Speaker-oriented attitude datives as authority indexicals

Evidence from family talk in the Syrian soap opera *ba:b l-ḥa:ra*

Youssef A. Haddad
University of Florida

Most, if not all, Arabic dialects license the use of optional dative pronouns that index or point to the speaker as an authority figure in relation to the hearer and the activity that the speaker and hearer are involved in. I refer to these pronouns as speaker-oriented attitude datives and analyze the social conditions on their use as authority indexicals. I focus on directives (e.g., orders, requests) used during family talk in the Syrian soap opera *ba:b l-ḥa:ra* 'the neighborhood gate.'

Keywords: authority, attitude datives, indexicality, power, pragmatic markers, family talk

1. Introduction

Most, if not all, people have experience with the relational concept of authority in some form or another. From an early age, we realize that certain individuals around us, such as our parents and other caregivers, have authority over us – an authority that we recognize even if we do not always willingly embrace it. We also realize – or tacitly comprehend – that authority is hardly ever absolute, that it depends on contextual factors, and that social actors use different means (some linguistic and some non-linguistic) to index or point at the form of authority that they mean to project.

As we grow older, we take on different forms of authority and learn the parameters of our authority: whom to use it with, where and when to use it, and to what end. In interacting with individuals over whom we have (or are trying to exert) authority, we learn how to employ the linguistic and non-linguistic means at our disposal to cue our hearers to recognize our authority and take seriously the message we are trying to convey.

The means that social actors use to index themselves as authority figures are often subtle. An assertive tone, a confident posture (e.g., standing with a straight spine), or the use of pragmatic markers (e.g., *you know*) is often enough to highlight a social actor's authority, forcing other social actors to see it and feel its impact. At the same time, such means are not as distinct as, say, facts or opinions that people may isolate and discuss separately. In this paper, I investigate a class of pragmatic markers in Syrian Arabic in order to examine how they serve as indexicals of authority. These are optional dative pronouns that refer to the speaker. I label them speaker-oriented attitude datives (SP-ADs); the pronoun in boldface in (1) is an example.

(1)   Context: The head of the district police, Abu Jawdat,[1] gives a direct order to
       Nuri, the second in command, to search for Samo, a person of interest in a
       burglary.

       *nu:ri:,   bta:xod   ʔarbaʕ ʕana:sˤer w-bitdawru:-**li:***   *ʕala:*
       Nuri,   you.take   four soldiers   and-you.search-**me.DAT**   for

       ha:da: Samʕo.
       this   Samo.

       'Nuri, take four soldiers and look [**me**] for this man Samo.'
       From the Syrian soap opera *ba:b l-ħa:ra* 'the neighborhood gate' –
       Season 1 – Episode 20 – 00:14.20

SP-ADs are optional in the sense that deleting them does not affect the main message of an utterance. Like other interpersonal pragmatic markers, they serve two broad functions: (i) an evaluative function, expressing a stance toward the main message of an utterance, and (ii) a relational function, managing (e.g., affirming, challenging) a relationship between social actors (see Brinton, 1996, Chapter 2; Beeching, 2016, Chapter 1; Haddad, 2018, and work cited there).

This paper examines the contextual factors that inform and are informed by the use of SP-ADs. I begin the discussion in Section 2 by providing a more elaborate definition of authority as a relational and contextual concept. I also specify the

---

1.   Most of the examples used here contain names that begin with *ʔim* (Im) and *ʔabu:* (Abu). These mean 'the mother of' and 'the father of,' respectively. In the Arab world, they are used as teknonyms: i.e., adults are referred to by referencing their eldest son. If a man is not married, he may still be addressed as, say, *ʔabu: kari:m* 'father of Karim,' with the assumption that his eldest son will be named Karim. This is especially the case if the man's father's name is Karim and he plans to name his future son after his father. Finally, *ʔim* and *ʔabu:* may also be used to refer to a salient characteristic that a person may have. For example, knowing that *xdu:d* means 'cheeks,' the term *ʔabu: xdu:d* may be used to describe or refer to a person with chubby cheeks, just as the term *cacheton* is used in Colombian Spanish, and perhaps other varieties, to describe a person with big *cachetes* 'chubby cheeks.'

form of authority that will be the focus of this paper and illustrate how authority may be indexed in interaction. I end Section 2 by delimiting the main purpose of this paper. All the data in this chapter come from the Syrian soap opera *ba:b l-ħa:ra* 'the neighborhood gate.' Section 3 provides an overview of this TV series and discusses some potential issues with the use of a scripted show as a source of data. Section 4 highlights elements of the sociocultural context that are relevant to the rest of the paper. Section 5 examines the use of SP-ADs as indexicals of hierarchical authority in directives, focusing on the immediate situational context and providing the co-textual context. Section 6 concludes by highlighting the significance of this type of research from a learnability perspective.

2.   What is authority and how is it indexed?

Authority may be defined as "a form of legitimation [that is] legally, culturally, and interactionally constructed" (Wilson and Stapleton, 2010, p. 50; see also Dickerson, Flanagan, and O'Neill, 2009, p. 20). It is an attribute that a social actor claims for her- or himself and that society acknowledges based on the social actor's identity. During interaction, authority, as a form of legitimation, is based on one or more aspects of a social actor's identity in relation to (i) the identities of her or his interlocutors and (ii) the interactional activity (e.g., family dinner, committee meeting) in which they are involved. A social actor's identity may include her or his individual identity (e.g., physical strength), group identity (e.g., gender), and relational identity (e.g., kinship). Omnipresent in all these social dimensions is the broader sociocultural context of shared values, beliefs, and norms.

Exercising one's authority in a social interaction is optional and may or may not result in the granting of power. For example, a boss may choose to exercise her or his authority by asking an employee to fulfil a work-related task. Only if the employee complies, however, does the boss's authority result in power. If the employee does not comply, the boss's bid for authority has failed, and she or he will need to decide whether to pursue further action or let the employee get away with her or his refusal to follow instructions.

Not all power derives from authority; it may also arise through a social actor's "ability to act effectively on persons or things, to make or secure favorable decisions which are not of right allocated to the individuals or their roles" (Rosaldo, 1974, p. 21). This is different from power that derives from authority that is recognized by all parties involved; this latter form of power is based on legitimation and on "the recognition that it is a right" (Rosaldo, 1974, p. 21).

Authority is not a uniform concept; different types of authority may be recognized. For example, one may distinguish between hierarchical authority and

knowledge authority. Hierarchical authority is a form of legitimation in which one or more aspects of a social actor's identity rank her or him legally or socioculturally above other social actors in an interaction. In this paper, I will use the term "hierarchical" authority specifically to refer to a form of authority that is potentially coercive and punitive. In other words, hierarchical authority allows the social actors who have it to force those they outrank to comply with their desires, and to punish those who disobey. A boss's authority over his or her employees, for example, is coercive and punitive within a work setting: employees may be fired for failing to do what the boss asks.

Knowledge authority, conversely, is derived from a social actor's level of expertise, and is neither coercive nor punitive. For example, a physician has the knowledge authority to prescribe medications to patients but may not force them to take the recommended dose or punish them if they don't (at least not without further support from the state).

Authority manifests itself in daily interactions and is affirmed, redefined, or negotiated via the linguistic choices that social actors make during these interactions (Wilson & Stapleton, 2010, pp. 50–51). Languages in general allow social actors to overtly state an aspect of their identity in order to affirm, redefine, or negotiate their authority with respect to the hearer. For example, a speaker who wishes to give a hearer a directive may start by saying: *This is me talking to you as your boss/lawyer/legal guardian*. Alternatively, a speaker may choose to waive authority by saying: *This is me talking to you as your friend, not your boss*. Assertions like these function as perspectivizers à la Verhagen (2005). They invite the hearer to view the rest of the utterance from a specific perspective. If the utterance is a directive, perspectivizers instruct the hearer to view that utterance either as an order that they must obey or as a request/suggestion that they should consider but not necessarily obey.

Although language allows this overt establishment of authority, speakers rarely need to use it to affirm their authority in an interaction. A social actor's role (e.g., as a boss) is often enough to prime the hearers to view that person's remark as something that they should take seriously; see Holtgraves (1994). Alternatively, speakers may make use of non-verbal cues, such as uttering a directive with a falling contour (characteristic of commands) versus a rising tone (characteristic of requests); see Wichmann (2012). Subtler verbal cues are also available: interpersonal pragmatic markers that project or waive authority and cue the hearer to view the utterance from a particular perspective. For example, inserting *will you?* at the end of a directive in English cues the hearer to view the directive as a request. As Pérez (2002) puts it, "it expresses a reduction of the speaker's expectations with respect to the compliance with the request on the part of the hearer" (69–70).

The main purpose of this paper is to examine the use of speaker-oriented attitude datives (SP-ADs) as indexicals of hierarchical authority in directives. SP-ADs are optional dative pronominal clitics licensed in Levantine Arabic (Jordanian, Lebanese, Palestinian, and Syrian Arabic), as well as in other Arabic dialects; see Haddad (2018). The focus here is on Syrian Arabic. The utterance in (2) is an example. See also (1) above.

(2)   Context: The wife of the neighborhood coffee shop owner, Abu Hatem, is pregnant and needs some medical attention. Abu Hatem orders his employee, Msallam, to fetch the midwife.

    msallam …   *wsˤal-**li:***   *la-be:t*   *ʔim ziki:*   *l-da:ye* ,   *ʔill-a:*   *tru:ħ*
    Masallam …   go-**me.DAT**   to-house   Im Ziki   the-midwife ,   tell-her   go

    la-ʕinn-a: *ʕa-l-be:t*   *l-ʕya:l*   *ʕa:yzi:n-a:*   *dˤaru:ri:*   *ʔawa:m* .
    to-place-our   to-the-house   the-family   need-her   urgently   immediately.

    'Msallam, go [**me**] to the house of Im Ziki, the midwife, right away and tell her to go to our house; the family needs her urgently.'

                                           Episode 12 – 00:40:50

In both (1) and (2), the SP-AD expresses the speaker's responsibility for the directive and his right to it. It also affirms the speaker's role as a boss and cues the hearer to view the directive as an order that he must obey because it comes from an authority figure. The SP-AD serves as a perspectivizer that reminds the hearer of this shared understanding.

Importantly, there is nothing in the lexical composition of the SP-AD itself that signifies hierarchical authority. Rather, the dative serves as a linguistic index pointing to the presence of hierarchical authority in the interaction. Ochs (1996, p. 411) defines a linguistic index as follows:

> A linguistic index is usually a structure (e.g. sentential voice, emphatic stress, diminutive affix) that is used variably from one situation to another and becomes conventionally associated with particular situational dimensions such that when that structure is used, the form invokes those situational dimensions.

The situational dimension invoked by the SP-AD in (1) and (2) is the identity of the speaker as a hierarchical authority figure in relation to the hearer and the interactional activity the two are involved in.

Crucially, a linguistic index is variable and conventional – or "conventionalized," in the sense that its meaning is context-dependent and its pragmatic contribution varies with contextual factors (Culpeper, 2011, p. 129, drawing on Gumperz, 1982 and Terkourafi, 2005). The behavior of SP-ADs fits this description. The identification of a SP-AD and the interpretation of its pragmatic contribution as an indexical of hierarchical authority (versus, say, knowledge authority

or any other form of authority) depends on the context. Three types of context are relevant (see LoCastro, 2003; Culpeper, 2009):

i.   the broader sociocultural context, along with all social values, beliefs, and norms that members of a given community live by and take for granted;

ii.   the immediate situational context of an interaction, including the identities of the interlocutors and the type of activity they are involved in; and

iii.   the co-textual context or actual linguistic interaction that the SP-AD is a part of, including the utterance that the SP-AD occurs in and the utterances that precede and follow it.

In the rest of this paper, I focus on SP-ADs as indexicals of hierarchical authority. The broader sociocultural context is a Damascene neighborhood as portrayed in Season 1 of the Syrian soap opera *ba:b l-ḥa:ra* 'the neighborhood gate.' The immediate situational context involves family members (mother, father, and children) and family-related activities (e.g., arguments between wife and husband, dinner preparation). The co-textual context involves directives, along with any relevant utterances that precede or follow them.

3.   The source of data

As I pointed out earlier, all the data come from family interactions depicted in Season 1 of the Syrian soap opera *ba:b l-ḥa:ra* 'the neighborhood gate.' It was originally aired in 2006. It is made of thirty-three episodes. Each episode is about fifty minutes long.

The show is about daily life in a neighborhood called *ḥa:ret l-dˤabeʕ* 'the neighborhood of the hyena' in early twentieth-century Damascus, Syria. At the time, Syria was under the French mandate. The storyline in Season 1 revolves around two threads: (i) the theft of gold coins from a resident of the neighborhood and ensuing attempts to find the perpetrator, and (ii) the infiltration of a spy who works for the French and who tries to stymie efforts by leaders of the community to support the Palestinians in fighting for independence from British control. Around these two threads, all types of events and subplots are featured in the show, ranging from family feuds to arranged marriages and from storytelling to street fights.

In Haddad (2018), I closely examined the thirty-three episodes of Season 1 and transcribed all instances of Attitude Datives, including the SP-ADs examined in this chapter.

A potential concern about the data is that they are based on texts scripted by show writers. As such, they are not necessarily representative of naturally occurring

data spontaneously produced by social actors on the basis of their shared socio-cultural knowledge, identities, and activities. While it is true that these data are produced artificially, I do not believe that detracts from their informative value regarding the immediate context of the show. The show's writers are aware, consciously or subconsciously, of the norms and expectations that their characters live by, and they take these norms into consideration as they prepare the script for them and put words in their mouths.

Moreover, in Season 1 of *ba:b l-ħa:ra*, the interactions between characters are mainly improvised. In an interview on Alsharjah TV with Abbas l-Noury, who plays the role of Abu Esam in the show, the actor comments that he and his fellow actors in the show often "improvised the dialog of the series in the same moment the cameras were doing their job" (from a 2009 online article; my translation).[2] This observation was confirmed to me independently during an exchange with the actress Laila Sammur, who plays the role of Fawziyya. Ms. Sammur explained to me that most of the time, the actors were not given scripts, but instead broad guidelines, and the dialogs were mostly improvised. It is not clear what percentage of the dialog was actually improvised. However, the comments by l-Noury and Sammur suggest that improvisation was rather common. The comments also suggest that when actors in the show get into character, they use language, including the SP-ADs under examination, as informed by the identities of their characters, the types of activity that their characters are involved in, and the broader sociocultural values and beliefs that the show assumes and the characters often articulate.[3]

4.   The sociocultural context of *ba:b l-ħa:ra*

As I mentioned in the previous section, The Syrian show *ba:b l-ħa:ra* is about daily life in a Damascene neighborhood in the early twentieth century. Because the setting is an earlier period in Syrian history that some viewers may not be familiar with, the show goes to great lengths to articulate the cultural values, beliefs, and norms considered by the show's writers and producers to be characteristic of Damascene communities of the time. Viewers learn about the sociocultural context through the words of the characters as well as their behavior.

---

2.   http://alasr.me/articles/view/10983/ accessed on 8/24/2016

3.   See Haddad (2018) for evidence that even in shows with carefully scripted texts that actors are required to adhere to, the use of attitude datives like the SP-ADs under examination is subject to improvisation.

It is important to note before we proceed that the observations I am about to make in this section are only meant to articulate the sociocultural values and beliefs depicted in the show. They are not meant as a generalization over a whole population (e.g., Damascene or Syrian culture). These values and beliefs may or may not be historically completely accurate, and in fact some of them have been criticized on exactly this basis. For example, in a 2007 article in the newspaper *l–ħiwa:r l–mutamaddin 'Civilized Debate'*, Rima Nazzal, a member of the secretariat of the General Union of Palestinian Women, criticizes the show for portraying women as objects and for not highlighting the important roles that women played in early twentieth-century Syria. For the purpose of the analysis presented in this paper, however, the important question is: how do the sociocultural values, beliefs, and norms that the members of the community in the show live by inform – and how are they informed by – the use of SP-ADs as authority indexicals?

The following are some of the relevant sociocultural values, beliefs, and norms that the show's family members live by and take for granted. First, the husband and father is the highest authority in the household; as long as he provides for his family and protects its honor, he may not be blamed or defied. The following are some examples that reflect the importance and superiority of men as husbands and fathers:

(3)   Context: Two single young women, Latifeh and Jamileh, are talking about marriage when Latifeh expresses the sentiment that a man has the right to discipline his wife by beating her.

l-riʒʒaːl   maː   bikuːn   riʒʒaːl   ʕan ħaʔʔ w-ħaʔiːʔ   ʔiz: ma: dˤarab   mart-o
the-man   NEG   is   man   for.real   If   NEG   beat   wife-his

kil   yoːm.
every   day.

'A man is not a man for real if he does not beat his wife every day.'

Episode 9 – 00:23:45

(4)   Context: Two older women, Im Khater and Im Ziki, are talking about a third woman, Buran, and how her husband beat her while the two were arguing. They dismiss the incident as insignificant and add:

Im Khater: w-ʔiza: ka:n   bu:ra:n   ʒo:z-a   dˤarab-a: ʃi:
and-if   was   Buran   husband-her   beat-her   some

marra ?   ʔixt-i: ha:da: riʒʒa:l ,   w-l-riʒʒa:l   ma:
time ?   sister-my   this   man ,   and-the-man   NEG

byinʕa:b   ʃu: ma: ʕimil.
blamed   whatever   he.did.

'And what if Buran's husband beat her every now and then? Sister, this is a man, and a man may not be blamed or shamed whatever he does.'

Im Ziki: *ʔe: w-alla: ʕam-tiħki: sˤaħi:ħ . l-riʒʒa:l ma:*
yes by-God PROG-you.say the.right.thing . the-man NEG

byinʕa:b bno:b .
blamed at.all .

'Yes, I swear, you are right. A man is never to be blamed or shamed.'   Episode 11 – 00:46:30

(5) Context: Abu Bashir, the neighborhood baker, tells his son about the importance of a man/father in the family for maintaining order.
l-be:t lli: ma: fi-i riʒʒa:l , l-wla:d ma: bila:ʔu:
the-house that NEG there-it man , the-children NEG find

mi:n ydˤibb-un .
who keep.well.behaved-them .

'If a house is without a man, the children will have no one to keep them well-behaved.'   Episode 10 – 00:21:00

Examples (3) through (5) reflect the belief, shared by all members of the society (women and men, young and old) as depicted in the show, that a husband is superior to his wife and that he has authority over her and over his children. Of course, a husband's group identity as a man and his relational identity as a spouse and father come with expectations at the level of individual identity. For a man to be recognized as the head of his household and as an authority figure, he must work hard, provide for his family, and protect his family and its honor by keeping everyone – especially the women – from misbehaving (e.g., smoking, talking to strangers of the opposite sex).

A wife has no authority over her husband – or at least, she is not expected to.[4] She does, however, have authority over her children, both female and male, in relation to household activities. Such activities include cooking, cleaning, purchasing groceries, and entertaining visitors. She is also in charge of making sure the children of all ages are well-behaved. As (6) illustrates, children are aware of their mother's role and her authority.

---

4.   A wife may have power over her husband; she may be able to manipulate him in order to secure certain decisions. This power, however, is different from authority; only authority is legitimized and recognized as a right by all social actors involved and by the community at large; see Rosaldo (1974).

(6)   Context: Latifeh, a young woman, suggests to her friends that they should
       have coffee just like their mothers. To this, Jamileh responds:

ʔe: w-alla: w-alla: ma: tismaʕ   ʔimm-i: ʔinn-i: ʃribet   ʔahwe
INTER   by-God   by-God   for   hear   mother-my   that-I   drank   coffee

ʃi: marra: ,   la-tiʔsˤof   ʕimr-i: ʔasˤʕef !
some   time ,   then-she.snap   life-my   snap !

'I swear, if my mother hears that I have ever had coffee, she will kill me.'

                                                           Episode 9 – 00:23:00

Whereas the husband/father's authority is inherent in his group identity as a man,
the wife/mother's authority is delegated by her husband and is thus part of her
relational identity as a wife. If the children defy their mother's authority, for exam-
ple, the mother may threaten that she will tell their father that they have not been
obedient. The threat often works. The only individual in the household that may
bypass a mother's authority in relation to household activities is the father, but he
rarely does. Even when the father notices that one of his children – especially a
daughter, but also a son – is misbehaving, he often instructs his wife to address the
issue, provided it remains within the confines of the household.

   If a mother has sons, her authority extends over her daughters-in-law once
the sons get married. Women in the world of the show move in with their in-laws
when they get married. The instructions in (7), given by a mother to her soon-to-
be-married daughter, illustrate the social expectations of mother-in-law/daugh-
ter-in-law relations. The authority of the mother-in-law is normally boosted by the
fact that, in the event of an argument with the daughter-in-law, the son/husband
is expected to side with his mother rather than his wife, which he normally does.

(7)   Context: Upon learning that her husband has just arranged for their
       daughter's marriage to a man he knows, a mother gives her daughter the
       pre-marriage talk.

ʔahamm   ʃi: ya:mo[5] tismaʕi: kala:m-o   w-kala:m
most.important   thing   mom   listen   speech-his   and-speech

ʔimm-o   w-ma: tʔili:-lo   laʔ   bi-ħaya:t-ik … w-bu:si: ʔi:d-o
mother-his   and-NEG   say-him.D   no   in-life-your … and-kiss   hand-his

w-ʔi:d   ħama:t-ek   … ʔana: raħ   zu:r-ek   ʔiza: ʔabu-ki
and-hand   mother-in-law-you … I   will   visit-you   if   father-your

---

5.   The use of *ya:mo* 'mom' by the mother to address her daughter is an instance of a reverse
role vocative, whereby an older relative uses her or his kinship role to address a younger rela-
tive. For example, a father may address his daughter or son as 'dad,' and an aunt may address
her niece or nephew as 'aunt.' See Rieschild, 1998.

> *samaħ-li: .   w-ʔahamm   ʃi: ma: btitˤlaʕi: min be:t-ek*
> allow-me.D . and-most.important thing NEG get.out of   house-your
>
> *ʔiza: ma: ʔaxadti: ʃo:r   ħama:t-ek   w-ʒo:z-ek .*
> if   NEG take   permission mother-in-law-your and-husband-your .
>
> *w-ʔiza: ʔal-lek   laʔ , yaʕni: laʔ . la: ta:xdi: w-taʕˤˤi:*
> and-if he-say-you.D no , this.mean no . NEG take   and-give
>
> *maʕ-o   bi-l-kala:m ,   ħa:kem l-riʒʒa:l ya:mo ma: biħibb*
> with-him in-the-speech , for   the-man mom NEG like
>
> *l-ħirme   tridd   b-wiʒʒ-o .*
> the-woman answer   in-face-his .
>
> 'The most important thing, sweetheart, is for you to obey him and his mother and never ever disobey him. And kiss his hand and the hand of your mother-in-law. I will visit you if your father lets me. Most importantly, never leave the house without asking your mother-in-law and your husband for permission. And if they say no, then no. Do not try to argue with him, for men do not like women to talk back to them.'   Episode 13 – 00:24:30

As a daughter-in-law grows older, has children (especially sons), and takes charge of her own household, she acquires more authority. She gains knowledge and experience and the trust of her husband to run the internal affairs of the household. These qualities, in turn, qualify her as an authority over the household in terms of management and organization: dividing chores related to cooking, cleaning, and running errands among her daughters, sons, and later her own daughters-in-law. See Rassam (1980) for similar observations and a discussion of family dynamics in Morocco.

It follows from these norms and beliefs that even among siblings, brothers have authority over their sisters, but not the other way around. Boys, especially the eldest among them, are raised to replace the father in the event of the latter's death, as the following example illustrates.

(8)   Context: A father is giving his eldest son the pre-marriage talk. In the process, he reminds him that, although he will be a married man soon, he will still be responsible for his mother and sister when he, the father, passes away.
     ʔiza: ʔalla: ʔaxad ʔama:nt-o   … ʔimm-ak   w-ʔixwa:t-ak
     if   God   took consignment-his … mother-your and-sisters-your

     bi-raʔibt-ak   la-ħa:l-ak .
     in-neck-your   by-self-your .

     'If I die one day (if God takes what is owed to him), you alone are responsible for your mother and sisters.'   Episode 25 – 00:10:00

In the next section, we will see how the sociocultural values and beliefs presented here inform the use of SP-ADs as authority indexicals in directives during family talk, and how the use of SP-ADs perpetuates these values and beliefs.

5.   SP-ADs, family interactions, and indexicality

Based on the sociocultural sketch presented in the previous section, it is clear that the characters in *ba:b l-ḥa:ra* live in a strictly patriarchal society. Within the confines of family life, this patriarchy translates into hierarchical authority that applies as follows: husband/father → wife/mother → sons → daughters; the order of authority never proceeds the other way around (unless a speaker means to challenge the system and negotiate a new identity, an attempt that does not happen during family talk in Season 1 of the show). In this section, I will show how this familial system informs the use of SP-ADs; at the same time, we will see that SP-ADs perpetuate the system by serving as authority indexicals that affirm social roles and remind all parties involved of "who's boss" in the interaction.

The focus in the rest of this section will be on directives. During family activities, family members may perform directives in any direction; that is, a mother may perform a directive with her son, and a daughter may perform a directive with her father. However, a SP-AD is only used when the speaker performing the directive has hierarchical authority over the hearer and wishes to affirm (or even enhance) this authority.

Let's start with parent–child interactions. It is common for parents to use SP-AD directives with their children. They may do so in a loving tone, as in (9), or in a tone that is not so loving, as in (10). In both cases, the SP-AD indexes the speaker as a form of parental authority – caring in the former case, cruel in the latter.[6] Whether caring or cruel, however, this parental authority is coercive and potentially punitive, as is expected of hierarchical authority in general (see Section 1). For example, when the son in (10) questions his father's order, the father gets upset and tries to beat him up; he only fails to do so because he is too drunk to keep his balance.

(9)   Context: Zahra is peeling potatoes in the kitchen. Her mother, Im Khater, walks in and, in a loving tone, gives her some instructions.
ya:mo zahra , *tiʔibri:ni:* ,[7]   *bas*   *txalsˤi:*   *taʔʃi:r*   *l-batˤa:tˤa* ,
mom   Zahra ,   sweetheart ,   when   you.finish   peeling   the-potatoes ,

---

6.   For the interaction between SP-ADs and politeness/facework, see Haddad (2018: 76–78)

7.   This is a term of endearment that literally means 'bury me,' but has come to mean 'sweetheart.' It is often – though not exclusively – used by parents or older relatives addressing younger people, based on the premise that the young should always outlive the old and not the other way around. As such, it may be translated as 'may you outlive me!'

> *bitxartˤi:-**li:***   *l-bandu:ra:t ,*   *w-bitʔaʃri:-**li:***
> you.dice-**me.D**   the-tomatoes ,   and-you.peel-**me.D**
>
> *l-xya:ra:t ,*   *ʔe:*   …
> the-cucumbers ,   OK …
>
> 'Sweetheart Zahra, when you are done peeling the potatoes, dice [**me**] the tomatoes and peel [**me**] the cucumbers, OK?'   Episode 9 – 00:33:15

(10)   Context: Idaashari comes home drunk one night and decides that his donkey is cold and needs to be covered. He calls his son Sobhi and says:
       nitˤtˤ *ʒib-**li:***   *lħa:f ,*   *w-ɣatˤtˤi:-**li:***   *ha-l-ʔasˤi:l ,*   *yalla: .*
       jump bring-**me.D** blanket ,   and-cover-**me.D** this-the-well-bred ,   go.on .
       'Go bring [**me**] a blanket and cover this well-bred [normally used for horses]. Go on now.'   Episode 17 – 00:22:30

A mother may use SP-ADs with her sons as well, as Example (11) illustrates. Note that the yogurt the mother asks her son to bring home is for the whole family and not only for her; thus, –*li* 'me-D' cannot be interpreted as a beneficiary. Compare this Example to (14) below, in which the same speaker gives her husband a directive and uses a dative that references not only her, but also the rest of the family.

(11)   Context: Im Esam is assigning chores to her daughters in the house. Her son Esam is about to leave. This conversation takes place between the two right before he leaves.
       Im Esam: *ʕisˤa:m ,*   *la:*   *tinsa:-**li:***   *l-labana:t .*
                  Esam ,   NEG forget-**me.D**   the-yogurt .
                  'Esam, don't forget [**me**] the yogurt.'
       Esam: *ħa:dˤer ,*   *ya:mo .*
                  at.your.service ,   mother .
                  'Okay, mother.'   Episode 24 – 00:21:50

Throughout the show, daughters and sons are normally on the receiving end of directives and rarely give their parents directives. When they do, the directives often take the form of complaints, and never employ SP-ADs; thus, children never index themselves as a hierarchical authority in relation to their mother or father.

One example from Season 1 comes close to breaking this rule: Example (12). In this conversation with his mother about his father, the speaker, Khater, uses a SP-AD to index himself as a knowledge authority who knows better than his father does. He tries to negotiate this identity in order to get his mother to agree that he is right and that his father/her husband is wrong about treating a new employee, Riyad, more favorably than everybody else. The mother immediately dismisses the knowledge authority indexed by the SP-AD, and informs her son that he should follow his father's instructions because the father knows better what is good for business.

(12)   Context: Khater works for his father, Abu Khater, as a coppersmith. Abu
Khater recently hired a new employee, Riyad, who is very good at what he
does and has become Abu Khater's favorite. This has made Khater jealous and
upset. One day, he comes home around lunchtime to bring some groceries
and take lunch to his father. The following conversation takes place:

Khater: *ʔab-i:*   …   *ʒa:yib-**li:***   *wa:ħed   ʕa-l-ʃiɣil*
            father-my   …   brought-**me.ᴅ**   one   to-the-work

            w-ʕa:ml-o   *mʕallem   ʕale:-na: w-huwwe* …
            and-made-him   boss   on-us   and-he   …

            mitl-o   mitil-na: …
            like-him   like-us   …

            'My father hired [**me**] a new employee and he made him our
            [my and my coworkers'] boss although he is no better than us.'

Im Khater: …   *ʔabu:-k*   *ʔadra:*   *bi-masˤlaħt   l-ʃiɣil*   …
            …   father-your   know.better   about-need   the-work   …

            ʃu: ma: sa:wa …   *ʔinta   ʕle:k   ta:xod   bi-raʔy-o*
            what.ever   he.does …   you   must   take   with-opinion-his

            w-tnaffez   *lli:*   *biʔu:l-o* …   *ʔabu:-k*   *biddo*
            and-implement   what   he.say-it …   father-your   want

            yiʒi: yitɣadda: bi-l-be:t   … ?
            come   have.lunch   at-the-house   … ?

            'Your father knows better what is good for business. Whatever
            he does, your job is to take him seriously and do what he says.
            Is your father coming home for lunch?'

Khater: *la: ya:mo ,   l-ʃiɣil   la-fo:ʔ   ra:s-na:* .
            no mother ,   the-work   till-above   head-our .

            ħitˤtˤi:-lo   l-ʔakel .
            pack-him.ᴅ   the-food .

            'No, mother, we are swamped with work. Pack lunch for him.'
                                                          Episode 6 – 00:31:00

Note that in the final part of this exchange, the son gives his mother a directive
to pack lunch for his father. In doing so, he does not use any mitigating words,
such as *min fadˤlik* 'please', to overtly mark the directive as a request. This does not
necessarily make the directive impolite or inappropriate if the purpose is transac-
tional or task-oriented, as is the case here; see Spencer-Oatey (2005, p. 107). Note,
however, that the dative the son uses in this utterance references the father as a
beneficiary; he does not use a SP-AD, which would index him as a form of hierar-
chical authority. If he did, his mother would put him in his place just as she does
when he uses a SP-AD as a knowledge authority indexical.

     Now we turn to SP-ADs used in directives between spouses. In a context like *ba:b
l-ħa:ra*, where men are considered categorically socioculturally superior to women,

SP-ADs are far more likely to be used by men speaking to women than the other way around. The exchange between Abu Esam and Im Esam in (13) illustrates this power relation between husband and wife. In this example, the SP-AD indexes Abu Esam as a hierarchical authority in the household, and as the individual in the relationship who has the final say. The authority that Abu Esam assumes through his use of the SP-AD reflects the shared belief in the community that a husband must control his wife and that a wife must obey her husband, a belief that both women and men in the show explicitly state as a social fact on various occasions, as we saw in Section 4.

(13)   Context: After a disagreement, Im Esam has kicked her son's soon-to-be mother-in-law, Firyal, out of the house. Firyal is also the niece of Abu Saleh, the neighborhood mayor, whom Abu Esam holds in high esteem. When Abu Esam learns of his wife's treatment of Firyal, he gets upset. He grabs Im Esam by the arm and demands that she go to Firyal's house and apologize to her.

Abu Esam: *bitru:ħi: la-ʕind   l-maxlu:ʔa   bi-ra:s-ek* ,   *bitdiʔʔi:*
             you.go   to-place   the-person   with-head-your ,   you.knock

             ba:b-a: ,   *w-btiʕtizri:*   *minn-a:* ,   *w-bitsakri:-**li:***
             door-her ,   and-you.apologize   to-her ,   and-end-**me.D**

             ha-l-ʔisˤsˤa: *kill-a: !*
             this-the-story   all-it !

             'You go to Firyal's house, you knock on her door, you apologize to her, and you end [**me**] this issue completely!'

Im Esam: *ʔana: ʔiʕtizir   min-ha: ?   la:* ,   *la-ħad   ho:n   w-bas !*
            I   apologize   to-her ?   no ,   enough   is   enough !
            'You want me to apologize to her? No way! Enough is enough.'

Abu Esam: *la-ħad ho:n w-bas ?   ʃu: ha:y   la-ħad ho:n w-bas ?*
            enough is enough ?   what   this   enough is enough ?
            'Enough is enough? Are you out of your mind?'

Im Esam: *msˤa:laħa   ma: raħ   sa:leħ-a:* ,   *w-ha:da:*
            making.up   NEG   will   make.up.with-her ,   and-this

            l-mawdˤu:ʕ   ʔinta   la: titdaxxal   fi-i ,   *laʔann-ak*
            the-topic   you   NEG   interfere   with-it ,   because-you

            ma: btaʕrif   ʃu: fi: be:n-i: *w-be:n   Firya:l …*
            NEG   know   there is   between-me   and-between   Friyal   …

            ʔinte   la: tiħʃer   ħa:l-ak   be:n   l-niswa:n ,   *w-*
            You   NEG   insert   self-your   between   the-women ,   and-

            titdaxxal   bi-ʔisˤasˤ-un …
            interfere   with-stories-their …

            'I will never make up with Firyal. This topic is none of your business and you have no idea what is going on between Firyal and me. Don't get in women's business and concern yourself with their issues.'   Episode 33 – 00:42:30

As I mentioned earlier, hierarchical authority is potentially punitive. Following the exchange in (13) where Im Esam defies Abu Esam, he exercises that punitive power by pronouncing her divorced.[8]

The interesting part about (13) is that Im Esam actually uses very strong language with her husband; she even yells at him at times. She could easily have used a SP-AD with either *titdaxxal* 'interfere' or *tiħʃer* 'insert' (highlighted in grey in (13)), but she doesn't. In fact, I was not able to find a single scene in any of the thirty-three episodes of Season 1 in which a woman uses a SP-AD directive to establish hierarchical authority when speaking with her husband. On the rare occasions that a woman uses a dative to address her husband, the dative takes a beneficiary form. For example, in (14), Im Esam uses a plural dative to refer to all the family members, herself included, as beneficiaries. Compare this to the SP-AD that she uses with her son in (11) above, when she asks him not to forget to buy yogurt.

(14)   Context: Abu Esam is about to leave the house to go to his store. His wife, Im Esam, adjusts his scarf around his shoulders and in a loving tone asks him to have some sweets sent home for dessert.
bʕat-**ilna**   ʃwayyet   ʔatˤaːyef   ʕasˤaːfiːri: la-l-tiħlaːye ,   tiʔbirni: .
send-**us.D**   a.little   sweet.pies   bird.like   for-the-dessert ,   sweetheart .
'Sweetheart, send **us** some small sweet pies for dessert.'

An interesting case in the show is the marital relationship between Fawziyye and her husband Abu Badr. The two are the comic relief in an otherwise very dramatic soap opera. The comedy stems from the fact that Fawziyye is the boss in the relationship. She orders Abu Badr around; she has him do household chores, which is unusual for men in the context of the show; she also restricts his freedom, imposing a curfew on him and requiring him to ask for permission before he leaves the house. Despite this inverted power dynamic, however, Fawziyye never inserts a SP-AD in any directive she gives to her husband. Given how much power she has over him, and how explicit her use of that power is, it is perhaps surprising that she never uses a SP-AD as a hierarchical authority indexical. Close examination, however, shows that Fawziyye's imposition of power over Abu Badr does not occur because she wishes to negotiate a new identity for herself as a woman with hierarchical authority over her husband, but out of necessity because, in her words, he is not "man enough to take charge." It is clear that she would prefer to embrace the socioculturally expected role of women as subordinate and obedient; indeed, on a number of occasions, she explicitly wishes her husband would be "a real man":

---

8.   In Islam, a husband may unilaterally divorce his wife by pronouncing her divorced.

(15)   Context: Talking about her husband to a neighbor, Fawziyye says:
        ya: re:to ʃi: marra: yidˤrib-ni: … bas ħis   ʔinno mitʒawze
        I.wish.he some time   hit-me   … only I.feel that married

        riʒʒa:l ʕan ħaʔ w-ħaʔi:ʔ !
        man   for.real !

        'I wish he would hit me at least once just so that I would feel that I am
        married to a man for real!'   Episode 3 – 00:45:00

On the very few occasions when Abu Badr actually lives up to her expectations
and acts like "a real man," Fawziyye celebrates his behavior and feels better about
herself:

(16)   Context: Abu Badr yells at Fawziyye. When he leaves the room, she smiles
        with excitement, and reacts as follows:
        ma: ʕam-sˤaddiʔ !   sˤarrax   bi-wiʒʒ-i: !
        NEG PROG-I.believe ! he.yelled in-face-my !
        'I can't believe it! He actually yelled at me!'   Episode 14 – 00:08:30

The same observations we have made about interactions between spouses apply
to interactions between siblings as well. Brothers may use SP-ADs in directives to
their sisters, as (17) demonstrates, but sisters never use SP-ADs with their broth-
ers. When a sister uses a dative with her brother, the dative normally refers to all
the members of the family as beneficiaries, as (18) illustrates.

(17)   Context: Zahra asks her brother Khater about a young man called Riyad,
        who was mentioned by their father over dinner. Khater does not like Riyad,
        and he does not want his sister to mention his name again. So he says:
        *smaʕi: wle: ,   ma: bitʒi:bi:-**li:**   ʔism-o   ʕa-lsa:n-ik*
        listen you.girl , NEG bring-**me.DAT** name-his on-tongue-your

        bno:b ha: !
        never   huh !

        'Listen, girl, don't you ever mention [**me**] his name on your tongue again.'
                                                              Episode 19 – 00:34:00

(18)   Context: A bad smell comes from part of the courtyard used as storage.
        Shafiqa, a young woman, thinks it could be a dead animal. When her
        brother Sobhi comes home, she asks him to check it out. She says:
        *fu:t   ʕa-l-xara:be ʃif-**ilna:** ʃu: ha-l-ri:ħa   lli: tˤa:lʕa minn-a: .*
        enter to-the-yard see-**us.D** what this-the-smell that rise   from-it .
        'Go into the courtyard and find out **for us** what that smell is that's coming
        from it.'

The use of a SP-AD by a woman addressing her husband or her brother – or any
man other than her son – would index her as a legitimized authority figure in

relation to him. Within the sociocultural context of *ba:b l-ħa:ra*, such indexing would be inappropriate; a woman is expected to obey her husband, and the only man she may exercise authority over is her son. Any deviation from this norm (e.g., the relationship between Fawziyye and Abu Badr) is frowned upon as an anomaly. As Ochs (1996, p. 418) maintains, "the indexical potential of a form derives from a history of usage and cultural expectations surrounding that form."

Of course, women may use SP-ADs when addressing men in order to negotiate a new identity for themselves. This does not happen in *ba:b l-ħa:ra*; the women in the show embrace the cultural expectations of their community and abide by the tacit rules of the use of SP-ADs. However, if we fast-forward to late twentieth-century and early twenty-first-century contexts in Syria and the rest of the Levant, we see that gender relations have been redefined – or at least, are in the process of being redefined. Accordingly, we find scenarios in which a woman assumes an authority role in relation to the men around her, including her husband and brother; see Haddad (2018) for a detailed account.

6.   Conclusion

This chapter has presented a sociopragmatic analysis of SP-ADs, focusing on the specific social conditions on their use in order to understand their functions as indexicals of hierarchical authority. Why is this sort of investigation of indexicals – that is, elements that "are associated in one's mind with particular contexts" (Culpeper, 2011, p. 129) – important?

When we learn a language, we learn not only the structure and mental representation of linguistic forms, but also the rules that inform who may use those forms, with whom, where, when, and for what purpose. All these restrictions are mandated within the sociocultural context. As Mey (2016) maintains, "language is more than sounds and grammar rules: It is primarily a way of dealing with the world" (19–20); see also Ochs (1996). This observation is particularly relevant to pragmatic markers like the SP-ADs under investigation because these markers are entirely use-conditional (rather than factual or truth-conditional). Their use-conditionality makes them highly context-dependent; examining the social conditions on their use is thus especially important. After all, our understanding of these pragmatic markers "depends crucially on the worlds in which their speakers live" (Mey, 2001, p. 29), on the "situational, i.e., indexical meanings" that speakers assign to them, and on the associations they build between these factors "and particular identities, relationships, actions, stances, and the like" (Ochs, 1996, p. 410).

Studying SP-ADs and other pragmatic markers is especially useful in the context of teaching an Arabic dialect as a foreign language. In recent years, universities

in the United States and other countries have been incorporating Arabic dialects into their foreign language curricula. Helping students understand and use these datives may be challenging. Native speakers have a tacit understanding of these datives and intuitively know how, where, when, and with whom to use them; however, because this knowledge is tacit, they may have difficulty articulating the indexical meaning of these pragmatic markers and may thus struggle to teach them or explain them effectively.

The issue of learnability and foreign language pedagogy in relation to pragmatic markers is often compounded by the fact that these markers have no simple equivalent in the students' native language (e.g., English). This is especially true of attitude datives, which may explain why they are categorically ignored in Arabic-English translations of novels and movies. To illustrate this omission, observe the Example in (19). Here, a speaker from a Lebanese movie uses three SP-ADs when addressing her daughter. The English subtitles of the movie, however, contain no sign of the datives or their effect.

(19)   Context: In a village inhabited by Christian and Muslim families, a Christian young man, the youngest of two brothers and a sister, is killed while running an errand outside the village. His mother decides to keep his death a secret for a while because she believes his elder brother may assume that Muslims were responsible for his death and go after the Muslims in the village. She says to her daughter:

*rita, ma baʔaʃ baddi: ʃu:f-ik ʕam-btibki: . ɣasli:-**li:** wiʒʒ-ik ,*
Rita, no longer I.want see-you PROG-cry . wash-**me.D** face-you ,

*tˤlaʕi: ħitˤtˤi:-**li:** ʃi ʕa-ʕinay-ki . w-ɣayri:-**li:***
you.go.up put-**me.D** something on-eyes-your . and-change-**me.D**

tye:b-ik , lbisi: mlawwan
clothes-your , wear colorful (clothes)

'Rita, I don't want to see you crying anymore. Go upstairs, wash [**me**] your face, put [**me**] some makeup on your eyes, change [**me**] your black clothes and wear colorful clothes.'

                    From *hallaʔ la-we:n* 'where do we go now' – 01:06:00 – LEB

A systematic analysis of the indexical meaning of these datives and other pragmatic markers is the first step in making the task of Arabic dialect instructors and learners easier.

Acknowledgement

References

Beeching, K. (2016). *Pragmatic markers in British English: Meaning in social interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139507110

Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110907582

Culpeper, J. (2009). Historical sociopragmatics: An introduction. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 10, 176–186.

Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511975752

Dickerson, M. O., Flanagan, T., & O'Neill, B. (2009). *An introduction to government and politics: A conceptual approach* (9th ed.). USA: Nelson College Indigenous.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611834

Haddad, Y. A. (2018). *The sociopragmatics of attitude datives in Levantine Arabic*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781474434072.001.0001

Holtgraves, T. (1994). Communication in context: Effects of speaker status on the comprehension of indirect requests. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 20, 1205–1218. https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.20.5.1205

LoCastro, V. (2003). *An introduction to pragmatics: Social action for language teachers. Ann Arbor*, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics. An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mey, J. L. (2016). Pragmatics seen through the prism of society. In A. Capone & J. L. Mey (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society, perspectives in pragmatics, philosophy and psychology 4* (pp. 15–24). Switzerland: Springer.

Nazzal, R. (2007). sˤuratu l–marʔati fi: musalsali ba:b l–ħa:ra 'The image of women in the soap opera "the neighborhood gate"'. *l–ħiwa:r l–mutamaddin 'Civilized Debate'*, 2081. http://www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=113483 (last accessed September 2016).

Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. J. Gumperz, & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407–437). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pérez, F. (2002). On the use of internal modifiers in request production in Engish as a native and as a foreign language. *The Grove: Working Papers on English Studies*, 9, 59–78.

Rassam, A. (1980). Women and domestic power in Morocco. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 12, 171–179. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743800000465

Rieschild, V. R. (1998). Lebanese Arabic reverse role vocatives. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 40, 617–641.

Rosaldo, M. (1974). Woman, culture, and society: A theoretical overview. In M. Rosaldo & L. Lamphere (Eds.), *Woman, culture and society* (pp. 17–42). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behavior, Culture*, 1, 95–119. https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.95

Terkourafi, M. (2005). Beyond the micro-level in politeness research. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 1, 237–262. https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.2.237

Verhagen, A. (2005). *Constructions of intersubjectivity. Discourse, syntax and cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wichmann, A. (2012). Prosody and pragmatic effects. In G. Anderson, & K. Aijmer (Eds.), *Pragmatics of society* (pp. 181–213). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wilson, J., & Stapleton, K. (2010). Authority. In J. Jaspers, J.-O. Östman, & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Society and language use* (pp. 49–70). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hoph.7.04wil