, people working on address terms are finding that the most interesting and unexpected results may be obtained from languages as different as possible from those which have already been studied (see also McGivney 1993; Oyetade 1995).
2. THE STUDY

Even though much work has been done on address norms in different speech communities, there has been scarcity of literature dealing with this issue in Arab speech communities in terms of the perceived social relationship that exists between individuals. Apart from Parkinson's (1985) study on terms of address in Egyptian Arabic, address norms in the Arab world has only been touched on by Farghal/Shakir (1994) in their work which focused primarily on kinship terms, with a minimal reference to honorific terms as norms of address.

Although Farghal/Shakir's work has revealed some interesting and valid conclusions with regards to the use of kinship terms, the study did not introduce an analysis of other aspects of this phenomenon, which are not restricted only to kinship and a few other relational terms. So, a sociolinguistic analysis of address norms as they are used by Jordanian speakers in their social context, is essential for a better understanding of the language and the sociocultural factors governing its use.

2.1. Objectives

This is a descriptive study of address terms in Jordanian Arabic (JA). The major aim of this investigation is then to provide a description of address norms in Jordanian society in relation to the social context in which they are used. The present study assumes that the use of address norms in JA is not random, but rather functional, structured and rule-governed. That is to say, the use of address terms in this social context is expected to be governed by a number of sociological factors. So, an attempt will be made in this study to discover what type of linguistic and/or extralinguistic factors may affect the use of address terms, and their distribution in the repertoire of Jordanian speakers in terms of such sociological factors as social distance, socio-economic status, age, sex, and occupation.

2.2. A sociolinguistic background on Jordanian society

To understand more fully the relationship between language and society, it is helpful to briefly give an idea about the society in which linguistic norms are used. In any ongoing relationships certain common rules, values, and characteristic verbal and nonverbal patterns develop as a natural sequence of reciprocal data processing (Ruben 1984). In this regard, Ruben also adds that:

"As casual friendships between individuals evolve toward greater intimacy, each person adapts to the communication patterns, rules and maps of each other. In a process of compromise and negotiation of which the individuals involved are only partially aware, the body of join rules, habits, greeting forms, symbols, knowledge and standardized meanings are forged in a developing relationship. This standardization and patterning occur in a very natural way, as the individuals involved adopt over time to one another and their environment."

(Ruben 1984: 86)
Jordanian society is a case in point where three groups of people from three different regional origins form the population of the country. The first group of Jordanians are those who lived in the country long before the introduction of Palestinians. And second, Jordanians of Palestinian origin who can be divided into two main groups in terms of regional origin: those who came to the East Bank from the large urban centers in Palestine, and those who came from the central part (the rural areas) of Palestine.

Socially, these three groups of people, who form the major population of Jordan, can be described at present as one nation. Social interaction between them has begun to generate social change at all levels of life and in all directions. Each group without exception has begun to give up some of its customs, habits, and traditions in favor of others from one of the other groups.

Linguistically speaking, like all other speech communities in the Arab world, the one under investigation has two major varieties of Arabic: a spoken language (dialects) and a literary one (the classical language) (see Ferguson 1959). So, it is a diglossic speech community. Jordanian Arabic, which comprises three colloquial varieties, is the native spoken language of all people in Jordan. These are the Urban (the dialect spoken by Jordanians of Palestinian urban origin), the Fellahi (the dialect spoken by Jordanians of Palestinian rural origin), and the Horani or Bedouin dialect, the local dialect of the country.1 All three varieties form an integral part of what is called the Syrio-Palestinian family of dialects. Although they differ from one another in terms of pronunciation, and to a lesser extent, lexicon, such difference does not hinder intelligibility among the Jordanian speech community members. As far as the terms of address are concerned, the three groups of speakers tend to use almost the same norms of address, though a slight difference in their use can be noticed between the Horani/Bedouin dialect on one side, and the Fellahi and Urban dialects on the other. Jordanian society is thus characterized by having a great deal of heterogeneity in terms of people and language. It is a modern society, which is still in the making, particularly, in terms of sociocultural background and language use (see Al-Khatib 1988). A study of address norms in this particular society is then essential for a better understanding of the language, and the trends of change, taking place. It is to this effect that the present study aims to make a contribution.

2.3. Data collection

Dickey (1997) has reported that early studies of forms of address were often conducted by written questionnaires administered in the absence of the linguist, and the data were not always checked against any other form of evidence. In some other cases, the data were col-

---

1 Horani is a name derived from Horaan plain, which forms an integral part of the northern region of Jordan.
lected from interviews and/or observation. Dickey (1997) criticizes these methods on the grounds that, as Labov (1972) puts it, people who know that their language is being scrutinized or even observed, do not speak as they would in other situations (Dickey 1997: 2). Dicky therefore believes that conclusions are much more likely to be valid if they are based on data collected in a variety of ways. Among these is the method employed by Oyetade (1995) which seems to be in line with the sociolinguistic technique of Labov (1972). In Oyetade's study the data were derived from short radio and TV plays and from direct observation of actual usage as well, followed by unobtrusive note-taking at every opportunity, to record the terms utilized by dyads in a given situation.

The method of data collection used in the present study is modeled after that employed by Oyetade (1995) and Adeniran (1990), among others. The data are composed of two main portions. The first portion consists of video tape-recording made by myself during a period extending for a year of TV series, plays, conversations, discussions and debates. At least two plays and several episodes taken from various famous TV series were tape-recorded. The material recorded yielded a huge number of address norms used in a multidirectional mode by people of different ages, genders, status and origin backgrounds.

The works from which the data were collected depicted people belonging to different walks of life. Authors, who intended to represent a cross-section of population, including people belonging to different socio-economic status created the texts used in the play and the series. The reason why I collected the data from the media was that the plays and TV series reflect the life style and social pattern of Jordanian people. Among the series used for the purpose of investigation (four TV popular series) are *harit ?abu ?awad* (Abu Awad's Alley), a famous serial consisting of 50 half-hour episodes, that was presented on TV weekly; *?al*îlmu ?uur* (Education and Enlightenment), *?alju?uur ?alTayebah* (The Good-natured Ancestors), *?alayl ?alTawiil* (The Long Night). The tape-recorded discussions and debates were also taken from the following Arabic TV programs: A View Point, Face to Face, encounter, and On Air Together.

The second portion of data was collected by employing the Hymesian ethnographic approach which was used successfully by Hymes (1964, 1972) and many others (e. g. Gumperz 1971; Blom/Gumperz 1972; Wolfson 1983). This corpus of data was derived from direct and personal observation of actual usage, followed by recording my observations and the terms used by individuals in face-to-face interactions in varied speech events: family gatherings, wedding ceremonies, parties, shopping gatherings etc. It is also worth mentioning that the data were collected from participants who were not aware that their speech could be used for the purpose of study. By using this method I was able to side-step the 'observer's paradox' (Labov 1972).
3. DATA ANALYSIS

Personal introspection based on a lifelong experience with Jordanian society, combined with a careful examination of the data, suggests that some of the address norms in JA are used more often than others, and that the choice between them appears to be socially constrained. To account for these deferential and selective patterns of address norms, the literature suggests (see, for example, Brown/Gilman 1960; Ervin-Tripp 1972; Oyetade 1995) that for each speech community a complex set of elements work together to influence speakers decisions as to which form of address they may use, how to use them, and how to interpret and retain the information pertaining to their use. A great many of these factors have to do with the nature and socio-cultural background of each society.

In light of these assumptions, I shall examine and analyze the diverse aspects of address norms in JA. Addresses in JA can be classified broadly into five main categories: pronouns, names, kin terms, titles, and occupational terms. In this section, I will take up each category separately, and give some examples from the collected data.

3.1. Pronouns

Pronouns as address terms are usually used at the beginning of interaction. From the outset, it should be noted that all Jordanians tend to utilize the same pronominal patterns, irrespective of their regional origin, status, or other sociological factors. An examination of the data shows that pronouns in JA appear to play grammatical role in the language but not significant social functions. That is, the use of pronouns in JA has nothing to do, for example, with the familiarity/distance scale or the scale of respect/lack of respect. Also it has been noticed that the JA address system contains no trace of any type of T/V (i.e., tu/vous) distinction. In the present study, I found that most pronouns have nothing to do honorifically with signaling the dissimilarity in the status of interactants.

However, among the few honorific uses that were shown in the data is the non-reciprocal use of pronouns among the elderly on one side, and the young on the other, namely although it is usual for a father to address his son by using the pronouns ?inta 'you' or huwa 'he', it is unusual for a son to address his father in the same way. A father should be addressed by using a kin term like baba 'father'. It is also important to note that the 2nd and 3rd person pronouns can be combined with an honorific title for the purpose of addressing a high ranking or an older person with whom one is involved in dyadic relationship, as in the utterance given below:

1) mumkin hadritak ta'tini masrufi!
possible excellency-your give-me pocket money-my (son – father)

'Would your Excellency give me my pocket money, please?'
So, neither a father nor a senior male or female member in a family can be addressed by using the 2nd or 3rd person pronoun. The same is also true of people of wide authority such as a university lecturer, a manager or a high-ranking official. Such people are more likely to be addressed by using a pronoun along with an honorific title like *hadritak, janabak, sa'adat* etc., all of which mean 'excellency'.

3.2. Names

Traditionally, Jordanian people tend to address each other by using names. Personal names in JA are unique and meaningful, in the sense that they usually emerge from the surrounding Arab environment. Personal names in Jordanian society are the most common type of norms of address. Names can be broadly classified into three main categories:

**Personal names**

*a. Birth name*

Under this category come all those names, which are given to children by their parents at the time of their birth.

*b. Praise name*

A *praise name* is a special name that may be usually used as a norm of address by close friends or family members of a person.

*c. Epithet*

An epithet is defined as an adjective or a short descriptive phrase, which is used in praise or criticism of someone. For convenience, only unpleasant names will be referred to hereinafter as epithets. This type of names could be used as a norm of address, for example, by individuals of the same peer group for the purpose of kidding, teasing or trying to make fun of someone. In Jordanian society, using an epithet in criticism of someone is a common practice, particularly among speakers of rural origin.

**Family name**

This category includes the person's name shared by other members of the same family. It is usually the person's last name.

**Full formal name**

The full formal name of a Jordanian person consists mainly of four characters, the last character being her/his family name.
In what follows, we shall take up each pattern separately and show how its use is governed by a number of sociocultural factors. An attempt will also be made to see whether some of the sociocultural factors examined are more effective than others.

3.2.1 Personal names

The exchange of personal names is subject to a strict set of social constraints. That is to say, the reciprocal and non-reciprocal use of such names are determined by a considerable number of sociocultural factors like intimacy, age, familiarity, and acquaintanceship.

3.2.1.1 First names

Broadly speaking, personal names (i.e., first names) are to be exchanged between individuals according to two main patterns, reciprocal and non-reciprocal. The reciprocal use is usually the norm among brothers, sisters, friends and people of the same age group. The non-reciprocal, on the other hand, appears to be subject to different set of norms. For example, by virtue of the hierarchical social age structure, the father or senior member in a family, legally recognized as head of the family with authority over its members can address the juniors by personal names, but he must not be addressed or mentioned by such names. Seniors or older people have to be addressed by using either honorific titles like hajj 'pilgrim', doktor 'doctor', ?ustad 'sir' or generic kinship terms such as baba 'father', mama 'mother', jidi or sidi 'grandparent', 'ami 'paternal uncle' and so on, as in the utterances in (1) below:

1a) ?a$tini qamisak ya ahmad lawsamahit
   Give-me shirt-your VOC Ahmad please (mother – son)
   'Ahmad, would you give me your shirt, please?'

1b) hadir mama
   Sure, mother (son – mother)

The same also is true of other senior-junior relationship such as official-populace, teacher-pupil, university professor-student, employer-employee, correlation. Consider the utterances in (2) below:

2a) $u r?ayak ya ramzi
   what opinion-your Ramzi? (professor – student)
   'What is your opinion Ramzi?'

2b) xalini afakir ħwayeh daktor
   let me think a little bit doctor (student – professor)
   'Please, let me think about it a little bit, doctor.'
3.2.1.2 Praise names

Within this category, the use of praise names shows a great degree of sensitivity to intimacy and social context than any other norm of address. A praise name in JA is usually a name derived from the person's first name. For example, a person named 'Ahmad' may be called *hamada*, 'Sami' *Simsim*, 'Mirvat' – a lady's name – *Movi* or *Riri* and so on. Lovers and husband/wife for cajoling usually use praise names. Generally, a praise name may also be given to a person by family when he/she is a child. So, the reason why this type of name is so sensitive is because they are invented for the purpose of conveying intimacy in a particular situation. There is a widespread belief in the country, particularly among males, that only spoiled people are called by their praise names. Therefore, praise names are used only for kids. And as a male person grows, he has to grow out of being addressed by his childish name, particularly in front of strangers. The same is also true of praise names used by lovers or couples. Jordanian society is a rather serious one, where cajoling plainly is an unappreciated behavior. A person may be embarrassed in the company of others, if he/she is to be called by praise name. So, married couples do not address each other in public by their praise names. Praise names are used by a husband or a wife only in the very narrow context of their home.

3.2.1.3 Epithets

As said previously, an epithet is an adjective or short descriptive phrase used in criticism of someone. Although the use of epithets as norms of address is a main characteristic of the speech behavior of rural people, it is not unusual for the city inhabitants to invent and use them as norms of address (see Al-Khatib 1994). In Jordanian society, epithets are extra names emanating from the social fabric of the peoples' lives, and are usually given for the purpose of teasing or making fun of somebody. A good example of epithets for praising or commending somebody is the use of expressions that have in them a pleasant referential meaning. A blond boy may be called *?abu Jaqra* 'the blondish', a tall man to be called *?abu tawileh* 'the tallish' and a handsome boy may be called *lihleiwa* 'the handsome'. And a good example of the use of epithets for the purpose of teasing or ridiculing someone is the use of such expressions that have a bad referential meaning in themselves, as in the following:

a) Epithets derived from animal names like:

- *?ilbis* 'the cat'
- *?ilfar* 'the mouse'
- *?il?arnab* 'the rabbit'

b) Epithets derived from ideas invoking in themselves negative attitudes like:

- *?ilnahis* 'bad-omen'
- *?abu nakad* 'the miserable'
c) Epithets derived from shape, body parts, and facial features:

- ?ilqazam 'dwarf' – for a short man
- ?ildub 'the bear' – for a fat man
- ?il?ai'war 'one-eyed man'

Such names are usually used by friends and associates, or more specifically by individuals of the same peer group, as illustrated by the utterances in (3-4) below:

3) ?akalit kol ?isandwifat ya abu karj

   eat-you all sandwiches VOC father of belly (friend – friend)

   'You have eaten all the sandwiches, you with big belly.'

It should also be noted that close friends in very specific situations usually use them where outsiders are not allowed to do so. Therefore, the use of such norms of address is conditioned by two main factors: intimacy and situation. Improper use of epithets by the wrong person, in the wrong situation may result in a kind of serious friction between the addressee.

3.2.2 Family name

Once again, Jordanian names usually consist of four characters, the last character being her/his family name. People in Jordanian society are usually addressed by first name. But in some cases they might be addressed by the family name. It should be noted that the surname is a casual norm of address used by school students or people of the same age group or the same social status who share values, interests, and intimacy.

It is also important to note here that family name may be used, for example, by school-teachers to address their students. This can be seen as a mark of the wide authority a teacher may have over his students. The process here seems to be enhanced by such factors as authority or social distance, age, status and situation. These same factors are valid with regard to Oyetade's (1995) study.

3.2.3. Full name

The norms of address described thus far are extremely constrained by the notion of power and solidarity. By contrast, it is evident that the notion of power and solidarity does not play an important role in determining the use of full names. Full names are used for achieving a particular goal in a particular type of situation; namely they are used as a regulating element in a rather formal social context. The calling of students by their full names when the teacher marks the register everyday at the beginning of each lesson is a case in point. In like manner, people waiting for their turns in hospitals, health centers, and other governmental offices are usually called by their full names. It is also worth noting that in most
cases full names are called without using titles. So, this is why full names have nothing to do with power and solidarity, rather they are only a matter of formality.

There is one final, but important, point about the different ways of addressing people by full names, the names used are often not restricted to marking the power-solidarity relations between speaker and addressee, but may also mark the relations of the speaker to an entity rather than the addressee (see also Oyetade 1995).

3.3. Kin terms

In their study of kin terms as relational social honorifics, Farghal/Shakir (1994) isolated two types of terms: first, those which are used denotationally, to designate family relations among relatives; and second, those which are used honorifically to maintain and enrich social interaction among both related and unrelated participants. Kin honorifics were divided by Farghal and Shakir, according to their function, into two main groups: distant kin vocatives and affectionate kin vocatives. Farghal/Shakir have also reported that Jordanians use kin terms more often than any other type of address norms.

Evidence from the present study also seems to support this claim. One important factor that contributes to the heavy use of kin terms by Jordanians is the fact that social life in Jordanian society has always centered around the family and the relation of the individual to other members of the family (see Jureidini/Maclaurin 1984). The traditional Jordanian family consists of more than the usual nuclear family of the individual (i.e., parents and children). The Jordanian basic family unit is an extended one, comprising parents, children and patrilineal relatives to the third level, such as aunts, uncles, cousins, etc. In short, Patai (1950: 136) described the Jordanian family as having six main traits: extended, patrilineal, patilocal, patriarchal, endogamous and polygamous. Although at present this does not seem to be the case in modern Jordanian society—because the familial relationships have undergone a great deal of change—Jordanian people still identify themselves with their extended families. As a result, the extended family system and the familial relationships have resulted in using a considerable number of wide ranges of terms.\footnote{2} The discussion which follow relies on two primary types of kin terms: affectionate kin terms and distant kin terms. Each kin term may have, by virtue of the way it is used and with whom it is used, a symbolic significance for the concerned speaker.

\footnote{2 The following are the most common kin terms used by Jordanian speakers: 
\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item zawj 'husband', zawjeh or marah 'wife', \?ax 'brother', \?uxt 'sister', \?ab 'father', \?um 'mother', \?am 'paternal uncle', xaal 'maternal uncle', xaleh 'maternal aunt', \?ameh 'paternal aunt', siid or jid 'paternal and maternal grandfather', sit or jedeh 'paternal and maternal grandmother', \?ibn \?am 'paternal cousin', \?ibn xaal 'maternal cousin', qariib 'relative'.
\end{itemize}
3.3.1 Affectionate kin terms

In the case of the parent-child relationship, kinship terms like *ya?ibni* 'my son', *yabinti* 'my daughter' are rarely used by parents to address their children. Children are usually addressed by such expressions as *baba* 'father', *mama* 'mother' or by their personal names. But, once again, it is not accepted for children, on the other hand, to address their parents by their personal names. Rather they should address them by using kinship terms like *baba* 'father' and *mama* 'mother' in return. As for the children-children relationship, on the other hand, the case is different; namely children may address each other by personal names.

It is also not acceptable for children to address older relatives/elders, for examples, like their uncles or aunts by personal names. If one has to, the personal name of the addressed relative should be accompanied by the appropriate kin term like *?ami x* 'my paternal uncle x' or *xalti x* 'my maternal aunt x' and so on. In return, an uncle or an aunt may address his/her nephew or/and niece by personal name or personal name accompanied by the appropriate kin term like *?amu x* and *xaltu x* respectively, as in (4) below:

4a) *keifak ya mustafa*
   - how-you VOC Mustafa (uncle – nephew)
   - 'How are you, Mustafa?'

4b) *kwayes ?amu ?alhamdu lilah*
   - ok-I uncle-my thanks God (nephew – uncle)
   - 'I am Ok my uncle, thanks God.'

Another use of kin terms that often plays a subtle but significant role in other's inferences about participants are those used by husband and wife. In Jordanian society, the terms used by a wife and husband may be the basis of first impressions of the type of family life they are involved in. Calling a wife by her first name in the presence of others, for instance, provide clues to how much a wife is loved and respected by her husband. It is clearly evident that the terms used by a husband and wife in this present society is subject to a large number of sociological constraints. Among these are context, age and even the educational background of the couple. In the narrow context of their home, for example, the husband may address his wife by either her personal name or praise name, and the wife does the same conversely. However, in the presence of others, regardless of whether they are related or not, a couple may not be able to do so, rather they tend to address each other by the name of the first-born male child. That is to say, the husband addresses his wife as *?um x* 'mother of x' and the wife does so in return. In a word, husbands and wives almost do not use personal names openly and publicly.

Age also seems to play a role in the process. Although a young couple may address each other in front of their children by personal names, an elderly couple does not do so,
rather the usual address form between them is the name of the first-born-male child, namely by using the eldest child’s name in complementation with 'father of' and 'mother of', or hajj and hajji respectively.

3.3.2. Distant kin terms

Kin terms have been extended beyond the use for which they were coined. As said previously, most of them can be used honorifically to refer to both relatives and non-relatives. That is to say, they can be used as distant kin terms to facilitate the process of interaction between strangers, and promote a kind of solidarity among them. For example, the word ya ?ax 'hey brother' can be used by someone to address a stranger along the main road as a means to get his attention. The kin term ?amu 'somebody’s uncle' can also be used honorifically to address an old unrelated man. A man and a woman who are as old as someone's parents are also called ya?umi 'mother' and yabuyi 'father' respectively. Similarly, a young lady who is as young as one's sister may also be called ?uxt 'sister'.

Kin terms can also be used along with a politeness formula so as to enhance Jordanian greetings relationally among strangers (see Farghal/Shakir 1994). Consider the utterances below:

5a) marhaba ya ?ax
   Hello VOC brother
   'Hello Sir?'

5b) masa? ?il xeir ?amu
   Evening-good uncle
   'Good evening uncle?'

It is worth noting that while the affectionate kinship terms can be used in complementation with personal names, the distant ones are usually used without personal names. It should be noted also that the reciprocal use of kinship terms is the norm among strangers. For instance, when a young boy greets a neighbor, who is as old as his father, he tends to greet him by saying marhaba ?amu 'Hello uncle', the addressee will respond in return ?ahlan ?amu 'Welcome uncle'. The case between relatives is different; namely the usual address form can be reciprocal and nonreciprocal at the same time. In this pattern, although the uncle, for example, may address his nephew by personal name, the latter dares not reply to the former in the same way. In like manner, in addressing an older relative with whom a younger person is involved in dyadic relationship, the latter should use either a generic kin term or an appropriate honorific title like hadritak (a respectful form of address) or hajji (a honorific form of address used to the elderly who did or did not make the pilgrimage to Mekka). In return, a younger male or female interlocutor could also be addressed by an elderly man or woman, regardless of
whether there is a definite relationship between them, as *ya'ibni* 'my son' or *yabinti* 'my daughter' respectively. This practice can be illustrated in (6) below:

6) *wein maktab ?ilbarid yabinti*

   Where the post office daughter-my (old man – young lady)
   'Where is the post office my daughter?'

Although what a particular participant employs of kin terms or honorific titles is important means for enhancing solidarity, the way he uses them can be even more important than the expressions used as solidarity-enhancers.

One final point in this regard that has to be mentioned is that unlike the notion of solidarity as was postulated by Brown/Gilman (1960), which implies equality between interactants, that is inherently reciprocal, solidarity in Jordanian society does not deteriorate the power of the older interlocutor over the younger addressee. Oyetade (1995: 528) came to a similar conclusion with regard to the use of address forms in Yoruba when he wrote:

"Although solidarity is shown by the use of kinship terms, it does not erode the power of the older speaker over a younger addressee. Therefore solidarity does not necessarily imply equality, as Brown and Gilman indicate; and some kinship terms used in addressing people are neutral with regard to power."

3.4. Titles

Titles can also be seen as social honorifics that are used to promote power and solidarity in formal summons among interlocutors. This tendency is promoted by the fact that titles, which are a frequent component of formal conversational discourse, constitute the primary genre through which individuals express their respect for each other, particularly when the notion of face (Brown and Levinson 1987) is directly involved in the interaction in question.

Titles in JA can be classified into three main categories in terms of their source of derivation:

1) Titles derived from Arabic and Islamic culture

- *Sheikh* (an Arab chief or leader of a tribe)
- *Pilgrim*
- *His Grace* (used as an honorific title before the name)
- *His Excellency* (title of cabinet ministers)
- *His Excellency* (used as an honorific title to executives schoolmasters, lawyers, etc.)

2) Titles taken from English and other European traditions.

- *sir* (schoolteacher, and a title of respect used to an well-educated and well-dressed person)
- *Mr.*
- *Mrs.*
3) Titles borrowed from Turkish

- **beik** - Bey
- **baʃa** - Pasha (chief, senior)
- **?afandi** - Gentleman (A title of respect used by the elderly when referring to somebody wearing Western type of clothes)

Social perceptions of hierarchical relationships – in terms of strata – as well as such sociological factors as occupation, level of education, age and tribal background of the addressee all play a very significant role in determining the choice and use of titles in Jordanian society. For example, a title like **feix 'Sheikh'** is highly likely to be used to an elderly eminent man who is known to be head of a particular tribe. The word can also be used in complement with **sidi 'sir', sidi ?iʃeix 'My sir the Sheikh'** to refer to a prayer leader (i.e. Imam).

Similarly, persons with whom there is no definite relationships are also addressed as **hajji 'pilgrim',** particularly if they are approximately as old as somebody's grandparents, as in (7) below:

7) **ma ʃalaʃ ?istana ʃwayeh ya hajji**
   'Will you wait a little bit VOC hajji (an official – old man)'

Also, it should be noted that there is a kind of correlation between the use of these terms (i.e. Sheikh and hajj) and the manner of dressing. For instance, people who wear the traditional Arab dress – kufiya – are more likely to be addressed as **hajji 'pilgrim'** and **feix 'Sheikh'** than those who wear the Western style of dress.

As for the other two titles; **ma'ali** and **utufat,** the first is usually used to ministers, and the second to important officials such as mayors, university presidents and so on. It should be noted that close friends might also use such terms as a means of teasing and ridiculing each other, particularly among those who are not entitled to be addressed by such titles. Therefore improper use of these terms to strangers who are not entitled to be addressed by them is unacceptable socially for it shows a kind of sarcasm.

As for the use of the titles, which are taken from English and other European language traditions, these titles are usually honorifically employed in referring to university professors, school teachers, officials, and executives among others. They can also be used by people who are not known to each other, or at the initial stage of their contact. For example, consider the casual summons in (8) below between strangers:
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8a) law samahit ya?ustad gadeif ?isa’a?
   if possible VOC sir what time is it
   'If you please sir, what time is it?'

8b) walah ya ?usta?i ?isa’a siti
    by God sir-my time is six
    'By God sir, it is six o'clock.'

Titles belong to this category can also be used as a politeness strategy for promoting solidarity. They may function as politeness-enhancers by interacting with politeness formulas. Consider the following utterances in (9) below:

9a) ya ?aniseh minfadlik ?istani fway!
    VOC miss if please-you wait a little bit
    'You miss, would you please wait a minute!'

9b) mumkin ya madam ta?i?ini waslik?
    possible VOC madam give-me receipt-your
    'Would you madam give me your own receipt?'

The use of these titles are obviously formal. It is also worth noting that titles in JA, unlike those of English, are combined with first names not surnames. For instance consider the utterance in (10) below:

10) hasa ?na muhadarah ma? ?idaktor x
    now have-we lecture with doctor x (student – student)
    'We have now a class with doctor x.' (where x is the doctor's first name)

Nevertheless, they may also be used by themselves, particularly when talking to a stranger who is unknown to the speaker.

Interestingly, even though it is unusual for relatives or close friends to address each other by titles, the reciprocal use of titles is the norm among friends and relatives, particularly when talking to each other in the presence of outsiders. That is, it is usual for relatives or close friends to address each other by personal names or any other casual norm of address. But if an outsider took part in the conversation, the case would be different, namely friends would begin to address each other by titles, particularly if one of them was occupying an important position or carrying a prestigious academic degree like a Ph.D. or M.D.3

Also, titles of Turkish origin constitute a set of occupational terms that were used by Turkish people during their occupation of the Arab world. For example, the word ba?a ‘pasha’

3 As a sign of prestige Jordanian people tend to brag about having a relative or a friend carrying, for example, a Ph.D or a high major in medicine, because this is an indication that the speaker and his interlocutor and relations are of a high socioeconomic status. So, participants intend to use these titles in such situation.
was and is still used to address a person who holds a high officer's rank in the armed forces like a General or Lieutenant General. At present, the term has also come to be used to refer to a few number of chieftains who acquired their socioeconomic status by virtue of their tribal background. The utterances in (11) below illustrate this phenomenon:

11a) walah ya bafa ha siyarah jaydeh
   by God VOC pasha this car good (car seller - retired General)
   'By God pasha, this is a good car.'

11b) indak wahadeh oanyeh
   have-you one another (General - seller)
   'Do you have another one, please.'

Similarly, the word beik 'bey' was originally used to officers occupying a high rank positions in the army such as a brigadier or a colonel. These titles have also come to be used presently to refer to such people as judges, mayors, executives, managers, and so on. Title-holders in this category are referred to as bikawat 'beys', namely people of a very high socioeconomic status.

An additional and important claim made in the literature, and which will be maintained here, is that "being chief does not necessarily confer any special privilege on a person in terms of address" (Oyetade 1995: 529). For example, people occupying very important positions in the social hierarchy are treated like all other people, namely they are subject to the same sociocultural norms of the speech community in question. As they can be addressed by highly prestigious terms, they can also be addressed by personal names and less formal norms of address. The use of norms of address in relation to them is a matter of more or less rather than either or.

3.5. Occupation

In JA it is not common to use occupational terms as norms of address. However, in some cases, a small number of occupations may be used to address their practitioners. The most common ones which are primarily used are the following:

qaadi: 'judge'
feix: 'Imam or prayer leader'
taskari: 'policeman, or soldier'
sister: 'nurse'
hakiim: 'medical doctor'
jufeir: 'taxi driver'

Some of these terms may be used alone to address the occupation practitioner as illustrated by the utterances in (12) below:
12a) ya askari mumkin ?a'tuf ?ildabit
VOC soldier possible see-1 the officer
'Soldier, can I see the officer, please?'

12b) ya sister minfadlik wein Yurfeh 32
VOC nurse please where room 32 (visitor – nurse)
'Would you nurse tell me where is room 32, please?'

Also, some others can be used along with honorific terms as a politeness strategy. Such terms can be classified as 'politeness-enhancers', the function of which is to enhance the process of communication among interlocutors. Consider the utterances in (13) below:

VOC sir-my the judge I am responsible-not for this problem (suspect – judge)
'My sir the judge I'm not responsible for this problem'

13b) ya sidi ?ifeix fu ra?yak fi hal mas?alih?
VOC sir-my the Sheikh what opinion-you of this matter (worshipper – mosque Imam)
'My sir the Sheikh, what do you think of this matter?'

13c) samahat ?ilmufti yatahadad ?ilykum
eminence-his the Mufti is talking to you (a TV broadcaster introducing the official interpreter or expounder of Islamic law)
'His eminence the Mufti is talking to you.'

It is also a widespread practice in Jordanian society to call some occupation practitioners by the name of the material or food being sold by them, such as:

- gas for the gas bottle seller
- durah for the corn seller
- turmus for the turmus (lupine) vendor

In some cases the name of the material or food being sold can be prefixed with bayaa‘ 'vendor'.

- bayaa‘ ?ildurah 'corn vendor'
- bayaa‘ ?ilbuuza 'Ice cream vendor'

This phenomenon can be illustrated by the utterance (14) below:

14) bayaa‘ ?il durah gadeif kuuz ?idurah
Corn vendor how much is a corncob? (boy – vendor)
'Corn vendor, how much is a corncob?'

3.6. Norms of address and linguistic change

Having seen how the various norms of address are used by Jordanian speakers, an attempt will be made to shed some light on the process of change which affect address norms at the present time. It has been said earlier that the Jordanian speech community has a great deal
of heterogeneity. Such heterogeneity may result in change in all aspects of life, including language use. Like all other linguistic phenomena, norms of address are not immune to change. A close examination of the data along with my personal observations shows that there is a relationship between the age pattern of Jordanian speakers and their adoption of the usual norms of address peculiar to Jordanian society. It can be seen that there is a clear change in progress taking place at present in terms of the use of these patterns of address, and such change is most frequently spearheaded by the younger age group of speakers (14-30 years old). The process appears to have been pioneered principally by the younger age group – university students – who have benefited from formal education and have had greater exposure to the outside world through mass media and other means of communication. For example, I have personally noticed that the great majority of university students, irrespective of sex or inequality in their age or level of educational achievement tend to address each other by personal names. Moreover, I noted that some of them tend to refer to their professors (in a non-guarded situation) by names alone, namely without using academic titles like doctor or professor. But it should be noted that no student dares to address his professor in face-to-face interaction without using a title.

Epithets have also been noticed to be used less often by the younger. As said previously, the tradition of using epithets as norms of address was common among people of rural origin. Apart from the influence of education, the younger speakers have always been subject to social constraints of the type, which motivate the individual to move linguistically toward the prestige norms of the language. The older speakers, however, who are usually not inhibited by such constraints, appear to adhere to the linguistic features, which they are accustomed to. This is partly because of their age and partly because of their emotional attachment to the traditional norms of their society.

All indications suggest that the change is taking place in the direction of the urban variety, namely the Fellahi and the Horani/Bedouin varieties speakers appear to be affected by the Urban variety in terms of language use in general and addresses use in particular. It is clearly evident that most of the younger and the middle-aged speakers of rural origin have begun to borrow some terms from the urban variety. For example, it is becoming common for most parents and children of rural origin to use \textit{baba} 'father', and \textit{mama} 'mother' instead of \textit{yaba} and \textit{yamma} respectively. The same is also true of using praise names by the new generation of speakers of rural origin, a habit that was originally confined to speakers of urban origin. Furthermore, it is easy now to trace a kind of change in their speech in terms of using address terms borrowed from English and other European languages such as \textit{madam} 'wife', \textit{miss} 'a female teacher', \textit{sister} 'nurse', a process which appears to have been initiated by the urbanites who were more educated and as such more exposed to these languages in an earlier stage than the ruralites.
4. CONCLUSION

The discussion above has provided ample evidence of precisely how particular norms of address are employed to create specific communicative ends. The proper strategic use of these patterns, along with other means of communication, helps maintain the interlocutor's positive face (Brown/Levinson 1987) and promote solidarity among individuals. Additionally, certain sociocultural factors such as kinship, equality in age, familiarity, intimacy, acquaintanceship, sex, socioeconomic status, education, and setting determine the choice of the proper norm of address, and the way they are used as well. Moreover, the study reveals that improper use of these norms may result in damaging the other party's face – the addressee – in relation to the speech event in question. This study has also demonstrated that the patterns of address may function as politeness-enhancers, particularly when they interact with other politeness formulae. Address norms in JA were found to share a number of common features with those in other languages like English, French, German, Spanish and Yoruba.

Furthermore, the study reveals that the use of norms of address is undergoing a great deal of change exerted by both foreign languages – those items borrowed from English and other European traditions – on one side, and the urban variety, on the other. This investigation also has implications for the study of human behavior in general, and the mechanism of communication in particular.
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