

“Si Mohammed!”: Names as Address Forms in Moroccan Arabic

Terrence M. Potter

U S Military Academy

Perhaps the archetypal form of address, names are ubiquitous in human interaction and central to purposeful communication. Names as address forms and patterns of their use according to social, addressee and addresser variables among Moroccan Arabic speakers are described and set in the context of historical naming practices which are developing into modern ones. Combinations of given and family names, used with and without titles, provide evidence of a rich and complex system of address in a society undergoing rapid change.

Introduction

One of the primary functions of a proper name is as a form of address. An address form is a vocative used to call or to secure the attention of an addressee. Putting a name to such use is highly context-dependent communicative behavior. The contexts in which one address form or another may be appropriate are assumed to be well known by most language users, but are not well understood in terms of the specifics of context or other factors which may trigger the use of one form rather than another.

Although names are probably the preeminent address forms, they are not routinely investigated by researchers concerned with the analysis of address behavior. Such analysis can provide a range of sociolinguistic information regarding speakers' address practices through elicitation and observation, recognizing, of course, that social circumstances do not likely account for all of the reasons why speakers choose one address form rather than another. This study seeks to identify and provide a first description of the more important sociolinguistic variables involved in choosing address forms—especially name-based forms—as reported by a group of Arabic speakers living in the Moroccan capital city of Rabat.

The primary question investigated here is what are the necessary preconditions for an addresser to use a first, last or other name-based form in address? Specifically, what form(s) will addressers use when

addressing someone who is well known to them? Is the use of someone's personal name restricted, and, if so, to which conditions or contexts? What information does name usage reveal about the relationship of the addresser and addressee? Are gender and/or age important in choosing an address form? Finally, is the choice of name form culture specific?

Background

The cultural and linguistic situation in Morocco is characterized by remarkable diversity. Language differences among the 25 million Moroccans are reinforced by social and geographical differences which help to preserve cultural practices that predate the Arab expansion of the first through the seventh centuries. Youssi (1991) describes the two principal contrasts that prevail within Morocco (as well as the rest of North Africa): first, the geographical contrast that exists between city and country (or city and mountain), and second, the social contrast that exists between the educated élite and the largely uneducated general population. In this context of contrasts, a complex trilingualism of Arabic, French and Berber languages has developed. The language variety of concern here is the Arabic spoken by the residents of Rabat. This is an emerging version (*koine*) of Arabic (Caubet 1993a) that tends to be spoken by the intellectual and administrative leadership of Morocco, and it is also the language most often heard on television and radio.

Traditional and Modern Names

Given and family names are of two kinds in Morocco today: traditional and modern (Youssi 1992). Traditional names were the rule prior to 1950, when modern record-keeping procedures were introduced. Traditional family names may derive from prestigious Andalusian Muslim families (*Benchekrout, Bennani*), Arab tribes (*al-Fihri, as-Sufyani*) or Arab dynasties (*al-Alaoui, al-Idrissi*), or place names (*al-Fassi* 'from the city of Fez', *as-Soussi* 'from the Sousse region'). These names were not traditionally used in address.

First names often derive from variants of the name of the Prophet (*Mohammed, Hmed, Hamid*), the names of his companions (*Ali*,¹ *Umar, Fatima, Khadizha*), or the conjoining of *abd* 'slave, servant' with one of ninety-nine names of God (*Abdellah* 'servant of God', *Abdel-krim* 'servant of the Generous'). Some names are found in both the Bible and the Koran (*Brahim, Sliman*) and others suggest something

of the circum-stances surrounding the birth of the named (*buzhm^ca*, *zhmi^ca* 'relating to prayer day, Friday'). Such traditional names are still in widespread use in Arabic-speaking communities and retain an analyzable meaning which parents may often have in mind when choosing a name. Moroccan parents also choose prevailing popular names for their children. These include names with religious,² ethnic or family significance. Published compendia of names will indicate preferred and popular names, as well as names that parents should not choose.³ Some Moroccans will also give to their children names that are popular outside their country or region.

Along with colonialism (which ended in 1952) came reform in civil administration (Youssi 1992). Such reform made it necessary for most Moroccans to have a family name. Modern names include those that allude to heroes of the Moroccan and Arab past, to popular contemporary figures, even to humorous physical attributes. First names of prominent political leaders, actors, singers and others have gained currency. The influence of both the Middle East and the West is found in Morocco, where, increasingly, younger people avoid or alter the traditional first names of the past.⁴

Methodology

The study of address systems is connected with and may well have originated in the examination of the second person pronouns such as *tu ~ vous*, *tu ~ usted* and *du ~ Sie* in European languages. Brown and Ford (1961) extended the investigation into American English forms of address. Since then sociolinguistic studies of address forms have been conducted for many languages, including several for varieties of Arabic. Especially noteworthy is Parkinson's study of Egyptian Arabic (1985).

Based upon the results of study of a film⁵ and an on-site pilot study in 1994, I completed basic linguistic research in Rabat. Relying upon data from that corpus, I examined name use in address as reported by 250 native speakers of Moroccan Arabic, each of whom was guided through an interview questionnaire by a native speaker assistant. Addressee identities and aspects of the hypothetical context of use were systematically varied across the interview questionnaire. Respondents' reported address practices were subsequently analyzed according to selected addressee and addresser (speaker) variables.⁶

Speaker-reported use of address forms is useful for a variety of reasons. An obvious advantage of reported over naturally observed data

160 Names 47.2 (June 1999)

is the large amount that can be collected in a short period of time. The speaker-reported data presented here was supplemented by participant-observer reports and separate interviews with educators and students. This descriptive sociolinguistic account is motivated by variation analysis studies and contributes to the baseline of reported information that may be further compared with actual behavior.

The number of interview questionnaires analyzed was limited to 250. For this study, each informant's responses to 160 questions are considered. Of the total possible number of responses (40,000), 35,963 were usable. Of the 250 native speaker informants 120 were female and 130 were male. Several age groups were represented: 28 informants were between 14 and 18; 115 were between 19 and 35; 74 were between 36 and 55, and 33 were 56 or older.

The informants, all native speakers of Moroccan Arabic, answered questions about address forms directed to people employed in a range of occupations that ordinary Moroccans would recognize and would know how to address. Seven of these occupations are traditionally male: doorman, grocer, professor, medical doctor, factory owner, police chief, and governor. Three are presently recognized as occupations women have: factory worker, public sector worker, and government engineer. The addressee variables are familiarity to the speaker, age, and gender; the speaker variables are age and gender.

Parkinson (1985) describes names as "prototypical terms of address" (43), suggesting that (proper) names play a special role in address systems. As a functional category of address forms they may constitute the superordinate set of all possible addressees. I recognized three broad categories of names: given names (here called first names), family names (here called last names) and nicknames. The analysis will focus on the use of name-based address forms, which may consist of first or last names alone or in combination with titles. Nicknames are not considered in detail here although they are deserving of study in their own right.⁷

In general, first (given) names, either alone or combined with a title, occur more frequently than other address forms in the data and the first name alone (without an accompanying title) occurs more frequently than any other name-based form. The given or personal name (*ism* in Arabic)⁸ is the proper name that encodes the gender of the addressee and may suggest the bearer's religious affiliation (Jewish, Christian or Muslim) or ethnic group membership (Arab or Berber). Among the

numerous sociolinguistic variables that influence address by using a first name, the degree of familiarity that exists between the speaker and the addressee is likely to be the most important factor. The regular use of a first name, alone and in combination with other forms, as an address form, has been reported for other varieties of Arabic as well, including those in Egypt (Parkinson 1985) and Kuwait (Yassin 1978).

In addition to using a given name only, speakers frequently use common collocations of the form *title plus first name*. The title in such collocations is addressive in function and refers to any of the titles or permissible combinations of titles that imply respect or social distance. Examples of such titles include *si Mohammed* 'Mr. Mohammed' and *lalla Fatima* 'Madam Fatima'. Examples of professional titles include *duktur Khalid* '(medical) doctor (m.) Khalid' and *duktura Ibtisam* '(medical) doctor (f.) Ibtisam'.⁹

Moroccan speakers generally use first names to call, to identify or to reaffirm familiarity and, in the case of title plus first name, the speakers precede the name with a title that conveys appropriate respect or deference or further specifies the relationship. In addition to other contextual variables (such as setting), variables associated with the addresser and with the addressee influence the use of title plus first name over first name alone and over other forms of address. Characteristics of the addressee's identity, such as status (age, education, socioeconomic class, etc.) or role (occupation, civil position of authority, etc.), as well as familiarity, will contribute to this choice. Always purposeful, a speaker's address choice may flatter or help to favorably dispose the addressee to honor requests. It may, alternatively, influence the addressee to accept the speaker's pronouncements as true whether they are truthful or not. Thus, we recognize that use of names in address is significantly context-based (as it is with all address forms), incorporating principal context features as variables.

Occurrences of last name, or title plus last name, are also clearly address options for Moroccans, but they are used much less often than are first names. In some situations, however, address by last name or title plus last name is common, even the norm. Teachers, for instance, generally address students by their title plus their last names. This usage is especially noteworthy since Moroccan (and Berber) last names are usually meaningful in ways in which many Western names are not. Moroccan last names may be meaningful in one of three ways. First, they may indicate patrilineal or matrilineal descent (called in Arabic

kunya) or the relation of sons or daughters to their fathers or mothers (in Arabic *nasab*). Second, last names may refer to a historical surname, a geographical name or a tribal affiliation (in Arabic *nisba*). Finally, the last name may have been acquired in recognition or commemoration of the important historical event, calamity or personage it refers to. (Other derivations and interpretations of a last name are also possible and many speakers may not even be aware of the specific or even possible interpretations that can be given to their last names.) As with first name use, the sociolinguistic significance of using title plus last name lies in what it reveals about addresser-addressee familiarity, and other variables associated with addresser and addressee individually.

Speakers report (as they do with first name usage) that they can precede a last name with a title; a man named Younoussi may be addressed simply as *Younoussi* or as *si Younoussi* 'Mr. Younoussi'. Comparison of the use of last name alone or with a title suggests that the social semantic expressed by using a last name is attenuated by adding the title. Thus social distance may be increased or decreased in a number of ways. This study suggests that lexical choice of one name form over another reflects the speaker's desire to regulate social distance and to convey the appropriate level of respect to the addressee in response to a number of sociolinguistic variables.

Results

The results of the study are based upon an analysis of the elicited responses to questions asked about addressing the ten different hypothetical addressees mentioned above (doorman, grocer, professor, medical doctor, police chief, factory owner, governor, factory worker, public sector worker, and government engineer). The results are presented according to the variables of context that the respondents were asked to bear in mind. Accordingly, the discussion begins with a consideration of the effects for the addressee variables of familiarity, gender, and age, and is followed by a consideration of the effects for the speaker variables of gender and age.

Names and Other Address Forms

Table 1 shows the frequency of name-based address forms compared to the non name-based address forms in the data. (Non name-based address forms include such items as kinship terms and titles that were not collocated with names.) The data show that speakers choose to use

Forms of Address in Moroccan Arabic 163

names (i.e., one of the four name-based forms first name, last name, title plus first name, title plus last name) over other forms of address whenever they are acquainted with the addressee.¹⁰ As table 1 shows, informants overwhelmingly report using a name-based form to address anyone they know well (86.8%). A small number of respondents do report using names to addressees who are not well known to them (7.0%). These informants reported that they would address someone whom they had met on a single previous occasion with a name-based form rather than, say, a title alone.

Table 1. Address Forms Generally

Addressee:	Not Well Known		Well Known	
	N	%	N	%
Name Forms	1259	7.0	15600	86.8
Other Forms	16730	93.0	2374	13.2

p < .001

Address forms other than names are numerous and occur frequently in Moroccan Arabic; they are generally preferred when the addressee is unknown, but they may be used even when the addressee is known. When this is the case, a title and a name is usually most frequently preferred. The non-name forms most frequently reported by my informants include kinship terms, titles and nicknames.

Names to Males and Females

Tables 2 and 3 show how the respondents (males and females combined) reported they would use names to address male addressees as a group and female addressees as a group. These tables suggest that overall name-based forms are used to males and females at essentially the same rate. Differences that might be attributed to specific name forms or to speaker identities are considered later.

Table 2. Address Forms to Males

Addressee:	Not Well Known		Well Known	
	N	%	N	%
Name Forms	882	07.0	10861	86.4
Other Forms	11704	93.0	1713	13.6

p < .001

164 Names 47.2 (June 1999)

Table 3. Address Forms to Females

Addressee:	Not Well Known		Well Known	
	N	%	N	%
Name Forms	377	7.0	4739	87.8
Other Forms	5026	93.0	661	12.2

p < .001

Table 4 shows the types and frequencies of name-based forms which may be addressed to males. First names may be used alone or may be combined with permissible titles and kinship forms to produce titles plus first names. Some speakers also report they would use a last name or precede this with a permissible title, hence a *title plus last name*. Though infrequent in the data, it is clear that last name alone or in combination is an address option for Moroccans today; some suggestions as to which speakers might use last name patterns and why they may choose to do so are given below. Again, the data suggest that knowing a male addressee well is a prerequisite for using a name of any kind, and that most speakers, by no less than three to one, prefer to precede that name, either first name or last name, with a title. It is noteworthy that the first name option (including first name alone and title plus first name) is not only the most frequently reported form for well known addressees, it is also the most often reported form in the entire corpus.

Table 4. Name-based Forms Addressed to Males

Addressee:	Not Well Known		Well Known	
	N	%	N	%
First Name	149	16.9	2329	21.4
Title + First Name	481	54.5	7212	66.4
Last Name	10	1.1	87	0.8
Title + Last Name	242	27.4	1233	11.4
Total Name-Based Forms	882	7.0	10861	86.4

p < .001

Percentages are of name-based forms except Total, which is percentage of all forms in the corpus.

Table 5 shows the name-based forms addressed to females. The same general patterns are found for female as for male addressees; first names may also be used alone or they may be combined with other addressives to form title plus first names. As for male addressees, these collocations include permissible titles and kinship terms followed by the

Forms of Address in Moroccan Arabic 165

first name. Similarly, some speakers report they would use a last name alone or combine it with a permissible title or kinship form to create a title plus last name. Also as for male name patterns, familiarity or acquaintance with the addressee is a prerequisite for the use of the name-based patterns, and addressives that are built upon a first name are more often reported for a well known female. Finally, first names or titles plus first names are reported much more often than last names and titles plus last names.

Table 5. Name-based Forms Addressed to Females

Addressee:	Not Well Known		Well Known	
	N	%	N	%
First Name	105	27.9	1894	39.9
Title + First Name	242	64.2	2675	56.4
Last Name	4	1.1	53	1.1
Title + Last Name	26	6.9	121	2.6
Total Name-Based Forms	377	7.0	4743	87.8

p < .001

Percentages are of name-based forms except Total, which is percentage of all forms in the corpus.

For both male and female addressees, then, well known or not, more speakers would use title plus first name than would use first name alone; they would also use title plus last name rather than last name alone. When the addressee is well known, however, more speakers would use first name alone to females than to males; conversely, more speakers would use title plus first name to males than to females. While last names alone and titles plus last names are options for addressing either group, the tendency is to use fewer titles plus last names to females than to males. If the use of name plus title encodes greater respect than name alone, this finding would suggest that males are extended respect more often than females.

Table 6 shows the reported use of the address form, *si Mohammed* 'Mr. Mohammed'. While this form is structurally of the pattern title plus first name, its function is different since it is ordinarily used to address a man who is unknown to the speaker. It alludes to the Prophet Mohammed and those who use it consider it appropriate in a service setting, for instance in a café or at a grocery market, or in the street to call to or to gain an addressee's attention. Younger speakers might also use it to address one-time male acquaintances who are younger or of the

166 Names 47.2 (June 1999)

same generation as they are. This use suggests that *si Mohammed* expresses solidarity over respect. Interviews with the respondents indicated that older addressees reject this form as disrespectful to the Prophet and to themselves. (I was unable to discover a feminine form that corresponds to *si Mohammed*).

Table 6. *si Mohammed*

Addressee:	Not Well Known		Well Known	
	N	%	N	%
<i>si Mohammed</i>	722	45.0	2	0.0
Name-Based Forms	882	55.0	10861	99.9

p < .001

Names to Males and Females by Age of Addressee

We can conveniently operationalize addressee age by generational categories in relation to the addresser. An addressee of the Ego - 1 generation would be of the same generation as the addresser's son or daughter, an addressee of the Ego generation would be of the same generation as the addresser, etc.

Table 7 shows the name-based address forms reported to males in each of four generations and table 8 shows the forms reported to females in each of the same generations.

Table 7. Address Forms to Males by Generation

Addressee Generation:	Ego - 1		Ego		Ego + 1		Ego + 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
First Name	983	39.9	1134	32.3	285	8.8	76	3.0
Title + First Name	1305	52.9	1927	54.9	2473	76.0	1998	79.3
Last Name, Title + Last Name	177	7.2	452	12.9	497	15.3	446	17.7
Total Name-Based Forms	2465	41.1	3513	58.6	3255	46.5	2520	40.6

p < .001

In tables 7 and 8, percentages are of name-based forms except Total, which is percentage of all forms in the corpus.

Table 8. Address Forms to Females by Generation

Addressee Generation:	Ego - 1		Ego		Ego + 1		Ego + 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
First Name	787	73.5	919	60.5	222	15.6	71	6.4
Title + First Name	268	25.0	545	35.9	1134	79.5	970	88.0
Last Name, Title + Last Name	16	1.5	56	3.7	71	5.0	61	5.5
Total Name-Based Forms	1071	49.7	1520	50.7	1427	47.6	1102	41.5

p < .001

For both male and female addressees, the use of names and name patterns (total name-based forms) remains generally consistent across addressee generations, but there does appear to be a slight trend suggesting that name-based forms are somewhat less appropriate for older addressees. Also the percentage of total names addressed to males by generation parallels that of the total names addressed to females by generation, suggesting that the choice of name-based versus other forms is relatively independent of addressee gender across generations.

It is also apparent that, as addressee age increases, the use of first names alone is seen as less appropriate, suggesting that the use of these would convey less respect for and/or less distance from the addressee than other forms. Thus, while title plus first name may be appropriate for addressees of any age, those addressees in generations older than the addresser receive title plus first name more often than do younger addressees, suggesting that respect and/or distance increases as use of title plus first name to older addressees increases.

There are also differences for males and females, within generations, according to name-based forms. While in all generations females receive first names more often than males, within generations younger males, those of the generation of the addresser and the generation below, receive more title plus first name than do younger females. Thus males may be receiving more respectful or more distancing address than females. Older females, however, receive somewhat more title plus first names than do older males. This difference may be explained by the increase in non name-based forms addressed to older males. Considering last name-based forms together (last names combined with titles plus last names), males and females both receive somewhat more of these as their ages increase, but males receive proportionally more in each generation. While this increasing trend with age may again suggest greater respect shown to males than to females, there are so few instances of forms based on last names that this possibility can only be considered tentative.

Addresser Gender

Informal observation suggested that the gender of the addresser might have an effect on address form. Table 9 shows the distribution of forms directed by male and by female speakers to female addressees and table 10 shows the distribution of forms directed to males.

168 Names 47.2 (June 1999)

Table 9. Forms Reported, by Speaker Gender. Addressee is Known, Female.

Addresser:	Female		Male	
	N	%	N	%
First Name	935	23.8	1062	25.4
Title + First Name	1452	37.0	1449	34.7
Last Name, Title + Last Name	109	2.8	93	2.2
Total Name-Based Forms	2496	63.6	2604	62.4
Other Forms	1431	36.4	1572	37.6

p < .05

Table 10. Forms Reported, by Speaker Gender. Addressee is Known, Male.

Addresser:	Female		Male	
	N	%	N	%
First Name	1175	12.9	1301	13.4
Title + First Name	3617	39.6	4050	41.6
Last Name, Title + Last Name	807	8.8	731	7.5
Total Name-Based Forms	5599	61.3	6082	62.5
Other Forms	3538	38.7	3647	37.5

p < .005

Both female and male speakers report using names (i.e., name-based forms) to females and males with essentially the same frequencies. Both genders use first names to address females somewhat more than they do males, and both genders use title plus first name somewhat more often to males. Furthermore, both males and females give last name or title plus last name to males slightly more than to females. As a group these observations suggest that, while both males and females give about the same percentage of names to each gender, they address males and females with different name-based forms. Thus, the choice of the particular name-based form varies largely with addressee gender rather than speaker gender.

Addresser Age

Table 11 shows the combined male and female use of address forms by addressers to same-generation and younger addressees; table 12 shows combined usage by addressers to older generations.

Forms of Address in Moroccan Arabic 169

Table 11. Address Forms by Speaker Age. Addressee is Well Known and of Ego or Ego - 1 Generation.

Speaker Age:	14 - 18		19 - 35		36 - 55		56 +	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
First Name	362	56.2	1603	47.9	1267	46.3	369	30.0
Title Plus First Name	201	31.2	1431	42.7	1281	46.9	852	69.4
Last Name, Title + Last Name	81	12.6	315	9.4	186	6.8	7	0.6
Total Name-Based Forms	644	90.4	3349	92.3	2734	93.8	1228	94.5
Other Forms	68	9.6	278	7.7	182	6.2	72	5.5

p < .001

Percentages for the top three rows are for name-based forms; Total and Other are for all occurrences.

Table 12. Address Forms by Speaker Age. Addressee is Well Known, of Ego + 1 or Ego + 2 Generation.

Speaker Age:	14-18		19-35		36-55		56 +	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
First Name	71	8.3	303	8.1	170	8.3	78	9.7
Title Plus First Name	643	75.5	2908	78.0	1710	83.4	709	87.7
Last Name, Title + Last Name	138	16.2	516	13.8	171	8.3	21	2.6
Total Name-Based Forms	852	76.1	3727	81.3	2051	73.9	808	85.8
Other Forms	268	23.9	857	18.7	723	26.1	134	14.2

p < .001

Percentages for the top three rows are for name-based forms; Total and Other are for all occurrences.

Comparing the total name-based forms with non-name forms in each table, we see that speakers in each of the four age groups chose name-based forms to address both younger and older addressees much more often than they chose other address forms, such as kinship terms or occupational titles. At the same time, by comparing the non-name totals in each table, we see that speakers of all ages prefer address forms which are not name-based more frequently for older addressees and name-based forms for addressees of their own or younger generations. While addressers of all ages are more likely to use non name-based forms to older addressees, this usage decreases as the speakers grow older. Similarly, as speakers age, there is a tendency toward increased use of title plus first name to both younger and older addressees.

As we might expect, speakers of all ages use first names to younger addressees much more frequently than they do to older addressees. As

speaker age increases, preference for the use of title plus first name with addressees of all ages increases while the use of first name alone diminishes—to less than 10% for older addressees. It is also to be noted that the use of last name alone or title plus last name, although not particularly widespread, is found more among younger addressers and declines as the age of addressers increases. This apparent time distribution, along with interviews I have conducted and general observations lead me to believe that younger speakers may be at the forefront of a change in address practice and that the use of last name alone or title plus last name may become more widespread, in spite of the fact that few older speakers would use—or presumably would wish to receive—last name or title plus last name.

Conclusion

This initial examination of address practices shows clearly that most Moroccans prefer to address someone they know well with one of several name-based address forms. Forms based upon the addressees first name are much preferred over last name forms. Speakers are likely to precede a first name with a title when they wish to convey respect or to maintain appropriate social distance. Using a title plus first name is probably the most appropriate form of address in most situations because it is respectful to addressees of different ages and of different occupational status, and maintains a suitable social distance between the addresser and the addressee.

The evidence suggests that a change is almost certainly underway in the address practices of this community. Whether or not (or how quickly) it will spread from urban Rabat to villages and the countryside remains to be seen. Additional research using different techniques (such as participant observation) from those employed here promise to yield additional information on address choices and address behavior which will extend our knowledge in this area.

Names and their use in address are important aspects of culture that reflect the salient history, customs and values of linguistic and social communities. While their study can provide valuable insights into the structure of a particular community, it also reveals social and linguistic patterns that can be compared to those of other communities. Consideration of the use of names in address can not only promote greater awareness and increase understanding of language in use, but it can also help to identify those social semantics that extend across linguistic and communal boundaries and underlie all human communication.

Notes

I would like to express my gratitude to the professors and graduate students at the University of Mohammed V. I am particularly indebted to Drs. Mohammed Dahbi, Abderrahim Youssi and Mohammed Chafik, and to Messrs. Bessou Aït Berka and Khalid Younoussi, without whose advice and assistance this project would not have been possible. I also thank the many colleagues at the U S Military Academy for their encouragement and assistance.

1. The symbol ʕ is used to represent the voiced pharyngeal fricative called ʕain. This is the initial consonant in such words as ʕarabiyya 'Arabic' and ʕarab 'Arabs'.
2. In *Ninety-Nine Names of Allah*, Friedlander (1978) elegantly and respectfully presents the divine names that are a traditional source of children's names in the Islamic world.
3. Hakeem (1997) provides a useful compendium and cautions against selecting inappropriate names for children. These would include various derivations of Muslim names which enjoy popularity despite their apparent irreverence.
4. Youssi (1992, 454-56) briefly describes both masculine and feminine modern given names. Informants revealed the trends toward adopting popular names and abbreviations. Hakeem (1997, 28-31) gives evidence of the latter trend when he advises against altering traditional ʕabd- collocations.
5. See Potter (1994) for an analysis of the Moroccan address forms contained in the film entitled *Dmuʕ al-Nadem*.
6. No claim is made that reported behavior is identical to actual behavior. In fact, parallel participant observation suggested that actual behavior differs frequently from reported behavior.
7. Generally speaking, Arabic nicknames (*laqab*) are morphological derivations of a first name or a last name or they are metaphorical appellations, often based upon a salient behavioral or physical characteristic. While the number and variety of possible nicknames might appear to be infinite, nickname use is governed principally by the relationship that prevails between the addresser and the addressee. Nickname use is typical where relationships of considerable familiarity or intimacy prevail, as in the family. Diminutive forms, for instance, are ubiquitous and are regularly used for address within the family and among close friends; *Mustapha* might be called *mmstafa* or even *sstuf*; *Khadizha* might be *khadzha* or *khwidizha*.
8. Schimmel (1989) elaborates upon these definitions.
9. Kinship terms and titles are not analyzed here. See Potter (1995) for a discussion of Moroccan Arabic titles and kinship forms used in address.
10. The category *Not Well Known* in table 1 combines responses to two questions coded for different levels of familiarity. For the first question the addressee is unknown, and for the second the addressee is familiar from one previous acquaintance. The categories *Not Well Known* and *Well Known* each cover 50% of the questions posed. This distinction is not important for the analysis.

References

- Brown, Roger and Marguerite Ford. 1961. "Address in American English." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62:375-85.
- Caubet, Dominique. 1993a. *L'Arabe Marocain, Tome I, Phonologie et Morphosyn-taxe*. Paris-Louvain: Éditions Peeters.
- _____ 1993b. *L'Arabe Marocain, Tome II, Syntaxe et Catégories Grammaticales, Textes*. Paris-Louvain: Éditions Peeters.
- Encyclopedia of Islam*. 1960. 2nd edition. Netherlands: Leiden.
- Friedlander, Shems. 1978. *Ninety-Nine Names of Allah*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hakeem, Ahmed Abdul. 1997. *A Treasury of Favorite Muslim Names*. Chicago: Pearl.
- Lacoste, Camille and Yves Lacoste. 1991. *L'état du Maghreb*. Casablanca: Éditions le Fennec.
- Parkinson, Dilworth. 1985. *Constructing the Social Context of Communication: Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Potter, Terrence M. 1994. "Moroccan Terms of Address in the Film *Dmu^c al-Nadem (Tears of Regret)*." *The Georgetown Journal of Languages and Linguistics* 3/2.
- _____ 1995. *A Study of Moroccan Arabic Address*. Ph.D. dissertation, Georgetown U.
- Schimmel, Annemarie. 1989. *Islamic Names*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh U.
- Yassin, M. Aziz F. 1978. "Personal Names of Address in Kuwaiti Arabic." *Anthropological Linguistics* 20:53-63.
- Youssi, Abderrahim. 1991. "Langues et parlers: Un trilinguisme complexe." In Lacoste and Lacoste: 272-77.
- _____ 1992. *Grammaire et Lexique de l'Arabe Marocain Moderne*. Casablanca, Morocco: Wallada.