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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ʕāmmiyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Algiers Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>aspect marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Classical Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Catania dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Cairene Egyptian Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>code-mixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>code-switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>connective particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLF</td>
<td>classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>determinative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF ART</td>
<td>definite article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSA</td>
<td>Damascus Syrian Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Egyptian Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EALL</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>fuṣḥā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>Kuwaiti Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>first language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-S</td>
<td>lexico-semantic status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mauritanian Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEA</td>
<td>Manṣūra Egyptian Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Father Mattā al-Miskīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>morphophonology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPS</td>
<td>morphophonosyntax (morphophonosyntactic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Native Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>nominal classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEA</td>
<td>Non-Cairene Egyptian Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFT</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>predicate marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON SUFF</td>
<td>pronoun suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>(generic) Sicilian dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Standard Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>tense-aspect marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>vocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YA</td>
<td>Yemeni Arabic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transcription conventions

- `/` simple pause (less than 1”)
- `//` long pause (more than 1”)
- `à` non-CEA stress
- `?` interrogative tone (rising tone)
- `!` exclamatory tone
- `|` conclusive tone (falling tone)
- `a:` lengthening of vowel
- `abc` SA or +SA segments
- `abc` EA or + EA segments
- `...` words not fully pronounced or interrupted
- `[coughs]` transcriber's comment
- `[........]` not understandable
- `[xxxxxx]` doubtful transcription
- `ehm` hesitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>places of articulation</th>
<th>manners of articulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plosive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilabial</td>
<td>(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labiodental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interdental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velarized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dental</td>
<td>t  d  s  z  l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velarized</td>
<td>t  d  ş  ž  l**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postalveolar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velar</td>
<td>k  g  x  ģ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uvular</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pharyngeal</td>
<td>h  ğ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glottal</td>
<td>?/ʔ*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x) = marginal, occurring in foreign loans  *ʔ = etymologically a /q/ ** every time /l/ appears in the word /allaːh/ it is velarized

Table 1 Table of consonants. For a more detailed description of phonemic transcription (consonants, vowels, stress, article, prefixes and prepositions, prosody), see appendix 2.
Preface

This study falls within a broad field of the sociolinguistics of Arabic, namely the diglossic variation between spoken Standard Arabic (SA) and Native Arabic (NA). I borrow the latter term from Owens (2001) which seems to me more “neutral” than ‘colloquial’ or ‘dialect’: NA is, in fact, the first variety of Arabic people learn since they are children. It deals with one of the main approaches to variation, code-switching, within a specific region, Egypt, and within a specific genre, Christian homilies. I will use EA to generically indicate Egyptian native varieties. Whenever I need to specify that I deal only with Cairene Arabic, I will use the abbreviation CEA (Cairene Egyptian Arabic).

The general question this study starts from is: if the combined use of SA and NA at various level of Spoken Arabic is a very common practice among Arab speakers, attestable through simple linguistic observation, what are the rhetorical motivations for which Arabs code-switch from SA to NA and vice-versa? And specifically what does code-switching add to the argumentative construction of an oral text, specifically a Christian religious discourse?

The hypotheses posited that will be tested in the course of this study are: 1) diglossic code-switching occurs with considerable frequency in Christian religious discourse as well as in other genres; 2) these switches occur only at an intersentential level; 3) switches are always rhetorically functional, that is they help the speaker build his discourse, differentiating textual material, just like other rhetorical mechanisms, such as figures of speech; 4) functions of code-switching are distinguishable from loci (i.e., parts of the text where code-switching is most probable to happen); 5) patterns of rhetorical code-switching (loci and functions) are clearly definable and divisible between “general” (common to all the genres) and “particular” (specific of one genre); 6) frequency of code-switching is related to specific part of discourse. Whenever the term SA will be used, it will mostly refer to Spoken Standard Arabic unless otherwise specified.

Diglossic code-switching cannot be dealt with without retracing the approaches to diglossic variation: from the rigid models of diglossia proposed by Marçais and Ferguson to the several approaches to variation in the Arabic language (the concept of multilayered

---

1 The term “rhetoric” has come to have a variety of uses. I will use it here with two meanings: one broad and one narrow. The broad one sees every symbolic interaction as inherently rhetorical (Burke 1950, Crocker 1977, Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 2008). The narrow one is the Aristotelian sense: rhetoric is persuasive discourse intended for a popular audience.

2 It is interesting to notice how the distinction between Spoken Standard Arabic and Written Standard Arabic, and between production of SA (both written and spoken) and comprehension, is not always made clear (see Schmidt 1974:12 and chapter 2).
varieties and the continuum-with-levels, Educated Spoken Arabic or triglossia, quadriglossia, multiglossia etc.). Moreover one of the main problems which will be faced is how and to what extent one can speak of code-switching in a linguistic situation, such as the Arabic one, where SA and NA used in context (especially spoken contexts) are not always clearly distinguishable. What has to be considered SA or NA and on what bases?

The core of this study is mainly descriptive linguistics. The theoretical framework and the interpretation of the data combine several sociolinguistic approaches which involve the relationships between spoken and written language, rhetorical and genre issues and applied studies in the domain of language contact and variation. In particular, the interpretative frameworks of conversation analysis and interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz 1982) has been merged with Auer’s sequential analysis (1984, 1988, 1995) and with studies on Italian sociolinguistics (Berruto 1980 et al.; Grassi et al. 2006 and others) which I found particularly inspiring for the Arabic situation. In fact, the Arabic linguistic case, although being peculiar, presents many similarities to bilingual situations and to standard-with-dialects situations (the Italian situation is one of the latter). One of the main points in common between the Italian situation and the Arabic one is the structural distance between dialect and standard and the remarkable number of shared lexical items. The proximity in some levels and the distance in some others between H and L causes, in both cases, the formation of mixed utterances where the codes are used next to each other or “mixed” up. It is no coincidence that the Italian situation is described as a peculiar diglossic situation, defined by Berruto as dilalia\(^3\). A number of studies on corpora, in different linguistic communities, have also been particularly useful in defining the general functions, the loci of the CS, the similarities and differences between the Arabic linguistic system and the other situations and between discourse genres. Again the Italian linguistic situation, seemed to me particularly close to the Arabic one. Alfonzetti (1992), who studied code-switching and code-mixing in Catania (Sicily), offered a valuable general qualitative scheme of analysis that I have adapted to the Egyptian situation. Of course, other studies on corpora, concerning the Arabic situation, have been essential for

\(^3\) In fact, the Italian dilalia shares with the Arabic diglossia several points: a) there are several major dialects, namely native, of the languages named LOW varieties; b) there exists a superposed, in the sense of a secondary, variety, learned after the native variety in formal classroom settings. This variety is named HIGH; c) both L and H varieties coexist in a stable way; d) the H variety is related to the L but structurally distant; e) the H variety is a vehicle for a prestigious literary tradition; f) the H variety is standardized and codified; g) the H variety is used for nearly all (i) written purposes and (ii) formal speech. What separates the two situations is the fact that the H variety in Arabic is mostly used by well-educated people and not especially in ordinary conversation. Standard Italian, on the contrary, seems much more present next to local dialects: a) in primary socialization; b) in ordinary conversation; c) creating a domain overlap between the two codes, besides the exclusive domains of one and the other (see Berruto 2007:192).

The kind of approach adopted here cannot be only predictive. The predictive approach, in fact, aims at establishing the extralinguistic causes (situational, conversational, social, etc.) that govern, in a stable manner, a linguistic practice observed in speakers. The only predictive approach posits a too rigidly deterministic and too simplistic relationship between context and code-choice. The classical distinction made by Gumperz (1982) between situational vs. metaphorical code switching, which seeks to distinguish two classes of factors, social and textual, should not be considered a sharp dichotomy but rather a continuum of overlapping phenomena. The communicative situation is dynamically re-interpreted on account of many changing factors, internal and external to the text, which are not always possible to trace entirely. In contrast, the postdictive approach alone risks to lose sight of the presence of the constants of this phenomenon so that it appears a mere irregular mixture of different systems (see Labov 1971:457). The approach which has been adopted is, then, both predictive and postdictive: from working hypotheses, already proposed and tested in other contexts by certain scholars, we seek to test them on the studied corpus in its own context. The corpus will provide not only further evidence on the phenomenon but also new data that need to be tested in other corpora. The phenomenology of the functions of the code-switching certainly needs further evidence. As Owens wrote in 2001 «there is lacking extensive research on the discourse/pragmatic and social framework of Arabic diglossic ‘switching’» (2001:433). Much has been done in the last ten years but still what is needed is further systematization.

Many of the scholars have dealt with code-switching within a genre (political discourse, mainly, but also Islamic religious discourse, panel presentation, academic lectures). I focused on another genre, that of the Coptic Christian homilies. Very little has been written on the subject from a sociolinguistic perspective. The only study I could find is Shenouda 1994 which is a socio-demographic research of language variation within sermons in Coptic churches in Cairo. Another reason why I opted for the genre of homilies is that it shares many similarities with other monological genres but it also presents some peculiarities. The corpus chosen for the analytical part is part of a more vast unexplored and only partially published corpus of homilies of father Mattā al-Miskīn (1919-2006)\(^4\), also known in the English-speaking world as father Matthew the Poor, the spiritual father and hegumen of the Monastery of St. Macarius in the desert of Scetis in

Egypt. As a cultured person, and an important reformer of the Coptic Orthodox church, he was a controversial figure who has left, in addition to publications concerning spiritual, social and political topics, a huge corpus of recordings ranging from 1973 to 2001, all affected by the phenomenon of mixed varieties of spoken Arabic (for more details on the corpus and on the transcribed homilies see Appendix 1). The reactions to this study showed (once again) the strong ideologization of the Arabic language and the numerous clichés about the language that Arab speakers, no matter what religion they belong to, share. Many educated Copts with whom I talked about this work were deeply disappointed when I specified, after saying that I was involved in sociolinguistics, that the field of study was the Arabic language. “Why Arabic?”, was the typical question, “Why not Coptic?” It is sure that the first thing they thought was that I was dealing with Islamic studies. The equation which normally took place in their mind was: Arabic Language = Classical Arabic = Islam. When I explained to them that in reality I was dealing with the language used by father Mattā al-Miskīn, they were surprised even if, after all, ”Mattā al-Miskīn writes very well”. When I further specified that the object of the study was his spoken Arabic and not his books, their looks suddenly got more than perplexed. As a final step, some of them suggested me Coptic figures who spoke more eloquently than father Mattā al-Miskīn. Similar reactions I encountered from the Islamic side. The equation was always the same (Arabic = Classical Arabic = Islam), so educated Muslims were very happy thinking I was dealing with Ibn Rušd or al-Mutanabbi or the Qurʔān itself. In the moment I revealed to them that I was studying contemporary mixed Arabic and, moreover, spoken homilies of a Christian monk, an enigmatic expression got painted on their faces, which I would not describe as sympathetic or positive.

The choice of the corpus of one speaker has its motives. Code-switching, especially in monologues, is a powerful rhetorical device, as it will be clear in the course of the present study, and, as such, it must be studied as a tool used differently from a speaker to another, according to personal choices, although following general socially functional patterns (Saussurian langue et parole). Abstraction must be derived from concrete linguistic objects, which means, for spoken language, transcriptions. What we know about this phenomenon of spoken Arabic cannot be confirmed and developed but through the study of corpora. As Milroy & Milroy put it «some approaches emphasise internal characteristics of the language system itself and do not look to social factors for the primary causes of change. Languages, however, do not exist independently of speakers, and if changes take place in them, such changes must be the reflexes of speaker-innovations, established as new norms by speaker acceptance. In other words, it does not seem possible to account fully for linguistic change (as observed in language systems)
without inquiring into the social origins and social mechanisms of change. It is speakers who innovate in the first place – not languages» (1985:55). Moreover, the choice of one speaker allows us to offer a wider corpus, although always limited in space and time, from which to draw more or less partial conclusions. In some studies, conclusions are often drawn on the basis of the comparison of brief transcribed passages of different speakers taken from very limited corpora. Thus, the risk of multiple speakers is remaining at the surface although offering a certain limited degree of diversification within the community. The one-speaker-approach, as far as monologues are concerned, can offer more insight into the context, the author (his thought, his leitmotifs, the subjects he deals with), the rhetorical structure of the texts and their internal coherence, shedding light on code-switching as a creative and flexible mechanism.

This study is organized in the following parts: chapter 1 is an introduction and offers a general overview of the problem of the diglossic mixedness in the Arabic linguistic situation (in particular the Egyptian one) starting from the contemporary earliest formulations of the concept of diglossia and passing through the various approaches to mixedness and variation. The second part of the chapter is dedicated to the mechanisms of variation (code-switching, code-mixing and nonce borrowing), their motivations and functions and it focuses on the textual functionality of code-switching or what Gumperz named the metaphorical code-switching. Chapter 2 deals with a crucial issue: labelling. If code-switching is a functional passage from one code to another, on what bases can a segment be labelled SA or EA? It critically analyses concepts such as standardness, normativity, correctness and attitude applied to SA. It states the importance of using a double approach, both grammatical (objective) and perceptive (subjective) to define SA, and describes the grammatical features that help us (or prevent us) tag sequences of mixed spoken Arabic in a clear way. Chapters 3 to 5 treat separately the features selected for investigation: quotation (locus): persuading, giving expressivity or authority, marking polyphony of speech (relative functions); reiteration (locus): clarifying, stressing, emphasizing (relative functions); argumentative elaboration (locus): elaborating, specifying, defining, explaining, exemplifying, focusing, de-focusing, synthesizing, analysing, differentiating rhetorical material (relative functions); prayers (locus): giving graveness and solemnity to the moment; dramatization of words and clauses (function without a specific locus). After a first general introductive part with examples taken from other corpora, in the three chapters excerpts from the corpus analysed and the comments related to them are presented. The excerpts, which are numbered (EXC1, EXC2 etc.), always precede the

---

5 Some of the examples presented are taken from an article I have published in Pragmatics (Hamam 2011).
commentaries often offering a contextualization within the rhetoric movement from
which they are drawn. In the texts analysed some Coptic and Greek expressions also
appear. They are taken from liturgical books (Coptic) and the Bible (Greek). This is due to
the fact that, although Coptic is not any more a living language, it is still used as the
liturgical language par excellence and considered as the source language of the later
Arabic translations. On the other hand, Greek is considered one of the source languages of
the Bible. MM often refers to Greek whenever he disputes what he considers an inaccurate
Arabic translation.

In the appendices I have included several elements: Appendix 1 presents some
information concerning the greater corpus of homilies of Mattā al-Miskīn which the
transcribed homilies have been drawn from, its socio-cultural context (composition,
extension in time, types of homily, typology of the public) and a brief outline of the
homilies transcribed; Appendix 2 is a description of the linguistic and the extralinguistic
conventions used for transcription, while Appendix 3 contains the transcriptions of the
three homilies that have been chosen. It must be considered that the transcriptions have
been divided into minutes (from 0’ to 1’, from 1’ to 2’ etc.) and every minute into lines (1,
2, 3 etc.). This means that where an indication such as MM50 - 23’8. → 24’5. is found in
chapters 3, 4 and 5, at the bottom of the excerpts, it indicates ‘homily entitled “al-
maḥabba”, from the 8th line in the 23rd minute to the 5th line in the 24th minute’. This
expedient proved to be very useful when analysing the text and helped keep in mind that
transcription is a passage from a temporal datum to a spatial one.

I hope that the discussion of the theoretical framework and of the data will be found
useful, that this study will add additional evidence of the close links between rhetoric and
argumentation and CS in Arabic, that it will make available new exploitable transcribed
oral data and that it will also give a rare insight into the ascetical thought of a prominent
representative of the modern Egyptian monasticism.

I would like to thank my two supervisors, Prof. Giuliano Lancioni (Sapienza) and
Prof. Johannes den Heijer (UCL), for accepting to tutor me during the PhD and helping
me with accurate comments and suggestions. I also thank Sapienza Università di Roma for
offering me a scholarship which helped my researches in Egypt, Italy and Belgium. I am
deeply grateful to brother Wadīd al-Maqārī, one of the disciples of father Mattā al-Miskīn,
who helped me, with inexhaustible patience, every time I had any kind of doubt or
question. He always showed me interest and care and warmly welcomed me twice in the
monastery of Saint Macarius. I also want to thank father Pachomius al-Maqārī and
brother Jonah al-Maqārī (for patiently correcting with me the catalogue of homilies) and
father Hilarion al-Maqārī (for opening to me his audio editing laboratory in the midst of
the desert and sharing with me his work). I am also indebted to my Egyptian friends who encouraged me, shared with me their opinions about ‘mixed varieties’ and their language use, and helped me during the transcription and the translation: Lydia Adel, Raafat Moussa, Yostina Assad. Thanks to them and to Elisabetta Benigni, Tamar Pataridze, Marcel Pirard and Paolo La Spisa for supporting and encouraging me in many ways and shared with me my difficulties, both on a scientific and a human level. A special thank to Vivienne Ghabrial who kindly accepted to review my (bad) English. I also thank Bastien Kindt for spending many hours with me for a project of digitalization and automatic treatment of Arabic transcriptions that could not be implemented during the years of the research and that I hope will one day see the light of day.
Chapter 1 ‘Diglossic mixedness’ between grammatical/formal and pragmatical/functional approach

1.1. Diglossia

1.1.1. Diglossia as seen by Marçais and Ferguson

The situation of the Arabic language has been described, since Marçais (1930), with the technical term diglossia\(^6\). About twenty years ago, Fernández (1993) published a monograph that examined a vast bibliographic review of works concerning the concept of diglossia from 1960 to 1990, including about 3000 titles\(^7\). The very term ‘diglossia’ has been intended by the authors, from time to time, in various ways ranging from a very narrow definition, referring to the particular situation of certain regions (the German-speaking Switzerland, the Arab world), to a very wide definition that practically overlaps with that of bilingualism\(^8\) (see Berruto 1995:191-204). In this ocean of publications that, for reasons of space and coherence with the subject under investigation, it is not possible to review, it is important to follow some benchmarks. What I will do in the next few pages will be touching on the complex phenomenon of diglossia in a manner functional to my subject.

1.1.1.1. Marçais (1930)

Marçais is considered the minter of the term diglossia used for the first time in a 1930 article in which he described the linguistic situation in the Algeria of that time. Marçais, who made an impressionistic description of the situation of Arabic of Algeria without considering either Berber or French, spoke of «deux aspects sensiblement différents: 1° une langue littéraire dite arabe écrit ou régulier, ou littéral, ou classique qui seule a été partout et toujours écrite dans le passé […]; 2° des idiomes parlés […]» (1930:401) or «deux états d’une même langue, assez différents pour que la connaissance de l’un n’implique pas la connaissance de l’autre» (1930:409).

---

\(^6\) The term is etymologically the same as bilingualism. But instead of the Latin prefix and lexeme (bi- ‘two’ and lingua ‘language’) the Greek equivalents have been used (δίς ‘twice’ and γλώσσα ‘language’).

\(^7\) Titles included (1) index of languages, (2) diglossia in literature, (3) historically oriented works, (4) pedagogically oriented works, (5) theoretical works, and (6) thesis and dissertations. The year before, Hudson (1992) considered 1092 titles.

\(^8\) According to Kaye (1987:675) diglossia refers to a situation in which two varieties of the same language function side by side, in contrast with bilingualism which supposes the existence of two different languages.
Table 2 The ambits of use of the two varieties of Arabic according to Marçais (1930:401).

As it is evident from table 1, for Marçais diglossia basically means a distinction between a variety which is only written and one that is only spoken.

1.1.1.2. Ferguson (1959)

Although Altoma (1969) cites literary and philological studies about diglossia as early as the ninth century A.D., the real contemporary debate about *diglossia* started with Ferguson’s famous article in which he considered the linguistic situation of Greece, Haiti, Switzerland and the Arab countries.¹

Let’s start from Ferguson’s definition of diglossia:

Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation (Ferguson 1959:336).

Ferguson develops the intuition of Marçais. According to Ferguson, diglossia exists when the speech community is characterized by the following situations:

(a) existence of primary dialects (Low variety, L);
(b) existence of a secondary variety superposed to dialects (High variety, H);
(c) stable coexistence of L and H;

¹ Whether the language situation in the Arab world has always been diglottic is not known. The debate is open: favourable (Ferguson 1959:616-617), Eid (1990:7), El-Hassan (1978:113) and others; unfavourable (Ditters 1992:13 for example).
(d) H is a cognate language of L but it is structurally distant from the latter;
(e) H vehicles a prestigious literary tradition;
(f) H is highly codified and standardised;
(g) H is learnt at school through formal education;
(h) H is used in almost all (i) written situations (ii) formal spoken situations;
(i) H is never used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation.

Table 3 synthesizes the main differences between the two varieties in diglossia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIND OF CODE</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standard/superposed</td>
<td>colloquial/primary dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTIGE</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>inferior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITERARY FUNCTION</td>
<td>classic and literary</td>
<td>popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQUISITION</td>
<td>learnt at school</td>
<td>learnt in everyday life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(mother tongue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARDIZATION</td>
<td>highly standardised</td>
<td>highly varying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAMMAR</td>
<td>complex grammar</td>
<td>simple(r) grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONOLOGY</td>
<td>may have more complicated</td>
<td>may have less complicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>morphophonemics than L</td>
<td>morphophonemics than H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>(i) almost all written</td>
<td>used in ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>situations; (ii) formal</td>
<td>conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spoken situations; (iii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never used in ordinary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conversation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Characteristics of H and L, according to Ferguson (1959:329).

According to Ferguson, diglossia is different from the standard-with-dialects languages for a number of reasons, mainly for the fact that H is not spoken in ordinary conversation.

Diglossia differs from the more widespread standard-with-dialects in that no segment of the speech community in diglossia regularly uses H (the prestigious variety\(^\text{11}\)) as a medium of ordinary conversation, and any attempt to do so is felt to be either pedantic or artificial. In the more usual standard-with-dialects situation, the standard is often similar to the variety of a certain region or social group which is used in

\(^{10}\) From *diamesia* (Greek: δια ‘through’ + μέσον, ‘means’), sociolinguistic variation related to the medium of expression.

\(^{11}\) The prestige issue will be discussed in §2.4.3.
ordinary conversation more or less naturally by members of the group and as a superposed variety by others (1960:337).

Under this system speakers only know two discrete varieties (H and L), the use of both of them corresponding to certain contextual or communicative functions according to socio-cultural norms. Ferguson himself clearly divides some sociolinguistic settings between H and L. The speaker will use a variety primarily according to one factor: the diaphasic one\(^\text{12}\). From this evaluation follows a rigid categorization of codes commonly used in a number of possible settings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sermon in church or mosque</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal letters</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech in parliament, political speech</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University lecture</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News broadcast</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper editorial, news story, caption on picture</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation with family, friends and colleagues</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions to servants, water, workmen and clerks</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio soap opera</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caption on political cartoon</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk literature</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Situations where only H or L (diaphasic factor), according to Ferguson (1959:329).

This analysis, which was not tailored to the linguistic situation in Arabic-speaking countries and that appears in many ways an idealized image of diglossia, raises numerous issues among which I will consider only a few that strictly relate to the particular situation of the Arab countries and to my analysis:

\(^{12}\) *Diaphasis* (greek: διά ‘through’ and φάνει, ‘to state’) is a parameter of sociolinguistic variation determined by the changing setting in which the speaker communicates: the context, the interlocutors, the circumstances or the purpose of the communication etc.
(i) ONE SYSTEM, TWO SYSTEMS

Do H and L belong to the same linguistic system? In fact, part of the problem is the distance that H and L must have in order to be considered forming diglossia (see Fasold 1995:50ff.; Britto 1986:10-12,321; Kloss 1976). It is well known that most Arab scholars, especially those who did not study or teach outside the Arab world, adopt the ‘one-system option’ (see for example Badawi 1973:7 who comments on this).

Hary explains his concept of multiglossia (1996) (see §1.2.6.) in terms of a monosystemic approach. For him and other scholars, the Fergusonian diglossia, by postulating two “blocks” (even if within a one-system reality), one totally H and one totally L, is unable to explain variation. Variation in the ‘two systems theory’ is what happens between the two blocks and in order to be explained one has to postulate code-switchings. A real mono-systemic approach means that there is a single prototypic centre which is NA from which the natives move to SA (see fig. 1).

![Diagram](image.png)

Figure 1 The ‘one system’ approach according to Hary (1996:73).

Schmidt makes a long analysis of morphophonological variation in the spoken Arabic of Egypt and asks himself whether H and L are ‘one system or two’. Basing himself on a series of interdependent rules of phonolexical variation, Schmidt affirms that one can speak of one grammar SA/EA (that is one system) because variation is only explicable if one system is considered (1974:184). Yet, basing himself on other analysis of a morphosyntactic type (and not phonetical or lexical) Schmidt states that one must speak of two grammars if one wants to explain variation (1974:204-211). The paradox is that «without adopting a single grammar approach, it is impossible to adequately describe

13 Giacolone Ramat raises the problem of separate systems/single system when it comes to the linguistic repertoire of the bilingual community dialect-with-standard (like the Italian one, in this case of the author). The author argues for separate systems («the two extremes of the continuum are very clearly identifiable as separate systems» (1995:46)) although, within these extremes one can speak of «a continuum with fuzzy boundaries» (1995:46). This continuum is divisible into a number of points, for the sole purpose of the sociolinguistic analysis. We will come back on the concept of continuum in §1.2.2.
variation in Egyptian spoken Arabic. But since it cannot be shown that all underlying forms are shared – in fact, can be shown that some underlying forms are clearly not shared – and since there are areas of the grammars of CA and EC [Egyptian Colloquial] which must not be compromised, it seems to follow that a single-grammar is inadmissible (1974:221; emphasis is mine). Schmidt affirms that diglossia is at one time «one system and two systems» (1974:211): one system on a phonolexical level, while two systems on a morphosyntactic level. Mejdell adopts this partial systematicity approach (Mejdell 2007:88). This point will be particularly important while discussing about what is SA and what is EA (see chapter 2);

(ii) DISTRIBUTION OF AMBITS

This aspect concerns the ambits of distribution of H and L given by Ferguson (see table 3) and the degree of complementarity between H and L. It is difficult to say that there is always a neat and obligatory separation between the ambits where H or L is acceptable. The grid proposed by Ferguson (table 4) is rarely found in reality and on the contrary «costituirà casi tutto sommato eccezionali, specie nella moderna società dominata dai mass media»14 (Berruto 1995:194). El-Hassan (1977:113-116) comments on the Egyptian situation by saying that

A ‘sermon in a mosque’ (Ferguson H) is quite often (in fact, more often than not) given in educated spoken Arabic, or even in ‘pure’ colloquial, depending on the type of audience listening to the sermon […] A sermon in a mosque is not categorically H as Ferguson has asserted. Similarly a speech in parliament, or a political speech elsewhere (Ferguson H) is usually given in educated spoken Arabic and sometimes in pure colloquial. Nasser's political speeches are a case in point. Nor is it true to say, as Ferguson does, that a university lecture is given in H invariability. To be sure all depends on what is meant by a university lecture. If by this, Ferguson refers to the language generally used by an instructor of, say, maths, engineering, history, etc. when addressing a class of university students, then it is not nearly correct to say categorically that the instructor uses H. Part of the lecture may be given in H, but the main body of it will almost certainly be in ESA […] The same objection applies to ‘personal letters’ (Ferguson H). It is true that a personal letter is supposed, by virtue of the fact that it is written, to be in H, but all too often parts of a personal letter are in L […] One may take issue with every item of the list of functions which Ferguson correlates with his H and L constructs.

(iii) HOW MANY H VARIETIES?

14 «It represents, all in all, exceptional cases, especially in the modern society dominated by mass media».
Is there only one H? (Parkinson 1991:36; Bassiouney 2009:11). Is it Classical Arabic (CA) or Standard Arabic (SA) or both? Has only H got prestige in a given diglossic community, specifically in the Egyptian one? This is a problem will be dealt with in chapter 2;

(iv) DIFFUSION OF H AND L in a given speaking community. Is it necessary for all members of the community to master both H and L in order to speak of diglossia? Or is it enough that only part of the community masters both varieties? This problem will be also discussed in chapter 2 and especially §2.4.3;

(v) VARIATION, SWITCHING, MIXING, INTERMEDIATE FORMS

Does variation exist between H and L? To what extent do H and L mix? Is it possible that H and L can be used together and according to what linguistic and sociolinguistic factors? Can there be intermediate forms between H and L? This is the main issue that will be dealt with because it is strictly related with the object of study and it is also the aspect that has most been criticised in Ferguson’s article. In fact, although saying that «in one set of situations only H is appropriate and in another only L, with the two sets overlapping only very slightly» (1959:328), he in fact hinted at the possibility of ‘mixed’ forms (see §1.2.1).

Despite the numerous criticisms that the article suffered, Ferguson’s merits were essentially two: (1) having considered «the spoken language, thus marking a shift away from the philological Arabicist tradition orientated mainly toward the interpretation of written texts» (Owens 2001:423)15; (2) having discredited a certain myth that the so-called ‘classical’ Arabic was spoken only by intellectuals and that the dialect was the prerogative of the uneducated masses. For Ferguson both varieties, coexisting side by side, are known and spoken with varying proficiency by intellectuals and illiterates. So, according to Owens (2001:425), integrating the two varieties into a single conceptual framework favoured the work on comparison and variation between them that was performed later.

In his own self-criticism (Ferguson 1996), a ‘revision’ of the 1959 article made after thirty-seven years, Ferguson comes to terms with a literature which is critical of his formulation of the concept of diglossia and he admits that he neglected an important aspect, namely that of ‘variability’ within diglossia. In this regard, he confirms a number of the statements made in the previous article. He proposes again the existence of sharp boundaries between H and L («the boundary between the high variety and the vernacular in diglossia is behaviourally and attitudinally sharper than in creole continua» (1996:52))

15 Of course here Owens refers only to a certain philological Arabicist tradition. In fact, new approaches to Arabic philology are well aware of the importance of considering the spoken language.
and confirms the existence of only two oppositional poles («in the diglossia case the analyst finds two poles [...] ; there is no third pole» (1996:59)).

With regard to the linguistic variation, Ferguson proposes a variation H / L - what he calls the super-register variation since both varieties present also register variation within themselves - as a ‘register variation’ related to the situational factor. The choice of a given variety depends on a number of factors such as recipient, subject, setting, etc. This dichotomy is highlighted by the fact that the linguistic variations occur, for Ferguson, almost exclusively within a single variety and not in-between. In this sense, the speaker chooses either H or L and within one of these two varieties he opts for a language level according to a sum of extra-linguistic factors.

It’s worth reading what Ferguson writes in this regard:

If we assume that there are two basic dimensions of variation in language, dialect variation correlating with the place of the speaker in the community and register variation correlating with occasions of use, then the H and L varieties of diglossia are register variants, not dialect variants. There may of course be dialect variation in either the H variety or the L variety (typically more in L), and there may even be (regional and/or social) dialect variation in the pattern of use, the ‘functional allocations’ of the respective varieties. But the H and L varieties represent variation by occasions of use, i.e. individual users of the language have the H-L variation as part of their repertoire of variation that can be drawn on for use with different addressees, topics, settings, etc. and their pattern of variation is to a large extent ‘conventionalized’ and part of the community repertoire. Since both the H and L varieties in diglossia typically include within them other register variation, it might be convenient to have a label that recognizes this ‘super-register’ status, and I have sometimes used the terms ‘macro-register’ and ‘hyper-register’ (Ferguson 1996:56; emphasis mine).

Table 5 outlines such Ferguson’s vision of linguistic variation:
Table 5 The linguistic variation under diglossia, according to Ferguson.

In this dichotomy Ferguson recognised again the existence of intermediate forms that can be described only in the framework of H/L:

The researcher can document a continuum of forms between the H and L varieties, and some linguists have denied the validity of my identification of the diglossia situation on this account. I recognized the existence of intermediate forms and mentioned them briefly in the article, but I felt then and still feel that in the diglossia case the analyst finds two poles in terms of which the intermediate varieties can be described: there is no third pole. Also the users of the language in a diglossia situation typically deal with it attitudinally as a two-term relation and use metalinguistic labels that refer to the two poles and ‘mixed’ or ‘in-between’ varieties (1996:59; emphasis mine).

This suggests that, in the updated version of his first article on diglossia, Ferguson’s position remains essentially the same with respect to linguistic variation considering it at the edge of a bipolar system where variation is intended primarily with respect to an H/L switching (‘super register’) and where only occasionally the two poles mix up.

As Van Mol said «the dichotomic division between a High variety and a Low variety only gives a very general view of the Arabic language situation […] We take the view that the notion of diglossia is not fine enough to conduct empirical investigations into the spoken language varieties» (2003:49).

As we have seen, the integration of H and L made by Ferguson, has certainly set off a series of comparative work between varieties. What emerged was a new approach that described Arabic language not in terms of diglossia but in terms of a diglossic continuum (see Eid 1990:21).
1.2. Variation: How H and L Mix in Arabic

1.2.1. Mixed Varieties of Spoken Arabic and the Terminology Issue

We can start with the observation of the linguistic reality of the Arab world. H and L do mix up, in a very frequent way and on many levels. There exists a range of mixed linguistic varieties/forms/styles, that are not categorizable nor - or exclusively - as SA nor as NA. Part of this category - which could be defined in general as ‘mixed varieties’16 – are those sentences in which speakers move along a linguistic continuum (see §1.2.3.). These forms are well attested in spoken Arabic, since sociolinguistics began to take advantage of the modern means of recording and playback, i.e. late Sixties, beginning of the Seventies.

These types of mixed Arabic represent a very well-attested linguistic phenomenon in the present linguistic landscape of the Arab countries, so much that Boussofara-Omar considers them «a practice that is increasingly growing in the Arab World» (2006a:77). In fact, such mixed forms are easily recognizable not only in all Arab audiovisual mass media, in university lecture halls, in national parliaments, but also in mosques and churches and in all those occasions in which one discusses more or less educated topics. Ibrahim writes that «la possibilité pour un locuteur de passer consciemment d’un système à l’autre à l’intérieur d’un même discours voire d’un même énoncé [...] sans pour autant heurter le sentiment linguistique de ses interlocuteurs, fait partie intégrante de la compétence linguistique des locuteurs natifs scolarisés» (Ibrahim 1978:14).

Ferguson (1959) made a brief mention of the possible existence of what he called ‘intermediate varieties’ within the strong dichotomization H(igh variety)/L(ow variety). He said that

In Arabic, for example, a kind of spoken Arabic much used in semiformal or cross-dialectal situations has a highly classical vocabulary with few or no inflectional endings, with certain features of classical syntax, but with a fundamentally colloquial base in morphology and syntax, and a generous admixture of colloquial vocabulary (Ferguson 1959:332).

16 I used this general term simply for convenience, like a ‘big container’ in which to put, approximatively, the phenomenology of the Arabic mixed forms, both written and spoken, both modern and pre-modern. This, especially in the light of the fact that there is no unanimous opinion among scholars about the terminology to be adopted with respect to these types of varieties. I follow, in this, Larcher («Il faudrait parler en anglais de Mixed Arabic» (2001:605)) and Lentin («Nothing prevents us [...] from regarding Middle Arabic [...] as belonging to a large ensemble that could be labelled ‘Mixed Arabic’» (2008:216)). See also §1.2.1.1.
Ferguson alluded to the fact that in the spoken language, between H and L, there are a number of «relatively uncodified, unstable, intermediate forms of the language (Greek mikti, Arabic al-.luğah al-wuṣṭā, Haitian créole de salon) and repeated borrowing of vocabulary items from H to L» that try to solve «communicative tensions which arise in the diglossia situation» (1959:332). It is an intermediate in-between space of forms not properly classifiable as either H or L, but with a basically morphological and syntactic L basis where the two varieties, L and H, are exclusive. This bridge between the two varieties is simply represented by the vocabulary that the two poles lend to each other. However, Ferguson, did not bring any empirical evidence for his claims.

The study of the ‘real’ language, based on the analysis of corpora, quickly revealed that native speakers rarely use purely one or the other variant. But it is at the end of the Sixties and the beginning of the Seventies, that is in the time in which sociolinguistics was emerging as a discipline, thanks to the work of Labov and adjunct researches added by other scholars, that the Arabic language was also investigated from a new perspective.

In particular, from the Seventies onwards mixed forms of spoken Arabic have been the subject of in-depth sociolinguistic investigation. One of the first attempts was the definition of a model based on levels and/or varieties within two poles (see §1.2.2.). There are two main problems of this approach according to Owens & Bani Yasin 1991: 1. the difficulty, already admitted by Blanc (1960:85), of assigning a given text to one level or another because of the possibility of classifying it differently according to different linguistic and paralinguistic criteria; 2. the use of ideal poles, SA and dialect, without clear definition, the competence of which is not the same for all Arab speakers17. Whether it is possible to clearly define SA and EA, and within what boundaries, represents one of the main theoretical aspects of this research. This point will be dealt with later.

Mejdell states that literature about the mixed varieties considers two main starting points:

(i) in line with Ferguson, one of these says that this kind of mixed forms are unstable intermediate forms of the language. This is the opinion of numerous scholars, e.g. Diem who speaks of «als Ergebnis von gegenseitiger Interferenz des Hocharabischen und des Dialekts entsteht häufig eine Sprechweise, die man weder dem Hocharabischen noch dem Dialekt zuweisen kann. Es ist eine Mischsprache ohne festgelegte Formen und Regeln, wie auch Ferguson (1960) betont hat» (1974:26; emphasis is mine) while Blau speaks of «infinitely Varied Mixtures of Classical and Middle Arabic elements» (1981:25; emphasis is

17 For a more comprehensive exploration of the developments of Arabic pre-modern and modern sociolinguistics see Owens (2001). For the main trends of contemporary Arabic sociolinguistics see Bassiouney (2009).
mine) «very similar to the admixture of Classical Arabic with elements of Modern Arabic dialects» (ibid, note 1);

(ii) the other argument is that these forms «are not the product of random mixing or switching or selection, but regulated by rules and constraints of both structural and pragmatic nature, to the extent that switching is, at least to a considerable extent, predictable» (Mejdell 2007:86). Examples of this kind of approach are Schmidt (1974), Eid (1982 et al.), ElGibali (1993 et al.), Mejdell (2006 et al.), Bassiouney (2006 et al.), Boussofara-Omar (2006a) and many others. These authors have dealt with the mixed forms of spoken Arabic according to three main approaches:

(i) **definition of levels and/or varieties within a continuum** formed by two poles (e.g. Blanc 1960, Badawi 1973 and Blau 1981);

(ii) **analysis of stylistic variation within a diglossic continuum or the setting of rules for a grammar of hybridization, especially on a morphologic level** (e.g. Elgibali 1993, Hary 1996 and Mejdell 2006a): what I will call the 'grammatical approach';

(iii) **the use of the concept of CS** (e.g. Eid 1982, Bassiouney 2006, Mejdell 2006a and Omar Boussofara 2006a): what I will call the ‘functional approach’.

1.2.1.1. terminology used for mixed varieties

As regards terminology, there is no agreement among scholars. Many are, in fact, the terms used by the scientific literature in relation to specific approaches of scholars. The adopted solutions are often ambiguous, limited or generic. Moreover, not all scholars agree about connecting mixed written forms of pre-modern Arabic with mixed spoken forms of contemporary Arabic.

For now, we can say that for pre-modern written Arabic, namely the Arabic used in pre-modern Jewish, Christian and Muslim texts presenting varieties of written Arabic which deviate from the ‘classical’ norm, we find in English the term ‘Middle Arabic’; in French ‘moyen arabe,’ ‘arabe moyen,’ ‘arabe mélangé,’ ‘arabe mixte’ and ‘arabe médian’;

---

18 I will come again later on the concept of *continuum* (§1.2.3.).

19 From an interview I conducted with Gunvor Mejdell in 2008 in Cairo.

20 A brilliant attempt to find points in common between the two study currents was carried out by Mejdell (2008b).

21 To get an overview of the meanings and of the use of this term see Lentin (2008).

22 About the use of the word ‘arab moyen’ Pierre Larcher writes: «Pourquoi continuer à employer le terme de Middle Arabic? L’emploi d’un tel terme, dans un tel sens, est en effet un contre-emploi! Il revient en effet à employer un terme qui, au départ, n’a pas une simple connotation chronologique, mais en fait une dénotation historique, pour désigner, à la fin, ce qui relève d’une sociolinguistique variationniste. Il faudrait parler en anglais de Mixed Arabic et en français, *où la place de l’adjectif épithète est pertinente*, d’« arabe moyen »» (2001:605; italics are mine)
in German ‘Mittelarabisch’; in Arabic ‘al-ʕarabiyya al-wusṭā’, ‘al-ʕarabiyya al-waṣīṭa’ and ‘al-ʕarabiyya al-muwallada’. The term ‘Middle Arabic’ is somehow ambiguous. The question is whether ‘middle’ is to be intended chronologically (such as a term like ‘Middle English’), sociolinguistically intermediate or only linguistically mixed. In Italian, through the distinction ‘medio arabo’ / ‘arabo mediano,’ the misunderstanding has been - apparently - solved by providing a double denomination for the double meaning of ‘middle’: the first one is the term that defines the language of pre-Modern text which deviate from the norm; but it is with the second term, which has a sociolinguistic meaning, that one defines the almost exclusively spoken Arabic which is far from the norm. Now - coming to the contemporary times - this expedient does not solve a further ambiguity that is inherent in the word ‘medio’ or ‘mediano’. In fact, how legitimately can one call these varieties of mixed Arabic ‘middle’ or ‘intermediate’? Moreover, how to define those modern written forms of mixed Arabic (press, prose, poetry etc.) since the linguistic datum (‘being mixed’) and the historical datum (‘contemporaneity’) overlap? Another question is: how to distinguish, within the term ‘mediano’, morphosyntactic hybrid forms F/A from the phenomenon of CS between F and A? Therefore, the two Italian terms do not seem to be indicative as much as the term Middle Arabic.

Perhaps because of this ambiguity, a number of scholars have suggested, regarding contemporary spoken Arabic, a terminology ‘independent’ from the concept of ‘middle Arabic’. Just to name a few authors: Blanc (1960) identifies three levels of language variation between two ‘pure’ poles, plain colloquial and standard classical: koineized colloquial, which represents any colloquial in which levelling elements are introduced; semi-literary or elevated colloquial, any plain or koineized colloquial which is classicized beyond the ‘slightly formal,’; modified classical: classical Arabic with dialectal elements (see §1.2.2.1.). El-Hassan (1972), Meiseles (1980) and Mitchell (1986) use the term Educated Spoken Arabic (ESA) (see §1.2.4.). Badawī (1973) calls the ‘mixture level’ʕāmmiyat al-muθaqqafīn (A of well-educated people) (see §1.2.2.2.). Meiseles (1986) offers two mixed levels: Oral Literary Arabic (OLA) and Educated Spoken Arabic (ESA) (see §1.2.5.). Hary (1989) speaks of Variety B (opposed to a Variety A [standard] and Variety C [dialect]) and Variety Bn or mesolect (opposed to Variety A/Acrolect/Standard Arabic and Variety C/Basilect/Colloquial Arabic) (Hary 1996) (see §1.2.5.). Mejdell (2006a) speaks of mixed styles.

Some studies such as Eid (1982), Bassiouney (2006), Mejdell (2006a) and Boussofara-Omar (2006a) tend to see in mixed forms of spoken Arabic linguistic and sociolinguistic mechanisms similar, and sometimes identical, to those recorded in bilingual contexts. In this regard, the title chosen by Boussofara-Omar for an article of her
is certainly indicative of this approach: ‘Neither third language nor middle varieties but diglossic switching’.

Even if not yet resolved, the question of terminology brings us to assume this last approach which aims at adapting sociolinguistic studies applied to bilinguals and standard-with-dialect(s) to the Arabic situation.

1.2.2. Defining levels and continuum-with-levels (Blanc 1960 and Badawi 1973)

1.2.2.1. Levels: Blanc (1960)

After Ferguson, other authors treated the Arabic linguistic situation starting from the spoken language. In 1960 Blanc wrote that: «the practical Arabist must at some point come to grips with the fact that speakers often do not stick exclusively to ‘genuine dialect’» (1960:81).

Blanc, who can be considered a precursor of contemporary Arabic sociolinguistics\[23\], transcribed and analyzed a conversation whose topic was the ‘Arabic Language’ which took place between four lecturers of Arabic employed in the Army Language School in Monterey, California: Two lecturers were from Baghdad (B1, Muslim, and B2, Christian), one from Jerusalem (J) and one from Aleppo (S).

1.2.2.1.1. The two processes of change in the dialect

Blanc was one of the first to propose a description of the two major processes underlying variation within Arabic dialects which can also occur simultaneously:

(i) leveling;
(ii) classicizing.

(i) leveling primarily occurs in situations of inter-dialect dialogue and to avoid localisms in favour of ‘koineized’ elements, more common or best known. Blanc writes:

In certain situations, usually interdialiectal contact, the speaker may replace certain features of his native dialect with their equivalents in a dialect carrying higher

---

\[23\] In the very general sense given by Fishman: «[the sociology of language] is concerned with describing the generally accepted social organization of language usage within speech community (or within speech-and-writing communities, to be more exact)» (1972[1971]:2). Ferguson’s article is considered one of the first essays of sociolinguistics in the sense given to it by Fishman, but it did not concentrate only on Arabic (Owens considers that it «probably marks the beginning of Arabic sociolinguistics» (Owens 2001:423)). On the “ancestors” of modern sociolinguistics since the Forties of the Twentieth century, see for example the synthesis of Le Page (1997:15-21). For some notes on the proto-sociolinguistics in the medieval Arab grammarians see Owens 2001:420-423.
prestige, not necessarily that of the interlocutor [...] In limiting case, complete dialect substitution may of course take place (1960:1982).

This process can also happen without the speaker moving from his dialect, by simply avoiding those lexical or phonetic elements that seem too ‘local’ or ‘rustic,’ that is socially marked.

(ii) CLASSICIZATION serves to ‘formalize’. Classicization is, for example, replacing certain dialect elements with other “classical”. For example /q/ replace /ʔ/ (Cairo, Damascus, Beirut etc.) or /g/ (Baghdad).

Classical forms are of daily use for all the educated Arabic speakers. Particular indication of a semi-formal or semi-literary style is the use of the etymologic hamza as in /marʔa/ ‘woman’.

The classicization is based on a series of extra-linguistic factors («the speaker’s personality, his mood, his attitude toward the interlocutor or the topic of discussion» (1960:84)) and concerns phonetic variations (e.g. /bila:d/ for /bla:d/ ‘country’) or syntactic variations (use of ?an to introduce subordinate clauses) or it can be realized in whole clauses «in some sort of Classical Arabic» (1960:84).

1.2.2.1.2. levels

Blanc distinguishes five linguistic levels:

(i) plain colloquial: the simple speech characteristic of a given region. It may have a ‘informal’ or ‘slightly formal’ variant;
(ii) koineized colloquial: any colloquial in which levelling elements have been introduced, more or less freely;
(iii) semi-literary or elevated colloquial: any plain or koineized colloquial that has been classicized beyond the ‘slightly formal’;
(iv) modified classical: CA with dialectal elements;
(v) standard classical: CA without dialectal interference (1960:85).

These five levels are based on intuition and on a very limited investigation although Blanc worked in a way which was anything but theoretical – contrary to what Ferguson (1959) did - working on a recorded conversation. Yet, one of the other limits of Blanc’s work is that he dealt with koineization and interdialectal contact (i.e. how well-

---

24 A simplified version of Blanc’s levels, is given by Blau who distinguishes - for the specific case of Judeo-Arabic - three levels: «1. some kind of Classical Arabic with Middle Arabic admixture; 2. semi-classical Middle Arabic; 3. some kind of ‘classicized’ Middle Arabic» (1981:25).

25 For criticism see El-Hassan 1977.
educated Arabs from different countries speak when they meet together) and not with the different levels of spoken language in one region. This would be done by Badawi.

1.2.2.2. Continuum-with-levels: Badawi (1973)

Badawi's classic, Mustawayāt al-ʕarabiyya al-muʕāṣira fī Miṣr ('The levels of contemporary Arabic in Egypt'), is probably the first investigation in which a scholar speaks of a continuum of different levels. In Badawi's sociolinguistic analysis one cannot speak of a diglossia stricto sensu, that is of two oppositional varieties (H(igh)/L(ow)) when one speaks about Arabic of Egypt, but rather of a continuum which is divisible, for descriptive purposes only, in five linguistic levels (two F levels and three A levels) used by speakers mainly according to the 'education' factor (although not the exclusive reason) rather than the 'setting' one that, according to Ferguson, explains the election of the variety H or L. Badawi writes that «each of these five systems, or levels, contains elements which exist also in one or more of the other levels, but in varying proportions» (Badawi & Hinds, 1991:VIII). As Holes points out «Badawi conceives of these levels as representing both the community's shared repertoire of potential styles, the individual's choice of which is determined by communal rules of contextual appropriacy, and at the same time the actual 'normal styles' of certain socially defined groups» (1993:14; author's small caps). Arabic is seen by Badawi as a continuum, the various systems or levels are not to be considered as discrete varieties: it is like a rainbow – just to use Badawi's metaphor - where one finds areas where colours are crisp and areas where colours are melted in those immediately adjacent (see §1.2.2.2.3.). This also means that speakers, starting from a given variety, can move through the linguistic spectrum adapting their own language, even in short periods of time (Badawi, 1973:92-93). The analysis proposed by Badawi, which recognizes and demonstrates the dynamic nature of spoken Arabic, although restricted to the Egyptian linguistic reality, can be considered, at least to a certain extent, a scheme of interpretation of other realities of other Arab countries.

1.2.2.2.1. Badawi's mustawayāt

The five levels of Arabic systematized by Badawi are the following:

1. *fuṣḥā at-turāθ* 'fuṣḥā of the heritage'
«the linguistic vehicle of the legacy of Islamic high culture and religion» (Badawi, 1991:VIII);

«it represents the prescriptive Arabic grammar as taught at traditional institutions like al-Azhar University [...]. It is a written language, but is heard in its spoken form on religious programmes on TV» (Bassiouney 2009:14-15; emphasis is mine). It is the code used by Islamic linguistically ideologized speakers who want to rehearse traditional texts in their language;

2. *fuṣḥā al-ṣaṣr* ‘contemporary *fuṣḥā*’

«*Fushah* differs [...] from the somewhat ideal picture left us by the ancient linguists of the Arabic language [...] As long as we will consider *fuṣḥā al-ṭurāth* in this way, we will not need to provide a description of it, having the ancient Arab grammarians undertaken this»

«*Fushah* al-ṣaṣr is the written record of sciences and knowledge of the contemporary age. This archive can remain written and can be read in public. A minority can try - sometimes with some success - to speak extemporaneously in the same linguistic ‘level’ and with the grammatical constraints of the written language».

3. *ʕāmmiyyat al-muθaqqafīn* ‘*ʕāmmiyya* of the cultured’

«This is the level in which the corruption of the traditional characteristics of *fuṣḥā* reaches such a level that it can no longer be considered within the limits - or the degrees - of *fuṣḥā* [...] It is the limit in which *ʕāmmiyya*, moving upwards towards *fuṣḥā*, reaches a degree where it becomes able to express, orally, contemporary culture».
I think Bassiouney makes a good point when she says that ūmmiyyat al-μuθaqqafīn «may be used for serious discussion, but is not normally written. It is used by ‘cultured’ (i.e. well-educated) people on television. It is often the language used in formal teaching in Egyptian universities, and it is becoming the means of educating students and discussing with them different topics. In other words, it is becoming the medium of instruction in Egyptian classrooms» (Bassiouney 2009:15; emphasis mine);

4. ūmmiyyat al-mutanawwirīn ‘ūmmiyya of the educated’

«This is the everyday language that people educated to a basic level (but not university level) use with family and friends, and may occur on TV in a discussion of sport or fashion or other ‘non-intellectual’ topics. Cultured and well-educated people also use it when talking in a relaxed fashion about non-serious topics» (Bassiouney 2009:15)

5. ūmmiyyat al-ʔummiyyīn ‘ūmmiyya of the illiterates’

«This is the language that is based on illiteracy of its speakers with all that it entails in terms of living standards and outlook about life» (Badawi, 1973:189)

29 «ūmmiyyat al-μuθaqqafīn expresses the same cultural function of fuṣḥā al-Saṣr, it has the same expressive capacities and it shares the same scientific and cultural domain. The first one is printed while the second one is [orally] produced».

30 «ūmmiyyat al-mutanawwirīn is characterized by being a practical language, far from abstractions. The language of sale, of social life, in which we ask about state of health, living conditions, family, friends and so on».

31 «ūmmiyyat al-ʔummiyyīn is the level that is based on illiteracy of its speakers with all that it entails in terms of living standards and outlook about life».
Levels can interact in various ways («they are in continuous connection and interaction one with another» (Badawī 1973:92; translation mine)) according to sociological and linguistic rules or constraints (1973:93).

As regards the linguistic elements that are perceived to affect the change of level Badawī is mostly vague although he seems to give more importance to some features over others as in this examples quoted in the book (1973:11 et seqq.):

**This is a topic which interests all parents and educators**

The sentence is realized in three variants to show the passage from a +F level to a +A level:

**BAD1**

*ha:ða: mawḍu:ʕun yuhimmu kulli lʔa:ba:?i wa-l-murabbi:n*\(^{32}\) ‘This is the first variant that respect the orthoepic norms established by the grammarians’.

**BAD2**

*ha:za(:) mawḍu:ʕ yahumm kulli lʔa:ba:? wa-l-murabbi:n*\(^{33}\)

---

\(^{32}\) Badawi presents these example in Arabic letters with ending vowels.

\(^{33}\) The verb is written with ḍamma in the text (1973:11) and the *DET* is written with ḏal. But when commenting the example (1973:12) Badawī writes that the verb is pronounced with taskīn and the ḏal is pronounced za:y.
Here there is a phonological variation /ð/ → /z/, pausal realization of vowel endings although in context, verb is not correctly vocalized (Sadam ḏabṭ ḏabṭan ʂahi:han, according to Badawi). Badawi says: this is SA according to the general consensus (al-ʕurf al-ɭuɡawi al-muttafaq ɭalayhi).

BAD3

ha:za(:) mawɗuːs yihimm kulli lʔaːbaː? wa-l-murabbiːn

The difference between sentence BAD1 and BAD2 has increased to a degree that makes it impossible to consider both of the same time. The main difference between BAD2 and BAD3, though, is the EA vocalization of the verb. According to Badawi, the verb here seems to play a stronger role than the SADET or of other neutral, or share, lexical forms. We will come back again on this issue in chapter 2 and on specific issues treated by Badawi, during the analysis.

1.2.2.2. Šāmmiyat al-muθaqqafin as an essentially mixed variety

Šāmmiyat al-muθaqqafin is the level in which SA and EA forms mix up, or as Badawi (1973:151) himself says tatazāwağ ‘[they] combine’.

Badawi describes Šāmmiyat al-muθaqqafin as the solution to a linguistic necessity which is the result of the acculturation in Egypt, starting with the French campaign at the end of the 18th century. This necessity has two principal causes: (1) the failure of Šāmmiyyat al-ɭummīyyin and Šāmmiyyat al-mutanawwirin to express the purposes of the high culture such as art, music, philosophy, modern social problems, etc.; (ii) the incapacity of the vast majority of intellectuals in Egypt to use fuṣḥā for spontaneous expression, scientific debates and political discussions (Badawi 1973:150-151). The solution, according to Badawi, is the creation of a new language, the «luɡat al-ɭadidi Sind al-muθaqqafin» ('the conversational language of the intellectuals') (1973:151) which combines elements from SA and others from EA.

34 «This has been done by combining characteristics of Šāmniyya and fuṣḥā, or in other words, of those elements of fuṣḥā in which well-educated people are competent (technical terms, lexicon and the modalities through which it expresses
This kind of mixed language, which is represented by ʕāmmiyat al-muθaqqafīn, uses rhetorical/stylistic potentialities of SA (besides SA lexicon) and EA syntax. What rhetorical/stylistic potentialities mean, will be explained later when discussing about the rhetorical functions of CS in chapter 3, 4 and 5.

1.2.2.2.3. Language levels as a rainbow

The two main merits of Badawī are (i) having related sociological factors (though not always sufficiently clear) and linguistic factors and (ii) having applied to Arabic the concept of continuum. In fact, some years later Holenstein (1980) used the same metaphor of the chromatic spectrum to describe continua. In this respect, Badawī writes that the levels have no clear and rigid boundaries separating each one for the other. Moreover, the transition from one level to what neighbours happens gradually so that, in each level, one can distinguish between "a middle region" or the top and "a marginal region", a region in which the features of the two neighbouring regions mix up to an extent that, in some cases, it becomes difficult to judge whether a certain utterance belongs to a given level or to the level which neighbours it (Badawī 1973:96-97).

Arabic is seen by Badawī as a continuum, the various systems or levels are not to be considered as discrete varieties: «The divisions between the levels are of course blurred rather than clear-cut, each level can nonetheless be typified by its own specific combination of linguistic and allied social, educational and psychological characteristics» (Badawī & Hinds, 1991:VIII). It is like a rainbow – just to use Badawi’s metaphor - where one finds areas where colours are crisp and areas where colours are melted in those immediately adjacent. Social identity, except perhaps in the case of the completely illiterate, does not determine the speakers’ style. This means that speakers, starting from a given variety, can move through the linguistic spectrum adapting their own language, even in short periods of time, according to what they perceive to be the requirements for appropriate language use (Badawī, 1973:92-93).

While here Badawī speaks of a gradual transition from one level to another, he deals with a more neat transition in the final part of his book. We will return to this point in §1.8.1.. Eid reproaches Badawī the fact that his work is based on intuitions and not on an empirical research on corpora (1990:22). Yet, his work had a vast echo in the Western
studies of Arabic and the lines he marked for spoken Arabic have been further developed by many other authors.

1.2.3. **Continuum of Varieties**

One of the developments of the Fergusonian concept of ‘diglossia’ is the «substitution of dichotomous relations with scales along a *continuum*» (Fernandez 1993:XIX).

The concept of *continuum*\(^{35}\) has been adopted in many fields\(^{36}\). In linguistics, it was first\(^{37}\) used to describe creoles, generally meaning a linguistic space ranging from a high variety (acrolect) to a low variety (basilect) throughout a range of intermediate varieties (mesolect)\(^{38}\). As we have seen, this last perspective has been used by Hary (2006) in his multiglossia theory (see also §1.2.6.). In fact, the main problem of using creole studies for the Arabic situation is in that ‘mesolects,’ in the creole *continuum*, cover the vast majority of the linguistic usages: basilect has almost disappeared, while acrolect is little attested (see Berruto 1987:29\(^{39}\)). This is not exactly what happens in the Arabic situation, where all the parts of the *continuum* are used, although basilect or basilectal forms are probably the most employed.

By variety I mean «un insieme di forme linguistiche (lessicali, morfologiche, sintattiche, foniche ecc.) riconoscibile, e riconosciuto in quanto tale dai parlanti»\(^{40}\) (Grassi et al. 2003:143). All the simultaneously available varieties of standard and colloquial in a given lapse of time compose the *linguistic repertoire* of a community. The *linguistic repertoire* of the Egyptian people is basically formed by: (i) *varieties of SA*; (ii) *varieties of EA*; (iii) *mixed varieties*. Most Egyptians know – or understand - and use *some* varieties of SA and the majority of them know – or understand - and use more than one variety of EA.

It is interesting to notice that in sociolinguistics *continuum* was first used for the geographic variation of dialects and not for the social one: «[la] nozione di continuum in sociolinguistica si rifà alla concezione tradizionale del continuum dialettale, riferito alla

---

\(^{35}\) It is a Latin word, coming from the adjective *continuus*, whose etymology is con + the verb teneo which means “keeping together, containing, comprehending” that is an uninterrupted whole whose parts are continuous and contiguous

\(^{36}\) E.g. mathematics, physics, music, psychology, philosophy etc.

\(^{37}\) Berruto (1995:129; footnote 19) says that the first one to use the term was Reinecke & Tokimasa (1934) speaking about the English creole of Hawaii.

\(^{38}\) Although some authors (Lawton, Edward, Siegel) still prefer to consider creoles as a ‘double system’, the creole and the lexifier, «usually the language of the group in control of the area where contact occurs» (Siegel 2008:1). Also see Siegel 2008:237.

\(^{39}\) Berruto quotes Bickerton and Reinecke/Tokimasa.

\(^{40}\) «A set of linguistic forms (lexical, morphological, syntactic, phonetic etc.) recognizable and recognized as such by speakers»
variazione geografica, con cui si intende una serie di dialetti, di solito geneticamente
imparentati, tale che dialetti adiacenti siano fra loro reciprocamente comprensibili,
mentre non lo siano più i dialetti all'estremità della serie: in altri termini, i parlanti di un
dialetto A comprenderebbero bene il dialetto vicino B (e viceversa), i parlanti di B
comprenderebbero il dialetto C (e viceversa), ma i parlanti di A non comprendono più il
dialetto, poniamo, M, e viceversa»\(^{41}\) (Berruto 1987:27). If we move to a specific
geographic area, \textit{continuum} is used to describe a space of social variation within this
geographic area, the nature of dimensions of variation and their combination.

On the other hand \textit{continuum} refers «in primo luogo al carattere dello spazio di
variazione di una lingua, o di un repertorio linguistico, che non conosce
compartimentazioni rigide e bene separate ma appare costituito da una serie senza
interruzioni di elementi varianti, e, conseguentemente, al fatto che le varietà di una
lingua sono in sovrapposizione e si sciolgono impercettibilmente l’una nell’altra, senza
che sia possibile stabilire limiti rigorosi, confini certi di dove finisce una varietà e ne
comincia un’altra (Berruto 2007:128–129)»\(^{42}\).

The term \textit{continuum} is thus meant to describe the \textit{space of variation} in the linguistic
repertoire, highlighting the continuity of the phenomena of variation, as opposed to a
discrete “black and white conception”:

all’interno di una data comunità linguistica [...] si osserva, prima di tutto, l’esistenza
di due varietà facilmente identificabili [...] e che sono identificate dal parlante come
la varietà ‘più alta’ e ‘più bassa’ [...] Tra queste due varietà estreme esiste tutta una
gamma di varietà intermedie, che sfumano lentamente dall’una all’altra di esse. Si
definisce \textit{continuum} l’insieme di tutte queste varietà (Mioni & Trumper 1977:330)\(^{43}\)

\(^{41}\) «[it] refers to the traditional conception of the dialectal continuum, referred to the geographic variation, with which one means a set of dialects, usually genetically related, in which adjacent dialects are mutually intelligible, while the
dialects at the end of the series are no more: in other words, the speakers of an A dialect understand well the close B
dialect (and vice versa), the speakers of the B dialect understand the C dialect (and vice versa), but most speakers of A
do not understand, let’s say the M dialect, and vice versa»

\(^{42}\) «Primarily to the space of variation of a language or of a linguistic repertoire, which knows no rigid and well
separated divisions but it appears formed by an uninterrupted set of varying elements. Consequently, [it refers] to the
fact that varieties of a language are overlapping and melting imperceptibly into one another, without it being possible
to establish strict limits, definite boundaries of where one variety ends and another begins».

\(^{43}\) «Within a given language community [...] we observe, first of all, the existence of two easily identifiable varieties [...] and which are identified by the speaker as the ‘highest’ and the ‘lowest’ varieties [...] Between these two extreme
varieties there is a range of intermediate varieties, which fade slowly from one into the other. Continuum is defined as
the sum of all these varieties}.}
In this perspective, it is believed that in order to capture the complexity of reality, continuous categories are better suited than discrete categories, consisting of focal points with a wide edge that fades into their close categories without precise limits. Single cases are referred to these focal points on the basis of a more or less sharing of sociolinguistic features.

1.2.3.1. a continuum-with-condensations

Arabic continuum seems to have specific characteristics.

(i) First of all, some authors, including Berruto, argue that the continuum is indeed a continuous gradation but it has points of discontinuity. I think what has been agreed upon for the Italian situation can be useful to describe the Arabic situation too. The Italian complex sociolinguistic situation is defined by scholars as a form of diglossia, called dilalia\textsuperscript{44}, or, in terms of continuum, as a continuum-with-condensations (Berruto 1987:29-31: continuum con addensamento). By the latter term one means that «i tratti variabili tendono a disporsi lungo un asse in maniera molto distribuita, ma tuttavia con addensamenti in punti corrispondenti alle varietà principali della gamma. Questi punti di addensamento sono concepibili sia in termini di cooccorrenza dei tratti sul continuum, quando più tratti non standard (marcati) occupano più o meno lo stesso settore dello spazio di variazione, in covarianza con tratti extralinguistici, sociali e situazionali; sia in termini di frequenza nell’uso dei parlanti, quando un certo tratto o una certa variante ricorrono con frequenza più significativa in corrispondenza di certi tratti dei parlanti»\textsuperscript{45} (Berruto 1987:30-31). This continuum is oriented (to the poles) but not polarized: «L’orientamento del continuum dipende dal fatto che si va da usi ‘alti’ ad usi ‘bassi’: le varietà appaiono abbastanza ben riconoscibili, e in parte delimitabili fra loro, anche se conservano un’area non indifferente di sovrapposizione e sono lontane dall’essere proiettabili a priori lungo la scala di differenziazione socio-geografica dei parlanti con tutta nettezza»\textsuperscript{46} (Berruto 1987:31).

\textsuperscript{44} For the differences between diglossia and dilalia refer to Berruto (2007:204-211).

\textsuperscript{45} «the variable features tend to arrange themselves along an axis in a distributed way, though with condensations in points corresponding to the main varieties of the range. These points of condensation are conceivable both in terms of co-occurrences of features on the continuum, when various non-standard features (marked) occupy roughly the same area of the variational space, in covariance with extralinguistic traits, social and situational; and in terms of frequency of use of the speakers, when a certain feature or a certain variant occur with more significant frequency in correspondence with certain traits of the speakers»

\textsuperscript{46} «The orientation of the continuum depends on whether one move from ‘high’ to ‘low’ uses; varieties appear fairly well recognizable, and partially delimitable between them, despite they retain a considerable area of overlap and they are far from being projectable a priori on the scale of socio-geographical differentiation of speakers with all clarity». 
A scheme of a possible spoken SA-CEA continuum could be the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>lastu</td>
<td>ʕala:</td>
<td>ʕilmim</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>bi-ma:</td>
<td>qi:la</td>
<td>lahu</td>
<td>fi-ma:</td>
<td>ha:ʔula:ʔi</td>
<td>0-ʔala:0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>lastu</td>
<td>ʕala:</td>
<td>dira:yatin</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>bi-ma:</td>
<td>tamama</td>
<td>-hi</td>
<td>bi-ʔaʔni</td>
<td>ha:ʔula:ʔi</td>
<td>ʔaθ-ʔala:0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>lastu</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ʔaʔlamu</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ma: (lla:ði:)</td>
<td>qi:la</td>
<td>lahu</td>
<td>bi-ʔaʔni</td>
<td>ha:ʔula:ʔi</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>lastu</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ʔadri:</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ma: (lla:ði:)</td>
<td>qi:la</td>
<td>lahu</td>
<td>bi-ʔaʔni</td>
<td>ha:ʔula:ʔi</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>la:</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ʔaʔlam(u)</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ma: (lla:zi:)</td>
<td>qi:la</td>
<td>lahu</td>
<td>bi-ʔaʔni</td>
<td>ha:ʔula:ʔi</td>
<td>is-sala:sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>la:</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ʔaʔrif(u)</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ma: (lla:zi:)</td>
<td>qa:lu:</td>
<td>lahu</td>
<td>bi--regexp</td>
<td>ha:ʔula:ʔi</td>
<td>is-sala:sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ʕaraf</td>
<td>-ši</td>
<td>ma:za</td>
<td>qi:la</td>
<td>lahu</td>
<td>bi-xuṣṣu</td>
<td>ha:ʔula:ʔi</td>
<td>is-sala:sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ʕarif</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>?e:h illi</td>
<td>?iτra47</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>ʔan</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>it-tala:ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ʕarif</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>?e:h illi</td>
<td>?iτra</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>ʔan</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>it-tala:ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ʕaraf</td>
<td>-ši</td>
<td>?e:h illi</td>
<td>wiṣil</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>ʔala</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>t-tala:ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>ma-ni:š</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ʕarif</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>?e:h illi</td>
<td>rału-hu:</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>ʔala</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>t-tala:ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 A scheme of the continuum-with-condensations in spoken Arabic [Egypt].

This is a fictitious example that, as such, is very limited, simplifying and arbitrary: limited in the possible variations and possible combination between them; simplifying because the spectrum is more vast than this, especially phonologically; arbitrary because I ‘cut’ where I thought it was right to do it. Here we find eleven possible variables that for simplicity I have grouped under 8 letters:

A. the forms of NEG: lastu/la:/ma-/miš/ma-ni:-š (A2. represents the EA NEG suffix)
B. the lexical opposition for ‘to know’: ʕala: ʕilm/ʔaʔlamu/ʔadri:/ʔaʔrif/ʔaʔraf/ʕaʔrif;
C. the pronoun in indirect interrogative, the variants of the interdental /ð/ and the COMPL: bi-ma:/ma: (lla:ði:) / ma: (lla:zi:) / ma:za/?e:h illi. To simplify I did not consider the common postposition of the EA interrogative pronoun: ?iτrallu ?e:;
D. the opposition between passive and active form, and variants of /q/: qi:la/tamma ?iτrax:rihi/qu:lu:/?iτral/ʔa:lu;
E. the forms of the suffixed preposition: lahu/-hi/lu;
F. the opposition complex prepositional syntagms/simple prepositions: fi-ma: yaxuṣṣu/bi-ʔaʔni(i)/bi-x(u)ṣuṣ/ʕaʔlu/ʕala;

47 It is the abbreviated form of /ʔiτral/ because the verb is followed by the composed preposition lu.
48 Berruto states that «la possibilità stessa della descrizione e analisi scientifica è legata alla costituzione di categorie astratte che debbono essere in buona misura discrete» (1995:128; ‘the very possibility of the scientific description and analysis is related to the constitution of abstract categories that should be largely discrete’).
G. the forms and the position of \textit{DEM}: \textit{haʔulaʔi/do:l} (G2. represents the postponed \textit{DEM})

H. the variants of the interdental: \textit{θθalaθa/(i)s-sala/sa/t-talaːta};

Table 7 Variable features in table 6.

While utterances from 1 to 4 can be easily labelled as ‘a textbook SA’ and those from 9 to 12 as ‘a textbook CEA’, some problems arise from 5 and 8. Utterances 5 and 6 present peculiar phonological characteristics: a sibilant /\textit{z}/ at the place of the interdental /\textit{ð}/: /(a)lla:ziː/. Utterance 7 presents syntactical mixing: it has a principal clause which is clearly CEA but a secondary clause which seems to be SA despite the substitution sibilant/interdental and the epenthetization of the /\textit{u}/ vowel typical of CEA. Utterance 8 has a similar syntactical mixing: it presents a principal clause which is SA (\textit{NEG}, vocalization of the verb) but a secondary clause which is CEA (interrogative pronoun, passive form, substitution dental/interdental, \textit{DEM}). When I proposed this table to an Egyptian informant, she told me that utterance 5 was the unmarked SA utterance while utterance 12 was the most socially ‘low’. She said: «I would never say something like this, but it does exist». Form 1 was felt as \textit{ṭalʕa min maktab muḥaːmi} (‘looks like it comes straight out of a lawyers office’) so we could label it as the most SA ‘bureaucratic’ form (see fig. 3 below). When I proposed utterance 7 and 8 she refused to accept them while another informant accepted them as possible. There are some forms which were felt as +SA like \textit{laʔaʕalam(u)} probably because it is the only verb, unlike \textit{ʕarafa/ʕirif} and \textit{dara:/diri}, which is almost exclusive of SA\textsuperscript{49}. There are other forms that are, by the way, theoretically impossible:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{lastu ʕala: ʕilmi bi7maʔitəlu ʕan t-talaːta do:l}
  \item \textit{maʔni:ʃ ʕaɾif ʔeːh allal qːil lahu biʔaʔani haʔulaʔi θθalaθa}
\end{itemize}

Explications to this are linked to \textit{continuum} or CS constraints (see §1.4.):

(1) «le relazioni di cooccorrenza sono per lo più sfrangiate, non discrete, ma se mai probabilistiche»\textsuperscript{50} (Berruto 1987:32);

(2) «vi sono comunque anche settori discreti» (Berruto 1987:32), e.g. \textit{ma: llaːdiː:} is likely that it is accompanied by \textit{qiːl} (and not \textit{ʔitəlu} for instance);

(3) «le varianti che occupano solo livelli alti e quelle che occupano solo livelli bassi non cooccorrano, mentre nei livelli intermedi c’è una vasta area di possibile cooccorrenza,

\textsuperscript{49} In EA, \textit{ʕalima} is used almost exclusively in relation to God, e.g. \textit{ʕilim rabbina} ‘God knows’.

\textsuperscript{50} «the relationship of co-occurrences is mostly fringed, not discrete, if ever probabilistic»
anche se alcune cooccorrenze sono probabilisticamente più normali di altre»" (Berruto 1987:32);

(4) consequently, there is a partial implicativity: a form may implicate or exclude another (see §2.6.1.);

(5) CS does not happen when the two grammars conflict;

1.2.3.2. a multidimensional continuum

This brings me to a second consideration about continuum in general, and Arabic continuum in particular. The continuum, besides being with condensations, is also multidimensional (see discussion in Rickford 1987:22-30). Some authors (e.g. Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985) have criticized the concept of continuum, as defined by creole studies, because of its monodimensionality and because it fits on a single axis (basilect/creole-acrolect/lexifier). According to this approach, the linguistic productions are distributed according to a series of variable traits that can be sorted according to this single dimension. This means that the two varieties are only identifiable when ‘pure’ and that within each single point of placement it is not identifiable in terms of variety. Sociolinguistics assimilated this criticism of monodimensionality of the continuum. Sociolinguistic studies of contemporary Standard Italian proposed the existence of more continua, one for each of the four main axes of sociolinguistic variation:

(a) SPACE - diatopic variation (linked to a geographical differentiation);

(b) SOCIETY - diastratic variation (linked to a sociological differentiation);

(c) FUNCTION - diaphasic variation (related to topic, formality, communicational intention etc.).

(d) MEANS - diamesic variation (related to the means of communication: written, spoken, televised, broadcast etc.)

The figure below summarizes this multidimensionality of the continuum for the Italian situation.

51 «those variants that occupy only high levels and those who occupy only low levels not only co-occur, while in the intermediate levels there is a vast area of possible co-occurrences, even if some co-occurrences are probabilistically more normal than others»

These dimensions coexist. It is therefore possible to speak of a *continuum* of *continua* where utterances may be placed, multidimensionally, intersecting and combining multiple axes of variation and positioning the speakers or the productions on
multiple dimensions simultaneously. It should be remembered that in fig. 3 dialect is excluded. The presence of dialect would certainly have complicated the scheme.

1.2.3.3. fluidity and discreteness

I think that for the Arabic situation, the two approaches mono- and multi-dimensional can live together where the monodimensional approach is an ideal that «captures the essential features of the variability» (Rickford 1987:29). This means that, the *continuum* includes fluidity and continuity but also discrete sections, namely «une gradation d’unités discrètes» (Stehl 1988:38) or a succession of clusters (Downes 1984). As we have seen, one can speak of a *continuum*-with-condensations (Berruto 1987:29-31: *continuum* con addensamenti). This means that one finds clusters of linguistic features in certain points of the *continuum*, with overlaps, since many features are characteristic of different varieties. From table 5 and 6 emerges how each variety is constituted by the features common to all the varieties, the features common to certain varieties and the features specific to that particular variety. Each element of the language which is not part of the common core of the linguistic system can be placed on one or more dimensions (there are, therefore, NON-MARKED ITEMS, that is neutral and MARKED ITEMS, that is typical of one or more varieties, see §2.8.). Passages in the *continuum* take place from +A/-B areas to more +B/-A areas. Moreover, not all the theoretically possible variables or varieties or subvarieties are actually realized both because variation is often linked to idiolects, and because, even within the community, these potential variables are not recorded.

Although the concept of *continuum* is theoretically very useful to describe and explain phenomena with a high degree of complexity, however, many scholars find that it is not a practical tool for forecasting and sociolinguistically analysing variation.

1.2.4. Educated Spoken Arabic (ESA) or rather triglossia

Mitchell proposed for the mixed forms the term *Educated Spoken Arabic* (ESA), within a project called ‘the Leeds project’ under his direction in the late 70’s and early 80’s. According to Mitchell, ESA «draws upon both MSA and Colloquial Arabic. MSA, ESA and Colloquial Arabic constitute a continuum. These varieties of Arabic are neither discrete nor homogeneous, rather they are characterized by gradation and variation (El-Hassan 1978:32). ESA was considered as an independent variety in itself (Mitchell 1982:155) in

which one finds an «interplay in everyday speech between MSA and vernacular [...] the
“literary”-cum-vernacular forms of the language that are in fact its commonest manifestation» (Mitchell 1975:70-71). El-Hassan, Mitchell’s collaborator, used also the
terms acrolect (SA), basilect (NA) and mesolect (ESA) (1978:54).

Mitchell (1986:10) distinguishes some diverging features between ESA and SA:

(1) *verbs*: no ʔiʕra:b; mood is expressed by various analytical devices; passive voices
are realized otherwise in ESA although one can find SA forms;

(2) *nouns*: no markers for case and (in)definiteness;

(3) *negation*: lam, lan, la: and *ma*: substituted by NA NEG forms; «sentences
containing lam and lan, for example, will be heard, but are too high-flown for inclusion in
ESA» (1986:10);

(4) *numerals*: vernacular forms are preferred to SA correlates;

(5) *dual*: in ESA dual is marked only in the noun and in F-style adjective.

Mitchell (1980, 1986) also makes a stylistic differentiation in ESA between
linguistic forms. He distinguishes between +Formal (+F), which are conform to the
orthoepic SA form, and –Formal (-F) which are not. This last category (-F) is divided into
‘Careful style’ (-Fa) and ‘Casual style’ (-Fb) in those cases in which there are more than
two variants.

Mitchell and El-Hassan’s model has received many criticisms. Mejdell, for example,
says that the problem is that «Mitchell define ‘style’ on the basis of linguistic form alone,
i.e. based on single variants of a stylistic variable» (2006:50) without relating them with
syntax. Van Mol offers a critical discussion (2003:59-70) to the Leeds project which
focuses on 5 points: contradictory definitions, indistinct grammatical difference between
ESA and the dialects, indistinctly-defined categories of investigation, indistinctly-defined
geographical categories, ESA as Educated speech is too limited53.

1.2.5. QUADRIGLOSSIA (MEISELES 1980)

Meiseles, who investigated spoken Arabic on the radio, poses the existence of
another spontaneously spoken variety which approaches SA to a high degree. Given the
vagueness of the concept of ESA, he distinguishes not three but four linguistic levels or
varieties in contemporary Arabic. These four levels do not nullify, however, the existence
of only two basic language systems: Literary Arabic (LA) and Arabic dialects. Each of the
four levels may, therefore, orient toward LA or dialects. Meiseles starts from the

53 See also Eisele 2002:12-17.
consideration that these two systems form a linguistic *continuum* based language of which they represent the extremes. He writes:

> Arabic is known as the archetype of ‘sharp’ diglossia: a polar opposition between two related but distinct varieties of the same language. [...] But [...] the linguistic range between the poles of Arabic diglossia, which is – *de facto* – an uncharted sea of intermediate shades, whose overall picture is one of a state of flux; or, to put it somewhat differently, it seems to be an open language system which has, theoretically, every grade of a finite, but huge number of varieties, ranging from plain local vernaculars to the standard prescriptive non-native LA. These varieties are characterized by the greatest mutual receptivity, which shows a general tendency to moderate the tensions between the literary language and the dialects (1980:120).

Speakers, according to Meiseles, naturally fluctuate from one variety to another along the scale of the linguistic *continuum* of Arabic varieties. This is evident from empirical analysis: «every text», writes Meiseles, «embodies an incommensurable amount of variation and shifts alternative between one variety and another, even within the frame of a sentence» (1980:132).

Meiseles places a series of premises before the analysis. First, the interaction between the different varieties of Arabic depend on factors difficult to control so that determining or predicting the use of these varieties appears as impossible. He admits the great fluidity and the overlapping typical of the Arabic varieties that make the number of the possible varieties, in fact, almost infinite and he claims that the problems of description of these varieties are too complex to reach an easy solution. The same division of the *continuum* implemented by Meiseles appears as motivated by practical and methodological needs and it does not aim at offering a coherent description of the intricate Arabic linguistic reality.

### 1.2.5.1. Four levels

Meiseles posits the following levels, distinguishing two intermediate varieties between the two poles of the Arabic *continuum*:

1. Literary Arabic (LA);
2. Sub-Standard Arabic (SSA);
   1. Oral Literary Arabic (OLA);
   2. Informal written Arabic (IWA);
3. Educated Spoken Arabic (ESA);
(4) Basic plain.

It is worth considering that Meiseles sees that this subdivision applies to both spoken and written Arabic. I will only focus here on his reflections about the situation of spoken Arabic and especially those concerning the level (2), (2.a) and (3).

1.2.5.1.1. Literary Arabic (LA)

LA is «the language Arabs learn in the course of their formal education, and the one they aspire to follow in writing and, at times, in their speech as well» (1980:123). It includes SA and CA. For Meiseles, despite some differences, especially lexical, the two Arabics are essentially identical from a grammatical point of view, although distinct diachronically. LA represents the linguistic system whose grammatical structure is explicitly formulated in grammar books and dictionaries stored in a lexicon. The language used, *par excellence*, in the written texts.

1.2.5.1.2. Basic plain

Basic plain Arabic or vernaculars are spoken, even if occasionally used in the literature. It is used in informal conversations. In more formal conversation, many speakers have the tendency to abandon it in favour of higher varieties, first ESA.

1.2.5.1.3. Sub-standard Arabic (SsA)

Sub-standard Arabic, of which the most important manifestation is oral, is the attempt made by Arabs to speak LA. One seeks to realize the LA model but a number of factors, many of which extra-linguistic (spontaneous speech, poor knowledge of grammar, influence of the native dialect or a foreign language, little formal occasions, etc.) cause a deviation from the standard norm in favour of the inclusion of dialectal elements.

1.2.5.1.4. Oral Literary Arabic (OLA)

OLA - the oral variety of SsA - is used when there is no need to use LA. It is the level generally used by the media on all occasions, formal and semi-formal. OLA is not identical to the variety used for reading aloud written texts (it is essentially LA; see also Killean 1980:177, Morsly 1986:255). OLA differs from LA for a number of elements far from the norm: a preference for analytical structure (rather than synthetic as in the case of L) and the introduction of dialectal elements in a fundamentally SA syntactic structure. Common dialectal elements are aspectual prefix *b-, fi:(h)* in the sense of ‘there be’ and the COMPL *ʔinnu*. 
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OLA has rules and features shared by its speakers. Meiseles provides some examples:
(a) the development of 'symbiotic' forms that preserve the form of the dialectal and the standard element, present in a single structure. An example is the use of SA verbs with the prefix bi-: bi-naqūl, bi-yuṣallūn, bi-yuṣṣī, b-aṣṣiąqīd, bi-yuqāl, bi-yiṣṭąțį, b-arā (Meiseles 1980:183);
(b) the creation of 'hybrid' forms from the union of dialectal forms and SA forms. Examples: ūṣif (LA ūṣafa + CEA ūṣif), ūla: kullen (LA kullīn + DSA koll), ma:daemona: ha:daemona: (LA ma: maʕna: ha:daemona: + CEA da yaʕni ?e:).

Another feature of OLA is that its phonetics is influenced by the dialectal substrate of each speaker.

1.2.5.1.5. Educated Spoken Arabic (ESA)

The process of koineization and borrowings from LA is typical of the ESA. According to Meiseles the spread of education, the influence of mass media, the increasingly frequent contacts between populations have led to the development of a type of dialect characterized by the attempt to get rid of particular marked elements of the speaker’s own dialect to increase the mutual intelligibility between Arabic speakers who speak different dialects and to avoid shame. ESA is in fact the primary means of interdialectal communication.

So, for example, while OLA shows dialectal interferences in a SA context, ESA, through the process of classicization (see Blanc §1.2.2.1.1.) introduces, in a dialectal context, SA interferences. ESA cannot always be distinguished from the highest intermediate variety OLA.

1.2.5.1.6. differences between OLA and ESA

How to distinguish OLA from ESA? The boundaries between the two levels are closely intertwined, unstable and vague. In general «a text belongs to SsA when the general character of its sentence structure is in accordance with LA norms; a text belongs to ESA when its sentence structure is in general dialectal» (Meiseles 1980:129). Meiseles traces the following points of possible differentiation. One gets what ESA is in negative.

The lexical choice reveals the will of the speaker to ‘ennoble’ (style-raise) or not his language. An OLA indicator is the regular substitution of dialectal lexemes with SA-felt counterparts, e.g.: raʔa for šaf, δahaba for raḥ, ṭallā:δį: for ṭillį:, naʕam for ʔaywa, fa-qaʔ for bass. The use in OLA of SA COMPL ʔinna and (la-)quad belongs to the same logic.

54 When discussing of the grammatical approach, we will see that this easily happens when mixing SA L-S and EA MPP.
Another OLA indicator is predilection of SA terms and expressions not shared by dialects, e.g.: ʔistaṭaʕ for qadara (CEA: zidir); ʃaːda for raḡaʕa (CEA: rigʕ), ʃada: for ʃinda (CEA: ʃand/ʃind) etc.

An important characteristic of OLA is that it tends to restore ?iṣrāb while in ESA it is absent (whether total or partial, it is not specified by Meiseles). The final vowel -a of the 3PS of the PFT (kataba) and certain tanwin forms are used more regularly. The major character of non-SA-ness of ESA is the absence of inflected vowels, according to Meiseles.

The OLA speaker makes use of duals with their relative agreements, though numerous, trying not to use dialectal forms (where the agreement is usually with the plural). The hyper-use of the dual form concerns also DEM (e.g. haːdayni l-lafḍayn) and even when grammar allows the plural (e.g. waʔamsaku: yadayhima:, where the rule would accept ?aydiyahuːm or ?ayaːdiyahuːm).

In ESA verbs are conjugated according to the dialectal MPP and, unlike the nouns, there are no phonetic changes to make them more SA. An index of ESA is the use of the verbal form ?itfaʕ(ʕ)al (like ʔistanna) that does not appear in OLA.

Another OLA indicator is the use of NEG lam instead of mā. Here, too, a form shared with dialect is avoided. OLA also makes extensive use of the COMPL ʔan and ʔanna, while ESA uses most often asyndetic construction, typical of the dialects. The example given by Meiseles is as follows:

OLA = narɡuː mina lʔustaːz ʃUsmaːn ʔan yataḥaddas lana […]
ESA (egyptian) = narguː … yitkallim (1980:131)

The hyper-use of ʔan and ʔanna causes them to appear in the secondary clauses where rules prefer asyndetic forms like for the modal verbs kāda, ᵍaʕala, ʔaxaːda etc.

According to Meiseles, one of the concerns of the speaker of OLA is the use of the etymologic /q/ and the interdental while ESA prefers the glottal stop and dentals.

1.2.6. MULTIGLOSSIA AND ‘INFINIGLOSSIA’ (HARY 1996)

The level and continuum-with-level approach has showed many weak points, especially when scholars tried to translate it into practical terms using it in the analysis of transcribed corpora. The impression is that this approach is useful only for a very general description of the Arabic language but one cannot actually take advantage of it on real texts. Holes clearly considers the Leads project as failed (1993:16). Another risk is that of creating new levels every time: «rien n’empêcherait alors, sans l’hypothèse d’un tel découpage, de la segmenter à l’infini, sans pour autant la saisir dans sa réalité propre; rien
n’indique, en outre, que chaque niveau corresponde à un code linguistique cohérent, homogène et spécifique» (Tarrier 1991:12).

Hary (1996), coined the term *multiglossia*, by dividing the Arabic *continuum* into 9 levels on the basis of a single short sentence: ‘I saw him’. He says

This area in the middle is not composed of only one variety, or of three varieties as proposed by Blanc (1960) or Badawi (1973); there can be an almost *countless number of lectal varieties* on the continuum between the two ideal types. The number of lects is probably not infinite, since the number of Arabic speakers and writers as well as the number of linguistic features is limited, but it seems that we can always find a third intermediate text between two different texts (1996:72; emphasis is mine)

I wonder, with Van Mol (2003:75), if one can describe and divide a language *continuum* (spoken and written) by considering the variation of only a single sentence.

1.3. **CODE-SWITCHING**

Before introducing the other two approaches to variation, i.e. the grammatical and the functional approach, it is necessary to introduce the mechanism of code-switching (from now on CS) which will be a key concept in the next chapters.

According to Berruto «la commutazione di codice, e il discorso commutato che ne è il risultato, non sono affatto accidenti afunzionali, mescolanze caotiche di pezzi disparati di lingua, bensì hanno una funzione nello svolgimento dell’interazione verbale, sono per lo più dotati di significato interazionale o sociale e sono governati da principi e restrizioni anche linguistiche»,55 (Berruto 2007:217; italics are mine). There seems to an evident relationship between these interactional or social meanings of CS and the principles and restrictions that govern it in bilingual contexts and in situations of standard-with-dialect or diglossia (Eid 1980:84).

Many bilingualisms (and diglossia is a special bilingualism as we have seen) and situations of standard-with-dialect share a great deal of motivations, characteristics and mechanisms but, of course, every bilingualism has also got its own peculiarities. There is evidence that Arabic diglossic CS have many things in common with CS in other bilingual systems although there are phenomena that, in Arabic diglossia, do not happen and others

---

55 «Code-switching, and the switched discourse that results from it, are not afunctional accidents, chaotic mixing of disparate pieces of language, but they have a function in the development of the verbal interaction, they are mostly provided with interactional or social meaning and they are governed by principles and restrictions, including linguistic ones». 
that are more accentuated. CS is, certainly, a tool that allows the analysis of the mixed forms, also in the Arabic situation.

Approaches to CS and related studies are numerous and the proposed models are often in competition with each other. Mainly, the boundaries and the definition given represent the elements that differentiate an approach from another. CS, in fact, may go from a broad definition that includes all the combination of any grammatical or lexical-grammatical element at all the levels of the sentence to a narrow definition that relates to the functional switch from a code or a language system to another at a higher level of the sentence, namely at an intersentential level (i.e., between sentence boundaries).

Given this breadth of terminology and definitions of CS it becomes important to pose the problem of defining the mechanism of investigation. Here the approaches and the definitions that most befit the situation of contemporary spoken Arabic, with particular attention to the situation in Egypt, will be considered.

In the next chapters, three kinds of switching will be distinguished:

(i) **INTERSENTENTIAL** - intersentential switching includes those cases in which an entire sentence (complex or simple) or an entire clause within a sentence are switched. In the intersentential switch, the switching point is between a sentence and another, or in other cases between a clause and another. I will label this kind of mechanism and the kind of analysis of it CS, which is normally bearer of pragmatic and rhetoric functionality (see §1.8., 1.9., 1.10.). Alfonzetti says that this kind of switch (and the insertional borrowing) «richiedono [...] una competenza minore, poiché non comportano l’integrazione delle regole dei due sistemi linguistici in contatto» (1992:177);

(ii) **INTRASENTENTIAL** – the intrasentencial switching is the juxtaposition within a single clause of segments belonging to the two systems in contact. I will call this mechanism and the kind of analysis of it code-mixing (CM). I will consider the intra-word switching, i.e. that which occurs within a word, itself, such as at a morpheme boundary, as part of CM, which is normally not pragmatically or rhetorically functional. Alfonzetti says that this kind of switch «richiede una maggiore abilità in entrambi i codici, in quanto, giustapponendo all’interno di una singola frase costituenti appartenenti a due diversi sistemi grammaticali, il parlante rivela di essere in grado di integrarne le rispettive regole, senza con ciò violare eventuali restrizioni» (1992:177);

---

56 «[it] requires [...] a minor skill, because it does not involve the integration of rules of the two linguistic systems in contact»

57 «[it] requires greater skill in both codes, because, by juxtaposing in a single sentence constituents belonging to two different grammatical systems, the speaker reveals that he is able to integrate their rules, without infringing potential restrictions»

60
(iii) INSERTIONAL, TAG OR NONCE BORROWING – it is a kind of intermediate category between the two previous types. It includes honorifics, interjections, fillers, verbal tics, all segments that are less closely linked with the rest of the sentence, since their position is completely or relatively free inside it. I will also refer with this term to those lexemes of a code that only enter once in the context of the other code (and that are therefore not assimilated in the target code; see §1.3.5.)

Since my focus is on the functions of CS, we can start with Gumperz who defines CS as

the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems (Gumperz 1982:59)\(^{58}\)

This definition needs to be specified more: it must refer to a same speaker in a same turn, if it is a dialogue, or in a specified unit of speech, if it is a monologue (see Berruto 2007:217).

The definition that will be adopted is that of Grassi et al. who narrow down Gumperz’ definition by saying that

all’interno di un’interazione verbale, [CS] è il passaggio funzionale da un sistema linguistico a un altro, in concomitanza con un cambiamento nella situazione comunicativa: ad esempio nelle intenzioni comunicative, nell’argomento, nell’interlocutore a cui ci si rivolge, nelle funzioni, nella chiave, ecc. (2006:186)\(^{59}\)

These communicative functions will be seen in details in the part dedicated to the functional approach and in §1.8., 1.9 and 1.10.

Another element that seems to characterize CS is that it happens fluently: «Speakers communicate fluently, maintaining an even flow of talk. No hesitation pauses, changes in sentence rhythm, pitch level or intonation contour mark the shift in code. There is nothing in the exchange as a whole to indicate that speakers don't understand each other. Apart from the alternation itself, the passages have all the earmarks of ordinary conversation in a single language» (Gumperz 1982:60).

---

\(^{58}\) Gumperz speaks of conversation code-switching. We will come back to this subject later.

\(^{59}\) «Within the verbal interaction, [CS] is the functional transition from a linguistic system to another, in conjunction with a change in the communicative situation: for example in the communicative intent, topic, interlocutor to whom one addresses, functions, key etc.»
CS must not be confused with code-choice which is «the bilingual ability to choose one or the other of his two languages in a particular speech situation» (Bentahila & Davies 1983:301).

Although focusing on CS, nevertheless I will also consider CM in the analysis of the macrolevel.

1.3.1. MAIN FACTORS FOR CODE-CHOICE AND CS

Factors that influence code-choice and CS, that is the motivations and the goals for which speakers normally code-switch, can be grouped into four types (adapted from Grosjean 1982:136) that we can regroup in two categories:

A) SOCIAL-RELATED MOTIVES AND GOALS

(i) PARTICIPANTS - language proficiency (one knows one code better than the other, in domains one code is seldom used for example); language preference and attitude (one has an ideological or an affective attitude towards one code and prefers it or children of a stigmatized minority may decide not to use their native language with their parents so as not to be differentiated from the children of the majority group); socioeconomic status (real or apparent: a code can be a vehicle for a certain social status); age (youngsters may prefer a code while their grandparents prefer another); sex; occupation; education; ethnic background; history of speakers’ linguistic interaction; kinship relation; intimacy; power relation; outside pressure (a state can impose on people to use a certain code in certain situation);

(ii) SITUATION – location (in some area within bilingual situations one code could be preferred to another); setting (degree of formality: formality may elicit a code, while informality, intimacy or familiarity may elicit another); presence of “monolinguals”60 (it can elicit a CS from one code to another to include monolinguals in the conversation); degree of intimacy (one uses a code only with strangers whereas one switches to another code with friends);

(iii) SOCIAL INTERACTION - to raise status; to create social distance (one can choose a code different from the one of the interlocutor breaking group solidarity); to exclude someone (one may choose one code to exclude someone so that he may not understand); to request or command.

B) DISCOURSE-RELATED MOTIVES AND GOALS

60 Of course here I do not mean for monolingualism speakers’ competence (speakers often master more than just one language) but the use of only one language at a time in a given oral interaction.
(i) CONTENT OF DISCOURSE – topic («some topics are better handled in one language than another either because the bilingual has learned to deal with a topic in a particular language, the other language lacks specialized terms for a topic, or because it would be considered strange or inappropriate to discuss a topic in that language» (Grosjean 1982:140)); type of vocabulary (we will see in §1.8., 1.9. and 1.10 that “topic” is a complex motivation for CS);

Factors often overlap: «rarely does a single factor account for a bilingual’s choice of one language over another», says Grosjean (1982:143). Many of these factors work for different speech events although some of them are also valid in a single speech event (and these are those which concern us here). Of course some factors are more relevant in some bilingual contexts, playing a greater role when combined with other factors, while other are less relevant or not at all relevant. Motivations are not totally conscious, although it would be incorrect to consider them totally unconscious. Grosjean stresses that «a bilingual rarely asks the conscious question, “which language should I be using?”

Language choice, like the act of speaking itself, is a well-learned and complex behaviour whose extreme complexity only becomes apparent when it breaks down. In everyday life, the bilingual will go through his or her daily activities quite unaware of the many psychological and sociolinguistic factors that interact in what are probably complex weighted formulas to help choose one language over another» (1982:145).

Many of these factors have been already considered when I dealt with the three main axes of variation along the continuum (§1.2.3.).

The next table, based on Spanish/English corpora, synthesizes the main reasons of CS offering some examples and dividing them between ‘response to external factors’ (to speech, i.e. social) and ‘response to internal factors’ (i.e. textual or discourse-related).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situational switches</td>
<td>Related to social role of speakers</td>
<td>Woman uses Spanish to chat with her mother but switches to English to talk to son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual switches</td>
<td>Situation, topic, setting, etc., linked to the other language</td>
<td>People may switch to English to discuss numbers or money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity markers</td>
<td>In-group membership stressed</td>
<td>Ese bato, ¿qué, andale pues used in English conversations regardless of actual Spanish fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotations and paraphrases</td>
<td>Contextual: related to language used by original speaker.</td>
<td>Le dije a la mujer, “I’m gonna get out of line.” (Remark was actually made in English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random switches of high-frequency items</td>
<td>Unpredictable; does not relate to topic, situation, setting, or language dominance: occur only on word level.</td>
<td>Very common words such as days of the week or colors—function like English synonyms. No aguanto los Mondays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switches reflecting lexical need</td>
<td>Related to language dominance, memory, and spontaneous versus automatic speech.</td>
<td>Yo tengo un plastic bag grande. Includes the “tip-of-the-tongue” phenomenon; item may be temporarily forgotten or unknown word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triggered switches</td>
<td>Due to preceding or following items</td>
<td>I wanted to pero no podia. (Switch is triggered by the discourse marker pero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preformulations</td>
<td>Include linguistic routines and automatic speech</td>
<td>Pero ay, ¿Qué no?, You know, once in a while</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse markers</td>
<td>But, and, of course, etc.</td>
<td>I wanted to pero no podia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotations and paraphrases</td>
<td>Non-contextual; not related to language used by original speaker</td>
<td>…y dije, “I guess no one is here.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic switches</td>
<td>Obvious stylistic device for emphasis or contrast</td>
<td>Me tomé toda la cafetera, the whole coffee pot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential switches</td>
<td>Involve using the last language used by the preceding speaker</td>
<td>Certain speakers will always follow the language switches of other speakers; others will not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Reasons for Code-Switching (adapted from Valdes-Fallis 1978b:16)

Table 8 represents motivations for CS before Gumperz’ work. In fact, metaphorical CS, which is the heart of this study, is not represented. I will be widely discuss this motivation in §1.8., 1.9., 1.10..

**1.3.2. CS AND ITS CONTRASTIVE VALUE**

The most important factor in this type of CS is its having an essentially contrastive value: it breaks up the speech flow and draws attention to a change in code. The contrast created by CS allows the speaker to highlight, marginalize, emphasize certain segments helping him argumentatively structure his discourse.

This contrast is readable where the «language chosen for one speech activity must be seen against the background of language choice in the preceding utterance» (Auer 1995:120). As Gumperz writes about an American preacher, «he is contrastively using two ways of speaking, [...] this contrast is meaningful within the context created by the sermon, and that the shift along the black-white variable axis, along with the shift in prosodic and lexical cues, is essential to the signalling mechanisms» (1982:194; emphasis is mine). In this sense «in speech act terms [Austin 1965] contrasting standard- and dialect-like
variable here contributes to the *illocutionary force of an act* (Gumperz 1982:195; emphasis is mine).

1.3.2.1. CS and sequentiality

Auer writes that «any theory of conversation code-alternation⁶¹ is bound to fail if it does not take into account that the meaning of code-alternation depends in essential ways on its ‘*sequential environment*’» (Auer 1995:116; italics are mine). The sequential environment is given by

(1) the immediately previous turn that provides the *contextual frame* and
(2) the following utterance that reflects the interpretation of the previous utterance.

Auer defines CS in this specific sense in this way: «Code-alternation (used here as a cover term, i.e. hyperonym for code-switching and transfer) is defined as a relationship of contiguous juxtaposition of semiotic systems, such that the appropriate recipients of the resulting complex sign are in a position to interpret this juxtaposition as such» (Auer 1995:116).

Proximity is important and means that segments of the same speaker far from each other or segments of the same speaker but in two different speech events do not fall under this definition. Style-shifting (see §1.3.3.), i.e. a gradual transition dialect $\leftrightarrow$ standard, is not included in the definition because it is a non-functional tool.

1.3.2.2. CS as a contextualisation cue

CS can have a value of *contextualisation cue* where contextualisation has to be understood, as Gumperz said, as «the means by which speakers signal and listeners interpret what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows» (1982:131; italics are Gumperz’), or in Auer’s words «all those activities by participants which make relevant/maintain/revise/cancel some aspects of context which, in turn, is responsible for the interpretation of an utterance in its particular locus of occurrence» (1995:125). This means that «conversationalists need to provide their hearers not only with well-formed propositions in order to communicate what they want to say, they also have to provide a context in which these propositions can be embedded and in which they become interpretable» (Auer 1984:17). CS has no meaning in itself but it gets it from its context, as seen in the previous paragraph. CS is, therefore, also a sort of prosodic cue (like intonation, rhythm, accent, gestural cues etc.) which can signal various things, for

---

⁶¹ Auer uses this term as a cover term, i.e. as a hyperonym for CS (1995:116).
example, that a topic is terminated and a new one is about to begin: «Switching is, in this sense, very similar to other contextualization strategies such as lowering or heightening of pitch level, change of posture (e.g. leaning back, leaning forward), change of speed of utterance delivery (lento vs. allegro speech), and some others» (Auer 1984:18). Bilinguals have at their disposal a further para-linguistic tool “monolinguals” do not have. The importance of the contextualisation clues lies in the fact that their misuse by the speaker, creates a «miscommunication [...] regarded as a social faux pas and leads to misjudgements of the speaker’s intent», «a speaker is said to be unfriendly, impertinent, rude, uncooperative, or to fail to understand» (Gumperz 1982:13).

CSs must be subjected to analysis in order to have sense:

1. «they do not have referential (decontextualised) meaning of the kind we find in lexical items». It is needed a process of inferencing, or sequential analysis, which depends on the context of its occurrence. The same clue might have different interpretations;

2. this analysis/interpretation is twofold:
   (a) by contrast the only ‘meaning’ the cue has is to indicate otherness;
   (b) by inherent meaning potential this inherent contrast has a restrict number of possible inferences;

3. contextualisation cues often bundle together.

Auer’s approach, which is calibrated on conversation, will be adapted to monologues which represent all the texts of my corpus.

1.3.2.3. CS and direction of switch

Gumperz states that the direction is essential in understanding CS, its contrastive value and its meaning (see §1.7.2.). For Auer also «the direction of conversational code-alternation enters into its interpretation» (1995:121). Auer quotes Sebba & Wootton (1984) who state that Jamaicans in London switch to the London Jamaican (LJ), in a basically London English (LE) elocution «as having differential status from the adjacent LE material, providing the principal message content» (1984:3; italics are mine, see also Sebba & Wootton 1998:266). In contrast, LE stretches embedded in LJ correspond to «material of secondary importance, such as speakers’ comments on thematically more important material» (1984:3). Also Gal, in his study on bilingualism in Oberwart, in Austria, said that switching Hungarian \(\rightarrow\) German occurred when one wanted to mark a climax of disagreement or hostility «a last word that was not outdone» (1979:117). So, here, German connotes not only prestige and social distance but also authority.
More on CS, its contrastive value and its creative nature, will be said in §1.8., 1.9., 1.10. and chapter 3 to 5 when discussing the textual and argumentative/rhetorical functions.

1.3.3. CS AND STYLISTIC VARIATION

With CS I do not mean the stylistic shift. Style-shifting, in fact, «will refer to change in language varieties which involves changing only the code-markers; there are variable features which are associated with such social and cultural dimensions as age, sex, social class and relationship between speakers» (Saville-Troike 1982:61). Style-shifting, though, will be integrated whenever it is functional to my analysis of the phenomena in discussion. Although the two phenomena may be regarded as particular manifestations of the linguistic variation, combining CS and stylistic variation in the same category, «fa perdere alla nozione di code switching ogni specifità significativa» (Alfonzetti 1992:18) in the normal daily behaviour of each speaker of any language and linguistic community.

1.3.4. CS AND CM (CODE-MIXING)

Scholars do not always make an explicit difference between CS and CM. Such a distinction, however, is useful for the present work. As already mentioned, usually the distinction is formal. As Grassi et al. write code-mixing is a «combinazione – o frammistione – nella stessa frase di elementi di diverse varietà, che danno luogo a segmenti mistilingui» (Grassi et al. 2006:189). So, at a formal level, CS is mainly an intersentential switching or a macro-switching, and CM is an intrasentential switching, a micro-switching. But there is also a communicatively functional criterion that can provide a further basis for the distinction between the two. According to Grassi et al., in fact, «diversamente dal code-switching, il code-mixing di norma non è condizionato da cambiamenti nella situazione (contesto, argomento, interlocutore): non è intenzionale, e non ha – almeno apparentemente – una funzione comunicativa specifica, né nel processo comunicativo né nel procedere della singola conversazione» (2006:189).

---

62 I will refer to Mejdell 2006 and Badawi & Hinds 1986 to distinguish CS and stylistic variation in our texts.
64 «combination - or admixture - in the same sentence of elements of different varieties, that gives rise to linguistically mixed segments»
65 «Unlike the code-switching, code-mixing is not usually affected by changes in the situation (context, topic, interlocutor): it is not intentional, and has not – at least apparently - a communicative specific function, either in the communicative process or in the progress of the single conversation»
While CS is a communicatively functional passage of codes, CM is an admixture of MPP structures of two systems, normally but not necessarily, without a specific communicative function. Often, CM is motivated by a certain degree of overlap of the two grammars. Grassi et al. say that «l’uso incrociato dei due codici è favorito dal fatto che le strutture della lingua e di molti dialetti sono assai simili, soprattutto a livello sintattico: si può dire che il parlante utilizza una sintassi unica, attraversando la morfologia e il lessico dei due codici, in entrambe le direzioni, con grande disinvoltura» (2006:190). Berruto says that «normalmente è difficile assegnare un valore discorsivo o una funzione pragmatica a passaggi di questo genere, che non coincidono con un cambiamento nel flusso della situazione comunicativa e paiono dovuti semplicemente all’equiparabilità funzionale dei due diversi codici e all’interpenetrabilità delle loro grammatiche» (2007:220). A point raised by Berruto is, in fact, that «mentre la commutazione di codice vera e propria, dotata di una riconoscibile funzione, sembra spesso manifestare – e dipendere da – un conflitto tra i due codici, l’enunciazione mistilingue pare invece sintomatica di una situazione non conflittuale, in cui i due codici coesistono in maniera ampiamente intercambiabile» (2007:220, note 126; my emphasis).

Some examples of CM taken from the corpus:

1. ana | ba-ʔaddim | il-ʔubb | w-ɓaʕde:n | ?inta
   I preverb-I offer | ART-love | and-then | you
   *I offer love and then it is up to you to*

   bi-ʔafḥas | wa-tataɗawwaq
   preverb-you examine | and-taste
   *examine and taste.*

(MM50 – 18’5. → 18’6.)

---

66 «The cross-use of two codes is favoured by the fact that the structures of language and of many dialects are very similar, especially at the syntactic level: we can say that the speaker uses one single syntax, moving across the morphology and the lexicon of the two codes, in both directions, with great ease»

67 «it is normally difficult to assign a discursive value or a pragmatic function discursive to passages of this kind, which do not coincide with a change in the flow of the communicative situation and appear to be due simply to the functional comparability of the two different codes and the interpenetrability of their grammars»

68 «while real code-switching, which has a recognizable function, often seems to manifest - and depend on - a conflict between the two codes, the linguistically mixed enunciation rather seems symptomatic of a non-conflictual situation, in which the two codes co-exist in a largely interchangeable way»

69 See Appendix 1.
In this example two verbs, that have a +SA MMP form (notice the prefix ca- in both verbs [ta-] and also the interdental in \textit{tata\text{"a}w\text{"a}q}), are inserted in a +EA context (\textit{taf\text{"a}s} is also preceded by the EA preverb bi-).

1. ehm ʕan il-maḥabba fi l-wa:qiʕ ma-ɾa:ɾ-ʃi (EA)
filler about ART-love in ART-reality I cannot

\textit{Ehm, as regards love… actually I cannot,}

ya ʔabbahaːt
voc fathers

\textit{fathers,}

3. ʔubaːʃir waːʃiːfati ka-ɾab (SA)
I fulfill my function as-a father

\textit{fulfill my function of father but through love.}

ʔilla ʕan ʈariːq il-maḥabba
but through love

\textit{but through love.}

(MM50 – 18’2. \(\rightarrow\) 18’3.)

Here is a typical example of syntactic CM in Arabic: an EA primary verb + an SA dependent verb: ma-ɾa:ɾ-ʃi ʔubaːʃir (‘I cannot fulfill’) with the typical asyndetic EA construction.

1. fa-ɾiːza ʔistaːtʃt ʔinnak ehm //
so-if \textit{you could} COMPL-you filler

\textit{If you are able to, ehm,}

2. tuqaddim ehm il-fiːl il-ʔilaːhi ʕala mustawa
\textit{you offer} filler art-act ART-divine on level

\textit{offer, ehm, the divine act on the level of}

bazl yamwi:
sacrifice daily [...] 
\textit{a daily sacrifice [...]}

(MM50 – 86’3.)
Here there is another typical example where the SA primary verb and secondary verb (\textit{\textipa{ʔistaṭaʕt}} and \textit{\textipa{tuqaddim}}) are used with EA \texttt{COMP\textsubscript{\texttildetilde{ʔinn}}} (\textit{ʔinnak}).

1. \textit{ṣalaːh bi-ṭībaː muttagiha ittigaːh waːḥid}
   \textit{A prayer preverb-it is addressed direction one}

2. \textit{la tatawaqqaf / ḥatta taṣil ʔila hadafha n-nihaːʔi  |}
   \textit{it does not stop until it arrives to its goal ART-final}

   \textit{unceasingly, until it arrives to its final goal},

   \textit{taṣil ʔila qalb allaː:}
   \textit{it arrives to heart God}

   \textit{it arrives to God’s heart.}

This kind of CM which happens at the level of the clause and that aims at highlighting it (in this case, a final clause) will be addressed at the end of this study (§5.4).

Summarising:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MECHANISM</th>
<th>FORMAL CRITERION</th>
<th>FUNCTIONAL CRITERION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>intersentential switching</td>
<td>communicative functional juxtaposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{(inter-clause switching)}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>intrasentential switching</td>
<td>communicative non-functional juxtaposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Formal and functional criteria in defining code-switching and code-mixing (adapted from Alfonzetti 1992:20)

CM seems to be ruled-governed and many studies have succeeded in defining the main constraints that concern what is not admissible or acceptable. We will discuss the main constraints of CM in Arabic spoken language on various levels in §1.4.

1.3.5. \textit{CS, CM AND TAG OR NONCE BORROWING}

Borrowing is another phenomenon of interference between two codes that will kept distinguished from CS: «it is a form that has spread from one linguistic variety (the ‘source’) into another variety (the ‘target’ or ‘replica’). In this sense it is nearly
synonymous with 'loanword,' but a borrowing is often really a stem (smaller than a word), and may be a phrase (larger than a word). Borrowing is also the term for the act of incorporation itself, so there is a certain semantic ambiguity between process and result in the usage of the term» (Heath 2001:432)

The difference with CM is that, while CM occurs at a morphosyntactic level, borrowing mainly involves lexicon (single lexemes) but it may also concern grammatical morphemes, like subordinating particles and connectives, or crystallized idioms. According to Grassi et al. borrowing happens when «il parlante prende una parola dell’altro codice e la inserisce nel suo discorso [...] per lo più la adatta fonologicamente e morfologicamente alla lingua che sta usando» (2006:190-191).

Because of the fact that in diglossic systems many cognates (words that have a common etymological origin) are shared between L and H, borrowing is a very common phenomenon in diglossic systems like Arabic, although not always fully recognizable for the same reason: «decision as to what constitutes Standard vs. Egyptian Arabic are often hard to make since we are dealing here with varieties of the same language which, by definition, would have many shared properties. In making such identifications, the analyst [...] has to rely on his/her linguistic knowledge (phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical) of similarities and differences between the two varieties as well as extra-linguistic knowledge that involves language use and word choice» (Eid 1988:52).

Borrowing can relate, on the one hand, to stabilized and integrated borrowings into a code (e.g. in EA SA integrations such as word like /θawra/, /ʔiktiʔa:b/, /maglis niya:bi:/ etc. adverbs like /ʔiṭla:qan/, /niha:ʔiyyan/, /ʔa:liban/, /ʔawwalan/ etc., verbal syntagms like /la: yumkin, la: yuga:ra/ etc., see also §2.6.). On the other hand, borrowing concerns extemporaneous borrowings, due, for example, to the lack of a precise term or because the term in the code used is not as expressive as the one of the other code (either because the speaker does not know it, or because it lacks in one code) (see Grassi et al. 2006:191). Alfonzetti states that «il criterio della frequenza d'uso e della diffusione comunitaria si rivela decisivo per distinguere il prestito dalla frammistione di single parole» (1992:22). I will use for such non-integrated borrowing the term tag or nonce borrowing. The tag or nonce borrowing is «a word or phrase from SA or EA occurring in a

---

70 This is similar to what Auer calls transfer (1984:24-30).
71 «The speaker takes a word from the other code and inserts it in his speech [...] he mainly adapts it phonologically and morphologically to the language he is using»
72 «the criterion of usage frequency and the spread in the [linguistic] community are crucial to distinguish borrowing from admixture of single words»
73 Mejdell (2006:396) calls this insertional or tag CS. I borrow from her the term tag but not CS because the definition of CS adopted here is very narrow. Nonce borrowing if from Poplack (1990:38).
stretch of speech structurally defined as the other variety» (Mejdell 2006:396). It falls within the Saussurian ambit of parole because it concerns the lexical competence of the individual. Sometimes, tag or nonce borrowings can be reported without morphological adaptation or, more frequently, a phonological one. This is clearly reflected in the corpus under investigation as well as in many other corpora, where SA words have been grafted into NA contexts without necessarily being adapted phonetically. Tag or nonce borrowing can also function as lexical filler. It is well known in the literature about CS in bilingualisms that one of the main situations in which bilinguals switch is when «they cannot find an appropriate word or expression or when the language being used does not have the items or appropriate translation for the vocabulary needed» (Grosjean 1982:150). Typical of Arabic speech is that, even if a speakers tries to use SA for his elocution, for whatsoever reason, he will switch to NA when he will encounter numbers. Sometimes there is really no correspondent in the other code but some other times the speaker simply has «not learned or is not equally familiar with the terms in both languages» (Grosjean 1982:150).

Tag or nonce borrowing also works as a synonymic mechanism for a stylistic variation. A speaker can select a word from a code into another just as a synonym for instance to slightly raise or lower the used style.

Some examples from the corpus:

1.  w-barḍak     kida
   CONJ also       like this
   And also in the same way

2.  Šala          mustawa  il-gaːʔiʕ    ruːħiyyan  ?aw
   on level       ART-starving          spiritually          or
   on the level of the spiritually starving or

   il-ʕaṭšaːn    ruːħiyyan    hàːkaːza    nasqi    wa-nuṭʕim
   ART-thirsty    spiritually    so    we water    we feed
   spiritual thirst, we water and we feed.

(MM50 – 69’9. → 70’1.)

The EA expression barḍak kida (line 1) is used within a + SA context (line 2).

1.  ?in kaːn  il-ʕaːlam  taʕbɑːn  ?in kaːnit  ir-raḥbana  taʕbɑːna / 
   If the world suffers, if monasticism suffers
2. It is because they have not yet related properly to Christ.

ya rabbi ʔattina:na kullina / ḥa:dihi ʃ-ʃu:ra l-gàyyida wa-l-ḥasana giddan

O Lord, give us all this good, very good image

so that we can relate to you personally through every starving and thirsty

weak, sick and ill person. Oh Lord, every deprivation existing

in the world is still born on the shoulders by Christ, suffering for it

asking for our mercy, as if he were in great need of our mouthful or

our glass of cold water from our hand, or

or any kind of help a weak person might need.

Here an EA nonce borrowing hidmitna l-zadi:ma (‘our old piece of clothing’) is inserted into a +SA context (last line in paragraph 2) (use of ʔanna, final vowel in verbal forms yahmiluhu [‘he bears him], dual and diphthongization katifayh [‘his two shoulders’], ḥāl clause muta?alliman bi-hi [‘suffering for it’] etc. that are strong SA markers74).

1. When, o Lord, when will you release one or more hearts among us

In order that they can put their Christianity or their Christ into action

so that the world sees you once again, going about doing good, in the midst

of the blind, the withered, the halt, the… and the sick people,

or any kind of help a weak person might need.

74 See §2.6. and 2.8.
healing those in need of healing, your elected place being in the midst of the poor.

(MM50 – 97’3. → 97’7.)

Notice the EA syntactic nonce borrowing ʕaša:n (‘so that’) in a context which is clearly lexically and syntactically +SA (the following verb raʔa, the final vowel in marratan ʔuxra [‘once more’] or the ḥāl clause ga:?ilan taṣnaʕ xayran [‘going about doing good’]).

1.3.6. A CONTINUUM OF INTEGRATION FROM BORROWING TO CS

The complexity and the fluctuation of these phenomena do not allow rigid internal categorizations. Alfonzetti proposes a continuum of integration that goes from the borrowing to the CS\textsuperscript{75}. On the one hand there are «gli items integrati a vari livelli – fonetico-fonologico, morfologico e sintattico – che costituiscono i prestiti stabilizzati e integrati nella lingua mutuante, mentre dall’altra si ha la completa assenza di integrazione ai vari livelli, che contraddistingue idealmente il code switching. All’interno di tale continuum si collocano categorie intermedie, quali, ad esempio, prestiti non integrati, nonce borrowings e il code switching caratterizzato, come nella situazione da noi indagata, dall’interferenza sistematica di un codice sull’altro a livello fonetico-fonologico»\textsuperscript{76} (Alfonzetti 1992:23; emphasis is mine). To understand this, it is sufficient to consider that if we took the first and the third example quoted in §1.3.4. and looked at them from a lexical perspective (and not a morphological one) we could have considered them as nonce borrowings and not CM. In fact, despite this perhaps not entirely satisfying distinction between CS, CM and nonce borrowing, it is true that the phenomena partially overlap.

Stylistic variation, CM, integrated borrowings or nonce borrowings, unlike CS, are all mainly stylistic mechanisms that operate a smooth shift\textsuperscript{77} from one code to another (for a single or more few items) through a continuum of many variants (see §1.2.3.), especially

\textsuperscript{75} Auer (1998b) would propose a similar model of continuum of language alternation in a range going from CS, to language mixing (LM) and to fused lects (FLs).

\textsuperscript{76} «the items integrated at various levels – phonetic-phonological, morphological and syntactic - which constitute the borrowings stabilized and integrated into the borrowing language, while on the other hand is the complete lack of integration at the various levels, what ideally characterizes the code-switching. Within this continuum lie intermediate categories, such as, for example, not integrated borrowings, nonce borrowings and the code switching characterized by the systematic interference of a code on the other on a phonetic-phonological level»

\textsuperscript{77} Poplack defines smooth code-switching differently (1987:51-77), where smooth means a transition from L1 to L2 «unmarked by false starts, hesitations or lengthy pauses» (1987:54). Here we mean a non clear-cut but a gradual shift or, better, a diffuse admixture especially at a morpholexical and morphosyntactic level, that has no specific rhetorical effect.
MPP, to the extent that it becomes impossible to clearly identify only one code. However, in some occasions it is possible to deduce the syntactic context that can be identified as \( [\pm \text{dialectal}] \) or \( [\pm \text{standard}] \) in parts of the continuum + standard/- dialect or + dialect/- standard, i.e. the peripheral parts of the continuum. As seen in §1.2.3., this is not always clear when we deal with the central parts of the continuum.

This smooth shift is not the described functional CS since it does not bear rhetorical but only stylistic or social values.

1.4. THE GRAMMATICAL APPROACH (CM) TO MIXEDNESS

Before getting into the discussion of the rhetorical and argumentative functions of spoken Arabic, it is necessary to provide a framework on the situation to which the research arrived to about what I call the ‘grammatical approach’ to the complex phenomenon of diglossic mixedness. Indeed, without such a framework, it would not be possible to approach the functions of the code-switching. The ‘grammatical approach’ deals with the intrasentential level or micro-level of the sentence and tries to answer the question: how do varieties or languages or codes mix up? It is, therefore, not interested in WHY, that is for what textual purposes, this happens. It has two principle goals, according to Mejdell: (1) the analysis of stylistic variation within a diglossic continuum and (2) the setting of rules for a grammar of hybridization, especially on a morphologic level. As Owens & Bani Yassin say «one of the central themes of Arabic sociolinguistics has been the identification of the parameters defining this variation» (Owens 2001:429).

In contrast to the level and the continuum-with-levels approach, the grammatical approach aims to understand the degree of randomness of the SA and NA mixture and to find the possible MPP rules of grammaticality and acceptability on the basis of empirical analysis of transcribed corpora.

I will adopt Mejdell’s approach (which is also Schmidt’s approach (1974:223)), that of ‘PARTIAL SYSTEMATICITY’. According to this approach, the constraints that can be found for the mixed forms «have predictive force only in a negative manner: they claim that certain combinations will not occur» (Mejdell 2007:88; emphasis in the original). What is totally or partially unpredictable is what alternative construction will be chosen by the speaker. In fact, there exists evidence that in the same speech many alternative and conflicting constructs may occur. In positive, one can therefore only speak of probabilities, on the basis of the frequencies of occurrences and not of any particular rules.

As we have seen before, there is a significant relationship between the kind of switching that takes place between varieties of the same language and that which occurs
between different languages in the speech of bilinguals. SA and NA elements interact linguistically at several levels through CM (see §1.3.4.)

1.4.1. MINIMAL LEVEL: THE WORD AND HYBRIDISATION

At the level of the word, SA and NA determine hybrid forms through hybridisation. Berruto states that «il fatto che le lingue si mescolino in superficie e diano luogo a prodotti linguistici che possono sembrare ‘ibridi’ non significa ovviamente che anche le grammatiche che possiede il parlante siano ibride: la riflessione teorica sinora esistente porta piuttosto a vedere le due (o più) grammatiche come parzialmente in sovrapposizione o come separate (la struttura profonda di una frase con commutazioni è quindi sempre data da uno dei due sistemi linguistici) ma interagenti attraverso dispositivi di filtro»78 (2007:224).

Holes (1995:295) gives the following example to illustrate hybridisation, that is mixing at the level of the word:

HOL1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>CEA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>rama:</td>
<td>rama</td>
<td>‘he threw’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>qa:la</td>
<td>za:l</td>
<td>‘he said’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ʕarafa</td>
<td>ʕirif</td>
<td>‘he knew’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>raʔa:</td>
<td>ša:f</td>
<td>‘he saw’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) «the only difference between the citation forms is the length of the final vowel. In spoken MSA this long vowel is neutralised in pre-pause position making it identical with the dialect form, and in both the MSA and the Cairene it is pronounced long if the verb has an object suffix, i.e. ramaːni: ‘he threw me’ for both» (1995:296). In this case the two competing forms are so close to be almost identical;

(2) two differences: the initial consonant and the final vowel of the SA form which does not appear in CEA. The hybrid form is qaːl which can be seen, according to Parkinson, as ‘dialectalised SA’ (loss of person-marker) or ‘standardised CEA’ (substitution of /q/ for /ʕ/). The surrounding context would normally make it clear if it is the first or the second possibility;

78 «The fact that languages mix up at the surface and give rise to linguistic products that may seem ‘hybrid’ does not mean that also the grammars that the speaker possesses are hybrid: the so far existing theoretical reflection rather brings to see the two (or more) grammars as partially overlapping or separate (the deep structure of a switched sentence is always given by one of two language systems), but interacting through filter devices».  
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(3) three differences: the vowels in the first and second syllables – a vowel prosody – and the presence/absence of the final inflection as in (2). Possible hybrids: ʕaraf (absence of inflection, as in the hybrid of (2)) and ʕarif (two CEA features [loss of inflection, change of the second vowel] + one SA feature [first vowel]). According to Holes, ʕaraf is +SA while ʕarif is +CEA. Here too context will be the decisive factor of whether it is ‘dialectalised SA’ or ‘standardised CEA’;

(4) here hybridisation ceases to be a possibility: one can choose either a SA form or a CEA form. Consequently, a lexical shift raʔa: ʃa:f (or vice versa) is seen as stylistically more significant than hybridisation of (1)-(3). This is correct, although it should be specified that this is valid for the 3rd person form: forms like raʔe:t (SA stem raʔ- + NA inflection –e:t), for example, are well attested.

The process of hybridisation is not random but rule-governed. For instance, in example (3), *ʕiraf is an impossible hybrid in CEA mainly because the vocal concatenation CiCaC in CEA is nominal, never verbal (ḥilal ‘pots’). Yet, this form is perfectly possible in Baghdad where hybridisation rules are different. Other impossible hybrids would be (2) *xa:la and *ša:fa because they violate a principle of stylistic compatibility: the final /-a/ inflection are too SA to be combinable with forms as markedly dialectal as the phoneme /ʔ/ instead of /q/ and the lexeme ʃa:f. As Holes correctly says, xa:la would be interpreted to mean ‘tool or ‘instrument’ while *ša:fa as a joke form. Hybridisation is not a bidirectional process: rules valid for NA hybridisation may not be valid for SA hybridisation. For example, ʃa:f rules out SA choices (for example SA inflections, i.e. tašu:fu:n) while qabila admits NA MPP realisations and combination with NA grammatical morphemes (for example tiqbalu [2P] etc.).

1.4.1.1. ambiguous (neutral), intermediate forms (hybrid) and style-shifting

In this context, Eid distinguishes ambiguous forms and intermediate forms. An ambiguous form is a «form identical in both varieties» (1988:55). This can be example (1). She also says that «ambiguous forms [...] can [...] provide no evidence for/against switching. Hence, in determining whether or not switching occurred, ambiguous forms were simply disregarded» (1988:56; see also 1982:58). Bassiouney calls these forms neutral «items that are used in both varieties with the same phonological realisation» (2006:36) to which she adds the SA loanwords into EA that have no EA equivalent (e.g., maba:diʔ ‘principles’).

As for the hybrids of example (3) it is clear that these forms vary from one dialect to another: e.g., yabği is the preferred Moroccan form to say ‘he wants’ and it is almost identical to the SA form yabği: yabği would therefore be an ambiguous form in a
Moroccan setting while it would be an SA form for EA settings where the normal form for ‘he wants’ is ʕa:wiz or ʕa:yiz. Speakers tend to avoid ambiguous forms when they intend to style-shift.

*Intermediate* forms, on the contrary, are «forms identified by speakers as belonging to one variety but given the pronunciation of the other» (Eid 1988:55). Ex. *salasa* is SA because there exists an EA alternative, namely *tala:ta*. Bassiouney calls these forms *mixed* (e.g., forms like *yibḥaθ ‘he searches’*). She adds to this category forms that are mixed by blending a bound morpheme from one code and a free morpheme from another (e.g., *bi-tunaffaḍ ‘are implemented’*).

Although on the minimal level a scale seems possible, it is not the same for higher levels in the sentence: «the point that emerged from the study of spoken corpuses drawn from a cross-section of speakers is that the classification of variants according to a pre-set scala ranging between SA [Standard Arabic] and NA [Native Arabic] was problematic. In some instances, as with Sallam’s Beirut speakers, discrete correlations do emerge, but with others, as with El-Hassan’s demonstratives, they do not. One of the central themes of Arabic sociolinguistics has been the identification of the parameters defining this variation» (Owens 2001:429).

Eid also considers that «the ambiguous, or unspecified, lexicon serves to mediate the difference between the two varieties. It creates a shared, or an in-between space, consistent with the two distinct codes. In doing so, it contributes to this linguistic collage by allowing smooth transitions from one code to the other, thereby blurring the distinction between the two. Hybrid forms, I would add, serve a similar purpose: they can be heard and interpreted as one, the other, or both varieties. The result is a style that does not sound too ‘colloquial’ (dialectal) or too ‘literate’ (fuṣḥā) – a balancing act that allows each speaker to accommodate the situation and create personas and identities that are sufficiently separate yet similar enough to be viewed as one» (2007:422). This will be discussed more extensively later, when dealing with the attitude approach to normativity, indicators and code markers (chapter 2).

**1.4.2. MORPHOSYNTACTIC (INTRASENTENCIAL) CONTRAINTS: THE DOMINANT-LANGUAGE HYPOTHESIS**

The most important thing that has been confirmed by studies on the grammar of CM in Arabic is the assumption that the two varieties, SA and NA, are ‘asymmetric’ in the sense that «die Interferenz zwischen zwei Sprachen geht überwiegend von derjenigen der beiden Sprachen aus, die das Individuum am besten beherrscht» (Diem 1974:24). This
The principle seems to enjoy a certain universality and has been variously formulated and applied to many languages, in particular to bilingualism (e.g. Petersen (1988) and Myers-Scotton (1993, 1995 et al.)).

The ‘asymmetry’ appears in the restrictions on the combinations of morphemes and lexemes in a single word. This is what Petersen called the ‘dominant language hypothesis’:

The dominant-language hypothesis states that in word-internal code-switching, grammatical morphemes of the DOMINANT language may cooccur with lexical morphemes of either the dominant or the non-dominant language. However, grammatical morphemes of the NONDOMINANT language may cooccur only with lexical morphemes of the nondominant language (1988:486).

As Mejdell observes «this formula seems to subsume the general constraints observed for Arabic code interaction, where EA (and the other Arabic vernaculars) must by definition be considered the dominant variety – in the sense of the most deeply entrenched, usually first (naturally) acquired language/variety» (2006:63). This means that one can attach EA grammatical morphemes to SA lexemes but not the other way round.

Ex.:

| SA DEM (nondominant) + SA lexical item (nondominant) | haːda (haːza) l-qiṭaːr (‘this train’) |
| EA lexical item (dominant) + EA DEM (dominant) | il-żaṭr da (dawwat etc.) |
| SA lexical item (nondominant) + EA DEM (dominant) | (i/a)l-qiṭaːr da |
| *SA DEM (nondominant) + EA lexical item (dominant) | *haːda (haːza) l-żaṭr |

Table 10 Example for the dominant language hypothesis (Petersen 1988:486)

Mejdell also notices that this hypothesis must be extended also to cover not only the grammatical morphemes of the ‘dominant’ language, but its phonotactics (MPP and suprasegmental phonology). Ex.:

| munaqaša | SA lexical item (nondominant) + SA (Form III) syllable structure (nondominant) |
| minaža | EA lexical item (dominant) + EA syll. struct. (dominant) |
| munaqša | SA lexical item (nondominant) + EA syll. struct. (dominant) |
| *minaʔaša/munaʔaša | EA lexical item (dominant) + SA (Form III) syllable structure (nondominant) |

Table 11 The extension of the dominant language hypothesis made by Mejdell (2006:63)

---

79 Dominant language is not exactly the same thing as matrix language (a term coined by Myers-Scotton). The dominant language in the matrix language system is the language that, in bilingualism, supplies system morphemes. The distinction is discussed in Bentahila and Davies 1992 and in Mejdell 1999.
One of the first to illustrate this principle for Arabic was Schmidt who found that the combinations SA + EA were composed of a SA lexical stem + EA grammatical suffix but not EA stem + SA suffix. Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>SUFFIX</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>ḥa:rabat (“she fought”)</td>
<td>[SA ḥa:rab- + SA –at]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>ḥarbit</td>
<td>[EA ḥarb- + EA –it]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>ḥa:rabit</td>
<td>[SA ḥa:rab- + EA –it]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>*ḥarbat</td>
<td>[EA ḥarb- + SA –at]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Adapted from Schmidt 1974:175.

This principle has been proved as correct for the following morphosyntactic structures:

(i) **SUFFIX PRONOUNS**
- **SA lexical item + SA PRON**
  - qiṭa:r-uka (‘your train’)
- **EA lexical item + EA PRON**
  - ḋaṭr-ak
- **SA lexical item + EA PRON**
  - qiṭa:r-ak
- ***EA lexical item + SA PRON**
  - *ḍaṭr-uka

(ii) **VERBAL PREFIXES**
- **SA lexical item + SA PREFIX**
  - sa-yaðhab(u)
- **EA lexical item + EA PREFIX**
  - ha-ɣur:ḥ
- **SA lexical item + EA PREFIX**
  - ha-yaðhab (bi-yaðhab is also ok)
- ***EA lexical item + SA PREFIX**
  - sa-ɣur:ḥ

(iii) **DEMONSTRATIVES**
- **SA DEM + SA lexical item**
  - ha:ḍa (ha:za) l-qiṭa:r (‘this train’)
- **EA lexical item + EA DEM**
  - il-ḍaṭr da (dawwat etc.)
- **SA lexical item + EA DEM**
  - (i/a)l-qiṭa:r da
- ***SA DEM + EA lexical item**
  - *ha:ḍa (ha:za) l-ḍaṭr

(iv) **RELATIVES**
- **SA REL + SA lexical item**
  - alla(:)ḍi(:) (alla(:)zi) istaṭa:ʕ...
- **EA REL + EA lexical item**
  - illi ẓidir...

---

80 Probably Schmidt got confused here (he writes ḥarbit): the 3psf of a III form verb has usually the reduction of the first long vowel: 3psm Cv:CvC / 3psf CvCCvC.

81 «In cases where EA = SA pronoun suffixes (-ni, -na, -ha, -hum, -ka, -ki, -kum [-ka, -ki are not present in EA suffix pronoun system]) speakers and observers alike may consider suffixation on SA stems as just a case of oral SA ‘pausal’ forms, without considering the effects suffixation has by applying EA phonotactics and syllable structure, e.g. in EA tasli:m + hum > taslimhum; ẓuyu:f + ha > ẓuyufha» (Mejdell 2007:87). See also Mejdell (2006:345-347).
Interesting is that in the corpus the ‘dominant-language hypothesis’ is not always confirmed, for example in the final clauses, as illustrated in this example:

1. **fa-tagassada  l-masi:ħ  wa-ta?annas  libis  il-insa:n**  
   so-he was incarnate  ART-Christ  and became man  he put on  ART-man  
   **So Christ was incarnate and became man, he put on man**

2. **likay  /  yirgaʕ  ta::ni  li-l-insa:n  li-yukammil**  
   in order to  he returns  again  to-art-man  to-he fulfills  
   **so that he could come back to man to fulfill**

   fi:h  xīṭtāt  alla:  
   in him  plan  God  
   **in him God’s plan.**

(MM136 – 13’1.)

---

82 For the asymmetry of SA and EA in negative forms, see also Eid (1988).
A SA grammatical item (the final conj likay) is followed by an EA lexical item (yirgaʕ).

As stated earlier, Mejdell speaks of a partial systematicity where to the negative predictive element (the non-occurrence of certain forms) one must add the probable choice of certain competing or alternative forms. In her study Mejdell notes, on the basis of the distribution of the SA:EA variants, that SA dem and neg particles are preferred to EA forms while EA comp and pron are preferred to SA forms.

\[
\text{highest value SA } \quad > \quad > \quad > \quad \text{highest value EA} \\
\text{DEM/NEG} > > > \quad \text{REL/COMP} > > > \quad \text{PRON}
\]

(Mejdell 2007:89)

1.4.3. INTERSENTENCIAL CONSTRAINTS

The intersentential constraints are more complex. Schmidt’s ordering rules and constraints (§1.4.2. and §2.6.1.) do not work syntagmatically, i.e. hold across words at phrase, clause, and sentence level.

On a macrolevel, the base rule is that the switching point will occur where the two grammars do not conflict (Auer 1984 et al.). Eid (1982, 1988) examined occurrences of CM in her data in four syntactic constructions: relative clause structures, subordinate clauses, tense and verb constructions, and negative and verb constructions. The components that marked each of these structures (and especially adverb and pronouns such as alla:ði:, fi:ma:, sa7, lam etc.) were called ‘focal points’. Eid examined which combinations of SA and EA elements occurred (or were accepted) in the slot immediately preceding and following SA and EA variants of these ‘focal points’. What emerges was that the SA or EA variant of the word preceding the ‘focal point’ was ‘free,’ i.e. it was not bound to the SA or EA variant of the ‘focal point’. If the focal point was from SA, «the element immediately following that focal point must also be from SA» (1988:61). Conversely, if the focal point was from EA, «switching was found to be permitted after all focal points excepted after the negative» (1988:61). This was explained with the incongruity of the two grammatical systems as regards neg.

She found two constraints:

1. CONTRADICTORY EFFECT CONSTRAINT «switching at some point, P, between two elements A and B is not permitted if the grammars of the two language varieties involved include contradictory conditions applicable to A and B—conditions that cannot be satisfied simultaneously» (1988:74). If the two grammars conflict, there will be no CS;
2. DIRECTIONALITY CONSTRAINT «if the focal point is from SA, switching to EA would not be permitted at the position immediately after that focal point» (1988:74).

1.4.3.1. base language

How to find the base language? That is: in a given SA/EA mixed mophosyntactic construction, how can we decide what is the base language? In this example

BAS0
ʔilli bi-tqaʕ ʕala ḥoːḍ il-bahr il-mutawassiṭ
that MOD-lie on basin the-sea the-Mediterranean
‘that lie on the Mediterranean basin’ (BAS0, Bassiouney 2006:45)

what is the base language? Is it SA or EA?

To understand this, Bassiouney (2006, 2009) critically discusses three models for her analysis (the two constraints theory, the government principle and the model of matrix and embedded language) but finally adopts the model of matrix language frame model (MLFM) by Myers-Scotton. Briefly speaking when two languages are brought together by bilinguals, there is a dominant language at work. This language is called matrix language (ML) and it can be only one. ML supplies and is defined by grammatical constituents, while content morphemes are supplied by ML and the other language, the embedded language (EL). There are two kind of morphemes: (i) CONTENT MORPHEMES (CM) assign or receive thematic role, like ‘agent,’ ‘experiencer,’ ‘beneficiary’ etc. This category includes noun, descriptive adjectives and most verb stems; (ii) SYSTEM MORPHEMES (SM) cannot assign or receive thematic roles. This category includes inflections, determiners, POSS adjectives and intensifier adverbs. EL can only supply CM. Apparently, in Egyptian Arabic ML is EA and EL is SA. Ex.:

BAS1
il-ʔiːmaːn miš kaːfiː (Bassiouney 2009:45)
DET-belief NEG enough

SM =

il DEF ART EA

miš NEG marker EA

83 Refer to Myers-Scotton’s major works in bibliography.

84 As we have seen before, the dominant language in this context is not the same thing as the dominant language in Petersen (1988).
CM =
ʔi:ma:n noun SA
ka:fi: adjective SA (see below for a comment on this)

SM are supplied by the ML (=EA) and CM are supplied by EL (=SA).
In a redefined version of the MLFM, Myers-Scotton proposed the 4-M models giving
four kinds of morphemes and not just two:
(i) CM;
(ii) EARLY SYSTEMS MORPHEMES – they add semantic/pragmatic information to their
heads (CM): e.g. plural markers add specific information to their head;
(iii) BRIDGES or LATE SYSTEM MORPHEMES – possession or association fall into this
category: e.g. the English preposition ‘of’;
(iv) OUTSIDER LATE SYSTEM MORPHEMES – case markers, affixes to nouns and markers on
verbs that refer to the subject of the verb.

According to Bassiouney, this model can resolve examples which are not explicable
with the MLFM system, when, for example, SA and EA SM cooccur (2009:46-52).
However, there is also another model for those cases in which ML is not clear: it is the
composite ML (Meyers-Scotton 1998). Ex.:

BAS2
haːda  k-kalaːm laysa  kaːfiyan
DEM.M.SG. DET-talk NEG enough.ACC

SM =
haːda DEM SA
k- assimilated DEF ART EA
laysa neg SA
—an case marker SA

CM =
kalaːm noun neutral
ka:fi: adjective SA

In this example there are SM from both codes. So what is the ML? According to the
4-M model, the ML is SA because k- is an EARLY SYSTEM MORPHEME and so, by adding
specificity to its head \( (ha:ða) \) is considerable SA. Moreover, says Bassiouney (2009:48-49) the structure of the clause is SA because in EA, \texttt{DEM} usually follows the noun. Later this same example is considered as having a composite ML (2009:56-57) because system morphemes are from both codes.

I have personally found a series of problems with this approach:

(i) the three models proposed by Myers-Scotton (MLFM, 4-M and composite ML) conflict with each other, or at least they conflict with regard to Arabic diglossically mixed forms. The result given by one model can be reversed by that given by another model, as in BAS2;

(ii) given the extensive MPP overlap of SA and EA, the starting point itself is very questionable, namely the labelling of individual lexical and grammatical items. Changing the labelling of the individual factors, could affect the results provided by the model. For instance in BAS1, Bassiouney considers \( ?i:ma:n \) and \( ka:fi: \) as being SA. On what basis does she decide this? We do not know and we can only imagine that it is because of the long vowelling. In fact they are ambiguous or shared words between EA and SA. Similarly, in example BAS0 (quoted at the beginning of this subparagraph), \( ho:ð \) is considered as EA. As we will see in chapter 2, monophthongization of diphthongs is seen as an indicator (see §2.6.1.) and have little effect on the speakers’ perception of an element as being SA (Hary 1996:81);

(iii) are these models valid in more complex syntactical examples? If the base language is the result of the counting of the single items, what are the syntactic boundaries for this counting?;

(iv) it seems to me that these models poses again the problem instead of resolving it. The question is, in fact, what is the base language? The use of one of those models should serve to understand to what language or code a given mixed segment belongs. The result is that we can end up having a base language (ML) which is... mixed! So what is the utility? I believe that using insertional borrowings can solve a lot of problems, as we will see in the empirical investigation.

Alfonzetti is also very critical towards the models proposed by Myers-Scotton which she considers inapplicable to her Italian corpus «due to the high degree of parallelism in the syntactic structures of the two systems in contact» (1992:176, note 6). Myers-Scotton herself admits that CS in communities where the two languages show a good deal of morphosyntactic convergence, especially in the case of closely related languages, presents the biggest challenge to her models (see Myers-Scotton 1990:18).

I will come back again on this subject when I will deal with the labelling of the segments (§2.8.1.).
1.5. THE FUNCTIONAL APPROACH (CS) TO MIXEDNESS

As we have seen, the ‘functional approach’ is interested in the intersentential level or macro-level (of the sentence) and has, as a principle goal, finding functions (or motivations) on various levels but especially on two: there are socially/psychologically/identity meaningful CS and sociolinguistically/textually meaningful CS (see §1.3.1.). The functional approach tries to answer the question: WHY do varieties mix up? As Gumperz put it «why should literate individuals who can communicate in one language insist on being allowed to use another which may be quite similar to the first in underlying grammatical and semantic structure? Why should speakers want to preserve and in bilingual situations alternate among several distinct ways of communicating similar referential information?» (1982:21).

The functional approach cannot do without the grammatical approach. It can concern conversations and monologues.

1.5.1. SOCIALY/IDENTITY MEANINGFUL CS

CS seems to relate to social-group membership communities in bilingual and multilingual societies. CS is related to behaviours and class, ethnicity, and other social dynamics. Auer (1984) clearly suggests that CS does not simply reflect social situations, but that it is a means to create social situations. In fact, CS is one more tool that bilinguals have at their disposal and that they can use in the dynamics of the interactional and verbal communication which are also typical of situations of “monolinguisms” which have been studied by conversation analysis (see Ten Have 2011).

As Grosjean says, the social motivations for CS can be raising one’s status, creating social distance, excluding someone, requesting or commanding (Grosjean 1982:136). CS is also linked to identity: speakers use a code or another giving evidence to the symbolic charge of the one or the other code used. This is what Gumperz (1982) calls the ‘we-code’ and the ‘they-code’ (see §1.7.1.).

Myers-Scotton (1993:113-150) gives an insight into the socially meaningful CS. She posits that language users choose a language that clearly marks their rights and obligations, relative to other speakers, in the conversation and its setting. She presents various socio-psychological factors as motivations for CS by proposing what she calls the markedness model. This markedness model adapts the premise that CS is a reflection of socio-psychological values associated with different linguistic varieties in a specific speech community. CS is essentially used in order to negotiate a change in social distance between the speaker and other participants in the conversation. In this model, the social meanings of
code choice, as well as the causes of alternation, are entirely defined in terms of participant rights and obligations. The markedness model comprises the negotiation principle, and three maxims namely; the unmarked choice maxim, the marked choice maxim and the exploratory choice maxim. The negotiation principle is modelled on Grice’s (1975) cooperative principle. According to Myers-Scotton (1993:113), speakers choose the form of their conversational contribution such that it indexes the set of Rights and Obligations (RO) which the speaker wishes to be in force between him/her and the addressee during the given exchange. Myers-Scotton (1993:150) explains that CS occurs due to one of following four motivations.

(i) CS occurs to make a sequence of unmarked choices such that if situational factors change during the conversation, then a new code becomes unmarked;

(ii) CS is the unmarked choice with the presumption that a person with the sociolinguistic profile of the speaker will need to index the social identities associated with different codes in the same conversation allowing the speaker to switch between these codes thus realising different identities simultaneously;

(iii) CS as a marked choice in a case where the speaker negotiates a change in the social distance between him/herself and fellow participants with a need to dissociate him/herself;

(iv) CS as an exploratory choice whereby the speaker is uncertain of what language is required either because the interaction is new or that there is no prior sociolinguistic profile of the fellow participants.

According to Myers-Scotton, marked choices are often accompanied by prosodic features such as pauses, or metalinguistic commentaries on the switch. When the unmarked choice is not clear, speakers use code-switching in an exploratory way to establish the favoured social balance.

The Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT), developed by Giles (Giles & Clair 1979), seeks to explain the cognitive reasons for code-switching, and other changes in speech, as a person seeks either to emphasize or to minimize the social differences between him- or herself and the other persons in conversation. Giles posits that when speakers seek approval in a social situation they are likely to converge their speech with that of the other person speaking. This can include, but is not limited to, the language of choice, accent, dialect, and para-linguistic features used in the conversation. In contrast to convergence, speakers might also engage in divergent speech, with which an individual person emphasizes the social distance between him- or herself and other speakers by using speech with linguistic features characteristic of his or her own group.
1.5.2. DIGLOSSIC CS (NA→SA) IN CONVERSATION

Holes stated in 1993 that sociolinguistic studies on Arabic had mainly adopted a descriptive-linguistic approach and that the etiological-sociolinguistic approach had still obtained little attention.

Almost all the work done so far has been addressed to the descriptive problem in answer to questions such as “What is Educated Spoken Arabic?” and “What linguistic features characterize interdialectal Arabic?”. Little attention has been paid to questions which seek to explain observed variation like “What factors cause a speaker to switch styles?”, “How is a switch signalled, linguistically and paralinguistically?”, and “What range of styles do individual speakers possess, and how do they use them?” (Holes 1993:17)

CS in conversational Arabic contexts mainly interests dialectal koineization when speakers who meet from different Arab countries and try to adapt their language moving back and forth from their own dialect to dialectal forms of the interlocutor or SA form or koineized forms (Holes 1995:293-294). An interesting example of how CS can be used to signal changes in the role a speaker is playing or claiming for him/herself in a conversation is given by Holes (1995:291). He quotes one conversation of the corpus gathered by the Leeds University team (see §1.2.4.) in which a group of two Jordanians (both male diplomats) and a Syrian (female secretary) who all live in Damascus discuss the shortage of housing in the city. The two men begin to speak about the nature of the problem and its cause (rent inflation, lack of prefabricated building materials etc.) in a close approximation to SA. Holes says that they treat the issue impersonally as an abstract ‘social problem’ and «the tone is one of an academic lecture» (Holes 1995:291). The two Jordanians then ask the Syrian woman to intervene. At the beginning she speaks a «nervous and hesitant» (ibid.) SA but, after a laughter that followed to a quip about whether she, as a Syrian and a house-owner, was one of the causes of the problem, the lady shifted to a more relaxed NA. Holes comments the extracts of the conversation (1995:292) with the two following points:

(i) DEGREE OF DISTANCE – speakers code-switch with relation to the degree of distance they put between themselves and the topic: academicness, detachment, ‘3rd-person abstract’ is more related with SA while concreteness, confidentiality, ‘1st-person narrative’ is more related to NA;

(ii) ORGANISATIONAL DISCOURSE - «even in parts of conversations where speakers are, like the two Jordanian men, giving an authoritative statement of ‘how the world is’ in a
language level approximating to fuṣha: parenthetical asides and comments based on personal experience, and invitations to other participants to state their views on the matter at hand are delivered at a more dialectal level» (1995:291-292; italics are mine).

1.6. SITUATIONAL/METAPHORICAL CS

As we have seen in §1.5. the question that the functional approach of CS have been seeking an answer for is why speakers choose to engage in CS, what are the motivations and the goals for it. Blom and Gumperz’s (1972) studied language use in Hemnesberget, a small village in northern Norway. In Hemnesberget, two varieties of Norwegian are used: Ranamål, a local dialect, and Bokmål, the standard variety. The speakers’ decisions regarding which variety to use is in no sense arbitrary or haphazard. Blom and Gumperz report that the villagers use these two varieties on different occasions, largely because of the different social meanings they fulfil. Ranamål is used for locally based activities and relationships reflecting shared identities with the local culture. In contrast, Bokmål is used in official activities, such as school, church, and mass media, communicating an individual’s dissociation from the local group.

Weinreich (1953:83) also had claimed, before Blom & Gumperz, that people switch because of the level of (in)formality of a given “situation”. For example, a professor would use a formal code when he delivers a lecture because of the environment (lecture room). But he would use an informal code when, after the lecture, he would be asked by a student about more personal issues. So in this sense CS is given by the nature of the speech event: topic and participants solicit a certain code or another. Participants do not exercise choice but their switching will be determined by the two main circumstances (topic and participants).

Blom and Gumperz observed that in the villagers’ conversations, switching from one variety to the other might occur in response to a more complex number of factors. For example, when an outsider joins a group of locals engaged in a conversation, the locals will often shift from Ranamål to Bokmål. This type of shift, occasioned by a change in participants, is referred to as ‘situational’ CS: «the notion of situational switching assumes a direct relationship between language and the social situation» (1982:424).

Among the types of factors seen in §1.3. there was content of discourse and in particular “topic”.

Some topics are better handled in one language than another either because the bilingual has learned to deal with a topic in a particular language, the other language
lacks specialized terms for a topic, or because it would be considered strange or inappropriate to discuss a topic in that language (Grosjean 1982:140)

This more complex type of CS, that occurs in response to a change in topic, was termed by Blom and Gumperz ‘metaphorical’ code-switch: «the language here relates to particular kinds of topics or subject matters rather than to change in social situation» (1982:425). The classic example of metaphorical CS is of a conversation at the local community administration office, where two villagers switch from the standard variety of Norwegian, in which they have been discussing official business, to the local variety to discuss family and other private affairs.

Blom and Gumperz’s study is important because (i) it illustrated that CS is a complex, skilled linguistic strategy used by bilinguals to convey important social messages above and beyond the referential content of an utterance; (ii) sparked an interest in studying CS data in terms of a dynamic, interactional model that focuses on individual choices rather than static factors related to an individual social status; (iii) added new complexity to the factors at the base of CS.

In the example given by Holes (§1.5.2.) we have seen, however, that a same topic (“shortage of housing”) could elicit both conflicting codes (in this case SA and NA) for two main reasons: (i) DEGREE OF DISTANCE – speakers code-switch with relation to the degree of distance they put between themselves and the topic: academicness, detachment, ‘3rd-person abstract’ is more related with SA while concreteness, confidentiality, ‘1st-person narrative’ is more related to NA; (ii) ORGANISATIONAL DISCOURSE - «even in parts of conversations where speakers are, like the two Jordanian men, giving an authoritative statement of ‘how the world is’ in a language level approximating to fusha:, parenthetical asides and comments based on personal experience, and invitations to other participants to state their views on the matter at hand are delivered at a more dialectal level» (1995:291-292; italics are mine).

In fact, Gumperz offers a developed version of his definition of metaphorical CS in his 1982 book: “Discourse strategies”.

1.7. OUTLINE ABOUT RHETORICAL VALUES OF CS

In his 1982 book, Gumperz posits that «rather than claiming that speakers use language in response to a fixed, predetermined set of prescriptions, it seems more reasonable to assume that they build on their own and their audience’s abstract understanding of situation norms, to communicate metaphorical information about how they intend their words to be understood» (1982:61). The individual’s choice of a code
has, for Gumperz, a symbolic value and interpretive consequences that cannot be explained simply by correlating the incidence of linguistic variants with independently determined social and contextual categories. He, therefore, coins a new term for metaphorical CS: conversational CS.

Gumperz’ definition of conversational CS is as follows:

the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems (1982:59)

This juxtaposition is meaningful for bilinguals and it is a communicative resource while it could seem unpredictable for ‘outsiders’.

This mechanism of spoken language, typical of bilinguals, is thought to bear a number of rhetorical or metaphorical significations or functions similar, in some respects, to the figures of speech: «Detailed observation of verbal strategies revealed that an individual’s choice of speech style has symbolic value and interpretative consequences that cannot be explained simply by correlating the incidence of linguistic variants with independently determined social and contextual categories» (Gumperz 1982:VII; Italics are mine). Monolinguals as well use similar rhetorical mechanisms. They are not accomplished, however, through CS but through some particular prosodic characteristics. Alfonzetti writes, in fact, that the practice of bilinguals is considerable as «an alternative [...] to the other techniques normally used in monolingual discourse, like self-interruption, vowel lengthening, hesitation pauses, repetition etc.» (1998:186; italics are mine). From the analyzed corpus it is clear how bilinguals use these prosodic features side by side with CS so that, for instance, switching from EA to SA is accompanied by a slowdown in expression, hesitation etc.

As we have seen, the phenomenon is not to be related to diaphasic or diastratic categories since, even if one fixed diaphasic and diastratic variables, this mechanism would occur anyway.

Given its importance as a rhetorical mechanism, CS could be even considered, for bilingual settings, as the fifth fundamental rhetorical operation, added to the four defined by classical rhetoric (quadripartita ratio): addition (adiectio = for example, in repetition), omission (detractio = for example, in asyndeton), permutation (immutatio = for example, in metaphor) and transposition (transmutatio = for example, in anastrophe). In reality, CS is not an operation in itself but it helps speakers to realize these four main operations. On a rhetorical level, one would encounter something similar to what occurs, in written texts, with figures of speech, literary devices aiming at creating a particular sound or meaning.
effect. Figures of speech are, as it is well known, dozens. However, only some relate to meaning, while others refer to diction, elocution, rhythm. Figures of meaning (tropes) are those in which a word or an expression is redirected from its own meaning to a figurative one or it delivers a content other than the original and literal one. What figures of meaning and rhetoric values of CS share is their being metasemantic. Just as the rhetorical meaning of a metaphor or an antonomasia also rhetorical meanings of CS appear clearly only after a metatextual interpretation. However, while usually in metaphor only the figurative meaning represents the real intention of the writer (otherwise there is just no metaphor), in CS the rhetorical sense exists in the same time with the message conveyed by the elocution. So, in spoken language, through the switching from one code to another not only one expresses an extra-textual, rhetorical sense, but the proper meaning of the elocution is preserved. A process of metatextual (rhetorical) interpretation will let an interpretation of this extra-textual sense possible. A further difference between written text and oral conversation is a dynamic dialogic relationship that is established between speaker and listener and that constantly changes during the linguistic interaction with the changing of certain sociolinguistic and/or rhetorical variables. In this regard, Gumperz points out:

Conversational exchanges do have certain dialogic properties, which differentiate them from sentences or written texts [...]: a. interpretations are jointly negotiated by speaker and hearer and judgements either confirmed or changed by the reactions they evoke; b. conversations in themselves often contain internal evidence of what the outcome is, i.e. of whether or not participants share interpretive conventions or succeed in achieving their communicative ends. (1982:5; italics are mine)

In fact Gumperz quotes Grice’s discussion of conversational implicature. Conversation, for Grice, is a cooperative activity where the participants, in order to infer what is intended, must reconcile what they hear with what they understand the purpose of the activity to be. So what is conveyed in a conversation is (i) the literal meaning in the sense in which that term is understood (ii) a series of indirect inferences based on what Grice calls the cooperative principle: «Make your contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged» (1975:67). The principle is a description of how people normally behave in conversation, although it has been phrased as a prescriptive command. People who obey the cooperative principle in their language use will make sure that what they say in a conversation favours the purpose of that conversation. Yet
Gumperz states that code usage reflects more complex conventions created through networks of interpersonal relationship subject to change. Conversational principles (as the four sub-principles of Grice’s cooperative principle) are universal but the way they are articulated in a given situation is culturally specific. This specificity applies to CS too: bilingualisms share a lot of mechanism but everyone of them has its own specificity.

1.7.1. ‘WE-CODE’ VS. ‘THEY-CODE’

The basic distinction in conversational CS is the ‘we-code’ and the ‘they-code’. The ‘we-code’ is «associated with in-group and informal activities» while the ‘they-code’ is the majority language (he speaks about situation of bilingualisms) which is «associated with the more formal, stiffer and less personal out-group relations» (1982:66; emphasis is mine). This distinction is based on the «meaningful juxtaposition of what speakers must consciously or subconsciously process as strings formed according to the internal rules of two distinct grammatical systems» (1982:66; first emphasis is mine, last one is the author’s). Gumperz means that a non-meaningful juxtaposition is not a conversational CS but something else (a borrowing, for example). To understand the meaning a detailed investigation of speakers’ use of CS strategies is needed based on empirical data. The identity opposition ‘we’ code/’they’ code, theorized by Gumperz in bilingual conversations, tends to bring significant psycho-social signification. He writes: «participants are likely to interpret ‘we’ code passages as personalized or reflecting speaker involvement and ‘they’ code passages as indicating objectification or speaker distance. But this does not mean that all ‘we’ code passages are clearly identifiable as personalized on the basis of overt content or discourse context alone. In many of these cases it is the choice of code itself in a particular conversational context which forces this interpretation.»85 (Gumperz, 1982: 83-84; Italics are the author’s).

1.7.2. Metaphorical Functions According to Gumperz

According to Gumperz, CS has a number of functions, namely «tacit presuppositions which are best recovered through indirect conversational analysis» (1982:75). CS works as a vehicle of metaphorical information aiming at achieving the main purposes of rhetoric: ‘distinguishing different parts of the discourse’ and ‘convincing others’:

The social norms or rules which govern language usage here, at first glance at least, seem to function much like grammatical rules. They form part of the underlying

85 For a critical test of the distinction we-code/they-code see Sebba & Wooton 1998.
knowledge which speakers use to convey meaning. Rather than claiming that speakers use language in response to a fixed, predetermined set of prescriptions, it seems more reasonable to assume that they build on their own and their audience’s abstract understanding of situational norms, to communicate metaphoric information about how they intend their words to be understood (Gumperz 1982:61).

Gumperz provides the following possible metaphorical/rhetoric functions of CS:

1.7.2.1. Quotations «in many instances the code switched passages are clearly identifiable either as direct quotations or as reported speech» (1982: 75-76). Gumperz offers an example of this type of CS. The speaker recounts his medical examination at the doctor switching from English to Hindi: (GUMP1) “He says: ye hi medsin kontinyu kəro bhai (continue taking this medicine friend)” (1982:76);

1.7.2.2. Addresse Specification code is switched depending on the person one talks to, an adjustment to the conversation partner(s)’s language. I wonder if this function is to be considered rhetorical or not. In fact it seems to me not to be text-related;

1.7.2.3. Interjections «the code switching serves to mark an interjection or sentence filler» (Gumperz 1982:77);

1.7.2.4. Reiteration speaker repeats the message or part of it in the other language, in order to clarify or emphasize: «frequently a message in one code is repeated in the other code, either literally or in somewhat modified form. In some cases such repetitions may serve to clarify what is said, but often they simply amplify or emphasize a message» (Gumperz 1982: 78);

1.7.2.5. Message Qualification one produces in the other language a segment that qualifies or specifies or comments what is said in one language;

1.7.2.6. Personalization vs. Objectivization «the code contrast here seems to relate to such things as: the distinction between talk about action and talk as action, the degree of speaker involvement in, or distance from, a message, whether a statement reflects personal opinion or knowledge, whether it refers to specific instances or has the authority of generally known fact» (Gumperz 1982:80; Italics are mine).

Since it will be one of the main features found in the analyzed Arabic corpus, I think it is interesting to quote the example set by Gumperz (1982: 81) referring to the latter function of the conversational CS.

GUMP2

Spanish-English. Chicano professionals. A talks about her attempt to cut down on smoking:

A: ...I’d smoke the rest of the pack myself in the other two weeks.
B: That’s all you smoke?
A: Tha’s all I smoked.
B: And how about now?
A: Estos...me los hallé...estos Pall Malls me los hallaron (these...I found these Pall Malls they...these were found for me). No I mean that’s all the cigarettes...that’s all. They’re the ones I buy.
Later in the same conversation:
A: ...they tell me “How did you quit Mary?” I don’t quit I...I just stopped. I mean it wasn’t an effort that I made que voy a dejar de fumar por que me hace daño o (that I’m going to stop smoking because it’s harmful to me or) this or that uh-uh. It’s just that I used to pull butts out of the waste paper basket yea h. I used to go look in the...se me acababan los cigarros en la noche (my cigarettes would run out on me at night). I’d get desperate y ahi voy al basarero a buscar, a sacar (and there I go to the wastebasket to look for some, to get some), you know. [Gumperz’ italics]

Commenting on the latter example, the author states: «the code contrast symbolizes varying degrees of speaker involvement in the message. Spanish statements are personalized while English reflects more distance. The speaker seems to alternate between talking about her problem in English and acting out her problem through words in Spanish». (Gumperz 1982:81; italics are mine). In this passage, Spanish is used to express feelings, convey intimate and personal feelings while English is used to convey facts. This wavering between two linguistic codes show an ambivalence in the attitude of the woman of the example in relation to the question discussed. It appears evident here how CS can be a bearer of meaning as much as of lexical choice, for example.

Gumperz states that in order to really understand the semantic processes that are at work in CS, one must see whether CS’s direction is from a ‘we code’ to a ‘they code’ or the contrary. He proposes these two examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CS THEY CODE ➔ WE CODE</th>
<th>CS WE CODE ➔ THEY CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(GUMP3) Father talking to his five year old son, who is walking ahead of him through a train compartment and wavering from side to side: Keep straight. Sidha jao (‘keep straight,’ Hindi)</td>
<td>(GUMP4) Adult talking to a ten year old boy who is practicing in the swimming pool: Baju-me jao beta, andar mat (‘go to the side son, not inside,’ Hindi). Keep to the side!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GUMP5)</td>
<td>(GUMP6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Spanish-English sequence taken from a mother’s call to children:


In GUMP3 and GUMP5 the CS is from the ‘they code’ (English) to the ‘we code’ (Hindi and Spanish) while in GUMP4 and GUMP6 the CS is reversed. When speakers were asked if there was a changing in meaning, they agreed that the reversal normally does make a difference: «the shift to the ‘we’ code was seen as signifying more of a personal appeal, paraphrasable as “won’t you please,” whereas the reverse shift suggests more of a warning or mild threat» (1982:92). So ‘we code’ and ‘they code’ can in fact have metaphorical extension. They can, in fact, mean the oppositions: warning/personal appeal; causal remark/personal feeling; decision based on convenience/decision base on annoyance; personal opinion/generally known fact (1982:93-94).

Coming back to the similitude figures of speech = rhetoric of CS, in the continuous mixing between multiple linguistic systems, it is possible to see a process of ‘sense’ building. Sense, here, has to be meant, using Wittgenstein’s maxim («the meaning of a word is its use in the language»)

What on surface seemed like a relatively homogeneous, isolated and therefore presumably stable Norwegian community revealed fundamental differences in social values [...] It was this difference in values [...] that served to explain the basic facts of language usage in the community. All residents spoke both the local dialect and a regional variant of Bokmål, one of the two accepted forms of standard Norwegian. However, all speakers differed with respect to where and for what communicative goals they chose among the two codes. What was normal usage for some in some situations counted as marked for others. Marked forms, moreover, tended to be used to convey indirect inferences which could only be understood by someone who knew both the speaker’s family background and his or her position within the local spectrum

86 Wittgenstein (1958:43).
of value operations. Language usage in situations such as these is thus not simply a matter of conforming to norms of appropriateness, but is a way of conveying information about values, beliefs and attitudes that must first be discovered through ethnographic investigation, and that in everyday situations define the underlying assumptions with respect to which participants infer what is intended (1982:27).

It should be pointed out that this ‘interpretation’ of the rhetorical intentions of CS is not always immediate and that it may sometimes be changeable. Garfinkel (1972) showed how a variety of interpretations is sometimes possible while Brown & Yule (1983:11) write that «the perception and interpretation of each text is essentially subjective.»

Gumperz’ list of code switching functions inspired many later scholars to refine or propose their own lists of functions (e.g. McClure and McClure 1988; Romaine 1989; Alfonzetti 1992; Nishimura 1997; Zentella 1997 and others). Sometimes, as Auer (1995) suggests, the functions suggested by such lists are often ill defined. For example lists tend to combine linguistic structures (such as interjection) and pragmatic or conversational functions (message qualification etc.) without attempting to trace the relationship between forms and functions.

1.8. RHETORICAL VALUES OF THE CS IN SPOKEN ARABIC

1.8.1. UPWARD AND DOWNWARD SWITCHING ACCORDING TO BADAWĪ

To these rhetorical and symbolic values of CS, in spoken Egyptian Arabic, Badawi devotes a brief hint in his Mustawayāt al-Šarabīyya al-mušāšira fī Mīsr that we have discussed in §1.2.2.2. According to Badawi (1973:151) the level in which SA and EA ‘mix up’ in oral elocution is mainly the intermediate level, the Šāmmiyat al-muθaqqaqafin, as seen before in §1.2.2.2.1 and §1.2.2.2.2.

In particular, we have seen how mixed language (which is represented by Šāmmiyat al-muθaqqaqafin) uses rhetorical/stylistic potentialities of SA (besides SA lexicon) to express abstract meanings and EA syntax.

This hint was developed by Badawi in a short appendix of his work - a clear sign of the fact that this interpretation of the discursive activity in Arabic was still in an embryonic stage - entitled ‘some general questions regarding levels’. In section b. of this appendix, ‘the bases of level switching during conversation’, Badawi, (1973:207-213) distinguishes two issues:
As far as the first point is concerned, Badawi states that, since the cultural factor is an essential characteristic of switching, ʕāmmiyat al-ʔummiyyīn is to be considered excluded from those levels within which switching can take place. This is because, in the Badawian scheme, ʕāmmiyat al-ʔummiyyīn represents the lowest sociocultural level (§1.2.2.2.1.). In addition, switching does not normally occur between ʕaṣr and ʕaṣr because the education that the speaker has received - religious or secular - leads him to prefer either one (ʕaṣr) or the other (ʕaṣr).

With regard to the second point, Badawi outlines two possible chains of CS:

1. ʕaṣr ↔ ʕāmmiyat al-mutanawwirīn ↔ ʕāmmiyat al-μuθaqqafīn
2. ʕaṣr ↔ ʕāmmiyat al-mutanawwirīn ↔ ʕāmmiyat al-μuθaqqafīn

(see Badawi, 1973:208)

According to his pyramid model, Badawi speaks of two switching mechanisms between these three levels:

1. ‘UPWARD SWITCHING’;
2. ‘DOWNWARD SWITCHING’.

1.8.1.1. upward switching

Regarding upward switching, namely the transition from ʕāmmiyat al-mutanawwirīn to ʕāmmiyat al-μuθaqqafīn or ʕāmmiyat al-μuθaqqafīn to ʕaṣr or ʕaṣr, Badawi (1973:208) writes:

By presenting some examples of upward switching, taken from his corpus, Badawi includes among its functions also expressing a hwnda ‘maxim’. Example:

87 «The upward switch takes place from the second level [ʕāmmiyat al-mutanawwirīn] towards the third [ʕāmmiyat al-μuθaqqafīn] or from the third towards the fourth [ʕaṣr]. It occurs when the speaker reaches a point where he wants to epitomize something which has been said or to draw a lesson».
(BAD4) The interviewer Kamāl al-Malāx asks, in a tv programme “Sinimāʔiyiyāt”, the actress Samīra Aḥmad about the role of the dumb she became famous for.


Lexically and MPP this sentence is perfectly EA. Then al-Malāx, «suddenly» (1973:209) wants to epitomize the situation or to derive the sense of it and he says:


We ignore a lot of elements of this sentence because Badawī could not specify them in his transcription with Arabic letters. We do not know whether, for instance, final vowels are pronounced or not. He only specified that (i) in qudra, /q/ is pronounced and (ii) in yaʕgiz, the pronominal prefix is vocalized with /a/ «كمبيوتو عال من نطق هذا الفعل» (1973:209)⁹⁰. This means that these are for Badawī features that cause a switch in level (see also §1.2.2. and §2.6.1.). In fact he says that in this example a passage from Šāmmiyat al-mutanawwirīn to Šāmmiyat al-muθaqqafīn takes place. This passage expresses a ḥikma ‘maxim’. We will come again to some features like the COMP ḥa:nu or the last EA clause ḥa:nu yu:lu bī:ha embedded in an almost-SA context.

Once the ḥikma is expressed, the speaker switches again to a lower level (see 1973:188 and 209): kam film ḥa:nu Šamalti: fi ḥa:yatik?

1.8.1.2. downward switching

As far as the downward switching is concerned, namely the transition from fuṣḥā al-turāθ or fuṣḥā al-Ša:ṣr to Šāmmiyat al-muθaqqafīn or from Šāmmiyat al-muθaqqafīn to Šāmmiyat al-mutanawwirīn, Badawī (1973:208) says:

⁸⁸ Transcription adapted from Arabic letters. «Good eveniing, our guest tonight will speak. Weird! Though she was dumb, or this is the name that made her famous. She was the protagonist of the film “The Dumb”. And if people meet her in the street they’ll say 'here comes the dumb'»
⁹⁰ «In any case, it is the ability of the artist to represent any character that common people fail to perform»
⁹⁰ «With a high level of pronunciation of this verb»
Badawi gives this example:

(BAD5) *Taken from a conference entitled “al-tarbiya fi Miṣr wa-baṣid mašākiliha”* (*‘Education in Egypt and some of its problems’*). The lecturer begins with *SA*:


Here the lecturer feels he must give some explanation («šarḥ») so he changes his tone and he starts saying:


91 «The switch in the opposite direction, namely downward, occurs from the fourth [fuṣḥā al-ʔašr] or the fifth [fuṣḥā al-turāθ] level towards the third [ʕāmmiyat al-muθaqqafīn] or from the third towards the second [ʕāmmiyat al-mutanawwirīn] in cases of gloss or exegesis, namely in those situations opposed to those that require upward switching. That is, the speaker might quote an issue or a problem that seems condensed or ambiguous enough to require an explanation. In this case, he frequently uses the lower level that he takes as a tool to achieve his own purpose». It seems that Badawi got confused with regard to the five-level model that we have previously described (Badawi, 1982:89-91). What is not clear (but then everything is understood through context) is whether the levels cited by Badawi should be counted starting from ʕāmmiyat al-ʔummiyyīn or fuṣḥā al-turāθ. In fact, in the pages where he describes the five-level model the first of these is fuṣḥā al-turāθ and the last is ʕāmmiyat al-ʔummiyyīn. So, the upward switching should be understood from the fifth (i.e. the last) towards the first one and vice versa with regards to the downward switching while Badawi inadvertently reverses the scale and he talks about an upward switching from the first to the fifth level and a downward switching from the fifth to the first. Also, in the first quotation about the upward switching Badawi does not seem to consider fuṣḥā al-turāθ at all.

92 «Muḥammad ūAli came to Egypt in the early Nineteenth century and found that education was limited to two systems: the ancient religious system and the modern system that is represented by the national schools»
Here too, there are a lot of MPP characteristics got lost in the Arabic transcription and could help us understand the nature of this passage better. We don’t know, for example, to what extent the consonantic sequence يُتَمْسِل is colloquialized (is it /yatamassal/, /yitmassal/, /yitmassil/ etc.) or is سير pronounced /ʕatiːq/ or /ʕatiʃ/ (I chose this last one). Badawi says that here is a passage from fuṣḥā al-ṣaṣr to Šāmmiyat al-muθaqqafīn. It seems to me that many features confirm that this EA (MPP of verbs like yitmassil, yiʕallim, ʕamli:n etc.; ADV like barḍak etc.). Badawi, though, does not consider the last clause la yatamayyaz ʕan itʔtaʕliːm ilʔislaːmi fi šeʔ as a further upward switching. It seems that this last clause becomes a sort of a triggered switch (see §3.1.1.) The lecturer, in fact, after giving the șarḥ, switches back to SA.


Al-ṣuʕūd and al-ḥubūṭ fi l-mustawayāt, as Badawi defines the diglossic CS, is not a mere sociolinguistic possibility but it brings in itself clear rhetorical significances.

### 1.8.2. RHETORICAL USE OF SA AND EA IN POLITICAL SPEECH (HOLES 1993)

Holes is among those who reflected about this rhetorical value of CS in spoken Arabic. In a famous article of his, he confirmed, through the analysis of contemporary oral texts, the function of the interaction personalization vs. objectivization that was mentioned by Gumperz (see §1.7.2.) and described by Badawi for the Egyptian situation (see §1.8.1.).

Holes analyzed some political speeches. While admitting that political speeches are a genre in itself, which do not always adhere to the stylistic rules of ‘normal’ speech, however, he considers that the six excerpts of the Egyptian leader Ġamāl ʕAbd al-Nāṣir that he analysed might be considered patterns of improvised live dialogues in which the interlocutor (most often the ‘Egyptian people’) was absent. Holes focuses on code

93 “There where two systems: religious system represented by the kuttabs and mosques’ schools and this was very ancient; it taught the basics of reading and of the Islamic religion, Koran and some mathematics. As far as the Egyptian Christians and the Jews are concerned they used the same system: Jewish religious education or Coptic religious education, which did not distinguish itself from the Islamic education at all”

94 “When Muḥammad ʕAlī came, he found this system and, beside it, the foreign schools”
changelings of some of Nāṣir’s speeches in which he passes, suddenly, from a SA sentence to a EA, as the following:

HOL1

šaʕa:runa ʔannana sa6nuqa:til, sa6nuqa:til wa-lan nusallim --- SA
‘Our slogan is that we will fight, we will fight and will not surrender’
da šaʕa:r kulli fard min il-quwwa:t il-musalla:ha, wa-da šaʕa:r kulli fard min aš-šaʕb --- EA
‘This is the slogan of every individual of the armed forces and this is the slogan of every individual of the people’ (Holes 1996:27; Holes’ transcription has been adapted)

Holes explains this sudden change as the differentiation between oral material considered as ‘text’ (in SA) and material considered as ‘comment,’ ‘exegesis’ of the ‘text’ (in EA). The two sentences are almost identical in meaning. The first sentence says what ‘our slogan’ is. This ‘text’ is accompanied by prosodic elements: a pause, both before and after the text, a slow and modulating rhythm. In addition, the output in SA provides him a certificate of authoritativeness (see Mazraani 2008:669-670). SA expresses, in fact, abstraction, idealization and eternal values because they have become associated in Arab society with «an abstract and idealized form of language, and to be effective to an Arab audience, however dimly some of them may understand the actual words, a message which sets out to appeal to abstractions and ideals should itself be in an idealized form of language, that is, fuṣḥā» (1996:26-27). The second sentence is considered by Holes as the ‘comment’ to the text. It refers to the ‘text,’ which has been previously made clear, and specifically reiterates that ‘that’ (the one expressed in SA) is the slogan’ (Holes 1996:27). In the ‘exegesis,’ prosodic features like źiʕrāb which are important to the ‘scripture’ (the ‘text’), are inappropriate.

1.8.2.1. SA = truth, abstractness; EA = marginal discourse, concreteness

Holes tries to establish the rhetorical relationship, on the one hand, between types of ideal items and personal systems of reference, and, on the other hand, linguistic codes (dialect, standard, hybrid Arabic). From the analysis of his corpus, the author concludes that the ‘important’ messages, what are perceived as ‘truths’, ‘theorizations’ are expressed in SA and are paralinguistically marked by a slow elocution; the ‘organizational speech’, which is not central to the message, and it is thus marginal, it is said in EA and in a faster way. SA is used by Nāṣir to express abstract, idealized, metaphoric messages, and without any kind of personalization. EA is used, instead, to channel what is felt as concrete and physical and it is strongly linked to the personalization of the facts (see Holes, 1996:33).
EA is also used to express reference to the $\text{mi:\theta\alpha q}$ (Nāṣir’s work), rhetorical questions and the asides. The two varieties are used in tandem: SA conveys the abstract aspect of a question and EA amplifies its effects in the real world. Holes (1993:33) summarizes this dynamics stating that «the ġāmmiyya organizes for the audience in ‘real time’ the ‘timeless’ fu\shā text». It is interesting to notice that Holes continues to see as SA («a kind of standardized Arabic» (1993:31-32)) a segment like this:

HOL2

kullina ġandina tagruba waḍḥa [...] min ṭablī 东方财富 wa:gihit id-dimuqra:ṭiyya l-muzayyafa lam takun bi-ʔayyī ḥa:l tuma\thil ?illa: dimuqra:ṭiyyit ir-rag\\siahya [...] id-dimuqra:ṭiyya illi ka:nit mawgu:da ṭablī 东方财富 / lamma ka:nit ir-rag\\siahya tusayṭīr ṣala iqtiṣād il-bilād wa sarwit il-bilād / ka:nat hiya ša:hibat an-nufuz / wa-ka:nat ar-rag\\siahya hiya ša:hibat al-ʔimtiyya:za:t / ka:nat dimuqra:ṭiyyya muzayyafa [...] ‘We’ve all got clear experience of this ... Before the revolution, the façade of counterfeit democracy never represented more than the democracy of reactionary forces ... the democracy we had before the revolution, when reactionaries controlled the economy and resources of the country and were influential and privileged, was a fake democracy’ (1993:42; Holes’ translation; transcription adapted)

Holes considers the COMP illi as an «occasional concessions to the colloquial in items chosen to fill certain slots» (1993:31). Despite these EA elements, the «impression is still one of Nāṣir giving an academic exposition» (1993:31).

1.8.2.2. SA = political axioms; EA = false discourses

In another interesting excerpt EA is used to report an anonymous ‘they’ ’s claim that democracy already existed in Egypt.

HOL3

‘And they used to say that there was political freedom and there was political democracy’
‘But exploitation, feudalism and exploitative capital put an end to the idea of democracy’
c. illi ṣalī:ha [EA]
‘which they meant’
d. ṣalaš:an kida ihna bi-nu:lu [EA]
‘so that’s why we say’

‘it is impossible in any circumstances for it to be claimed that there is freedom unless democracy exists alongside social democracy’ (Holes 1993:32; Holes’ translation and division; transcription adapted)

The importance of the passage is that Nāṣir, by using EA, between two SA claims (b. and e.) that present two political axioms (“exploitation, feudalism and exploitative capital put an end to the idea of democracy” + “it is impossible in any circumstances for it to be claimed that there is freedom unless democracy exists alongside social democracy”), wanted to give to their declarations less weight because they have less truth value than his axioms. This will be clear also in our corpus: often EA marks what ‘is not correct’ or ‘shouldn’t be done’ in relation to what ‘is correct’ or ‘should be done’.

1.8.2.3. Repetition of the same segment to emphasize and as role-specifier

Another aspect of the mixed elocution is especially highlighted by this brief excerpt:

HOL4


‘Today, my brethren, we look at the past with its victories, we look at the past with its battles, we look at the past with its martyrs, we look at the flags that we raised in victory […] and we remember our blood stained flags’ (Holes 1993:34; Holes’ translation; transcription adapted)

Text a. and text b. are identical. Text b. ‘rewrites’ text a. in another code. According to Holes between the two a process of lexical replacement occurs in the first place: al-yawm (a.) → in-naharda (b.); nanẓuru (a.) → nbuṣṣ (b.); nataḍakkar (a.) → nifṭikir (b.). Then the replacement occurs on a morphosyntactic level: allati (a.) → illi (b.); $idāfa$ (a.) → bitaʕ (b.). The need to deliver twice the same concept with two different codes is explained by the fact that the first ‘we’ (nanẓur, nataḍakkar) refers to Egypt on an international level, an Egypt that works for peace and stability while the second ‘we’ (nbuṣṣ, nifṭikir) refers to the Egyptians themselves, to the public. Once again the use of EA is the concrete expression and the location of a rhetorical and world message and becomes the ‘comment’ to a ‘text’
expressed in SA. Somehow the ‘tactical’ role that Nāṣir wants to assume precedes, according to Holes, the linguistic choice.

Holes emphasizes how these functions have «much wider geographical and social validity» (1993:37) than these Nāṣir’s discourses. He quotes the example already mentioned above in §1.5.2. which concerns a Damascene woman and two Jordanian men and briefly recalls some examples from his Bahrāynī corpus.

Not far from the conclusions drawn by Gumperz in other linguistic contexts (see Holes, 1993:37), Holes summarizes in three key factors the variation in Arabic: (i) **status** that the speaker wishes to be accorded to what he is saying and that may change frequently during a conversation; (ii) **speech function** a part of the speech is felt as ‘textual’ and another ‘organizational’; (iii) **role** which one hopes to play with the interlocutor. We will concentrate on the second point since it is the one which bears rhetorical meanings, while the other two are mostly linked to social factors.

**1.8.3. FACTORS GOVERNING CODE CHOICE IN MONOLOGUES (BASSIOUNEY 2006)**

Bassiouney (2006) analyzed the factors that govern CS in a series of monologues (political speeches, Islamic sermons and university lectures) on the basis of a tripartite grid: **speaker-related factors**, **audience-related factors** and **subject matter-related factors**. The most important part of the analysis is devoted to the identity and the role that the speaker gives himself through the code-choice SA/EA. She shows that in the political discourses of Ḥusnī Mubārak, the former Egyptian president exploits at the utmost the socially symbolic values of SA and EA. Similarly to what we have seen with Nāṣir (§1.8.2.), whenever Mubarak wishes to create distance with the audience and put on the clothes of the governor (then assigning to the audience the role of governed) he uses SA; on the contrary, whenever he wants to put on the clothes of the peasant, or the ‘good old friend’ or the ‘fellow Egyptian’ and thereby reducing the distance and increasing the degree of involvement with the audience, he suddenly switches into EA. The roles at stake, according to Bassiouney, seem to be “president”, “friend”, “father”, “expert advisor”. Yet, this code-choice does not apply to another political speech of a member of the Egyptian parliament (whose name is not mentioned by Bassiouney) where SA vehicles involvement in another sense: the speaker uses, in fact, SA addressing himself to the Arab audience to put on the clothes of a pan-Arab citizen. When it comes to sermons, it seems that Bassiouney contradicts herself about the relationship between CS and role played by the speaker in Islamic sermons. After stating that «there is no change in role on his part» (2006:198) and that «in religious sermons there are some speakers, like Sharawy [...]
who manipulate language to the utmost as well, but without any indication of a change in their basic role-relationship with the audience» (2006:205) she asserts, a few lines below, that «Sharawy seems to move from the role of the learned religious teacher to that of the popular preacher who speaks just like his audience [...] However, although, he moves from the role of the formal religious teacher to the role of the popular preacher, in both cases he is still in a didactic mode (still a teacher)» (2006:205). It is not clear why Bassiouney excludes the role of “father” or “fellow-Muslim” whenever Šaʿrawī uses EA in his sermons, as it is the case with Mubārak’s speeches. Other sermons (whose authors are not mentioned by Bassiouney) and university lectures (authors unmentioned) do not confirm this relationship between CS and the role played by speaker. So here Bassiouney introduces what she calls «type of ideation, or the way a speaker chooses to tackle a certain subject» (2006:167), i.e. the rhetoric functionality of CS. Nevertheless she does not go beyond considering the use of SA and EA to distinguish analytical parts from synthetical parts. After analyzing the relationship between involvement and code-choice, Bassiouney concludes that «it can be seen from this that involvement by itself is neutral in this regard» (2006:215), i.e. it does not elicit a specific code. On the contrary topic elicits CS in one of the sermons analysed by Bassiouney. According to Bassiouney, a particularly complex philosophical subject could trigger the use of SA. It appears clearly from Bassiouney 2006 that the main reason for CS is actually rhetorical, that it is related to the process of construction of meaning within a given speech event.

1.9. Diglossia as a Double Modality of Speech

A text, written or spoken that it may be, is never plain and it is always “hybrid” in some ways, that is it includes different modalities of speech. Classifying a type of text on the basis of situational criteria such as ‘field of discourse’ (journalistic, scientific, religious, etc..) or ‘domain’ (literary, didactic etc.) is certainly limiting. As stated by Hatim, who dealt with Arabic argumentation, «texts are multifunctional, normally displaying features of more than one type, and constantly shifting from one type to another» (1991:190). To account for this hybrid nature of all texts, a rhetorical model of the text must take «a view of context which is comprehensive enough to accomodate communicative, pragmatic and semiotic values, the interaction of which ultimately constitutes a given text type» (1991:190).

As we have seen in Badawī and in Holes, not only CS is rhetorically meaningful but also the direction of CS gives a further hint of how CS must be interpreted. Gumperz too stated that the passage we-code → they-code does not have the same meaning as the passage they-code → we-code (§1.7.1. and 1.7.2.). I put forward the hypothesis that in
Arabic (but not only) standard and dialect represent in fact two modalities of speech that have their root in a primitive distinction, that between written and spoken language.

### 1.9.1. Spoken and Written Language: Staticity and Dynamicity

The main differences between written language and spoken language are in nature, in complexity and in goals. The first difference between spoken and written language is formal. Speech is an auditory medium: it is produced orally and received by the ear; writing is a visual medium: it is produced manually and received by the eye. Unlike writing, that has no immediate context, speech can rely on a number of situational factors to help to convey meaning. Kay (1977) states, in this sense, that while spoken language is context-bound, written language is decontextualized and autonomous. Bernstein (1958, 1973) distinguishes restricted and elaborated codes by saying that the restricted code is implicit, particularistic and context bound, as opposed to the elaborate code more frequently controlled by higher status speakers which is explicit, universalistic and context free. Written language is characterised by an absence of reliance upon immediate context for their interpretation, and by conjunctions such as because, therefore, since which express explicitly temporal and causal relationships between clauses.

When we speak, we use paralinguistic features to help our elocution: vocal (intonation, tone, pauses, emphasis etc.) or non-vocal (gesture, facial expression). When we speak we can repeat if the message we convey is not clear to the participants. Speaking is primarily a social activity. So vagueness, ellipsis and ambiguity are much more tolerated in speech than in writing (cf. Milroy & Milroy 1985:63).

#### 1.9.1.1. Two Different Processes

Written and spoken language are also characterized by different processes. Halliday states that

since in the written language we only keep the final draft, this grammar gives an idealized picture of what language is. Moreover, it tends to be used in a normative way, as an ideal that everyone should strive for (Halliday 1992[1985]:176; emphasis and retranslation into English are mine)\(^5\).

---

\(^5\) Unfortunately I could only find the Italian translation of Halliday's book. From now on, quotes from Halliday are my (re)translations.
What is meant here is that when we analyse written texts we are always confronted with the final product which is the result of corrections and changes we cannot see, unless we possess the drafts, which is a rare case. So we know very little about the complex process which generates the final written text. On the contrary, in spoken language, we analyse the entire process of expression with all its corrections, eliminations, insertions, pauses, re-formulations, interruptions, repetitions etc. Another very important thing Halliday underlines is that

since the spoken language is a *dynamic image of reality*, so, in giving an account of reality, it emphasizes that aspect, it gives a good picture of *how things work*. Thus, for example, *verbal instructions are usually easier to follow, provided they are given at the right time to fit the purpose, while the written instructions must often be accompanied by illustrations*. Written language, however, emphasizes the synoptic aspect: *it can offer a better report of the finished product* (Halliday 1992[1985]:179; emphasis is mine).

It is clear that spoken language is *dynamic* in its nature while written language is characterized by *staticness/synopticity*. This statement has been confirmed by Gumperz’, Badawi’s and Holes’ analysis on CS: one code usually conveys dinamicity and the other staticness. As we have seen for Arabic (§1.7. and §1.8.) the we-code (NA) explains, comments what has been said in the they-code (SA). In this sense, Halliday also affirms that spoken and written language «impose different grids to experience. In a sense, they create different realities. Writing creates a world of things, speech creates a world of events» (Halliday 1992[1985]:167). Using a metaphor, Halliday defines the written language as «a diamond shaped under pressure» while the spoken language is metaphorically compared to «a fluid movement as that of a rapidly flowing river» (Halliday 1992[1985]:160).

**1.9.1.2. lexical density and syntactic intricateness**

The complexity of written language is in its being not also *static* but also *lexically dense*, while the complexity of the spoken language is in its being (i) *dynamic* and (ii) *syntactically intricated*. In spoken language, grammatical intricateness takes the place of lexical density. In the written language ‘information’ is vehicled by a high lexical density. This means that the number of “words” in a given clause normally exceeds that of particles. Among these words, *names* normally exceed *verbs* which indicates the staticness of written language (see Halliday 1992[1985]:117-129). On the contrary, spoken language is «a process (and it becomes a product only through translation – being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAL1 WRITTEN TEXT</th>
<th>HAL2 SPOKEN TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the use of this method of control unquestionably leads to safer and faster train running in the most adverse weather conditions</td>
<td>you can control the trains this way and if you do that you can be quite sure that they’ll be able to run more safely and more quickly no matter how bad the weather gets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Written and spoken texts (from Halliday 1992[1985]:148).

HAL1 and HAL2 say almost the same thing. In example HAL1 which represents a one long clause, lexical density is 60% (8 grammatical items vs. 12 lexical items). Example HAL2 is grammatically more complex than example HAL1 and it is for this reason that Halliday divides it into 5 clauses (a pair or group of words that consists of a subject and a predicate) in this way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAL2 SPOKEN TEXT</th>
<th>HAL3 SPOKEN TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you can control the trains this way and if you do that you can be quite sure that they’ll be able to run more safely and more quickly no matter how bad the weather gets</td>
<td>you can control the trains this way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Spoken text divided into clauses (from Halliday 1992[1985]:125).

In HAL3 lexical density is 60% too but on the whole complex sentence. For Halliday density must be measured as «the number of lexical items per clause» (Halliday 1992[1985]:125). So, if we analyse every single clause we will, in fact, realise that lexical density is 30,2% (average for every clause). So Hallidays states that the spoken language is lexically poorer than the written language but syntactically more complex.

Interesting is the distinction made by Vachek⁹⁶ (taking over the division made by Paul⁹⁷ at the end of the Nineteenth century) between *standard norms* valid for the written

---

⁹⁶ Cit. in Bartsch 1987:155.
⁹⁷ Cit. in Bartsch 1987:150.
and the spoken language which are different but mutually related. The difference between them is due to their different functions they have. According to Havrànkek\(^{98}\) the spoken norm, compared to that of written language, (i) is less functionally differentiated (ii) one has a less developed consciousness of it (iii) it has a less strict notion of obligatoriness. We will deal with this issue when talking about normativity in chapter 2.

1.9.1.3. message-oriented and listener-oriented functions

Brown distinguishes two main functions of spoken language: a *MESSAGE-ORIENTED* and *LISTENER-ORIENTED* style. They have different goals. *Message-oriented* utterances have as a goal «expressing the message [...] communication of a propositional or cognitive (information bearing) message to the listener» (1982:77). *Listener-oriented* utterances, on the other hand, are normally associated with an informal range of styles that aim at establishing or maintaining a relationship with the listener. The exact content of the information conveyed is less or not important. Most children do not normally know how to deal with message-oriented utterances that they learn to use at school. They can chat with their schoolmates but they are often unable «to develop an argument to the class or justify a particular viewpoint» (1982:76). With exercise at school they acquire the tools that allow, on the one hand, synthesis and on the other, analysis. When they state something they are invited to justify it with analysis while, when they tell ‘stories,’ they are told to synthesize them and find abstract ideas. Telling the story of the battle of Waterloo is not enough, students are asked to express the importance of this battle in the history of Europe.

Brown concludes by saying that «the more the conversation is listener-oriented the less of it is, of its nature, highly structured, whereas the more a conversation is message-oriented the more it is, of its nature, highly structured» (1982:78; my emphasis). We must not consider “structure” here as syntax but as argumentative complexity. In fact, she says that there are times when it is necessary to produce a clear description, a straightforward narrative, or a complicate argument laying out pros and cons: «the ability to produce and to understand highly structured speech, with information relatively densely packed, while remaining sensitive to the listener’s state of knowledge and ability to draw relevant inferences, represents a very complex skill» (1982:81).

1.9.1.3. externally authoritative (centripetal) vs. internally persuasive (centrifugal)

\(^{98}\) Cit. in Bartsch 1987:156.
Bakhtin addressed the relationship between written language and authority. By **authoritative**, Bakhtin means a powerful and commanding discourse that inspires adoration and respect. Authoritative discourse is intended by its users and perceived by its hearers or readers as **untouchable, removed and distanced**, and its binding authority seems unquestionable. Bakhtin defines authoritative discourse as that which «demands that we acknowledge it, that we make it our own; it binds us, quite independent of any power it might have to persuade us internally; we encounter it with its authority already fused to it. The authoritative word is located in a distanced zone, organically connected with a past that is felt to be hierarchically higher. It is, so to speak, the word of the fathers. Its authority was already acknowledged in the past. It is a prior discourse. It is therefore not a question of choosing it from among other possible discourses that are its equal. It is given (it sounds) in lofty spheres, not those of familiar contact. Its language is a special (as it were hieratic) language. It can be profaned. It is akin to taboo, i.e., a name that must not be taken in vain» (Bakhtin 1981:342). Authoritative discourse takes many forms, but it most often addresses political, ethical, moral, or religious issues and it is the monologic word of parents, elders, or teachers. It commands «our unconditional allegiance» (Bakhtin 1981:343). A discourse is felt as authoritative not only because of the text itself but also because of extra-textual elements (cultural, social etc.). Authoritative texts become untouchable: they speak their "truths" with so much power that readers no longer question their assumptions. In contrast to authoritative discourse, Bakhtin posits what he refers to as the **internally persuasive**: «internally persuasive discourse - as opposed to one that is externally authoritative - is, as it is affirmed through assimilation, tightly interwoven with "one’s one word" [...] Its creativity and productiveness consist precisely in the fact that such a word awakens new and independent words, that it organizes masses of our words from within, and does not remain in an isolated and static condition» (1981:145). Internally persuasive discourse, unlike authoritative, is proximate, dynamic, and closely connected to and assimilated into the writer's own words. Internally persuasive discourse does not pretend allegiance but encourages creativity.

Although Bakhtin speaks about different voices within written novels, I believe that this differentiation concerns the nature of written and spoken discourse, on the basis of what have been said so far. Written language is, by nature, an expression of an external authority. Spoken language is learnt naturally and the most general grammatical rules of a language, or dialect of a language, are learnt by the native speaker in infancy and childhood without explicit instruction. Although the basic grammar of the spoken language has already been acquired by the time children go to school (our parents often
'correct’ them, thus exercising a sort of authority on them), writing and reading are learnt when learning the rules of language, which are the expression of authority in language. Milroy & Milroy point out to a very basic issue, namely that writing is learnt after speech: «writing, however, is not a ‘natural’ activity in quite the same way that speech is. Speech is acquired by all normally endowed human beings without explicit instruction, whereas writing has to be taught after the basic grammar, phonology and lexicon of spoken language have already been largely mastered. In the experience of the child, writing is built up on already acquired knowledge of speech» (1985:55). Writing is an art, while speech is an innate capacity: «Whereas writing can be described as an art or a skill that is not universal to all human societies, speech is not fundamentally an art, but an innate human capacity that is universal to all societies» (1985:55). The acquisition of the elaborated code (that is of the characteristics of the elaborated code, as we have seen in see § 1.9.1.) is tied up with acquisition of literacy. Moreover teachers, who represent governmental authority in schools, endorse textbooks, which are written, as source of authority. Documents, which represent again governmental authority, are ‘written’ too.

1.9.1.4. involvement and detachment

In studies on the relationship between oral and written discourse, another concept emerged that synthesizes what we have said till now: that of INVOLVEMENT. Although terminology might vary, spoken mode is felt as characterized as INVOLVED while written mode was described as DETACHED (see Chafe 1979, 1981; Ochs 1979; Tannen 1982b).

Involvement (in spoken language) is seen as the product of the following factors (see Tannen 1982b:8 and 2007[1989]:25-42):

(i) DEVICES by which the speaker monitors the communication channel (rising intonation, pauses, requests for back-channel responses);
(ii) CONCRETENESS and IMAGEABILITY through specific details;
(iii) a more PERSONAL quality; use of 1st person pronouns;
(iv) EMPHASIS ON PEOPLE and their relationships;
(v) EMPHASIS ON ACTIONS AND AGENTS rather than states and objects;
(vi) direct QUOTATION;
(vii) reports of SPEAKER’S MENTAL PROCESSES;
(viii) FUZZINESS.
(ix) EMPHATIC PARTICLES (really, just).

On the contrary, detachment (in written language) is seen as characterized by:

(i) a higher degree of ABSTRACTION;
(ii) as the writer has more time, he will have an integrated text and deal with more thoughts at once;

(iii) emphasis on states and objects having things done to them;

(iv) impersonal aspect;

(v) while involvement deals with events in an ‘experiential’ and detailed manner, detachment gives a more abbreviated report (Chafe 1983:1099).

Involvement (and its opposite, detachment) is a deep dimension, reflecting what Goffman (1979) has described as footing, i.e. changes in alignment we take up to ourselves, others and toward the material or content. While we speak we often shift from one foot to another, signalling this in various way, CS being only one of these signalling devices (1979:22). Switches in footing can range from gross changes in social settings to the most subtle shifts in tone. Therefore, features of involvement and detachment, which Chafe finds characteristic of writing and speaking respectively, can be combined in a single discourse type.

1.9.1.5. CS as a tool for differentiating modalities of speech

Of course one cannot speak of a clear-cut dichotomy written/spoken but of a continuum whose ends are “ideally written” and “ideally spoken” discourse, as Lakoff states (1979). Written and spoken language have been dealt with here as abstract concepts.

This discourse is the necessary premise to stress an important fact. In spoken Arabic the use of SA often represents the characteristics and the modality of speech typical of written discourse, while by NA one conveys functions and modalities of speech typical of spoken discourse. So paraphrasing Halliday, for example, we will see how the ‘final draft’ (§1.9.1.1.) (which is normally represented by the written language) of a discourse will be normally given to speakers in SA while the ‘process behind the final draft’ or ‘the drafts’ – what Holes calls ‘organizational function’ - will be often given in NA. NA will give the dynamic image of reality by emphasising the account of reality, and will tell how things work, will provide the illustrations to the ‘written’ instructions given by SA. SA often creates a world of things or facts (in the sense of ‘truths’), while NA creates a world of events, as Halliday says speaking about written and spoken language (1992[1985]:167). SA is (i) static and (ii) lexically dense, while NA is (i) dynamic and (ii) syntactically intricated. In SA the ‘information’ is vehicled by a high lexical density, that is that the number of names in a given clause normally exceeds that of particles. NA gives the argumentative process by its possessing «some unquestionable organizational properties» (Halliday 1992[1985]:146) as we have seen in Holes. NA is lexically dispersed (see
Halliday 1992[1985]:147). SA is message-oriented, it aims at «expressing the message [...] communication of a propositional or cognitive (information bearing) message to the listener» (Brown 1982:77). NA is listener-oriented, it aims at establishing or maintaining a relationship with the listener: the exact content of the information conveyed is less important. The use of both SA and NA allows the very complex skill of producing highly structured and complex speech, with information relatively densely packed, while remaining sensitive to the listener's state of knowledge and ability to draw relevant inferences (see Brown 1982:81). SA is used to give detachment by the abstractness, by emphasizing states and objects instead of actions, by underlining impersonal aspects, by giving an abbreviated report of facts without involving experience. NA is used to convey involvement by concreteness and imageability, by story-telling, by a more personal quality (e.g. the use of the 1st person), by emphasising people and their relationships, by stressing actions and agents, by reporting one's mental processes. Another important point is that written language expresses authority, as we have seen in §1.9.1.3., while spoken language expresses ordinary speech. SA is not only the language of textbooks in school, of the press and of news in television (another expression of authority), but it is itself a bookish language learnt at school (while NA is learnt naturally at home). Speaking SA means to be, somehow, «un livre qui parle», as Taine-Cheikh points out (2002:193). For long time SA has no practical application in Arab children’s lives, except learning at school and praying (especially for Muslim children)99. That is why SA expresses authority and power (see also Haeri 2003:139) while NA expresses “ordinary speech”. Moreover, for Muslims SA/CA expresses even more than simple authority: it expresses sacreadness. That is why Saeed (1997:199) finds out in his corpus of Muslim sermons, that SA utterances are perceived as «serious, formal, logical» and SA speakers as «powerful, authoritative and/or honest». Also for Christian Arab speakers SA expresses sacredness (the Bible normally used by them is a translation into SA) although in a different way, as we will see when speaking about Arab religious discourse. Schmidt says that «it is reasonable to hypothesize that for some topics or semantic fields the usual channel for discussion has resulted in a more classical or classicized lexicon than for other semantic fields» (1974:60-61). So we have that “more abstract” (e.g. scientific and technical fields, religious and philosophical argumentation, politics and diplomacy) concepts and words are SA while «less abstract» or «concrete semantic fields» as Schmidt says (1974:60,75)

99 The changing in language attitude which is taking place in the last five or ten years through the influence that television is having on Arab children, particularly the international satellite channels of cartoons in SA, is remarkable and should be evaluated, although this is not the place to do so. For some reflections on Diglossia and schooling in the Arab world see Alrabaa (1986).
are preferably represented by NA words. NA expresses the sentiment, whereas SA expresses the intellect. Haeri quotes the Egyptian poet Īmān Mirsāl who says that «your knowledge about society passes through fuṣḥā on the level of a cultural experience but not as an experience in your life... as if culture exists in one place and the living of life in another place [...]» (2003:122). Īmān comments writing letters in a sort of mix SA/NA and she says that the excerpts that were akθar ṣidqan (‘more sincere’) were in NA «as if the place for existence of [...] emotions were ʕāmmiyā not fuṣḥā» (2003:122; my emphasis). On the contrary «SA provides an expanded source of vocabulary for conversation about topics which the colloquials can only describe circuitously» (Owens & Bani Yasin 1991:26). Saeed (1997:200), in his Muslim sermons corpus, finds that NA utterances are perceivable as «non-serious, trivial, impractical, nonsense» and speakers, while speakers of NA are seen as «weak, naïve, or cunning».

Diglossic CS is a tool for differentiating this double modality of speech, that we can define biglossia. This allow SA and NA to be complementary: in many settings and for many topics, SA and NA are synergic and work together to convey meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRITTEN LANGUAGE</th>
<th>SPOKEN LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lexically dense</td>
<td>lexically dispersed, syntactically intricated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hypotaxis</td>
<td>paraxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘final draft’</td>
<td>drafts, ‘process behind the final draft’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staticness/synopticity</td>
<td>providing a dynamic image of reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how things are or should be</td>
<td>how things work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written instructions</td>
<td>illustrations to the written instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creating a world of things or truths</td>
<td>creating a world of events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conveying abstractness (abstract semantic field)</td>
<td>conveying concreteness and imageability (concrete semantic fields)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasizing states and objects</td>
<td>emphasizing actions and agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underlining impersonal aspects</td>
<td>emphasising people and their relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving an abbreviated report of facts without involving experience</td>
<td>story-telling with personal quality, reporting one’s mental processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>message-oriented</td>
<td>listener-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restricted</td>
<td>elaborated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving detachment</td>
<td>conveying involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority</td>
<td>ordinary speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>externally authoritative</td>
<td>internally persuasive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Functions” are not a prerogative of CS but belong to the pragmatic aspect of language itself. As we have seen, written and spoken language have different characteristics and also different functions, both lexicosyntactic and pragmatic. With pragmatic functions, we shall mean the use of messages in communicative situations or in a word “how we use language”. Several scholars have addressed the issue and there exist many semiotic theories about the functions of language. I will briefly mention two of them.

Using the Socratic term of ὀργανόν, Bühler (1933, 1934) proposed the “organon model of language” and distinguished three main pragmatic functions of language: REPRESENTATION, EXPRESSION and APPEAL.

(i) representation - the function of representation dominates when the focus of the message is on the object of the discourse (Aristotle’s logos, i.e. the unfolding of the argument);

(ii) expression - the function of expression dominates when the focus is on the sender and the sign expresses his or her “interiority” about the object (Aristotle’s ethos, which has to do with the character of the speaker);

(iii) appeal - the function of appeal dominates when the message focuses on the hearer (Aristotle’s pathos, which appeals to the emotions of the audience).

Each of these functions is to some degree present in any act of communication and some functions only prevail or dominate.

Jakobson extended this theory and posited a six «constitutive factors of verbal communication» (1960:355) to which he correlated six corresponding functions of language.

The model is defined by Jakobson as follows:

The ADDRESSER sends a MESSAGE to the ADDRESSEE. To be operative the message requires a CONTEXT referred to […] seizable by the addressee, and either verbal or capable to being verbalized; a CODE fully, or at least partially, common to the

---

100 «A name is an instrument ὀργανόν of teaching and of separating reality» (from Plato’s Cratylus).
addresser and addressee [...] and finally, a CONTACT, a physical channel and psychological connection between the addresser and the addressee, enabling both of them to stay in communication (Jakobson 1960:353)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>REFERENTIAL FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MESSAGE</td>
<td>POETIC FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESSER</td>
<td>EMOTIVE FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTACT</td>
<td>CONATIVE FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>PHATIC FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>METALINGUINAL FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 Jakobson's model of the constitutive factors and the corresponding functions of verbal communication (1960:353,357)

The function of message, that corresponds to each of these basic elements of communication, is determined by the communicative “orientation”, i.e. the predominant focus on the respective factor of the communicative situation. As in Bühler, many functions can co-exist in the same message but one will be predominant.

(i) referential function - it is orientated towards context and it focuses on the cognitive aspect of language (conveying information) (it’s Bühler’s function of representation);

(ii) emotive or expressive function - it focuses on the speaker’s attitude toward the content of the message and it conveys emotion (it’s Bühler’s function of expression);

(iii) conative function – it is oriented towards the addressee and it conveys commands (it’s Bühler’s function of appeal);

(iv) phatic function – it concerns contact and conveys «messages primarily serving to establish, to prolong, or to discontinue communication, to check whether the channel work (‘Hello, do you hear me?’), to attract the attention of the interlocutor or to confirm his continued attention (‘Are you listening?’)» (1960:355);

(v) metalinguistic function – it is oriented towards language and communication. Talking about “definition” and “spelling” has a metalinguistic function (such as ‘What do you mean?’) etc.

(vi) poetic function – it focuses on the message for its own sake and it is not confined to poetry. It conveys play or pleasure, e.g. play with form: rhyme, repetition, alliteration
(repeat consonants), assonance (repeat vowels), juxtaposition of paronyms (phonetically similar words) etc.; play with meaning: unexpected juxtaposition of words that are quite unlike each other, artful exploitation of synonyms, all forms of ambiguity, deliberate violations of meaning, puns (fat and fiction about margarine), allusion etc.

CS distributes these basic functions. In Arabic, NA is more appropriate for the expressive function while SA for the referential function, as showed in §1.9. Moreover, in §1.3.3, we saw how the very basic function of CS is creating an apposition between two or more codes. As said before, CS has an essentially contrastive value. This contrast allows the speaker mainly to emphasize the message he wants to convey. This emphasis is obtained by highlighting, marginalizing, reiterating, reinforcing, focusing, defocusing, stressing certain segments allowing him to argumentatively structure his discourse. Commenting on the discourse strategies of an American preacher, Gumperz writes that what was meaningful was the contrastively using of two ways of speaking. This is the basis upon which we can deal with rhetorical function of CS.

1.10.1. LOCI AND FUNCTIONS OF CS

Auer (1995:120) distinguishes conversational loci from functions of CS. He considers conversational loci as those parts of discourse, or those rhetorical and argumentative mechanisms, that are particular susceptible to CS. In these conversational loci, CS produces a series of functions. For example: emphasis is a function, whereas reiteration and elaboration are the conversational loci in which this function can take place.

These functions are not at all «a closed and comprehensive inventory, but [...] an open list» (1992:59), according to Alfonzetti, who studied CS between Standard Italian (SI) and Catania dialect (CD). Any finite list of functions will be more or less arbitrary, as Nilep (2006:10) suggests: «it will be preferable to observe actual interaction, rather than starting from assumptions about the general effects of code switching». Starting from defining general conversational loci and functions, in fact, in chapter 3, 4 and 5 we will discuss specific sub-loci and sub-functions in our corpus. Other qualitatively different corpora will certainly provide different functions or sub-functions.

Functions usually overlap: in one and the same sequence one can find more than only one function overlapping over one another. Another important point is that not every CS (especially intersentential switches) produced will always perform a specific rhetorical function. Sometimes CSe are rhetorically meaningless, but they might be stylistically relevant. Finding reasons for CSs is not always fully accomplishable. The task
here is often similar to that of finding reasons for a monolingual’s choice for one synonym over another.

1.10.1.1. taxonomy of the main loci and functions

Auer (1988:199, 1995:120) finds in his corpora these main conversational loci:

(i) reported speech;
(ii) change of participant constellation;
(iii) parentheses or side-comments;
(iv) reiterations;
(v) change of activity type, also called ‘mode shift’ or ‘role shift’;
(vi) topic shift;
(vii) puns, language play, shift or ‘key’.
(viii) reformulations/elaborations.

Grassi et al. (2006:186-187) give a more complete list of functions of CS, many of which are typical of discourse (also Auer’s conversational locus change of participant constellation is typical of discourse). Some of them do not seem to occur in monologues.

1. rectify an unbalanced proficiency - the speaker changes the code that best masters;
2. mark the change of the interlocutor - the speaker changes code depending on the interlocutor: (i) to help him, (ii) to hinder his understanding;
3. mark disagreement with the interlocutor;
4. mark a change in theme, or a new development of the argument;
5. self-correction;
6. marking the beginning and the end of a ‘storytelling’ - the speaker marks the beginning or the end of a story with a formula in the ‘other’ code;
7. comment - mostly with a strong emphatic nuance;
8. evaluation - comment with a strong evaluative content (very positive, very negative);
9. greetings;
10. expressions of courtesy;
11. allocutives - sir, doctor etc.
12. interjections;
13. tics and fillers;
14. quotes;
15. **emphasis** – often one emphasizes by repeating the same segment in the ‘other’ code\(^\text{102}\).

To these one can add a recreational function (CS in order to joke), exploitation of connotative potentials of a code (such as the evocation of an environment) and so on (see Pizzolotto 1991).

The functions identified by Alfonzetti (1992:59) are more rhetorical-focused:

(1) *correction of errors*;
(2) *marking sequential organization*;
(3) *internal structurization of story-telling*;
(4) *elaboration of the message*;
(5) *giving emphasis to the message through mechanisms such as repetition*;
(6) *highlighting the polyphonic nature of discourse, as it happens with quotes*;
(7) *emphasizing the expressive attitude of the speaker*;
(8) *marking the use of polite forms*.

Holes notices that propensity to switch to SA depends also, not only on choice but also on real knowledge of SA: «However, even in what appears to be the ‘same’ situation, and the ‘same’ topic, individual speakers’ (as well as individual national groups’) propensities to classicise differ, and the differences seem to depend as much on attitudinal factors as on their objective knowledge of MSA» (Holes 1995:295) «Case language choice seems to have been governed at least to some extent by affective and political ends» (Holes 1995:314, note 34).

\(^{102}\) The list, although presenting a larger number of function, in fact confuses *conversational loci* or mechanisms with function: emphasis, for example, is a function of evaluation, quotes, interjections, fillers etc.
Chapter 2 What SA is and what it is not in mixed oral texts: standardness, normativity, correctness and attitude

The main obstacle we face when dealing with mixed forms is mainly defining the boundaries of SA. My hypothesis is that if we understand what SA is and what it is not, we will also understand where are the boundaries of NA in mixed discourse. The question of variation and variability of NA is in fact recognized by linguists, including Arabs (see for example El-Hassan 1977). On the other hand, there is still much resistance in recognizing that SA is variable too. The problem is that language guardians usually want to impose only one usage from a set of equivalent variants and recommend this form as the only ‘correct’ form. This choice is often arbitrary and the arguments used to support it can be matched by equally good arguments in support of the unaccepted forms.

Is SA really so uniform as purists want to show it? Is there any acceptable variation and what are its boundaries?

I thought it was necessary to put this reflection after the theoretic part about spoken mixed forms and their functions because it is a problem one faces when passing from theory to the analysis of texts or vice-versa. This second chapter will be still, at least partly, theoretic but it will help us in the operation of labelling which is at the core of this thesis.

Before entering the subject, I wish to give a real-life example of how SA and NA are quite ‘relative’ concepts. During a work-shop organized by the Netherlands-Flemish Institute in Cairo (NVIC), March 26th and 27th, 2008, entitled Mixed varieties of Arabic, an interesting discussion between Humphrey Davies, a leading translator of Arabic literature into English, and Wafāʔ Kāmil, a member of the Arabic Language Academy in Cairo, took place. Commenting on an Ottoman period text by Yusuf al-Širbīnī, Haẓẓ al-şuhrūf fī šarḥ qaṣīdat Abī Šādūf, Davies noticed the presence of the NA form of the geminated verbs at the PFT tense: lammēt. Wafāʔ Kāmil argued that these forms can by no means be considered NA: they are perfectly fuṣḥā because they are considered by Sibawayhi in his Kitāb.

So what is exactly SA, what is NA? What is not SA, what is not NA? What are the phonological, morphological, syntactical and lexical boundaries of both? Are there clear boundaries? And in particular what is and what is felt as SA in oral productions? If English forms as “I loves Elvis, he’s great” or “there’s lots of museums” (Cheshire 1999:135,138) are considered to be not ‘bad English’ but (sub)standard English (also
can the same be said for those Arabic forms that are not completely adherent to the classical norms?

SA\textsuperscript{103} is the first official language of nineteen members states of the Arab League (twenty if one considers Djibouti). It is a living language, used in many circumstances (especially in written text) by a large number of people. Written SA is used daily in publishing, journalism and in every other formal writing setting. Spoken SA is also used on radio and television in many settings especially during news programmes. I agree with what Van Mol also says, i.e. that «MSA is spoken nowadays more than it used to be» (2003:48) and I agree with him that the first step to discuss variation within spoken SA is to distinguish written from spoken SA: «spoken SA is not identical to the written form» (2003:49).

As said before, whereas there is general consensus about variation within Arabic dialects, many and different are the opinions and the positions about variation within CA/SA (there is seldom a clear distinction between both), both on a geographical and a historical level. A great number of contemporary Arab scholars and grammarians, especially those who have not studied abroad, have an ‘extreme’ position in that Arabic language is synchronically and diachronically (completely) uniform. Yet, in their description of CA/SA they only base themselves on corpora of F texts, with the Qurʔān occupying the most important place. They also assume that CA/SA is correct only when every single linguistic level agrees completely with the grammatical rules as established by ‘traditional’ writings. These rules, mainly deduced out of the Qurʔān and other ancient writings, are found by those purists to be still applicable to contemporary SA. Most of these scholars regard contemporary SA as corrupted and they believe it should be corrected through turning to classical norms. These scholars normally assume that people used to speak F in some historical time, generally in Muhammad’s time, and that by time, people stopped speaking it in favour of A. So they see NAs as a corruption of an original, epic language. Therefore, NAs should be avoided so that one day people could eventually return to speak F. About this point of view, which stress the \textit{stability}, the \textit{uniformity} and the \textit{immutableness} of CA/SA as a sort of religious dogma and which we can put under the label of \textit{purist approach} Blau says that «for the majority of Arab linguists, with few exceptions, only one uniform Classical Arabic exists, which alone is worthy of imitation» (1981:150) while Meiseles writes that «most of the linguistic research done so far tends to treat language and varieties thereof as if they were coherent, homogeneous static systems, with a minimum of variation or none at all» (1980:121)\textsuperscript{104}. Purist views, like those of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[103] I will mainly refer to Van Mol 2003:1-21 and Mejdell 2006:1-44.
\item[104] See also the introduction to the entry “Diglossia” in EALL (Versteegh 2006a:629).
\end{footnotes}
many Arab linguists, exclude any theoretical flexibility: «Values such as those represented in the traditionalist notions of linguistic purism and cultural continuity clash with the modernist linguistic valorisation of linguistic neutrality, “native speaker” usage, and linguistic vitality, while the traditionalist notions of unity and competition clash with the modernist valorisation of variation and the underlying European-language (and especially English-language) bias of its representations» (Eisele 2002:11; italics are mine)

Other scholars stress the variation within SA. For example Diem (1974:2) points out the big differences between Eastern and Western SA and states that the impression of unity of SA is due to the great difference in Arabic dialects among themselves. Harrell (1960:3), while stating a relative uniformity of written SA, speaks of a not entirely uniform spoken SA. Ditters (1991:200) holds the view of a strong variation in SA on the basis of «subject-matter, register, genre, style, target-group, frequency of appearance and a few more».

It is then clear that there is no uniformity in defining SA and many contradictory impressions and traditions coexist in parallel.

### 2.1. Two Main Approaches to SA

There are two main approaches to SA that, according to Parkinson, must not be ignored. Without considering both of them, we will not completely understand the complexity of SA:

(i) the grammatical approach that looks at the rules. This approach can be (1) normative (and in its extremist positions it can be purist) and watches only at the «prescriptive system inherited from Classical Arabic, watched over by the language academy» (Parkinson 1993:48). Whatever is outside these boundaries is felt as ungrammatical and unacceptable (for the difference between grammaticality and acceptability see §2.4.2. et seqq.) thus not-standard; it can be (2) empirical, and it is concerned with variability of the norm within the prescriptive system;

(ii) the perception approach which focuses on SA as «a part of a communicative continuum of linguistic resources ranging from the deepest colloquial to the most elevated and recherché classical expression», «an imperfectly known, but fully functional, part of most Arabs’ communicative lives, associated with a rather high degree of linguistic insecurity, both respected and revered to the degree that it is viewed as a close relative or descendent of Classical Arabic, and despised and denigrated to the degree that it is taken to be a degeneration of Classical Arabic» (Parkinson 1993:48). Eid (1988:52) favours only this approach when she says «SA here has to be understood as SA as used by EA speakers and not as grammar books tell us it should be». Schmidt (1974:76) also adopted this
approach writing that «what has been recorded and analyzed here is speakers’ conceptions of their codes, and [...] what is presented as a CA or EC form by an informant would in many cases be classified differently on linguistic grounds».

2.2. THE GRAMMATICAL APPROACH: BETWEEN NORMATIVITY AND EMPIRICISM

On a grammatical level, paraphrasing two concepts in the study of Bartsch (1987) (see also §2.4.2.7.), one can distinguish a (i) normative approach and (ii) an empirical approach. On a normative level, the limits of F and A are almost clearly definable. In any case, one must always refer himself to a specific grammar textbook, especially for controversial subjects (see §2.4.1.2. for what Mejdell calls ‘core’ and ‘fuzzy areas’). Excepted those morphosyntactic and lexical cases in which ‘pure’ SA and ‘pure’ NA are not fully distinguishable because of their linguistic proximity, their linguistic features are normally distinct, both on phonology, morphology and syntax. The question that arises, however, is whether the purely theoretical definition of SA and NA matches the language actually spoken and written. If one turns on television or listens to a more or less ‘educated’ conversation, one will realize that the use that Arabs make of SA and NA – similarly to the use all speakers of a given language in general make of their available codes – does not often correspond to that described by grammar books. This is even more problematic for SA, to the extent that the Arab speakers’ competence of it is normally inferior to that of their own NA, since the latter represents their mother tongue.

At an empirical level, one can realize that SA, just like the vast majority of other standards, has a wide range of variants. In this sense, they can be regarded as SA and are accepted as such by most of the linguistic community (here one must except only the purists). It is perfectly acceptable to say, for example, from a phonetical perspective, istisnāʔ ('exception') instead of istiθnāʔ(un), or morphosintactically lam tutaḥ li ?al-furṣa ('I was not given the opportunity') instead of lam tutaḥ li: l-furṣa (abbreviation of the long a: and alif madda in the DEF ART) or al-sayyidatān waṣalu: ('the ladies [DU] arrived') instead of al-sayyidatān waṣalata: (these last two examples are also well accepted in written SA). In one word, speakers will not feel embarrassed both if they pronounce these expressions or if they hear them: they are acceptable.

The questions I ask myself here are:
(i) is SA actually a standard language or not?
(ii) is spoken SA as written SA? is it variable and to what extent?
Let’s start with what is meant by standard.
2.3. Standard Language and the Standardization Process

Generally speaking a standard is a ‘dialect’ which has had a political promotion. Standard language is to be understood, according to Bartsch, as «a model of correctness with validity in a speech community for official or public language use» (1989:199). Before or after receiving the standard label, this dialect passes through a standardization process.

Standard language «is a relatively young concept in general linguistics» (Van Mol 2003:11). The term standard does not mean the same thing for all the authors who dealt with it and it is used together with other words such as Literatursprache, Schriftsprache etc. Mejdell says, in fact, that «literature on standard languages and standardization does not reflect a unified field of research. It appears to be a particular specialization of Central and East European linguistics» (Mejdell 2006:5).

Garvin gives two different definition of standard language, at a distance of thirty years: (1) «a codified form of a language, accepted by, and serving as a model to, a larger speech community»; (2) «codified variety of a language that serves the multiple and complex communicative needs of a speech community that has either achieved modernization or has the desire of achieving it» (see Mejdell 2006:6). Also cited in Mejdell (2006:6) is the dictionary by Hartmann & Stork (1972) which defines a standard language as «the socially favoured variety of a language, often based on the speech of the educated population in and around the cultural and/or political centre of the language community». As we will see, if we accept this last ‘social’ definition of standard language we will have to speak of a ‘double standard’ for spoken SA.

According to Van Mol (2003:11) the term “standard” is often used in two ways: (1) standard language as the norm of good language, as a result of language planning; (2) standard language as sociolect of a certain group in society (§3.4.3.).

As far as the process of standardization is concerned, Ferguson defines it as «the process of one variety of a language becoming widely accepted throughout the speech community as a supradialectal norm – the ‘best’ form of the language – rated above regional and social dialects, although these may be felt to be appropriate in some domains» (1968:31). Milroy & Milroy suggest that standardisation must be seen «as an ideology and a standard language as an idea in the mind rather than a reality – a set of abstract norms to which actual usage may conform to a greater or lesser extent» (1985:23; my emphasis).
In fact, it is interesting to notice that Mejdell affirms that standardization has often been seen in terms of degree\(^\text{105}\). This means that there might be languages which are more standardized than others.

There is also another problem: does one mean by “standard” language written or spoken language or both? The history of language teaching shows how much the standardization of spoken and written language has been for long time felt linked together and, according to time, sometimes people are asked to speak as they write or to write as they speak. This is also true for Arabic. Owens (1991:17) considers the written norm to be the ‘standard’ so standardization is the gradation with which one can express how far the spoken language approaches the written form.

The difficulty of precisely defining a standard language is, for Cheshire, the fact that linguists are not always able to keep two things distinct: (1) the description of the language, including all its varieties; (2) the description of the norms of speech for specific communities, including the significance of the use of a particular variety in a specific situation (see 1999:146). The reason is that it is difficult for linguists to be ‘neutral’ towards the prestige of the standard variety and the influence of language norms on their descriptions of the varieties.

With specific regard to the Arabic language, Van Mol (2003:12) sees that there are two different approaches as far as standardization is concerned:

(1) one approach assumes that a standardized written language already exists whose rules have been known for centuries (see Ditters 1991:200; this is the purist approach);

(2) the other approach sees that a process of standardization or re-standardization is taking place right now: «Arabic is undergoing standardization on a vast scale» says Ferguson (1990:49).

In a well-known article, Trudgill affirms that Standard English:

(i) IS NOT a language: «it is only a variety of English among many» (2002:160);

(ii) IS NOT an accent: Standard English does not correspond to an accent;

(iii) IS NOT a style: Standard English has a wide range of styles within it, all considerable Standard English;

(iv) IS NOT a (technical) register: «there is no necessary connection between standard language and technical registers» (2002:165);

(v) IS the most important dialect (one variety of English among others) from a social, intellectual and cultural point of view. It is a social dialect and not a geographical one especially used in writing (2002:159-170).

\(^{105}\) Mejdell quotes the Prague school (Jedlička (1982), Garvin (1964 and 1993)); Haugen (1966); Ferguson (1968); Ammon (1987a and 1989a); Bartsch (1987 and 1989).
Cheshire uses the term ‘standard English’ to refer to “the set of norms to which speaker and writer conform to a greater or lesser extent” (1999:146; emphasis is mine) while Milroy & Milroy affirm that “it is difficult to point to a fixed and invariant kind of English that can properly be called the standard language, unless we consider only the written form to be relevant. It is only in the spelling system that full standardisation really has been achieved, as deviations from the norm (however logical) are not tolerated there. When, however, we refer to ‘standard’ spoken English, we have to admit that a good deal of variety is tolerated in practice, and scholars have often had to loosen their definition of a ‘standard’ in dealing with speech” (1985:22).

In my opinion, these are valid points for SA too.

2.3.1. THE PHASES OF THE PROCESS OF STANDARDIZATION

Haugen (1966:110; 1977:137) affirms that standardization is a process which undergoes a number of phases: SELECTION of norm, CODIFICATION of form, ELABORATION of function, ACCEPTANCE by the community and PROPAGATION. Van Mol adds NORMALIZATION to the process (2003:15). Through this whole process «one variety of a language becom[es] widely accepted throughout the speech community as a supradialectal norm – the ‘best’ form of the language – rated above regional and social dialects, although these may be felt to be appropriate in some domains» (Ferguson 1997:69).

2.3.1.1. selection

Haugen says that «selection involves the decision among various dialects or pre-existing written traditions or the creation of an entirely new norm. This is essentially a political decision» (1977:137). Trudgill (1992:71) calls this process “language determination” which «refers to decisions which have to be taken concerning the selection of particular languages or varieties of language for particular purposes in the society or nation in question». Coulmas (1989:220-221) affirms that «functionally unrestricted standard language is a modern phenomenon and that at present, too, only a small fraction of all languages belong to this category». Mejdell points out that what is called SA is also the result of a modern process, i.e. al-nahḍa, in which intellectuals, especially of the Eastern Arab Word, called for a renewal of Arabic as an intellectual medium. Certainly, the rediscovery of the cultural heritage of the golden age of Islam and its linguistic medium, CA, were a fundamental part of al-nahḍa. Authors rediscovered, and in a sense “reselected”, an ancient language whose rules were codified in books of grammar and whose vocabulary was contained in dictionaries after centuries in which CA
had lost its prestige in favour of Ottoman Turkish (osmanlı) and, at the beginning of the Twentieth century, in the educated classes, in favour of English and French. It is at this historical juncture that secular institutions like the Dār al-ʔalsun (‘House of languages,’ founded in 1837) or Dār al-ʕulūm (‘House of sciences,’ founded in 1932) tore CA from the mere Islamic religious field. With the arrival of European settlers, CA opened up to technology and science and their technical languages. It is at this time that CA and what is called MSA or SA took two different paths.

2.3.1.2. codification and elaboration

Codification means that alphabet, orthography, lexicon and syntax rules are recorded in grammars and dictionaries which give norms authority. The sources of codification of grammar are mainly scientific descriptions of a language but the goal of codification is prescriptive. Lexicon’s sources may be varied. Trudgill (1992:17) see codification as the process whereby a language variety «acquires a publicly recognised and fixed form».

Concerning written standard, editors of books and newspaper have an important role in elaborating codification because of their practical role in selecting what is acceptable and what it is not. Elaboration means, in fact, that the standard language is constantly adapted to the changing social and cultural circumstances through developing vocabulary and syntax, within more or less precise limits. The role of the press in shaping a “new” kind of written Arabic during the period of al-ʔahḍa is well known (and its role is undeniable still today). The challenge for Arab élites in that time was, after choosing the archaic, literary norm of CA, to make this language functional for new domains. So news stylistic conventions were invented, new vocabularies were created, or old vocabularies were expanded, new phraseological and syntactic forms were introduced. A major area of linguistic experimentation was the press that contributed decisively to the development of a modern standard language. This process was usually the result of the personal effort of writers who used language in new fields, sometimes with conservative results and some other times with innovative results. The same process, especially at the lexical level, happened when the terminology of the new-born Islam was borrowed from the ancient language of the Bedouin, establishing new meanings that were suited to the new religious precepts and the new cultural environment. Even then, the Arabic language went through a process of ‘rejuvenation’ or modernization. It is worth noticing that, even in that era of modernization or readaptation of Arabic to the new civilization, there were texts in Middle Arabic, and not just for literary purposes.
Another important point is that the academy did not preside at the linguistic reform of the *nahḍa*, at least not directly. In fact, according to Delanoue (1998), it was only after 1890 that people felt the need to protect F from the European cultural influence and it was only in 1918 that *Mağmaʕ al-luga al-Sarabiyya* was founded in Damascus, a public institution which aimed at “regulating” the various developments that the Arabic literature was taking and that ended up becoming an institution for the defence of the purity of the Classical language.

Nowadays, most of the Arab grammarians still base their work on older grammars, on poetry and on the Qurʔān and not on contemporary “good” Arabic prose and correctors use Medieval grammars to correct contemporary texts (see Haeri 2003:67).

### 2.3.1.3. propagation and acceptance by the user community

SA is the official language of all Arabic-speaking countries and is accepted as standard varieties by Arabic speakers. Generally speaking, a standard language has no native speakers. The standard language has an artificial character and its rules are learnt at school. Propagation refers to the spread of the rules mainly through education and media. Van Mol states that the learning of the standard language always ought to be seen as second-language acquisition (2003:20) and that is why one can speak of a sort of *interlingua* when speaking about substandard forms.

### 2.3.1.4. normalization

Normalization, according to Van Mol, is a process in which «old norms are substituted by new ones, or adapted. It is very well possible that these new norms are generally accepted and applied without being explicitly depicted in a grammar» (2003:17).

This is due to the fact that not everybody, within a certain language community, masters the standard language in the same way. It is evident, especially for Arabic, that *passive knowledge* and *active knowledge* of the standard is not the same (Van Mol 2003:16). Only a minority really masters the standard language according to the norms and they are normally those who work with language: teachers, writers, journalists, politicians etc. This is not always the case, of course, especially for Arabic (see §3.5.2.). When the norm is felt as unattainable for a very large group within a language community, this may cause not only frustration but also – and this is most important thing here - *the emergence of a non-orthoepic form, a sort of interlingua*. This form is normally not codified by a higher authority but it has its ‘tacit rules,’ or rather its regularities, and its use may be
widespread. These regularities form the *empirical standard* (Bartsch 1987:258; we will come back to Bartsch’s theory later) or what Van Mol calls a *non-institutionalized variation* (2003:19), i.e. the variation that might occur in the functioning of the language but which is not generally accepted theoretically.

Garvin (1993:41) states that a successful standard must be stable and flexible. The spoken language shows how flexible the standard norms are and not by chance Trudgill’s 1999 article expresses, for the English standard, almost the same idea stated by Parkinson and Kaye for the Arabic standard, namely that it is easier to say what standard is not than to say what it is. Flexibility is therefore intrinsic to the very concept of standards because it is intrinsic to the concept of language (see for example the double saussarian concept of *langue* and *parole*). SA, as well as the standard Czech or the standard German in Switzerland cited by Mejdell (2008a), failed to impose itself on the spoken language. Mejdell indicates also that there is a general trend in other languages (not only Czech and Swiss German, but also English, German, Dutch and Swedish) to «downplaying the formal, toward decreasing concern for ‘correct’ behaviour, reflected, sociolinguistically, “in less formal registers, in a preference for oral styles” [Haas 1992:321], and a disregard for standard norms – what may be termed ‘destandardisation’» (Mejdell 2008a:49).

### 2.3.1.5. Is SA a standard language?

To conclude this part, one can say with Mejdell’s words (2008a:49) that SA is a «typical standard variety» (2008a:49), according to these properties:

(i) CODIFICATION;

(ii) ELABORATION;

(iii) «serving as a VARIETY WITH VALIDITY AS A NORM OF CORRECTNESS for speakers across the Arabic dialect continuum» (2008a:49).

But SA IS NOT a standard as far as POLIFUNCTIONALITY is concerned namely «it does not cover most spoken styles and registers» (2008a:49).

From these considerations it appears clearly that SA, which regulates the written language, is not necessarily or not always a standard for spoken language. Some scholars have shown, on the contrary, how a double standard must be considered in the spoken Arabic and how ‘prestige’, which should be part of SA, is often given to certain dialects or dialectal forms. On this subject I shall return later (§2.4.3.).

---

106 The same concept of *langue* is highly controversial. As Gumperz notices theoretical linguists tend to see *langue* as a highly abstract set of rules, while other more socially oriented scholars see it as the vector sum of the processes of change in a statistically significant sample of speakers.
2.3.2. ARE WRITTEN AND SPOKEN STANDARD THE SAME?

Another issue to be considered is whether written and spoken standard are the same. In fact, in the sociolinguistic studies, in general, and in those about the Arabic language, scholars not always specify what kind of SA they are talking about. As I said before, written SA and spoken SA have to be distinguished in analysis because they present numerous differences.

The subject ‘written and spoken standard’ brings us to the larger question as to whether written language is the same thing as spoken language. We have already discussed this subject in §1.9., when analysing the textual modalities of SA and NA and their link to the characteristics of written and spoken language. Written texts are the final product which is the result of corrections and changes we can only rarely be aware of. Spoken language, on the other hand, is a process in which we are conscious of all corrections, eliminations, insertions, pauses, re-formulations, interruptions, repetitions etc. In fact, in order to analyse the spoken language, which is dynamic in nature, we have first to “fix” it statically in a visualized form (a paper, a screen etc.). In this way we make it a sort of final product which still contains all its argumentative processes. Spoken and written language “create” different realities and have different goals: «writing creates a world of things; speech creates a world of events» (Halliday 1992[1985]:167). Moreover, it seems that written language is normally lexically complex (many lexical items vs. grammatical items) while spoken language is syntactically complex (many clauses).

Although in a first stage, the standard language is selected between a number of varieties (as seen in §2.3.1.1.) which make their impact on writing, in a second stage the opposite direction of influence often take place: this new-selected written standard language starts influencing the spoken language and correction is based on the written standard (see Subačius 2001:127) so that one function of written language and the writing system becomes to «enforce or maintain standardisation» (Milroy & Milroy 1985:59). This is also true for linguists whose intuitions and beliefs are influenced, in their analysis of spoken standard, by formal written standard (Cheshire 1999:145). In fact, most scholars consider standard language to be primarily written because it is there that norms are better realized.

Historically, a spoken standard language emerges approximately as the same time as the written one does (or briefly afterwards). On the contrary, propagation, as a separate stage, can last many years and in fact realistically never be completed. Press and prestigious speakers (as seen in §2.3.1.3.) play a key role in this stage.
Subačius affirms that «historically, a spoken standard is partially a copy of the written standard» (2001:134; emphasis mine). The spoken standard represents a differentiated structure and is, only partially, influenced by the written standard. In general, one can say that spoken standard shares only partially the features of written standard and that dialectal or local influence on spoken standard is more evident than in the written standard. Spoken standard is seldom “neutral”: accent makes one's origin clear. As far as spoken SA is concerned, Badawi writes that

لا يوجد الآن في مصر ولا في أي بلد عربي آخر من يستطيع مهما بلغت درجة إتقانه الفصحى أن ينطق بما دون أن يكشف عن البلد العربي الذي نشأ فيه. ومعنى ذلك [...] أن نطقنا جميعا للفصحى مشوّب بصفات محلية يمكن لنا أن نسميها صفات عامة (1973:119)

Approximately the same words are found in Grassi et al. speaking about the Italian situation:


This influence is more evident the greater the competition of another variety in the spoken language. Subačius states that spoken forms of standard are often to be considered substandard forms (2001:135).

Spoken standard presents features that are «polypragmatic and multifunctional, responding to speakers’ needs to plan simultaneously as they go; to take, keep or signal their intention to yield the floor; to present information in manageable chunks; to create interpersonal involvement; to introduce conversational topics» (Cheshire 1999:145).

107 «Nowadays there is nobody in Egypt or in any other Arabic country who, regardless of the degree of his mastery of the fushā, is able to pronounce it [fushā] without revealing the Arab country in which he was been raised. This means that [...] the pronunciation of us all of the fushā is vitiated by local characteristics that we can call colloquial».

108 «[Standard Italian] is realized mainly in written language. In spoken language, standard itself is very rare: typically, the speaker makes the origin area or the social class to which he belongs recognizable, through the use of characteristic linguistic traits. A geographically and socially unmarked variety, is only used by ‘professional’ speakers: actors, some radio announcers, some teachers particularly careful and attentive to the problems of linguistic correctness»
Spoken standard is very variable along a formality *continuum* and a *continuum* between planned and unplanned discourse (see Ochs 1979). Depending on the situation, some features may be more present than in others. Planned discourse, for example, will display a greater number of the features typical of the written standard (see Cheshire 1999:145). After discussing some non-orthoepic features in spoken Standard English, Cheshire comments by saying that «[...] the features discussed [...] are not ‘bad English’ or performance errors, but structures that are functional and appropriate for the situation in which they occur. It is difficult enough attempting to explain that forms such as multiple negation, though not ‘standard’, are grammatically well-formed and, though stigmatised, often appropriate to the situations in which they occur» (Cheshire 1999:146).

### 2.3.2.1. the models of ‘good spoken SA’

Television has a great role in spreading models of what ‘good spoken SA’ is. If spoken CA is mainly represented by TV Islamic scholars (in many cases mixed with NA) as well as by certain *musalsalāt* (TV series) on the classical tradition in which one imitates that kind of language, the model for the realization of ‘good spoken SA’ is typical of professional radio and TV journalists (especially in news broadcasting) that are subject to strict linguistic policies: they are the official voice of authority and therefore they are intended to have normative force, to be models of standard language. Skogseth (2000:21-25) explains that training courses for the national Egyptian radio journalists are meant to establish the linguistic ‘norm’ to which employees must adapt. Special attention is given to phonetic features such as the emphasis (*tafaxim*), the realization of interdentals, the realization of long vowels and so on. The SA achieved by these professional journalists and also their mixed SA/NA speech, in situations more ‘spontaneous’ than newsbroadcasts (like talk shows etc.), becomes a competing ‘model’ with the standard norm. A standard that, as mentioned, often provides a degree of variability due to the

---

109It is believed that many BBC journalists still continue to use the Received Pronunciation (RP), an accent of spoken English used by educated Anglophone British people for formal speeches, which is therefore also called the BBC English (or Public School Pronunciation). Its morphosyntactic system represents the model used for teaching English to foreigners and is considered the spoken orthoepic standard British English. In reality, since the post-war period, BBC does not impose linguistic choices on its employees and the spoken standard, at least until the Seventies, was affected by a number of ‘non-RP speakers’. However, the fact remains that the language used by journalists from BBC is extremely accurate, especially in phonetics, so much so that there is, since 1926, a dedicated group of language experts (Pronunciation Unit) that takes care of examining and listing all the possible correct pronunciations of a given lexeme in a foreign language. (See Olausson/Sangster 2006:41-42). It seems that this care for the standard has passed to the major Arab satellite news channels (Aljazeera, Alarabiya etc..) many of whose journalists come from the Arab sector of the BBC. One could speak of “Aljazeera Arabic".
tension between ‘standard’ patterns and phonological, morphological and syntactic dialectal patterns.

**2.4. Normativity of SA: Problems and Solutions**

**2.4.1. Is SA ill-defined?**

In a controversial article, Kaye defines SA an *ill-defined system*. Kaye borrows a couple of terms that the American linguist Charles Hockett first used for linguistics: *well-defined* and *ill-defined system*. According to Hockett «a *well-defined system* is any system (physical, conceptual, mathematical) that can be completely and exactly characterized by deterministic functions» (1968:45), while an *ill-defined system* is all that is not *well-defined*. To explain that, Hockett used the example of scoring in American football where the final score is neither *computable* nor *incomputable*, but *ill-defined* (cf. Hockett 1968:47). Kaye defines SA as an *ill-defined system* because «it is much easier for the linguist to say what MSA is not than what it is» (1972:33). For example, it is not possible to describe the phonology, morphology and syntax of SA with the same precision with which one describes a given NA. Kaye analyzes, for example, the question of the accentuation, summarized in this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA form for ‘they wrote (fem. dual)’ = graphemically clear → /ktbta/, /katbata:/ = how is the long vowel realised? The forms /katabata:, /katabata:, /katabata:, /katabata:/ are all possible MSA forms. The pronunciation mostly depends on the phonological nature of NA.</td>
<td>/kit:a:, /bi-yiktib/, /madrása/ are clearly Cairene accentuation /ktab:, /ka-yektib/, /medrása/ are clearly Damascene accentuation /ktb/, /ka-yektib/, /medrása/ are clearly Rabat accentuation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 The problem of stress in SA (Kaye 1972).

**2.4.1.1. Some critics to Kaye**

Although Kaye offers questionable examples about SA which help confirm his views, he states that the vast majority of the Arabic grammars do not take into account the spoken use of SA but they remain on a purely prescriptive level. For Kaye, Ferguson’s
theory of diglossia is false, not because of the known limits of the well-known article, but because the existence of a H variety is far from being demonstrated. In conclusion, Kaye says that «diglossia in Arabic […] involves the interaction of two systems, one well-defined, the other ill-defined» (1972:47) for which Arabic diglossia cannot be considered a «relatively stable situation» as Ferguson describes it (1959:336).

In fact uneducated speakers (who are the majority in most Arab countries because of the high rate of illiteracy), «try to imitate with respect to phonology and morphology, generally, but more importantly, lexically» (1972:39) the speech of the educated people, basing themselves on their exposure to SA. The result is a ‘bastardized-corrupt-vulgar’ SA according to the purists of the language, i.e. a non-orthoeptic or a non-prescriptive SA as Kaye names it.

Kaye cites a number of examples that represent ‘incorrect’ forms according to the rules but in fact they are more common than the orthoeptic forms. He gets them from the reading of Arabic-speaking speakers from various parts of the Arab world (he does not specify where from) of the first fifty pages of the book of Aḥmad Amīn Ḥayāṭī:

/fi: maqha/ instead of /maqhan/;
/kasla:nun/ instead of /kasla:nu/;
/ʔawqa:tin ?ahsanin/ instead of /ʔahsana/;
/ʔaktib/ instead of /ʔaktub(a)/;
/ʔad:risin/ instead of /ʔad:risa/.

In his article Kaye shows mainly that:

(i) NA is the only variety that is morphophonosyntactically well-definable;
(ii) NA influences SA phonetics;
(iii) the use of spoken SA provides a wide acceptance outside the rules.

Kaye’s article has been questioned by many scholars including Schmidt (1974:19-23), El Hassan (1978:116) and Mejdell (2006:25-26). Schmidt states that:

(i) the possibility of writing a prescriptive grammar of any language is questionable, since not everything that is described in grammars is necessarily prescriptive;
(ii) if lexicon is taken into account, NA too may not be precisely describable, since a word may be expressed in different ways depending on the social stratum of the speaker (Schmidt gives the example of ‘head’ that in his research has been expressed by /ra:s/ or /dimaːɡ/). The importance of the variability factor, which is presented in NA too (and which Kaye totally ignores), and the fact that variability is not synonymous with ill-definedness is also highlighted by El-Hassan (1978:116);
(iii) Kaye compares two phonetic utterances of two speakers at the ends of the sociolinguistic continuum, an illiterate and a professional of language, bypassing the entire
mid-range that exists between these two extremes. Moreover, Schmidt also believes that these same two speakers, very realistically, would not even speak NA in the same way;

(iv) as it is not always easy to say what SA is, so it is not easy to decide what exactly NA is.

Consequently, Schmidt says that:

(a) from his field research Schmidt believes that speakers normally consider a given form to be NA if it contrasts with a form they consider SA;

(b) both SA and NA are partially defined by what they are not;

(c) this suggests that linguists should consider SA and NA as abstract poles, opposite ends of a spectrum of which speakers only control certain ranges.

Mejdell states, in line with Schmidt and El-Hassan, that Kaye’s model is based on a homogeneity of the linguistic system that is disputed in most studies of sociolinguistics which consider «‘internal diversity’ and ‘inherent variability’ as typical of language use whatever the kind of variety involved» (2006:25).

2.4.1.2. are there competent users of SA?

Kaye, like many other authors, has pointed out one the main consequences of the fact that SA has no native speakers:

I do not think presentīday MSA has native users with their own “native-speaker” intuitions because this latter notion is, of necessity, intertwined with the overwhelmingly crucial fact that it is their native colloquial dialects to which their respective native-speaker intuitions are, on the whole, related and on which they are dependant (1994:51; emphasis mine)

Mejdell believes that the question of the absence of competent speakers in SA is actually more complex than in many other languages: competent speakers of SA do exist but their expertise is not necessarily the same as that of that of their NA. These ‘experts’ would be competent for a ‘core’ of knowledge. This knowledge is the result of their internalisation of an extensive and in-depth linguistic knowledge based on school education and on other SA input (reading, listening to other prestigious speakers etc.). This allows them to judge the acceptability of most of the linguistic SA structures. Around this ‘core’ there exist ‘fuzzy areas’ (2006:26) that are not known or introjected in the same way in their linguistic repertoire. Here, judgement becomes uncertain, variable and sometimes contradictory from person to person. Mejdell affirms that the substantial difference between the Arabic diglossic situation and that of standard-with-dialects of
other languages is that the group of competent speakers and the width of this ‘core’ is
significantly smaller.

2.4.1.3. two important points

Despite these critics, I believe that Kaye focuses on two important points:

(i) the difficulty of establishing what has to be considered correct SA and who are
    competent speakers in SA in order to express value judgments on SA (this point is also
    highlighted by Mejdell and Parkinson, see paragraph §2.5. et seqq.)

(ii) he emphasizes the fact that the SA described by grammars is a very ideal
    construction and that substandard forms of Arabic are much more common
    than the orthoeptic standard described by grammars.

Yet, I agree with Schmidt who says that: «each code must […] be partly described by
reference to the other» (Schmidt 1974:76).

2.4.2. Norms, perscriptions and correctness

Bartsch’s analysis of the linguistic norm is essential when we talk about any
standard. Bartsch investigates the rules governing the language that she considers «as the
social reality of [linguistic] correctness notions» (1987:xiv) without going into
«psychological questions about norms» (1987:xiv) which represents also another
important perspective. We will see Bartsch’s definitions of important terms like
correctness, norms, regularity etc. and then we will focus on the author’s position about the
mixed forms and, specifically, the mixed forms in Arabic and their relationship with the
standard and dialectal norms.

2.4.2.1. correctness in phonetics, morphology and syntax

Norms reflect the ‘ideas of correctness’ and in this sense «correctness concepts, which
as concepts in a certain sense are psychic entities, have a social reality and objectivity above
or outside the individuals that grasp them by constructing a psychic representation of them.
Their correctness is socially established in varying degrees of formality, from providing
models of correctness to providing codifications of the norms» (1987:4; emphasis is mine).
What is meant by correctness? Phonetics plays a socially very important role. There exists
a process of selection of phonemes on the basis of the social meanings that they involve.
This process is transferred to the new generation «through welcoming and rewarding
sounds of their language produced by infants, thus reinforcing the production of these
sounds; they disregard and discourage the production of other sounds» (1987:5). Bartsch
goes on to explain that the correctness of a given phoneme means that it is within acceptable boundaries of realization in a given context: $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$ where $X$ is a phoneme and $n$ the context in which $X$ is realized (see Bartsch 1987:5ī6).

For lexicon, each individual speaker bases his judgments of correctness, in the first place, on what is recorded in his memory, and only later will he accept what is recorded in ‘public lexica’. A number of factors of linguistic origin (e.g. morphophonologic structure) or social origin (e.g. prestigious lexeme) or linked to communication needs (is the lexeme really needed?) are at the basis of correctness of new lexemes. As for syntax, Bartsch creates a hierarchy in 4 points regarding the acceptability or correctness of the syntactic form. A given syntactic form can be:

«syntactically correct according to the standard of written language»;
«syntactically incorrect according to the written standard, but acceptable in everyday spoken language»;
«syntactically incorrect and not acceptable in everyday spoken language of native speakers»;
«otherwise incorrect and unacceptable but can, if at least understandable and interpretable, be acceptable when used by people of whom one does not expect correct speech.»

The bottom limit is what is incomprehensible and uninterpretable: this is what is totally unacceptable (see 1987:16).

An important principle quoted by Bartsch is the ‘principle of charity’ (see 1987:52) according to which the listener is ready to accept an incorrect sentence, for example pragmatically incorrect (on correctness and pragmatics, see Bartsch 1987:40-70), assuming that the speaker speaks rationally, according to a purpose and he does not contradict himself.

2.4.2.2. correctness and norms, central and peripheral models

Correctness and norms are not the same notion, despite being linked. Norms are what «create, delimit, and secure the notions of correctness», on the social level (1987:70). According to Bartsch, these norms are based on social balances of power that create models that must be followed. There are more and less central models: the social relations determine who offers these models, who must follow them, what are the acceptable margins of deviation. Bartsch says that the hierarchy of these models roughly reflects social hierarchies and, thanks to the media of mass communication, the central models have become available to usufructuaries of peripheral models. Intellectuals follow and forge the central models, the less educated follow models of the more educated (their teachers, for example) while the uneducated follow the models of those who are socially in a higher
step if they have the possibility or the desire to climb the social ladder. Norms, therefore, are based on these balances of power that give rise to *norm authorities*, *norm enforcers*, *norm codifiers* and *norm subjects*. These models, and the relative social control that is expressed in acts of *correction* which are characterized by *rewards* and *penalties*, represent the strength of the norm.

Hart\(^{110}\) also distinguishes between *prescription* and *norm*: a *prescription* is a rule whose breaking is negatively sanctioned; while a *norm* is only a guideline for action. So prescriptions accepted by the speakers are norms but not all the norms are prescriptions or prescriptive.

### 2.4.2.3. norms and mixed forms

Bartsch also refers to the gumperzian concept of *conversational code-switching* (see Gumperz 1982:VII) stating that «people use different languages and varieties as different codes which are connected to different types of situations. People can use two languages with a different stylistic value in different functions, and in a manner that is absolutely natural to them» (1987:95) and interprets it in normative terms, explaining that:

> there are *in-between forms of norm adoption and compromises* which show that the speaker accepts the standard norms to be valid in certain situations, even for himself, and that he has, as far as these situations go, the internal view with respect to the standard norms, although his linguistic behaviour is only partly adjusted to these norms. Acceptance of the standard can also be indicated symbolically by using a few indicators of the standard while at the same time retaining those indicative of his regional and social identity (Bartsch 1987:96; my emphasis)

For Bartsch, therefore, the speaker often assumes *different normative systems* as stylistic or functional devices. These normative systems, in certain situations, may come into conflict or competition. For this reason, some stylistic registers appear linguistically mixed. These mixed forms do not necessarily represent a linguistic incompetence but rather they are the result of *normative conflicts* of strategies to overcome them (cf. Bartsch 1987:98).

Bartsch then distinguishes between *correctness* and *validity* of speech acts. She says:

> Even a non-correctly performed speech act can be valid, if it is not evident that the conditions of correctness are violated, i.e. if the hearer believes (and is justified by the

\(^{110}\) Cit. in Bartsch 1987:76.
available evidence in his belief) that the conditions of correctness are fulfilled. This can be the case when non-satisfaction is hidden in such a way that the hearer cannot realize it (Bartsch 1987:133; emphasis mine).

### 2.4.2.4. norm and regularity

Another relation analyzed by Bartsch is that between **norm and regularity**. They are related because the norm implies the expectation of a regularity although it does not depend on whether the regularity is totally realized. Bartsch writes:

Deviation of a norm, i.e. not realizing the expected regularity, does not **abolish or abrogate the norm as long as such deviation is subject to criticism, correction, and sanction, or is admitted as an exception in special cases.** In this way, a norm is also more than a mere expectation of a regularity. **Such an expectation, to be sure, would be suspended as soon as the expectation has been disappointed several times** (Bartsch 1987:166; emphasis mine).

This seems to echo a Latin maxim which says: *error comunis facit ius* (*common error makes the law*). Bartsch also distinguishes between **norm** and **custom or usage**. Custom or usage implies a certain expectation of regularity. When this vanishes it makes its use also fade. On the contrary, the norm is continually reinforced by **criticism, correction and sanction** which makes the normative force of the norm (1987:166).

Bartsch also distinguishes two types of norms of communication:

- **norms of communicative products** that represent the social reality of the correctness notions in phonemic, graphemic, morphemic, syntactic, gestural and intonational properties of expressions;
- **norms of use of communicative means** that represent the social reality of the correctness notions in semantic, pragmatic and stylistic properties of expressions (cf. Bartsch 1987:171).

### 2.4.2.5. norm description

Norm consists, according to Bartsch, in:

- **norm content** - it states a regularity;
- **norm character** - obligatory, optional;
- **norm kernel** - is formed by norm content and norm character and has a normative force;
agents - norm authorities, norm subjects, norm promoters, norm enforcers, norm beneficiaries, norm victims = roles fulfilled by persons or agencies that are involved in establishing the social reality of a norm;

Schematized:

Table 17 Adapted from Bartsch 1987:177.

Norm exists as:
(A)  

- **norm concept** = it conceptualizes an expected regularity;
- **norm formulation** = it is a formulation of the norm concept;
- **norm codification** = it is an official formulation of a norm concept;
- **norm promulgation** = it is the activity of introducing a norm as valid for a population

(B)  

- **norm N exists** for a population P as a norm if N is a practice in P, not under pressure (if not we have a prescription). Existence can be natural (N is acquired in primary socialization) or adopted (N is acquired later in life);
- **norm N is accepted** by a population P as a norm if correction if favour of N is welcome or at least accepted in P;
- **norm N is adopted** by a population P as a norm if N is accepted and comes to exist in P;
- **norm N is valid** for a population P as a norm if and only if the members of P are justified in referring to N as the reason for certain behaviour;
norm N is *justified* in a population P as a norm if behaviour according to N does not conflict with a higher norm or a value in P (see Bartsch 1987:177-178).

So we have:

(B₁)

...N exists \(\rightarrow\) *existence domain* of N;
...N is accepted \(\rightarrow\) *acceptance domain* of N;
...N is adopted \(\rightarrow\) *adoption domain* of N;
...N is valid \(\rightarrow\) *validity domain* of N;
...N is justified \(\rightarrow\) *justification domain* of N

that is the group of people by whom N exists, is accepted, is adopted, is valid and is justified.

There are also situations domains of N in which N is, respectively, a practice, is accepted, is valid, is adopted and in justified.

Norms may exist etc. also only for a part of P (cf. Bartsch 1987:184).

All the rules are justified in relation to what Bartsch calls the *highest norm of communication* (HNC), which is expressed in two parts:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{||| SPEAKER} & \text{‘express yourself in such a way that what you say is recognizable and interpretable by your partner in agreement with what you intend him to understand’} \\
&\text{||| HEARER} & \text{‘interpret such that the interpretation will be in agreement with what the speaker intends’ (cf. Bartsch 1987:212).}
\end{align*}
\]

So when N prevents the satisfaction of the HNC, the satisfaction of HNC precedes the satisfaction of N. A strict correctness with respect to N against HNC may result in partial or total failure of communication. When specific Ns are in stark contrast with HNC, this may cause a change in the norms if a significant and regular deviation is set.

### 2.4.2.6. normative and empirical standard

Bartsch often quotes the doctoral dissertation of Subbayya (1980) which unfortunately was not available to me\(^{111}\). The situation of Marathi, a language mainly spoken in the Indian state of Maharashtra, seems to have many points in common with the mixed varieties of Arabic. In Marathi Sanskrit loans and that which Subayya calls ‘sanskritization’ are elements of a highly formal language found in major newspapers (written Marathi), or in formal speeches (spoken Marathi). Subbayya has proved how Marathi allows a large range of variation according to specific factors. Standard is used next to the local dialects, in specific situations of a certain formality. And there are

---

\(^{111}\) I will briefly refer to the synthesis given by Bartsch (1987:253-278).
varieties that are used next to the standard and considered as *also standard*, *still standard* or *approximate standard*, a compromise between standard and vernacular. Bartsch writes that standard Marathi «has a range of flexibility in it, by which it is adapted to various needs» (1987:257).

Starting from Subbayya (1980), Bartsch discusses whether the standard is to be regarded as a *range* or a *point*. For Bartsch

from an *empirical point of view*, the standard is a *range*, namely a set of linguistic means and situations of their use, including a lot of variation recognized and accepted as standard by the population and by language specialists [...] from a *normative point of view*, the standard has rather been considered as a *point*, i.e. a single variety with no variation between forms (Bartsch 1987:258; emphasis is mine)

So Bartsch distinguishes two kind of standard:

*prescriptive standard* «as a normative concept of language planners [...] [it] has a role as the ultimate model towards which the *submodels* for the standard linguistic usage are oriented. It is identified by linguistic experts, but it is *more a construct or something postulated than something real*. However, there are people in the speech community who are considered to be pretty close to it and are therefore its models»;  

*empirical standard* «as a descriptive concept of socio-linguistics [...] » (Bartsch 1987:258; emphasis is mine).

Subbayya (1980) postulates a range of linguistic features acceptable as standard to a higher or lower degree. Based on the empirical approach towards Marathi, the observed data can be schematized as follows:

![Diagram](image)

*Table 18 From Subbayya (1980) (see Bartsch 1987:260)*
Excluding the hypercorrection as non-standard, which is questionable in such a framework (one wonders why it is not then a hypocorrection, for example), one must consider that there is a continuous re-directing to the higher varieties of substandard models and in some ways, then, there are variable boundaries of where the standard ends. It is, in fact, the very essence of the standard to provide some normality and homogeneity (§2.3.) so that a continuous creation of new varieties far from the orthoepic norm could compromise intercomprehension between speakers of the same community. So Bartsch (1987:262) proposes the following model:

\[
( \ldots ( \ldots ( \ldots ) \ldots ) )
\]

**WEAKER MODELS...STRONGER MODELS...WEAKER MODELS**

There is a hierarchy of power in the models: the *central*, the **NORMATIVE CENTRE** or **STANDARD**, is the strongest and it is the point of orientation for the correct behavior. That force is weakened in the periphery: «the strength or weakness implies that correction takes place in one direction: the strong models overrule the weaker ones» (Bartsch 1987:262). Bartsch says that grammar books, dictionaries and style manuals serve as central models. The speaker’s attitude towards what ‘is acceptable’ depends on where he is located in this scheme: the more central is his position, the less wide will be his range (purists). Some elements of the Bartsch’s description of the non-standard variants cannot be applied to Arabic. For example statements such as «these varieties are prevented from being put to use […] in new functions that arise with modernization» or «they become less useful» (Bartsch 1987:268) are not fully valid for the Arabic situation.

Mejdell (2006:29) applies this scheme to the SA situation with two lexical examples of which I retain one:

[θaːliθun]  θaːliθ]  θaːlis / saːlis ]

[    1    ]
[    2    ]
[    3    ]

All the three are ‘felt’ as standard: [1] is the ‘normative’ standard with inflected vowels; [2] pausal standard form; [3] sibilant variant for interdental. Outside what is considerable as standard one should add, according Mejdell, the dialectal form taːlit whis
is non-standard. In this sense Mejdell states «we have to recognize several norms of the written standard: the strictly orthoepic classical codified norm and wider, more flexible, ‘empirical’ norms. These norms may have validity with different people – conservative purists vs. modernists; religiously educated vs. ‘foreign institution’ educated» (2006:29-30).

2.4.2.7. classical and standard languages: the case of Arabic

Bartsch then proceeds to discuss whether the so called ‘classical’ languages may represent a norm for the standard language and she quotes, of course, also the case of Arabic along with Sinhala and Telugu. The position of Arabic is considered by Bartsch to be «more severe» and with a difficult solution as a result of the religious datum that the language represents (1987:273). It is worthwhile to quote what Bartsch replies to the question of whether or not CA can represent a norm for the spoken language:

Such a classical standard, by being too far away from colloquial educated speech, finally might lose its function as a standard altogether. Awareness of not complying with the norm may be lacking if the colloquial standard emerging from the variety of the educated speakers competes with the old classical standard in everyday life. People who fill important positions in state and society will neither be able nor willing to conform to the classical standard, but nevertheless, their speech (in a non-classical dialect) will be a model for many other speakers who recognize them as important people in official positions. These people, by way of their prestige, become models and that implies that their speech receives the certificate ‘standard’ or ‘good speech’ by the masses, though not by the religious and classical experts. This way, a competing colloquial standard arises [...] (Bartsch 1987:274; emphasis mine)

This passage is of a crucial importance in my opinion. It is true that Bartsch here does not make any distinction between CA from contemporary SA and, therefore, she speaks of a possible loss of standard function of CA/SA. While citing the language of the educated people, Bartsch does not consider the possible and actual functions that CA/SA has in their language.

However, it must be acknowledged that Bartsch highlights several points that I consider worthy of note for the Arabic situation:

LACK OF AWARENESS «awareness of not complying with the norm may be lacking»;

112 See also §1.2.2. and table 6 for other examples of SA-ness on a level higher than the word.
COMPETING STANDARD «the colloquial standard [...] competes with the old classical standard in everyday life» (especially in educated people’s everyday life, one can add); «This way, a competing colloquial standard arises»;

PEOPLE ACTING AS ‘GOOD SPEECH’ MODEL «people who fill important positions in state and society [...] their speech (in a non-classical dialect) will be a model for many other speakers who recognize them as important people [...] These people, by way of their prestige, become models and that implies that their speech receives the certificate ‘standard’ or ‘good speech’ by the masses, though not by the religious and classical experts».

It is interesting to note that Bartsch uses the term colloquial standard without specifying what it exactly means. I suppose it could mean a colloquial normative system which conflicts with the standard norm. This is a point on which we will return, namely the presence or absence of a double standard in the spoken language (§2.4.3.). Bartsch states that «norms need not and cannot be complied with in all situations in which they are valid, but they have, at least, to be strengthened by showing acceptance and paying tribute to them. This can be done by apologizing for not following them, by correcting oneself if that is possible, or by expressing acceptance of them symbolically. These proofs of reference to a community’s norms are a method to reinforce one’s membership» (1987:320-321; emphasis is mine). In many cases, this is exactly what happens in (spoken) Arabic.

2.4.3. A DOUBLE STANDARD FOR FORMAL SPEAKEN ARABIC?

As seen before, there are more and less central models of correctness of speech, whose hierarchy is mainly determined on social bases, according do Bartsch. Central models are forged and followed by intellectuals, the less educated follow models of the more educated (their teachers, for example) while the uneducated follow the models of those who are socially on a higher step if they have the possibility or the desire to climb the social ladder. These models, and the relative social control that is expressed in acts of correction which are characterized by rewards and penalties, ensure the strength of the norm. Another social consideration is that a kind of language, in order to be accepted and recherché has to be used by people with social prestige. Quoting Haugen, and Ray\textsuperscript{113}, Bartsch says that a norm must be adopted by the lead of whatever society and the lead is a subset of users who are regarded as imitation-worthy and therefore have prestige: «this not only seems to hold for variants within a single language, but also among speakers of competing languages» (Bartsch 1987:239). Intellectuals, by way of their prestige, become

\textsuperscript{113} Citt. in Bartsch 1987:239
models and that implies that their speech receives the certificate ‘standard’ or ‘good speech’ by the masses, though not by the religious and classical experts. «This way, a competing colloquial standard arises», says Bartsch (1987:274).

Prestige, in general, is seen as a positive social evaluation in relation to something, that is the fact of being worthy of imitation, because positively evaluated on the basis of socially favourable characters. In sociolinguistics, the concept of prestige ranges between two extremes, according to Berruto (2007:89): on the one hand, it refers to a general good social evaluation of a variety, a form, or a linguistic behaviour; on the other hand, it refers to the social importance a variety, a form, or a linguistic behaviour have as means of social advancement. A variety of language is, therefore, prestigious if it is a necessary condition to climb the social ladder. Various are the factors in defining the sociolinguistic concept of prestige. Berruto establishes at least four elements:

«a) favourable language attitudes of speakers of the members of the community;
   b) the symbolic value assigned by the community to the (varieties of) language;
   c) being a vehicle of a vast and appreciated literary tradition;
   d) being spoken by the dominant social groups» (2007:90).

Point d) is labelled by Berruto as social prestige (although he underlines the fact that prestige is always a social concept). Berruto also distinguishes an open prestige, one that is overtly recognized by all the members of the community, and a covert prestige, that is a prestige that differs from the prevailing values in the community and whose existence is not explicitly admitted (2007:91). If we consider the four points established by Berruto, we will realize that while b) and c) are prerogatives of SA, a) and d) are prerogatives of NA. In this sense one can speak of an overlap between NA and SA in terms of prestige. Both have prestige in themselves, although on different levels. In particular, point d) is controversial for spoken Arabic because the dominant social groups do not speak just one variety, but, at least partially, mixed varieties SA/NA. Moreover, while SA has overt prestige, the prestigious NA has a covert prestige.

2.4.3.1. Prestigious variety vs. SA and sex differentiation

In all the Arab countries there is a L variety which is considered to be prestigious and which is in competition with SA and that Ibrahim calls super-dialectal L. Arab women confirm that the prestigious variety is not SA. In fact, they tend to use more NA prestigious form than men and the reason for this is, according to Ibrahim, the fact that they feel socially and psychologically less secure than men so they are expected to “behave themselves” linguistically by using prestigious forms. These form allow them to “acquire” that social prestige they lack. This is in perfect conformity with many patterns
of language use in other language communities investigated for sex differentiation. In this sense, SA appears to be socially neutral and unmarked with respect to the speaker’s class. Of course it does not lack prestige because of its religious, ideological, and educational values but «its social evaluative connotations are much weaker than those of locally prestigious varieties of L» says Ibrahim (1986:125). In fact, prestigious forms of NA, not those of SA, «carry most of the important social connotations that matter to most individuals in life such as socioeconomic class, urban vs. rural origin or affiliation, and social mobility and aspirations» (1986:125).

2.4.3.2. Prestigious variety vs. SA in Bahrayn and Baghdad

In Bahrayni prestige varieties is a complex issue. In this little state there exists two big speaking communities: Šarab, of recent immigration, Sunnis, and the dominant political group in the country, and bahārna, shiite. They speak two different dialects that have many differences. Holes isolates 19 phonomorphological variables for comparison. The author reaches the following conclusions:

(i) Bahārna tend to move towards the phonetic variants of the Šarab and the opposite does not happen: bahārna switch, in certain circumstances, their /ğ/ to the Šarab’s /y/ like in ya ← ġa (‘venne’) although /y/ is stigmatized in SA;
(ii) when there is a common form (bahārna, Šarab) other than SA, bahārna tend to use the SA form; when there is no common form, even if the bahārna variant is equal to the SA form, bahārna tend to use the Šarab’s form (thus, not the SA form) (see e.g. Owens 2001:435).

For Holes, this explains that the prestige dialect has great importance and have, in many cases, more ‘social weight’ than SA has got. So it is clear that (1) Šarab have some linguistic confidence and move to SA, (2) bahārna move both towards SA (for example, a common form bahārna/Šarab) and to the realization of the Šarab group. The Šarab speech is therefore the prestige dialect and it represents a centripetal force together with SA114. The same happens in many Arab countries where next to the prestige of the SA one must consider the competitive prestige of the ‘spoken’ language of the capital.

According to what is usually called the ‘standard-vernacular model,’ standard variants are generally prestigious:

1. they are the ‘model’ to which one tends;

---

114 I wonder whether the recent uprising in Bahrayn (February 14, 2011 until the moment this thesis is being written) will produce any change in the linguistic situation of this little country.
2. they are the basis for overcorrection (when, in order to appear educated, one tends to ‘overdo’);
3. they represent the linguistic norms of society.

In Arabic, something similar and, at the same time, different takes place. Holes has shown, for example, what happens for the variable [q] in Baḥrayn, where there are three variants:
(i) /q/, SA value;
(ii) /g/ and /ğ/ (interchangeable), ʕarab values;
(iii) /g/ (not interchangeable with /ğ/), baḥārna value;
(iv) /ḳ/ (back velar k), baḥārna, mostly rural.

The /q/ variant is not the only prestige variant. In addition to /q/, which appears in SA imported lexemes, Holes has discovered that the ʕarab retain their own variant, /g/ and /ğ/, specific to this community, while baḥārna, in those lexemes in which they do not pronounce /q/, move, not to the SA variant (i.e. /q/) but by the /g/ of the ʕarab. This confirms that the ʕarab variety is that of prestige in this community and represents a model to which to conform: «it appears that the two forces of social prestige and linguistic ‘correctness’ are pulling in opposite directions» (1980:81).

A similar statement was done by Abu-Haidar in her study of the Muslim and the Christian dialects of Baghdad. She states that «apart from MSA (the H variety for all Baghdadis), CB speakers [Christian Baghdadi] use their own dialect as a L variety in informal situations at home and with in-group members, while they use MB [Muslim Baghdadi] as another H variety in more formal situations with non-Christians» (1991:92).

2.4.3.3. Prestigious forms vs. SA in Cairo

The predominance of Cairene Arabic in Egypt is a well-known linguistic fact. This means that non-Cairenes, in situations of formality or in presence of non-local people, avoid geographically stigmatized forms in favour of urban Cairene forms. So non-Cairene have to learn not only SA but also an approximation of the dialect of Cairo. The prestige of Cairene Arabic is so strong that SA forms can even become stigmatized by the dominant social classes. Haeri, who worked on the use of /q/ and its variants in Cairene Arabic (CEA), suggests that speakers with the highest level of education do not have the highest frequency of /q/ lexical items in their speech while a middle class college educated man is the most frequent user of qāf lexical items. She excludes that the

---

115 Of course Cairene Arabic is not a homogeneous and static variety and many factors, such as degree of urbanization, exposure to the mass media, religious education and foreign cultures, contribute to the linguistic differentiation of the population (see for example Haeri 1997).
problem is attending private international schools. Although some of the informants have attended this kind of school and their knowledge of SA is ‘less’ if compared with those who attended public schools, Haeri suggests that using a /q/ variant does not mean knowing or not SA. In CEA, for example, there are a lot of lexemes from European languages normally used by Egyptians which does not mean that they know these languages. Job is not a cause either (1991:138-139). The question is that «other prestige systems are also at work» (1991:139) as Haeri states quoting Schmidt (1986): «Both upper class men and upper class women seem to be responding to a prestige norm which distinguishes between classes but which is not in the direction of classical Arabic». SA is not the only, or the major source of symbolic prestige for them, and, also, it is not a source of social mobility.

2.4.3.4. a double standard

If the linguistic models of the socially dominant class are considered prestigious, the question is what are the models forged by these classes in spoken Arabic?

According to Bartsch, standard language is «a model of correctness with validity in a speech community for official or public language use» (1989:199). This poses a problem in Arabic. SA is certainly a model of correctness for official and public language use but is it the only model? Again Hartmann & Stork (1972) define standard language as «the socially favoured variety of a language, often based on the speech of the educated population in and around the cultural and/or political centre of the language community». If the first part of the definition is acceptable about SA, in the sense that without SA social climbing is impossible (and nowadays in many Arab countries it is also impossible without a foreign language like English), we may certainly say that SA does not represent the speech of the educated population of the cultural and/or political centre of the language community. At least not ‘pure’ SA. We must then postulate another competing ‘standard’.

As we will see in details in §2.5. (Haeri 2003; Parkinson 1991, 1993, 1994; Owens & Bani Yasin 1991), native Egyptian speakers are ready to accept a wide variability of features, all of them perceived as SA. Moreover it is clear how big the discrepancy is between what is grammatically ‘correct’ and what is ‘good’ language: they do not always coincide. Grammatically ‘incorrect’ forms can be still be good language and hypercorrect forms can be bad language, because they are felt to be pedantic and heavy.

In order to understand what the ‘empirical norms’ of SA are we should observe the linguistic behaviour of those speakers whose language is considered to be ‘prestigious’. Being worthy of imitation, these people provide a model of ‘good’ Arabic and have
normative force in linguistic matters (see §1.9.2.). As Mejdell says «in Egypt, as elsewhere in the modern world, public broadcasting is a means for linguistic education» (2006:33). Radio and TV represent a wide range of styles of spoken language. Readings of classical poems and texts, taḡwīd, films or musalsalāt (TV series) on the classical heritage and the news programmes broadcast by some channels\textsuperscript{116} offer the orthoepic norm for CA and SA; educated speech is heard in discussions/interviews on serious topics; urban educated speech is heard in entertainment shows and musalsalāt; street or rural level is normally heard in interviews or films.

Public formal or semi-formal sociolinguistic settings (often in the presence of an audience) offer formal and semi-form linguistic education. That is: how should one speak publicly in order to convey his message and not let the audience sleep? Religious discourse is certainly a part of this kind of sociolinguistic settings with similar problems and goals to any other formal setting.

SA is only one of the possible sources of linguistic elements for spoken Arabic. In fact, Ibrahim (1986), Abd-El-Jawad (1987), Holes (1987), Haeri (1991) and others state that when we consider spoken Arabic we cannot do without considering another ‘standard’ (and by standard here they do not mean a highly codified language but mainly prestigious) system which socially conflicts with the \(H\) variety or SA. So we must speak of a ‘double standard’ where the prestige variety concurrent to SA can be labelled ‘non-standard (in the sense of non-SA) standard’ (in the sense of prestigious code) (for the use of this last term, ‘non-standard standard,’ see Holes 1986:19,27). The difficulty of finding a socially proper definition for the language spoken by intellectuals stems from the fact that there is an understanding that equates standard language with prestigious language. This is due to the fact that in many standard/dialect languages prestigious and standard variety coincide. And this also explains why for a long time SA has been considered as a prestigious variety: «the identification of \(H\) as both the standard and the prestigious variety at one and the same time has led to problems of interpreting data and findings from Arabic sociolinguistic research» (Ibrahim 1986:115).

Ibrahim makes a good point when he says that the problem of prestige has only recently been raised in Arabic sociolinguistic studies. He says that this is one of the consequences of the 1959 Ferguson’s article which sees \(H\) as superior to \(L\) in a number of aspects.

\textsuperscript{116} Newsreaders go through a special training programme to read ‘correctly’ (see Harrell 1960 and Skogseth 2000:21-25).
2.5. THE ATTITUDE AND PERCEPTION APPROACH

Social psychologists define *attitude* as «a psychological tendency [...] expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favour or disfavour» (see Versteegh 2006b:650). Language attitude concerns a specific language, language variety, or language practice. Similarly, perception is defined in philosophy, psychology, and cognitive science, as the process of attaining awareness or understanding of sensory information. Attitude is the result of one’s perception of reality. Perception, and the resulting attitude, is not reality but how one approaches and interprets reality. The study of language attitude is indispensable if one wants to really understand not only how language is normatively systematized but also how language is used and viewed by their own speakers. There is no doubt that the ATTITUDE AND PERCEPTION approach is unstable and questionable because it is not ‘objective’. But the studies that currently exist give us a rather clear picture of trends in the Arabic-speaking people’s attitude towards their own or other’s SA utterances and of the vast range of variability accepted under the ‘SA label’. They also show the difficulty of establishing the limits of SA.

The fact that speakers of SA are not native and do not have native-speaker intuitions should mean that one cannot decide what constitutes SA because their own dialect and the degree of their school learning of it will influence, in ways we will see later, attitude and judgements about SA as Ayoub also says (1981:12). This means that somehow there does not exist a group who imposes normativity of SA to speaker: «the social group responsible for the prestige variety is a sub-set, and nothing more, of the speakers of the low variety, learning SA as a second language in the course of their education. What this means in relation to spoken (as opposed to written) Arabic is that there is no independent group of speakers of the prestige variety to dictate what the spoken norm should be. The speakers of SA are free, as it were, to establish what their spoken norms should be» (Owens & Bani Yasin 1991:25). But this does not mean that there are not ‘native users’ (Parkinson 1994:51) with their “native-speaker” intuitions, of course related with their native colloquial dialects, and that there are ‘experts’ (see §2.4.1.2.).

Moreover, as Mejdell states, it is a mistake to consider «non-intentional interference from the vernacular mother tongue on attempts to speak fuṣḥā, [as] only one of many psycholinguistic processes which may produce some kind of mixed style in Arabic. There is much evidence that speakers perceive mixed style as ‘THE target’ in certain communicative situations, and Arabic speakers, scholars and non-scholars, identify the link between luġa wusţā and semi-formal situations» (2007:85). By saying «[assuming

\[117\] For an introduction to this vast subject, see the entry Language attitudes in EALL (Versteegh 2006b:650).
that] the target is standard Arabic», Mejdell means here ‘orthoepic SA’. The use of SA imposes a different flexible norm: «The purism of the official norm authorities [...] preserves the codified orthoepic ‘classical’ written standard, as taught in the educational system. A more flexible ‘empirical standard’ imposes itself by its users, with validity according to variable ‘notions of correctness’ in the language community» (Mejdell 2006:37).

The discrepancy between ‘perception’ and ‘norm’ is considerable and it is even more in the spoken language. We will find, in fact, that ‘perception’ frequently coincides with the Bartschian concept of empirical standard (§2.4.2.7.) where the substandard is perceived, along variable limits, as acceptable standard. According to Bartsch «the practice (or existence) domain of the standard variety is much smaller than its validity domain, this means that there are less people who in fact use the standard than there are people for whom the standard is valid» (Bartsch 1989:201) (see also §2.4.2.5. for the concepts of practice domain and validity domain).

The perception of the speakers is one of the epistemological elements to assess the kind of speech we evaluate. While Eid marks on this point by saying that «SA here has to be understood as SA as used by Egyptian Arabic speakers and not as grammar books tell us it should be», Mejdell seems to have a more moderate position when she writes that «[we should] be very receptive to native speakers’ perceptions of what counts as meaningful variation» (Mejdell 2007:96). Yet, it is clear that a concept like ‘perception’ is at least very vague, as we said before. Who perceives? Does everybody perceive the same way? However I am convinced that ‘perception’ is forged on the basis of competence. Thus, in theory, it could be argued that the reference perception is that of those who work with the language (journalists, writers, speakers, etc..) or, better, those who produce educated speeches. These speakers’ evaluation can be labelled as ‘central perception’.

2.5.1. THE USE PEOPLE MAKE OF SA CHANGES THEIR PERCEPTION TOWARDS IT

A rare study on the wide perception of CA and SA is that of Haeri (2003). Haeri shows how the idea of CA or SA, whose distinction does not exist but for a certain Arab secular élite, varies greatly between speakers depending on the level of education, occupation and age.

Haeri describes how CA is perceived by her interviewees. For Nadia and her family CA represents their daily prayers and Qurʔān. They have a limited daily contact with SA that takes place when they seldom have to read, and even more rarely, to write. SA is not
a means of self-expression for them. All the programmes they watch on TV are not in SA. It is interesting to quote what Nadia says about the tv appearances of Shay Sa'rawi:

Many people said they liked him because he spoke “directly” (‘alaa ṭuul) to them, “as if he were sitting” in their “living room”. Sheikh Sha'rawi in fact offered interpretations of sections of the Qur’an in Egyptian Arabic in a very friendly tone, with broad smiles and much enthusiasm for his task. He clearly addressed ordinary viewers and not other religious scholars. His program was in fact talked about by many people and a professor of Classical Arabic commented that if one were to transcribe the sheikh's interpretations, one would have for the first time, a written translation of the Qur’an in Egyptian Arabic. Offering Qur’anic interpretations in Egyptian Arabic is probably not that usual. But as many people commented on his use of that language, it does not seem to be very common either (Haeri 2003:32-33).

On the contrary, “lack of mastery of Classical Arabic for oral interaction”, says Haeri “on the part of a majority of people “makes its use take time” and is not ‘alaa ṭuul” (2003:39). Haeri also points out that for certain people SA means difficulty (ṣaʕba), heaviness (tizi:la); it lacks humour (ma-fiha:-š xiffit damm), it is ‘pretense and affectedness’ (mutakallifa) (Haeri 1991:171). On the contrary, CA of Qurʔān is beautiful (gami:la), a miracle (muʕgiza). Haeri says that it is af if CA of religion is a distinct language from the CA or SA of everything else (2003:43).

Text regulators and correctors have another idea of SA, because they work with it. Although they consult Medieval grammatical treaties during their work (2003:67) for contemporary texts, correctors somehow “make” the language. They have to translate many interviews from EA to SA before printing them118. Haeri also points out that there is a sort of battle between the old guard pro-SA and a new guard pro-EA and this battle is fought in real life through censorship, for example, which can even arrive to the extent of closing magazines written in EA in order not to lose the privilege of the censors of being “priests of SA”.

2.5.2. How do Egyptians use SA?

2.5.2.1. What Egyptians mean by SA?

---

118 An interesting case quoted by Haeri is a televised meeting in which the former president of Egypt, Ḥusni Mubārak, answered every question in EA. The next day all newspapers reported the answers in SA (March 1, 1996; Haeri 2003:68).
Parkinson has dedicated four articles to the survey of the speakers’ attitudes towards SA, mainly through the use of proficiency tests\(^{119}\) on a broad sample of informants.

In his well-known and widely quoted 1991 article, Parkinson states that it is already complicated to explain to native speakers what one refers to by the term MSA and that the definitions of Arabic speakers of MSA and of the specific term F greatly vary depending on education and the ideological position so much so that «people do not agree on a term, and [...] they do not agree on what specific part of the communicative continuum, i.e., what specific varieties, any particular term should refer to» (Parkinson 1991:33). As Haeri also says, Parkinson insists on the fact that «educated Egyptian [...] appear to be clearly aware that their modern formal language differs in many respects from the classical language, but they differ about whether this is a good or bad thing, and about whether they have a right to use the term fuṣḥa to refer to the modern form» (1991:35).

A series of anecdotes and reflections said by Parkinson are very meaningful about perception. I summarize them briefly in seven points:

- an Azhari scholar stated that newspapers Arabic IS NOT F but a form greatly influenced by NA;
- an Egyptian woman, who has participated in one of the tests, distinguished F from fuṣḥā fuṣḥā (repeated twice; ‘very fuṣḥā’) to distinguish a normal from a convoluted style;
- one of the informants defined as F the language of an article written in a convoluted, archaic, recherché and pedantic style;
- a journalist stated that F is also the language of the press;
- a professor at Dār al-ʿUlūm told Parkinson that many of his colleagues dispute the Egyptian Nobel Literature laureate, Naguib Mahfouz, because he makes many mistakes in his works;
- press and publishing industry produce texts in which words considered NA - and therefore avoided by writers - are returned to their classical etymology, and so they are ‘freed’;
- the same dictionaries, which should present the normative standard, offer a mixture of «archaic, classical, and modern meanings under almost every entry, with no marking whatsoever on which are likely to be understood by modern readers, and which are entirely out of date» (Parkinson 1991:36);

For this reason, Parkinson sees that it is correct to speak about «\textit{many modern fuṣḥās, or many levels of modern fuṣḥā}, some blending almost imperceptibly into a very classicized

\(^{119}\) On the linguistic critiques of language tests see for instance Milroy & Milroy 1985:157-174.
medieval style, and others blending imperceptibly into elevated mixed colloquial/fuṣḥā style in such a way that it truly is difficult to define the form without fuzzy edges» (Parkinson 1991:36; emphasis is mine). Parkinson states that although «naming and carefully defining distinct intermediate styles (such as Oral Literary Arabic [Meiseles 1980], Educated Spoken Arabic [Mitchell 1986; El-Hassan 1977, 1978]) [...] focuses our efforts and helps us look for independencies we might otherwise miss, also has a tendency to reify that style and give it an independent existence which it may not have for native speakers who apparently have no category for thinking or talking about it [...] we know we have a broad spectrum of mixed styles on this continuum, but beyond that we simply do not have the information to go much further» (Parkinson 1991:37-38; emphasis is mine). Beyond what exactly SA is, SA is certainly a part of the Arabic language continuum, and although there are no native speakers, there are ‘native users’.

2.5.2.2. Proficiency tests

Parkinson proposes three types of tests (i) MIXED TEXT EXPERIMENT, (ii) READING EXPERIMENT, (iii) LISTENING MATCHED GUISE EXPERIMENT.

(i) MIXED TEXT EXPERIMENT distinguishing between the EA and SA sections of a mixed text, from passages taken from the Egyptian press. In particular, informants have been given a passage by Aḥmad ‘Ādil120, known for using a mixed SA and EA style in his articles. Two of the informants were linguistically trained native speakers. They were asked to score, with three different colours sections considered as SA, as NA and those on which they were uncertain. Parkinson noted that the trend is that:

- in the syntactically SA segments «for both experts and the regular subjects, it tended to be true that a single colloquial vocabulary item or grammatical marker would cause them to mark a whole section as colloquial» (Parkinson 1991:44; italics are mine);

- in the syntactically EA segments «it was less true that a fuṣḥā grammatical marker or vocabulary item would cause a text to be taken as fuṣḥā, particularly in the case where colloquial markers were also present. This indicates that informants assume that colloquial can and will borrow fuṣḥā vocabulary, morphology, and syntax to style-rise, etc., but that fuṣḥā will only rarely borrow colloquial forms» (Parkinson 1991:45; italics are mine).

So ultimately what can be drawn is that «mixed forms are thus taken to be colloquial at base, with fuṣḥā borrowings, and only rarely as fuṣḥā at base with colloquial borrowings» (Parkinson 1991:45; italics are mine). Interestingly, Parkinson notes that, despite some discrepancies, non-experts do not agree on the labels given to the sections clearly labelled

---

120 The text is in Parkinson 1991:42-43.
by experts. It must be said that the Parkinson’s examples seem to me to be mainly present in written texts or in a comic spoken context (and in fact the passage analysed is meant to be funny) where the use of both codes is intended to cause hilarity. In this test of Parkinson ambiguity and the resulting difficulty of both labelling the sections of the text as SA or NA and interpreting the results, are in that many segments of the proposed passage can be read in one or more SA or NA readings. I believe that an eventual test based on an oral text (a recording) would have eliminated or at least mitigated this ambiguity.

(ii) READING EXPERIMENT five articles taken from al-Ahrām to be read and linguistically valued through a scale from 1 (+SA) to 7 (-SA): 1. front-page story; 2. article written by a religious šayx; 3. a passage by Ahmad ‘Ādil; 4. an article by a member of the Egyptian parliament; 5. a sport article. Two patterns emerged:

- ratings were highly influenced by the topic: the more the topic was serious, the more the article was considered as SA;
- all writings were considered as SA or close to it no matter the topic.

APPROPRIATNESS: the texts which were considered most appropriate were

- the easiest, comprehensible, almost-F: for these people the term F designates a complicated, convoluted and obscure style. Parkinson writes that «fuṣḥā seems to be a moving target. When you are far from it, it seems to function as the ideal style all are aiming for, but as you approach grammatical Arabic, fuṣḥā itself recedes for some into a classicized, metaphor-laden, complex style not achievable by most modern writers» (Parkinson 1991:51). For them, a hypothetical continuum is composed of NA, luğa sarabiyya and F;
- the +SA, in view of the fact that SA is the appropriate level for the written word: for these people the term F is also appropriate for modern formal Arabic. For them F as classicized level has no influence on their language judgment.

(iii) LISTENING MATCHED GUISE EXPERIMENT one test chosen by the expert informants as the most elegant was read by a man and a woman in seven different versions (1 ++SA, 7 --SA) with different features especially at the phonetical level (the seventh version also included the insertion of certain dialectal prefixes such as bi- etc.). Informants were asked to rank the performance in a 7 point scale (1 ++SA, 7 --SA). The surprise was that the version 4 was considered +SA than 3. The difference between version 3 and 4 concerns vowelling (3 = full vowelling, 4 = partial), pausal form (3 = modern, 4 = incorrect) and phonology (3 = /ɛ/ g and /θ/ s 4 = /ɛ/ g and /θ/ s). Parkinson then draws the conclusion that «the phonological variable far outweighs the other variables in determining the subjects’ ranking» (1991:57). To emerge is also another fact: more than half of all subjects
has labelled each of the seven tests as SA, but when they were given the opportunity to explain the choice they have created a scale between versions, «this appears to indicate that most subjects have room in their notion of fuṣḥā for all of these various styles, even though they are clearly able to distinguish between the styles [...] this appear to indicate a high tolerance of a wide variety of styles of oral fuṣḥā performance» (Parkinson 1991:58; emphasis is mine). Parkinson also indicates the version 3, that is the one with the interdentals pronounced correctly, the numbers read correctly and with some but not all final vowels as the ‘emotional formal target’ despite only a minority of Egyptians would be able to reach it.

Parkinson concludes that the ‘modern F’, as he names it, does exist and that «many of our problems in describing it stem from the fact that it forms a relatively broad but indeterminate section of a much bigger continuum, and while there is general agreement about the continuum, there is little agreement about where the natural breaks in that continuum lie» (Parkinson 1991:60).

2.5.2.2.1. knowledge of SA and knowledge to SA

In another article, the results of two types of proficiency test given to 170 adult speakers show the existence of two kinds of knowledge of SA:

(A) KNOWLEDGE OF SA (theoretical knowledge);
(B) KNOWLEDGE TO SA (practical knowledge).

These may overlap but not necessarily. Parkinson gave the example of a person who knows all ‘about’ how to drive a bike (gear ratios, pedal straps, mechanics of balance etc.) but who does not really know ‘how’ to drive a bike. The same can be said of a language. The questions that Parkinson asks himself are: (1) What is SA? (2) What is SA for its speakers? (3) How much does the average urbanized Egyptian knows SA? Parkinson divides testees into groups based on sociological variables of sex, age and education. The latter would be the variable that will prove itself to be more important than all the others. Parkinson distinguishes different levels of education: Lo (=no high school), Mid (=high school), Hi (=graduates), Hi Ar[abic related] (=graduates with a special focus on Arabic language teaching, journalists, broadcasters etc.). People were given a multiple choice grammar test that involved certain production tasks including translating sentences from EA to SA, vowelling the endings of underlined words in a text or filling up gaps with the right word. The general results of the grammatical correctness of the tests were divided by level of education: Hi Ar 73%, Hi 61%, Mid 48%, Lo 21%. The second type of test had no less disappointing results. The eight exercises of the first type concerned the use of: (1) accusative masculine sound plural noun as first term of ḵāf; (2) fist person jussive
form of defective verb of last /w/; (3) accusative vowelling of verbal noun (maṣdar) when it is object of a verb; (4) accusative /a/ agreement of feminine singular definite adjective with sound feminine definite plural accusative /i/; (5) internal phonetic shape of the IMP common form I verb (kataba); (6) pronoun (baʕḍ) referring back to a 3-10 counted noun; (7) vowelling of definite subject of sentence-production test in which subjects were asked to vowel the ending of the underlined word; (8) vowelling of indefinite accusative adjective agreeing with sound feminine plural – production test in which subjects were asked to vowel the ending of the underline word. The results show that:

**BASIC ITEMS** «there are some very basic items – mostly those similar to colloquial, but also some others – which everyone with at least a high school education appears to have acquired»;

**ITEMS SHARED BY HI AR, HI AND MID** «there are also a large number of grammar points which Arabic specialists have acquired well and which about two-thirds of those with at least a high school education also appear to have acquired»;

**ITEMS KNOWN BY MID AND ABOUT HALF OF HI** «there are a few other items with a similar pattern, but which only those with a college education appear to have acquired that well, with less than half of high school graduates showing knowledge of the rule»;

**ITEMS IGNORED BY MOST OF THE TESTEED** «there are many ‘difficult’ points which few if any acquire, including the Arabic specialists»

Parkinson interprets these results by saying that:

Although the fully vowelled form may be the only acceptable prescriptive form, it is clear that there are lesser levels of MSA that appear to be acceptable to many users on specific occasions. Guests on television cultural programs, for example, can occasionally keep up a fairly good oral MSA, but entirely without the iʕrāb (case vowels) [...] In other words, even within the section of the continuum that most natives might eventually accept as MSA (even if not fuṣḥā), we find a continuum, and it is on this continuum that this grammar test places users. Most of the more difficult grammar rules turn out to be not very important to the actual communicative process; so when the goal is merely to communicate, people do not feel at a loss, even when they cannot use the language flawlessly (Parkinson 1993:60; emphasis is mine).

The second type (knowledge to SA) consists in testing their proficiency in four modalities: READING, WRITING, SPEAKING and LISTENING. That is to say one wants to know how much is the average Egyptian able to (1) read a newspaper (2) hold a conversation in SA without using NA and without major grammatical errors (3) express himself correctly writing (4) understand SA of the mass media.
The very term ‘proficiency’ was coined in U.S. government circles - Parkinson recalls - when it was clear that having studied and eventually got good grades in a given language does not necessarily mean mastering it. To test the actual linguistic ability of the candidates, tests of gradual difficulty were prepared to, assessed on a scale of 0-5. It’s very interesting to see the summary table of basic skills scores that Parkinson reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LO</th>
<th>MID</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>HIAr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READING</td>
<td>1 (0-2+)</td>
<td>2 (1-3)</td>
<td>3 (1-4)</td>
<td>3 (1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISTENING</td>
<td>1 (0-2+)</td>
<td>2 (1-3)</td>
<td>3 (2-4)</td>
<td>2+ (1-3+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING</td>
<td>1 (0-2+)</td>
<td>2 (0-3+)</td>
<td>2+ (1+ -4)</td>
<td>3 (1+ -4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING</td>
<td>0+ (0-2)</td>
<td>2 (0-4)</td>
<td>2+ (1-4+)</td>
<td>3 (0-4+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 Proficiency correlates of basic skills scores (from Parkinson 1993:64)

The data in the left column refer to the average performance while those in brackets represent the recorded range. A series of meaningful data emerges:

(i) none of the 170 participants, even among experts, scored 5 and the averages do not exceed 3;

(ii) for everyone (except for experts) there is a mismatch between the passive skills and the active one, the latter are weaker than the first;

(iii) other perhaps obvious datum is that people have obtained the highest score in the fields where they actually use SA, e.g., some xuṭabāʔ scored a comparatively very high score on speaking while passionate readers got a high score in reading.

Parkinson draws the following conclusions for each of the four categories considered, and other more general:

**LO SPEAKERS** «appear to have a minimal ability to understand basic sentences at a very slow rate, and to express themselves on very concrete straightforward topics; they can use MSA in a pinch, they probably know enough about it that it can influence their colloquial a bit, but efforts at longer communication in MSA are likely to be judged more colloquial than MSA, and longer reading passages are likely to be avoided when not absolutely necessary» (1993:68-69);

**MID SPEAKERS** «might be described as abominably fluent. These subjects are quite familiar with MSA, use it with a certain amount of ease, and can both take in and produce large quantities of material [...] In the productive skills they are able to make themselves understood in speaking and writing in a form that is not colloquial and which approaches MSA. It is, however, so full of mistakes and colloquialisms that it does not really approach the prescriptive standard, and may not be judged as MSA by native judges» (1993:69).
Limits: «in the receptive skills, they are very good at understanding straightforward narrative and description, but understanding quickly drops when more complicated or analytical texts are encountered» (1993:69);

Hi SPEAKERS «could be described as competent user[s] of MSA [...] like Mid’s, while they are able to express themselves very fluently, their production is still so flawed that it is far from the prescriptive standard» (1993:69);

HiAR SPEAKERS «while those with a specialized Arabic education do approach that standard [prescriptive standard] in speaking and writing much more closely, they often do not go beyond it to what might be termed professional competence, the ability to use the language in an effective and convincing manner, and to understand it in all its richness» (1993:69).

KNOWLEDGE OF SA FOR COMMUNICATIVE PURPOSES «at least in the case of high school graduates and higher, subjects do not appear to experience MSA as a foreign or ‘second’ language [...] it must [...] be admitted that these people do know the language well, certainly well enough for their own communicative goals and purposes» (1993:70; emphasis mine);

SPEAKERS’ ATTEMPTS CONSIDERED SA «their attempts at MSA, their incorrect and iʕrāb-less internal readings and representations of it, are MSA for them. It is what they do when they think they are using MSA. And it works for them on a functional level» (1993:70; emphasis mine);

DELIBERATELY AIMING LOWER «there are clearly informal contexts (personal letters, etc.) in which writer may be thought of as ‘aiming lower’ than MSA for stylistic effect, with the implication that even if they could write more correctly, they would not do so» (1993:70-71; emphasis mine);

A CONTINUUM «it is fairly easy to grade what they do use on a continuum from mainly colloquial with some MSA phonological, lexical and grammatical features, to mainly MSA with some colloquial phonological, lexical and grammatical features» (1993:71);

SOCIAL AND RHETORIC USE «Mid, and sometimes even Lo, speakers move in and out of MSA in a remarkably seamless fashion, using it to proclaim personal fatwa’s “religious decisions” about moral questions that come up, for example, to stress particular points with appeals to authority [...] as a mark of their religiosity [...] others use it for sarcastic effect» (1993:71);

RETHINKING AND REDEFINING MSA «we need to rethink our characterization of MSA itself [...] What are the implications of the fact that the majority of even highly educated users are 30s in the receptive skills, but not quite 3’s in the productive skills, and that the large numerical majority of its users (those with a high school or less education) rarely
rise above the 2 level? [...] *We need to look carefully at our cherished grammar rules, and ask ourselves what role they are playing in real life MSA, since it is clear that one can be a proficient reader without knowing them.* We probably must redefine the functional role of parts of the grammatical system, such as the iṣrāb vowels, looking at possible social and stylistic purposes instead of simply assuming that they play only a grammatical role [...] *We must discover an appropriate language for talking about a form with such a range of manifestations, and with such a clash of overt and covert norms and expectations, so that we can characterize what people actually do on TV cultural programs, for example, in addition to simply pointing out its deficiencies in terms of the prescriptive system.* It probably would not be appropriate to multiply descriptions of separate levels (an informal MSA, a slightly formal MSA, a quite formal MSA, a very formal MSA) since that would both miss the relationship of all these levels to each other, and imply that these levels are experienced as separate entities, rather than as a continuous whole. We need to learn how to felicitously describe longer ranges of the continuum within a single description» (1993:72-73; emphasis mine).

**LEVEL OF EDUCATION** a higher level of education corresponds to a higher performance of SA but Parkinson specifies that «education level is only one of the predictors of good oral fuṣḥā ability» (1994:183) although he underlined, on the one hand, in his 1993 article, that «education is a highly significant variable» (1993:67), «education is highly significant» (1993:68) and, on the other hand, in the 1994 article that one cannot ignore the high rate of illiteracy by which Egypt is affected (1994:207), which implicitly implies that a partial knowledge of SA is due to a lack of education.

Parkinson also dedicated part of his research to the use of *ending vowels* by Egyptian educated non-expert speakers. Among the one hundred people who participated in the interviews, the interviewers chose four persons (experts of Arabic of al-Azhar and Dār al-ʿUlūm) who covered a vast socio-cultural spectrum and various levels of performance, as judged by the expert native speakers. Parkinson does not exclude that ‘vowels’ may have been a factor that, consciously or unconsciously, affected more than others the rating of the speakers. In fact, the rate of vowelling and the percent of correct vowelling roughly correspond to the total score given by the experts to speakers.

The one before the last in the scale of the score had an interesting use of the final vowel /a/ as a «marker of fuṣḥā» and «general all purpose case marking vowel» (1994:190), that is, «because it sounds fuṣḥā» (1994:194). These examples explain this use:
ʔan yakuːna r-ragul ḥaːzim / wa-takuːna l-kalima kalimatuːh / fi l-ʔaːxir / ?in kaːna haːːa l-ʔamr(i) šaːḥ(i) yaquːl šaːḥ / ?in kaːna xaṭaʔ yaquːl xaṭaʔ (Parkinson 1994:190; transcription adapted)

fiː taːrīːxa maṣr […] hiya ʕiddatə ʔasbaːb (Parkinson 1994:194; transcription adapted)

To Parkinson, the use of the final vowel /a/ as fixed voice is so obvious (Parkinson says: the strategy is ‘if you want to vocalize something just put the /a/’ [1994:92]) that even when used correctly (for example, for the subjunctive) it is paradoxically ‘correct by mystake’ or ‘accidentally correct’\(^\text{121}\). The last speaker, MRM, a professor of a school of art, «has a gift for language, is interested in it, and spends a lot of time with it […] [he] is a full time and enthusiastic participant in the literary culture of Arabic» (1994:202) because of his love for reading. He achieved an excellent result, being able to vocalize «consistently and correctly» (1994:201), and he was so confident that he deliberately vocalized words that would be in pause just to show his proficiency.

Parkinson concludes that:

- the most ‘disappointing’ performance in terms of grammar, is the likely performance of the vast majority of Egyptians. Representativeness drastically decreases with the third speaker who would represent only 10% of educated speakers. The performance of MRM is considered by Parkinson as «utterly unique» (1994:207) and represents a very small percentage of educated Egyptians;
- speakers would not recognize two varieties from which to make their own choices: «for them, Arabic is one thing, a single very rich source of communicative resources. Rather than placing themselves or their performance on a continuum, speakers stand in front of the continuum of choices, and must repeatedly choose between competing forms, just like a diner standing in front of a banquet table» (1994:208; emphasis is mine);
- «When they make choices from the fuṣḥā end of the continuum, they are using fuṣḥā. Although a small number of speakers have both the ability and the desire to choose exclusively from the fuṣḥā spectrum, most have neither. In other words, their particular internal fuṣḥā is impoverished to the extent that it simply does not provide all the resources they need to express themselves adequately, so they choose from fuṣḥā what they can, but must fall back on other parts of the spectrum to complete their ideas» (1994:208);
- cultivated speakers, while able to use SA, seek a compromise, a language that is acceptable by their interlocutors (and SA alone is not acceptable because, in the long run,

\(^{121}\) Parkinson established, through a test, that the speaker did not know how to properly use the rules of the subjunctive.
it is boring and pedantic). Nicely, Parkinson says that MRM «clearly annoyed the
interviewer, who had to swallow a couple of times to keep from showing it» (1994:209).
MRM seeks no compromise. On the contrary, he wants to show off his excellent language
skills, probably because of the artificiality itself of this exercise that had every appearance
of being an exam and not a chat, even if an educated chat (see §2.5.2.2. about the
primacy of communication on grammar).

2.5.2.3. conclusions

What I think emerges clearly from Dilworth Parkinson’ survey is that:

» only a number of speakers so small as to be considered exceptional gets close to
orthoepy. These speakers are either (1) particularly fond of the Arabic language
(Parkinson 1994) or (2) experts in Arabic language (Parkinson 1993). One must also bear
in mind that, even among those, none has managed to get the full orthoepy. All the rest
have realized something that could be called a pseudo- or sub-standard;

» education is a key variable, and that is why the group Lo, the one with little education
(less than high school), speaks a SA so ‘ungrammatical’ to be considered by experts to be
non-SA and the cause of this is certainly their little or no knowledge of SA that seems to
be mostly passive knowledge;

» non-orthoepy of graduates and, above all, of experts in Arabic (i.e. native and expert
speakers) raises the questions Parkinson asked himself. Yet, what is clear, once again, is
that there is a range of acceptability whose spectrum is the cultivated speech which
functions as a model for the less educated speakers.

2.5.3. SA-ness of some features

Owens & Bani Yasin (1991) tested speakers reactions to recorded texts which have
different mixtures of SA and NA features. Two variables were considered:
[q] and [g] realization of ق
agreement of the verb with plural abstract nouns.
A text has SA q + NA agreement. Another NA g + SA agreement as in this example:

(1a) ʕala:q-i:t ṣa:rīan relations-F.PL še:r-an became-F.PL SA q + NA f pl agreement

While the other was:

(2a) ʕala:g-i:t ṣa:r-at relations-F.PL še:r-at became-F.SG NA g + SA f sg agreement
The texts, whose length was of about 20 seconds, were recorded by the same speaker, and were listened twice by 10 evaluators who were then asked to express an opinion about the speaker: (1) the most polite; (2) the one who travelled the most; (3) the person who dresses better; (4) the most healthy; (5) the most friendly.

The result is that the formula $SA / q/ + NA f \text{ pl}$ was considered the most polite and healthy while the formula $NA / g/ + SA f \text{ pl}$ as the most sympathetic or friendly. The phonetic datum $/q/$ has the prominence in determining if a segment is $+SA$. Owens & Bani Yasin speculate that «SA is not a perceptual whole, that there are certain features in it, like the pronunciation of certain sounds, which evoke associations with SA to a greater degree than do other “equally” SA traits (like agreement)» (1991:20). Still they say something very important: that the mental SA of speakers is not grammatical SA: «an analysis in terms of Col [NA] interference in SA is rendered meaningless to the extent that the SA target which speakers have in mind when they produce an SA utterance is different from the SA as understood by the investigator using standard rules as his/her parameter» (2001:20).

2.6. SA and Mixed Forms

2.6.1. Indicators, Style Markers and Saliency

Research on empirical SA has showed how many features numerous scholars feel as important SA characteristics are in fact completely ignored by speakers in the labelling process while few others have a great importance. I am here speaking about indicators and markers the interest for which goes back to Labov’s early work on variation:

- an indicator is any variable which helps mark varieties of language, but which is not perceived at a conscious level;
- a marker is a variable which has social value, and is perceived at a conscious level (Labov 1972:188): a sort of shibboleth.

Hence markers are perceived in the labelling process because of their high stylistic value. By style I mean here utterances «characterized by a pattern of recurrent selections from the inventory of optional features of a language. Various types of selection can be found: complete exclusion of an optional element, obligatory inclusion of a feature optional elsewhere, varying degrees of inclusion of a specific variant without complete elimination of competing features» (Winter 1969:3; emphasis is mine). Conversely, indicators pass mostly unnoticed because they have no social value. The reason why some features are perceived or not as ‘important’ is mainly that «greater awareness attaches to forms which are
overtly stigmatized in a particular community. Very often, this overt stigmatization is because there is a high-status variant of the stigmatized form and this high-status variant tallies with the orthography while the stigmatized variant does not (Trudgill 1986:11). Moreover, «speakers are also more aware of variables whose variants are phonetically radically different» (Trudgill 1986:11) between SA and EA.

Saliency is also an important phenomenon. Mejdell says that saliency «reflects an awareness of speakers and listeners with regard to certain features, and this awareness makes the feature amenable to manipulation, to monitoring, to conscious use, to a larger extent than features which are less salient, not at the same level of awareness—it is thus a gradual, not categorical, phenomenon» (2006:387). Holes says that «not all variables are similarly calibrated to the demands of changing formality/informality of context […] and switches on some variables may, from the user’s point of view, be more salient and significant than switches on others» (1995:280). Owens and Bani Yasin say that «SA is not a perceptual whole, that there are certain features in it, like the pronunciation of certain sounds, which evoke associations with SA to a greater degree than do other “equally” SA traits (like agreement)» (1991:20).

There exists a hierarchy within markers. Not all markers have the same weight. Mejdell says that «the features do not all play the same sociostylistic role» (Mejdell 2007:95).

2.6.1.1. phonetics

Parkinson says, basing himself on his proficiency tests, that «the phonological variable far outweighs the other variables in determining the subjects’ ranking» (1991:57). Schmidt finds a hierarchy of phonetical ‘colloquialization’ features (1974:77-107) with some exception. In this hierarchy the first feature is the more rapidly switched.

1) /g/ → /g/ (1974:79-82);
2) /θ/ → s (1974:91-98);
3) /ay, aw/ → /e:, o:/ (1974:99-107);
4) /q/ → /ʔ/ (linked to sex: women apply this more often than men) (1974:82-91);
5) /θ/ → /t/ (culture: less cultivated apply this more often) (1974:91-98);

It seems that speakers will first switch those particular features which will immediately convince the audience that a switch has taken place: «What is perceived by the speakers as ‘salient’ in one variety is taken over more easily and faster by the other than what is perceived as ‘less salient’, and that ‘more salient’ features of the assimilating variety may be given up more readily than ‘less salient’ ones» (Auer, Barden & Grosskopf 1998:163-4).
This is also evident from the rules of interdependencies of these variables. In the image the vertical arrow indicates a clear interdependency and an angled arrow indicates a weakly established interdependency.
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*Figure 5 The rule of phonetical interdependencies in colloquialization (Schmidt 1974:159)*

This means that, except for (1) and (5), it is clear that unless there is a switch of a given phonetic level, there cannot be a switch in a lower level. So, while *salğ* ‘ice’ is a possible form *śalğ* or *taltğ* are not possible forms because one has applied colloquialization of level 2 and 5 before level 1 etc. In this sense, Schmidt speaks of a one SA/EA grammar (1974:184). This shows us also another thing: the pronunciation of the sibilant instead of the interdental (*θ → s; δ → z; ḍ → ḍ*) and the monophthongization of diphthongs (*ay → eː; aw → oː*) precede colloquialization of */q/ (q → ?) and the dentalization of the interdental (*θ → t; δ → d; ḍ → ḍ*). While processes 2 and 3 are unmarked and do not affect the SA labelling of a word, processes 4 and 5 are highly marked as EA markers.

**Phonetic indicators**

(i) *monophthongization* has little effect on the perception of the speakers of an element as SA (Hary 1996:81). Eid considers, for example, a word such as *raʔeːt* (1988:56) as SA;

(ii) the *voiced realization of interdentals* (*θ → s*) goes almost unnoticed (Harrell 1960:16; Skogseth 2000:60–61; Badawi 1973:136; Mejdell 2006:213);

(iii) the realization of *DEF ART al- ~ il- and fem. endings -at ~ -it* have low stylistic value and the variants are unstressed (Mejdell 2006:386). Although other scholars (Mitchell 1986) stress that the use of *ʔal-* is one of the important SA markers;

**Phonetic markers**

(i) although the sibilant realization of interdentals goes almost unnoticed, yet the SA *unvoiced interdental */θ/* (Elgibali 1993:87) and */ḍ/* (Mejdell 2006:213) appear to be markers for formal SA;
(ii) /q/ is an important SA marker (Mejdell 2006:383): «In the Middle East at least, the use of q, and perhaps q alone, appears to move the discourse to a more formal SA level, where other variants, agreement or diphthongs for example, lack such strong symbolic character» (Owens 2001:448). In Elgibali’s proficiency tests it has emerged that /q/ is in any case felt as less standardizing than /θ/ (1993:87).

This means that, paradoxically, a word like /qo:l/ can be felt as more SA (+SA) than /bayt/ (despite the monophthong).

2.6.1.2. morphosyntax

MORPHOSYNTAX INDICATORS

(i) although a clear indicator of EA, the prefix bi- seems to have little stylistic value, i.e. does not function as a marker of EA, but it occurs with SA verbal forms and other SA features (Mejdell 1996:318; 2006:390);

(ii) EA PRON SUFF seems to have a low degree of salience as code markers to native speakers — even to the linguistically trained among them (Mejdell 2006:345). Trained Arab linguists tend to neglect PRON SUFF in their analysis of standard and vernacular features of ‘mixed’ data: «it might be an indication of low salience of this feature, reflecting low awareness. The relatively high usage level of EA variants, combined with SA head, or host, words, confirms this suggestion» (Mejdell 2006:373);

(iii) EA ʔinn(-u) may not be marked, does not bring down the style (Mejdell 2006:386)\(^{122}\);

MORPHOSYNTAX MARKERS

(i) ʔštrâb is a SA stylistic marker (high-flown style) but it is avoided or neglected because it is «considered by most speakers as too elaborate, too formal for most spoken purposes» (Mejdell 1996:319);

(ii) EA NEG are perceived as strong EA markers (Mejdell 2006:384);

(iii) SA COMPL ʔan and ʔanna are clearly perceived as markers of SA, and style markers of non-casual speech (Mejdell 2006:386);

(iv) REL has a medium value of saliency, as the phonetic realizations of the EA and SA variants are not very distant (Mejdell 2006:386);

(v) DEM and NEG are easily taken up as SA variants and given up as EA features in the process of style raising (Mejdell 2006:386);

\(^{122}\) An interesting commentary is provided by one of Mejdell’s informants: «In the interview, NA2, when I pointed out to him his frequent use of ʔilli, commented that ʔilli or ʔallazi did not do anything to his discourse, while haːða/hazza gave it a flavour of seriousness» (2006:386; emphasis mine)
2.6.1.3. lexicon

LEXICAL MARKERS

Generally speaking, Schmidt believes that speakers normally consider a given form to be EA (EA-marker) if it contrasts with a form they consider SA. This is what emerges from the lexical comparison he realized between SA and EA items: the more the distance between SA and EA items, the more they are to be considered markers. These ‘two parallel’ dictionaries SA and EA coexist in a very conscious way, according to Schmidt: «speakers of Egyptian Arabic ‘know’ that CA and EC forms are ‘the same’ on some level. Of this anecdotal evidence there is no lack, since Egyptian speakers know the relevant correspondences in a very conscious way» (1974:202).

Here, again, the problem is establishing what is SA and what is EA lexicon. One of the main difficulty in recognizing and distinguishing EA and SA is in the fact that identical or semi-identical forms represent a great part of the lexical pairs.

By analysing 900 pairs of corresponding words, Schmidt arrives to some conclusions as to which kind of lexemes is +EA and which is +SA (1974:53-76). He distinguished:

(i) identical forms SA and EA (37,8% of his corpus of 900 pairs, a percentage that would raise to 47% if ج is realised /g/ and if interdentals are realised as /s, z, ẓ/ in both EA and SA);

(ii) non-identical forms

(ii-a) non-cognates (i.e. EA forms not etymologically derived from the equivalent SA forms)\(^{123}\)

(type 1) different roots (the larger group, 19,9% of the corpus; e.g. faqat/bass ‘only,’ kamā/zayy ‘as,’ raʔā/sa:f ‘see,’ alʔān/dilwazti ‘now’ etc.). Schmidt calls these pairs TRUE DIGLOSSIC PAIRS «since the appearance of one of the alternatives labels speech as CA or EC [Egyptian colloquial]» (1974:56). They are lexical markers;

(type 2) different morphological derivation (e.g. verbal patterns). Schmidt considers that a major source of lexical differentiation in SA and EA, which can become lexical markers, are EA words that are etymologically SA to which SA normally prefers other forms, e.g. EA ʕidir from qadara vs. SA ʔistatāʕ (‘be able’), EA ʕitkallim from takallama vs. SA taḥaddaθa. These forms are SA/EA markers;

\(^{123}\) This does not mean that they are not etymologically linked to SA in absolute. /imbāriḥ/, for example, quoted by Schmidt is linked to al-bāriḥa and /dilwazti/ to (hā)dā l-waqt etc.
(ii-b) **cognates**, pairs that are distinguished only by phonetical modifications. Schmidt distinguishes:

(ii-b-1) short vowel differences (e.g. SA fahima/EA fihim);
(ii-b-2) SA /ğ/:EA /g/;
(ii-b-3) SA /q/:EA /ɬ/;
(ii-b-4) SA /θ, ð, ɖ/:EA /s, z, z~t, d, ɬ, ẓ/;
(ii-b-5) SA /ʔ/:EA /y~Ø/;
(ii-b-6) SA V:EA v;
(ii-b-7) others: emphasis (SA /ṣadr/:EA /sidr/ ‘chest’); consonant gemination (SA /huwa/:EA /huwwa/ ‘he’); metathesis (SA /zawğ/:EA /go:z/); loss of part of a morpheme (SA /ḥādā/:EA /da/ ‘this’); historical changes (SA /nīṣf/:EA /nuṣṣ/) etc. Schmidt considers these pairs as «lexically distinguished» (1974:60), then as markers of EA or SA.

Topic also plays a role in determining lexical markers. Certain formal topics (e.g. scientific and technical fields, religious and philosophical argumentation, politics and diplomacy) may elicit more SA lexicon - in SA or EA syntactic environment -, while other informal topics may elicit more EA lexicon. Schmidt justifies this by stating that formal topics pass through the medium of printed material (which is in SA; see also §1.9.1.5.). What emerges is also that for informal topics or concrete semantic fields, speakers keep the codes apart and may even lack a great deal of the SA equivalents of EA words simply because they never use them. On the contrary, for abstract fields there was much less lexical differentiation of the code and vocabulary was more SA than for concrete fields: EA lacks vocabulary for these fields.

### 2.7. **A double approach**

We have seen the differences and similarities between the grammar approach and the perceptive approach towards SA. Using Bourdieu’s categories we could speak of an **OBJECTIVE APPROACH**, *external*, *normative*, and a **SUBJECTIVE APPROACH**, *internal*, *pragmatic*, through the point of view of the object itself or of the individuals involved in it. Bourdieu does not choose one or the other approach but aims at an integration of both these two approaches. According to Eisele the “objective” approach would balance the human perceptions and representations that are «limited» or «biased in some way» (2002:5). An integration of the two approaches would instead promote «the consciousness of this bias into the evaluation of the representation» (2002:5). Because of the great rigidity of the purist/external approach and, on the other hand, the great variability and instability of the pragmatic/subjective, we have adopted a double approach that will take into
consideration speakers evaluation (that is mainly Parkinson’s studies, Badawī & Hinds’
dictionary and my perception) and also lexical and grammatical reflections (I will mainly
make use of the dictionary by Badawī & Hinds and Mejdell 2006).

2.8. Distinguishing the Base Language in the Corpus

2.8.1. Labelling Sequences

When in chapters 3, 4, 5, I speak of SA or EA, I will mean areas of the continuum that
are +SA/-EA and others +EA/-SA. As I showed in table 6 many utterances in the top
part of the continuum, could be easily labelled as SA and many at the bottom as EA. Only
the middle part of the continuum created labelling problems. Normally, I do not believe
that this middle part carries any rhetorical functions but mainly (sometimes more clear,
some others more vague) stylistic significations. I will try to justify the labels I will choose
moving on both the levels we discussed in this chapter: objective and subjective. This is an
important point to consider, since many times in my corpus what is labelled as SA or EA
is not what purist grammarians have in mind. Sequences often present hybrid elements
which, however, do not affect the functional analysis of CS. In fact, what I am concerned
with here, is not analysing linguistic constraints or CM, although in many cases it will be
indispensable in order to better interpret the intention of the speaker and to label on
more solid grounds (see also §1.4., the entire paragraph where I discussed the base
language in relation to CM in Arabic).

The studies on the so-called “base language” include at least three different
approaches (see Appel & Muysken 1987:121-122):

(i) Psycholinguistic (base language is the dominant language);

(ii) Sociolinguistic (base language is the code which is not marked in a particular
setting);

(iii) Grammatical (it is the code that imposes certain restrictions on the possibility of
switching). We have seen this last approach in §1.4.3.1.

I think the sociolinguistic approach is the most useful for my corpus. Sometimes the
context of a sequence, especially when CS happens at an intersentential level, is clearly
labellable, despite the presence of some phonetic or morphologic elements which are in
fact, as said before, irrelevant. Other times, the mixing happens at a level lower than the
intersentential, so that the definition of the context becomes more complex. Mazraani
(1997:39) affirms that “the “MSAness” or “colloquialness”, that is +SA or +EA, quality
of a given passage <is related to the cooccurrence of MSA or dialectal elements from the
phonology, morphophonology, syntax and lexicon occurring in its component sequences: a sequence is the speech between two pauses». This is not always simply applicable in empirical analysis because mixedness can take place, simultaneously, on different levels and what is to be meant by pauses is not always clear, since pauses are very frequent at every level of the elocution. In these cases, with reference to other similar linguistic situation as well, such as the Italian one, I adopted here, as a defining criterion of the ‘base language’ or ‘context,’ the number of elements (phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical) in a given segment of the analysed discourse (Alfonzetti 1992:175-177) although this will not be crucial, as for Mazraani. In fact, she correctly says that «simply counting MSA, dialectal or mixed features within a sequence is a crude procedure and would be erroneous since sequences are of varying lengths» (1997:39). Other elements used to determine if a sequence is +SA or +EA are paralinguistic features. Following Mazraani they are: speed of delivery (fast versus slow pace and number of words per second); rhythm and intonation; conversational versus oratorical delivery. Normally, in fact, SA segments are pronounced in a slow pace with a lesser number of words per second, rhythm is slowed down and oratorical tone is used. On the contrary, EA segments are pronounced in a fast pace with a great number of words per second, rhythm is fastened up and conversation tone is used. Paralinguistic factors have a great importance in catching the attention of the audience in cases of CS.

Sequencing has its limitations (I quote from Mazraani 1997:40-41 what is useful for my case too):

(i) sequences can be very short even consisting of one word;

(ii) there might be different labelling for similar items, depending on the context. Frequently SA elements can be borrowed into an EA context and, less frequently also the contrary happens with different goals;

(iii) some mixed sequences (i.e. combining SA and EA elements on various levels) produce a stylistic fulcrum which paves the way for a CS. Mixed sequences seem to reflect contrasting textual or rhetorical goals.

It is worth mentioning here that the labels neutral and mixed, used by Bassiouney in her work of 2006, of these mixed forms, detached from the context, are at least questionable from the point of view of the attitude and perception approach, as seen in §2.5., especially in consideration of the fact that she does not specify whether these forms must be regarded as +SA or +EA. In fact, forms such as bi-tunaffað and ik-kaːriθa that she quotes, are actually labellable only in regard to the context in which they are used: if the context is +EA they are to be considered as loanwords or nonce borrowings (because of the +SA lexical item); but if the context is +SA the preverb bi- and the assimilation of
the /l/ of the article with the /k/ of karīḍa do not lower the level of the utterance which remains in the upper part of the continuum, i.e., +SA. From the attitude approach perspective it has been showed how the preverb bi- used with SA lexical items is just an indicator.

In the labelling process, I will base myself on three main factors:

(i) the indicators and the markers (described in §2.6.1.): a sequence that combines SA morphophonosyntactic features such as SA phonemes (especially interdentals and /q/), SA MPP of the verb, COMP ḍan + subjunctive or ḍanna + substantive, SA NEG, SA REL, SA abstract lexicon, word order (verb-subject), long nominal clauses, ḍifrāb, will be considered as SA. On the contrary, a clause or a sentence is EA when it combines EA elements such as: EA phonology (use of /ʔ/ instead of /q/), monophthongization of diphthongs, vowel patterning, asyndetic verb strings, EA NEG, EA REL, EA lexicon, word order (i.e. the use of post-poned demonstrative etc.). Although this is true, this does not happen all the time. Very often we face “mixed” morphophonosyntactic features so that, let’s say, a monophthongized word is found in an SA context. Every case must be studied separately;

(ii) the syntactic structure will have priority on lexical elements in labelling sections;

(iii) SA lexico-grammatical elements in EA contexts and EA lexico-grammatical elements in SA which will not influence the textual function in the CS will be considered as functionally irrelevant but stylistically meaningful (I will mainly follow Mejdell 2006). Rare cases of EA elements embedded in SA contexts, will be discussed. As we have seen, in the example given at §1.8.2.1. (page 98), Holes considers the EA COMP ille as an «occasional concessions to the colloquial in items chosen to fill certain slots» (1993:31). Therefore, Holes has no doubt in labelling this segment as SA, «a kind of standardized Arabic» (1993:31-32).

Badawī offers a similar example:

ʕala kull ḥal hiya qudra min il-fanna:n ḍinnu yumassil ḍayy šaxšiyya yağīz al-insa:n il-ʕa:di ḍinnu yiʕu:m bi:ha\textsuperscript{124} (Badawī 1973:188).

\texttt{ʔinnu yɪzʊm bɪːhɑ} is simply ignored by Badawī who considers this sentence as +SA. An hypothesis I advance is that SA switches may in fact end up with some –SA features, as a sort of ‘final relaxing fall’ after the ‘tension’ that is perceivable in SA.

\textsuperscript{124} «In any case, it is the ability of the artist to represent any character that common people fail to perform»
What comforts me in these labelling rules is that in other linguistic situations, for example in the Italian one, one finds numerous similarities with respect to Arabic, the same difficulty in labelling and similar solutions. Consider this example taken from the SI/CD corpus analysed by Alfonzetti:

**per dare da manciare è me figghi debbo vive/debbo campare sempre io. Si mmoru iù, a mme mugghieri cci rùnunu mità ri pinzioni e i me figghi unni arrèstunu? Peri peri (Alfonzetti 1992:106)**

*In order to feed my children I should have to live eternally. If I died, they would give my wife half the pension and where will my children go? They would be on the street.*

It seems evident that the first sentence does not reflect an orthoepic SI but a regional one: *manciare* (a middle way between SI *mangiare* and CD *manciari*), monophthongization of the preposition *ai* in *è*, *me* instead of *miei*, *figghi* instead of *figli*. Despite regionalisms and a non-bookish SI, Alfonzetti does not hesitate to label the first period as SI since it is in stark contrast with what follows.
Chapter 3 Quotation

After discussing the various approaches to standardness, normativity, correctness and attitude, the importance of using a double approach, both grammatical (objective) and perceptive (subjective) to define SA, and the grammatical features that help us tag sequences of mixed spoken Arabic in a clear way (or prevent us from doing so), we will deal with the conversational loci of CS and their functions. A general presentation of the conversational locus will be followed by excerpts taken from various corpora. Finally, I will present the examples found in the corpus under study.

3.1. CONVERSATIONAL LOCUS: QUOTATION (OR REPORTED SPEECH); FUNCTIONS: PERSUADING, GIVING EXPRESSIVITY OR AUTHORITY, MARKING POLYPHONY OF SPEECH

Quotation is the repetition of one sentence or a passage of an author by someone other than the author. Quotations are often well-known or explicitly attributed by citation to their original source, and they are indicated in written texts with quotation marks. In classical rhetoric, quotation «n’est qu’une figure de communion quand elle ne sert pas à ce qui est son rôle normal, appuyer ce que l’on dit par le poids d’une autorité» (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 2008:240). Klein states that quotation in spoken texts have different pragmatic functions in relation to written texts. In fact, while in the latter - especially scientific and journalistic writings – a quote has the main function of a more or less faithful witnessing of the thought of a certain person, through his own words, in the spoken language other functions are at work, in particular of distanciation and identification. Distanciation or identification can be stated explicitly before or after the quote, or emphasized through paralinguistic elements.

Quotation can have (or not have) a sequential frame such as:

a) meta-communicative introduction – quotation – conclusion;
b) meta-communicative introduction – quotation;
c) quotation – conclusion (Klein 1994:257).

The meta-communicative introduction states the fact that “now we are going to quote” and this is usually realized through the verbum dicendi, i.e. “as that person said,” “he or she said,” or “quote” etc.
Quotation is particularly common in CS\textsuperscript{125}: «Le citazioni vengono spesso usate per riportare fedelmente – sotto forma sia di discorso diretto sia di discorso indiretto – enunciate prodotti in un’altra situazione, dal parlante o da altri. Lo scopo è per lo più persuasivo (si citano le parole estate per dare più autorità alle parole che si riferiscono), o espressivo (si rifà il verso a una certa persona per metterla in una certa luce – ad esempio comica -, o per attirare l’attenzione di chi ascolta...): in generale si cerca, con le citazioni, di riprodurre la polifonicità del discorso così com’è realizzato ‘in situazione’»,\textsuperscript{126} (Grassi et al. 2006:188).

Gumperz considered quotation to be one of the metaphorical functions of CS: «in many instances the code switched passages are clearly identifiable either as direct quotations or as reported speech» (1982: 75-76; see also Gumperz’ example at page 87).

The main functions of reported speech are: to persuade (by quoting authoritative texts) or to create expressivity, provoke hilarity.

Paraphrasing Tannen (2007[1989]:63-64) we can distinguish:

(i) FORMS

\textit{self-quotation vs. allo-quotation} (quotation of others);

(ii) CONTENT

\textit{exact quotation and intonation} (the same words uttered in the same rhythmic pattern) vs. \textit{pseudo-quotation} (paraphrase: similar ideas in different words) vs. \textit{imaginary quotation} (one quote hypothetical words a person could say with the regard to the points under discussion)

(iii) TIME

\textit{intertextuality} (see also Auer 1988:88-92).

The main difference between reiteration and reported speech, besides the presence of the \textit{verbum dicendi}, is that reiteration concerns what has been said in the same interaction or monologue, while reported speech concerns what has been said outside the interaction or the monologue. In my corpus there will be another consideration to be made. A major problem of religious texts is to determine where quote ends and where the repetition begins. A same quotation from sacred texts can be repeated over and over again in the same monologue, being repetition and citation are the most used functions in sermons (see chapters 3, 4, 5 on this). Another problem is determining what is and what

\textsuperscript{125} See Auer (1984), Gumperz (1982), Grosjean (1982), Lüdi/Py (1986).
\textsuperscript{126} «Quotations are often used to faithfully report - either in the form of direct or indirect speech - utterances produced in another situation, by the speaker or by others. The aim is mainly persuasive (we quote the exact words to give more authority to the words which we relate), or expressive (we make a certain person to put her a certain light - such as comical - or to attract the attention of the listener...): in general we try, through quotes, to reproduce the polyphony of the speech such as it has been realized ‘in situation’»
is not the self-quotation, or self-repetition and allo-repetition. This will be discussed in the conclusions.

3.1.1. TRIGGERING

The main problem of CS and reported speech is related to the extension of CS in relation to the extension of the quote: sometimes they coincide, but other times CS extends beyond the boundaries of the reported speech in a mechanism similar to that of the consequential triggering described by Clyne (1969) at a lexical level. According to Clyne (1969:349) the triggering process (i.e., a word that triggers CS) can be consequential and anticipational since «switching occurs not only in consequence but also in anticipation of a trigger-word» (1969:345). It happens that the speaker ends the quotation marked by CS and then, instead of returning to the previous code, he goes on in the new code until the end of sentence, or until he feels the need to switch back for an argumentative, conversation or interactional necessity. Clyne writes that the effect of a trigger-word can sometimes continue «until the end of the sentence or clause or until the speaker exhausts the topic under discussion» (1969:346). Example from Italian:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kid:u} & \quad \text{mi ris:i} & \quad \text{ka kwan:u} & \quad \text{kjovi} & \quad \text{l-akwa (SD)} \\
\text{that one} & \quad \text{me told that when} & \quad \text{it rains} & \quad \text{water} \\
\text{entra,} & \quad \text{pecché} & \quad \text{puttroppo} & \quad \text{è fatto} & \quad \text{al contrario (SI)} \\
\text{comes in} & \quad \text{because unfortunately} & \quad \text{it is made} & \quad \text{contrariwise} \\
\text{il bagno} & \quad \text{e quindi ci vuole} \\
\text{the toilet} & \quad \text{and so is needed} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘That person told me that when it rains, water comes in because unfortunately the toilet has been made contrariwise and so it is needed’

Grassi et al. comment this CS by saying that considering that the form ‘water’ is the transition point between a colloquial section and an Italian one: «possiamo ipotizzare che sia proprio la vicinanza strutturale fra i due codici ad agevolare – e in certo senso ad avviare – il passaggio di codice»\(^{127}\) (Grassi et al. 2006:190)

3.1.2. VERBUM DICENDI

\(^{127}\) «We can assume that it is precisely the structural proximity between the two codes to facilitate – and in a certain way to start - the transition of code»
The *verbum dicendi* is a word that expresses speech or introduces a quotation, such as “say”, “utter”, “ask” etc. It can:

(i) be the triggering-word that anticipates CS;
(ii) be the only switched element;
(iii) be preceded by a CS that functions as a *focus marker* (Saeed 1997:165).

(i) It can be the triggering-word that anticipates CS. Example:

**ALF5**

Sì, sì. Poi la parola ci manca. Poi lui parla. Ma più che questo, perché s’era arrivato a alzare, a camminare, c’è venuto come una forma di depressione (SI)

Yes, yes. *Then he just misses the word. In reality, he speaks. But more than this, because he had come to stand up, to walk, he got a form of depression*

Rici “Picchì ai’a ccampari?”, va, “Accussì non vògghiu campari” (CD)

he’s like “Why live?” you know “I don’t want to live like that”

(Alfonzetti 1992:121)

In Saeed’s corpus there is a similar example. The Kuwaiti speaker explains to the external audience the danger of not teaching Muslim Arab children Arabic. He criticizes the way Muslim parents in the U.S. let their children speak English rather than Arabic. In this example he speaks about an incident in which some Muslim Arab offspring thought that the speaker, wearing his Kuwaiti attire, was a ghost.

**SAE2**

fa-lamma  daxaltu  ṣalayhim  bi-ḥaːdaː  z-ziy  wa-ḥaːdaː
so-when  I entered  to them  in-this  the-attire  and-this

š-šakil  ḥasabuːniː  šabāḥ  (SA)
appearance  they thought me  a ghost

So when *I entered in this attire [he was wearing Kuwaiti attire], they thought I was a ghost*

gaːlu  “a ghost” (KA and English)
they said  “a ghost”

*They said “a ghost”.*

(Saeed 1997:137)

In this example only the *verbum dicendi* triggers a double CS SA→KA→English.
(ii) It can be the only switched element. Ex.:

**ALF6**

Io perché mi servo sempre dello stesso personale? Sperando un giorno che cesserò l'attività e (SI)

*Why do I always use the same staff? Hoping that one day I will close down and* cci ricu (CD)

*I'll tell them*

**“Ve ne dovete andare” (SI)**

*“You have got to leave”*

(Alfonzetti 1992:122)

Alfonzetti does not see these cases as «cases of admixture of individual lexical items, with no communicative functionality» (1992:121-122). Instead, being very frequent in her corpus, she hypothesizes that this kind of *verbum dicendi* can work as a highlighter of the following quote.

(iii) It can be preceded by a CS that functions as a *focus marker* (Saeed 1997:165). It draws attention to the quotation: “pay attention to what has been said”.

**SAE3**

1 wa-liða:līk fiː taʃrī:f ar-ribaː / qaːla baʃqū l-ʃulamaːʔ / (SA)
   and-thus in defining the-usury said some the-scholars

2 ʔunḍrūː l-ʔiḥtiyyaːt ḥagguhum (YA)
   look the-caution theirs

3 qaːluː kullu qarḍin / ɣaaːra manfiʃatan / fa-huwa ribaː (SA)
   they said every loan led interest so-it usury

4 Thus in defining the term ‘usury,’ some scholars said – look how cautious they are –
   “Any loan that results in some interest is usury”

(Saeed 1997:165)

So bilinguals have many possibilities or resources to highlight a quotation, some of which are also common to monolinguals:

(i) simply modifying the pitch of the voice;

(ii) using *verbum dicendi*, as a conventional indicator of a reported speech (these first two common to monolinguals);
(iii) CS of the verb only;
(iv) CS extended to all the quote;
(v) CS including *verbum dicendi* and quote (see Alfonzetti 1992:122).

### 3.1.3. FIDELITY TO THE CODE QUOTED: POLYPHONY

Speakers are usually faithful to the code that they quote. Gal states «quoting is relatively predictable. All one needs to know to predict the language in which most quotes will be spoken is the language in which the original utterance was spoken» (1979:109). Sometimes, however, the quoted segment can be in the other code. So the “criterion of faithfulness to the original language” is not, according to Alfonzetti (1992:125), as determinant, or binding as Gal assumed, to the extent that it makes CS predictable. Speakers can choose to be faithful or not. The code used in code-switched quotations is not entirely predictable. Speakers seem to give priority to the need of «distinguire il discorso riportato da ciò che segue e/o precede, o, in termini più generali, di evidenziare la ‘polifonia’ del discorso, differenziando la pluralità di ‘voci’ che prendono parte all’interazione» (Alfonzetti 1992:130). Polyphony has been described as the presence in the same discourse «de plusieurs destinateurs et destinataires» (Lüdi & Py 1986:158).

Unlike monolingual speech, where polyphony is not always easy to express since all the voices are expressed in the same language (see Lüdi & Py 1986:158), in bilingual speech, on the contrary, the contrastive juxtaposition of the two codes creates complex polyphony. It is theatrical: «In the *mise-en-scène* set up by the speaker in conversation, the transition from one character to another can be signalled in several ways: by the use of mimicry, tone of voice, imitation of personal ways of talking, different verbs of saying and, last but not least, by different languages assigned to the different ‘voices’ taking part in this communicative performance» (Alfonzetti 1998:205).

### 3.1.4. IMAGINARY QUOTES

One can also use imaginary quotes. These quotes «occur in the form of illustrative examples, short stories, episodes and scenarios that support the position of the speakers. This strategy – presenting examples or supporting evidence in the form of dialogic scenarios or narrative-like styles – serves to add vividness and is a device to convince the audience of the logic and sensibility of speakers’ arguments» (Saeed 1997:143).

---

128 «Distinguishing the quoted speech from the following and/or the preceding one, or, in more general terms, emphasizing the ‘polyphony’ of discourse by differentiating the plurality of ‘voices’ who take part in the interaction»
They often have the function of «saying something, but at the same time distancing oneself from what one is saying. The use of the other code makes it possible to depersonalize the expressed point of view, attributing it to a voice external to the interaction, with the purpose both of not taking the responsibility for what it is said and to provide it with greater objectivity and meaningfulness» (Alfonzetti 1992:136).

This is clear from this example in which direction in CS is indicative:

SAE4

1. baʕde:n yugu:llak bi-šarṭ / laːzim širuːt ?eːʔ? (YA)
   afterwards he says to you on one condition must conditions what?

2. gaːl ?ana ǧiːblak al-muhandisiːn […]
   he said I bring to you the engineers

3. ġaː l-маːʂruːʕ ?az-ziraːʔi / yalla wadduːʔ ʔinda
   it came the project the agricultural alright take-it to

4. l-xabiːʔ | darasuh ʔal-xabiːʔ
   the expert he studied it the expert

5. ʔaːʔ ʔiðan maːʂruːʕ naːğiːh / ʔiswaːʔ sa-naːʃtariːk (SA)
   yes so project successful listen we will share

6. maʕaːk fiː l-laʔidaːʔa / naːʔib ʔanna wa-naːʔiːb
   with you in the management representative for us and representative

7. ʔank | wa-l-laʔidaːʔa takuːn kaːðaː wa-kaːðaː ʔaːʁiːʔ
   for you and the management are such and such okay

After that he tells you: “On condition”. There must be conditions. “What [are they]?’. “I supply you with the engineers”, he replies […] When an agricultural project comes, [the Islamic bank says] “Take it to the expert”. Once it has been examined by the expert: “Hmm, it is a [potentially] successful project”. The Islamic bank then suggests: “Let’s be partners in the project. We will administer it together, a representative from our side and one from your side, and the administration should be as such and such

(Saeed 1997:147)

Here we find two imaginary quotes (stories): one between a loan customer and another from a representative of a non-Islamic country or bank (lines 1 and 2) and between a loan customer and a representative of an Islamic bank (lines from 3 to 7). Saeed says that in the first example, the code used is always YA to «show the loan lender’s deception» (1997:148) while in the second example the šayx switches to SA in order to «convince the audience of the soundness of his categorization of Islamic banks as humane,
and Islamic banking as an honest way of banking» (1997:148), within a function Saeed calls “iconic”.

### 3.1.4.1. iconicity

Here we can introduce what Saeed called ‘iconicity’ (1997:114-117) or iconic function: «this kind of code manipulation can be considered a form of iconicity, in that the form of the language mirrors the content [...] In other words, the H code is used to express what is perceived to be [+ positive] and the L code to express what is seen as [-positive]» (1997:117). When discussing the function of exemplifying he states that in his corpus NA is used for hypothetical, non-real examples while SA is used for real examples. This is very common in Saeed’s corpus. The goal, according to Saeed, is to distinguish what has been highly thought of, or what is very serious (SA) (see 1997:142-143) from what «they do not value or respect, possibly to downgrade its importance, or to ridicule it or its significance» (NA) (1997:131). We will deal again with iconicity in the corpus in chapters 3,4,5.

### 3.1.5. DIRECTION IN CS

The direction of CS, according to Alfonzetti, is, in fact, only «partially indicative» (1992:137). When it is meaningful it is because the speaker has mimetic intentions, he looks for an unmarked use of a code or in relation to certain other sociolinguistic parameters. However, priority is given to the possibility of differentiating the number of voices even if this could lead to a reversal of the linguistic choice of the quoted speaker. Let’s say: if A-speaker is using A-code and wants to differentiate voices, when he quotes B-speaker, he will do it in the B-code, even if B-speaker had originally said what is quoted in the A-code.

### 3.2. QUOTATION IN THE CORPUS

I will consider as quotations only those that appear in the homilies for the first time. In fact, quotation and reiteration are loci that largely overlap in religious discourse. A same quotation from sacred texts is repeated over and over again in the same homily.

In a sense this is typical of every speech act, but especially of homily. Homily is a speech activity (Levinson 1978), i.e. «a set of social relationships enacted about a set of schemata in relation to some communicative goal [...] [it] implies certain expectations about thematic progression, turn taking rules, form, and outcome of the interaction, as well as constraints on content» (Gumperz 1982:166). Homily, therefore, is an articulate
speech act that consists of multiple units or rhetorical movements, according to the strategy the preacher establishes for certain intentions. In fact, to convince requires a strategy. Homily involves an ordered sequence: «sermons are a movement of language from one idea to another, each idea being shaped in a bundle of words. Thus, when we preach we speak in formed modules of language arranged in some patterned sequence. These modules of language we will call “moves”» (Buttrick 1987:23).

Homily is sequential talking (Buttrick 1987:24) in the sense that, as a type of speech, it takes shape gradually and it must consider that listeners are unable to go back to what has been said. Homily has its own internal logic that aims at imaging ideas not only through syntax but also by means of metaphor and image. These sets of moves help build a plot as the result of an interaction between the public and the hermeneutics of the preacher. Plots travel. In telling a story, one moves from an episode to another episode. If we wanted to reconstruct the movement of a plot we would find in it an internal logic according to which the story unfolds. In story-telling one always has in mind an audience and a purpose: providing suspense, forming a moral consciousness etc.

As in a normal conversation, the homily may go from smallest to largest or from general to particular, in a logically articulated way. The difference between normal conversation and homily consists in that it targets a group consciousness which needs more time to be formed. That’s why rhetorical movements, in order to be engraved in consciousness, must be further developed, without, however, being excessively long and as to lose the public’s attention.

3.2.0. SUBLOCUS: BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS AND PSEUDO-QUOTATIONS

The main functions of quotation in Mattā al-Miskīn (MM)’s texts are certainly persuading and giving expressivity. Yet, the most common function of quotation is to support his statements with authority, for quotations are normally taken from sacred books: Bible (Old and New Testament), Liturgical books (mainly euchologion\(^{129}\) and tasbiha\(^{130}\)) or spiritual books (mainly Bustān al-Ruhbān) etc.

In the corpus, quotations seem to have a sequential frame such as:

a) meta-communicative introduction – quotation – conclusion or comment;

b) meta-communicative introduction – quotation;

\(^{129}\) In Arabic خُوْلُوْنِیِّ، it is one of the chief liturgical books of the Orthodox Church. In the Coptic church it contains the three liturgies currently used: the liturgy of Saint Basil, Saint Cyril and Saint Gregory of Nazianzus.

\(^{130}\) «Ein besonderer liturgischer Gottesdienst, aus Psalmen, Theotokien (تنكیه) [composition of hymns in honor of the Mother of God], Psali (پسالی) [hymns with short verses, often with alphabetic acrostics and refrains] und Hősät (هوس) [songs] zusammengesetzt» (Graf 1954:57).
c) quotation – conclusion or comment (see Klein 1994:257).

The meta-communicative introduction states the fact that “now we are going to quote” and this is usually realized through the *verbum dicendi*, i.e. *ra:l* (‘he said’), *ra:l* + PRON SUFF, *ʔišzu:liθa* (‘as X says...’) etc.

EXC1

1. bi-sm il-ʔa:b wa-l-ibn wa-r-ru:ħ il-qudus il ila:h il-wa:ħid am:i:n | ///
   *In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, one God amen.*

ha-nitkallim /// ʕan il-maḥabba // w-ʔaxta:r fašle:n // ʕaša:n bass yibzu

*We’ll talk about love. I will choose two chapters [of the Gospel] so that they can be madxal // ?aw fi l-wa:qiš / miš madxal li-l-mawdū:ʕ / wala:kin // quwwa dafʕa an introduction, or in fact, not a introduction to the subject but a spur*

li-n-nafs // ʕaša:n tuhayyaʔ fi l-ʔiḥsa:s bi-l-maḥabba | // li-ʔinn lamma
to the soul in order to be prepared to sense love. For

ha-nitkallim ʕan il-maḥabba // maʕna: ha-nitkallim ʕan / il-ḥaya: kullaha /
talking about love means talking about life altogether

li-ʔinnaha ḥaya:t il-masi:ħ | w-ʔaxta:r fašle:n // fašl min famm il-masi:ħ

*because it is Christ’s life. I will choose two chapters, one that contains Christ’s words w-fašl min famm / ir-ru:ħ il-qudus ʕala / lisa:n / bu:lis ir-rasu:l | ///

and one that contains those of the Holy Spirit by the Apostle Paul’s mouth.*

min ingi:l /// yu:ḥanna r-rasu:l il-ʔišḥa:ħ is-sa:biš ʕašar | //

*From the Gospel of the Apostle John, chapter 17*

2. takallama yasu:ʕ bi-ha:ða: wa-rafaʕa ʕayne:hi nahw as-sama:? wa-qa:l /
   *Jesus spoke these words, lifted up His eyes to heaven, and said:*


*“Father, the hour has come. Glorify Your Son, that Your Son*

ʔayḍan | / ʔið ʔaṣṭaythu sulṭa:nan ʕala kulli gasad

*also may glorify You, as You have given Him authority over all flesh, li-yu:ʕti ḥaya:tan abadiyya li-kulli man ?aṣṭaythu | /*

*that He should give eternal life to as many as You have given Him.*

ha:ðihi hiya l-ḥaya:t il-ʔabadiyya ʔan yaʕrifu:k / ʔanta l-ʔiλa:h il-ḥaqi:qi / waḥduk

*And this is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true God,*

wa-yasuʕ il-masi:ħ illa:ði ?arsaltu(h) | […]

*and Jesus Christ whom You have sent”131.*

---

131 All the English translations of the biblical verses are taken from the New King James Version.
Quotation of the sacred texts in SA is a typical *conversational locus* of religious discourse in Arabic. In this example, the introductory Trinitarian doxology (called *basmala* by Arab-speaking Christians) opens up the homily of MM, as it happens in all his homilies. It is a formula taken from the Gospel, and therefore it should be considered SA, but it is so common that it can be considered a SA integrated loan in EA.

Then MM states, in a brief cadenced prologue in a “clean” EA, the main topic of the homily and the two main readings that he will use to give ‘a propelling force’ to a topic central in life and in Christian faith such as love. After a pause of just over a minute he reads aloud chapter 17 of the Gospel of John in SA (he goes on until 5’3.).

---

**EXC2**

1. ʕan famm… ʕan ir-ruːh il-qudus ʕala lisaːn buːlūs ir-rasuːl
   *through the mouth… from the Holy Spirit by the Apostle Paul’s mouth*
   ṭabːan ʕarfīːn kurunsus talaṭṭaːʃar nizraːha
   *of course you know Corinthians 13 [the Epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 13]. Let's read it*
sawa laʃallaha yakuːn fiː-ha daːʃit / bi-yyirfaʃ nafsina šwayya ʕan suxṭ il-gasad
   *together, hopefully it will be a incentive that will relieve us from our tiredness*
xuʃuːʃan baːd šuɡl in-nahar kullu w-ɪnnaːʃaː sabʃa in-nahar... ilwaːti ///
especially after working the whole day, and it is seven o’clock right now.
barḍak min risaːlit kurunsus ʔil-ʔuːla nhaːyaː yiʃaːh ihtnaːʃar w-bidaːyit talaṭṭaːʃar |
*Also from the first Epistle [to the] Corinthians, end of chapter 12, beginning of chapter 13*

2. walaːkin gidduː li-l-mawaːhib il-husnaː / waʔaydən ʔuriː:kum ʔarsiːqan ʔafdaːl |
   *But earnestly desire the best gifts. And yet I show you a more excellent way.*
   ?in kuntu ?atakallamu biʔalsinati n-naːsi wa-l-malːaʔiːka /
   *Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels,*
   walaːkin laysa liː(maːḥabba / fa-qad ʂirtu naḥhaːsan yaṭinna
   *but have not love, I have become sounding brass*
   ?aw ʂingan yaṛinn | / waʔin kaːnaːt liː(ː) nubuwwaː(h) waʔaʃlam
   *or a clanging cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand*
gamiːʃ il-ʔaːṣraːr wa-kulla ʃilm / waʔin kaːna liː(ː) kulla lʔimaːn
   *all mysteries and all knowledge, and though I have all faith,*
   ḥatta ʔanqil il-gibːaːl walaːkin laysa liː(ː) maːḥabba faːlaʃtu šayʔan | [...]
   *so that I could remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing*”. [...]
The same happens here. MM gives a brief meta-communicative prologue to the quote (“We will read this...”) in EA (the brief SA embedded CS will be discussed later). then he starts reading from 1Cor 12:31-13:13 for approximately 3 minutes (until 14'7.).

Monasticism is simply and solely love. It is, in fact, the implementation of the greatest and most important commandment.

because He says:

«If you want to be perfect

If you are perfect [If you want to be perfect]

If you want ... perfect, just love [If you want to be perfect, just love]
Jesus said to him, “If you want to be perfect, go, sell what you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me”.

Before quoting the first part of the verse in SA he only switches to EA for the *verb* *um dicendi*. This is a widespread phenomenon as said in §3.1.2, aiming to highlight the following quote, working as a sort of “frame”. After quoting the first part of the verse in SA, MM asks the monks in the audience to complete the verse in order to create suspense and to finally arrive to a reformulation of the verse itself that reaffirms the main theme of the homily, i.e. ‘Love is the first and most important law’ (line 8). In line 8 there seems to be a selfcorrection ʕa:w[w] / an tur:i:d but in fact the audio is not clear here and MM might have experienced a *lapsus linguæ*: in fact, line 8 does not make much sense grammatically. What seems clear here is that MM emphasizes the ‘polyphony’ of discourse by differentiating the plurality of ‘voices’ who take part in the interaction, namely the Gospel, himself and the audience.

**EXC4**

1. ʔišzu:litā il-qiddi:s / ʔuḡusti:nus yišu:l
   
   *As Saint Augustine says*

2. ḥibb wa-ʔiṣnaʕ ma šiʔt?
   
   *Love and do what you will*

   (MM50 – 16’.3)

   Here CS into SA takes place after the *verb* *um dicendi*. ḥibb instead of the +SA ʔaḥibb can be considered here as a sort of ‘relaxed’ realization of the IV form.

**EXC5**

1. yaʔni ʔawwil ma ftataḥ ʔingi:l yu:hanna ʔa:l
   
   *I mean, at the very beginning of John’s gospel it says*

2. ha:kaza ʔaḥabb a lla:h il-ʕa:lam ḥatta baðala ʔiβnahu
   
   *For God so loved the world that He gave His Son*

   (MM50 – 19’6. → 19’7.)

   The quotation from Jn 3:16

   حَكَّادَ أَحَبَّ اللَّاهُ الْعَالَمَ حَتَّى بَدَلَّ ابْنِهِ الْوَجِيدَ.
For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son.

is marked again by a CS.

EXC6

1. faːːsːan intu taftakar ʿaːya ʿiːliː ʿalha 1-maːsiːḥ lamma waːḥid
   And of course, you remember the verse said by Christ when one
   ʿal-lu ʿeːh il-ʿaːya il-ʿuẓma ʿal-lu ʾil-ʿaːya il-ʿuːla
   asked him: “What is the greatest verse?”. He replied: “The first,
   w-ik-kibiːːra xaːliš w-il-ʿuẓma(ː)
   greatest and most important verse is

2. ʿan tuḥibb ir-rabb ʿilaːhak min kulli qalbika
   you shall love the LORD your God with all your heart,
   w-min kulli nafsika w-min kulli fikrika w-min kulli qudratika
   with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength
   ʿarbaːʕa qalb w-nafs w-fikr w-qudra
   four: heart, soul, mind, strength.

(MM50 – 23’2. → 23’4.)

Here MM quotes the episode described in Mk 12:28-34 when ‘one of the scribes’ asks Jesus what is the first commandment of all.

وَإِنَّاْ وَاحِدٌ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَمِنِّ الْقُرْآنِ مَفْتَاحُ عُلُوْمِهِ وَلَمْ يُرْسَىْ رَأِيَ أَلْلَهَ أَحْبَابِهِ حَسَنًا، سَأَلَهُ:ُ فَأَيُّهَا وَصْيُّ عِيْنٍ هُوَ أَوَّلُ َّكْلِمَةٍ؟

Then one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, perceiving that He had answered them well, asked Him, “Which is the first commandment of all?”.

This first part is quoted by MM in EA. Then he quotes Jesus’ answer from Mk 12:30 (which is itself a quotation from Deut 6:5) marked by a CS into SA.

نُحِبِّ الْرَّبَّ إِلَّهَيْنَا مِنْ كُلِّ قَلْبِكَ، وَمِنْ كُلِّ نَفْسِكَ، وَمِنْ كُلِّ فَكْرِكَ، وَمِنْ كُلِّ فَرْزِيْكَ

You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength.

Here again MM varies the voices in the quotation from the Gospel by leaving in SA the most important part of the quotation, Jesus’ words, that on which he will carry on the analysis.
1. ḥubb ṭila: hi xa:xar / xa:rigi wa-mandu:r | / ʔil huwa lʔa:ya // lamma: / There is another divine love, external and visible, which is expressed by the verse in which ʔil-masi: ḥ bi-yitkallim fi ʔawa:xir il-xidma btaštu / bi-yizul-luhum ʔin ana // ehm/ Christ speaks at the end of his service and says “I – ehm -

2. kunt gaʔiš / faʔatšamumu:n wa-kuntu ťaša:n fa-saqaytumu:ni / I was hungry and you gave Me food; I was thirsty and you gave Me drink; wa-kuntu ʔurya:nan fa-kasaytumu:ni wa-kuntu mari:dan fa-zurtumu:ni I was naked and you clothed Me; I was sick and you visited Me; wa-kunt masgu:nan faʔe?: / faʔataytum ʔilayya /// I was in prison and what? you came to Me.

3. fa-zuli:li [sic] ya rabb mata raʔayna:k kida? ʔal-luhum “But tell us Lord, when did we see you like this?” He answered them

4. bi-ma ťinnukum fašaltumu: bʔaḥad / ʔiš-šiga:r fa-bi: qad fašaltum | “Inasmuch as you did it to one of the least of these My brethren, you did it to Me” (MM50 – 23’5. → 24’5.).

In this excerpt MM quotes from Mt 25:35-40.

35 For I was hungry and you gave Me food; I was thirsty and you gave Me drink; I was a stranger and you took Me in; 36 I was naked and you clothed Me; I was sick and you visited Me; I was in prison and you came to Me.’ 37 “Then the righteous will answer Him, saying, ‘Lord, when did we see You hungry and feed You, or thirsty and give You drink? 38 When did we see You a stranger and take You in, or naked and clothe You? 39 Or when did we see You sick, or in prison, and come to You?’ 40 And the King will answer and say to them, ‘Assuredly, I say to you, inasmuch as you did it to one of the least of these My brethren, you did it to Me.’ ”

MM introduces the quote in EA and after a brief hesitation switches to SA to quote by heart verses 35-37. Then he switches again to EA only for the verbum dicendi (fa-zuli:li,
it might have been a lapsus he has not corrected) and subsequently he plays the role of the ‘righteous’ of the episode and pseudo-quotes them in a code which is not entirely SA. It is as if the EA ADV kidā ‘like this’ replaces the words of the King’s words (‘when did we see You…’) that the righteous reiterate from verse 37 to verse 39. The quote ends in SA (the King’s words) after the brief EA switch of the verbum dicendi.

EXC8

1. fa-l-ʔa:ya l-ʔawwala:nīyya iḍ-ẓama:n li:ha
   So, what ensures [the effectiveness of] the first verse
   ʕalaša:n ma-tfarraq-š il-baṭṭa:riyya lamma titšiḥin bi-yuẓu:l ?e:?  
   so that you don’t run the battery down when it gets charged, is in the words

2. ṣalli fi l-ʔa:f:a:?
   Pray in the secret place
   (MM50 – 29’2. → 29’3.)

The CS → SA in line 2 is a partial quotation of Mt 6:6 which stresses the duty of praying ‘in the secret place’.

6 But you, when you pray, go into your room, and when you have shut your door, pray to your Father who is in the secret place; and your Father who sees in secret will reward you openly.

EXC9

1. ḥayatak maʕa ḥubbak l ila:hi ʕilaqtak
   Your life with your God, your divine love, your relationship [with him]
   must be in secret. Nobody has to behold it.

2. ʔidxul ba:bak ʔidxul maxdaʕak w-ugliq / ba:bak
   Go into your room, shut your door

   what for? So that nobody sees you.
   (MM50 – 29’5. → 29’6.)
After commenting in EA the excerpt above, MM completes the previous quote (Mt 6:6) in SA to stress again the fact that prayer must be done in secret.

**EXC10**

1. w-baṣde:n ʔa:yat iḍ-dama:n li-l-ḥubb il-ẓamali
   
   Furthermore, the verse that ensures [the effectiveness of] concrete love

2. la tuṣarrif šima:lak ma taṣnaʃ yami:nak

   *Do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing,*

(MM50 – 30’4. → 30’5.)

The quote from Mt 6:3 is marked by a CS → SA without any *verbum dicendi*. For the elaboration of this quote see below.

**EXC11**

1. di ṣanʕit il-ḥubb ʔana ba-sallim ṣanʕa // w-illi ʕa:wiz yibʔa

   *This is the art of love, I am passing an art. The one who wants to become*

2. man lahu ʔaða:n li-s-samʃ fa-l-yasmaʃ | //
   
   *He who has ears to hear, let him hear.*

3. fi l-waqiʕ ʔil-ʔa:ya il-ʔawwalaniyya ʔulti-lku ʔinnaha […]

   *In fact, the first verse, as I told you, is […]*

(MM50 – 35’7. → 36’1. […]

MM quotes a verse, in SA, that is reiterated six times in the Gospel (for instance Mt 11:15). Here too MM uses it as a closing statement of the previous movement in EA to move on to another explicative part. Elements like the falling final tone of *fa-l-yasmaʃ* and the pause signal the ending of the movement.

**EXC12**

1. ʔal-ḥubb huwa ʔiṭ-ṭari:q il-waḥi:d il-muwaṣṣil li-qalb alla:
   
   *Love is the only way that leads to God’s heart.*

2. fi-l-waqiʕ il-masi:h karrasu b-dammu / w-id-damm ?e: ġe:r il-ḥubb

   *In fact, Christ consacrated it with his blood. And what is blood but love*
fathers, what is Christ’s blood but love? In fact,

God so loved the world that He gave His Son’s blood.

Here we find another pseudo-quotation from Jn 3:16

For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son.

This time MM adds the word ‘damm’ ('blood') to strengthen his point. The quotation is marked by a CS into SA. It is interesting to note that it is introduced by an EA particle, *ma*, that has a strong emphasizing value (see Badawi & Hinds 1986:809). As a result, the quotation gets highlighted.

EXC13

1. tiʕrafu baɂa Ɂinn irīrahbana
   *You know that monasticism*

2. taqu:m Ɂasa:san ʕala kayfa naʕu:d wa6naṣi:r misl il6Ɂaṭfa:l?
   *is mainly based on how to return to be childlike?*

3. šuftu baɂa išīšaxṣ / mi:n illi biīyingaḥ wīmi:n biīyi gri fi sīsikka? huwwa lli
   *Now, you see the one... who is successful and who proceeds rapidly in this path? The one who*

4. ʕa:d wa6ṣa:r misla ṭifl
   *returned to be childlike*

Here MM indirectly quotes Mt 18:3 to affirm one of the basic goals of monasticism (and an evangelical spiritual principle), i.e. ‘to become as little children’:

And [he] said, “Assuredly, I say to you, unless you are converted and become as little children, you will by no means enter the kingdom of heaven.

The pseudo-quotation is made in SA in the 1st person plural, after an EA segment, but the switch begins in fact earlier in the clause, with the verb *taqu:m* ('is based’). This is a typical problem of CS as a tool for quotation and Alfonzetti suggests that one can speak of *anticipational triggering* (Clyne 1969:349; §3.1.1.). In line 3, MM switches into EA to
specify again the quote (see below) and then he restates the pseudo-quotation this time in the 3rd person singular.

EXC14

1. mi:n illi bi-yingaḥ w-mi:n bi-yigri fi s-sikka? huwwa lli
   who is successful and who proceeds rapidly in this path? The one who

2. ʕa:d wa-شا:r misla țifl /
   returned to be childlike

3. w-sa:b w-tarab bi-ʔirattu marra w-bi:-ʔaša ll:a:h marra
   and renounced [everything], sometimes of his own free will, other times by God’s rod
   wi-bi:-bi-nax il?-a:b marra w-in-naxs bita:ți šwayya bi-yibza
   sometimes by the Father’s prod and my prod is sometimes kind
   marra _ALARM_ w-marra murr bass ?ana ba-ʕmil maʃa l-ʔa:b yaʃni |
   and other times harsh, but I do work with the Father.
   As the Apostle Paul says

4. man huwa bu:luṣ wa-man huwa ʔabulluṣ / ʔilla / ʕa:mla:n
   Who is Paul, and who is Apollos, but workers
   God’s fellow workers, but it is God who… workers with God, right?
   workers with God but it is God who gives the increase

5. ?iḥna bi-nizraʃ wa:ẖid bi-yizraʃ wa:ẖid bi-yiszi wa-lla: huwwa ?illli bi-ynammi
   we plant: one plants and another waters but it is God who gives the increase.

   So then neither he who plants is anything, nor he who waters, but God who gives the increase.
   (MM50 – 55’8. → 56’7.)

Here MM opens a parenthesis, within his presentation of the importance of become as children. He makes an SA quote from 1Cor 3:5-7 (line 4 and 6) which is preceded by the _verb_ _dicendi_ ʔišzu:liṣa in EA (‘as the Apostle Paul said’) in the attempt to justify the fact that his ‘prod’ is part of his working with God through planting and watering. Finally, God is the only one who gives the increase.
Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers through whom you
believed, as the Lord gave to each one? 6 I planted, Apollos watered, but God
gave the increase. 7 So then neither he who plants is anything, nor he who
waters, but God who gives the increase.

MM quotes by heart that’s why he asks the monks to confirm that ʕaːmilaːn is the
right word used by the Gospel. The repetition in line 5 is discussed below in §4.2.3.

EXC15

1. taʕaːla ya bni bi-yizul-lu ?aruːh fe:n? bi-yizul-li maʕleːš

2. il-ʔarð ʔallaːti ʔuriːk
   [to] the land that I will show you”

(MM50 – 57’6. → 57’7.)

This is a quotation halfway Biblical and imaginary. The first part, in EA, starts an
imaginary conversation between God and the monk. God asks the monk to follow him.
When the monk asks him ‘where do you want me to go?,’ MM makes God reply with a
Biblical verse concerning Abraham (Gn 12:1): ‘towards the unknown’.

وَقَالَ الَّذِي رَبِّي ۖ يَا أَدْخِلْ بِنِي عِبَادَتِكَ مِنْ أَرْضِكَ وَمِنْ عَشْرَيْكَ وَمِنْ نَبِيْتِ أَبِيكَ إِلَى الأَرْضِ الَّتِي أَرَاهَا.

Now the Lord had said to Abram: “Get out of your country, from your family
and from your father’s house, to a land that I will show you”.

It is interesting to notice that the only SA segment is the quote, while the framing
mise-en-scène is in EA.

EXC16

1. ʔiːl-mustawa l-ʔawwal ʔilli huwwa mustawa mumaːrasat il-ʔubb il-ʔiːlaːhi bi-ʃ-ʃala:
   In the first level, that of practicing the divine love through prayer
   w-bi-l-ʃalaːqa l-mubaːʃira maʃa allaː il-mustawa d-daːxili /
   and the direct relationship with God – the inner level -
   fi:ha ʔil-masiːh bi-yibza qaʔiːd is-ʃ-salaː bitaʃna / sawaːʔ in kunna fi xuːras
   Christ himself leads our prayer, no matter if you are in the choir
   walla ʔinta waḥiːd f ʔallaytak huwwa t-taːni btaʃak ʔaw
   or if you are alone in your cell. He is your “alter-ego” or,
   ʔin getː li-l-haːz miʃ huwwa t-taːni / huwwa ʔinta ʔil-maʃbuːʔ /
   to be more precise, he is not your alter-ego. He is the one you are supposed to be.

2. lastu ʔana ʔahya bal il-masiːh yahya fiyya |
It is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me.

Here CS into SA for the quotation from Gal 2:20 is a certificate of authority that further clarifies that ‘Christ prays in us’ and that he is our the true self.

It is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me.

EXC17

1. ṭaṭet li-k-kull wi-xadamt ik-kull
   You have bowed your head to everybody, you have served everybody,
   w-nafsak ?intahat wi-tmasaḥit xa:liš
   your soul is worn-out, completely exhausted
   w-ma-bẓat-š ḥa:ga f za:tak mamsu:ḥa ḥa:ga mawgu:da /
   nothing is left in yourself, everything is over.
   Only then, you put on Christ, because Christ cannot put on
   ?insa:n ḫati:q | lamma l-insa:n il-ʔati:q yixlaṣ / xa:liš
   the old man. When the old man is totally over
   yalizz li-l-masi:ḥ ḥ?innu yilbis il-ʔinsa:n il-gadi:d | /
   Christ takes delight in putting on the new man.

2. ʔalla:ði naḥnu ʔallaði:n ʔiʕtamadna
   That who... We who were baptised...
   miš ʔallaði:na ʔiʕtamadna mutna li-l-masi:ḥ?
   wasn’t it we who were baptised, we died into Christ?

3. ʔahù da l-mot ?illi ba-tkallim ʔannu min ḥe:s il-gasad il-ʔati:q min ḥe:s ?e:
   This is the death I am speaking of, that which concerns the old body, the ehm
   ehm the body of sin, that concerns ehm life according to the body.
   yaʕni kullaha / lamma bi-tmūt /
   I mean all [this life], when you die

   We who were baptized into Christ have put on Christ.
In line 2 and 4 there are two pseudo-quotations. In line 2 CS triggers a pseudo-quotation from Rom 6:3, in SA

كل من اعتماد ليسوع المسيح اعتمدا ليومئيه

As many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into His death?

Miš in line 2 is an EA insertional borrowing for what Valdes-Fallis calls preformulations (Valdes-Fallis 1978b:16), i.e. linguistic routines and automatic speech. It seems to be much easier here to use miš in the sense of ‘wasn’t it?’ than the more marked ?a-laysa or ?a-lam yaqul etc.? It is noteworthy the fact that, although it is not a precise quotation, MM still uses SA to recall and utter it.

In line 4 the pseudo-quotation in SA is from Gal 3:27

كلكم من الذين اعتمدا ليسوع المسيح قد اعتمدا ليسوع

For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

MM uses the 1pp (naḥnu Ɂallaði:na ?iṣṭamadna ... labisna ...) while the verse is in the 2pp (كلكم الذين اعتمدا لSTEM).

EXC18

1. fi l-wa:qiš ya ?aḥibba:ʔi ehm ʔaddit ʔalayya nuḍta
   Actually, my beloved, ehm, I have come across a point that
   ?aḥibb ʔanabbihku li:ha / lamma bi-yizu:l il-masi:ḥ
   I want to draw your attention to. When Christ says

2. kuntu gawʕa:n kuntu ʕaṭša:n kuntu ʕurya:n kuntu mari:ḍ
   I was hungry, I was thirsty, I was naked, I was sick,
   kuntu masgu:n fi l-ʕa:lam
   I was in prison in the world

(MM50 – 87’4. → 87’6.)

MM switches to SA for a partial (only the King’s words are considered and not his interlocutors’) pseudo-quotation (fi l-ʕa:lam, for example, is not present in the Gospel) from Mt 25:35-36, introduced by an EA verbum dicendi.

لأتي جعّت لأطعمهم. عطّنت فسيمعوني. كنت غريبًا فآتيتموني. 36 غرباني فكسوتموني.

For I was hungry and you gave Me food; I was thirsty and you gave Me drink; I was a stranger and you took Me in; 36 I was naked and you clothed Me; I was sick and you visited Me; I was in prison and you came to Me.
Notice how, while the final u vowel of the 1st person singular of the PFT of kāna is pronounced, the xabar kāna is realized without tanwin.

EXC19

1. Ɂinta baɂa lamma b-ti:gi tuma:ris ʕamaliyyit it-taʕziyya ?aw it-tasliyya
   When you dedicate yourself to console and entertain [the others]
   or to satisfy the hunger and the thirst of the starving, the tired, the ill
   and so-and-so, you are actually acting as who? As Christ himself.
   li-ʔinn il-masi:ʔ huwwa
   For Christ

   alone is the one who is able to go about doing good
   yišfi gami:ʕ il-mutasallit ʕale:hum ?ibli:s wa-/Sury wa-Surg wa-Susm
   healing all who were oppressed by the devil, the naked, the halt, the withered
   wa wa ?ila ?a(:)xirih
   and so on.
   (MM50 – 90’2. → 90’7.)

In line 2 MM switches to SA to pseudo-quote from Acts 10:38

[Jesus] who went about doing good and healing all who were oppressed by the devil.

The second part of the quote is from Jn 5:3

في هذه كان مُضطَلّعًا جَمِيعًا كَبِيرًا مِن مَرْضَى وَعَمَى وَعَرْجَ وَعَعُسُ، يَتوَفَّعُونَ تَحْريْكَ أَلْيَاءٍ.
In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water.

After the final tone and the pause in line 1 the CS starts slowly. The real change in tone and the introduction of SA elements begins in line 2 where the more +SA huwa is opposed to the +EA huwwa. yišfi in line 2 is a EA-flavoured realization of a verb that is cognate (shared) SA/EA: SA šafā/yašfī:EA šafa/yišfi. The ‘relaxed’ realization of only this shared item does not seem to affect the SA-ness of the context.
1. That’s incredible, this is an amazing treatment. What’s that o Lord?

What’s that? I take from your Spirit and I give it back to you? Oh my,

it is said in the Liturgy

2. from your own

3. from what is thine

4. for every condition, from what is thine we give

To support and give authority to his statement - namely that when one gives from himself one takes from Christ to give Christ himself - MM quotes from the Liturgy of Saint Basil, from the part known as Epiclesis (or invocation of the Holy Spirit), switching from EA to SA. He tries to recall the Coptic expression and repeats in Coptic the first part quoted in SA, i.e. min ḍalla:di lak. He then closes the quotation and the movement switching again to SA. By repeating the quote in Coptic after SA, MM gives to his statement a double certificate of authority. In fact, because of the limited knowledge of it that Copts have, the Coptic language represents a source of authority higher than SA.

EXC21

1. We are unable to see Christ who looks up at us, stretches out his hands

and asks our aid. And because of our blindness and misery, we consider that this is just a poor

or a wretched man or that this is just a beggar, so much the worse for him,

he thinks that wasting his health [in working] is not worth it. As some say

dan dam du gitta yidawwar sa:ya | abadan da nta galt:an

“He has such strength that he could raise mountains, mate”. Not at all, you are wrong.
He is Christ himself.

   Do not forget to entertain strangers, for by so doing many
   malà:ʔika wa-hum la yadru:n |
   have unwittingly entertained angels.

(MM50 – 99’1. → 99’6.)

MM switches to SA after a conclusive tone and a pause to quote a verse from Heb 13:2 to strengthen his opposition to the wrong words of despise of some people towards poor people.

لا، ننسوا إضافة العرباء، لأن بها أبناء مناكسة وهم لا يذرون.

Do not forget to entertain strangers, for by so doing some have unwittingly entertained angels.

EXC22

1. w-balad fi l-ṣalma:diyya zal-lina xudu baza ?intu baze:tu wla:di /
   Then, in the Baptism he told us: “Take, then. You have become my children
   ʔilbisu:ni w-iʃmilu ʕamali / middu ?ide:ku / zayy ma na madditha
   put me on, do my works, give a helping hand, as I gave mine
   to every blind and poor man, wear yourselves out, night and day,
   ʔitʕa:fi l-giba:l w-ṣallu
   then climb the mountains and pray

2. ṣallu wa-la tamallu
   pray and lose not heart.

(MM50 – 101’3. → 101’6.)

In line 2 MM switches to SA in order to pseudo-quote or elaborate the quote from Lk 18:1

وقال لهم أيضاً مماً في أنْ يَبْتَغَيْ أنْ يَصِلَّى كُلْ حِينٍ وَلا يَعْمَلُ.

Then He spoke a parable to them, that men always ought to pray and not lose heart
This quote emphasizes the previous ṣallu as a primary source of strength to work like Christ.
1. *liza:lik tulaḥzu ʔinn dayman dayman ka:n il-masi:ḥ ʔe:nu min il-magd*
   That is why you notice that Christ always had his eye on the glory

2. *ʔal-magd ʔalla:ði ʔaʕtātani ʔana ʔaʕtaytahum / the glory which you gave me I have given them*

3. *yaʕni huwwa hiyya il-غا:ya il-غا:ya n-niha:ʔiyya fi l-ʔa:ya š-šuğayyara di | so the very aim is in this short verse.

(MM136 – 13’2. → 13’4.)

The quotation from Jn 17:22 is marked by the CS to SA.

---

**EXC24**

1. *nahnu naʕi:š il-ʔa:n màwtana nahnu / naʕi:š ṣala:t il-mawt*
   *We live now our death, we live a prayer of death*

   wa-laysat ṣala:t il-ḥay:ha | /
   *and not a prayer of life.*

2. *ʔit-tarti:la bi-ṭrū:l*
   *The chant goes:

3. *ma ʔaḥla: saʕatan xaλlu fi:ha maʕa l-ḥabi:b | “How beautiful is that hour that I spend alone with the one I love”*

(MM270 – 6’4. → 6’5.)

Here the only code-switched element (EA) is the *verbum dicendi* in an SA context.

**3.2.1. SUBLOCUS: SELF-QUOTATION VS. ALLO-QUOTATION**

---

**EXC25**

   *One of the fathers who loves much, sent me a question in his copybook of confession saying*

   ma raʔyak / hal il-maṭa:niyya:t yibza:ʔaʕmil ke:t w-ke:t w-baʕde:n il-māza:mir
   *“Do you think I should make prostrations so-and-so and sometimes it happens*

   saʕa:t bi-yiḥsal ke:t w-ke:t fa-raḥt ra:did ʕale: li-ʔinnu mutaqaddim giddan
   *with the psalms so-and-so. So I answered him, because he loves*

   fi l-maḥabba | / ʕult
   *much, and I said*

2. *ʔallaːdi:na / ehm / daxalu fi ṭariːq ʔal-ḥubb il-ʔilaːhi*
those who, ehm, set out on the way of divine love
wa-nkašafa lahum is-sirr / laysu: / taḥt in-na:μu:s baʕd |  
and have been revealed this mystery, are not yet under the Law\textsuperscript{132}.

(MM50 – 16’3. → 16’8.)

In this excerpt MM recalls that once a zealous but loving monk asked him, in the copybook of confession\textsuperscript{133}, about how to pray, with how many prostrations and psalms. It is a partial quotation, an allo-quotation in fact (see §3.1.), in EA. Then, after a pause and the \textit{verbum dicendi ult}, MM switches to SA when quoting his own reply to the monk. Of course both of them have written what MM quotes, so much probably they have used SA, but SA here is used to create contrast in what Alfonzetti calls a \textit{mise-en-scène}: SA marks the transition from the voice of one character to that of another. Notice also that MM uses SA only to highlight the transition. He then goes back again to EA to specify the self-quotation.

\textbf{3.2.2. SUBLOCUS: IMAGINARY QUOTES}

As seen in §3.1.4 imaginary quotes consist in supporting one’s point in the form of dialogic scenarios or narrative-like styles.

EXC26

1. \textit{fa-yuʔmin wa-yaʔṭiq wa-yaʃrux bi-ʔann ha:ḏa: ḥubb wa-ha:ḏa ḥubb  
and believes and says out loud that this is love and that this kind of love  
Sa:li giddan wa-ha:ḏa ḥubb muːḥil  
is sublime and astonishing.}

“How can they do this? Heavens, this is a divine love! I saw him do  
keːt w-keːt w- keːt |  
this and this...}  

(MM50 – 25’4. → 25’9.)

Here in line 2 an imaginary person asks himself about people who act with love with each other.

\textsuperscript{132} MM means “no more under the Law” (see Rm 6:14; Gal 5:18).

\textsuperscript{133} \textit{Kurrās al-ʔiʃtirāf} is a copybook that every monk has in which he writes down his confession and then brings it to the spiritual father who sends it back with his commentaries.
1. The Lord Jesus Christ saw in every sick, weak and paralytic
the image of his Creator. He was... doesn’t [the Bible say]
“Let Us make man in Our image” [Gen 1:26]?  

2. Christ used to take delight in going about doing good all day long.

Line 1 comes after a brief passage in which MM synthesizes the point that on earth we see Christ under the form of the sufferer (see EXC73 in §5.2.4.). Line 2 lightens up the passage by paraphrasing the previous movement and personalizing it in EA with an imaginary dialogue between Christ and believers.

EXC28

1. The human creation elevates in Christ and becomes a glorifying creation.

2. What do you think of Christ’s body up in the sky?

In line 2 the CS to EA marks the introduction of the voice of an imaginary person (divine or human) who points to Christ’s work for humanity, i.e. glorifying creation in himself.
3.2.3. SUBLOCUS: PERSONALIZATION OF QUOTES

As showed before, quotes from the Bible, prayer books and spiritual books are normally expressed in SA. There are cases where MM quotes some episodes of the Gospel in EA in an attempt to personalize them and make them closer to the listeners. What differentiates imaginary quotes and personalized quotes is that the latter reflect real quotations although they are somehow paraphrased; what imaginary quotes and personalized quotes share is that both have as a main function, not to express authority or provide an authoritative support to statements, but rather to involve listeners into the argumentation with a light and friendly tone.

The following example presents no CS but it will be used as a guideline to understand what is meant by personalization of quotes.

EXC29

1. huwwa Ɂilli ʕamma:Ɂ yiʃfi
   It is he [Christ] who heals.
2. wu-g-gaʃani:n ɂal-Ɂuhum ha:tu ya si:di xamas xubza:t w-samakte:n | /
   And he told the starving: “Bring me five loaves and two fish, my friend”
   gab-Ɂu xamas xubza:t ɂal-Ɂu Ɂakkal Ɂakkal / he? Ɂaʃani:n?
   They brought him five loaves. So he told them: “Feed, feed”. "Huh? Thirsty?"
   ?arwi:ku Ɂaḥsan rayy / ha:tu ya si:di Ɂandukum kam gurn malyani:n mayya?
   I will quench your thirst at the most. How many full waterpots do you have?”
   ɂal-Ɂu sitta ɂal-Ɂu Ɂirwi Ɂi::rbu
   They told him: "Six". He replied: "Quench their (the guests) thirst". And they drank
   miʃ mayya w-bass w-xamra Ɂayḍan |
   not only water but wine as well.

(MM50 – 90’7. → 90’10.)

In line 2 MM quotes two episodes: (1) the miracle of the multiplication of the five loaves and two fish (described in Mt 14:13–21; Mk 6:31-44; Lk 9:10-17 and Jn 6:5-15) and (2) the miracle of Cana of Galilee (described in Jn 2:1-11). He recalls the episodes by heart, not only translating but also re-arranging the core part of them in EA, that part that strengthen his point which is that all the good deeds come from God himself.

The next table shows how this personalization takes place in the first episode (i.e., multiplication of the five loaves and two fish).
He said to them: «Bring me five loaves and two fish, my friend». They brought to him five loaves. So he told them: «Feed, feed».

But Jesus said to them, “They do not need to go away. You give them something to eat.” And they said to Him, “We have here only five loaves and two fish.” He said, “Bring them here to Me.” Then He commanded the multitudes to sit down on the grass. And He took the five loaves and the two fish, and looking up to heaven, He blessed and broke and gave the loaves to the disciples; and the disciples gave to the multitudes. So they all ate and were filled (Mt 14:16:20)

The next table shows personalization in the second episode (i.e., miracle of Cana of Galilee)

"Huh? Thirsty? I will quench your thirst at the
utmost. How many full waterpots do you have?” They told him: "Six". He replied: "Quench their (the guests) thirst". And they drank not only water but wine as well.

stone, according to the manner of purification of the Jews, containing twenty or thirty gallons apiece. Jesus said to them, “Fill the waterpots with water.” And they filled them up to the brim. And He said to them, “Draw some out now, and take it to the master of the feast.” And they took it. When the master of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and did not know where it came from (but the servants who had drawn the water knew), the master of the feast called the bridegroom (Jn 2:6-9)

EXC30

1. kuntu gawʕa:n kuntu ʕaṭša:n kuntu ʕurya:n kuntu mari:ḍ
   “I was hungry, I was thirsty, I was naked, I was sick,
   kuntu masgu:n fi l-ʕa:lam
   I was imprisoned in the world

2. wi-ntum ?akkaltu:ni kattar xirku:m w-šarrabtu:ni w-kasitu:ni w-zurtu:ni
   and you fed me, thank you so much, you gave me to drink, you clothed me, you visited me
   and you came to me, I am really thankful”. “You, o Lord?”
   ʕана:l-luhum ma na kunt fi l-ʕa:lam / ma na ma-šufu:t-ʕ /
   He will answer them: “Yes, I was in the world”. “I didn’t see him”
   “I am the suffering Christ. It is true that

3. ʔана l-mumaggad ʔil-ga:lis ʕan yami:n il-ʔa:b f is-sama:? I am glorified, sitting at the Father’s right hand
   wala:kin risa:lat il-ʔa:lam lam takuff lam tantahi /
   but the mission of the suffering did not cease, did not come to an end yet,
   it is still present. I fill the whole earth up, every suffering man is myself”.

(MM50 – 87’5. → 88’1.)

As seen in Holes and Bassiouney (§1.8.2. and §1.8.3.), CS → EA may entail a different role the speaker wants to play vis-à-vis the listeners. Starting from the partial
quotation from Mt 25:35, MM uses EA to give a more sympathetic, involved and personal re-arrangement of the dialogue between Christ and the righteous. In line 3 he switches again into SA to give a more detached, hieratic imaginary elaboration of the dialogue (Christ speaks as God) then he goes back to EA to take it closer to speakers’ feelings. The last line ʔana ba-mlaʔ ʔalʔard ʔuallaha kull ʔinsa:n mutaʔallim da šaxśli has been considered SA despite the presence of an evident EA exclamatory particle da which is normally not translated as in the example given by Badawi & Hinds (1986:273): da ʔal-burtuqa:n is-sana:-di hilw zawi (‘the oranges are nice this year!’). This use of EA exclamatory particles in SA contexts is typical of MM. See also EXC84 in §5.2.6.

From the data, it appears that MM did not find any problems in quoting verses from the Gospel in EA whenever a rhetorical need, such as personalization, requires it. Quotation in SA is not a rule, although it seems more frequent. This seems different from what has been found by Bassiouney who analysed a few sermons of šayx al-Šaʕrawi who always quoted verses from the Qurʔān in CA (Bassiouney 2006:197-198).
Chapter 4 Reiteration

4.1. Locus: Reiteration; Functions: Clarifying, Stressing, Emphasizing

It is a common practice for speakers to repeat parts and bits from their own previous speech during conversation: «Repetition of sound and meaning is a pervasive property of all discourse, and it comes in a variety of forms and serves as an array of communicative functions» (Boumans 2002:301). Repetition is also a classical figure of speech (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 2008:236-238). The basic function of reiteration is to «reduce the flow of information and to make the discourse less dense» because «discourse becomes hard to follow if it is semantically too dense» (Boumans 2002:301; emphasis is mine). Reiteration has also a great role in giving coherency and cohesiveness to discourse, it helps organize discourse. Moreover, it is socially meaningful: it shows listership or ratification. Reiteration can clarify, stress or emphasize a part of the discourse.

Reiteration is particularly important for Arabic rhetoric. Koch (1980, 1981, 1983) has dealt with repetition in Arabic rhetoric and demonstrates how it tries to convince listeners or readers by repeating the same central message through paratactic, adductive and analogical mechanisms. All but one of her texts are on political topics. In some texts repetition appears on all levels: phonological, morphological and lexical, syntactic, and semantic, repetition of form and repetition of content. The repetition seems cohesive, rhythmic, and rhetorical: persuasion is a result of the number of times an idea is stated and the elaborate ways in which it is stated. The repeated discourse is paratactic and polysyndetic: «ideas flow horizontally into one another» (Koch 1983:52). It seems that Arab rhetoric does not aim to convince through logical argument (at least this is not the main mechanism; see also Hatim 1991) but through «instilling in the reader a sense of identification with its point of view» (Tannen 1980:7).

Tannen distinguishes various forms or criteria of repetition, with fuzzy boundaries:

---


135 Hatim described the different pragmatics of the argumentation in Arabic and in English. Argumentation in Arabic follows, according to Hatim, the following pattern: (1) thesis to be supported, (2) substantiation, (3) conclusion [through-argument pattern]. Unfortunately, he does not provide any concrete evidence from texts.
(i) FORMS

**self-repetition vs. allo-repetition** (repetition of others);

(ii) CONTENT

**exact repetition and intonation** (the same words uttered in the same rhythmic pattern) vs. **paraphrase** (similar ideas in different words). Midway on the scale, and most common, is **repetition with variation**, “such as questions transformed into statements, statements changed into questions, repetition with a single word or phrase changed, and repetition with change of person or tense” (2007[1989]:63-64);

(iii) POSITION

**immediate** vs. **delayed repetition** «where “delayed” can refer to delay within a discourse or delay across days, weeks, months, and years» (2007[1989]:64). The last one acts as a textual coherer;

(iv) TIME

**intertextuality**: formulaic language (or fixed expressions) is language repeated by multiple speakers over time (see also Auer 1988:88-92).

### 4.1.1. REITERATION AND CS

Bilinguals use CS as a tool in order to reiterate parts of speech. As Gumperz says «something may be said in one code and reiterated without pause in the other, or an expression in one code may be repeated in the other code elsewhere in the same conversation» (Gumperz 1982:65). Reiterative CS can happen sequentially or in two different parts of the speech. Saeed calls this **conversation locus focusing function** (Saeed 1997:121). For Grassi et al. «il cambio di codice ha spesso la funzione di sottolineare con enfasi un passaggio del discorso (per esempio il punto culminante di una storia) o di conferire espressività a un commento, rafforzando il punto di vista del parlante» (2006:188).

Gumperz considered reiteration to be one of the metaphorical functions of CS. Speakers repeat the message or part of it in the other language, in order to clarify or emphasize: «frequently a message in one code is repeated in the other code, either literally or in somewhat modified form. In some cases such repetitions may serve to clarify what is said, but often they simply amplify or emphasize a message» (Gumperz 1982:78). Auer sees reiteration as «quasi-translations into the other language, for example for the purpose of putting emphasis on demands or requests, or for purposes of

---

136 «changing code often has the function of strongly emphasize a passage of the discourse (such as the climax of a story) or to give expressivity to a comment, reinforcing the speaker's view»
clarification, or for attracting attention» (1995:120). This is not any different in Arabic (see for example how Boumans (2002) dealt with this conversational locus and its functions).

Examples of the relationships between different content forms and CS is given by Alfonzetti. She distinguishes three types of repetitions: (1) semantic equivalence (this is Tannen’s exact repetition and intonation); (2) elliptical repetition (Tannen’s repetition with variation); (3) elaborative repetition (Tannen’s repetition with variation); (4) pseudo-formulations (Tannen’s paraphrase).

4.1.1.1. semantic equivalence

Semantic equivalence means that «una sequenza in un codice viene [...] ‘tradotta’ nell’altro, letteralmente o in forma lievemente differente. La funzione in questi casi è prevalentemente quella di enfatizzare il messaggio»¹³⁷ (Alfonzetti 1992:110; emphasis is mine). Emphasis can be obtained through CS and prosodic elements: exclamatory intonation, emphatic pronunciation of the repeated sequence or of one of the elements, vowel lengthening. CS becomes a further tool, with respect to monolingual discourse, to emphasize a message.

ALF1
E allora chiḍḍi chiḍḍi ca, pìgghia, anu setti casi, u ottu casi e non pàvunu nenti? Nê vòlunù ṭruvari (CD)

And so those those who, for example, have seven houses, eight houses and do not pay anything? They do not want to find them.

Non li VOGLIONO trovare (SI)

They do not want to find them.

(Alfonzetti 1992:110)

Here we have a switch CD → SI with a semantic equivalence. The speaker stresses the word repeated “they do not want” by saying it aloud and slowing down on “vogliono”.

The following example is taken from another Arabic corpus (Hamam 2011:55-57). In an episode of the Qatari space channel tv Aljazeera programme, al-ittiğāh al-muʃākis (‘The opposite direction’), a Lebanese poet, Rafiq Rūhāna is asked by the anchorman, Fayṣal al-

¹³⁷ «A sequence in a code is ‘translated’ into the other, either verbatim or in slightly different form. The function in these cases is primarily to emphasize the message»
Qāsim, to begin speaking and those who follow are the first two phrases that are interspersed with a remark of Fayṣal al-Qāsim.

HAM1

1. ʁabəl ma žewb-ak / badd-i ʔəθəʔazər
   before I reply-2SG.M / want-1SG I apologize

From self-1SG as ART-turn ART-passed

‘Before replying to you, I want to apologize as I did it last time

2. mun sune ʔəθəṭazart / ʔin-n-i ʔana hallar
   ago year I apologized / COMP-1SG I now
   bidd-i hæ:žem loğːa w-bidd-i ʔkɛː-ha
   want-1SG I attack language and-want-1SG I speak-3SG.F

‘one year ago for that now I want to attack a language and I have to speak it.

3. Ḥaːydi kæːmːl7ak / ʔamma l-maːṭər kæːn læːzem
   This.F for-2SG.M as about ART-logic one ought to have
   ʔin-n-i ʔana ʔeθkɪ ləʔɛːɡɣa yallı
   COMP -1SG I speak ART-language REL

‘I do this for you but logic would have wanted that I speak the language that

4. bidd-i dæːfeʃ ʔən-ha / mis ʔəθkɪ
   want-1SG I defend from-3SG.F / NEG I speak
   ta hæːžem ʔeθkɪ ləʔɛːɡɣa / fiːya /
   in order to I attack language / in-3SG.F /

‘I want to defend¹³⁸ and not speak one to attack it.

5. Bass kæːmːl-ak / ʔamːma l-ʔaːnʃɛːt kæːn læːzem
   But for-2SG.M FUT we speak in-ART-F

‘Anyway, for you we will speak F.’

6. ʔaːʃni sːʔataːkallam il-ʔuʃːaː ᵃʔkɾæːːmːan laːka fiː(ː)
   I mean FUT-I speak ART-F honour-ACC to-2SG.M in

‘I mean, I will speak F as a tribute to you for conceiving

7. taːʃmiːːmːi-ka li-l-bəːɾnæːmeʃ / ʔamːma l-ʔuʃːuːl
   conceiving-ABL-2SG of-ART-programme / as about ART-principles
   kaːna yaːʃib ʔan ʔataːkallam-a l-lubnaːniyya

¹³⁸ He mean the Lebanese dialect or the ‘Lebanese language’ as Rafiq Rūḥāna calls it.
it should have been

that

I speak-SBJV

ART-Lebanese language

‘the programme. With regard to the principles, I ought to have spoken the Lebanese language

8. Ṭallāti ?atakallam-u-ha: )

REL.F I speak-IND-3SG.F )

‘that I speak’

(Hamam 2011:55-57)

The first part of the sample (HAM1) (from (1)1. to (1)5.) is separated from the second part (2) (from (1)6. to (1)8.) by a short question of Fayṣal al-Qāsim who asks Rafīq Rūḥāna:

Maːdə taqṣod be-ḏ-ḏabat yaʕni /?/

what(q) you mean exactly I mean ?

‘What do you exactly mean, I mean?'

The question brings Rafīq Rūḥāna to change the code.

As can be seen in table 20, a number of elements or markers makes us say without doubt that (1) is colloquial while (2) is standard, with a particular care for the ʔiʕrāb.

If one puts in parallel the first and the second part of the sample (1) one will notice how Rafīq Rūḥāna uses colloquial vocabulary, syntax and morphology in the first part and then ‘translates’ them into standard in the second part.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>part 1: NA</th>
<th>part 2: SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rə:nəhki bɑː-l-fuʃha (5.)</td>
<td>saʔatakallam il-fuʃha: (6.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karmæːlak (3.;5.)</td>
<td>ʔikraːman laka (6.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kæːn laːzəm (3.)</td>
<td>kaːna yaʒib (7.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?inni ?ana ?əhki (3.)</td>
<td>?an ?atakallama (7.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yalli (3.)</td>
<td>(a)lləːtiː (8.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 Elements of the first and second parts in parallel.

As can be seen, the intervention (2) of ‘retranslation,’ with a prosody slower than (1), contains the same colloquial morphological elements of (1) ‘translated’ into SA.
Notice also how \textit{karmæ:l} is translated into SA: not \textit{min ağlik} ‘for you’ as \textit{karmæ:l} normally means in the Lebanese dialect but going back to the SA “etymological” root of the colloquial expression, \textit{ʔikraːman laka}, which has a stronger sense in F (‘in your honour’)\textsuperscript{139}.

Those same features that in (1) make us say that the intervention is colloquial become, in (2), they make us say that (2) is standard (\textit{raːh} / \textit{sa}-; \textit{læːzem} / \textit{yažib}; \textit{ʔəhki} / \textit{ʔatakallama}; \textit{yalli} / \textit{lləti}).

In (1) and (2) the propositions are reversed, the syntax of the pseudo-verb (\textit{læːzem}) and of the preverbs (\textit{sa}-) changes. The two objective propositions change: \textit{kæːn læːzem ṭunni ṭana ṭəhki} $\rightarrow$ \textit{kaːna yažib ṭan ṭatakallama}.

As Gumperz would say, here one translates the message to emphasize it. Taking into account Rafīq Rūḥāna’s ideology, it appears clear why the change is NA $\rightarrow$ SA and not vice versa. He is trying to emphasize the fact that he is obliged to speak SA because of language policy of \textit{Aljazeera}, and that, although he is not willing to do that, he feels obliged to.

Three more examples are taken from the corpus of Islamic sermons analysed by Boucherit (transcription adapted).

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{BOU1}
\item \textit{limaː takðab} / (SA) \item Why do you lie?
\item ñlaːš takðaːb? / (AA) \item Why do you lie?
\item (Boucherit 2002:240)
\end{itemize}

Here there is an exact semantic equivalence: \textit{limaː} (SA) $\rightarrow$ ñlaːš (AA); \textit{takðab} (SA) $\rightarrow$ takðaːb (AA).

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{BOU2}
\item \textit{unðuru} (SA) \item \textit{Look}
\item šuːfu šuːfu matalan / l-ʔiːmaːm s-subki (AA) \item look for example the imam Subki
\item (Boucherit 2002:241)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{139} Notice also how the speaker uses a IV form, which is felt ‘more’ standard, rather than a I form \textit{karam(an)} or a II form \textit{takrim(an)}.
Exact equivalence again: unɖuru (SA) → šu:fu (AA). Here we can also see a classical figure of speech: **synonymy**. In fact, Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca describe synonymy as «la répétition d’une même idée à l’aide de mots différents, [qui] utilise, pour donner la présence, une forme qui suggère la correction progressive» (2008:238) as in the excerpt from Le Cid, by Corneille, in which he says:

*Va, cours, vole et nous venge* (acte 1, sc. VI)

As we have seen, Holes posits that Arab speakers sometimes use different lexical items which have a double realization, one in SA and one in NA (such as *naɖara* and *baʃş* in EA), as if they were synonyms.

**BOU3**

*ma: zilna baʃd lam naʃdil maʃa n-na:ʃs / (SA)*

We still have not established justice with people [who are our neighbours].

*ma:za:l ma-ʃandna:-ʃ ḥatta l-ʔinṣa:f maʃa ʔixwanna (AA)*

*We have not even established equity with our brothers.*

(Boucherit 2002:240)

Here the main difference is that the šayx uses a verb in the SA sequence (*lam naʃdil*) and, after a pause, he switches to AA using a sort of AA periphrase to fill the slot of the same verb (*ma-ʃandna:-ʃ l-ʔinṣa:f*).

### 4.1.1.2. elliptical repetition

The elliptical repetition is «meno informativa dell’enunciato che viene ripetuto, in quanto ne costituisce una versione ellittica. La funzione prevalente è anche qui quella di conferire enfasi al messaggio» (Alfonzetti 1992:115)

**ALF2**

E ppoi non ci a faːzzu iù a ccummattiricci (CD)

*and then I cannot cope looking after him*

*Signora, mi mi creda. Io non ce la faccio!* (SI)

*Madam, believe me. I just cannot cope!*

---

140 «less informative than the utterance that is repeated, since it is an elliptical version of it. The predominant function here too is to give emphasis to the message»
4.1.1.3. elaborative repetition

The elaborative repetition is exactly the opposite case of the eliptical repetition. The repetition is more informative of the preceding sequence and it aims to «elaborare e specificare il messaggio» (Alfonzetti 1992:116).

ALF3
Ma peggio per lui! (SI)
All the worse for him!

pèggiu ppi iddu ca cci a misi ddocu. Iù cci avissi šṭricatu (CD)
all the worse for him that he put put it [a car] there. I would have scratched it to him
(Alfonzetti 1992:118)

Here again three examples from the Algerian Arabic corpus of Boucherit concerning the elaborative repetition.

BOU4
wa:š yiqullu / (AA)
What did
‘Umar Ibn al-Khattab say to him? Listen Abū al-Ḥasan, sit next to your jewish adversary
sit with him on the same level. If you are an adversary to me, you have to sit next to me.
(Boucherit 2002:245-246)

BOU5
If every person approched his soul and sincerely spoke to her, he would be saved with [?] God. Get saved, man,
sällak ṛa:ṣāk mʕa llah (AA)
save your head with [?] God.
(Boucherit 2002:236)
BOU6

min ?ayna ġiʔtum bi-ha:da / min ?ayna ġiʔtum biha ya muxarrifi:n / (SA)
Where did you take this [discourse]? Where from did you take it romancers?

mni:n ģābtu ha:da l-kala:m ntaʔkum ġabtu:h min ʔand nabuliyu:n? (AA)
Where did you take this discourse of yours from? From Napoleon?
(Boucherit 2002:244)

BOU7

qa:la walla:hi la yabġuḍu ši:x l-ʔisla:m ibnu taymiyya ʔilla ġa:hilun ʔaw ʂa:ḥibu hawa: // (SA)
By God, only an ignorant or one carried away by his passion can abhor of šayx al-islām Ibn Taymiyya

ma-yibḍaɣ ibn taymiyya ʔilla waḥād fi:h ǧahl / ma-yafham-š id-di:n w-ma-yaʕraf-š š-šari:ʕa (AA)
only an ignorant who does not understand the [islamic] religion and does not know the šariʕa can abhor Ibn Taymiyya
(Boucherit 2002:241-242)

The following example, with a CS SA→YA, is taken from Saeed’s Muslim sermons corpus.

SAE1

laqad saʔaltu / r-raʔi:s / ha:da s-suʔa:1 | qultu lahu
INTENSIFIER I asked the president this question I said to him

ha:dihi: manṭiqatun ḥurra min ma:ða:? (SA)
this area free from what?

I have asked the president this question. I said to him: “This area is free from what?”

ništi niʕrif ʔeːši: ḥurra min ʔeːš? (YA)
we want we know what it free from what?

We would like to know what it is free from.
(Saeed 1997:124)

Saeed comments this example by saying that «here repetition cannot be motivated by an assumption that the audience may not have understood the wording of the question […] the apparent reason for the repetition is to emphasize the point, and to tell the audience that the speaker put it very plainly and simply to the president, requiring an
interpretation of what was meant» (Saeed 1997:125). He also sees another interpretation for this example. The switched repetitions means: “Mr. President, tell us in plain words!”.

4.1.1.4. pseudo-formulations


ALF4
E ppoi non ci a fa::zzu iù a ccummattiricci (CD)
and then I cannot cope lookin after him

Signora, mi mi creda. Io non ce la faccio! (SI)
Madam, believe me. I just cannot cope!

Iù, comu fa idđa a rresistiricci, iù n... non è na cosa nominali. (CD)
how she does resist to him, I do not ... it is not a normal thing

È è na cosa, va’, che non ci si può credere. (SI)
It is a thing, let’s say, that one cannot believe.

I stissi non ni ponu nàsciri … iù non n’ava vistu mai nà me vita. (CD)
Like him, no one will ever be born... I had not ever seen like him in my life

(Alfonzetti 1992:115)

Here “è è na cosa, va’, che non ci si può credere” (‘It is a thing, let’s say, that one cannot believe’) in SI can be considered, according to Alfonzetti, as a pseudo-formulation of the previous “non è na cosa nominali” (‘it is not a normal thing’) in CD, expressing both the same pragmatic meaning.

4.2. Reiteration in the corpus

We have already discussed CS as a tool for a typical conversational locus such as reiteration in §4.1. Repetition is a fundamental rhetorical strategy of homily when the speaker needs to stress or emphasize a point. It can be plain (“God calls us, yes God calls us”) or inverted (“We must love our neighbours. Our enemies we must love”); it can

\(^{141}\) «Although having a literal meaning different from that of the first version, they contain the formulation of a different aspect “of the same ‘underlying’ theme”»
concern *doublets* (“great and good, holy and happy”) or *triadic clauses* (“moral, spiritual and sacred”) (see Buttrick 1987).

Here I will distinguish:

(1) *semantic equivalence*; (2) *elliptical repetition*; (3) *elaborative repetition*. Pseudo-formulations will be considered within elaboration because they are *subloci* that seem to overlap. This point will be discussed in the conclusions.

### 4.2.1. SUBLOCUS: SEMANTIC EQUIVALENCE

With the semantic equivalence, CS translates, in the other code, words or expressions uttered in the other code, either *verbatim* or in a slightly different form (see §4.1.1.1.).

**EXC31**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>repeated segment</th>
<th>min ġe:r il-masiːḥ ?alla: ḥa-yifdal // ḥa:ga kbi:ra ɂawi ɂawi ɂawi / ɂawi ɂawi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Without Christ, God remains something very very very very very big,</em> mahu:la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>šeːʔ la niha:yata lahu muxiːf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>something unending, dreadful.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MM50 - 6’4. → 6’5.)

Here CS signals a reiteration with a semantic equivalence:

- EA ḥa:ga kbi:ra ɂawi ɂawi ɂawi / ɂawi ɂawi (‘something very very very very very big’): SA šeːʔ la niha:yata lahu (‘something unending’);
- EA mahu:la (‘frightening’): SA muxiːf (‘frightening’).

MM uses the same words in EA and SA to emphasize the message. This code-switched reiteration triggers an SA segment (until 7’1.).

**EXC32**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>repeated segment</th>
<th>w-huwwa waːzif fi ḥittitu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>And he stands firmly in his place</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>laːː yataḥarrak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>motionless</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MM50 – 67’1. → 67’2.)

Here the semantic equivalence is realized through negation:
EA wa:āif fi ḥittitu (‘stand firmly in place’): SA la:: yataḥarrak (‘he is motionless’).

Emphasis is obtained not only through CS but also through prosodic elements such as the lengthening of the vowel /a:/ of the NEG particle lā.

EXC33

| context | [fa-r-ra:hib šamʕa bi-twallaʕ hina zamaniyyan w-ḍu?ha z-zamani yataḥawwal li-ḍo:? ?abadi] [So the monk is a candle that lights here on earth, whose earthly light turns into everlasting light] |
| repeated segment | la:: yanṭafiʔ |
| repetition | ?enʔa:titšinu: [t̬̬̄n̬̬̄t̬̬̄ēn̬̬̄] inextinguishable |

(MM50 – 80′5. → 80′6.)

In this example MM repeats the concept of ḥabadi ‘light’. ḏo:? ḥabadi can be considered as an SA borrowing in a + EA sequence (see bi-twallaʕ ‘it lights,’ hina ‘here’). MM stresses the adjective ḥabadi by using once again an SA negation la:: yanṭafiʔ (‘inextinguishable’) then a Coptic adjective [t̬̬̄n̬̬̄t̬̬̄ēn̬̬̄] ‘inextinguishable’. This Coptic term is found in the tasbiḥa142, the collection of psalms and hymns that the Coptic monks sing every day at dawn and that, for this reason, they finish to memorize, at least partially. MM uses this inference, well-known to the monks to whom he addressed the homily, to stress the concept and give it authority. As we have seen before, for the Coptic quotation in EXC20 in §3.2.0., by repeating the concept in Coptic after SA, MM is not explaining the adjective but giving it more and more credit. Tasbiḥa, the source of the inference, also represents in itself an estimated collection of texts, especially for matters concerning Coptic Christian theology, as important as the Euchologion. Here too, the lengthening of the vowel /a:/ NEG particle lā, is a further tool aiming to emphasize.

---

142 See note 131. Specifically this adjective is present in the šīrat (hymns of praise for the Virgin Mary, from the Coptic (originally Greek) word χείρε meaning ‘Hail to’) of the Saturday lubš (conclusion of a religious song with a paraphrasing of the previous verses with biblical quotations and a prayer, from the Coptic word lwbs meaning ‘conclusion’ or ‘interpretation’).
Here MM uses a term (*yatfir*) found in the Arabic translation of the Bible (Van Dyck), the version normally used by the Coptic church outside liturgy. Repetition in EA here clarifies in simpler words the +SA term. The repetition comes after *yaṣni* that, according to Owens & Rockwood, can introduce information of the same status, as for instance in a paraphrase in order to clarify (2008:92).

The verb *taʔannas* of the quotation from the Euchologion (Liturgy of Saint Basil, Anaphora) is further specified with a repetition in EA.

In these last two cases, unlike the previous examples, the repetition aims at clarifying and not at highlighting and takes place from SA → EA.
CS here highlights and clarifies better what MM means for ‘being slow’. Repetition triggers a CS → EA that will continue after the locus itself.

**EXC37**

**repeated segment**

il-masiḥ in-naharda mawguːd fi: l-... maʃaːna ʃala l-ʔarq

*Christ, today, is present in… with us on earth*

bass fi ʔuːrat mutaʔallim /

*but in the form of the sufferer*

**context (1)**

[fi ʔuːrat kull insaːn gaːʔiʃ wa-ʃuryaːn wa-ʃatʃaːn wa-mutaʔallim /

*in the form of every starving, naked, thirsty and suffering man,*

muslim masiːhi / hindi / buːzi / yahuːdi / ʔafrangi / ʃarabi /

*Muslim, Christian, Hindou, Buddhist, Jew, Westerner, Arab*

ʔiṭlaːqan la yuːgad farq kull insaːn gaːʔiʃ

*there is no difference whatsoever: every hungry person,*

ʃala mustawa gasadi ʔaw ruːhi huwa huwa l-masiːh | /

*on a physical or a spiritual level, is Christ himself.*

**repetition**

fa-l-masiːh innaharda bi-yumaːris wuguːdu fi wasaːtana fi l-ʃaːlam

*So Christ today is present in our midst in the world,*

bàynana ʃala hayʔa ʃala hayʔat mutaʔallim | /

*among us, in the form of, in the form of the sufferer.*

**context (2)**

[w-ʔadi l-ʃamal iθiːθaːni / miʃ bi-tiʃmilu fi n-naːs

*So here is the second [kind of] work: you don’t do it to people*

da nta bi-tiʃmilu fi šaxʃ il-masiːh mubaː(ː)ʃaratan

*you do it directly to Christ.*

(MM50 – 89’3. → 89’8.)

Here we have what we can call a climax. In classical rhetoric, climax is a well-know figure of speech in which words, phrases, or clauses are arranged in order of increasing intensity (or importance). So here the switch begins slowly in the first contextual part and it increases with SA markers such as la yuːgad farq (SA NEG + /q/) until it closes the move (consider the final falling pitch and the following EA switch in context (2) line). Notice the use of the EA nonce borrowing innaharda (‘today’) in the repeated segment.
Christ, today, is present in... with us on earth

but in the form of the suffering

4.2.2. SUBLOCUS: ELLIPTICAL REPETITION

EXC38

repeated segment

You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart,
with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength [...] 

You shall love the Lord your God with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the mind, and with all the strength [...] 

the prayer offered with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the mind, and with all the strength [...] 

Shake off all that is in the heart, in the mind, in the soul and all our strength [...] 

Once we enter into God's presence during prayer, nothing, all our mind, all our heart and all our mind is for the Lord alone. 

Once you arrive to this point, your prayer will turn into a prayer of love from all the heart, all the soul, all the mind and all the strength [...] 

but the one who reaches it [this kind of prayer] is the one who practices min kull nafs u-min kull qudratu w-min kull ehm fikru [...]
from all his heart, all his strength, all his, ehm, mind [...] 

repetition (7) la yumkin insa:n yiṣalli l-alla: min kull qalbihi
It's impossible for anyone to prayer to God from all the heart,
w-min kull nafsihi w-min kull fikrihi w-min kull qudratihi [...] 
all his soul, all his mind and all his strength [...] 

repetition (8) ni:gi hina wi-nḥiss ?inn ?iḥna baze:na kba:r
We come here [the monastery] and we feel that we have become great,
w-baze:na baẓa wuẓYa:z muqtadiri:n w-niṣarraf w-naṭallim
we have become expert preachers, we teach and instruct
wi-nkkabar wi-nsawwi w-in-na:s bi-tbu:s ide:na
and we want to seem older, do great things while people kiss our hands.
?a:::h ti:gi tuẒaft li-š-šala la tiλtiz fi: ṣal l-alla:
Oh, then you stand to pray, you will find that neither your heart is all for God
wa-la l-qaql kullu l-alla: wa-la ha:da wa-la ha:da [...] 
nor your mind is all for God, neither this nor that [...] 

This is an example of a very complex delayed repetition of the verse Mk 12:30 (which is itself a quotation from Deut 6:5):

\[
\text{You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength.}
\]

The repetitions go on for at least half an hour and they are all elliptical (only the second part of the initial quote is repeated). The quote is repeated in an equivalent or elliptical way in SA (repetition 1,2,3,7), while MM elaborates in EA the repeated verse by applying it to prayer in the monastic life. The four elements of the quote (qalb, nafs, fikr, qudra) do not appear with the same order (see repetition 3 and 6), sometimes MM adds slightly different elements (ʕaWare, repetition 4), or omits an element (qalb is omitted in repetition 6) or both (repetition 8: added element: ʕaWare; excluded elements: fikr, nafs, qudra). The function here is not only to emphasize but to grave the verse in the monks’ mind. In this sense, repetition helps homily take shape gradually in the mind of the listeners who are unable to go back to what has been previously said.
4.2.3. **SUBLOCUS: ELABORATIVE REPETITION**

We have seen the characteristics of the elaborative repetition in §4.1.1.3. Here are some examples from the corpus.

**EXC39**

repeated segment  
\[ \text{ehm } \text{ʕan il-maḥabba fi l-wa:qiʕ ma-ʔdar-ʃi ya } \text{ʔabbaha:t } \]
\[ \text{Ehm, as regards love… actually, fathers, I cannot } \]
\[ \text{ʔuba:ʃir waзи:fatka-ʔab } \text{ʔilla } \text{ʕan } \text{ṭari:q il-maḥabba | } \]
\[ \text{fulfill my function of father but through love. } \]
\[ \text{miʃ mumkin } \text{ʔaʃallaḥ } \text{ʔayy ʔaʃala } \text{f wuʃt il-gama:ʕa } \text{ʔilla } \text{bi-l-maḥabba } \]
\[ \text{I cannot fix any error in the community but through love. } \]

repetition  
\[ \text{la: } \text{ʔastaτi:ʃ } \text{ʔinni } \text{ʔazawwidlak fi numuwwak ir-ru:hi } \]
\[ \text{I cannot increase your spiritual growth, } \]
\[ \text{ehm qayda šaʃra } \text{ʔaw qayda ʔiɾa:ʃ } \text{/ insa:n } \]
\[ \text{by one inch or one cubit, according to the measure of a man } \]
\[ \text{ʔaw mala:k } \text{ʔilla } \text{ʕan } \text{ṭari:q il-maḥabba | } \]
\[ \text{or of an angel\textsuperscript{143}, but through love. } \]

(MM50 – 18’2. \( \rightarrow \) 18’5.)

Spiritual fatherhood means also correction but correction cannot bear fruits if it is not carried out with love. MM emphasizes ‘I cannot’ by repeating it twice in EA and once in SA and ‘through love,’ elaborating differently what ‘fulfilling the function of spiritual father without love’ means after every negation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I cannot</th>
<th>ma-ʔdar-ʃi</th>
<th>miʃ mumkin</th>
<th>la: ʔastaτi:ʃ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>but through love</td>
<td>ʔilla ʕan ṭari:q</td>
<td>ʔilla bi-l-maḥabba</td>
<td>ʔilla ʕan ṭari:q il-maḥabba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXC40**

repeated segment  
\[ \text{la tuṣarrif šima:lak ma taʃnaʃ yami:nak […] } \]
\[ \text{do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing […] } \]

repetition (1)  
\[ \text{la tuṣarrif šima:lak ma taʃnaʃ yami:nak […] } \]

\[\text{143 See Rev 21:17.}\]
do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing [...]  

repetition (2) ma-xall-š ?i:di š-šima:l tǐfraf ?e:h illi bi-tǐf’milu l-?i:d l-yimi:n [...] 
I do not let my left hand know what the right hand is doing [...]  

repetition (3) ma-tǐfraf-š šima:lak ?abadan li-غا:::yit il-ʔa:xir li-غا:::yit in-niha:ya / may your left hand never know, until the end, until the very end, li-غا:::yit il-mot li-غا:::yit il-qabr |  
until death, until the grave  

repetition (4) la tuʕarrif šima:lak ma ʂanaʕathu yami:nak | [...]  
do not let your left hand know what your right hand has done [...]  
(MM50 – 30’5. [...] 31’5. [...] 32’1. [...] 34’5. → 34’6.; 34’6. → 34’7.)

Delayed repetitions are found here. They do not happen one after the other but after the interpolation of a commentary (see below). This quotation from Mt 6:3 is repeated four times:

لا تعْرَفُ شَمَالْكَ ما تُفْعَلْ بِهِ

But when you do a charitable deed, do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing.

MM uses the verb ʂanaʕa instead of faʕala. In the quote the code is SA and the verb is in the IMP tense without returning pronoun (taṣnaʕ). In repetition (4) the code is still SA but there is a slight difference: the verb is in the past tense and a returning pronoun is attached to it (ʂanaʕathu). Repetitions (2) and (3) are in EA and function as a personalization of the quote (see below). Although in repetition (2) verbs and REL pronouns are in the 1st person, a periphrasis is used instead of the imperative as in the quote, it is still an exact repetition of the verse. Repetition (3) is in the 2nd person, it uses the IMP tense (ma-tǐfraf-š) and it is an elaboration of the repeated quote, though incomplete. In fact, MM repeats (repetition 4) the first part again in SA and closes the quote in the same code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>la tuʕarrif šima:lak</th>
<th>ma taʂnaʕ yami:nak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do not let your left hand</td>
<td>what your right hand is doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la tuʕarrif šima:lak</td>
<td>ma taʂnaʕ yami:nak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not let your left hand</td>
<td>what your right hand is doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not let my left hand know</td>
<td>what the right hand is doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-tǐfraf-š šima:lak ?abadan li-غا:::yit</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>il-ʔa:xir li-غا:::yit in-niha:ya / li-غا:::yit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ilīmō:t liīgayit ilīqabr

May your left hand never know, until the end,
until the very end, until death, until the grave

La tussarrif šima:lak
Do not let your left hand

Ma šanaqathu yami:nak
What your right hand has done

EXC41

Repeated segment

Man huwa bu:luṣ wa-man huwa ?abulluş / ʔilla / ʕa:mila:n
Who is Paul, and who is Apollos, but workers
Fila:ḥat alla: wała:ki:n ʔalla:ḥ huwa ʔlaːdī ʕa:mila:n maʕ ʔalla:
God’s fellow workers, but it is God who… workers with God,
Right? Workers with God but it is God who gives the increase

Repetition (1)

ʔiḥna bi-nizraʕ wa:ḥid bi-yizraʕ wa:ḥid bi-yisʔi
We plant, one plants and another waters
Wa-ʔllaː: huwwa ʔiṭli bi-yunammi
But it is God who gives the increase.

Repetition (2)

Iḏan la li-ğaːris ʔay? wa-la li-saːqi ʔay?
So then neither he who plants is anything, nor he who waters,
Wała:kiːna ʔallaːḥ allaːdī yunammi
But God who gives the increase.

(MM50 – 56’3. → 56’7.)

Here MM quotes by heart 1Cor 3:5-7 (see §4.1. when discussing the quote)

5 ʼAːna ɡarṣat ʔalbūs ʕaːsmi, likn ʾallahu ʾkana ʾbiːṣi. 7 ʾIḏa ʾlaːs al-garṣat ʃiːna ʾlaːs al-safani, ʾallahu ʾl-ʾdiː yunammi.

5 Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers through whom you believed, as the Lord gave to each one? 6 I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. 7 So then neither he who plants is anything, nor he who waters, but God who gives the increase.

He then repeats part of the verse 6 in EA and then again in SA:

Wa-ʔllaː: huwwa ʔiṭli bi-yunammi
It is God who gives the increase
Wa-ʔllaː: huwwa ʔiṭli bi-yunammi

225
it is God who gives the increase
wala:kin alla:h alla:ði yunammi
it is God who gives the increase

EXC42

repeated segment

w-baːde:n ?iil-haːga ?illi law ?itʃallaːna min gufːu:n ʃeːneːna
Moreover, the thing that even if we did the impossible
ʃalaːṣaːn naḥṣul ʃaleːha miːʃ mumkin naḥṣul ʃaleːha ?illa
to obtain it, we won’t obtain but through
bi-l-ḥubb il-ʔilaːhi | ehm
divine love, ehm

repetition

kayfa nufarriːg ʔawaːtina min ʔawaːtina? /
is how to empty ourselves from our selves?
kayfa naˁbud allaː min kull il-qalb min kull in-nafs
How to worship God from all the heart, all the soul
min kull il-fikr min kull il-qudra la yumkin ?illa
all the mind, all the strength. This is impossible but through
bi-l-ḥubb il-ʔilaːhi | ?il-ḥubb lahu l-qudra ʃala t-tafriːɡ
divine love. Love has the capacity of emptying
w-it-taːthiːr

and purifying

repetition (2)

ma-lḥaːːʃ masiːl | kull waːḥid taːbaːn min naʃsu w-ʃaːwiz
which is beyond comparison. Everyone who suffers from himself and wants
yifaḍḍi naʃsu ma-ʃuddamuː-ʃ ʒeːr  tarafːiːʔ waːḥid ma-ːluː-ːʃ taːni
to empty himself he has no other way
huwa l-ḥubb huwa l-ḥubb
than love alone.

(MM50 – 103’1. → 103’6.)

The repeated segment in EA generally states the problem. MM switches to SA to give it more emphasis, by adding more information to what exactly we cannot obtain but through love. Then again he switches to EA and reiterates the idea expressed in the last SA line (ʔil-ḥubb lahu l-qudra ʃala t-tafriːɡ w-it-taːthiːr).
I hinted at this yesterday, or the day before, when I was sitting with you beside the wall.

And I said that the left hand symbolizes the ambitious soul that seeks honor and respect. While the right hand represents Grace that causes the soul does not want but that God alone be glorified, not man.

So the left hand symbolizes the human nature that loves dignity and money while the right hand symbolizes the divine nature, planted in ehm the new man which does not glorify and does not tolerate that anyone be glorified other than the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Here MM repeats the explanation of the meaning of ‘left hand’ and ‘right hand’ (Mt 6:3), in SA, by paraphrasing the idea. The use of the 1st person singular in the first part of the repeated segment (in EA) gives to the segment a personalized ‘flavour,’ a way to involve the listeners. The SA conclusive segment, with the final conclusive tone, gives a more objective definition.
the left hand expresses the ambitious soul that seeks honour and respect

while the right hand represents ehm, Grace that causes that the soul does not want but that God alone be glorified, not man.

EXC44
context

In every sick man, Christ saw himself
he saw the work of his hands, he saw his image, even the image of the Father.

repeated segment

If this is conceivable

repetition (1)

If this is perfectly conceivable and perfectly correct,

repetition (2)

if your mind is able to conceive this or imagine it.
The parenthetical repetition (1), in EA, has a very strong impact on the hearer because it is interpolated in a slow and meditated SA context. It is as if MM, by using SA, wanted to keep distance from the statement but then he just can’t cope with that so he switches to EA to give a more ‘personal’ and clear opinion about the fact that it is possible. Then he switches again to SA to repeat the same idea again. Repetition (2) is, in fact, a corrected elaborated version of the repeated segment.

EXC45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>repeated segment</th>
<th>yaʕni l-masi:ḥ lan yataxalla: ʕan gasadu ʕaw ʕan ʔinsaniyyitu ʕan gasadu fa-xala:ṣ gasad il-masi:ḥ Ɂaw Ɂinsaniyyitu Ɂilli xadha yasu:ʕ Ɂilīḥilw Ɂilli Ɂitrabba ʕala ḥuḍn ilīʕadra da:: xala:ṣ dah daxal ilīmagd who was raised by the Virgin, is now in the glory.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>yaʕni miś ha-yi:gi f yo:m yitxalla ʕan gasadu fa-xala:ṣ I mean, he won’t get rid of his body some day. Not at all. gasad il-masi:ḥ ʔaw ʔinsaniyyitu ʔillī xadha yasu:ʕ ʔilī-ḥilw Christ’s body or the humanity, that was taken by the good Jesus ʔillī Ɂitrabba ʕala Ɂuḍn il-Ɂadra da:: xala:ṣ dah daxal il-Ɂadgh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MM136 – 14’6. → 15’3.)

Here MM repeats in EA the same idea expressed in SA, by elaborating it a bit further, i.e. that ‘Christ will not get rid of his body’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>repeated segment (SA)</th>
<th>yaʕni l-masi:ḥ lan yataxalla: ʕan gasadu ʔaw ʔan ʔinsaniyyitu ʔabadan ma la la yumkin tataʃawwarha fi Ɂ-ʔabadiyya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>repetition (EA)</td>
<td>yaʕni miś ha-yi:gi f yo:m yitxalla ʕan gasadu fa-xala:ṣ I mean Christ will not get rid of his body or his humanity. Absolutely not, this is unconceivable in the eternal life. gasad il-masi:ḥ ʔaw ʔinsaniyyitu ʔillī xadha yasu:ʕ ʔilī-ḥilw ʔillī Ɂitrabba ʕala Ɂuḍn il-Ɂadra da:: xala:ṣ dah daxal il-Ɂadgh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I mean Christ will not get rid of his body or his humanity. Absolutely not, this is unconceivable in the eternal life. | I mean, he won’t get rid of his body some day. Not at all. Christ’s body or the humanity that was taken by the good Jesus who was raised by the Virgin, is now in the glory. |
Again, MM code-switches to reiterate an elaborated version of the same concept (in an interrogative form):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>repeated segment (SA)</th>
<th>repetition (EA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʔan yatʕallam / ?awla:d alla: š-ṣura:x [...]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*My soul, my beloved, fervently desires that God’s sons learn to cry out [to him] [...]*

Has nobody of his children learnt to cry out night and day?
5.1. CONVERSATIONAL LOCUS: ARGUMENTATIVE ELABORATION;
FUNCTIONS: ELABORATE, SPECIFY, EXPLAIN, EXEMPLIFY, FOCUS,
DE-FOCUS, SYNTHESIZE, ANALYSE

The locus argumentative elaboration is the most complex because it includes a large number of functions and sub-functions, all sharing a common rhetorical mechanism of argumentative elaboration of the text. Alfonzetti agrees that this locus not always presents sufficiently precise formal features (1992:105). Instead, one can speak of a plurality of heterogeneous structures.

Argumentation is how speakers, in a given speech, reach conclusions through a process of logical reasoning, that is, express claims based (or not) on premises. Elaboration, which means constructing rhetorically complex discourses, is the mechanism through which this is done. Argumentation is strictu sensu the ensemble of the «moyens discursifs [...] pour obtenir l’adhésion des esprits [...] la technique utilisant le langage pour persuader et pour convaincre» (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 2008:9). This seems the same definition of “rhetoric” given by Aristotle in his homonymous work: «the ability in any particular case to see the available means of persuasion» (I, 2, 1355b). We will see later some important points on argumentation in religious discourse.

Because of its capacity to create contrast, CS is greatly suitable to be used as a primary tool in the argumentative elaboration in a spoken text, in bilingual contexts. This is evidenced by the fact that elaboration and argumentation is a locus that has been found in many studies on CS. Here CS is strictly linked to the organization of discourse (see §1.8.2. and Taine-Cheikh 2002:195). As Taine-Cheikh states «il apparaît que la variation linguistique est mise au service d’une véritable stratégie discursive» (2002:197).

Alfonzetti describes the relationship between CS and argumentative elaboration in this way: «il parlante commuta codice nel produrre enunciate che servono ad elaborare, specificare, precisare, spiegare, esemplificare ecc. quanto detto precedentemente nell’altro codice»¹⁴⁴ (Alfonzetti 1992:105; emphasis is mine), «spiegare concretamente» (Alfonzetti

¹⁴⁴ «The speaker code-switches to produce utterances that serve to elaborate, specify, define, explain, exemplify, and so on, what has been mentioned earlier in the other code»
1992:107). Gumperz considered two metaphorical elaborative functions: message qualification and personalization vs. objectivization. In message qualification «one produces in the other language a segment that qualifies or specifies or comments what is said in one language» (1982:79) while in personalization vs. objectivization «the code contrast here seems to relate to such things as: the distinction between talk about action and talk as action, the degree of speaker involvement in, or distance from, a message, whether a statement reflects personal opinion or knowledge, whether it refers to specific instances or has the authority of generally known fact» (Gumperz 1982:80; Italics are mine). Grosjean (1982:155) too says that CS can be used for «qualifying what has been said»145. Berruto (1985) labels this locus thematic progression, narrative or argumentative development. Auer (1988:199) calls it reformulations/elaborations and in another situation he speaks about answer/account or explanation of the answer (198484) which also seems to me to be a function of this locus.

5.1.1. topicalization

Functions of this locus are multiple, as said before. Elaboration in itself can be realized in many ways one of which is the distinction between what is text, topical, conceptualization vs. comment, paraphrase, glossa. This locus is considered by Auer (1995:120) as a clear case of topicalization through CS. It is well-known that topicalization is a wide-spread subject in linguistics which falls within the domain of the interpretation of the utterance as information and is accompanied by many pragmatic mechanisms. By varying the distribution of the informative and the evaluative elements, the speaker helps the listener understand the message he wants to convey. Utterances are provided with what is called communicative dynamism: the lowest communicative dynamism is carried by the known elements, shared among the interlocutors while the highest communicative dynamism is carried by the non-shared or new elements that constitute the peak of information. The two main informative functions of the utterance are topic (also theme) and comment (also rheme or focus).

Topic refers to the informative element presented as “subject” of the utterance, that about which one intends to speak. By placing an item in the topical position, the speaker invites the interlocutor to store the following information as relative to the proposed topic. Comment refers to the portion of the statement that contains the higher degree of communicative dynamism. Normally the comment is placed in final position.

In an ordinary SVO sentence, topic is represented by the subject:

145 Other authors such as Huerta-Macias (1981) and Montes-Alcalà (2005) call this function “elaboration”.
(1) Police arrested Gary.

(2) Gary was arrested by police.

Although the two sentences have the same meaning, they have different topics. In the first sentence “Police” is the topic and “arrested Gary” is the comment. The comment talks about what the subject did. In the second sentence “Gary” is the topic and “was arrested by police” is the comment. In the second sentence we are concentrated on Gary while in the first on what police did. Of course, more complex syntactic structures are possible such as:

(3) I don’t care if they agree or not.

(4) If they agree or not, I don’t care.

Here the subject is in both cases “I” so the topic is not the subject. In (3) topic is “I don’t care” while comment is “if they agree or not” which specifies what I don’t care about. In (4) topic is “if they agree or not” while comment is “I don’t care” which specifies what is the opinion about the fact that they agree or not. Of course languages topicalize in many ways and different languages have different ways to topicalize: not only word order, but also intonation, syntax (passivisation for example) or lexicon (“As far as...”). In modern Romance languages and Arabic, (returning) pronouns play a key role in topicalization, for example:

(5) Le professeur, je l’ai vu hier (‘I have seen the professor yesterday’; le (in this case shortened to l’) is post-poned and refers to “le professeur”)

(6) Il professore, l’ho visto ieri (lo, shortened to l’, is post-poned and refers to “il professore’)”

(7) al-ʔustādu raʔayatuhu ʔamsi (-hu is post-poned and refers to “al-ʔustādu”)

(8) il-usta:z šuftu mba:riḥ (-u is post-poned and refers to “il-usta:z”)

In such a sentence, topicalization can take place on four elements at least: I, saw, yesterday or professor (like in the examples). Word order allows the speaker (or the writer) to focus on a particular part of the phrase or the sentence.

The topic is, therefore, the starting point of an utterance and, as such, it has a low degree of communicative dynamism. A particular type of topic is called antitopic that serves to enact or re-enact a topic identifiable by the interlocutors, but that the speaker believes may be inactive for the listener. This topic is placed in final position. In Romance languages this is obtained, for example, through pronouns:

(9) L’hai visto poi, quel film? (‘Did you finally watch that film?’)

A typical topicalization in Arabic is, of course, al-ġumla al-ismiyya (=nominal sentence; see Holes 1995:160-175 and Schreiber & Anshen 1974). That which is one of
the two possible phrase structures in CA, is composed by two basic elements: *mubtadaʔ* ('the beginning element') and *xabar* ('the piece of news, the informational element').

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>mubtadaʔ</strong></th>
<th><strong>xabar</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>al-ðahab(u)</td>
<td>maʕdan(un)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Gold is a metal’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>al-qādiyān(i)</td>
<td>yahkumān bi-l-ʔadl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘The two judges judge with justice’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>?an tattaḥidū</td>
<td>xayrun lakum⁴⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘It is good for you to unite’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both are *ğumla ismiyya* ((10) and (12) are a predicative clause) because a noun starts them and not a verb. In general the *mubtadaʔ* comes at the beginning of the phrase (*mubtadaʔ* means ‘the one which we begin with’) and it is *maʕrifa* (‘determinate’) with some exceptions (Niʕma n.d.:29). *Xabar* gives us information about the *mubtadaʔ* and specifies to us the content and the meaning of the *mubtadaʔ*. Without *xabar* the phrase would be meaningless (‘*ġayr mufīda*’) or incomplete. *Mubtadaʔ*, though, can be post-poned to the *xabar* (thus creating an antitopic):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>xabar muqaddam</strong></th>
<th><strong>mubtadaʔ muʔaxxar</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>mamnūʕ(un)</td>
<td>at-tadxin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Smoking is forbidden’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>xayrun lakum</td>
<td>?an tattaḥidū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘It is good for you to unite’¹⁴⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>fi t-taʔanni</td>
<td>salāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Slow and steady wins the race (lit. ‘In slowness safety’)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear here that what is highlighted is the *xabar muqaddam*: the information has more relevance than the object or the person we are speaking about and therefore it gets focused on. Other topicalizers in Arabic are the COMP *ʔinna* (*ʔinna l-ðahaba maʕdanun*), *la*- (*la-zaydun ?afḍalu min ʔamr*), *bi*- (*bi-n-nisba li-, ʔamma ... fa-*) etc.

Topicalization is a typical mechanism of classical rhetoric too, in figures of speech like *anastrophe* (She looked at the sky dark and menacing [Normally: She looked at the dark and menacing sky]), *hyperbaton* (Why should their liberty than ours be more?), *epergesis* (I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing) etc.

¹⁴⁶ All the examples for the *ğumla ismiyya* are taken from Niʕma (n.d.: 27-35)
¹⁴⁷ Example (11), if reversed, would become a *ğumla ftliyya* because a verb would begin the phrase.
CS serves also as a topicalizer, because of its natural characteristic of creating opposition within the speech, and helps distinguishing parts felt as topic from parts felt as comment, marginal sequences (parenthesis) from core discourse, maxim from argumentation that brings to the maxim or exegesis of the maxim or generalization of the maxim, narration from moral. CS can mark a change in argumentative ‘mode’ to the narrative ‘mode,’ or within the narrative mode, a change in the informative ‘block’ to a comment ‘block’ (see Grassi et al. 2006:186-187), synthesis from analysis, theory from practice, subjectivity from objectivity (as we have seen in §2.1 and §2.2).

Direction of CS seems very important. The passage from the we-code to the they-code, in fact, usually means a passage from comment to topic, from marginal sequences (parenthesis) to core discourse, argumentation to maxim, narration to moral, analysis to synthesis, practice to theory, subjectivity to objectivity for the motives described in §1.9. Arabic does not seem to be any exception. While in the two previous conversational loci, direction was not always meaningful, in this case the direction of CS NA → SA is even more important than, for example, in the Italian case of Catania described by Alfonzetti.

5.1.2. written text vs. oral comment

Textual elements can be only quoted (§3.1.) or be elaborated with comments. These examples show the insertion of quotation, as texts, and their elaboration.

HAM2
1. yaqu:l šəbli: šmayyel yaḥṣal il-ʔentexa:b
   he says Šiblī Šmayyil it happens ART-election
   iṭ-ṭabiːisi: ?allaːdi: men natiːžati-hi
   ART-natural REL from result-3SG

   ‘Šiblī Šmayyil says: «A natural election takes place whose result is’

2. mulaːšaːt il-ḥuduːd bayn il-луːɡaːt» /
   annihilation ART-borders between ART-languages /
   yaʃni ḥaːydi radd ʃala
   I mean DEM.M response to

   ‘the annihilation of the borders between languages». I mean, this is a response to’

3. ṭunː-o fiː: ʕiʃriːn alf laːɡa bayn il-bilaːd il-
   Comp-3SG in-3SG.M twenty languages between ART-country ART-Arab
   ʕarabiyya 20 thousand

   ‘the fact that there are twenty thousand languages in the Arab countries.’
The speaker quotes from a book in SA. Immediately after, he starts to comment on this quote in NA: ‘I mean, this is a response to the fact etc.’ then he gets interrupted. We are in front of a clear contrast ‘text’ / ‘comment’ where the text is actually a text (a quote) and the comment is a commentary to that text. This is a typical example of what happens in mosques and churches where sacred texts are read or quoted by heart in SA and then commented in NA.

In the Muslim xuṭab (‘sermons’) analysed by Saeed, comments can also appear in SA. The reason is, according to Saeed, that the opinion of the speaker (iconicity, §3.1.4.1.) influences the message commented on. In one of the examples given by him (1997:133) the speaker comments in SA a story in which he shows the benefits and the fruitful consequences of the Islamic banking system.

5.1.3. written text vs. parenthetical oral comments

Comments to a quote (especially, if it is an oralized written text) can also be inserted during the reading of the written text, in the other code, marking, again, a contrast between what is text and what a parenthetical oral comment to the text. Holes (1993:27) comments this mechanism by writing that «the rhetorical principle is exactly that of the imam or the schoolteacher reading the scriptures or the set book, and then looking up from his tome to explain to the congregation or class what it means». Taine-Cheikh comments this function by saying that «le changement de code, qui marque un commentaire, est l’équivalent à l’oral de l’ouverture d’une parenthèse» (2002:196).

This conversational locus is very common in many bilingual communities and it is also very typical of Arabic religious discourse. Yet, I could not find any of these examples in Saeed’s work (1997). In fact he did not even consider comment as a general category in his analysis, a fact which, at least, arouses curiosity. Saeed did not provide the transcribed virgin corpus but just his analysis and this has made it impossible to check whether or not this function is present therein.

5.1.4. marginal sequences (exophoric) vs. core discourse (endophoric)
This function is to be understood as highlighting marginal exophoric (extracontext) segments whose main purpose is to allow the execution of a series of secondary activities with respect to the endophoric datum (main flow or context) of the conversation. It is a kind of suspension of the speech, after which one returns to the main sequence. It is a phenomenon that also exists in monolinguals’ speech.

Fintanto che non c’è questo / bisogna utilizzare quello là. Però io non è che a quelli ehm ho dato il disco rigido / che che può supportare il word quattro e:: / e tutte queste cose qua. Perciò:: praticamente ci andrò / (SI)

As long as this is not there / we need to use that one. But I did not give them ehm my hard disk / that that can support Word 4 e:: / and all these things. So at the end I will go there.

Ma comu mai non sunò ccà stu cazzu ri sveglia? (CD)

But how come that this damn alarm didn’t ring?

Non ha suonato! / E io praticamente poi ci andrò di pomeriggio quando devo stampare (SI)

It didn’t ring! And so I will go there in the afternoon when I have to print.

(Alfonzetti 1992:72)

In example (1) M. speaks to this friend G. on the phone. the built-in alarm of M.’s computer did not ring on time. So M. suddenly stops the thread of the speech on the phone with his friend G. and comments on this fact aloud in dialect. The switch has the effect of marking the marginality of the commentary in relation to the main content. The immediately following repetition in SI serves as emphasis (double function in one segment). In the last line, M. goes back to his discourse about a laser printer.

‘The Arabic language has existed since before the Noble Quran and the Arabic language…’

‘The Arabic language has existed since before the Noble Quran and the Arabic language…’

2. ma  ʔaːtstæːz ʔəstæːz ʔəstæːz ʔəstæːz
   NEG you interrupt- VOC professor to-1SG
   1SG
‘don’t interrupt me, sir, I’ve been silent for an hour!’

3. žaːʔa l-Qurʔaːn bi-haːðihi l-.luḡa
   it came ART-Quran with-DEM.F ART-language
fi ḥæːlat-in mina t-taṭawwor
   in state-ABL from ART-development

‘The Quran came in this language in a state of development’
(Hamam 2011:57-58)

In this example (HAM3), CS has divided the SA period into two interpolated by a colloquial statement which represents a sort of ‘interruption’ of the main stream. The role of code interpolation is, in fact, interrupting the linguistic main flow to attract attention onto an issue out of context: ‘do not stop me because I have been silent for an hour!’

The first line and the second line of the phrase can be reunited, thus highlighting the ‘intrusion’ occurred in another code:

wa-l-.luḡa l-ʕarabiyya mawżu:da qabl il-Qurʔaːn
   interruption
žaːʔa l-Qurʔaːn bi-haːðihi l-.luḡa fi ḥæːlatin mina t-taṭawwor

5.1.3. theory (metaphorical text) vs. practical application (metaphorical comment)

HAM4
1. ʔal-luḡa fi taṭawwuri-ha: yaḥṣal maʕa-ha:
   art-language in developpement-3SG.F it happens with-3SG.F
   ?amraːn / tuṣbiḥ ?axṣar /
   thing.DU / she becomes shorter /

   ‘Two things happen to a language as it develops: it becomes shorter,’

2. ʔaʔall kammiyye / wa-tuṣbiḥ ʔaqall qawaːsed  )
   less quantity / CONG-she becomes less rules  )

   ‘- it gets smaller - and grammar lessens.’

3. hallaʔ ?iza žıt la-ṭæːxod luḡa ,/,
   now if you came to-you take language ,/,
   ?ana ?eza bidd-i ʕallem bo-ʔ-ẓaː:mʕa dars
   I if want-1SG I teach in-ART-university lesson
‘Now, if you take a language... if you want to teach a course\textsuperscript{148} at university’

4. \begin{align*}
& b\text{-}yæ:xod \quad ma\text{-}i \quad sett\' \quad sni:n \quad be\text{-}l\text{-}f\text{arabe} \quad w\text{-}b\text{-}yæ:xod \\
& \text{MOD.PART\text{-}it} \quad \text{with\text{-}1SG} \quad \text{six} \quad \text{years} \quad \text{in\text{-}ART\text{-}Arabic} \quad \text{CONG\text{-}MOD.PART\text{-}it} \\
& \text{takes} \quad \text{takes} \\
& ma\text{-}i \quad seni \quad ?aw \quad sentäy(n) \\
& \text{with\text{-}1SG} \quad \text{year} \quad \text{or} \quad \text{year.DU} \\
\end{align*}

‘it will take you six years with Arabic (F) and one or two’

5. \begin{align*}
& be\text{-}l\text{-}lbna\text{:ne} \quad hu: \quad zä:t-o \quad ) \quad ma \\
& \text{in\text{-}ART\text{-}Lebanese language} \quad 3SG.M \quad \text{self\text{-}3SG.M} \quad ) \quad \text{NEG} \\
& b\text{-}zi:d \quad w\text{-}ma \quad b\text{-}narreṣ \quad kalaœ:m \\
& \text{MOD.PART\text{-}it increases} \quad \text{CONG\text{-}NEG} \quad \text{MOD.PART\text{-}it decreases} \quad \text{speech} \\
\end{align*}

‘with Lebanese and it is the same course. I won’t add or remove anything!’

(Hamam 2011:60-61)

The first part is the exposition of a personal theory (text) while the second part is the concretization of that theory.

The ‘text’ opens, in SA:

\begin{align*}
\text{ʔal\text{-}luğa fi taṭawwuriha: yahṣal maʕaha: ?amræ:n / tusbiḥ ?axṣar / wa\text{-}tusbiḥ ?aqall qawa:sed} \\
\end{align*}

\text{ʔarlıl kammīyye ‘in less quantity,’ here, is a semantic equivalence repetition, a ‘translation’ of ?axṣar. The speaker seems to feel the need to clarify or emphasize ‘in other words’}.

After the text in SA (1-2), the ‘exegesis’ is in NA. This time, this part of the speech conveys a ‘practical aspect’ of the text which has been formulated before. That is that it presents in a concrete way the rule expressed before: ‘the language gets shorter... there I explained how, in practice,’ ‘in plain Arabic this means that...’.

Gumperz also finds this function when commenting on a black American preacher. He writes that «to the question of what the minister was trying to achieve by talking that way, the answer was that he was personalizing his message to increase audience to come to Church, rather than simply suggesting they come, and in the second case his switched remarks had the quality of confidential ‘down\text{-}to\text{-}earth’ talk» (Gumperz 1982:195; emphasis mine)

\text{\textsuperscript{148} Lit. ‘lesson’}.
5.1.4. detachment vs. involvement

BOU8

wa:š yiqullu ʕumar bnu l-xaṭṭa:b? asmaʕ ya / (AA)

What did ‘Umar Ibn al-Khattab say to him? Listen

ya ʔaba l-ḥasan ʔağlis ʔila xaṣmika l-yahu:di / (SA)

Abu al-Ḥasan, sit next to your Jewish adversary /

ʔağlis maʕa:h kifki:f (AA)
sit with him at the same level

(Boucherit 2002:245)

The passage is in AA. SA gives the objective ‘text’ that is then personalized, to involve the listeners.

BAS3

1 Θα:niyan / ʔiṣla:ḥu l-xalali fi l-miza:ni t-tuga:ri / Σαν ','=',$qi ziya:dati (SA)
   Secondly, redressing the deficit in the trade balance, by increasing
   exports and controlling imports. This is because the issue of the Egyptian exports
   qaḍiyyatun maši:riyya / yağib ʔan tašḡala ʔihtim:ami kullu l-fi:ʔa:t /
   is a crucial issue that has to occupy the minds of everyone
   allati tataḥammalu ga:niban min ʕibʔ / wa-mašu:liyyati l-ʔinta:gi fi maṣr /
   who is is involved in Egyptian production. This issue should also occupy the mind
   wa kullu l-muʔassasa:ti / allati taṣmalu min agli sala:mati l-ʔiqtiṣa:di l-maṣri /
   of all establishments that work for the security of the Egyptian economy
   [...] 

2 da ʔana marra ʔana kunt / fi šarm iš-ši:x / ʕarfi:n i-ṭayyara:t (EA)
I was in Sharm El Sheikh the other day. Do you know these kites
illi kunna b-nilṣmilha fi l-fallaḥi:n di / il-waraz di / wi-nil.za:ha bi-bu:š
we used to make in the countryside? the ones made from papers, the ones we used to fix with reed
wi-kuryit duba:ra wi-nṭayyarha / gaybinha mi l-barazi:l /
and a piece of string and then we would let them fly? They import these kites from Brazil!
/ ṭabʕan da mablaġ ha:yif / bi-ʔul-lak
Of course this is a trivial amount of money. Then someone comes and tells you
wi-da mablaġ? / ʔana ba-ḍrab masal /
“is this an amount worth bothering about?” But I am just giving and example.
Bassiouney comments this excerpt of one of the discourses of the former Egyptian president Ḥusnī Mubārak twice: when talking about the role the speaker wants to play vis-à-vis the audience and when discussing detachment and involvement. In the first case, she says that CS signals the passage from the role of ‘governor – governed’ to that of ‘good old friend’ or ‘fellow Egyptian’ (see also §1.8.3.). In the second case (involvement) she comments the CS by saying that «Mubarak decides to tell a story to explain a fact, which increases the level of involvement of the audience. The story is very appealing to the audience because it involves allusions to shared childhood memories» (2006:212; her emphasis).

---

SAE5

1 ʔamma fi: bila:di l-muslimi:n / fa-ʔinna l-muslimi:n / (SA)

   as for in countries the-Muslims CONJ-INTENS the-Muslims

   In Muslim countries, instead, Muslims


   not they venture in the-entering war with God

   do not venture to launch a war against God

3 la: la: la: la: ma-ba-duxul ʔahaft rib alla:h / (YA)

   no no no no no-MOD-I enter I fight God

   No, no, no, no, no – I will not fight God

4 yuʕarриʔu:na ʔima:nahum li-ʔdaya:ʕ [...] (SA)

   they jeopardize their faith to-loss

   They jeopardize their faith to be lost.

(Saeed 1997:125)

Saeed comments this example by saying that, in order to emphasize this point further, the Muslim Yemeni scholar, al-Zandani, repeats the message by assuming «the voice of an ordinary Muslim individual, who prefers to remain poor rather than deal with usury, uttering the words that such a Muslim might say when asked to join in usurious dealing» (1997:126). This takes place in YA. In doing this, the speaker shows involvement and brings himself closer to his audience. It appeals to the audience’s emotions to amplify
the point and make himself more convincing. NA is used «as a marker of the less sophisticated, weak or innocently naive» (Saeed 1997:127).

5.1.5. contrastive elaboration

Contrastive elaboration serves to distinguish what should be done from what is the actual reality.

BOU9

 Sindama: taqdub / qul l-ḥaqq / (SA)

*When you get angry / say the truth*


*when man gets angry (from another) he wipes out (from memory) all his good deeds and he only stresses his bad deeds*

(Boucherit 2002:238)

CS can be elicited in rhetorical questions that concern contrastive elaboration.

BOU10

[a] l-ṣadlu huwa ṣasa:su l-ḥaya:t / bihi qa:mat is-samawa:tu w-l-ʔaṛq // (SA)

*Justice is the base of life. Through it skies and earth were founded*

wi:n l-ṣadl ḥna bi-l-mutaxa:ṣim? / il-ʔinṣa:f ma-ʔandna:-š (AA)

*where is justice? We argue. We don’t have justice.*

(Boucherit 2002:237)

In this example the switch is SA → AA although it could be the reverse too. Here I suppose that it is a real-life question (‘Justice is theoretically the base but where is it in our lives?’).

BOU11


*If you and a person diverge over a jurisprudential matter, he says “By God so-and-so has said the right thing in a lot of questions but he was wrong in so-and-so”.*

---

149 I consider this a tag borrowing. Boucherit also considers line 2 as AA.

---

242
As for us, we say: “Oh no, this man does not understand anything, he knows perfectly nothing” (Boucherit 2002:242)

Here too, it is evident that here it is the contrary: SA marks what it is not correct and AA what is the correct evaluation.

HAM5

1. Yaʕni ha:ydi radd ʕala Sala
   I mean DEM.M response to
   ‘I mean, this is a response to’

2. ʔınn7o fi7:ʕıšri:n alf ləġġa bayn il-bila:d il-ʕarabiyya
   COMP-3SG in-3SG.M twenty thousand language between ART-countries ART-Arab
   ‘the fact that there are twenty thousand languages in the Arab countries.’

3. ši(:) ṭabi:ʕi il-ʔontuxa:b it-ʕašri:n alf ləġġa bayn il-bila:d il-ʕarabiyya
   thing natural ART-election ART-natural MOD.PART-it lets one
   ‘It’s a natural fact...the natural election lets one...’

4. ʔal- luğa la tatağa:yyar bi-qa:r min muʔassasa wa-law
   ART NEG she changes with-decision from institution and-if language
   ‘Language does not change by decree even if’

5. kæ:nat il-muʔassasa dikta:to:riyya / la yastaṭi:ʕ ayy zaʕi:m
   she was ART-institution dictatorial / NEG he can any leader
   ‘it were a dictatorial institution to issue it. No leader of any state of the region [Middle East] can’

6. il-yāw(m) fi duwal il-manṭeqa ʔan
   ART-day in states ART-region that(DECL)
   yaquːl sa-ʔugayyere il- luğa
   he says FUT-I change ART-language
   ‘say, today: I will change language.’

7. ʔal- luغا tataغا:yyar ʕıbr il-ḥayat:
   ART-language changes through ART-life
   ‘Language changes through life.’
   (Hamam 2011:61-62)
In the latter example (HAM5) the NA part, which represents the comment to the quote, opens up. After this short analytical part in NA, the speaker switches to SA and offers a ‘maxim,’ the synthesis of what he has said so far: ʔal-luga la tatagayyar bi-qara:r min mu?assasa ‘language does not change by decree of an institution’. The expression sounds like a slogan. Another maxim that has just been expressed has got a gloss that goes on in SA (4-5). Then again, a new maxim: la yastaṭi:ʕ ʔayy saʔi:m il-yaw(m) fi duwal il-manteqa ʔan yaqu:l saʔuġayyer il-luʔa ‘No leader of any state of the region [Middle East] can say “I will change language”’. After saying what language is not, RR explicits what language is. The used code remains SA which expresses a further maxim: ʔal-luga tatagayyar ʕıbr il-haya:t ‘Language change through life’. To paraphrase Holes’ words about ‘Abd al-Nāṣir’s speeches, we face a maxim that count for all times, a dogmatic explicitation that might be also an excerpt from a book of linguistics. It is SA to be felt as a tool to convey this synthesis.

5.1.6. analysis vs. synthesis

HAM6

1. ḋamma ʔənt bəʔ-ṭaḥṭel  bək  ṭostaʔmel
   when 2SG.M MOD.PART-you stop COMP.2SG.M you use
   /w-bəʔ-ṭaḥṭel  ṭəṭal hamm  ki:f
   rules / CONG-MOD.PART-you stop you bear concern how
   ‘When you stop using rules, you stop getting concerned’

2.  bək  tfakker ʔiʔza  be-ṭu:l  ḋamma ʔaw  ʔaʔa  ṭaʔa
   COMP.2SG. you think if MOD.PART-you  ḋamma  CONG  ʔaʔa
   /  kasra  CONG  feminine  CONG  masculine /
   ‘with using ‘u’, ‘a’ or ‘i’150, male or female,’

3. saʔaʕat-a fi:-k  ṭəbdeʕ
   hour-3SG.F in-2SG.M(=you can) you are creative
   ‘by then you will be able to be creative.’

4. ʔiʔzan  la: ʔaʔaʕeʕ bi-ʔuʔa
   then NEG creativity in-language
   lam taʔod  maʔkiyyi
   NEG returns(=not anymore) spoken

150 Ḍamma, fatha and kasra.
‘So no creativity with a language which is no more spoken.’
(Hamam 2011:62)

This example represents the opposite of the function written text vs. oral comment (§5.1.2.). There, analysis follows the maxim or the general statement. Here, as in the example quoted by Badawi (§1.8.1.1.), synthesis follows analysis. The final statement expresses the natural result of the discourse, it condenses it into a single period which is expressed in SA, after an NA elocution.

5.1.7. fixation of rules

CS to SA can have the function of fixing rules, especially negative rules.

TAI1
ḥadd kaːmǝl maː yaʕrav maʕnæ l-qaʔr:ǝn (MA)
The one who does not know the meaning of the Quʔān
la: yusammaː ʕaːliman (SA)
cannot be named ʕālim
(Taine-Cheikh 2002:195)

5.1.9. (story) frame vs. (story) climax

Telling stories, in general, represents, in bilingual contexts, an important occasion in which CS is involved and, in particular, its ability to create a linguistic contrast. Alfonzetti writes that «the contrastive function of code-switching may also be exploited to enact other changes in footing that occur during story-telling: for example to underline the climax of a story, to set off the setting from the events, to report the utterances of the characters in the story, to frame comments, to differentiate narrative from evaluative talk» (1998:195; italics are mine).

The next example is taken from Alfonzetti (1998:195-196)

1 Na volta, di carnevale, avevo diciotto anni, non è cara era vecchia, e m’aveva comprato, mia mamma me l’aveva regalato, un vestito. Era bellissimo, però era molto scollato di dietro, davanti no […] (SI)
Once, it was Carnival, I was 18, you can’t say I was old, and I had bought myself, my mother had given it to me as a present, a dress. It was wonderful, but it was very low cut at the back, not at the front. […]
Pecciò iù rissi ‘non mi nni mettu’ picchì si vireva dda striscia di reggipettu. Rissi ‘Non mi nni mettu’. Rissi ‘non ci rugnu a ssèntiri nenti’. N nni emu a bballari. Tannu èrumu, unni èrumu? à Pedara. **Insomma, era un bel locale.** Tutti, me cugnati, amici, cosi. Lei cci criri? mentri ca èrumu ddà, ficimu u primu bballu…u secunnu...si nn’accuggiu!

So I said to myself ‘I’m not wearing a bra’ because you could see a strip of the bra. I said ‘I’m not wearing one’. I said ‘I won’t let him know’. We went dancing. That time we were, where were we? At Pedara. Anyway, it was a nice night-club. Everybody, my sisters and brothers-in law, my friends, everyone. Would you believe it? While we were there, we had one dance...then another...then he noticed!

Alfonzetti comments this example by saying that the story is introduced by a conventional temporal locating device, followed by some information on the setting, in SI. Then the speaker switches into dialect to give an evaluative comment on her age at the time of the events being told. In doing this she differentiates objective information (avevo diciotto anni ‘I was 18’) and personal evaluation (non è ca rici era vecchia ‘you can’t say I was old’). Later on in the story, there is a second comment - in which the speaker positively evaluates the night-club where they had decided to go dancing (Insomma, era un bel locale ‘Anyway, it was a nice night-club’), this time in SI. In Alfonzetti’s corpus, in fact, the direction in CS is seldom meaningful. What is important is creating a contrast. She says: «This is a pattern which regularly occurs in almost all the stories in the data» (Alfonzetti 1998:196). Here SI frames the story while CD marks the climax.

HAM7

1. yaʕni | ?ana | lada-yya | ?am01la | / | bass
   I mean | 1SG | at-1SG | examples | / | CONG
   budd-i | ?qul-l-ak | šagle | / | yaʕni | fi-:
   want-1SG | I say-a-2SG.M | thing | / | I mean | in-3SG.M
   ‘I mean, I’ve got some examples, but I want to tell you one thing. I mean,’

2. karikate:r | šāft-o | qabāl | fatra | ?am
   cartoon | I saw-3SG.M | before | period | DUR
   b-qu:l | yaʕni | wa:hed | ža:yeb | ?o:bn-o
   MOD.PART-it says | I mea | one | bearer | son-3SG.M
   some time ago, I saw a cartoon which tells about a person who took his son

3. šala | madrase | / | ?ata: | bi-bni-hi
   to | school | / | he came | with-son-3SG.M
This example shows how CS is used to tell a story, in particular, a joke. It is known that few Arabs would dare tell jokes in SA because it is likely that they would become themselves a standing joke. If a well-known anchor-man as Fayṣal al-Qāsim (the speaker here) feels somehow ‘allowed’ to tell a story in SA, however he does not evade the rhetorical mechanisms described above.

In this example, there are three initial switchings that are not of a rhetorical nature. Fayṣal al-Qāsim begins in SA with an expression that can be considered as ‘fixed,’ which is present in his own vocabulary of anchor-man (see Khalil 2000). Pressed by describing a cartoon, Fayṣal al-Qāsim switches to NA and he then feels the used code to be ‘incorrect,’ ‘inappropriate’. It is the common function of ‘self-correction’. For this reason, he sharply re-switches to SA, translating an NA segment in SA with a clear SA expression, ʔataː biʔa, clearly perceivable as SA compared to the previous verbal form, ʔaːyeb, clearly perceived as NA. Then he begins telling his joke. The whole joke is in SA except for the final quip, the climax of the story, which is said in A using a typical syntactic construction of NA. After the narrative ‘tension’ that is perceivable in SA, we have the final ‘relaxing fall,’ in NA, which heralds fluent laughs. Or, more simply, the quip would not have made people laugh in SA as much as it does in NA. It would have seemed ‘artificial,’ almost like a political slogan or a religious prohibition: wa-lākin ʔiyyāka ʔan tuʕallimahu l-ʕarabīyya.
5.2. Argumentative Elaboration in the Corpus

We have seen in §5.1. in details what the conversational locus of the argumentative elaboration is about and what are its functions, namely elaborating, specifying, defining, explaining, exemplifying, focusing, de-focusing, synthesizing, analysing, differentiating rhetorical material.

In homily a threefold process of argumentative formation takes place that, far from being clearly separate, intersects all the time:

1. **Immediacy** (basically quoting from sacred texts or theological truths);
2. **Reflection** (basically explanation of the theological truth);
3. **Praxis** (basically application of theological truth in real life) (see Buttrick 1987:319-445)

It is like a visitor to a museum that 1. stands before a painting to get a first impression; 2. he then sits or moves away a little to better think about the painting or about the impression that the painting has made on him, 3. the visitor leaves the gallery with visual and emotional impressions and sees the world differently. In homily this process corresponds to: 1. immediate formation of an understanding; 2. reflection on the understanding; 3. looking at the world from the perspective of understanding.

5.2.1. Sublocus: Text (Quotation) vs. Oral Comment

This is a mechanism of differentiating rhetorically divergent parts of the text typical of the religious discourse as shown in §5.1.2: sacred texts are quoted in SA and successively commented in EA, when the SA text ends. This is not always the case for MM since he also quotes some verses of the Gospel, at least partially, in EA (see above). Normally the direction of CS is meaningful: text is in SA while comment is in EA. This is explained by Boucherit in these terms: «Il semble que le passage du classique au dialectal a plutôt une fonction de signal: inique aux interlocuteurs que le locuteur délaisse l’instance de la constatation atemporelle – dans laquelle la plupart des énoncés se manifestent – pour instaurer une relation plus personelle avec eux. De manière plus ou moins consciente, l’orateur signifie ainsi qu’il quitte le domaine de l’ “éternel”, pour aborder celui du “temporel”» (2002:148).
1. maggid ibnak li-yumàggidak ibnak Ḩayṭan | / Ḥayṭan Ḩayṭan
Glorify Your Son, that Your Son also may glorify You, as You have given Him
sulṭa:nan Ḩala kulli gasad li-yuṣṭi ḥayta:tan abadiyya
authority over all flesh, that He should give eternal life
li-kulli man Ḥayṭan | / Ḥayṭan Ḥayṭan Ḥayṭan to as many as You have given Him. And this is eternal life, that they may know
?anta l-Ḥila:ṭ il-Ḥay:ṭa:ṭ iyya / waḥdūk wa-yasūf il-masīḥ illa:ṭi Ḥarsaltu(h) | You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent.
[...] Ḥamma Ḥana fa-Ṣarīfak wa-ha?ula:ṭi Ṣarīf ak annaka Ḥanta Ḥarsaltani / but I have known You; and these have known that You sent Me.
wa-Ṣarrāftahum Ṣimak wa-sa-uu?arrīfhum li-yaku:na fi:hum Ḥal-Ḥubb
And I have declared to them Your name, and will declare it, that the love
?alla:ṭi Ḥabhābtani bi:(h) wa-ʔaku:n Ḥana fi:hum» | //
with which You loved Me may be in them, and I in them.

It is true that, in the whole chapter, only in the last verse love has been clearly mentioned;
wala:kin il-kala:m kullu Ḥa:ṭa:ṭa:ṭa:ṭ
nevertheless, all the words diffuse the fragrance of
bi-l-Ḥubb ir-raqi:q | [...] tender love.

(MM50 – 1’4. → 2’2. [...] 5’1. → 5’4. [...])

MM reads the entire chapter of Jn 17 in SA and then he switches at once into EA to
comment it. Written text is contrasted with MM’s commentary to it. This is a typical
example of what happens in mosques and churches where sacred texts are read or quoted
by heart in SA and then commented in NA.

EXC48

1. Ḥan tuḥibb ir-rabb Ḥila:ḥak min kulli qalbika w-min kulli nafsika
To love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul,
w-min kulli fikrika w-min kulli quadrika Ḥarba:sa qalb
with all your mind, and with all your strength. Four: heart,
w-nafs w-fikr w-qudra | //
soul, mind, strength.

*This I call the “divine love,” the inner, invisible one.*

(MM50 – 23’2. → 23’1.)

The same happens in this example. The verse here (Mk 12:30) is quoted by heart in SA and then starts the gloss in EA. It is indicative that the EA gloss starts with the DEM *dah*. Data confirm that a great number of CS SA → EA begins with DEM or fa- or yaʕni that seem to be strong discourse markers, i.e. elements that reveal speakers’ intentions, attitudes and plans for the text organization relative to elements of discourse and connect different parts of the discourse: «these are morphemes which signal cataphoric or anaphoric coherency relations, and which, given their peripheral position, potentially signal discourse boundaries» (Owens & Rockwood 2008:97). In particular Owens & Rockwood see three main elaborative functions for yaʕni: (1) it delivers more specific information than what was said; (2) it generalizes from what was said, or (3) introduces information of the same status, as for instance in a paraphrase (2008:92). In this case, *dah* serves to introduce a CS that generalizes the quote.

**EXC49**

1. **fa::īlamma bīɂu:l lana θiqa min ad-duxu:l ila lʔaqda:s**

*So when I say having boldness to enter ila lʔaqda:*s

bi-damm yasu:ʕ ṭari:qan ḥayyan ehm ḥadi:θan karrasahu lana

*by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he consecrated for us*

bi-l-ḥiga:b ʔay bi-ġàsadihi

**through the veil, that is, his flesh.**


*Ehm, this is the path of love, the path of love founded by Christ*

bi-l-gasad il-maksu:r w-id-damm il-masfu:k

*with his broken body and his shed blood.*

(MM50 – 49’6. → 50’1.)

Here again MM quotes by heart from Heb 10:19-20.
Therefore, brethren, having boldness to enter the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, 20 by a new and living way which He consecrated for us, through the veil, that is, His flesh.

In line 2 MM briefly comments in EA the expression ṭari:qan ḥayyan ehm ḥadi:θan. He refers to the ‘text’ and says that ‘this (the one quoted part) is the way of love, i.e. the one of which Saint Paul speaks here’. See §1.8.2.1.

EXC50
   *Blessed are the luminous-eyed people because their whole bodies are pure.*

2. le?: ia:bi:si:n ir-ru:ḥ il-qudu:s | // gasadak kullu yaku:n / nayyir /
   *Why? They are clothed with the Holy Spirit. Your whole body is full of light.*

   le?: ia:bi:si in-ru:ḥ miš kala:m min ʕandi / il-ʔaba?: ma-gabu:-š ḥa:ga
   *Why? You are clothed with light. This is not my saying, nor the Fathers made it up.*

   da l-ʔingi:l epnevmatufo:rus [πνευµατοφόρος] |
   *This is the Gospel: πνευµατοφόρος [bearer of the Spirit]*

(MM50 – 62’3. → 66’6.)

Here MM elaborates a quotation from Lk 11:34

> سِراَجُ الْحَسَدِ هُوَ الْعَيْنُ فَمَاتَ كَانَ عَيْنَكَ بِسَبِيلَة فِسَدَة كَلِهُ يَكُونُ نُبِيرًا

The lamp of the body is the eye. Therefore, when your eye is good, your whole body also is full of light.

He starts with a personal re-elaboration of the quote itself in SA, which sound like a ‘beatitude’ (on the model of Mt 5). Then he only switches to EA to ask ‘why’ and then he proposes a further definition in SA, again a partial quotation of the verse in SA and again the second le:? triggers a comment which is somehow a further repetition of the concept.

EXC51
1. la tuʕarrif šima:lak ma taṣnaʕ yami:nak | //
   *Do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing.*

2. ma hu miš mumkin nixabbi | šu:f il-ibda:ʃ šu:f il-ɪʃga:z
   *The fact is that we cannot hide it. See the ingenuity and the extraordinariness*

   fi t-taʃbi:r | / ?ana ʔultilku fi l-ʔawwal hal mumkin wa:ḥid yixdar yixabbi
   *in these words. I asked you at the beginning: can anyone hide*

   fiʃʃ il-maḥabba ṭilli bi-ʔismilu l-qari:bu? ṭabb il-ʔaax fawzi taʃba:n
   *the act of love that he offers to his neighbour? Take, for example, brother Fawzy. He is ill,*
w-ana run to my cell to bring him some medicine, then I go to his cell to ask about his health
and I give him the medicine. Who is he who won’t notice that? The whole monastery
will watch me doing that in eager expectation. “Did you see abūnā? He came out of his cell
by night, went running to So-and-so’s cell and brought him medicine, he is…
yo li-maḥabbā ya: sala:m! ṭabb ma na ḍiʿt ana [xxxxxxxxxxx] /
What a love! Oh my goodness!” But I risk to get lost in this way.
ṭabb ʿeh il-ṣamal? ʿe: ʿayt iḍīḍamā:n bara / ṭinn il-ḥīl / il-ḥīla:hi
So, what do we have to do, what is the verse that ensures me that this divine act,
this divine act of love, will not sneak away from me, fall through and get lost?
bi-yīzu:l ʿe:?
It says:

3. la tuʿarrif šima:lak ma taṣnaš yami:nak [rises a laugh] |
Do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing. [rises a laugh]

4. ʿana ʿana lli ba-ṣmil bass la:zim ʿaxabbī ʿan nafsi miš ha-ṣabbī ʿan in-na:s
The one who works is me but I have to hide this from myself. I cannot hide it from people
because I cannot hide it from people. [For instance] father Pishoi needs something
so father Macarius runs to him with open heart, he goes
li-ʿabu:na bšo:y yiʔul-lu ẓalabata:k w-ṣigri gary ta:ni
to father Pishoy, he asks him “What can I bring you?” Then he runs
again and he brings him [what he asked], then he breaks into a run again. Oh my!
?e: il-ḥubb da?
What is this love?
(MM50 – 30’5. → 31’9.)

The quotation from Mt 6:3, in line 1 and 3., has already been discussed (EXC40,
§2.4.3). Here what seems clear is that MM starts from the quote in SA and then elaborates
it with brief glosses (mahu miš mumkin nixabbi | šu:f il-ibda:š šu:f il-taʃbîr ; ʿana
There is therefore now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus.

Why? Because we are in Christ, *ἐν Χριστῷ*. As long as we are in Christ Jesus, it is impossible that there is any condemnation. Why? Because sin has sticked to him for a single sin, this is the judicial law.

Quotation from Rom 8:1 is followed by a CS into EA to explain the verse.

The chant goes:

“How beautiful is that hour that I spend alone with the one I love”

while people are asleep, and the cry and the moan come out from deep of the heart

Is our state acceptable to anybody? Frankly speaking, are the angels in the sky happy with the Church’s state and that of our hearts?

After quoting the chant in SA, MM comments it in EA.

5.2.2. SUBLOCUS: TEXT (QUOTATION) VS. PARENTHETICAL COMMENT
Comments to a SA quote (especially, if it is an oralized written text) are also inserted during the reading of the written text, in EA, marking, again, a contrast between what is 'text' and what are 'parenthetical asides' to the text. One opens a brief parenthesis to the core text to go back again to this latter.

EXC54

1. ḥal-maḥabba la: taḥṣid / ḥal-maḥabba la: tatafafa:xar wa-la tantafois /
   Love does not envy; love does not parade itself, is not puffed up;
la: taqbuḥ wa-la: taṭlub ma: li-nafsiha: / la: taḥtadd wa-la: taḏunn as-su:?
   does not behave rudely, does not seek its own, is not provoked, thinks no evil;
la: tafrāḥ bi-l-ṭiṭom bal tafrāḥ bi-l-ḥaqq | / taḥtamil kull šay?
   does not rejoice in iniquity, but rejoices in the truth; bears all things

2. bass itītargama iṣīṣiḥa / stegi: [στέγια] yaʃni bi-l-yuna(:)ni tḡaṭṭi ᵁala l-Suyu:b
   but the correct translation of the word στέγια in Greek is “it covers faults
   or it passes over them in silence, or forgives, or gives excuses”
da min il-qamu:s il-kibi:r | //
From the big dictionary151.

3. taḥtamil kull šay? di ṭil-ʔaqṣaf fi t-tašbi:r wala:kin tḡaṭṭi ᵁala ᵁyu:b
   bears everything, this is the weakest translation. Rather, it covers faults.

   Apparently, Saint Macarius used to know this verse in this way.

5. tḡaṭṭi ᵁala ᵁyu:b il-ʔaxari:n fi şamt |
   [Loves] covers the others’ faults silently.

6. hiya katabha taḥtamil taḥtamil daʃi:fa / daʃi:fa fi l-mafhu:m /
   They have translated it “bears”. “Bears” is imprecise.

7. ʔinnama hiya tḡaṭṭi ᵁala l-Šuyu:b / ʔaw tusa:mih wa-tušṭi ᵁudr /
   In fact it means “it covers faults, forgives and gives excuses”
   fi l-mafhu:m il-ʔaxla:qi |
   according to the moral meaning.

(MM50 – 12’2. → 13’2.)

While quoting 1Cor 13:7 MM opens a parenthesis in line 2 to comment the Arabic translation of the Greek word στέγει that has been translated in the Van Dyck’s Arabic Bible as taḥtamil, a translation that he criticizes. It is worth noticing that while the parenthesis is opened by an EA discourse marker (bass) which marks the CS, MM reuses SA to give a redefinition or the correct Arabic retranslation of στέγει. In line 3 he resumes in SA the translation and his retranslation interpolating a further parenthetical commentary in EA. In line 4 he adds a further extratextual comment. Again, in line 5 he repeats what he has said in line 3 in a slightly more detailed way.

EXC55

1. taḥtamil kulla šayʔ…

   [Love] bears everything…

2. bass ?ana mzawwid kilma ʕalaša:n yiba:n ilʔa:ya | ḥa-ʔu:l il-kilma

   But I will add a word so that the verse will be clearer. I will add a word
   w-di miš mawgu:da kilmit min alla min alla min alla ha-zkurha kti:r |
   which is not there, “through God, through God, through God”, I will often say it:

3. taḥtamil kulla šayʔ / min alla / tuṣaddiq kulla šayʔ / min alla / min alla

   [Love] bears all things through God, believes all things through God,
   targu: kulla šayʔ / min alla / taṣbir ʕala kulli šayʔ / min alla
   hopes all things through God, endures all things through God


   Love is never separated from God. But whether there are prophecies,
   fa-sa-tabṭul / wa-lʔalsina tantahi: /

   they will fail; whether there are tongues, they will cease;
   wa-lʕilm yabṭul […]

   whether there is knowledge, it will vanish away […]

   (MM50 – 13’2. → 13’7. […]

   A new parenthetical meta-comment in EA (line 2) that anticipates and prepares a reproposition of 1Cor 13:7-8 in which MM adds the word min alla to clarify the verse (ʕalaša:n yiba:n ilʔa:ya, line 2)
EXC56


As the Apostle Paul says [laughs] who is Paul,


2. muš kida?

right?

(MM50 – 56’3. → 56’5.)

We have already discussed the quotation from 1Cor 3:5-7 in EXC14 §3.2.0. and its reiteration in EXC41 §4.2.3. In line 2 CS to EA (muš kida?) is not exactly a rhetorical switch but it rather signals what Valdes-Fallis calls a preformulation, that is a sort of automatic routinized formula (1978:16).

EXC57

1. Ɂana Ɂuri:kum ṭari:qan ṭafḍal | /// giddu li6l6mawa:hib il6ḥusna

And yet I show you a more excellent way. But earnestly desire the best gifts

2. xud zayy ma nta ʕa:wiz ṭigri zayy ma nta ʕa:w...

take as much as you like, run as much as you like


and yet I show you a more excellent way, the way of the divine love.

(MM50 – 59’5. → 59’7.)

The quotation from 1Cor 12:31-13:1-13 has been already seen in EXC2 in §3.2.0. Here MM interpolates a parenthetical personalization of the quote (a sort of elaboration in plain words) in EA that further specifies the first part of 1Cor 12:31 and creates a contrast that prepares the real important part he wants to highlight, that is the second part of the same verse: wala:kin Ɂuri:kum ṭari:qan ṭafḍal (which is, in fact, repeated twice, once in line 1 and once in line 3).
1. For this reason, Christ died and resurrected: to transform everything.

The earth and heaven, the earth on which man fell

after he had been in the bosom of God and he fell doomed to

a permanent alienation and even to death. Heaven which used to protect him

?alla:ti yuSabbar ٝانha dayman bi-n-nišma // ka:nat in-nišma l-ʔu:la

which is always expressed with the term ‘grace’, this first grace

maSa ʔa:dam / ٝحات:ٝ lahu / lakinnahu lam yaḥfaٝtha // li-ʔannaha

was with Adam and protected him but he lost it, because

it was given to him as a gift. Yet, by Christ’s resurrection

?اردان ٝبٝدا:im wa-s-sama:؟an gadi:da / ٝارٝل la yaskun fi:ha l-mawt | // 
a new earth and a new heaven have appeared, an earth which death will not inhabit

man ʔa:mana bì: // man ka:na ٝحاتٝyan wa-ʔa:mana bì:

Whoever believes in me... whoever lives and believes in me

fa-lan yamu:t ʔila l-ʔabad // wa-man ʔa:mana bì: / fa-sa-yahya | // 
shall never die. And he who believes in Me, he shall live.

2. If we put the second verse next to this one, the triadic meaning gets clear:

3. man ʔa:mana bì: sa-yahya wa-man ka:na ٝحاتٝyan wa-ʔa:mana bì: 

he who believes in Me, he shall live and whoever lives and believes in me

fa-lan yamu:t ʔila l-ʔabad | // 
shall never die

4. and the third verse

5. Because I live, you will live also.

6. This is the source:

7. because I live, you will live also.

hادیٝ ٝارٝ il-ʔinsa:n il-gadi:da [...]
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This is the new land of man [...] 
(MM136 – 1’6. → 3’5. [...])

MM starts with a quotation from Rev 21:1-4 and, without code-switching, states, with great solemnity, the main topic of the homily, i.e. the new creation in Christ (line 1). Other quotations in SA (Jn 11:26 and a pseudo-quotation from Jn 11:25, line 3; Jn 14:19, line 4 and 7) are interpolated by brief EA peripheral segments (line 2, 4, 6). In line 7 MM resumes the exposition of the main topic in SA.

EXC59

1. yaʕni da:sa l-mawt yaʕni man ?a:mana bi: bidayt ik-kala:m
   *I mean he trampled death, whoever believes in me the beginning of the verse*
   wa-ka:na ḥayyan fa-lan yamu:t ?ila l?-abad man ?a:mana bi:
   *and lives, shall never die. Whoever believes in me*
   wa-ka:na ḥayyan ehm? wa-law ma:t fa-sa-yahya wa-man ka:na ḥayyan
   *and lives, ehm? though he may die he shall live... and whoever lives*
   wa-ʔa:mana bi: fa-lan yamu:t ?ila l?-abad |
   *and believes in me shall never die.*

2. di laha šarḥ haʔaggilu liʔinn il-ʔayte:n dol hilwi:n ʔawi lu:hum šarḥ
   *These two verses, which are very beautiful, have an exegesis I will postpone*
   bass ʕa:wiz ʔataga:wazu lwazti |
   *because I just want to pass it over right now.*
   (MM136 - 28’7. → 29’2.)

The quotation from the paschal troparion\(^{152}\) and from Jn 11:25-26 in SA is followed by an exophoric add in EA.

5.2.3. SUBLOCUS: ABSTRACTION VS. CONCRETIZATION (EXAMPLES)

In preaching, one has to shape a concept if one wants it to remain graved in the collective consciousness of the audience. Buttrick writes that «ideas without depiction are apt to be abstract and, oddly enough, unconvincing. Therefore if we are going to speak of “sin”, we will have to find some way of picturing what it is we are talking about; we must turn to lived experience» (1987:32; italics are mine).

\(^{152}\) «Christ is risen from the dead, trampling down death by death, and on those in the tombs bestowing life».  
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These depictions, which may be of biblical inspiration or taken from everyday life, must interact so that the language of the sermon appears acceptable and understandable. They are mainly of two types: illustrations and examples. The main difference between them is that examples «emerge from common congregational consciousness» (Buttrick 1987:128), that is a ‘story’ essentially shared by the congregation, while illustrations «[are] brought to a congregation from beyond the sphere of shared experience» (Buttrick 1987:128), that it is a particular ‘story,’ usually part of the consciousness of the preacher. They have great importance in sermons because they support a statement. They are interwoven into content and provide an image grid for an entire sermon. Buttrick says that «they function similarly to the clusters of images in a poem, forming in consciousness along with a meaningful structure. Just as images in a poem may recur and, in doing so, conjoin meaning, so also will images and illustrations in a sermon» (1987:163).

EXC60

1. fa:::mawt il-masi:ḥ takmi:l li-t-tagassud takmi:l li-t-tagassud
   
   So Christ’s death is the perfecting of the incarnation, the perfecting of the incarnation
takmi:l li-xami:s il-Ṣahd likay yuṣṭi l-bašariyya l-gadi:da
   the perfecting of the Covenant Thursday that gives the new humanity
ma yaḍman xulù:daha wa-ma yaḍman ṣadam suqù:ṭaha wa-yuṣṭi:ha n-nišma
   what ensures its eternity, wards off its fall and gives it the grace
lla:ti bi-la nada:ma yuṣṭi:na nišma bi-la nada:ma
   which is not to be regretted. He gives us grace not to be regretted,

2. miš mumkin yaxudha ya:nī fi-ma yaqaʃ fi: tisʃa w-tisʃi:n fiya... fi l-miyya
   that is he cannot take it back. You know, almost 99%
min in-na:s yirul-lak da l-masi:ḥ zaʃla:n minni ya ṣamm ma-tigtannin-ʃ
   of people will tell you: “Christ is upset with me!”. Don’t get mad, man!
il-masi:ḥ miš mumkin yizʃal xala:ʃ baṭṭal zaʃl [giggles]
   Christ cannot get upset, he stopped doing it! [giggles]
(MM136 - 28’7. → 29’2.)

CS → EA signals a concretization of the theological truth expressed in SA in line 1.

Those who, ehm, set out on the way of divine love

wa-nkašafa lahum is-sirr / laysu: / taḥt in-na:mu:s baʕd |
and have been revealed this mystery, are no more under the Law.

2. kull illi tiʕmilu yibrå šaḥḥ ?in šalle:t bi-l-maza:mi:r šaḥḥ

Whatever you do is fine. If you pray with the psalms, it is ok,

ʔin šalle:t bi-l-miyya w-xamsi:n mazmu:r šaḥḥ ?in wizift ṭu:l il-le:l ṭala rigle:k šaḥḥ
if you pray all the 150 psalms, it is ok, if you stand all night long [praying], it is ok
ʔin fiðilt ṭu:l il-le:l tiðrab maṭa:niyya:t šaḥḥ le:? li-ʔinn ha-yibrå id-da:ff
if you keep making prostrations all night long is ok. Why? Because the motive then
ila:hi w-il-ḥubb muḥriq / ma-yifarraʔ-š il-maḥhabba ma... yaʔni ?awwil ma tidxul
will be divine, love is burning and it does not distinguish... I mean once you get involved with
fi l-ḥubb il-ʔila:hi miš mumkin ʔiṭla:qan tifarraʔ ma be:n il-maza:mi:r
the divine love, you will not be able to all to distinguish between psalms
wa-l-maṭa:niyya:t / yastahi:l / wa-la-tfarraʔ ma be:n / iṣ-ṣubḥ
and prostrations, it’s impossible! And you will not distinguish between morning
wa-ʔd-ḍuhr ?aw il-le:l wa-la tfarraʔ ma be:n iḍ-ḍal... iẓ-ẓalma w-in-nu:r
and noon or night, you won’t distinguish between darkness and light
wa-la-tiẓdar tfarraʔ ma be:n il-xabar iṭ-ṭayyib w-il-xabar il-wiḥiš /
you won’t be able to distinguish between good and bad news,
wa-la yumkin tfarraʔ ma be:n il-yo:m ?inta tzu:m fi: sali:m giddan w-ʕa:fi ṭawi
you will never distinguish between the day you wake up perfect healthy
w-il-yo:m ?illi tzu:m fi: ma-tiẓdar-š tzu:m min ṭala ḥe:lak min ṭala l-farsha |
and the day you feel sick and unable to get up from your bed.

As we have seen in EXC25 in §3.2.1. a monk ‘who loves much’ asked MM to tell him
a canon a prayer. MM replies to him that those who walk on the path of God’s love are
not anymore under the Law. After focusing on the theoretic statement in SA, he then
switches to EA to concretize the theory through illustrations. SA serves also to give a
detached truth while EA serves to concretely get involved and involve the audience into it
(see also Bassiouney 2006:210-221). See §3.2. for the use of ɂult ‘I said’.

-MM50 – 16’3. → 17’6-
1. This is the new land of man, a land which death, grief
   sorrow and groaning have abandoned. Whoever has resurrected with Christ
   and is able to look, according to the Apostle Paul’s invitation, above,
   where Christ is seated [Col 3:1], will not find any place for sadness
   nor any motive for pain or complaint.

2. Once, a monk – I was preaching in the desert of Rayyān -
   may God let him rest in peace. I was speaking about sin, the devil, grace
   and God’s power. Suddenly he became so irritated and said: “Father, fahter
   it is impossible that man sins, he cannot sin!
   Sin is over! With a very very strange feeling.
   The devil cannot overcome me, it is impossible
   [he said this] with an inner feeling that let him say things he could not understand
   the moment he felt Christ’s power and resurrection.

As in the previous excerpt, MM switches from SA to EA to concretize his theoretical statement through illustrations.
1. Whatever you do is fine. If you pray with the psalms, it is ok, if you pray all the 150 psalms, it is ok, if you stand all night long [praying], it is ok if you keep making prostrations all night long is ok. Why? Because the motive then will be divine, love is burning and it does not distinguish [...] 

2. If love takes dominion and possession over the heart, it transforms life into a new sky and a new earth.

Theorization, or the theological dogma (in SA), can follow illustration (in EA) as in this example.
1. idqala:m qad laffa l-kani:sa wa-laffa nu:fu:sana san nu:r šahḥ

Darkness has wrapped the Church and our souls up; light has become scarce

The Lord’s voice is not heard. The Church lives

sad days. Her bridegroom has hidden his face. No power and no spirit,

yet, we think we pray and that our church

is perfect.

2. saʔaltu ehm insa:n ?a:?iš f l-xa:rig ba-zul-lu ?izzay ha:l

I asked him... ehm, I once asked a man who lives abroad “how is

the church abroad?” He replied “Excellent. The church abroad is not, as you think,

weak, not at all. We are a very strong church.

da l-awla:d bi-yiru:ḫu l-kini:sa w-bi-yitnawlu / w-ulti-lu bi-yifsilu ?e:

Children go to church and take communion”. So I asked: “What do they do

in the church?”. He replied: “Father, they listen to the prayer”. I said: “Every day?”

And he said: “No, every Sunday”. So I asked: “Do they know Arabic well?”. And he said

“No, they don’t know Arabic well”. “So what do they listen to?”

He said: “They take communion”. Oh, this is what the verse says


I am rich, have become wealthy, and have need of nothing


The church is in a state of coma called “the coma of the wealthiness”

and does not need anything. Prayers and masses are held on time

wa:-fi:ha na:s kiti:ra bi-titmala w-tifḍa fa-laha
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there are a lot of people, it [the church] gets filled up and emptied, and it has
maẓhar ʔal-ḥara:ra wa-l-Siba:da |
the appearance of warmth and devotion.
(MM270 – 1’1. → 3’1.)

In this complex passage, MM code-switches from SA to EA to concretize the abstract paragraph in which he describes the present situation of the Church. He does this by evoking the story of his encounter with a believer who lives abroad. Then the quotation from Rev 3:17 let him code-switch again and this CS triggers the following paragraph in SA in which he pass again to the ‘abstract mode’ by expressing the final moral taken from the story. Notice the EA nonce borrowing in paragraph 4. wa-ẓadadi:s ‘and masses’ and the EA clause wa-fi:ha na:s kiti:ra bi-titimala w-tifda ‘it got filled up and emptied’.

EXC66

1. nifsi giddan giddan giddan ʔan yafraḥ ʔalla: bi-ʔawla:d
   My heart’s wish is that God would rejoice at sons
   yaşru:uxu:na ʔilayhi ʔil-lay ... ʔan-naha:r wa-l-layl | ʕiwaḏ gi:l /
   who cry out to him, night and day, instead of a whole generation
   qaḍa ʔayy:mu wa-sini:nu / fi ʔala: ʔa:mita la ʔusmaʕ /
   that has spent its days and years in a silent and inaudible prayer
   bal / la / la taxrug min al-qalb | / ʔala: / bi-ʔafate:n
   which, moreover, does not come out from the heart. A prayer with their lips
   li-taʔdiyat wa:gil /
   just to perform a duty.

2. ʃalle:t kam maẓmuːr? ʔarbaʕ w:siːbi:n maẓmuːr | xaši:š il-ḥamdulillah
   How many psalms have you prayed? Seventy four. Good, thanks God,
   ʔana ʔaddeːt il-waːgil bitaːফi | […………………] wa-la simif ʔalla:
   I performed my duty. Neither God heard,
   wa-la simif ʔaḥad wa-la na simif |
   nor anyone, nor even I myself did.
(MM270 – 16’1. → 16’6.)

The code-switched paragraph 2 (SA → EA) makes the listeners involved by offering a concrete fictitious example (a dialogue) that illustrates concretely the more abstract paragraph 1. (in SA). Notice the use of the CM nifsi giddan ... ʔan yafraḥ ʔalla: ‘I would
5.2.4. SUBLOCUS: ANALYSIS VS. SYNTHESIS

CS can separate material considered as elaborative analysis and what is considered as a synthesis which often represents the closing part of a rhetorical movement: the speaker returns to the initial idea, and confirms it in a few synthetical lines. Sometimes «the return may be accomplished by use of exactly the same sentence with which the move began» (Buttrick 1987:51). The purpose of closure is, in broad terms, to «frame a field of meaning in consciousness so as to be able to shift focus in a different direction» (Buttrick 1987:52).

EXC67

1. law itkallim ḥan il-maḥhabba / yibzə ba-tkallim ḥan / il-ḥayya: r-rahbaniyya  
   When I speak about love, I certainly speak about the monastic life,  
   ḥala ṭuːl min ġer kalaːm yaʃni daxalt ḥala ṭuːl fi l-ʃumq |  
   it goes without saying. It mean I am getting directly into the deepness of it [monastic life].  
   w-baʃdeːn law itkallimna ḥan il-ḥayya: r-rahbaniyya / min hina li-sana gaːya  
   Morevore, if we spoke about the monastic life, from now until next year,  
   w-maːzakarnaːːʃi l-maḥhabba fi s-sikka yibzə ma-tkallimnaːːʃ  
   without considering “love” in the discourse, then it would turn out as if we didn’t speak  
   ḥan / ḥeː? / ḥan ir-rahbana |  
   about monasticism at all.  

2. ṭar-rahbana ṭawwalan ḥubb w-ʔaːxmin ḥubb /// fa-ḥiya / mumàːrasat  
   Monasticism is simply and solely love. It is, in fact, the implementation  
   il-waʃiyya l-ṣuẓma ṭaw il-ʔuːla ///  
   of the greatest and most important commandment.  

(MM50 – 15’1. → 15’5.)

The definition of what finally monasticism really is is expressed through a switch into SA that follows a brief analysis, in EA, about the relationship between love and monasticism. The central point, the final definition, or maxim, is expressed in SA while the peripheral information in EA. Notice how MM uses, in line 1, linking EA items, that mark development of a story (yibzə ma-tkallimnaːːʃ ḥan / ḥeː? / ḥan ir-rahbana). These linking items are typically used when telling daily anecdotes to create suspense.
1. Your life with your God, your divine love, your relationship [with him] must be in secret.

Nobody has to behold it. Get into your room, shut the door what for? So that nobody sees you.

Now, what do you think about the one who shuts the door and then raises his voice so that people would hear him [praying]? Has this person really shut the door?

Or does he pray out aloud in order to show off when saying “Lord, Lord” [he is referring to Mt 7:22] as if he rang the bells? In short,

2. so the verse that ensures the inner divine love, in prayer, is “Pray in the secret place”.

Here the CS to SA signals the synthesis of the idea analysed before (namely, ‘if you want that your love to God be effective and real, keep it secret’).
li-ğa:yit il-mo:t li-ğa:yit il-qabr |
until death, until the grave

2. la tuʕarrif šima:lak ma šanaʕathu yami:nak |
do not let your left hand know what your right hand has done.
fa::6da Ɂil6fiʕl Ɂaw fiʕl il6ḥubb il6Ɂila:hi il6maṣnu:ʃ ʃalanan
So the act of divine love realized openly
we cannot hide from the others
wala:kin maṭlu:b ?an nuːxFi: ʃan ʔanfuːsa | /
but we are asked to hide it from ourselves.

3. šuftu baʔ il-mustawayeːn?
Have you seen now the two levels?

4. il-mustawa d-daːxili da la yuʕlan ʔiṭlaːqan la liʔiːnsaːn wa-la li-ð-daːt
What is at the inner level must not be revealed at all, neither to people nor to the self

5. w-baːɗeːn it-taːn il-mustawa t-taːn
Then the second level

6. la yuʕlan li-n-nafs bass wala:kin la budd ?an yuʕlan ?aːmaːm an-naːs kūllaha
must not be revealed to one’s self but it must be revealed, by all means, to all the people
yaru: ?aː samaːlakum ?aːʃ-șaːliḥa wa-yumaggidu ᵉbaːkum
that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father
ʔallaːdī fi s-samawat: / fa-Ɂ-ḥubb il-ʔiːlaːhi bi yumaːras ʃala mustawayeːn
which is in heaven. So, the divine love is performed on two levels:
mustawa d-ːaːxili wa-mustawa xàːrīgī | al-mustawa d-ːaːxili sirr /
the inner level and the outer level. The inner level is a secret
la yaʕrifahu ʔiːlaː llaː wa-l-mustawa l-xàːrīgī ḥubb wa-baːöl maːnʤuːr
known only to God while the outer level is visible love and sacrifice
w-maːʃruːf lada kull ?insaːn
known to everybody.

(MM50 – 34’2.  → 35’6.)

SA parts (line 2, 4 and 6) are used to synthesize the previous analytical part. Line 6, in particular, can be considered a sort of elaborative repetition of the same synthetical segment. It is probably for this reason that no CS is realized. Line 2 and 6 contain two quotations (line 2: Mt 6:3; line 6: Mt 5:16) which help resuming and giving authority to the synthesis.
The switch to +SA signals the synthetic closing segment of a more analytic movement, where analysis is also represented by a great deal of personalization: in line 1 MM mainly uses the 2nd person singular and paralinguistic features such as laughing in order to add vividness to the message.
with a praising purity and an unceasing glorifying sanctification

\[\text{̃in aːt kara o: [ېبۇزنى ئاھىپەپەوەي}^{153}\]

unceasingly

bi-غەر hiduː? tasbiḥat il-גەلابە wa-l-xalaːş

unceasingly, the praise of the victory and of the salvation,

taqḍiːs il-؟ism il-kariːm il-قادیːm ism ی-؟alaːluː

the sanctification of the precious and great name, the name of the Trinity

wa-؟ism il-؟اːب wa-l-؟ibn wa-r-ruː? il-قەدەs | / چː-؟اːل yakuːn il-ماسىː؟

the name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. In this way Christ

raʔiːs tasbiḥatna qaʔid xuːras il-مەشەliln wa-r-ruː? چː-؟ەدەs

is the leader of our praise and of the worshippers’ chorus and the Holy Spirit

huwa چاۋبۇنا ی-مەنىːر چالداːði yuniːr ۇيۈːنانا

is our radiant garment which enlights our eyes

wa-yاقۇد lisaːnana li-ت-تاسبىː؟ wa-ش-شەکر |

and leads our lips that we may praise and give thanks.

(MM50 – 66’7. → 68’1.)

The switch to SA in paragraph 2, to synthesize and close a movement, comes after a long illustration in EA about how the Holy Spirit can work in man’s heart.

EXC72

1. miš bi-نلبەs il-ماسىː؟ ئىːرا wa-la ئەنە bi-يەلاببەسەنا ئەشاːن nitzayyin biː

We do not put on Christ to pretend, nor does he clothe us so that we can be adorned with him.

laʔ li-؟ین bi-نيːمەل چامەل כ-يەلاببەسەک ێناچ bi-؟ینەک

No. It is because we do his works. He will clothe you himself because

bi-تیːمەل چامەل כ-یەتەکسەر biːک li-؟ینەک bi-تکمەل ريسەتەع |

you do his works, and he is proud of you because you complete his mission.

il-ماسىː(؟)م ئەمال چەنین؟ باس ما-يەکافەع-ش ئا l-؟ارەد ya bbahaːt

Christ operated for three years? But they are not enough for the earth, fathers.

w-تیلیس w-سەب-لینا kull il-میراːس w-زەلبو k-کیبیːر w-سەب-لینا il-فەژرا ik-کیتیːر |

He ascended and left us all the inheritance, his big heart and all the many poors.

w-سەب-لینا ێناچ fi kull faqیːر ئالەشان ما-نێستەکەع-ش |

And he left us himself in every poor so that we might not disdain anyone.

2. il-ماسىː؟ كاːن bi-یەرە fi kull ێنساːن mariːق كاːن bi-یەرە / ێناچ //

In every sick man, Christ saw himself

---

153 Liturgy of Saint Basil (used by the Coptic Church), introduction to the Synaxis.
he saw the work of his hands, he saw his image, even the image of the Father.
ʔin ga:za ha:za /

*If this is conceivable*  
3. miš ga:yiz da hu ga:yiz miyya l-miyya w-ʃaḥḥ miyya l-miyya conceivable? This is perfectly conceivable and perfectly correct,

4. ?in ʔistataːʕ ʕaqlak ʔan yugiːz ha:za ʔaw yataṣawwar ha:za | if your mind is able to conceive this or imagine it.

ka:na r-rabb yasuː il-masiːh yara fi kull mariːqin wa-ḍaːʃiːfin wa-maːʃuːl /  
The Lord Jesus Christ saw in every sick, weak and paralitic

ka:na yara fiːhi ʃuːrat xaːliqih | / ka:na yara miʃ ʃanʕa...

the image of his Creator. He was… doesn’t [the Bible say]

halumma naʃnaː il-ʔinsaːn ʃala ʃuːratna?  
“Let Us make man in Our image” [Gen 1:26]?

fa-kaːna yaliːdː liːl-masiːhː ʃuːl in-nahaːr yaguːl yaʃnaːʃ xayran |  
Christ used to take delight in going about doing good.

(MM50 – 99’8. → 100’3.)

We have already discussed the repetition in line 2, 3 and 4 in EXC44 in §4.2.3. Here it is evident again how SA segments in line 2 and 4 try to summarize the analytical part. For the use of *miʃ* in line 4 see the commentary to EXC17 in §3.2.0.

**EXC73**

1. kull waːḥid taʃbaːn min nafsu w-ʃaːwiz yifadːi nafsu  
*Everyone who suffers from himself and wants to empty himself*

ma-ʔuddamuː-ʃ ɡeːr ʃariː waːḥid maːluː-ʃ taːni huwa l-ḥubb huwa l-ḥubb huwa l-ḥubb  
*he has no other way than love alone.*

ʃala mustawaya...

*on its two levels*

2. ʃala mustawayayhi ?al-ʔawwal ?al-mustawa ʔad-daːxili bi-ʃ-ʃala:  
*on its two levels, the first, the inner level, through prayer*

bi-l-ʔinṭilaːq maʃa alla: bi-la qeːd bi-l-ḥubb il-ḥaqiːqi ʃ-ʃaːdiːq  
*through the unrestricted impulse towards God, through a true sincere love*

min kull il-qalb wa wa wa-bi-l-mustawa l-ʔaːxar bi-l-ʃamal  
*from all the heart, through the other level, through work*

bi-l-baːd bi-la qeːd bi-la šarṯ ɡeːr murtabiṭ bi-zamaːn wa-la bi-qaːma wa-la bi-ʃumr
through unrestricted, unconditioned, timeless, unframed, ageless sacrifice.

(MM50 – 103’5. → 103’9.)

The repetition in line 1 huwa l-hubb huwa l-hubb probably helps MM to pass from the analytic modality to the synthetic one by code-switching into SA to summarize the two plans of love, the inner and the outer.

EXC74

1. fa-l-insaːn maːxlʊːq li-yartafis laː bi-naʃsihi
   Man is thus created not only to elevate himself,
   faqat da bi-naʃsihi awwaːlan w-bi-d-ðaruːra // walaːkin bi-t-taːli w-bi-t-taːli
   he is called to elevate himself first and necessarily, but accordingly
   bi-d-ðaruːra ðaydan law ðirtafaʃ il-insaːn bi-naʃsu(h) bi-yartafis
   and inevitably, if man elevates himself, he elevates
   bi-l-xaliːqa kʊllaha / likay takuːn ʃala mustawa tamgiːd
   all the creation so that it can reach a level consonant with the glorification
   w-tasbiːh allaː ka-xaliːqaː ehm taʃhad / l-allaː // wa-ː ehm taʃkis
   and the praise of God as a creation, ehm, that bears witness to God
   ehm suːrat magd allaː
   and reflects the image of his glory.

2. yibza magd allaː faʃːaːl yaʃni ʃallaːh / ma-huwwaː-ʃi / ehm fiʃl / ʃaːmit
   So God’s glory is dynamic, I mean God is not a static action
   w-ʃatta lamma bi-nzuːl il-masiːh kalima / miʃ kalima ehm ʃaːmita yaʃni maʃduːda
   and even when we say that Christ is the Word, we do not mean a static word, a limited one
   / zayy il-kilma ʃilli bi-nantazha kida walaːkin di kalima faʃːaːla […]
   like the word that we normally utter. It is a dynamic word […]

3. fa-l-insaːn xuʃiq likay yakuːn suːra li-magd allaː il-ʃaʃfaːl […]
   Man has thus been created to be an image of the dynamic glory of God […]

(MM136 – 10’4. → 11’3. […] → 12’1.,2. […])

After the synthetic part in paragraph 1. (SA) MM explains what has to be meant for “God’s glory” in EA in paragraph 2. Paragraph 3. signals a new synthetic segment that summarizes the concept express. A more extensive analysis on this movement is given in §5.2.6.
1. The law of sin has no authority over man anymore.

Sin has authority over the body. We will leave it our bodies and we will say to it: “Satisfy your appetite, we will leave you this [body] behind in the dust” and depart without sin because when Christ will come to take us, he will come a part from sin. It is written that he will come “apart from sin” [Heb 9:28].

Of course what is meant here is that he will come without condemnation for sins da ga:y yaʃni yumaggid // he will come to glorify.

2. Christ’s death destroyed what remained of God’s curse and of the law of sin which is in my members [Rm 7:23] in order to ensure ehm daymu:mat Ɂaw msugrat / in-niʃma / msugrat il-xala:ʃ the permanence or the “certification” of Grace, the certification of the Salvation, the certification of the eternal life.

(MM136 – 31’9. → 32’7.)

CS → SA in paragraph 2. signals again a recapitulation of the previous movement (‘Christ’s death and resurrection freed humanity from sin and ensured it the continuity of God's grace’). Notice the EA nonce borrowing in the SA paragraph msugra ‘certification [of a letter]’ that MM used in 17’6. In this synthetic part, he is recalling the term he commented on and applied to Christ’s work (namely that what humanity obtained through Christ’s work is like a certified mail, it cannot get lost).
1. My soul, my beloved, fervently desires that God’s sons learn to cry out [to him].
How much more does he listen to those who cry out to him, night and day.

2. Has nobody of his children learnt to cry out night and day?
When would the person who walks in the alleyways of the monastery hear the cry,
the cry of prayer and of calling upon God, night and day.

In this excerpt, which represents the very beginning of the homily MM270, MM introduces the main topic in SA and then code-switches to EA to analyze it. The EA part, besides being analytical, aims also to get involved the topic with a fictitious example.

5.2.5. SUBLOCUS: STORY FRAMING

As said in §5.1.9. CS can also be used to frame a story and to differentiate narrative material from evaluative material, or simply to mark the begin or the end of a story.
I used to tell my family

3. to the extent that I used to tell them “the house you lived in was made of so-and-so
and that the Nile, if you look from the Nile bank you find the place so-and-so”.

And I can specify directions but with the abilities of today.

So they became all perfectly convinced that I have an unparalleled awareness
I remember everything since I was three or four. This discourse serves to prove you
an important thing I am going to talk to you about. Around the year 1925, I was six
or five, I was sleeping on my bed next to my sister. Then,
at midnight I woke up. I woke up and, when I went to look in the living room, I found
three white-bearded persons sitting at the table.

In this and in the following passage MM tells an experience he had when he was
about 4 years old. He saw in his house some of those who are known, in the Coptic
tradition, as suwwāḥ 154. After making a metacomment stating that he will tell another
story, he switches to SA to mark the incipit of the story. A few lines later (in line 3) he
switches to EA, the code used to tell the narrative part of the story.

154 According to the Coptic tradition, suwwāḥ (lit. ‘wanderers’ singular sāʔiḥ) are anchorites who have practised
hermitage and extreme asceticism (including long fasts) for many years and have received several spiritual gifts,
including ubiquity. Well known suwwāḥ are Paul of Thebes (III-IV sec.), known as ‘the hermit,’ who is considered the
1. So when I speak about my spiritual awareness when I was a little child, I did not make prostrations, nor did I fast until sunset, nor did I practice a total abstinence from food for two consecutive days, neither this nor that etc. but they put me, they put me in this attitude, an attitude of prayer so I adopted this attitude of prayer. And I prayed with my heart, as a child. There, fathers. I expanded upon the subject so much just to arrive to “with all you heart, all your soul, all your mind and all your strength”. 

2. Believe me, fathers, this is what happened word-for-word. 

3. When I used to stand for prayer in that time my feelings and my whole being were at the presence of God. 

In this passage, and in that which follows, MM switches again to SA to frame the story, but this time, marking the conclusive part of it. It is evident how the conclusive part coincides also with a sort of synthesis in which the speaker gives a moral of the story.
1. We said “Let’s go to Scetis”. We came to Scetis, that is, of course, al-isqīṭ
the valley of the saints. We came to the saints and we said “It’s settled, then
daxalna f ḥuḍn il-masiːḥ | nibtidi baː? il-ʔeː? il-qaːːmaːt ir-ruːḥiyya il-ʕalya |
we have entered Christ’s arms. Let us attain the high spiritual peaks”.
yalla ya ʕamm ʔidxul il-qamaːt ir-ruḥiyya il-ʕalya daxalt w-šalleːt baː?
“Let’s go, mate! Attain the high spiritual peaks!”. I started praying
fi l-ʔingiːl w-kutub il-ʔaːbːaːʔ wa-wa ibtadeːt šwayya šwayya šwayya
with the Gospel and the books of the Fathers and I started, little by little,
ʔaːːxud il-ʔiːḥsːaːs iːt-ːtifli ʔill ana daxalt fiː sanat ʔaːf w-tusːumiyya ʔarbaːʔ w-ʔiːšːiːn
recover the childlike feeling that I experienced in 1924,
xamsa w-ʔiːšːiːn sitta w-ʔiːšːiːn /
1925, 1926.156

2. And it was the top. The feeling of the fear of God,
ʔaːʃ-ʃuːʃːuːr bi-r-raḥba ʔiːlaː hiyya
the feeling of the evidence of God who listens to prayers
ʔaːʃ-ʃuːʃːuːr bi-ʔiːn beːni w-beːn allaː la yuːːgad ʔaːyː faːːriːq
the feeling that between me and God there is no separation
ʔaːʃ-ʃuːʃːuːr bi-ʔiːn ʔaːdːiyya marfuːːʃa ʔaːmːaːm allaː li-s-saːːmːaːʃa
the feeling that an issue presented to God
w-ːinn ir-rabb samaːʃa
has been listened to by the Lord.

(MM50  – [39'1. …]41'7. → 42'8.)

CS into SA in line 2 frames the end of a story, namely that of MM’s experience of
prayer in his childhood, and it draws the moral from it.

155 He probably specifies this word in Arabic because it is the one used in the liturgical texts in the monastery of Saint
Macarius.
156 MM was born in 1919.
1. [...] ʔeːh doːl? w-homma yikkallimu baʕd min biʃiːd miʃ saːmiʃ ik-kalaːm
   *What are those? And they spoke to each other but I couldn’t hear them because of the distance,*
   w-yibru yibtasimu l-baʕd ibtisamaːt ʕagiːbt iʃ-ʃakl
   *they exchanged amazing smiles,*

2. wiʔaːna maʔxuːd bi-haːda l-manḍar ʔil-marsuːm ʔamaːm ʕaynayya
   *and I was fascinated by this scene painted in front of my eyes*
   li-ɡayt in-nahaːrd | /
   *until today.*

3. ʔaːmu iʃ-ʃubḥ baʔa ba-ḥkilhum il-ḥikaːya l-fagr
   *When they got up in the morning, I told them the story at dawn*
   ʕamaltiːli sawra fi l-beːt w-ʃaḥḥithum [...]  
   *I had made a big noise at home, and I had woken them up.*

(MM50 – [44’3. …] 45’7. → 45’10. […]

Here CS → SA in line 2 marks the closing of the first part of the story of the suwwāḥ, i.e. his encounter with them by night. A falling tone is followed by a pause then MM moves, by code-switching to EA, to the second part of the story, that of the reactions of his family the next day.

EXC81

1. kunt fi ʔawwil marra / ʔaʃalli fiːha bi-ʃuːraːx / kunt li-waḥdi fi makaːn naːʔi
   *The first time I prayed out loud, I was alone in a remote place*  

2. faːma kaːn liː / ʔaːʔiq / kunt ʔaʃrux bi-ʃoːt murtafiʃ / walaːkin bi-masarrːaː / /
   *so I had no barrier, I used to pray out loud, with a joy*  
   la yumkin ʔahissaha fi waqt ʔaːxar | w-gaːʔat ʔayyaːm wa-ʃirft fi
   *I could not feel after that. Days passed by and I found myself*  
   wuṣt in-naːs / kayfa ʔuṣalli bi-ʃuːraːx? /
   *in the midst of people. How can I pray out loud?*

3. nifsi ʔaʃarrax / nifsi ʔaʃarrax ya rabb ʔaːmil eː? giba hduːm w-ʕamaltetaha
   *I want to shout, I want to shout, o Lord, what shall I do? I took my clothes,*  
   zayy il-maxadda / ḥaṭṭitha ʕala buzzi / wa-ʔaʃatt ʔaʃalli bi-ʃuːraːx |
   *made it like a pillow and I put it in my mouth. I started to pray out loud*  
   id-dumuːʕ nazla ma-ḥaddiːš ʃaːyiʃha wi-ʃuːraːx ʕala ʔaʃlaː mustawa /  
   *Tears came down and nobody saw them, while the cry was very loud*  
   wa-la ḥadd samʃu ɡeːru huwwa |
and nobody heard it but him [God].

4. 

And I used to feel an unspeakable happiness.

And this remained a habit of mine: when I am in the midst of people

I pray with my mouth blocked so that no one hears me but Christ.

This story-telling shows three CS, one to SA (line 2), one to EA (line 3), one to SA (line 4). CSs frame the story by differentiating the incipit (EA), a first detached telling (SA), a second more involved telling (EA) and the final frame (SA) which closes up the movement. SA here highlights MM’s personal evaluation of the story (kunt ʔaṣrux bi-ṣot murtafiʕ / wala:kin bi-masarra:: / la yumkin ʔaḥissaha fi waqt ʔa:xar – line 2; fa-kunt saʔi:d saʔa:da la yumkin ?an yaḥlam bi:ha ?insa:n – line 4).

5.2.6. sublocus: contrastive argumentation

The language of preaching incorporates tension. To achieve this tension the speaker will use different types of rhetorical figures that also express the way we assemble ideas: association, dissociation, extension, contraction, etc. One of these is denial which signals God’s transcendent “otherness” (Buttrick 1987:120) (“certainly God is not…”) and serves to distinguish what should be done from what is the actual reality or what is not from what it is (unreal hypothesis vs. reality). In semantics, denial is considered a concept distinguished from negation (see Mughazy 2008). Negation is a semantic operator that reverses the true value of a proposition. While denial objects the veracity of a proposition that is assumed to be part of the addressee’s prior knowledge, whether this proposition was affirmed in an earlier speech or implied. CS here serves to take distance from the unreal hypothesis in order to state ‘how things are’.
This is why God appeared in flesh, this is why the Son was incarnate
likay yaʔxuð alla:h gasad il-insa:n ?aw ?insula:niiyyatu
in order that God might take man's body or his humanity
bi-maʃnaʔaʃahḥ waʔagmal waʔawqaʕ [...] in a more correct, beautiful and realistic sense [...] (MM136 – 6’5. → 7’2. [...] [])

CS in line 3 states what is the theological truth ('God was incarnate, took man’s humanity') vs. the theological speculation ('God re-creates Adam') as regards the solution God took to solve Adam’s fall.

EXC83

1. tagassada wa-taʔannasa | / şa:ra ?insula:nan kà:milan fi kulli šayʔ? // “He was incarnate and became man”\(^{157}\). He became a man complete in everything, gasad w-fiƙr // w-naʃfs wa-wigda:n waʔsaq\\/ wi-kullu | ?axað / body, thought, soul, feeling, mind, everything. [Christ] took il-gublaʔaʃa:damiiyya / kama hiya fi a:damaʃtaʃma:n / w-ara:d the Adamic nature, exactly as it was in Adam, and wanted ?annu yuʃkaʃmii fi:ha xiʃṭat alla:/ to fulfil in it God's plan.

2. yaʃni hiya xiʃṭat alla: fi xilqat il-insa:n fi a:dam / I mean, God's plan in the creation of man in Adam ma-kanit-ʃ maʃqu:ra ŋalaʔinu yixlaʔ a:dam w-yiʃi:ʃ maʃa l-ḥayawana:t was not limited to creating Adam so that he could live with animals, kida w-yinbasat w-yiʃab fi g-gine:na w-xala:ʃ | ma-ʃtaqid-ʃ | ma-ʃtaqid-ʃ like having fun, playing in the garden and that's it. I don't think so. I do not think ?inn di kaːnit xiʃṭit alla: fi xilqit il-ʔinsa:n [sound which means ‘no’] yixlaʔ this was God's plan in creating man. No. Like, he [God] creates a:dam w-ḥawwa w-yiʃul-luhum ?iʃʔiri baʃ kida w-imlaʔu kida w-inbasatu Adam and Eve and says multiply, and fill [the earth], have fun, wi-ilʃabu maʃa l-ʔusu:da wi-n-numu::ra w-hayyaʃu w-ʔa:xir il-ḥalaː wa yaʃni | play with the lion and tiger cubs and enjoy yourselves to the utmost. bass? hiyya di xiʃṭit alla: li-l-xala:ʃ? la la [repeats sound which means ‘no’] | That’s it? Is this God's plan for Salvation [Creation]? No, no.

\(^{157}\) Liturgy of Saint Basil, Anaphora.
God wanted to give life to a rational creation in his image that could elevate all his creatures so as to testify and bear witness to him continually. Man is thus created not only to elevate himself, he is called to elevate himself first and necessarily, but accordingly and inevitably, if man elevates himself, he elevates all the creation so that it can reach a level consonant with the glorification and the praise of God as a creation, ehm, that bears witness to God and reflects the image of his glory.

(MM136 – 9’2.ī10’7.)

Here MM is explaining the purpose of the Incarnation in relation to the Creation. Paragraph 1: the context is clearly SA without declensional vowels. In paragraph 2 CS to EA is triggered by yaʕni. The intent of the EA paragraph 2. seems clear: lightening up the discourse and making an ironic speculation in the pars destruens, by using inter alia expedients such as the language of children (ilʕabu maʕa l7Ɂusu:da wi7n7numu:ra). It is a denial of what is the purpose of creation before stating it positively in paragraph 3 after a new CS to SA. Paragraph 3 in SA completes the movement of paragraph 1. Later MM passes to another topic. SA has again an authoritative function and marks the contrast between ‘maturity’ vs. ‘childhood’ in EA (paragraph 2). Here SA seems to have also the iconic function stated by Saeed (see §3.1.4.1.) in the sense of being bearer of ‘theological truth’ vs. ‘theological speculation’ conveyed by EA. CS strongly marks this contrast.

The use of ?annu is interesting. Mejdell, who dealt with complementizers, defines ?annu as a hybrid form: neither the EA ?innu nor the SA ?annahu. In fact, in her corpus, ?annu only appears in the common form of li-?annu but never as ?annu. It is certainly an SA form especially if one considers what Mejdell says in this regard: «as pronoun suffix to a large extent is suprasegmental in nature, involving phonotactics and entire systems of syllable structure – it may be that speakers and listeners perceive this feature as part of

---

158 See commentary to EXC48 in §5.2.1. for the use of yaʕni as a discourse marker.
‘local accent’ [...] It appears not even to interfere with the perceive SA-ness of utterances» (Mejdell 2006:346).

The EA exclamatory particle da in the SA context of paragraph 3. is typical of MM and here has the meaning of bal: la: bi-nafsihi faqaṭ da [bal] bi-nafsihi ʔawwalan. See also the commentary to EXC30 in §3.2.3.

**EXC84**

1. ma hu ʔilli ʔilli ʔitfa:him maʃa iʃ-ʃiːtːa:n marra ta:ni marra tibza sahla ʔawi ʔawi ʔawi
   *It is very easy for the one who came to terms with satan once,*
li-ʃ-ʃiːtːa:n ʔinnu yiḥṭak ᵡaːleːh fa-kaːn šaddazni yaːnī ʔin kaːn ʔaʃːad-lu
   *to have his leg pulled again by satan. So, he [Adam], believe me, whether he remained*
fi l-ʔawwil ʔalfeːn talattalaːf sana maʃa l... fi l-firdoːs walla yoːm
   *at the beginning, two or three thousand years with... in Paradise, or just one day*
walla miʃ ʕarfiːn ᵡaḍad ʔadd ?ːe walla milyunːeːn sana walla ʕaʃːara /
   *we don’t know how long [did he stay there], whether it is two million years or ten,*
ma-ḥnaː-ʃ ʕarfiːn | ʔaː ʔaqall giddan giddan
   *we just don’t know. But he fell in a much shorter period.*

2. walaːkin likay yaḍman lana l-maʃːih ḥayaːh maʃa allaː
   *But in order to ensure us a life with God*
la yumkin fiː-ːa ʔa-raːʃa wa-la yumkin fiː-ːa s-suːqːːt
   *irreversible and without other falls*
liːzaːliːk tagassad ʔallaː ẓaḥaːr fi l-gaʃːad
   *for this very reason, God was incarnate, appeared in flesh*
lıkay yuʃːti il-ʔaːšariyya s-saːqːiːta l-ʕaːzːiːza ʕaleː ʔallaːti taʃːmil şuːːratu
   *in order to give the fallen humanity which is so dear to him, which bears his image*
ʕaːzːiːza ʕaleː liʔinnahaa taʃːmil şuːːratu w-taʃːmil xiʃːat ʔrʊqːiːyy
   *dear to him because it bears his image and the plan of evolution*
ʔilli huwwa ḥaṭṭaːha ka-biːra fiː
   *that he put in him as a seed*
xiʃːat ʔrʊqːiːyy ʔan yartaqi l-ʔiːnsaːn likay yazdaːd fi maʃːrifu l-ʔallaː
   *the plan of evolution of man who has to increase his knowledge of God*
wa-ʕaʃːiːʃ maʃa allaː ʕaːlaːtūːl faqadha
   *and live always with God. He [Adam] lost it.*

(MM136 – 38’3. → 39’5.)
CS is used again to contrast arguments: paragraph 1 describes Adam’s fall, paragraph 2 God’s solution to Adam’s fall.

5.3. Conversation Locus: Prayers and Praises

Traditionally Coptic monastic homilies end with a sensible moment, the conclusive prayers to God, that are a sort of recapitulation of the main points dealt with in which the speaker asks for God’s help so that listeners can apply the teachings illustrated throughout the homily. In MM’s homilies these final prayers always mark a CS into SA, or they are prepared by a triggering CS into SA, because of the graveness and solemnity of the moment.

EXC85


   If the world suffers, if monasticism suffers

2. li-Ɂinnaha lam tataʃa:mal baʃd maʃ il-masi:Ɂ kama yanbaği | //  

   it is because they have not yet related properly to Christ.  

   ya rabbi ?aʃti:na kullina / ha:ðihi š-su:ra l-gâyyida wa-l-Ɂasana giddan  

   O Lord, give us all this good, very good image  

   ?annana nataʃa:mal maʃak šaxšiyyan fi wagh kull ?insa:n ga:?iʃ wa-ʃa)fsa:n  

   so that we can relate to you personally through every starving, thirsty  

   wa-Ɂaʃi:f w-taʃba:n w-mari:d | ///  

   weak, sick and ill person. Oh Lord, every deprivation existing  

   fi l-Ɂa:lam la: l yaḥmîluhu l-masi:Ɂ ūala katifayh mutaʔalliman bi-hi  

   in the world is still born on the shoulders by Christ, suffering for it  


   more than the suffering person himself. He stands in front of us,  

   yamidd yaddu(h) / sà:?ilan raḥmatna kaʔannahu fi ?aʃadd il-Ɂa:ga  

   he stretches out his hand asking for our mercy, as if he were in great need  

   ?ila luqmatna ?aw ku:bat il-ma:?i l-ba:riḍa min yaddina / ?aw  

   of our mouthful or our glass of cold water from our hand, or  


   our old piece of clothing or any kind of help a weak person might need.

(MM50 – 95’3. → 96’4.)
The causative clause triggers here the switch to SA for a prayer that synthesizes once again the main argument of the rhetorical move. Notice the EA nonce borrowing in *hidmitna l-zadi:ma* (‘our old piece of clothing’) inside the +SA context.

In this excerpt, MM switches to SA again to raise his recapitulative prayer. In line 3 is a repetition in EA that emphasizes the word ‘when’. The final clause in line 4 opens a new CS into SA that continues until the prayer arrives to an end. Notice the EA syntactic nonce borrowing *fa:ša:n* (‘so that’) in a context which is clearly lexically and syntactically +SA: consider the final vowel in *marratan ?uxra* (‘once more’) or the *ḥāl* clause *ga:?ilan tašnaʃ xayran* (‘going about doing good’) that are strong SA markers.
1. kull wa:ḥid taʕba:n min nafsu wīʕa:wiz yifaḍḍi nafsu

Everyone suffering from himself who wants to empty himself

he has no other way than love alone.

Falal mustawayaya...

on its two levels


on its two levels, the first, the inner level, through prayer

through the unrestricted impulse towards God, through a true sincere love

from all the heart; and through the other level, through work

through unrestricted, unconditioned, timeless, unframed, ageless sacrifice.

Amen, o Lord Jesus Christ, give us to be disciples

of the divine love until we become white-headed and old. Let our prayer

never cease on our lips all the days of our life.

Give us o Lord to walk in the mystical way of love so that we know and

go deeply into your divine mystery, so that we can worship you in Spirit

and truth as it pleases the heart of the Father.

This excerpt has been already discussed before. Here the CS into SA to synthesize for
the last time the main point of the homily (the inner and the outer level of love) at the
beginning triggers a CS into SA for the entire duration of the final prayer.
5.4. Dramatizing Words or Clauses

The data show that MM also code-switches without a specific locus. The function is providing a dramatic effect in order to emphasize a part of a sentence and to temporarily attract listeners’ attention and then relax it by code-switching again. Gal (1979) shows how in an English/German bilingual environment, CS into German is a means of adding strength to the statement. David (2003) shows how a lawyer starts by using dominant Bahasa Malaysia and then code-switches to English to emphasize an important point to the judge, i.e. that the accused had not committed any crime for 10 years.

   Before this, OKT was caught in 1975 and 1986.
2. There has been a 10 years gap since the last offence
3. Semenjak itu OKT telah berumahtangga, mempunyai kerja tetap dan insaf
   since then OKT has married and has held a steady job
(David 2003:13)

Holes says, in this context, that «by using isolated MSA forms the speaker selectively emphasises elements of his message more than he would do if he ‘performed’ these meaning elements in the dialect» (1995:303).

In the corpus, the dramatized segment seems to be always in SA, normally represents the peak of the information, it is sometimes accompanied by prosodic prominence in the form of pitch accents and it usually concerns the clause. It can be considered as a specific case of topicalization through CS that creates opposition within the utterance by focusing on a brief part of it although not having a specific conversational locus (Fotos 1995; Ariffin & RafikīGalea 2009).

Here are some excerpts found in the corpus.

EXC88

1. yaʕni ʔa::xir ma qaddamahu l-masi:ḥ ʕala l-ʔarḍ ʕala:ḥ munsakiba
   The last thing that Christ offered on earth was a poured out prayer,
   kùllaha / maša:ʕir raqi:qa ʔašadd ir-riqqa min naḥw /
   full of deep feelings of tenderness towards
2. miš bas tala:mizu min naḥw kull illi bi-yu?minu bi: w-illī ha-yu?minu bi: |
   not only his disciples but also towards all those who believe and will believe in him.
The most tender feelings of God we heard about... as they say,

w-fi l-wa:qiʕ yaʕni ?ana ba-ʃîgha / law kan ?alla: / ?axla:u zayy il-masi:ɬ / but I will word it [in a different way]. If God’s moral standards are like those of Christ,
yibza ?alla: hiɭw |
then God is nice.

(MM50 – 5’5. → 6’2.)

MM starts in SA but he finishes the sentence in EA. Line 1 has no particular conversational locus. Notice the lengthening of the vowel /a/ in ?a:xir (‘the last [thing]’).

EXC89
1. yibza kull il-ʃafyia w-kull il-ma-ʃaniyya:t w-kull il-guhd w-kull it-tadqi:q / All the strength, all the prostrations, all the effort and all the precision
2. tahawwal ?ila tayya:r sirri ʃagi:ɬ turned into an amazing mystical “current”
3. yinawwar kiti:r / w yiʃtaɭal kiti:r that lights a lot and works a lot.

(MM50 – 21’7. → 22’1.)

EXC90
1. kull ʃala:h tuqaddam la-lla: / ma-fiha:-ʃi / ?il-ʃana:ʃir il-ʔarbaɬa do:l / Every prayer offered to God lacking these four elements
il-qalb wi-l-fikr / il-qalb wi-l-nafs wi-l-fikr wi-l-qudra heart, mind... heart, soul, mind and strength.
2. yuʃi:baha xalal wa-yuʃi:baha malal will be affected by confusion and tiredness.

(MM50 - 36’6. → 37’2.)

EXC91
1. ʔadd yirʔdar yiʃibb qari:bu w-la-yiba:n-ʃi? / ma-yiba:n-ʃ ʕale: ?innu bi-ʃiʃibb Can anyone love his neighbour without being noticed that he loves
qari:bu? / yastaʔi:l / da ʕa:wiz ma-ʃaʃabba yaʕni ma-ʃaʃabba ʃamaliyya waɗha ɬa:hira his neighbour? It is impossible. This kind of love is practical, evident and manifest
il-kull yiʃufha / ik-kull yiʃufha ɬatta l... ʔilli lissa ma-ʃiʃraʃ-ʃi rabbina xa:liʃ yiʃufha everybody notices it even the one who has not yet known God at all notices it


The dramatized segment on which MM wants to attract listeners’ attention (line 2) is followed by an imaginary quote in EA.

EXC92

1. fa-?na ha-nif?dal nibzil nibzil ḥatta ?ila l-mawt il-gasadi mumkin
   We will keep sacrificing ourselves even till our bodily death, maybe, wala:kin ma-qṣud-ši l-mawt il-gasadi but in fact I do not mean the bodily death
2. ḥatta la yabqa lana šay? / ḥatta la naʔud naku:n maḥsu:bi:n ?iṭla:qan until nothing is left over to us, until we take no more account whatsoever ʕind ?anfusna | of ourselves.
3. ya sala:::m yo:m ma-yif?dal-lak-š ha:ga / […] Good Lord, the day nothing is left over to you. […]\(\text{MM50 – 84’3. \rightarrow 84’5. […]}\)

The SA-switched part highlights the final clause.

EXC93

2. la laʔna la ḥuzn la kaʔa:ba la tahannud la fašal la buʔd la xoːf la ṣaduww
no curse, nor grief, nor sorrow, nor crying, nor failure, nor distance, nor fear, nor enemy, wa-la ʔayy ʔay? | wa-li-l-ʃagab il-ʃuga:b ʔan yafqīd ʔa:dam kull ha:za l-magd just nothing. And inconceivably Adam lost all this glory wa-kull ha:zihi / ʔal-wasa:ʔit ʔallati ʃafqa: ... ʔalla:ti ka:nat tarfaʃ ʔa:dam and all these means that used to... raise Adam ?ila múståwa la yumkin nataʃawwaru nnaharda yaka:d yaku:n to a level that we cannot imagine nowadays. It could be ?aʃla min il-malâ:ʔika | // [...] higher than that of the angels [...] (MM136 – 5’6. \(\rightarrow\) 6’5. [...] )

Here the dramatization of Adam losing Paradise in paragraph 2 is evident. Innaharda in paragraph 2. is a common EA tag borrowing. Another way of interpreting the last two lines of paragraph 2. could be a sort of ‘relaxed’ realization in EA of the relative final clause.

EXC94

1. w-diyyian ʃalamiyyat il-mumarsa l-haykaliyya ʔilli bi-nidxulha kull yo:m And this is our daily [liturgical] practice in the Sanctuary\(^{159}\) when we enter, f ʃaʃ / kida munsagim gami:l da:ʃil yiliff ḥawale:n il-gasad il-makṣu:r in a nice harmonious line, turning around the broken body w-id-damm il-masfu:k iṯ-ṯari:q ʔil-ḥayy ʔil-ḥadiːs ʔilli karraṣu bi-nuʃbur bi: and the shed blood, the new and living way which he consecrated\(^{160}\), we pass across it ʕale: ʕale: kida ka-ʃaʃ barḍak on it, on it, like this, in a line, 2. fi ha:za ṯ-ṯariːq w-nudxul sirran ʔila qalb ʔalla: wa-nataḥassas maka:nana in this way, we mystically enter into God’s heart and we perceive our place min qalb il-masiːḥ wa-qalb il-ʔaːb with respect to Christ’s and the Father’s heart. 3. w-nibtidi niʃmil ʔaʃma:lana l-yawmiyya | fi l-wa:qiʃ dî ʃalamiyyat mumâːra We are then able to carry out our daily work. In fact, this is a practice mumâːra:rasat ḥubb the practice of love. (MM50 – 50’2. \(\rightarrow\) 50’6.)

---

\(^{159}\) The sanctuary (haykal) is the most sacred part of the Orthodox church because of the presence of the altar.

\(^{160}\) Heb 10:20.
It is impossible to really perceive all our monastic force and our monastic strength, one day, and say “Father, today I felt I had spiritual strength.”

_unless we practice the divine love on its two levels._

(289)

It is true that Christ is the one who leads but the Spirit is the one who speaks and then, little by little, the Spirit clothes man who becomes clothed with the Holy Spirit, he purchases the Spirit to himself as a cloth, as a garment of light that illuminates every heart and it illuminates all the senses.

(344)

So the Lord... Christ wanted to give us a ‘certified’ thing that could never disappear unlike what happened to Adam, so that the creation could get lost again.

_For this reason, the divine nature and the human nature had to be united totally, so that grace could not abandon again_
EXC98

1. Ɂadi sirr Ɂaw is-sabab Ɂaw gawhar Ɂaw fikrit Ɂittiḥa:d il-lahu:t bi-n-nasu:t

   This is the reason or the essence or the idea of the union of divinity and humanity.
   ma-huwwa:-şi şe:? gabri / wa-la şe:? taşawwuri wa-la mawду:ɹ lahu:ti
   It is not an algebraic thing, nor a fictitious thing nor a theological topic
to be meditated about. It is a thing for our benefit that concerns the core of our lives,
w-fikrìnà w-xalaşna yo:m bi-yo:m / ʔin kunt tsadda? ʔilli huuwa ʔittiḥa:d
   our thought and our salvation, day by day, if you believe, I mean the union
   il-lahu:t bi-n-nasu:t
   of divinity and humanity

2. likay yaḍman li-n-nasu:t Ɂaw li-l-ʔinsa:n Ɂaw li-l-gasad yaḍman lahu /

   to ensure the human nature or man or the body, to ensure them
   niʕma la: yumkin ʔan tufa:riqu |
   a grace that cannot abandon them.

EXC99

1. ʔada l-lahu:t ill iḥna ʕawzi:nu w-miḥtagi:n ʔile: ʔadi l-gasad w-id-damm

   Here is the theology that we want and we need, here are the body and the blood

2. ʔalla:ði fi:hi n-niʕma ʔalla:ti la yumkin fâşlaha ʕan / il-gasad wa-d-damm |

   in which there is the grace that cannot be separated from them.

EXC100

1. ʕaẓamat il-qiya:ma ba:nit hina ʔinn ʔa:m

   Here appears the greatness of the Resurrection: he [Christ] resurrected
   bi-gasad muntahi gasad gadi:d bi-bašariyya gadi:da
   with a completely new body, with a new humanity that

2. la:: miš bass la taqbal il-xaṭiyya wa-la yumkin

   does not... that not only does not accept sin but also it cannot
   ʔan yuḥkam ʕale:ha la min qari:b wa-la min baši:d bi-ʔayy ḥukmin ka:na
   be condemned, in the least, in any whatsoever manner.

   xala:s ʔintaha
It's over.

In line 2 the REL clause is marked by a CS → SA to dramatize its content.

1. fa-ʕazaama ʕazaama fi l-ʕaqi:qa ?inn il-masi:ḥ
   *It is, thus, really great that Christ*

2. ?alla:di lam yaʕrif xaṭiyya yaqbal xaṭiyyati fi gasadu li-taskun fi: /
   *who did not know sin, let my sin inhabit his body*
   li-taskun fi: wa-yamu:t bi:-ha wa-yanhi ʕalayha
   *inhabit himself. Then he dies with it and destroys it.*

3. le?: li-ʔinnu ʕu:qib xala:ʃ ʕiqa:b mo:t / ma:t |
   *Why? Because he has been punished. Death, death punishment, he died.*
   ?a:xir ʕuqu:ba li-l-mawt ehm li-l-xaṭiyya l-mawt ma:t
   *The last punishment for death, ehm, for sin - that is death - he suffered [he died].*

4. li-za:lik qiya:mat il-masi:ḥ w-ʔiʕtaʔu l-.bašarıyya l-gadi:da
   *Therefore, the resurrection of Christ and his gift of a new humanity*
   l-munazzaha ʕan il-xaṭiyya ?aǰdan / bi-l-ʔiḍa:fa ?ila l-mawt
   *free from sin and from death*
   wa-ma yatbašuhu min hā:wiya wa-waʔila ?a:xirihi
   *and the resulting hell etc.*

   *show us how much... the plan of salvation from the Incarnation to the Resurrection,*

6. likay yuʕi::d ?i-l-xali:qa l-баšarıyya marra ?uxra ?ila gama:l xilqat alla:
   *in order to restore humanity, once again, to the beauty of God’s creation*
   wa-šù:ratu li-taḥya fi sama:ʔ in gadi:da waʔardin gadi:da
   *onto his image, that it may live in a new heaven and a new earth*
   wa-li-rabbina l-magd dayman ?abadiyyan ?ami:n
   *and to our Lord be the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.*

You know, our beards will all be white-haired and everyone will have taken a mission:

2. kayfa yuṭʕim in-nufu::s wa-yarwi::ha kayfa yaqu::d / xawa:ris fi ş-ṣala:(h)
how to feed and quench souls’ thirst, how to lead choruses in prayer,
wa-kayfa yuʕazzi qulu:b kaθi:ri:n šuʕu:b kaθi:ra |
how to comfort the hearts of many, from all the nations.

(MM50 – 70’7. → 70’9.)

EXC103

1. il-ʕa:lam kullu / miḥta:g giddan ?innu: / yistilim
   The whole world deeply needs to be delivered
2. kayfa yaku:n masi:ḥ / fi wasṭ musaḥa:ʔ |
   how to be a christ, in the midst of christs.

(MM50 – 94’7. → 94’8.)

In these last two examples, it seems that MM is used to dramatize specific clauses (in this case modal clauses). These data might support the hypothesis that in Egyptian Arabic there are syntactic loci where CS is more easily found.

EXC104

   I have no mind but a praying one, no feeling inside
   fa:Ɂe:ra iʔiːsali bi-kull ʕafiyiti bi-kull imkaniyya:ti | /
   but a praying one, with all my strength and all my capabilities.
2. hal ha:da Ɂa:sb? Ɂin ka:n Sala Ɂiʔf lam yakun Ɂa:sban
   Is this difficult? If it was not difficult for a child,
   fa-hal huwwa Ɂala qaːmat ragul Ɂa:sb? Ɂan nukad...
   is it difficult for a man?
3. hiya kull iʃ-ʃuːba:ʔiʔa nʔa Ɂiːna [...] 
   All the difficulty is that we [...] 

(MM50 – 47’1. → 47’4. [...] )

The use of rhetorical questions is a common linguistic strategy in homilies which serve to organize the discourse, move it forward and to engage the attention of the audience. After the story of his relationship with prayer when he was a child, when he could pray purely, and the other story of the suwwâh, MM switches to SA to pose a rhetorical question which serves to move the rhetorical movement forward. In fact he switches again to EA and carries on the same point, i.e. the importance to return to a “spiritual childhood” to pray purely.
Conclusions

The general question this investigation started from was: what are the rhetorical motivations of the CS between SA and NA and vice-versa? That is: what is the semantics of CS in a complex operation such as that of argumentatively building an oral text (in this specific case a Christian homily)? Is CS always rhetorically meaningful and at what grammatical level? Is there any relationship with figures of speech? Does the relationship between “written language” and “spoken language” shed any light on a better understanding of CS? It was hypothesized that diglossic CS occurs with considerable frequency in Christian religious discourse, that these switches occur only at an intersentential level, that the switches are always rhetorically functional differentiating textual material, that they are like other rhetorical mechanisms, such as figures of speech, that functions of CS are distinguishable from loci and that patterns of rhetorical CS (i.e., loci and functions) are clearly definable and divisible between “general” (common to all the genres) and “particular” (specific of one genre). Finally, frequency of code-switching is related to specific parts of discourse.

From a preliminary reading of the data, it emerges that the hypothesis of a significant frequency of CS in Christian homilies is confirmed. What also seems clear is that the presence of SA and EA in the three homilies is not equally distributed. Although it is very difficult to precisely weigh the presence of the two codes in every single homily, for the methodological problems illustrated in chapter 2, it is self-evident that the homily MM50 presents very long movements in EA, the homily MM270 very long movements in high levels of the SA continuum (many cases of ‘unusual’ tanwin, e.g. in nominative cases) while in the homily MM136 neither EA or SA seem to clearly prevail. The homily MM50, therefore, shows a rhetorical style that is mainly based on praxis (although other modalities are also present), MM270 mainly on immediacy and MM136 mainly on reflection (see Buttrick 1987:319-445 and §5.2.). In the three homilies also the value of CS and its rhetorical importance certainly change, depending on the “predominant” base language. This is particularly evident in the homilies MM50 and MM270: while in the former the most relevant and contrastive CS is EA → SA, due to the massive use of EA161, in MM270 the most significant and contrastive CS is SA → EA since almost the whole homily is built up in one mode: that of immediacy, through a massive use of SA.

161 Here one can speak of what Owens calls the additive nature of SA, that is, SA is integrated into spoken Arabic by adjoining it to the NA base rather than by displacing it. This is not always true as seen in MM270.
It has not always been possible to find a specific locus or a specific function for CS though it can be said, in the light of the data, that the basic function for all the cases of CS is essentially to generate a contrast within the text. Any other consideration on CS of whatever nature (social, psychological, textual, participant-related or situational) must be built on this preliminary consideration. The contrast created by CS, in fact, allows the speaker to focus or de-focus on certain segments helping him argumentatively structure his discourse. The strength and the success of the argumentation is given by a “good” dosage of the contrast within the discourse. This contrast can be charged or not with the symbolic values of the codes at stake. If the contrast is not charged with symbolic values (that is it is not rhetorically functional), then what is meaningful is not the direction of CS but only the opposition itself achieved by CS. If the contrast exploits these symbolic values, and makes them rhetorically functional, it means that the direction of CS is rhetorically meaningful.

The distinction made by Auer (1995:120) of conversational loci and functions of CS has proved to be particularly operative, although presenting a numbers of limitations (see below). Four main loci have been selected for the analysis - quotation, reiteration and argumentative elaboration, prayers and praises – which comprehend other main subloci: quotation (biblical quotation and pseudo-quotations, self-quotations vs. allo-quotations, imaginary quotes, personalization of quotes); reiteration (semantic equivalence, elliptical repetition, elaborative repetition); argumentative elaboration (text[quotation] vs. oral comment, text[quotation] vs. parenthetical comment, abstraction vs. concretization (examples), analysis vs. synthesis, story framing, contrastive argumentation, rhetorical questions, personalization). Yet, the differentiation between locus/function seems to be not always functional. The data show that MM also code-switches without a specific locus. The function of this unlocalized CS is to give a dramatic effect to a part of a sentence in order to highlight it in the sentence and to temporarily attract listeners’ attention and then relax it by code-switching again (see below). Another major difficulty encountered with the distinction locus/function was the overlapping of the loci. It is not always easy to determine where quotation ends and where reiteration begins, as often the same quote is repeated over and over again in the same monologue. The solution that was found was to consider as a quotation only the first time that this appears in the text while the following times it was considered as a repetition (i.e. a reiteration of a quotation). Still, comment can represent a repetitive segment, abstraction can represent a self-quotations, an elaborated repetition can represent a distinction between analysis vs. synthesis etc. Also, detachment and involvement (seen in §5.1.4.) seem to be attached to the switched codes in many loci. This means that if SA conveys abstraction it is also because it conveys
detachment (and abstraction is, by definition, an expression of detachment). It seems that this problem, that repeats itself for all the loci, cannot be solved, unless we look at the loci as potentially multi-layered, apt to be interpreted in more than only one way. A code-switched passage can thus be read, for instance, as a repetition or a comment and explained accordingly.

Quotation involved four main subloci: biblical quotations or pseudo-quotations, self-quotations vs. allo-quotations, imaginary quotes and personalized quotes. Quotation of the sacred texts was realised mainly in SA. Of the 27 excerpts of quotations given in chapter 3, 14 were realized with a *verbum dicendi* in EA and 13 without any *verbum dicendi*, intermingled in the flow of the discourse as if they were MM's words. *Verbum dicendi* always appear in EA and if the context is SA, *verbum dicendi* can be the only code-switched element in the sentence. In this case, the *verbum dicendi* acts as a highlighter of the following quote, functioning as a frame. The most common function of quotation is *distanciation* and *identification* with the quotation itself. *Distanciation*, in the corpus, is to be intended as a way to add authority to the speech. This is achieved through SA which help support with *authority* MM's statements, for quotations are normally taken from sacred books. SA quotes are also used as a framing element which closes up a movement to pass on to another. Although they seem more frequent, quotations in SA are not a rule. The data show, in fact, that MM did not find any problems in quoting verses from the Gospel in EA whenever it was rhetorically profitable. Thus, CS in quotation does not always take into account the original code used and it is performed to mark polyphony of the speech. Quotations of the Bible in SA are sometimes intertwined with imaginary quotations or interactions in which different voices are realized with different codes. This is one of the functions of CS in quotation in the corpus: emphasizing the ‘polyphony’ of discourse by differentiating the plurality of ‘voices’ who take part in the *mise-en-scène*. Besides representing ‘one of the voices’ or ‘one of the personalities,’ EA segments are often elaborated quotation used by MM when he wants to involve listeners into the argumentation with a light and friendly tone (not with the goal of expressing authority, then) he quotes some episodes of the Gospel in EA in an attempt to personalize them and make them closer to the listeners. Christ becomes, thus, a friendly figure who speaks the everyday language. This seems different from what has been found by Bassiouney who analysed a few brief sermons of šayx al-Šafrawi who always quoted verses from the Qurʾān in CA (Bassiouney 2006:197-198).

Imaginary quotations of Christ’s words can also involve both SA and EA so accordingly lengthening or shortening the distance between Christ, the speaker and the
audience. Sympathetic, involved and personal re-arrangement of Christ’s words are combined with a more detached, hieratic imaginary elaboration of them.

So, in general, direction of CS is not always meaningful in quotation. When it is, the passage from EA → SA serves to add authority to the speech or to take distance from it. This kind of CS mostly took place in biblical quotations or pseudo-quotations. While the passage SA → EA serves to personalize, lighten up and identify with the quotation. This kind of CS mostly took place in imaginary quotes and personalized quotes. When it is not meaningful, CS only aims at marking a contrast that creates a polyphonic text. This kind of CS took place in the corpus in imaginary quotes, personalized quotes and in distinguishing self-quotation from allo-quotation.

Reiteration proved to be much more important and frequent in the corpus than I had expected. It involved three main subloci: semantic equivalence, elliptical repetition and elaborative repetition. The homily most concerned by CS in reiteration was MM50. Being an essential rhetorical mechanism in Arabic prose and speech, reiteration gives coherency, cohesiveness and rhythmicity to the speech letting ideas flow horizontally (paratactically) into one another. The first function of CS found in reiteration was, then, reducing the textual density of the homily. This seems to be essential to imprint the message repeated into the consciousness of the audience. The other functions of repetition found in the corpus are mainly two: emphasizing or clarifying. Whenever MM wanted to emphasize a clause or a sentence or a quotation he used to code-switch to SA (often accompanied by other prosodic mechanism such as the lengthening of vowels). Coptic was also used together with SA, especially when reiterating quotations from prayer books such as tasbiḥa. Whenever MM wanted to clarify he used EA, often paraphrasing the segment repeated. Personalized repetition of quotes also took place in EA. SA and EA contributed in this locus as well to keep distance or get involved in what was said.

Direction of CS is not always meaningful in repetition, either. When it is, the passage from EA → SA serves to emphasize or to stress a segment or a passage or to take distance from it. While the passage SA → EA serves to personalize, lighten up and identify with the repetition. When it is not meaningful, CS only aims at marking a contrast that creates a polyphonic text.

Argumentative elaboration is the locus which shows the greatest numbers of excerpts because it involves many subloci: text (quotation) vs. oral commentary, text (quotation) vs. parenthetical comment, abstraction vs. concretization (examples), analysis vs. synthesis, story framing, contrastive argumentation, rhetorical questions. As stated, this locus is the most complex one because it includes many mechanisms and functions that are more complex than those seen for quotation and repetition, all sharing the common
The rhetorical goal of rationally elaborating the text. This *locus* does not always present sufficiently precise formal features and it can present different *subloci* depending on the *genre* of the monologues involved.

The main function of this *locus* in the *corpus* was distinguishing different rhetorical material: sacred text from comment, main flow of the elaboration from peripheral flow, abstract/theoretical material (theological dogma) from concrete or speculative material, analytical material from synthetical material. This means that CS, in this *locus*, operates many different functions: elaborating, specifying, defining, explaining, exemplifying, focusing, de-focusing, synthesizing, analysing.

This is the *locus* in which the direction of CS seems particularly meaningful, exploiting all the potential symbolic power of the codes, as seen in §1.9.. In this *locus*, also the gumperzian distinction *we-code*/*they-code* seems to work. In text vs. comment, text is marked by SA-ness while comment is normally EA unless the speaker wants to offer new definitions in which case he goes back and forth from EA to SA and vice-versa distinguishing his metacomment from the new definition he is trying to give. The textual part is often a quotation and, as we have seen, quotation can be done in SA and EA for specific reasons of metaphorical kinesthetics (again, detachment and involvement).

The CS from SA $\rightarrow$ EA marks (with the exception of story framing and contrastive argumentation) a passage from the *authoritative discourse* to the *internally persuasive* (see §1.9.1.3.), from the core message to the elaboration or the specification of it. MM quotes in SA and then elaborates it with glosses in EA; he gives the main text in SA and then opens marginal sequences in EA; the abstract segment is in SA and the concretization of it is in EA; SA offers synthesis while EA is used for analysis. The passage SA $\rightarrow$ EA has the main function of passing from the ‘eternal level’ to the ‘earthly level’, from the externally authoritative from the internally persuasive, by explaining a truth, offering theological speculation, clarifying a too hermetic text, de-focusing from the main flow, concretely depicting ideas. CS helps organize the different modalities of speech within the same rhetorical event. The switch EA $\rightarrow$ SA has the main function of lifting up the discourse from the ‘earthly level’ to the ‘eternal, divine level’ by offering the central point, the theological truth, the initial or final definition, focusing back on the main flow, summarizing or epitomizing a rhetorical movement. SA gives authority to the switched segment. As for quotes in SA, the code is also used as a framing element which closes up a movement to pass on to another. In this sense, given its peripheral position, SA potentially signals discourse boundaries. Of course, as said before, the direction SA $\rightarrow$ EA also means more involvement while EA $\rightarrow$ SA implies a more detached attitude.
On the other hand, the direction of CS does not seem to be particularly meaningful in story framing. What is exploited in this case is the contrast CS creates in the flow of speech to distinguish and highlight different parts of the story: climax from the main story, narrative from evaluative talk etc. MM used, for example, EA to tell the core of the story and SA to mark the incipit or the end of a it. Again, SA signals discourse boundaries, in this case story boundaries. In this case as well, overlapping of loci can take place. When, for example, the CS $\rightarrow$ SA indicates the end of a story it can, at the same time, aim at synthesizing it or expressing the moral one can draw from it or at achieving some detachment from it.

In the sublocus of contrastive argumentation the direction of CS seems to be useful and work like what Saeed defined iconicity (§3.1.4.1.) although this function is much more present and evident in his corpus. The main function in this sublocus it to distinguish once again different rhetorical material, namely theological speculation vs. theological dogma or pars destructens and pars construens: EA conveys the former while SA the latter.

Two of the hypotheses that proved not to be fully correct concern the fact that CS occurs only at an intersentential level and that CS is always rhetorically functional differentiating textual material. The cases in which these hypotheses are confirmed have been demonstrated and discussed just here above. Yet, what should be added is that data showed that many times MM code-switches without a specific locus. Exploiting the contrastive function of CS, the function of this kind of CS is probably dramatizing segments that represent a level less than the sentence, very often a clause, where the switching point is given by the point in which the two grammars do not conflict. MM switches to SA to emphasize a part of a sentence and to temporarily attract listeners’ attention and then relax it by code-switching again to EA.

The direction of CS seems to be meaningful. The dramatized segment seems to be always in SA, normally represents the peak of the information, and it is sometimes accompanied by prosodic prominence in the form of pitch accents.

It is interesting to notice, also, that CM appeared in the corpus to be not only a grammatical solution to diglossia (by mixing the two codes where grammars overlap) but also a rhetorical solution whenever the function the speaker wants to express is not clear in mind or when functions and rhetorical goals conflict during the argumentation.

At the level of the clause, it is probably possible to speak of a sort of rhetorical climax through CS. The switch begins slowly in the first contextual part and it increases with SA markers until it ends the movement. The opposite process is a sort of anticlimax: after drawing the attention on the climax in SA, the speaker relaxes it down by code-switching to EA. Yet, topicalization seems to be a more profitable key to better understand CS at this
level. Normally SA conveys topical clauses while EA conveys the comment part. SA conveys that about which one intends to speak. By uttering a clause in SA, the speaker probably invites the interlocutor to store the following information (in EA) as relative to the proposed topic. SA represents the static part of the communication (see also §1.9.1.). Comment is conveyed by EA and normally refers to the portion of the statement that contains the higher degree of information and communicative dynamism. Nevertheless, SA often conveys the peak of the comment part or a sort of restatement of the topic in different words. This is certainly a possible development for future research. Other possible paths for research would be studying the existence of phraseological loci, that is syntactic or phraseological structures that are more than others “sensible” to CS, and the links between style-raising and CM.

This kind of rhetorical analysis of CS is only one of the numerous ways to interpret this phenomenon. An “all-inclusive” model for the analysis of the combination of all possible motivational variants or purposes of CS in Arabic (social, situational, psychological, speaker-related, textual) is still far from being achievable since we are faced with extremely complex texts. Like anything else that can be subjected to analysis, CS may have very different (and divergent) readings, depending on the point of view one decide to choose and on personal interpretation. As stated by many authors quoted in the theoretical part, subjectivity of this kind of analysis is certainly a fact to deal with.

Moreover, it is clear that not always the loci presented here are CS-bearers. A locus does not mean an automatic CS. CS, in fact, still remains a free choice, a tool that speakers can choose to use or not for many reasons. Possible influencing factors and loci cannot absolutely foresee CS but only suggest the possibility that it will take place more easily. As Alfonzetti writes: «il passaggio da una lingua all’altra resta sempre una possibilità, una strategia comunicativa che il parlante è libero di utilizzare o meno, per raggiungere determinati obiettivi interazionali o per risolvere problemi legati alla conduzione e all’organizzazione dell’attività conversazionale» (1992:31). It is up to the speaker to choose how to treat a subject and in which rhetorical terms. Topics themselves do not impose any fixed rhetorical technique, beyond general lines and limits which are required by a given genre. The use of CS depends on how the speaker dynamically perceives himself, the public, and the message he wants to convey and must be considered as an essentially creative tool. And creativity is, by definition, difficult to be trapped in pre-set patterns. In Arabic, potentialities offered by SA and NA are enormous and data show how the “good” use of spoken Arabic consist in a complementary use of SA together with NA, in the sense that both symbiotically contribute to the construction of discourse.
I believe that what Mejdel stated with regard to stylistic variation in Egyptian Arabic applies also for CS, namely that «we may comfortably and impatiently continue the search for regularities, while keeping in mind the variable, diffuse and only partially systematic nature of this kind of data» (Mejdel 2007:96).
Appendices
Appendix 1 Corpus

The corpus I analysed is taken from a more vast corpus of homilies of father Mattā al-Miskin, also known in the English-speaking world as father Matthew the Poor (from now on, MM). MM was a prolific author. His writings concern mostly spiritual topics but there are also some works of social and political interest. In recent years, MM’s writings have experienced a considerable success not only in Egypt, even though these works suffer from a boycott by ecclesiastical institutions\(^{162}\), but also abroad where his works are read in Arabic – among Arab-speaker members of several Coptic immigrant communities - or in translation. Less known, especially abroad, is its vast corpus of oral teachings. The importance of this corpus should not be underestimated for several reasons. One cannot consider the fact that contemporary religious Arab culture is largely “audiophile”. This means, as Kepel writes in the Islamic context that

In the countries of the Third World, where much of the population is still unable to gain access to the written cultural, audiovisual equipment is the prime medium […] The spread of the cassette player during the seventies – and every emigrant brings back several for his family when he returns from the Arabian Peninsula – changed the flow of this discourse. People can now choose the cassettes they want, and can use them as antidotes to official discourse. The cassettes recorded by the ayatollah Khomeini, for instance, were a powerful factor in the overthrow of the Shah of Iran (Kepel 1985:173; italics are mine)

Somehow orality is the privileged means of transmission of religious knowledge - even in well-educated environments. This is what Hirschkind calls “cassette technology”: «[the cassette technology] makes the acquisition of a kind of traditional knowledge possible within the times and spaces of modern urban existence, one where the sort of long-term study, immersion, and apprenticeship characteristic of Islamic pedagogical practices has become inaccessible and impractical to most people» (Hirschkind 2001:642, italics mine).

This “ethics of listening” is shared by both Muslims and Eastern Christians. As since the early Seventies, the recordings of the rhetoric performances of šaykh Kišk began to spread in Cairo (elsewhere in Egypt, between Rabat and the New York Arab-speaking Muslim communities), that would have great impact over the religious education of a

\(^{162}\) In fact, despite the official boycott, the diffusion and the reading of MM's works is tolerated, provided that this remains in the private sphere. That is why many Copts, including members of the hierarchy, read MM but avoid talking about it publicly.
whole generation, in the same way, in the same moment, in Cairo (in the rest of Egypt, between the expatriate Coptic community and to a lesser extent, among other Eastern Christians) recordings of the īǧtimāʕāt (sort of catechetical meetings) of many Coptic prelates, started to circulate including the Coptic patriarch himself Shenouda III whose cassettes (and now, whose CDs) are on sale at all the Coptic churches. From the Seventies onwards, this phenomenon has always been very popular despite the competition of television. However, the space dedicated to the selling and the listening of Muslim and Christian sermons is significantly unequal. Whereas the Islamic sermons, in fact, are sold in mosques and the streets and be heard even in public places (shops, transport, etc..) recordings of the Christian sermons are sold inside the churches or in Christian bookstores and it is forbidden to play them in public places. The circle of sale narrows even more for MM whose cassettes (and now, whose CDs), due to mistrust in the hierarchy, are sold since the Eighties only within the walls of the monastery or in a small bookstore located in the Cairo district of Šubra (Dār Murqus), a subsidiary of the publishing house of the monastery.

1.0. TWO COLLECTIONS OF ORAL TEXTS

I have systematized a preliminary catalogue of the oral homilies of MM which has not been yet published. There are two collections of homilies in MM’s oral corpus, one public and one private. The first collection, which I have labelled as collection A consists of five CDs that contain about 190 homilies, speeches and spiritual reflections, that were transferred from cassettes to mp3 format. The total time of this collection is about 8,5 days. The collection of recordings is organized according to a chronological order: starting from 1973 until 2001. Before 1973, some monks used to take notes on

---

163 Bookstores in Egypt sell “generic” Islamic literature, but not Christian literature that has to be found in “specialized” Christian bookstores.
164 Brother Wadid al-Maqārī told me in April 2009 that MM’s oral corpus does not go beyond these two collections. Other records, not included in the two collections are incomplete or too short or otherwise felt as inappropriate, according to the monks, to be published. In the period MM spent out of the monastery, some lay disciples could have certainly recorded some casual conversations with him, but of these the monks have no news.
165 This has been organized by father Basilios al-Maqārī.
166 The terms used by the monks are two: ʕIza or waʕza to give the homily during a liturgical function; Kalima or Kalima rūḥiyya for catechesis delivered outside the liturgy.
167 This has been done by father Hilarion al-Maqārī. When I met him in April 2010 he told me that he was working on a great number of new recordings.
168 To be precise it is 207h 28’ 55”.
169 In April 2010, brother Wadid al-Maqārī told me a new enriched public version was going to be published.
some personal agenda. Today many of these notes are not considered suitable for publication by the disciples\textsuperscript{171}.

In fact, the first voice recording MM dates back to 1969. This is a short message sent from Cairo to the brethren, who were in Wadi al-Rayyān, and were informed by MM of the decision that which would mark the destiny of the community, namely the transfer of the monastic community from Wadi al-Rayyān to the Monastery of St. Macarius (see Tyvaert 2003). Only in 1973 a voice recorder was introduced in the monastery for the first time which permitted the recording of the first homilies.

This very first recording is found in the second collection, which I have labelled as collection B, organized by father Pachomios al-Maqāri. Of this collection two versions exist that I have labelled as B1 and B2. The last one is a mainly corrected version of the version B1 with a few modifications in the division of homilies (e.g. each homily has been made an independent file) and it is supposed to be the “final” version. This last version (B2), contains 288 homilies in six cd-roms for a total of about 241 hours of recordings. It is not for sale but it is privately distributed to the monks. It includes all of the sermons present in the market collection (A) with a substantial number of new recordings, on various topics. Among these we find a series of forty homilies of monastic interest which includes, in addition to the catechesis given to the novices and postulants, reading and commenting on MM of Bustan al-ruhbān\textsuperscript{172}. There is also a set of interviews and confidential discussions of MM, interviews with the Egyptian and the international press, with European and American Christian personalities of various Christian denominations. In the B1 and B2 collection homilies are grouped by ‘topic’ (e.g. “the Holy Spirit,” “the Gospel in our lives’), ‘occasion,’ or ‘feast’ (e.g. “Good Friday,” “Easter homilies”), ‘period of the liturgical year’ (e.g. “Lenten homilies,” “Advent homilies”) or ‘verse, Gospel excerpt or book commented’ (e.g. “Be transformed,” “John 17,” “Psalms”)\textsuperscript{173}.

2.0. CONTEXT AND AUDIENCE

Homiliesing is one of the fundamental monastic observances. Usually, homilies are delivered by older monks to younger monks as part of the practice of \textit{taslīm} i.e. the

\textsuperscript{171} Interview with brother Wadid Maqāri 20/04/2009.

\textsuperscript{172} Complex and heterogeneous compilation of hagiographies and apothegms of the desert fathers, in Egypt \textit{The Garden of the monks} (considered by some scholars, such as Fiey (1972:304), the Arabic version of the IV century Palladius of Galatia’s \textit{History Lausiaca}, which was written in Greek) is seen as the main source of inspiration and reflection on monastic life. It had a similar success to that which had, in the Latin world, the \textit{Rule} of Saint Benedict without having acquired the same legal value of the latter.

\textsuperscript{173} For example, are aggregated into a single folder, in a CD-ROM, all the homilies of the year on various holidays of Christmas, the fasting of Lent etc.
‘transmission / consignation’ of the monastic experience, that is the transmission of a tradition inspired by the Spirit and lived by the Apostles and the Fathers of monasticism, and not mere academic knowledge as a result of intellectual speculation.

On the occasion of pilgrims’ visits (young people, married couples, catechists, students, the workers who have worked for years in the monastery reconstruction) MM used to deliver a homily on a theme that approached their interests\textsuperscript{174}. The audience was often a mix of monks and lay people.

MM’s oral teachings took place on fixed locations: inside the monastery or in an annex of the monastery on the Egyptian North coast. Within the monastery of St. Macarius the places where MM used to delivery his homilies, during the liturgy\textsuperscript{175}, were: the three main churches of the monastery (the church of St. Macarius, the church of the forty-nine Martyrs of Scetis, the church of St. Apaschiron); the māʔida (at the same time ‘refectory’ and chapterhouse), where the monks gather for lunch and for teaching, since the second half of the Eighties\textsuperscript{176}, was the privileged place where MM pronounced his homilies outside the liturgical functions, besides being also the place where Bustān al-
ruhbān was read and commented during common meals; in the annex of the monastery we have the recording of four homilies (MM-266,267,268,269)\textsuperscript{177} delivered to some monks who had gone to visit MM in 1994; the guesthouse attached to the monastery was used as a place of teaching when the audience was composed by lay people.

According to his disciples, MM never read any work of \textit{ars praedicandi} thus remaining faithful to the Christian monastic tradition of homilying by following the inspiration of the Spirit without being bound by rules of ‘good rhetoric’ as stated by Leclerq: «In monasticism, they were content to imitate the models of genius that the Fathers of the Church had been [...] and to follow their suggestions [...]. Artifice is reduced to the minimum; it plays no greater part than that accorded it in ancient rhetoric where eloquence makes sport of eloquence, and \textit{where technique was never a substitute for inspiration}» (1982:174, italics mine). Most of the times, in fact, MM delivered his homilies without written note. Sometimes he used a sketch in which he concisely marked the main

\textsuperscript{174} For instance, during the visit of some medical students MM delivered a homily entitled \textit{al-ʕilm wa-7l7inǧīl} (‘Science and the Gospel’, 12/23/1975).

\textsuperscript{175} Since 1969, the year of the entry to the monastery of St. Macarius, until 2006, the date of his death, MM was the only one who delivered the homily during the liturgy or, in general, before the whole assembly of monks. Even today, during the liturgical celebrations, none of the monks deliver homilies but usually one of the elders reads a written text of MM or an transcribed oral homily. Interview with brother Wadīd al-Maqārī, April 2009.

\textsuperscript{176} Interview with brother Wadīd.

\textsuperscript{177} \textit{aṣ-šalāh bi-lā inqiṭāʕ wa-lā malal} (‘Praying always and without tiredness’, cf. Lk 18:1), 6.2.1994; \textit{aṣ-šalāh wa-r-rūḥ al-}
points of the speech which he developed during the homilies. The same notes often served as a starting point for his books\textsuperscript{178}.

\section*{3.0. Transcribed Homilies}

I have listened to more than 20 hours of recordings and I have transcribed three homilies which represent 179 minutes. In doing this I have tried to:

(i) diachronically choose them over the chronological space of 30 years (one in the Seventies, one in the Eighties, one in the Nineties);

(ii) choose different typologies, although the same homily contains many typologies with itself (one monastic/moral theology, one exegetical/festal/soteriological, one ascetical);

(iii) choose different duration (from 19 minutes to 109 minutes).

The chosen homilies are the following:

1. \textit{al-maḥabba} (‘Love’) (1975) (it will be referred to as MM-50, according to the catalogue), 109 minutes (unpublished);

2. \textit{samāʔ ǧadīda wa-ṭarḍ ǧadīda} (‘A new heaven and a new earth,’ Rev 21:1) (1980) (it will be referred to as MM-136, according to the catalogue), 51 minutes (published in \textit{Murqus}, n. 4/80, with the title “al-qiyāma wa-l-xaliqa”);

3. \textit{ṣalāt aṣṣurāx} (‘Outcrying prayer’) (labelled as MM-270 in the catalogue, it will be referred to as MM-270, according to the catalogue) (1994), 19 minutes (unpublished), was delivered at the Monastery’s annex.

\section*{3.1. MM-50 Outline}

In almost all the recordings, there is an initial announcement about introducing the content. The typical introduction is as follows: \textit{Dayr al-qiddīs Anbā Maqār bi-barriyyat Šihīt. Siţa (or kalima) li-ʔaţinā ar-rūḥī al-qummuṣ Mattā al-Miskīn ʕan (topic). ʔulqiyat yawm (date) (‘Monastery of St. Macarius, Desert of Scetis. Homily (or speech) of our spiritual father the hegumen Mattā al-Miskīn about (topic). Pronounced on (date)’). In this homily the introduction is as follows: \textit{Dayr al-qiddīs Anbā Maqār bi-barriyyat Šihi:t | / kalima li-ʔaţiba:n r-rū:hi: al-qummuṣ Matta al-Miskin ʕan il-maḥabba / muwaggaha li-l-ʔaba?: ir-ruhba:n fi masa?: is-sabt xamsa ?apri:l ʕam ?alft tusʔumiyya xamsa w-sabʕi:n (‘Monastery of St. Macarius, Desert of Scetis. Speech of our spiritual father the hegumen Mattā al-Miskīn about “Love”, addressed to the fathers monks the evening of Saturday 5th of April 1975’).}

\textsuperscript{178} Interview with brother Wadid al-Maqārī.
The day in which the homily was pronounced was the eve of the Samaritan woman’s Sunday.

The subject of this homily is ‘Love’. After opening with the traditional formula (‘In the name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, one God, amen’) and enunciating the topic, MM quotes the long passage of Jn 17. Then he comments the passage, contextualizing it within the monastic life. New quote from 1 Corinthians 12-13, the so-called ‘St. Paul’s hymn to love’. Again the passage is recontextualized within the monastic experience. A series of story-telling explains the outer level of love (towards our neighbour) and the inner one (towards God), interspersed with various quotes from the Gospel.

The effect of the outer level of love is ensured by the verse Mt 6:3. Long flash-backs tell two autobiographical experiences of MM: his relationship with prayer as a child (the story of the family prayer) and his precocious awareness (the story of the suwwāḥ). The moral is: union with God takes place when we are children, it is essential to go back to our childhood to learn how to pray. Man has to love God with all his heart, all his soul, all his mind and all his strength (Dt 6:5).

A story (that of a child who continues to praise God even after being killed) is used to explain how man continuously praises God when he is clothed with the Holy Spirit (the inner level of love). Others stories that have taken place in the monastery and are known to the monks are used to explain the praxis of love, the outer level, which is linked to the inner level as a plant which is planted and must be watered in order to give fruits: man must be watered by the Holy Spirit in order to practice love. Then he passes on to the importance of losing one’s own life (Mt 16:25) through the practice of love.

MM introduces a quotation from the Gospel of Matthew (25:35-36) which clears the way for a long reflection on the fact that the external acts of love are in fact accomplished to Christ himself. The apparent paradox is that we take from Christ to give Christ. The world need new christs who are able to work like Christ worked when he was on earth. God is love and cannot be reached but through love. The homily is closed by the ending prayer.

3.2. **MM-136 OUTLINE**

This homily, entitled samāʔ gadīda waʔarḍ gadīda (‘A new heaven and new earth’ – Rev 21:1), is introduced by the following incipit: kalima liʔquds abi:na r-ruhi ʔal-qummuṣ matta l-miski:n ʔulqiyat šaba:ḥ yo:m ʕi:d il-qiya:ma l-mag:gi:n sitta ʔabri:1 sanat ʔalf w-tisʕiniyya w-tamani:n bi-dayr al-qiddi:s il-ʔanba maqa:r bi-barrīyyat Šiḥi: (‘Speech of our
reverend spiritual father hegumen Mattā al-Miskīn, delivered in the morning of the great feast of Easter, 6th April 1980, in the St. Macarius, Desert of Scetis’). After opening with the traditional Trinitarian formula, MM quotes from Rev 21:1-4, greets the audience with the Paschal greeting (‘Christ is risen!’) and states the topic: Christ’s death and resurrection’s goal was to create a new earth and a new heaven after Adam’s fall.

Then he starts to evaluate Adam’s high position in heaven before the fall. God’s solution to the fall of man was not to physically re-create man but to put on everything belongs to the human nature, uniting his divine nature with the human one, in order to ensure that man will not fall from grace again, that he will thus fulfil the goal that God set for his existence and obtain the glory that the human race had in heaven (Jn 17:22). He then goes back and forth from Adam’s fall to Christ’s restoration of the human race through death and resurrection. Later on he comments on a statement by Athanasius of Alexandria according to which Christ took from the Virgin Mary a created body that he divinized so that it acquired all the attributes of divinity. Christ’s resurrection was inevitable because in him humanity, which was subject to death, was perfectly united with divinity which is eternal. After his resurrection Christ gave us himself in many ways: through faith, through Baptism, through the Word, through prayer, through the Eucharist. Christ not only took on himself the sin of the world but became sin himself, he united with it in his body that died on the cross. Then he resurrected with a new body not subject neither to sin nor to death. By his death and resurrection the creation is restored to its primordial beauty to live in a new heaven and a new earth.

**3.3. MM-270 OUTLINE**

This homily, entitled ṣalāt aṣ-ṣurāx (‘Outcrying prayer’), has no incipit and no Trinitarian formula. The main topic is the need to pray intensely. MM states that the present historical period is enveloped in spiritual darkness and God asks believers to pray with tears. The Church is not immune from this ‘spiritual night’ because, similar to the lukewarm church of the Revelation (the church of the Laodiceans, see Rev 3:14-22), it claims to be satisfied with itself while it is divided within itself and in need of God’s mercy. Prayer must spring from sincere wounded hearts, just as Christ’s prayer arose in the Gethsemane. The world needs outcrying prayers that move to pity God the Father’s heart. One of the elements that distinguish a genuine from a non-heartfelt prayer is the cry of the heart and sincere tears. Often God does not immediately answer the prayers of the believers because he desires that man prays more intensely and, therefore, in a more
sincere way. MM concludes the prayer by asking God that hearts may pray unceasingly and with an outcrying attitude.
Appendix 2 Transcription conventions

I have made a phonemic transcription (large transcription). I used some traditional characters of the transliteration of Arabic (e.g. ṣ, ṭ etc.), some characters taken from the International Phonetic Alphabet (e.g. θ, ð etc.) and other unusual but practical characters (e.g. ɂ, ɖ). Being SA, Cairene EA and Delta EA used by MM alternatively, the result is a mutual influence between them at every level of linguistic structure and so it goes for phonology. Performance of SA tend to reflect the phonology of the speaker’s dialect(s) (see Harrell 1960:6-30). None of the so called ‘religious’ phonetic features (see Holes 1995:55-56) occur in the texts. This seems to confirm that these features only characterize Islamic religious discourse.

1.1. CONSONANTS

The consonants of SA and EA and the symbols used for transcriptions in the following chapters are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>places of articulation</th>
<th>manners of articulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plosive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilabial</td>
<td>(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labiodental</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interdental</td>
<td>θ δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velarized</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dental</td>
<td>t d s z l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velarized</td>
<td>ţ ɖ ş ġ l**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postalveolar</td>
<td>š ż ġ r n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velar</td>
<td>k g x ǧ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uvular</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pharyngeal</td>
<td>ħ ğ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glottal</td>
<td>ʔ/ʔ* h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x) = marginal, occurring in foreign loans *ʔ = a glottal stop which is etymologically a /q/ ** every time /l/ appears in the word /allaːh/ is velarized

The symbols /p, v, ż/ stand for segments of marginal phonemic status, occurring only in unassimilated loanwords, e.g. /parakliːt/ ‘Paraclite’, /servant/ ‘servant (eng.)’,
/ʕilm il- análropolożi/ ‘Anthropology’. Sometimes the same word can be uttered with /p/ and /b/ e.g. /parakli:t/ or /barakli:t/. I have included the double ‘standard’ realization of the SA letter ﺇ in Egypt i.e. /ẓ/ and /ɖ/ and the double realization (SA or EA) of /ɡ/ i.e. the common /ɡ/ and the less common /ğ/.

As regards EA, I have not written down what I thought to be easily recognizable to those who know EA and, moreover, not essential for the analysis. On the contrary, I have distinguished the glottal stop which is etymologically a ء, e.g. /raʔs/ ‘head’ from that which is etymologically a ﺢ /ralb/ ‘heart’. No distinction has been made for those instances in which the dental fricative is actually etymologically interdental (or predental) i.e. /zaːlikə/ ‘that’ (→ /daːlikə/) or /saːbit/ ‘fixed’ (→ /daːbit/). I have not recorded secondary velarization i.e. /ɡ(i)rən/ ‘neighbours’ → /gaːɾi/ ‘my neighbour’ but /ɡarə/ ‘running’. Neither have I recorded /l/ because it is pronounced systematically in the word /allaːh/ only (cfr. Ferguson 1978). Most of the remaining consonants may be velarized when in proximity to one of the primary or secondary velarized consonants e.g. /nusʃʃ/ ‘half’ or /laːhiʒ/ ‘notice’. Since this is the case also for vowels (see next paragraph) I used Harrell’s (1957) and Schmidt’s (1974) approach, that is to treat velarization «as a prosodic feature which occurs over a segment of varying length but at least as long as one syllable» (Schmidt 1974:45). Velarization of syllables has not be noted down.

No allophonic utterances have been noted down e.g. /daːxtʃ/ has been noted as /daːgʃ/, /ʔiktamaʃ/ as /ʔigtamaʃ/. An exception is /ba-kkallem/ which is distinguished by /ba-tkallem/ which may give a hint about the diglossic characterization of an utterance.

1.2. VOWELS

SA has three short vowels /a, i, u/ and three long vowels /aː, iː, uː/ and two diphthongs /aw, ay/. EA has five long vowels /aː, iː, uː, eː, oː/ with /eː/ and /oː/ being the monophthongization of the SA diphthongs /ay/ and /aw/ respectively. When long vowels are pronounced somehow short brackets have been put around the colon e.g. /yilumu(ː)ni/.

As most authors do (see Schmidt 1974:46) only three short vowels have been transcribed as in SA /a, i, u/.

/a/ tends to be pronounced as [æ], but is more centralized and less open, closer to [ɐ̝], except when it occurs before or after velarized consonants, in velarized syllable or in some cases before and after /q/ or /ʁ/. In such cases, a is pronounced farther back in the mouth as [a], e.g. [sammi:ʃ] ‘he insisted’, [baɾɾiʃ] ‘terra firma’. When it occurs before or after /ʕ/ and /h/ it is pronounced more open as [a] e.g. [hansi:ʃ] ‘we will leave’. /aː/
tends to be pronounced as [æ:], but is more centralized and less open, closer to [a:], except when it occurs before or after velarized consonants, in velarized syllable or in some cases before and after /q/ or /ʁ/. In such cases, /a:/ is pronounced farther back in the mouth as [a:], e.g. /ʕaːr/ [ʕaːr], [ʕaːbi] ‘officer’, [ʕaːbir] ‘patient’, [maqːaːl] ‘article’, [taruʔa] ‘he revealed himself’. All the allophones of the short a have been noted as /a/ and all those of the long a have been noted as /aː/. Epenthetic /a/ has been noted e.g. /ˈhubbaha/ ‘her love’. I have made no distinction between alif maqṣūra, alif mamdūda and alif madda. All of them have been transcribed a, a(ː) or a: according to the length of the pronunciation.

The EA pronunciation of the vowel /i/ has a much wider allophonic range than the comparable vowel in English or in French. /i/ is often near-close and near-frontal so that some authors transcribe it as /e/. Schmidt affirms that there is, in fact, no real phonematic opposition i/e or /u/o (1974:47). Woidich/Heinein-Nasr use /e/ and /o/ only to distinguish the shortened /i:/ and /u:/ from normal /i/ and /u/ (see 2004:4). Here, the shortening of /i:/ has always been transcribed as /i/ and not /e/ e.g. /ˈtigibha/ ‘you bring her’ where a phenomenon of shortening takes place from the word /ˈtigi:b/ ‘you bring’ because the long vowel is followed by two consonants. The same has been done in every other case of shortening of vowels, e.g. /biːːl/ + /luh/ + /ka:za/ → /biːːlu:kaːza/ ‘you tell him so and so’ (syllables: biːːl/luh/kaːza; here the final CV:C – second syllable - ceases to be word final as a result of bound morpheme suffixation so the long vowel in the syllable is shortened). But /biːːlu:/ + /uh/ → /biːːlu:h/ (syllables: biːːlu:luh/)

It is sometimes realized as a closed non-labialized prevelar [ɨ] which occurs next to the velarized consonants e.g. [ˈʃinaːs] ‘industry’. The allophones of /i/ have not been noted down. So ‘our house’ (from /beːt/) and ‘we spent the night’ (from /baːt/) will be both transcribed as /bitna/. The epenthetic or helping vowel /i/ e.g. /ˈhɪlwiː zawi/ ‘very nice’ or /kulli sana/ ‘every year’ has not been noted down excepted when followed by suffix pronouns e.g. /ˈhubbina/ ‘our love’. The prosthetic vowel /a/ e.g. /ˈal-waːt/ ‘(the) time’ has been noted as /iː/ /ˈil-waːt/.

Like for the shortened /iː/, the shortened /uː/ has been transcribed as /u/ and not /oː/ e.g. /ˈyiːtuːlha/ [ˈyiːtuːlha] ‘he reaches her’ (from /ˈyiːtuːl/). The epenthetic vowel /u/ has been noted down e.g. /ˈʃuftuhum/ ‘I saw them’.

All other cases of shortened vowels have been signalled (see Abdel-Massih 2009:324-327).

---

179 I have used Woidich & Heinen Nasr 2004:4 with some emendments.
Elision at word boundaries (see Abdel-Massih 2009:320) has been noted down only in some cases e.g. /šafuː/ + /ʔimbaːriḥ/ → /šafuː mbaːriḥ/ ‘they saw him yesterday’. Elision of /i/ and /u/ from word-initial CiC- CuC- (see Abdel-Massih 2009:321) has been noted down e.g. /ʔinta/ + /biːtidris/ → /ʔinta b-tidris/ ‘you study’.

![Figure 6 Vowels.](image)

1.3. STRESS

«The conventions for word stress in ‘secular’ MSA reflect the rules for stress placement in the urban dialects spoken in the Mashreq (=the eastern Arab world), i.e. Egypt and the countries to the east of it. And just as between certain of these dialects there is a degree of variation in stress placement in certain syllabic concatenations (in particular between Egypt and the rest), so there is a corresponding fluctuation in regional realizations of these same concatenations in MSA» writes Holes (1995:50). In fact, stress rules are not always clear in SA. Stress is shaped almost totally by the NA stress (see Holes 1995:50-70). Moreover, the difference is often between Cairene EA and the rest while non-Cairene EA has often a stress which is similar to that of non-Egyptian mashriqi countries.
Cairene EA has one primary stress (more prominent) which is on the penult (i.e., pre-final syllable), e.g. /yiʕmilu/ ‘they do’, /matkâba/ ‘library’. The final syllable is stressed when (a) it contains a long vowel, e.g. /ʕâmâlù/ ‘they made it’ or when (b) it ends in two consonants, e.g. (b) /ʕâmâlt/ ‘I made’. The antepenult (i.e., the third from the end) is stressed if the last three syllables have the structure CVCV(C), e.g. /šâbaka/ ‘net’, /ʕâmalit/ ‘she made’, /munfaṣila/ ‘separated (f.)’. On the contrary, when the structure CVCVCV(C) constitutes a feminine singular of a perfect tense verb whose final V(C) is a pronoun suffix then the primary stress is on the penult, e.g. /ʃâfitu/ ‘she saw him’. If the structure CVCVCV(C) constitutes a broken plural with identical vowels in the first two syllable, e.g. /ḥîṣîna/ ‘horses’.

Cairene MS speakers stress SA forms of four or more syllables in a typical way which is different from other Egyptian or non Egyptian dialects. Not existing in Cairene EA, long vowels in antepenultimate position are neutralised and stress falls on the penultimate syllable, e.g. /muqâ:ba/ → /muqâ:bâ/ ‘meeting’ (see Tomiche 1964:91). Yet, Delta EA might bring the accent back on the long vowel, i.e. /muqâ:ba/. Thus, both competing forms exist in the texts. Forms like /ʔâmaltu/ ‘I made it’ or /ʔânnahu/ where the antepenultimate should normally be stressed may be stressed on the penultimate, e.g. /ʔâmâltu/, /ʔânnâhù/ or, under the influence of the dialectal verb form /ʔâmâltu/ and /ʔînnu/, may also be stress sometimes as /ʔâmâltu/ or /ʔânnahu/.

Whenever the accent in the text is not Cairene (that is influenced by the Delta native dialect of MM) I have signalled that by putting an accent, e.g. /yumâggidâk/ ‘he glorifies you’, /nâfsina/ ‘our soul’ etc.

1.4. Article

Article has been transcribed as /l-, al-, ?al-, il-, ?il-/ . The assimilated article has been noted, e.g. /š-šams, aš-šams, ?aš-šams, iš-šams, ?iš-šams/. Non-assimilated cases (e.g., /al-sabab/) of the article are frequent and have been signalled.

1.5. Ambiguous word boundaries

Word boundaries are not always clear, especially when words are in close transition. As Mejdell states «in a transcription and analysis of mixed styles, involving both basic codes, in addition to deviations in usage from both – especially with regard to lack of liaison with a following article, the issue has wider implications. For instance, whether I

180 I have used Abdel-Massih, Abdel-Malek & Badawi 2009:254.
transcribe *daras al-kimya* or *darasa l-kimya* ‘he studies chemistry’, would seem to reflect
different interpretations of code assignment: the first, *daras*, would be considered a
neutral verb form (shared by EA and pausal form SA); the second, *darasa* a SA full form
(2006:86). Here the same system used by Mejdell has been adopted: functionally
ambiguous cases of short vowels /a/ and /i/ have been transcribed as if belonging to the
following article, expected cases where the context is clearly +SA.

Preverbs have been generally transcribed as attached to the following word with a
hyphen (e.g. *bi-yizul* ‘he says’ etc.). Prepositions have been transcribed according to
orthography (e.g. *li-l-insa:n* ‘to man’ but *fi l-bet* ‘in the house’). EA preverbs as *bi*-
and *ha*-, have been transcribed as ba- and ha- when prefixed to 1PS imperfect verbs, e.g.
*ba-ʔurakkiz* ‘I concentrate’, *ha-ʕiːš* ‘I will live’. The EA intensive particle *ma*
has always been transcribed separated from the following word, also when the word is a pronoun,
e.g. *ma hu* ‘but in fact he...’, *ma na* ‘but in fact I...’.

When the preposition *li-* follows a verb, it has been noted with a hyphen: e.g. *ʔavul-
u* ‘I tell him,’ *ʔulti-―lu* ‘I told him,’ *ʔal-―lak* ‘he told you’ etc.

1.6. **SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF MM’S IDIOLECT**

Probably born in Banhā in 1919, MM lived across various towns of the Delta (mainly
Banhā, al-Manṣūra and Damanhūr) until 1948, the year in which he took his vows. MM’s
way of speaking presents many linguistic traits influenced by his origin. Among these, the
most relevant are the following:

- **accentuation** is of the kind: sàmak, sàmaka, yìktib, yìktibu, (y)ikàl(li)mu, màktaba
  (see Woidich & Behnstedt 1985, map 59);
- the use of /ğ/ instead of /g/ might be the result of the contact with șafîdî people
  (in the various monasteries he lived in) or the normal use of some microregions in
  the Delta as shown in Woidich & Behnstedt 1985, map 11;
- **lexical particularities**: the use of ?ilwazi (see Woidich & Behnstedt 1985, map 178,
  179);
- **syllable**: ‘break-up’ (*aufsprengung*) of –CC# → [CvC] in words like *suxn* → *suxun*
  (see Woidich & Behnstedt 1985, map 51);
- **verbal forms**:
  - verbal modification (3pms, imperfect tense): *b-imsik* instead of *bi-yimsik* (see
    Woidich & Behnstedt 1985, map 223);
  - verbal stems
V form (imperfect): yitkallam instad of yitkallim (see Woidich & Behnstedt 1985, map 226, 232, 237);
passive: yinḍarab (instead of yinḍirib) (see Woidich & Behnstedt 1985, map 245, 252) or yitbana (instead of yitbini) (map 295, 296).
Appendix 3 Transcription of the homilies

Transcription of the homily MM-50

0

bi-sm il-ʔa:b wa-l-ibn wa-r-ruːḥ il-qudus il-ilaːḥ il-waːḥid amī:n | /// ha-nitkallim /// ʔan
il-maḥabba // w-ʔaxtarː fašleːn // ʔaʃaːn bass yibrū madxal // ?aw fi l-waːqiʕ / miš
madxal li-l-mawdūːʕ / walaːkin // quwwa daʃa li-n-nafs // ʔaʃaːn tuhayyaʔ fi
fi

1

l-ʔiḥsaːs bi-l-maḥabba | // li-ʔinn lamma ha-nitkallim ʔan il-maḥabba // maʃna:
ha-nitkallim ʔan / il-ḥayaː kullaḥa / li-ʔinnaha ḥayaːt il-masiːḥ | w-ʔaxtarː fašleːn / faʃl
min famm il-masiːḥ w-faʃl min famm / ir-ruːḥ il-qudus ʕala / lišaːn / buːlis ir-rasuːl | ///
min ingiːl // yuːḥanna r-rasuːl il-ʔiʃhaːː is-saː biːf ʕaʃar | // takallama yasuːʃ bi-haːda:
wa-rafaʃa ʕayneːhi nahw as-samaːʔ wa-qaːl / ?ayyuhaː l-ʔaːb qad ʔaːtati s-saːʃa / maggīd
ibnak li-yumāġgidak ibnak ʔaydan | // ṭiː ʔaʃṭaytahu sulṭaːnan ʕala kulli gasad li-yuʃṭi
ʔaːḥ ḥayatːaːn abadiyya

2

li-κull man ʔaʃṭaytahu | / haːdihi hiya l-ḥayːaːt il-ʔabadiyya ʔan yaʃrifuːk / ?anta l-ʔiːlaːh
il-ḥaːqiːqi / waḥduk wa-yasaːʃ il-masiːḥ illaːʔi ʔaʃraltu(h) | // ʔana maggattak ʕala l-ʔard |
// ?al-ʃamal ʔallaːdi ʔaʃṭaytani / li-ʔaʃmal qad ṭakmaltu(h) / wa-l-ʔaːn maggidni ʔanta
ʔayyuhaː l-aːb ʕand ʔaːtika bi-l-magd illaːʔi: kaːn li: Ŧindak qabl kawni l-ʕaːːlam | / ʔana
ʔaʃḥaːrt ismak il-quddː... ismak li-n-nasː / ʔallaːziːna ʔaʃṭaytani mini l-ʕaːːlam | / kaːnu
laka wa-ʔaʃṭaytahum li: wa-qad ʕafaːdʁ kalaːmak / wa-l-ʔaːn salimu ʔanna kulla ma
ʔaʃṭaytani huwa min Ŧindak / li-ʔanna l-kalaːm ʔallaːdi ʔaʃṭaytani ʔaʃṭaytuhum wa-hum
qabalu wa-ʕalimu yaqːiːnaːn ʔanni xaragtu min Ŧindak wa-ʔamanu ʔannak ʔanta ʔaʃraltani
/ min ʔagliːm ʔana ʔasːal / lastu ʔasːal min ʔagl il-ʕaːːlam bal min ʔagl allaːdiːna
ʔaʃṭaytani li-ʔaːnnahum lak | //

3

kull ma huwa li: fa-huwa lak wa-ma huwa lak huwa li: wa-ʔana mumaggadun fiːhum | /
lastu ʔana baːʃd fi l-ʕaːːlam wa-ʔamma haʔulaːʔa fa-hum fi l-ʕaːːlam wa-ʔana ʔaːti ʔileːk | /
ʔayyuha l-ʔaːb il-quduːs ʔiʃfaːţhum fi ʔismak | / ʔallaːdiːna ʔaʃṭaytani li-yakuːnu
wa-ḥidan kama nahnu | / ʕiːna kunt maʃahum fi l-ʕaːːlam kunt ʔaʃfaːţhum fi ʔismika | /
ʔallaːdiːna ʔaʃṭaytani ḥaʃaṭtuhum wa-ʃah yahlik minhum ʔahad ṭilla ibn il-ḥalaːk |
li-yatimma l-kitaːb | / ʔamma l-ʔaːn fa-ʔinni ʔaːti ʔileːk / wa-ʔatakkallam bi-haːda fi
l-ʕaːːlam li-yakuːna lahum faraːhi kaːmilan fiːhum | / ʔana ʔaʃṭaytahum kalaːmak
wa-l-ʕaːːlam ʔabɡaːţhum li-ʔaːːnnahum laysu mina l-ʕaːːlam kama: ʔanni ʔana / lastu mina
1. یا،همام‌ها، که شایت نماید، من از یا،هام‌ها، می‌توانم یا،هام‌ها، را به‌طور کامل نمایم، و/or
2. یا،هام‌ها،/ زحمت می‌کنیم، که یا،هام‌ها،/ را به‌طور کامل نمایم، و/or
3. یا،هام‌ها،/ صدای زن و/or
4. یا،هام‌ها،/ صدای زن و/or
5. یا،هام‌ها،/ صدای زن و/or
6. یا،هام‌ها،/ صدای زن و/or
7. یا،هام‌ها،/ صدای زن و/or
8. یا،هام‌ها،/ صدای زن و/or
9. یا،هام‌ها،/ صدای زن و/or
10. یا،هام‌ها،/ صدای زن و/or
11. یا،هام‌ها،/ صدای زن و/or
null
ţari:qan ʔaʃda:l | ʔin kuntu tatakallamu bi-ʔalsinati n-na:si wa-l-malà:ʔika / wala(ː)kin
laysa li(ː) maḥabba / fa-qad širtu naḥːasːan yaṭinn ?aw šingan yarinn | / wa-ʔin ka:naṭ li(ː)
nubuwwa(wa) ha-ʔaʃlaːm gamiːr il-ʔasraːr wa-kulla ſilm / wa-ʔin ka:na li(ː) kulla l-ʔimaːn
ḥatta ʔaʃqil il-ɡibːaːl wala:kin laysa li(ː) maḥabba fa-lastu šayːan | / wa-ʔin

12

ʔaʃʔamtu kulla ʔamwaːli wa-ʔaʃlamtu gasadi ḡatta štaraːq / wala:kin laysa li(ː) maḥabba
fa-łaː ʔantəfisiːu šayːan | ʔal-маḥabba tatəʔannaː wa-tarfuq / ʔal-маḥabba laː tạḥʃid /
ʔal-маḥabba laː tatəfːaxːar wa-laː tantaːfːix / laː taqbuːḥ wa-laː taṭluːb maː li-naʃsiːaː / laː
taʔtadd wa-laː taqunan as-suːʔ / laː tafrəːḥ bi-l-ʔiːðm bal tafrəːḥ bi-l-ḥaːqq | / taʔtamlil kull
šayː bass ṭar-gamaː iʃ-ʃaːːliːʔaː / stegiː [ʃtēːqj] yaʃːni bi-l-ʔunoː(ː)ni tqaʃːti ʃala l-ʃuyːːb ?aw
taʃːbur ʃalaːha fi ʂamt / ?aw ʃusaːmːiːḥ wa-tuʃːiʃi ʃuːdːr / daː miːn il-qaːmuːs il-kiːbiːr | //
taʔtamlil kull šayː diː ʔiːl-ʔaʃːʃaːf fi t-taʃːbiːr walaːkin tuqaʃːti ʃala ʃuyːːb / ɾʌbdːuː ʔiːnː
iʒ-zaːhir ʔanbaː maːqaːːriːs kːaːn ʃaːːriːfːa kida | / tuqaʃːti ʃala ʃuyːːb il-ʔaxarːiːn fi ʂamt | /
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hiya katabha taʔtamlil taʔtamlil ʃaːfːaː fiː / ʃaːfːaː fiː l-maʃːhuːm / ʔinːnːama hiya eːhm tuqaʃːti
ʃala l-ʃuyːːb / ?aw ʃusaːmːiːḥ wa-tuʃːiʃi ʃuːdːr / fi l-maʃːhuːm il-ʔaxːlaːqi | / taʔtamlil kull
šayː ... bass ʔana mzaːwːiːd kilma ʃalaːʃːaːːn yibːaːn il-ʔaːyaː / ɾaːzːuːl il-kiːlma w-di miːʃ
mawgːuːda kilmːin allːaː miːn allːaː miːn allːaː haːzːkːurːa kṭiːr | / taʔtamlil kull šayː / miːn
allːaː / tuʃːaddiːq kulla šayː / miːn allːaː / targaː kulla šayː / miːn allːaː / taʃːbiːr ʃala kulli šayː
/ miːn allːaː / ʔal-маḥabba laː taʃːqːt ʔaʃbaːdaːn / ʃan allːaː | / waːʔamma n-nubuwwaːt
fa-sa-taːbːtːuːl / wa-l-laʃːinsaː tantːahiː / wa-l-ʃilm yabːtːuːl / li-ʔanːnːana naʃːlːam baːʔʃaː l-ʃilm /
wa-natanaːbaː baːʔʃaː t-taŋːaːbːuː / walaːkin mataːgaːʔa l-kaːmːil yabːtːul maː huwa baːʃːd | //

/// lamːma kunuː tiːflan

14

kaːtʃifl kunuː tatakallam wa-kaːtʃifl kunuː ʔaʃːtːin wa-kaːtʃifl kunuː ʔufakːiːr | / walaːkin
lamːma ʂirtu ragːuːlan ʔaʃː芰ːtuː maː liː-ʃtifl | / faːʔinːnːana nandːuːr il-ʔaːn fi miːrːaː / / fi luːʃːz
/// fi miːrːaːː hina yaqːʃːud ʔiːnː suːraː geːr muːbaːʃːira | layːsːa l-gawːhar naʃːfuː walaːkin fi luːʃːz
yuʃːabːir ʃan allːaː | / faːʔinːnːana nandːuːr il-ʔaːn fi miːrːaː fi luːʃːz laːkin ḡiːnaːʔiːdːiːn waghːan
li-ʔaʃːɡːoː yaʃːni ʃʃuːː raː ʃaːnyːaː ʔaw ig-gawːhar | ʔal-ʔaːn ʔaʃːriːf baːʃːd il-maʃːriːfa laːkin
hiːːnaːʔiːdːiːn saːʔaʃːriːf kama ʃuːrifː | / ʔamma l-ʔaːn / faːyaːbut il-ʔiːmaːn waːrːaːgːaːʔa
wa-l-маḥabba | / haːdːiː ʔoːaːlaːʔa walaːkin ʔaʃːdːəmːhunːa l-маḥabba /// baːzːuːl yaː baːʔi
/ ʔiːn
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law ikallimt ʃan il-маḥabba / yibːa baːtκallim ʃan / il-ɬːyaːː ʀ-raḥbːanːiːyːa ʃala ɬːuːl miːn
ğeːr kalaːm yaʃːni dαʃːt ʃala ɬːuːl fi l-ʃumːq | / wa-ʃʔaːdeːn law ikallimnːa ʃan il-ɬːyaːː:
r-rahbaniyya / min hina li-sana ga:ya w-ma-zakarna:-ši l-maḥabba fi s-sikka yibza
3  ḥan taku:na ka:milan fa-ʔe?: // [voices from the audience] bi:š ?amlakak w-ʔe?: w-ʔe?:
5  [………] ?a ru:l / [inaudible voice from the audience]
6  16
8  w-ba:šde:n mumkin ilwaẓtī bi-niḍdar niʃabbar ṣanha ṣi:za kunta ṣa:w... an tur:ši:d an
10  wa:ḥid min il-ʔa:ba: mutaqaddim fi l-maḥabba ba:ʃat ba:ʃišli fi l-kara:š; [kurra:š al-ʔi:tiraf,
11  everyone has his own] yizu:llemi:š fi ma raʔyak / hal il-maṭa:niyya:ya: t yibza ʔafmil ke:t w-ket
14  wa-nkašafa lahun is-sirr / laysu:/ taḥt in-na:mu:š ba:ʃd | / kull illi tiʃmilu yibza ʃaḥḥ ʔin
15  ʃalle:t bi-l-maẓa:mi:r ʃaḥḥ ʔin ʃalle:t bi-l-miyya w-xamsi:n mazmu:r ʃaḥḥ ʔin wiʃṣṭ tu:l
17  id-da:ʃi:š ila:hi w-il-ḥubb
18
1  muḥriq / ma-yifarraz-š il-maḥabba ma... yaʃni ʔawwil ma tidxul fi l-ḥubb il-ʔi:la:hi miʃ
3  wa-la-tfarraz ma ben:n / iṣ-ʃubḥ wa-d-duhr ṣaw il-le:l wa-la tfarraz ma ben:n iḍ-ḍal...
4  ʔa:ẓulma w-in-nuːr wa-la-ṭiẓdar tifarraz ma ben:n il-xabar iṯ-ṭayyib w-il-xabar il-wiḥi:ʃ /
5  wa-la yumkin tifarraz ma ben:n il-yoːm ŋinta truːm fi: saliːm giddan w-ʃaːfi ʒawī w-il-yoːm
6  ʔiːliː truːm fi: ma-ṭiẓdar-ʃ truːm ŋin ŋala ḥeːlak ŋin ŋala l-farːa / | / ʔiːza rakab il-ḥubb fi
7  l-qalb wa-malak bi-yuṣayyir il-ḥayaːh / samaːʔ gadiːda wa-ʔaːɾd gadiːda | / wa-kull ma
8  yaʃrīd ŋala l-insaːn bi-yibza ʃahi wa-mubaːrak giddan giddan | // faː-ṭaʃfən ʔeːh illi
9  id-daːfiː ʃaːni lamma ba-taḥħassas fi qalbi le: n-nahaːrdǝ fakkart
10
1  ʔaktub il-κilma bi-xtiːsah illi ʔuḍdaːmi di le: ʃaːshaːn ʔaːzdar atzakkarha ʃaːshaːn zihni miːš
2  ḡaːdir | / ehm ŋan il-maḥabba fi l-waːqiːf ma-ẓdar-ʃi ya ʔabboːhaːt ʔuːbaːšir waːqiːfatī ʔa ʔaːb
3  ʔiːla ŋan ṣaːriːq il-maḥabba | / miʃ mumkin ʔaːʃaːlaːh ʔaːy yalːtaː f wuːt ʔil-gaːmaːʃa ʔiːla
4  bi-l-maḥabba la: ʔaːstaːtːiʃ ʔiːniː ʔaːzaːwweedlak fi ʪunaːwweːk ir-ruːhī ehm qayda ʃaːʃra ʔaːw
5  qayda طيب / insaːn ʔaw malaːk ʔiːla ŋan ṣaːriːq il-maḥabba | / ʔaːna ba-ʔaːjaddim il-ʔuːbhb
6  w-baːʃdeːn ŋinta bi-tafhaːʃ wa-tataːawwaːq waː// tiː taːṭṭaːliːʃ / / fi: waːhiːd kalaːmi yimaːʃːi:
7  xaːtwa w-fiː waːhiːd kalaːmi bi-yimaːʃːi:
لا يمكنني قراءة أو تلخيص النص العربي في الصورة المقدمة.

ʕala l-maḥabba | 23
1 // fa::-ːtabʕam ḳantu shorts a=l?ya ḱilli ẓalha l-mashiḥ lamma wa:ḥid ṣallu ṭe:h il-ʔa:ya
3 min kulli qalbika w-min kulli nafsika w-min kulli fikrika w-min kulli qudratika ṭarba:ʕa
4 qalb w-nafs w-fikr w-qudra | /// dah ba-sammi: ḱana l-ḥubb / ḱil-ʔila:hi /// /// ṭid-da:xili //

24
2 ana // ehm / kantu ɣa:?iʃ / ḱa-ʔaṭʕamturnu:ni ḱa-wa:κuntu ʕaʔa:n fa-saqaytumunu:ni /
3 wa-kuntu ʕuɾya:n fa-κasaytumunu:ni wa-wa:κuntu mari:ʔa:n fa-zurtumunu:ni wa-kuntu
5 ḱal-luhum bi-ma ḱinnukum faʕaltumun:ni wa-wa:κuntu mari:ʔa:n fa-κasaytumunu:ni wa-kuntu
7 il-ʕuẓma bi-ma ḱinnukum faʕaltumun:ni wa-wa:κuntu mari:ʔa:n fa-κasaytumunu:ni wa-kuntu
ga:ri min żallayti gibtilu dawa w-ruḥt żallaytu w-sa?alt ʕale: w-iddithu:lu min ma-ša:f...
miš ha-yašufni? da d-de:r kullu ʕala rigl waḥda
31
ha-yašufni | / w-inta ʃuʃt ṣabu:na? da nizil min żallaytu bi-l-le:l w-ra:ḥ gary ʕala żalla:yi[t
fula:n w-gab-lu d-dawa ʃamma:l... ya li-l-maḥabbba ya: sala:m! ṭabb ma na ˁiʃt ana
la tuʃarrif ʃima:lak ma taʃnaʃ yami:nak [rises a laugh] | ṣana ṣana lii ba-ʃmil bass la:zim
ʔaxabbi ṣan naʃsi miš ha-xabbi ṣan in-na:s li-ʔinn miš mumkin ʔaxabbi ṣan in-na:s |
maftu:ḥ gary yiyu:ḥ li-ʔabu:na bʃo:y yiyu:lu ʃalabata:k y-wigri gary ta:n i w-yigib-lu
mumkin / bi-yiʃul-lak la? taxbiyu:lu miš nixabbi: baza ṣan il-ʔaxar:i:n
32
kala:m lazi:z bass miš maʃhu:m | / ṣana nabbaṭt ʕannu ʔimba:riḥ walla ʔawwil lamma
ʔiʃli ʕawza it-tazkiyya w-ʕawza l-kara:ma | / / w-il-ʔi:d il-ylimi:n ʔiʃli bi-tumaʃsil / ehm
in-niʃma / wa::ehm fa:ʃiʃiʃiʃa:lu fi n-naʃs bi-ʔinnaʃa ʕawza ʔalla: wahdu ʔiʃli yatamaggad
w-il-ma:(l) / w-il-ylimi:n taʃbi:r ṣan iht-ʃabi:lu ʃa l-ʔila:hiʃya l-μaʃruda:sa fi / ehm il-ʔinsa:n
il-gadi:di ʔiʃli la tumaggid wa-la taʃtiq ṣan yuʃmaggad ʔiʃla l-ʔa:b wa-l-ʔibn wa-r-ʁu:hu
il-quḍus | / fa-ba-ʔul-lu fiʃl il-ḥubb illi bi-tiʃmilu li-ʔaxu:k baʃa ma-t...
33
il-ʃaʃariyya / dayman titniʃiʃ ʕaw titgaʃza ʕala l-kibriyya:ʔ wi-l-ʃaʃama / w-il-madi:ḥ | /
ʃaḥi:ḥ ʃanʃa ya ʔabbaha:t / ʃanʃa w-ʃanʃa laazi:za giddan / w-ʃaʃde:n ma-ʃaraf-ʃ yimkin
fi: minku ngaḥa ʃwayya fi s-siʃka di w-farh:na bi:ha / ʔinn ma-ʃiʃraʃ-ʃ ʃmila:lu ʔe:h illi
bi-tiʃmilu yimi:nu | / yiʃmiʃ il-ʃamal w-ma-yismah-ʃ ayy haʃza da:xil ʃalbu ʔinnu yuʃhiss
ʔinnu ʃamal ʃa:ga / / maʃ ʔinnu yiku:n bazal bazal fo:ʔ il-ʃaʃl w-ʃo:ʔ il-waʃf / w-maʃ ʔinn
yiku:n il-ʔaʃx / ʔiʃli maʃdu:l lahu ʕaw il-maʃbu:b / ʔiʃli muqaddam luh kull il-guido ʕu:l
in-nahar: / miʃ mizadder il-ḥubb | / yiyu:lu ya ʔaxi / kamlam gimilal ya ʔaxi ma-tiʃbi:-ʃ
/ / bi-ʃyu:lu ya satta:r
34
da na maʃa:k min is-sa:ʃa saʃba ʃ-suḥb w-ilwaẓti bazit sitta bi-l-le:l / yiyuʃu ma-tiʃbi:-ʃ
kamlam gimilalak | / / fa:-ʔil-insa:n ʔiʃ-ṭaqgu:r / ʔiʃli ŝma:lu b-tiʃṭaʃal / yiyu:lu taʃ miš
w-yiḥiss ʔinn is-šala: wiṣlit | / fi: minku kti:r da:ʔ di w-kulluku ha-tdu:?u | / ʔana miš
ba-sallim qa:ma ʕal-ya / bi-l-ʔaqs / ʔana ha-bassaṭ-luku l-ʔamr li-daragit il-ʔiṣgāz ʔaw
il-μuʃgīza wa-l-muʃgīza fi ʔide:ku law qabaltum | / kunt il-ʔiṣxa lli fi madraṣt il... de la:
sall [De La Salle] ʔilli gum ẓalu:-li ʔu:m... yaʔnī ʔismaḥ ẓul-lina kilma fa-ʔiti:-lhum ʔintu
g:tu f de:r w-bi-tšu:fu ruḥba:n w-bi-tšu:fu:ni ra:hib danu be:ʔa w-ba:za:-li kti:r f
ir-raḥbana fa-yiṭhayya:ya li:ku ʔinn ʔana ʔinsa:n kbi:r w-insa:n ʕandi xibra:t ḍaxma fi
l-haya: r-ru(ː)ḥa:niyya wa-ʕandi qa:ma hayla fi l-ma:ṣi:h wa-fi r-ru(ː)ḥiyya:ya ʔaʃʃan waʃu
w-hazzu ra:ʃsuhum ʔulti:-lhum la:ʔ fi l-ʔaʃqi:qa ʔana ʔaʃẓulluku ʔe:h nafṣi

39
w-ʔe: ḥa:yati | / ʔulti:-lhum ʔana fi sanat ʔalf w-tuʃ:umiyya / ʔarba:ʃa wa-ʃiʃri:n xamsa
wa-yiḥuṭtu:n ruddamhum kida w-aʃalli bass ma-ʃarʃ-ʃ aʃalli yiru(ː)lu:-li ʔu:l ya ḡabi:bi
il-fila:ni // w-waḍʕ ta:ni kama:n ʔiːna kunna bitna faqi:r / w-ka:n ʔaʃbaːan ʔin:tu ʃarʃi:n
40
iʃmil xubz yaʔnī w-ḥagaːt zayy kida fa-kaːnu bitna faqi:r kaːnu yixbūzu bass miʃ niːxbiz fi
l-bet kunna nibʃuː niːbːat il-xabːiz yitxabːaz fi l-ʔafraːn ʔilli b-t... tixbiz li-n-naːs / ma-ʃarʃ-ʃ ma-ʃiː-ʃ mina lwaːṭi | / faːː-:w-kaːn yːgi d-diːziː min makanat iːt-ːtiːḥiːn gaːy
suxun f ṭufaf fa-yiwarːaːfuːni ruḍdaːm il-ːrufːa w-yimsikũ ʔiːdi ʔaṭbːan ʔiːdi ʔullahːa zay
ʃuːbaːʃ min ʃuʃbaːhum w-yimsikũ ʔiːdi w-ːyitakku f id-diːziː yiʃmilu ʃaliːb ʕa l-ːrufːa w-ːmiːʃ
waʃdiːn balhum ʔinn id-diːziː suʃxun w-ana ma-aːtːamiːl-ʃ is-ːsuxuːniyya btaːt id-diːziː
w-huwa ʃalːa deːhum daːf / bass walaːkin ʃalːa ʔiːdi l-ʃabd li-ːllaː [poʃeraccio] kaːn suxun
naːr / fa-ːkutt atlaːʃ w-askut ma-ʔdarː-ʃ akkallim ʃaːaːn baː-ʃalli | / ḡeːh ʔiːshaːsi w-aʃuːrːi
fi ʔaːka l-ːwaːqt ʃuːʃuːr raːbaː ʃaːgiːbaː giddan | / ḡaːsːis ʔinn
41
ʔaʃːuːya waraːya w-ʔuːmːi waraːya w-ixwaːti s-ʃaʃbːa waʃːiːn waraːya waːʔaːna ba-ʃaːlli
wi-ːhumma saːmiː ʔaːraːtiːs kalaːm faːchimt... faːhim ẓulaːyːil ẓawi ʃala ʃadd ʔarbaːʃ xaːmaːs
siniːn / ḡiːn il-mawdːuːʃ xaːtiːr w-inːn il-ːusːra f diːqa / w-inːn il-ːamːr marfuːʃ laːllaː
w-marʃːuːʃ ʃala;lːaː niːmahaddiːs bi-ːyiːʃaːlli waraːya daːna ʔiːlːi baː-ʃaːlli w-xalaːʃ faːraːbaː
kbiːra ẓawi tizizin w-ʃaːʔiːr b-ːraːbːina ʃuːʃuːr ʃaːgiːb / nhaytːu w-ːkbiːr w-ruːfːt il-ːmaːdaːrːiːs
w-xalːaʃt madaːrːiːs tiːʃiːbːaː f ʃ-ːşaːwaːrːiːʃ xallːaːna ʃ-ːşːaːwaːrːiːʃ / ʃaːɡːaluːna / fiː ʔaːʃmaːlaːna
w-iːʃtaːgalːaː f aːʃmaːlaːna w-ʃaːdeːn ʔiːsːaːna wazanːaːnaːliːneːna ʔiːhiːt ʔaːʃːaːn min il-ːkaːfːaː tːtːaːyːa
ʁulːna niːʃlaːʃ ʔiːhiːt
42
ir-ru:hiyya il-?alya | yalla ya ?amm ẓidxl il-qama:t ir-ru:hiyya il-?alya daxalt w-Ṣalalt baż
fi l-?ingi:l w-kutub il-?aba:? wa-wa ḭibade:t šwayya šwayya šwayya ?a::xud il-?iḥsa:s
bi-ḥinn qadiyya marfu:ya ?ama:ma lall: li-s-sama:ũ w-inn ir-rabb sama:ša li-ḥinn asm...
atasam:ša baz natig iṣ-šala ṭinn il-mawḍu:ũ intaha ma-yiẓulu:ũ:š ṭana baza ṭe:
43
fale:ha | / ḥa:ma? yinn ar-rabb tamaggad w-ḥinn iḍ-ṭi:q xilsit w-ḥinnu w-ḥinnu barakit
rabbina ḥallit wa-wa / fa-ʔafragh w-nbasaṭ bass miš ḥa:sis baza ṭinn da natig iṣ-šala bta:fi
il-ba:hr ṭubṣ wa:ša:š min il-ba:hr irtizi l-ḥitta l-fulaniyya | w-ʔa:zadir
44
ʔe:: ʔi:ši
45
ha-žar | // nhaytu w-ma xa:fit hiya w-ma-ba:zet-š... ṭu:šu kida w-bi-txa:f mot w-ṭu:ṭṭ
il-iğa: ila wiššaha wi-ana ?issallett min il-iğa: [mi è caduto il lenzuolo]  

w-zaːsatt nuṣṣ zaːda w-id-dinya šita / w-zaːsatt abuṣsilhum ma yaqrub min saːsa /  
w-mutaːʃaggib w-id-dumuː;az naẓla / ?eːh docːl? w-homma yikkallimu baːd min biːiːd miš  
saːmiː ik-kalaːm w-yibzu yibtasimu l-baːd ibtisamaːt šagibt iš-šakl wiʔana maʔxuːːd  
bi-haːda l-manḍar ?il-marsuːm ?amaːm ṣaynayya li-liʔayt in-naḥaːrda | / ṣaːmu isḥ-šubh baza  
ba-hki-lhum il-ḥikaːya l-fagr šamalti-li sawra fi l-bet w-ṣaḥḥithum faːːzaːlu ?eːʔ zaːlu la  
miš maʔzːuːl w-btaːːl w-baːdyeːn

46
raːhu ṣala s-sufrā zulti-lhum kat fiː šamfa ʔayda il-beːt ma-fihuːš šamf  
wa-ma-bi-nistaːmil-š šamf ʔabaːdan raːhu ṣala s-sufrā ẓal šamf laːru fiː kaza nuṭa  
maḥtuːta / ṣala il-šamf ʔaː / fː-yaːʃni lamma ba-tkallam ḡan waʃyi r-ruːhi waʔana tiːf  
šağiːr ma-kuntiːš ba-ḍrab maṭaniyyaːt wa-la ba-ʃuːm li-l-maɣrib wa-la ṣaːyy ṣaːyy yoːmeːn  
wła wa-la ṣila ʔaːxirih waːlin humma ḫaːṭtuːni / ḫaːṭtuːni fi l-mawqif da mawqif  
iš-ṣalaː faːwiʃft fi mawqif iš-ṣalaː / fː-ʃaː-iʃalleːt bi īqalbi kaːtiːf ʔaːː ?adi yaʔabbahat  
ʔana kull l-laff w-d-dawaraːn da kullu ʕalaːšːaːn aswaːl min kull qalbak w-min kull nafsak  
w-min kull fikrak w-min kull qudritak | ṣaddiquːn yaʔaːbːiʔaːʔaːʔi ʔaːnahu haːda ma tamm ma  
kaːna yatimm bi-l-ḥarf il-waːḥid kunt lamma ʔaːzaːʔaːsallu fi zaːka l-waqt šuːʔuːri

47
wa-kayaːni kuːlːuḥ ṣaːmaːm ʔallaː | maː-liːʃ šaːz ʔeːr il-ʃaːz ʔıliː bi-yiʃallı ma-liːː ʃiːhːaːː  
min guwwa ʔeːr ʔiːhːaːːs ʔıliː bi-yiʃallı bi-kull ʕaʃiyiti bi-kull imkaniyyaːti | / hal haːda  
șaːbːʔ ʔin kːaːn ṣala tiːf lam yakun ʃaːβan faː-ḥal huwwa ṣala qaːmat raːglu ʃaːbːʔ ʔan  
nukad... hiya kull iš-ʃuːʔuːbaʔaːn ʔiːn ʔiːhːna nunfuḍ nunfuḍ kull ʔıliː fi l-ʒalb w-illi fi l-ʃikr w-illi  
fː n-nafʃ w-kull qudritna xalaːʔaːntaːheːna daxalna fi ḫaːdrit allaː fi ʂ-ʃalaː maː-ʃi kull  
il-ʃaːz l-kull il-ʒalb w-kull il-ʃikr l-rabbinu li-rabbinu / ʃawwil ma tuːʃal liː-di yibza ʃalaː  
b-ḥubb min kull il-ʒalb min kull in-nafʃ min kull il-ʃikr min kull il-ʃudra | / faːʔiza waːsalṭ  
liː-ːdi bi-yiʃal balzaʔiːli ʃuwwa il-ʃiːl il-ʔilaːh l-muwaːʃːal / bi-yiʃal ṣiːtaʃːaːl b-allaː  
huwwa da l-iṭtiːhaːd yaʔaːbiʔaːʔi | / iːl-iṭtiːhaːd fi l-mafhaːm il-ʔursuzuksi

48
ʔaːli / l-iṭtiːhaːd b-allaː ʔaw bi-0-thaːluːʔa fi l-mafhaːm il-ʔurṭuːdaksi ?asːaːsi wa-yaqum ʃala  
ʔasaːs nuski taʃawwuʃ ʃaːli / bass bi-ʒuʃam ʔahyaːːnan min il-gamaːʃa il-lahutiyyiːn  
w-bi-ʒuʃam min in-naːs ʔıliː bi-ʒiru bi-ʃaːdam xibra ruːḥiyya ʔinn il-ʔiṭtiːhaːd da fi  
naːyaːiːt is-ːiʃka | yaʃni baːd ma nʃallı ktiːr w-baːd ma nʃuːm ktiːr w-nzaːdːi ʃumr tawːiːl fi  
l-nusku l-ʃiːbaːda wa-sa-yiːʃal iṭtiːhaːd b-allaː laʔa yaʔaːbiːʔiʔi ʔiːl-ʔiṭtiːhaːd yiʃal w-inta  
sinnak ʔaraʃːinːiːn w-talaːt sinːiːn ʔiza wiʃft ruddaːm rabbinu l-ʃalliːmuk tiːʃallı min kull  
qalbak w-kull nafsak w-kull qudritak | w-fi kullı marra min muːnu yaʃtadı waʃyaːk
?uxiḏt minnu // ?iza wuzift w-šall:et bardak min kull qalbak wa-fikrak wa-nafsak

1 wa-qudritak / ha-yiḥṣal il-ittiḥa:d / fa-l-ittiḥa:d b-alla: / bi-yitimm ʔan tariː? il-ḥubb //
2 bass / ʔalla:h maḥabba / w-ḥa:ḏi:ne:n ha-nu:ṣal li-šwayyaʔ ʔaktar bi-ʕumq aktar bass miš
3 mumkin nizdar nattašil b-alla: ʔilla ʔan tariːq il-ḥubb / ʔal-ḥubb huwa ʔiṭ-ṭariːq il-waḥiːd
4 il-muwassil li-qalb alla: / ʔi-l-waːqiːf il-maːsiːḥ karrasu b-dammu / w-id-damm ṭeː ɣeːr
5 il-ḥubb ya ʔabbahāːt damm il-maːsiːḥ ṭeː ɣeːr il-ḥubb? ma ha:kaza ʔahabba llaːh ḥatta
6 bazal damm ibnu / faːː-lamma b-ʔuːl lana ʔiːqaʾ min ad-duxuːl ila l-ʔaqdaːs bi-damm yasuːf
7 ʔariːqan ḥayyan ehm ḥadiːʔan karrasahu lana bi-l-ḥigaːb? ʔay bi-gāsadihi ehm ehm da
8 ʔariːq il-ḥubb / ʔariːq il-ḥubb ʔilli huwwa ʔassisu l-maːsiːḥ bi-l-gasad

50 il-maksuːr w-id-damm il-masfuːk / w-diyyian ʕamaliyyat il-mumarsa l-haykaliyya ʔilli
bi-nidxulha kull yooːm f ʂaff / kida munsagim gamiːl daːxil yilif hawaleːn il-gasad
il-maksuːr w-id-damm il-masfuːk iṭ-ṭariːq il-ḥayy il-ḥadiːs ʔilli karrasu bi-nuːʃbur bi: ʕaleː
daleː kida ka-ʂaff bardak fi haːza 邙-ṭariːq w-nudxul sirran ʔila qalb ʔallaː wa-nataḥassas
makasːnana min qalb il-maːsiːḥ wa-qalb il-ʔaːb w-nibṭiːdi niːʃmil ʔafmaːlana l-yaymiiya / fi
l-waːqiːf di ʕamaliyyat mumumːaraːsa mamumːaraːsat ʔubb / / bassi ʔilli bi-yiblughu huwwa ʔilli
bi-yidxul min kull nafsu w-min kull qudritu w-min kull ehm fikru / // faːːʔil-ḥubb ʔan
ṭariːq isː-šalaː ʔilli ba-sammiː ʔana ʔilli huwwa l-mustawaː d-daːxili li-l-ḥubb ʔaw il-ʔifːl
il-ʔilaːḥi ʕala ʔila ʔil-mustawaː d-daːxili

51 dah / bi-yitimm bi-basaːʔa / bi-muntaha l-basaːtä / miːʃ ʕaːwiz ʕaziːma / / ʔuluːli ʔana kaːn
ʕandi ʕaziːma w-ana sinni ʔarbaʃa snin xamas sinitiːt? kaːn ʔandi ʔiratdaː faḥhimuːni yaːʃni
ʔeːh in-nusk? ʕarrafuːni? ʔaluːliː ma-ḥaddiːʃ / w-ḥaːḏeːn b-aːʔul-luku bi-ṣiqd waːʔixlæːʃ fi
fen feːn feːn baːd maː gahitt ktiːr ʔiːdirt ʔaːḥiss ʔinn ʔana baːʔargaʃ li-l-waːqfi btaːʃi
l-ʔawwalaː wa-l-n-xibra l-ʔuːla ʔilli ʔaxatəha bi-ʔaʃxaːmaː mutanumaːha yaː wa-ḥaːḏeːn fakkat
ʕanni ʔan waʃyi w-ibtadːet ʔalq ⟨t⟩aːni min gidiːd / faː-/ʔil-ḥubb il-ʔilaːhi ya ʔaːḥibbaːʔi
la yangaːfiː ʔilla / waːḥid yihuttahaːli baza [voice from the audience] / ʔallaː la yangaːfiː
fiː ʔilla l-ʔatʃaːl / la yumkin tizdar tanya kamaːn yaːʃni ana ba-ʔuːl ilwaːṭi qawaniːn
saddaʃuːni la yumkin insaːn

52 yiːsali l-allaː min kull qalbihi w-min kull nafsahi w-min kull fikrihi w-min kull qudratiihi
ʔilla ʔiːza riːgifs ʔilla ɦaːlit / ʔuːfuːla waʃlaːkin ir-raːgil ʔilli ʕaːmil nafsu raːgil wa-ʃaːhiih
ʔaʃmaːl w-yaːʃaf yiːsali w-huwa waraːh ʔinnu yaːʃfur guwawa ʕaːʃaːn yizraʃ ik-kazwariːna
[casuarina, plant] ma huwwa walla l-maːṭbax ʔilli / maːʃuːn tuːl in-nahaːr bi-talatiːn
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1 huwwa lli ṣa:d wa-ṣa:r misla ẓifl / w-sa:b w-tarak bi-ʔirattu marra w-bi:-ʔaṣa lla:h marra
2 wi-bi:-bi-naxs il-ʔa:b marra w-in-naxs bita:ʔi šwayya bi-yibʔa marra ḥilw w-marra murr
6 ṭilha bi-nisraʃ wa:ḥid bi-yisraʃ wa:ḥid bi-yisi wa-lła: huwwa ʔilli bi-ynammi idan la
7 li-ʃa:ris šayʔ wa-la li-s-saːqi šayʔ wala:kin alla:h alla:dỉ yunammi | / fa-na ba-ʃmil maʃa ṭalla:
8 ṭalla: ṭin qabaltum haːda l-ʔiʃṭilaːḥ li-ʔiʃna ṭaːli ʔaːla qà:mati giddan li-ʔinn miːn ṭana? /
9 bass yaʕni iza qabaltum | fa-lła: bi-yanxus nafsu wa-na ba-nxus nafsi ṭaw ṭalla: bi-yizul-li
10 unxusu fa-na anxusu ṭalaːsa:n tiʃṭaː li-l-ḥubb tiʃṭaː:

57
1 li-l-basaːta ʈ-ʈufuːliyya tinsa nafṣak tinsa qudraːtak tinsa ʔimkanīyyaːt t-tirgaʃ taːni
2 ka-ʃaːğiːr fi bāy ʔaːbi | / wa-r-rabb ʔitståːrani | w-saddaːzuːni | ʔaw ma-tsaladduːniː-ʃ ṭana
3 ma-ba-friːd-ʃ kalaːmi ʕaːla ḥadd law saːd law ṭaːl wāf ṭaːrānd
4 ṭan ʔallaː ma-xtarar-ʃ ʔilla ṣaːnaːn ṭalbak ʂaːgiːr w-tʃif basiːt ʔayw waːḥid fiːkum | yoːm ma
5 ḥaːṭṭ ʃeːnu ṣaːleːk w-inta fi l-ʃeːt / ma-ḥaːṭṭi-ʃ ʃeːnu ʔilla bās ṣaː il-ʃal ṭuːlaːn wa-ʃáraːn
6 laːzaːk ka-qalb tʃif ṭaːl da yinfaːni da ʔaːhiːbu w-yiːḥiːbibi tɑːsaːla ya bni bi-yiːzaːlu ʔaːruːh
7 ʃeːnu bi-yiːzaːlu-ʃ maʃleːʃ il-ʔaːr ṭaːlatti ʔuriːkː / ḥaː da ma-ḥaːḥdiː-ʃ fi l-ʃeːlaːraːhib / saːhiːh
8 ya rabb miːʃ maʃuːl bi-yiːzaːlu-ʃ ʔiːmʃi wāraːya ma-tʃaːf-ʃ koːn maʃaːk allaː fiːdil yaːʃuːsak
9 wa-yaqːuːdak w-yifuːkkuːqīyːuːdak liː-ʃaːyaːit maː gaːbak fi ʔarar il-ʃamaːliːqa ḥaːsab il-ʔeː? /
10 ʔiːd-ʃaːhir

58
1 wa-ḥasab il-ḥaːqiːqa w-il-gawhar / fiː / fiːrdɔːs il-ʔeː? [someone replies from the audience]
2 / il-ʔaːtfəːl [laughs] | faː-ːmumaːrastaː il-ḥubb il-ʔilaːh ʃaːla l-mustawaː l-ʔawwal bi-yaːhtaːg
3 ʔilla qalb tʃifli giddan giddan wa-ḥaːyaː tʃuːfuːliyya giddan giddan giddan maʃa ṭallaː | / ma-fiː-ʃ ṭarrawaːʃiṣ ḥaːyaːti w-hammi tivil w-maʃʔuːliːyyiːzazːid t-ːdaxalt ːl-rgbina
4 gara ṭeː ya rabb ʔinta mistakbarni walla eː ma-tiːgɔːʃšiː ʃiːyya / da ʃaːbdak ʃaːn l-ʔaːzul ʃiːni ʃiːni ʃiːni ʃiːni ʃiːni ʃiːni ʃiːni ṭeː / ʃaːndi [laughs] ʃawgaːda ʃaː-ːtʃaːn il-ʃaːd bi-jaːnsa ʃaːrτuː ma-ːḥaddiːʃ bi-jaːdːar ʃiːfakar
5 f ʃuːrtu ʃaːbadan fa-ːʃ-ʃuːra ʃi diːmuːʃtaʃʃ biːha ha-ːaːzul ʃaːhu ʔaː maːzad-ʃ ʃaːn kita yiːʃlamburger ṭallaː: ḥaːraː maː-ːṭuːʃiː ʃalayya tɑːni [xxxxxxx] da na ʃɡayyar giddan giddan ma-tiːɡarriːʃ ʃiːyya

59
1 faː-ːraːbʃ ʃaltiːzi ya ʃiːːi l maʃaːya ya ya ʃiːːi l ʃaːnni | ʔiːlli ana baza niːgʃ hina w-niːhiss ṭinn
2 ʔiːnaː bazaːna ːkbaːɾ w-bazaːna baza wuʃʃaːʒ muːqtaːdiriːn w-niːʃarraf w-niːsalim
3 wiːnkkabar wiːnɔːwɔːi w-in-nas biː-ːtuːs ideːna ʔaːːːh tiːgi tuːraf li-ːʃ-ʃala laː tliːtzi fiː əlba
ţari:q il-ţubb il-ʔila:hi | / / ya rabbi ţaʕti:ni niʕma ţaša:n ?akammil | / / / fi:: /  
?il-mustawa l-ʔawwal ?illi huwwa mustawa muma:rasat il-ţubb il-ʔila:hi bi-š-şala:  
60  
i-š-şala: bitaʕına / sawa:? in kunna fi xu:ras walla ţinta waħi:d f ʔallaytak huwwa t-ta:ni  
btaʕak ţaw ţin ge:t li-l-ḥaʔa miš huwwa t-ta:ni / / huwwa ţinta ţil-mažbu:ţ | / lastu ţana  
ʔaḥya bal il-masi:ţ yaḥya fiyya | / yibza l-masi:ţ huwwa l-mutagalli fi ţufuq hayata:  
yatakallam fi fannak | / / bi-karit il-/ʔawfa:ţ ţilli fi:ha ḡubb ila:hi: š-ša:diq bi-nilbis  
sammu:hum il-ʔaba: / bass hiya tasmiya kbi:ra ziya:da la?  
61  
bی-yilbisu r-ru:ţ il-qudus / bi-yibza la:bishun fašlan yaši ni ma-huwwa:-š şa:ţ šala l-ʔinsa:n  
ʔinnu yudrik il-ʔinsa:n ţilli la:bis ir-ru:ţ il-qudus min ḥadi:su min kala:mu min taʃbi:ru  
min waghu w-min ʃamtu min ʃe:ne: saddazi | / / fa:-da l-mustawa l-ʔawwal ţil-ʔinsa:n  
yibza l-ʔinsa:n mutasarbil bi-ɾ-ru:ţ il-qudus yaqtani r-ru:ţ luḥ  
62  
il-ḥawa:ss w-ik-kala:m miš min ţandi min ʃa:nd il-masi:ţ ṭin ka:nit ʃe:nak / [voices from  
gasadak kullu yaku:n nayyir / le:? la:bis in-nu:r miš kala:m min ţandi il-ʔaba:? ma-gabu:š  
ha:ga da l-ʔingi:1 epnevmatufo:rus / \ / ya li-l-ţubb il-ʔila:hi ya li-l-ţubb il-ʔila:hi ya  
63  
ţari:q zamani ţabada:na miš ţaw:il miš mutʃi:vb miš ţasir ma-ʃu:-š finu:n ţiʔla:qan wala:kin
?abu:na bas:i lyus / ma nta fa:kir il-ʃinwa:n / ?illi mtargimi:nu ha? [voices from the

64

wa:xid ba:lu l-walad bi-yiʃaddi w-hu:wa ra:yih il-madrasa ʃala ʃart il-yahu:d | / f is-sikka |
il-yahu:d baza ha-yagginnu minnu yo:m b-yo:m yo:m b-yo:m ʃa:lu la da l-walad da
ha-yiganninna / da yataḥadda:na l-walad iʃ-ʃuqayyar da? fa-ṭiʃfu y f yo:m misku: w-huwa
w-ma-gaːʃ | ʕahyaʃit / nizlit hiyya w-abu: yidawwaru fi ʃ-ʃawa:riʃ ma-fiː ʃa:lu nimši fi
ʃ-ʃa:riʃ ʔilli ka:n ma:ʃi fi: maʃu fiː ʃ-ʃa:riʃ ʔilli ka:n ma:ʃi fi: ʃammalin: yidawwaru...

65

simʃu ʃo:tu | ʃarrabum lazu: fi l-bakaburt faṭahu lazu: madbuːʃ w-ʃamma:l yizuːl glo:rya
marya glo:rya marṣa[l [ride] | / ʃalu: laːtu raːbatu maːtuːʃa xaːliʃ w-saːmif ʃammaːl yizuːl
maryam | / xaduː f il-beːt w-gaːbu l-ʃasːis ʃaluːlu ʔeːh il-ʃawduːʃ? ʃaːl la da r-ruːʃ
il-quḍus ʃaṭṭ fi lsaːn il-walad bizrit it-tasbiːh li-maryam | / ʃaːʃaːzamu marṣa[l
wu-maggidu / ʔil-masiːh wa-ḥaʃtuː fi tabuːt w-dafanu: w-ʃaʃdeːn baʃda ma daʃanu: xaʃadu
yitʃaːnnaʃu min il-qabr kida min barra lazu: b-ʃuːl glorya marṣa[l glorya marṣa[l | / ʃiʃaː
ramziyya ʃinnama mubdiːʃa giddan ziritha w-ʃaʃarit fi ḥaːyaːti xaːliʃ ya reːt ir-ruːʃ
il-quḍus yiʃuṭṭ f bùzzina fi l-lisaːn yiʃraːʃ yiʃuːʃ iːl-lisaːn kida w-yiʃraːfi: bizrit it-tasbiːh
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1 ?aw bizrit il-ḥubb il-ʔilaːhi ʃaːn: lisaːn ma-yikufiːʃ ʔabadan ʔabadan ʃan tasbiːh
iːθiːθaːluːθ | // ʃa: ʔiːr-ruːh il-quḍus il-ʃaːmil fi: / ʔil-mustawa l-ʔawwil il-mustawa
d-dâːxili / yisarbiʃ il-gasad kullu yusarbiʃ il-lisaːn fa-yaʃtaniːr il-lisaːn ʔaw il-ʃeːn
bi-taʃtaniːr walaːkin il-lisaːn / bi-yanṭaliq li-yusabbih taʃbiḥat il-ʃaːlabat wa-l-xalaːʃ | ʔeːːː
il-qaʃl yaʃfir yaʃfir yaʃni yurzus / yurzus bi-stimraːr yaʃni yuzaʃ ʔabuːna krullus yisabbah
it-taʃbiḥa l-laʃiːfa baːʃ sabbiḥu: bi-ʃuʃuːfin wa-ʔeː? bi-ʃunuːgan wa-ʃuʃuːf zayy ma kunt
b-aʃul-kuːku ʃuʃuːf hiya ʔaʃlan yaʃni raʔq / sabbiḥu: bi-ʃuʃuːgim wa-raːq | ya salaːm ʃala
 siècle
bi-l-ḥubb il-ḥabīl  i lamma yismā'u l-kilma di ya sala:mm ha-yūrusu bass w-huwwa wa: zif
fi ḥittitu laː yataḥarrak ?innama kullu raqs / kullu raqs wa-ṭarab wi-l-zalb fi ?aṣla haḷat:t
il-baha wa-t-tasbiːḥ / / ḥaːkaza il-gasad kullu yakun: ṯaːhir yakun: musṭanīːr wa-l-ʔaʃda?
kullaha takun: maxtūːna bi-xītaːnat il-masiːḥ bi-tahaːra tusabbit ṣa bi-taqdīːs tumaggid
wa-bi-γayri hiduː ṭin aːt kara oː [eθɔːθ aːmʃiːroʊv, Liturgy of Saint Basil, introduction
to the Sinaxis] bi-γayr hiduː tasbiḥat il-γalaba wa-l-xalaːs taqdīːs il-ʔism il-kariːm
il-ʔaqdīːm ism iθːα-laːuːl ʊ wa:-ʔism il-ʔaːb wa-l-ʔaːbn wa-r-ruːḥ il-μudus | / bi-di yakun:
il-masiːḥ raʔiːs ṭasbiḥatna qaːʔid xuːrəs il-μuṣallīːn wa-r-ruːḥ al-μudus huwa ʔawwuna
l-muniːr ʔallaː(ː)di
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yuːniːr ʔuyuːnana wa-yaqːud liːsaːnana li-t-tasbiːḥ ʔaːʔeʃ-sukr / ṭadī ṭil-mustawa l-ʔaʔω scrollbar |
ʔil-mustawa t-taːni fi-l-waːqif ʔilli huwa l-ʃamal il-γuḥd ṭaːwiz tiːṣuːf il-ḥubb ʃala mustawa
l-gaːʔif wa-l-ʃaːʃaːnː wa l-ʃaːriːd wa-l-masqunː bass maːfːiː-ʃ masqunː ṭinnama
ʔaːwiz ʔaʃaf ʃiwayyə min mustawa il-gaːʔif wi-l-ʃaːtʃaː ʃala l-mariːd
wa-l-masqunː faːwiz ʔaːʔuːl in k:aːn ɡaːʔif liːxub il-μudus ʔaːw gaːʔif liːxub ʔis-samaːʔ
waːihad ṭin k:aːn ʃaːʃaːn  liːmaːʔ it-trumba ʔaːw maːʔ il-ziːr is-ṣaʃaːnː ʔaːw ʃaːʃaːnː  liːmaːʔ
il-ʔiːmaːn bi-r-ruːḥ il-μudus huwa ʔarḍak maːʃi ʔiːn k:aːn ʔuryaːn min ʔoːb wi-b-nigrī
ngib-lu ʃanilla ʔaːw ɡaːliːbiiyaː ʔaːwː / / ʔaːbuːna ɡaːy ʔaːbuːna minːa ʔana ħiːt gtib li-l-ʃiːyaːl
69
xamsiːn ʃandal w-μasbuːt w-ʃal-lu w-ʁuːḥt wiːmskt f xnaːʔa waːḥid ʃaːḥibna ʔismu ʔanba
ʂamːuːʔiːl wa-ʃul/></raw_text>
diżunku byiaḍḍat w-ana miš ša:yif qe:r damaːn bass bi-yibża hina fi g-gamaːʔa kùllaha
yaʃni tuːn d-diːuːn kullaha byiaḍḍat w-kull waːḥid xad risaːla kayfa yuṭʕim in-nufuːs
wa-yarwiːha kayfa yaquːd / xawarīs fi ʃ-ṣalaː(ḥ) wā-kayfa yuʕazzī quluːb kaθiːriːn
ʃuʃuːb kaθiːra | // faʔantum il-biθra
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1-տ-ાય્યીબા ил-l-masːiːh ʃammaːl bi-yzraːʔa yisːziːha ʃalaːšaːn lamma tikbar yiʃṭilḥa fi kull
2-ʔanhaːʔ il-ʃaːlam | fa-n-naharda ʔilli ʃabu maftuːh li-xidmit il-ʃaːmil wā-t-taʃaːtuf māʃaːhu
3- ila-faqiːr wā-ʃ-ʤaːfːiːʃ sawaːʔ ʔan kaːn ʔaxuː ʔaw ʃaːmil ʔaw ʤeːʃ ʔaw ʃarabi / ʃuʃtuːni
4-ʔana ba-zaːbil il-walad il-ʃarabi lii smu muḥammad il-ʃaːbid? daxal min il-baːb bi-ḥanṭiːʔa
5-f ʃiglu maʃtːaːʃaːla biːwaʃːaːn ʃaːlaːn anaː matta l-maskiːn hinaː faʔeːʃ il-ราːgil il-gariːʔaː? da ʔiːlli
6-bi-yizuːl matta l-miskiːn da // fa-ʃal-lu ʃuːraːf hina w-guːli ʃawiti ʃarabi ʔisːmuː e:
7-muḥammad aːːda ʃaːdiːʔi giddan | w-nzilt min il-zallaːya liʔinni ma-ba-ruːʔʃ
8-[[.................]] w-daxalt // ʔahlan muḥammad ya ʃaːːbid ʔizzayyak? xattu bi-l-ʃuːŋ
9-wiːl-ruhaːn wazaːfitaʃraːr eː daʔ ʃarabi ma-yiswaːːʔ biːtaːʃ wʔaːbuːna ʔaːsːiːd maʃaː
10-wʔaːmartitiːlu ʔinn ytitaʃaːl-lʔaːṣr
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1-w-ʃuːd ʃalaːriː ʃaːl-mːaːlaː yaː markit il-ʃaruːsa [laughs] // wʔaʃsan ʔaːkl ʃaːgi l-muḥammad
2-il-ʃaː bid yimkin ʒeh safiːr ingiltira maʃaːmalnanaːʂ [sic] kiːda | aː aː aː ya ʔaḥhibaːʔi
3-ʃallimm tʃallimm ʃallimni r-ruːh il-qudus maːdːar-ʃ afarraw ʃaːdar-ʃ yaʃdar-ʃ ʔafarraw
4-ma beːn is-safːiːr w-l-ʃaːfiːr ʔabadan ʔabadan maːdːar-ʃ ʔafarraw? ma beːn ir-raːhiba
5-wiːl-ʃaːmil wiːli darsni w-daraw ʔaxlaːzi ʃaːːrifni kwayyis giddan w-shaːːlaː ʃaːːlu
6-maʃaːya fi r-rayyaːna ya maː ʃaːraːʃu ʃaːlḥiti ʃaː yaː maː biːtu w-baːʃnuːmuː miʃaːgːaːsa ʃinni
7-liʔinn il-laːʃma b-aʃxudhum min buːʃuːm w-addiːha liʃ-ʃummaːlaː wa-l-ʃawaːdis yaʃniʃa lissi
8-f zihnuːmuː ʃawːuːda wːyːgiːn ʃaːbːaʃːaːla w-addiːha liʃ-ʃummaːlaː wa-l-ʃawaːdis yaʃniʃa lissi
9-liʃ-ʃummaːlaː illi yigibuːn lʃaːlaː gaʃoː baːʔulːlu ʃiːluːl(ḥ) w-dːa yuṭaʃafːaː biː
d liːʃummaːlaː illi yigibuːn lʃaːlaː gaʃoː baːʔulːlu ʃiːluːl(ḥ) liːʃummaːlaː ʃiːgi ʃakulaːta ʔaw
10-miːlaːbbasːa ʃiːluːl(ḥ) liːʃummaːlaː //
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1-ʃiːfraːx bi-ṭbiːʔad w-kɑːn ʃanḍina kullaha xamaʃtaːʃar farxaːla walla ʃaːʃar farxaːt ma na faːkiːr /
2-kaːnu ʔiːlli bi-nrabbīːuhum kullum ʃaːʃar xamaʃtaːʃar farxa liʔinn hiyya l-haːga tʃaːza
3-l-waːhiːda ʔiːlli kunna b-naʃkuːla hnaːk | / w-ʃaːmalnahaːʃ(i) ʔilla f aːxer ayyamaːna
4-ʔinnama f il-ʃayyaːm il-ʃuːla maːkunnaːʃ bi-nakul ḥaːga abadan | / azulːu ʃawwǐːʃ il-beːqːaː
5-yiʃuːli leːʔ ʔazulːu liːʃummaːlaː / yiʃuːli bass daːflːaːtʃaːbaːn wːaw fiːn w-ʃaːsːis ʔazulːu
6-ʔiːyaː ʔana ʃaːːrif il-xaːsːis w-ʃit-taʃbaːn / il-ʃummaːlaːgayiːːn w-ʃiːm haːniʃraf niːʔakkalhumm
7-w-dːol bi-yiʃtaːˈgaːlu ktiːr b-wiːbiːythaːzamu fi l-ʃuːɡl ʃiːl da liːʃummaːlaː | // bulubiːfiːʃiːlu
8-liːʃummaːlaː / šaːlamun ʃiːlu liːʃummaːlaː / ʔabuːna miːna giːh ʔalli ʔana liːziːt-lak ʔarbaː Şub
9-sanadːiːʔa šaːlamun ʃuːlːi ʃiːlu liːʃummaːlaː | / ṭabːan maːḥaddiːʃ bi-yismsːaː
َاذِنَ مَايَشْرَمُ كَلَامَكَ بِهَذَا ؛لَكَنِّي أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ وَمَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلَامِكَ مَا رَأَيْتُ مِنْهُ أَثَّرَ عَلَى مَعْنَى عَنْ مَعْنَىٰ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ،ْ أُنْفِسُ آمَنَ مِنْ أَنْ أَعْجِبُ مِنْ كَلا
لا معلومات قابلة للتوضيح أو الترجمة من الصورة المقدمة.
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waḥid ma-bi-yḥibbi-š yiṭla:n yiṭṣaṭṭal / waḥid muṣṭazil bi-yḥibb yuṣud f ẓallaytu kti:r
mumkin yixlaṣ diḥ? [laughs] ẓasdi miḥ yaxluṣ / mumkin yixlaṣ yiṣṭaṭṭal yaḥni w-iz-zaːt
bitaṣtu tintaḥiʔ? yastaṭtiːl yastaṭtiːl | miḥ mumkin iḥ-ḍaːt tixlaṣ ūilla bi-fiːfil
il-maḥabba 0-ʔaːni / mustawa l-ḥubb il-ʔilaːhi ʕala mustawa l-bazl wa-t-taḍḥiyya
waʔimaːtat iḥ-ḍaːt | / faʔiːza ʔiṣṭaṭṭalʔiːn ehm // tuqaddim ehm il-fiːfil il-ʔilaːhi ʕala
mustawa bazl yamwiː / waː-geːr maḥḍudː / la b-zaman wa-la biː... biʔiːmkanīyyaːt ehm
tibza maːši kida Ẓaːyid fa ʔar-raml ʔaːdː leːh ʔabuːna fa ʔar-ramlʔi yizːuː xiliṣṭ ya buːna /
šaṭṭabt li-ğːaːyit kida bass ya rabbi šwayyit Şafiyi la-ğːaːyit ma wṣal il-ʔallaːya |
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לא ניתן לקרוא את הטקסט המוצג פה באופן טבעי.
כותרת

2. maʕu:nitna w-bi-niḥsibha bi-ʃama:na w-xe(ː)bitna ʔinn da fa:i:r w-ɣalba:n ʔaw ʔinn da
5. tansu ʔiṭa:fat il-ɡuraba:ʔ ʔalla:ti bi-ħa ʔaடa:fa ʔuna:s kathirun malà:ʔika wa-hum la
6. ɬaydu:n / fa:-bi-l-ɬubb il-ʔila:hi ʔalla:ði bi-l-ʃamal wa-l-bazl ʔilli huwa ʕa l-mustawa t-ta:ni
8. l-wa:qif / miš bi-nilbis il-masi:h ʔi:ra wa-la ʔinnu
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1. bi-ylabbisna ʕaša:n nitzayyin bi: la? li-ʔinn bi-nišmil ʃamalu ha-yilabbi:sak nafsū li-ʔinnak
2. bi-tišmil ʃamalu wa-yaftaxir bikt li-ʔinnak bi-tkammil risaltu / il-masi(ː)hu ʃamal talat
3. sinin:n? bass ma-yikaffu:ʃ ʕa l-ʔarḍ ya bbaha:t w-ɬišliʃ w-sab-lina kull il-mirā:s w-ɬalbu
6. miyya l-miyya w-ʃaḥḥ miyya l-miyya ʔin ʔistaṭa:ʃ ʕaqīl ḥan yugiz ha:za ʔaw
7. yatašawwar ha:za / ka:na r-rabb ʔasufu:ʃ il-masi:hu
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3. in-nahar yagu:l yaʃnaʃ xayar / / w-baʃdən fi l-mаšmu:diyyya ʃal-lina xudu baza ʔintu
5. insan ʕaʃma w-faqi:r ʔiṭaʃu l-ʃe:l w-in-nahar:ʔ ʔiṭlaʃu fi l-giba:l w-ʃallu šallu wa-la
7. taʃmalu ʃamali / / tamtaliʔu bi-r-ru:ʃ ʃa-taʃmalu ʃamali / / fi l-waːqif yan ʔaḥiba:ʔi
9. lazet il-waːzt maʃtu:ʃ ʕala miʃrəʃe: / / miš xa:dir ʔaʃafillu
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1. fa-ʔaddi:-lu waʃla ʃalaša:n il-marra g-ga:ya / // ba-ʃu:l ʔinnu bi-ʃ-ʃala: w-il-ʃamal ʔiilli
2. huwa bi-l-mustawa l-ʃubb id-da:xili w-mustawa l-ʃubb il-xa:riːgi bi-mustawa l-ʃubb
3. is-sirri w-bi-mustawa l-ʃubb il-ʃalani bi-mustawa l-baːd el-ʃan l-alla: fi l-xaʃaːʔ fi
4. niʃf il-le:l w-bi-mustawa l-baad il-ʃandu:r lada kull ʔinsa:n bi-l-ʔitne:n bi-nasi:r fi ɬaːriːq
5. il-ʃubb is-sirri li-kay:ma nablug ʔila l-ʔitṭiha:d bi-0-0:a:lu:th / ʔallaːh māḥabba wa-la
yumkin ?an nablugu ?illa bi-l-maḥabba | ʕizzina r-raḥba:ni kull ṣa(::<)fiyyitna r-raḥba:niyya
miš mumkin ʔabadan ha-nimsikha fi ʔide:notum: ṣa:na f yom: w-nu:l ya bu:na ʔana ša:šart
innaharda ?inn šindi ʕa:fiya ru:ḥiyya ʔilla ṣiḍa ma:rasna l-ḥubb il-ʔila:hi ṣala
mustawayyah |
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mumkin ʔaḥṣul ʕale:ha ʔilla bi-l-ḥubb il-ʔila:hi | ehm kayfa nufarrīq ʕa:wa:tina min
il-ḥudra la yumkin ʔilla bi-l-ḥubb il-ʔila:hi | ʔil-ḥubb lahu l-ḥudra ʕala t-tafr:i:ʃ w-it-taṭhi:r
gә:r ṭaːrī:za wa:ḥid ma-la:-ʃ ta:ni huwa l-ḥubb huwa l-ḥubb ʕala mustawayya... ʕala
qe:d bi-l-ḥubb il-ʔa:qi:qi ʃ-ṣa:diq min kull il-qa:lba wa wa bi-l-mustawa l-ʔa:xaš
bi-l-ʕamal bi-l-baːd bi-la qe:d bi-la šaːr ḡer murtabiṭ bi-zama:n wa-la bi-qa:ma wa-la
bi-ʕumr

104
ʔaːmːi:n ya rabbi yasuːf il-maːsi:š ʔaːṣːi:na ʔan naːku:n talaːmi:š di li-l-ḥubb ʔiːl-ʔiːlːaːhi ʕaṭta
naiːʃ wa-naːʃi:x / wa-gʃaːl šalaːtana ʔalːaːti la takuf fi ʕala lišaːna:nin kull ayyaːm
ʔaːyaːtana ʔaːṣːiːna ya rabbi ṭaːriːq il-ḥubb is-sirrī ḡaṭta naːʃrīfa wa-naːdxiːl ʔiːlːaːyumq sīrːak
il-ʔiːlːaːhi wa-naːʃbudak bi-ɾuːh wa-l-ʔaːqːaː ka-muːʃtahaː qaːlb il-ʔaːb | ʔaːmːi:n ya ʔaːḥibbaːʔi
yalla nɯːl ʔaːbaːna ʔallaːzi | / bi-sm il-ʔaːb wa-l-ʔiːbːaːn wa-ruːh ʔil-duːs ʔiːlːaːhum ʔiːlːaːluːḥid
ʔaːmːiːn / ʔaːduːyaː h-ḥubb iʃ-ʃaːːf fi ya man ʔaːʃlantə ʔaːtaːk fi ʃaːlaː ʔaːtaːk fi l-ʔaːʃaː ʔaːs-saː:bif
ʃaːʃar min ʔiːŋiːl ʔuːḥaːnna / wa-ya man ʔaːʃlantə ʔaːtaːk ka-huːf ʔaːʃ⟩ʃaːmaːʃ ʃiːlːaː waːʃmuːʃ ʃiːlːaː
mustawa l-yadd wa-r-rigl mustawa l-liːsaːn wa-l-ʔaːyːn mustawa l-ɡaːsːad
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wa-l-ʔaːmaːlaː wa-laːmaːddə hiːnːaː naːlaːx uːn kuːntu ʃaːnaːʃ xarːaːn kuːntu nːaːmuːːd ʃaːlaː liːfaːl il-ʃaːmaːba
ʔaːluːmaːdːaː nːaːʃmaːlaːmaːh uːn ʔaːwaːtːaːnaː la bi-ʃiːlːaːliːnaː waːlːaːkuːn bi-ɾuːh ʃaːrriːfːaː muːsːaː l-ḥubb
id-daːxili ʔallaːdːi bi-hi nːaːduːx maːʃaːka fi ʃaːd ʃiːlːaːqa ʔaːbaːdːiːyyaː muːrtaːbitiːn bi-kə
bi-ɾiːbaːʃ il-kamaːl ʔallaːdːi huːwːa qaːːmiːl qaːːmiːl kull in-naːmuːʃ / ʔaːlaːmaːhaːbba |
ʔaːṣːiːna ʔan ʃiːlːuːfːaː baːniːbːaː baːniːbːaː ʃaː有限责任 wa-l-ʔawːar ṭeqːaːmaː ya muːnːaː kuːl maːdːaːbəː ʔahː l-iːluːdaː ya rabbəː yaʃaːf
l-ḥubb wa-gaːyːr ʔaːkifːaː waːlaːkuːn maːdːaːbəː ʃaːhuː waːkuː ʃiːn maːdːaːbəː ya ya rabbəː kifaːyaːtna
miːnːa ʔaːṣːiːna ʃiːlːaːya muːnːaː ʔan nːaːduːx fi ʃiːloːdːa ʃiːlːaː yaʃaːf l-iːluːdaː ʃiːrːiːm ir-ɾuːʃ
wa-yaːsuːʃ hatta nːaːʃʃaːlaː il-ḥubb
wa-qāl bana wa-nāfsana wa-qudrītina min kull il-ʕā:tfi:ya ?aʕṭi:na ?an nuḥibbak nuḥibbak nuḥibbak ya rabb bal
nuḥibbak wa-nansa: kull ḥubb ʔa:xa:ri siwa:k | nansa: / ehm kull taʕalluq ba:šari fi l-ma:di
wa-fi l-ḥa:dir wa-fi l-mustaqbal / ḥatta yataṭahhar qalbana li:-yaḥill fi:(h) ḥubbak | li-ʔanna ḥubbak ya rabb sawfa yamlaʔ? qalbana ʔi:nama nufarriḡuh min kull ḥubb ʔaw
ṣibh ḥubb | ʔa:h / ʔumma ʔaʕṭi:na ya rabb wa-garribna ka-tala:mi:ʔ 107
li-ʔasu:ʔ il-ma:si:ʔ kayfa nuqaddim il-bazl ḥatta ʕ-ṣali:b / kayfa nuqaddim il-bazl
huwa fi:šl il-ʕa:qa?: bi-ʔe:ɾ qe:d wa-la šarṭ ḥatta law ṣašala bi-na ʔila ḥa:fat il-mawt | ya
qalbana bi-tasbi:ʔana ʔalla:di la yakuff ḥalay wa-naḥa:r wa-bi-ʔa:ʕma:la ʕaraq il-gabi:n
ʔalla:di yataḥawwal fi kull qaṭra ʔila tasbi:ʔ wa-na:ila šukr yada:m ʔila l-ʔabad | ba:rikna ya
ta:gah wa-ʔikli:la:ha wa-la:basu:ʔa wa-šabaru | ʔigʕalhum šuфаʔa:ʔ ʔanna ʔigʕalhum
wa-nagahu fi:ha ḥatta: naqtafi: ʔasarhum ka-ma yanba:gi wa-na:ku:n ʕind ḥusn ʔannak ya
ʔibn ʔalla: ʔawla:d maḥabba wa-ʔawla:d nu:r ya sayy:idi ʔismaʕ ʃalawa:thum
wa-tašaffu:ʕa:thum ʔanna ʔil-qiddisi:s ʔanba maqa:r wa:-ʔanba maqa:r wa:-ʔanba maqa:r
maryam ʔalla:ti taqif ʕala ra:ʔs xawa:rishum ya rabb wa-tatašaffaʕ ʕanna bi-ʔa:ha:ratha
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2 l-muqaddasa uruḍi:м al-ʔadi:da / nà:zila mina s-sama:? min ʕind alla:h mūhayyaʔa
3 ka-ʕaru:sin mūzayyana li-raɡulīha / | samīʔtu šawtan ʕazi:man min as-sama:? qa?:ilan /
4 huwa ɗa: maskan alla:h maʃa l-ʔinsa:n | / wa-huwa sa-yakun maʃahum wa-hum
7 min ʕuyu:nim wa-l-mawtu la yaku:nu: fi: ma: baʕd / wa-la yaku:nu: ḥuẓnun wa-la
8 šuraxun wa-l-a wa-gaʃun fi: ma: baʔd li-ʔanna ʔil-ʔumu:r il-ʔu:la: qad maʃat | /
9 wa-li-rabbina il-magdu dayman ʔabadiyyan ʔami:n | [interruption of the recording, then
10 it begins again] // exristo:ς ane:sti [Χριστός ὄνεσθη] | [the audience replies, not audible] /
13 wa-habaṭa maḥku:man ʕalayhi bi-l-buʃd id-da?:im wa-l-mawt | // wa-s-sama:? ʔalla:ti
18 fa-lan yumu:t ʔila l-ʔabad //
21 fa-lan yamu::t ʔila l-ʔabad | / w-il-ʔa:ya t-talta li-ʔanna ʔa:na: ḥayy fa-ṣa... fa-ʔantum
23 il-ʔinsa:n il-gadi:da // ʔarḍ haraba minha l-mawt wa-l-ḥuẓn wa-l-kaʔa:ba wa-t-tanahhud
25 ʔila fo:q ḥaysu l-masi:ḥ ga:lis
26
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السيرة الذاتية لكلاً من أنطونيوس والراشدين

1. يحب أنطونيوس أن يذكّر فيلماً من القصص التي تتعلق بهما، ويذكر أن هناك رجلًا شابًا يُطلق عليه اسم أسطوري، حيث كان يعيش في قريّة صغيرة بين الجبال.

2. فيلماً من قصص أنطونيوس، يذكر أن هناك رجلًا شابًا يُطلق عليه اسم أسطوري، حيث كان يعيش في قريّة صغيرة بين الجبال.

3. فيلماً من قصص أنطونيوس، يذكر أن هناك رجلًا شابًا يُطلق عليه اسم أسطوري، حيث كان يعيش في قريّة صغيرة بين الجبال.

4. فيلماً من قصص أنطونيوس، يذكر أن هناك رجلًا شابًا يُطلق عليه اسم أسطوري، حيث كان يعيش في قريّة صغيرة بين الجبال.

5. فيلماً من قصص أنطونيوس، يذكر أن هناك رجلًا شابًا يُطلق عليه اسم أسطوري، حيث كان يعيش في قريّة صغيرة بين الجبال.

6. فيلماً من قصص أنطونيوس، يذكر أن هناك رجلًا شابًا يُطلق عليه اسم أسطوري، حيث كان يعيش في قريّة صغيرة بين الجبال.

7. فيلماً من قصص أنطونيوس، يذكر أن هناك رجلًا شابًا يُطلق عليه اسم أسطوري، حيث كان يعيش في قريّة صغيرة بين الجبال.

8. فيلماً من قصص أنطونيوس، يذكر أن هناك رجلًا شابًا يُطلق عليه اسم أسطوري، حيث كان يعيش في قريّة صغيرة بين الجبال.

9. فيلماً من قصص أنطونيوس، يذكر أن هناك رجلًا شابًا يُطلق عليه اسم أسطوري، حيث كان يعيش في قريّة صغيرة بين الجبال.

10. فيلماً من قصص أنطونيوس، يذكر أن هناك رجلًا شابًا يُطلق عليه اسم أسطوري، حيث كان يعيش في قريّة صغيرة بين الجبال.

11. يحب أنطونيوس أن يذكّر فيلماً من القصص التي تتعلق بهما، ويذكر أن هناك رجلًا شابًا يُطلق عليه اسم أسطوري، حيث كان يعيش في قريّة صغيرة بين الجبال.
il-ʔagya:l ?ila 1-liʔabadiyya ?alla:ti sa-yanta... sawfa yatawa... tatawaqqaf fi:ha ḥarakaṭ
13
fa-tagassada l-masi:h wa-taʔannas libis il-insa:n likay / yirgaʕ ta:ni li-l-insa:n li-yukammil
ʃe:nu min il-magd ?al-magd ?alla:di ʔaʃtati niʔana ʔaʃṭaytahum / yaʕni huwwa hiyya
ʔaʃṭaytahum wa-ʔatlab ?an yaku:n fi:hum il-ʃu:bb ʔalla:di ʔaḥbəbtani bi-hi / min qabl
ʔe:h raʔyak fi gasad il-masi:h fo:? fi s-sama:ʔa?? w-ʔiza ?i:nha yaʕni ma-kunna:-ʃ ɡaltani:n
14
kama:laha ?aw fi mil? qas:q kama:l alla:ha fi:ha | fa-l-masi:h ʔakmal xiṭṭat il-xa... il il il
bass li-ḥuṇḍ allah di raʃat ʕila ehm ʔittiθa:d bi-ɣayr iftiraːq / yaʕni l-masi:h lan
yataxaːla: ʕan gasadu ?aw ʕan ʔinsaniyyitu ʔabadan ma la la yumkin tataʃawwarha
15
fi l-ʔabadiyya yaʕni miʃ ha-yi:gi fi yoːm yitxallə ʕan gasadu fa-xala:ʃ gasad il-masi:h ʔaw
ʔinsaniyyitu ʔilli xadha yasu:s ʔiːl-ʃilw ʔilli ʔitraθəba ʃala ɭuːnd il-ʃa:dra daː xala:ʃ dah
daxal il-magd ʔa-ma: ʔayyuha l-gahala walla l-ʔagbiya:ʔ ʔa-ma: ka:na l-masi:h yanbaːg...
yanbaːgi ʔan yataʔallam wa-yadxul ʔila magdu?: daxala ʔila magdihi likay yuḥaqqiq
tamaːm garaːd alla: min xilqat il-ʔinsa:n | // ehm // ʔizzayʔ ʔamu ʔana ba-ʔu:l kida da
ʔaw-ʔaxad it-taʔmiːnaː t il-ʔiːdaːfiyya
il-ʔabadiyya w-yiḥutṭaha f buẓak da law kā:n ʔassī:s ḥa:fiẓ it-ṭaqṣ ʔassī:s mistaḏgil bi...
ma-bi-yuẓ-ši y-w-imkin ḥatta ma-yiṣraḥa:-š ḥinnama da la budd yizulha la-ʔənnahu la
yuṣṭi ʔayʔ min nafṣu da bi-yuṣṭi gasad w-damm hewwa mistaʔmin ʔala ṭinnu
yisallimhu:-lak bi-ṭabiṭitu aw bi-mumayyīza:tu yuṣṭa li-mağfirat il-xaṭa:ya di la budd
ʔin-niṣma miš mumkin ha-tfaːriq | ʔaynni badam nulna ḥaqq il-ḥayat il-ʔabadiyya yibʔa
yastaḥiːl nafqīd haːdhiː n-niṣma ?illi ʔaxadnaːḥa f i m-.ham yasːuːz gasadan wa-damman |
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?ana ba-buṣṣilha lwaːtī laḥzu min in-ɲaːya il-ʃamaliyya l-mahda miʃ ʃaːwij ḥadxul fi
l-gadal ḥillī saːri ʔabbay ya abuːna ʃin-ɲiːma mumkin tifaːriːna walla ma-tfarʔiː-ʃi? ʔabbay ya
ʔabuːna mumkin il-waːhid yaskut min in-ɲiːma walla ma-yusktiː-ʃi? ḥaza l-gadal ʔallaːdī
zaːḥaːra l-ḥaːḥut ūan waʔdsu / ʔīl... ʔil-ʃamali x-wallaː laːhut naːzhari / qaːbil li-l-ʔaːh
wi-l-ʃaːʔ / w-into ʔarʃiːn ʔinn il-маːʃiː [voices from the listerners] ehm? fiːhi n-naːʃam
wa-layṣa fiːhi l-laː ʔaːbːadān | fiːh in-naːʔam wa-l-ʔamiːn | & faːli li-l-ʔaːshīːn
lahutːi ʔiza xarag ʃan maʃhūːm al-ʃanfatə ʔallatːi min ʔagliːha taːʃaːd il-ʃaːmīː wa-min
ʔaʃg il-xalaːː ʔiːlī bi-nasːaː ʔiːleː bi-guhd gahiː bi-dimūːΖ biː-ːmː bi-ʃalaː bi-ʃiːʃaːd /
ʔaḍa l-lahutːi ill əthna ʕawziːnu w-miḥtaːgiːn ʔiːleː:
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ʔaḍi l-gasad w-ːid-damm ʔallatːi la yuːmkin fəːslaha ūan / il-gasad
wə-d-damm | ʔaw bi-t-taːli ʔal-ʃaːmīː ʃamma taːʃaad / səlːlama l-gasad ʃamma l-ʃaːmīː l-
ʔaːnasias il-lahutːu... ʔasanias ir-ruːsuːli walaːkin li-l-ʔaːʃaf ʔiːl-gumla di ʔaʃqiːla ʃaːla
məːsaːmiʃ il-lahutiːyiːn il-μəːʤaːθiːn ʔiːlwəːtə ʃalakinnahə luhutː səliːm wa-ʃaːhːiː ʃaːm
biʔ-ʃiːzːuːl ʔinn il-ʃaːmːiː liːbis gasad ʃaxluːq wa-ʔaːlalalːu | tibzə ʔaʃqiːla ʃaːla ʃaːlə maʃaːmiʃ
il-lahutiːyiːn il-μəːʤaːdiːn wə-ːʃiːfəl ʃagga f μuʃxuːnum ʃalakinnahə luhutː səliːm miːya
l-miːya ʔaxad gasad ʃaxluːz miːːn il-ʃaadə maɾyaːm ʃaxluːz wə-ːbaːdeːn il-gasad il-ʃaxluːz:
ʤən ʔaːliːhu bi-l-ʔiːtiːhəːd il-kəːmːil bi-l-lahutː / ʔaynni ʃaːniːsaːniːyit il-ʃaːmːiː
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ʃaːrat fiːha n-niʃma bi-laː firaːq bi-laː nadam təfːbːiːr ʔaːgiːb tərgamːa li-l-kilma l-
əuːnaːnı bi-laː nadam hiːya bi-laː firaːq bass yinaːsib ik-kiːlma l-
əuːnaːni | /// faːː-ːdiː sər təgaːʃaad
il-ʃaːmːiː ʃə-wədəʔaːs-sirr il al-munabəʔiːq minnu ʃamma ʃalluːnum ʃuːdu gasad ʃuːdu dəmi
kulə ʔiːʃəriebu li-maːɡfirat il-xaːtəː ya li-ːḥayaːh ʔabadiyya | / xalaːːs rafaːʔa taːni l-
ɪnːaːn min al-mawt waːḥukm il-mawt wa-l-
əlaːːk wa-l-
əubəd ʃən ʔallalh l-
əl-
əwaːdəʔ al-
əgaːdiːd ʔiːlili fiː /
moːgər ʔəfːni ʔiːl-
əbəʃariːyya ʔaʃbaːhət xaːlaːːsaha wa-ʔaʃbaːh ʃi l-
əmeːšiː yasːuːz | ʔaynni ʔaːna
haː-ʃərədiː fəːʃəːn ʔaːkːuːn bəːzaː shiːwayya ḥaːzir min il-lahutiːyiːn ʔiːlī bi-
-
əyiːʃaːduːli ʔil-kalimːaːt
w-ːb İl-
əaʃkaːr ʔaːna kəːmaːn ḥagari
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fi l-bašariyya l-gadi:da lla:ti yahmilha l-masi:ḥ fi nafsuh ma hu law [………] kilmit enxrstitu
da il il-miso:gar [giggles] yaːnī badal ma tuktub musu:gar ?aw musaggal tuktub kida en
xristu badam enxrstitu yaːnī fi l-masi:ḥ yasu:ʔ
8. 24
1. xaːlaːs la furaːq la nadam la ḥuzn la kaʔa:ba la tahannud la bašariyya šati:qa la ?arḍ
qadi:ma wa-la samaː? qadi:ma xalaːs | daxalit il-bašariyya fi wâdʔaḥa l-gadiːd ʔas-saːmi
3. ?allaːʔi yafuːq bi-maraːḥil ṭabiːʔaːt ʔaːdam liʔinn kat ṭabiːʔaːt ʔaːdam kaːnit in-niʃma ʔiːlli
fi: kwayłyisa w-ḥilwa w-ʃaːl zayy ma ſuʃna walaːkin kat qâːbila li-l-fuqdaːn ʔamma fi
5. l-masiːḥ yasuːʔ faːʔinna r-rabb yaːnī zayy ma ءانا ʔult miːḥ haʔʔud ?akarrar baza laḥṣan
baːdeːn yibrə katatiːb yaːnī leːh tagassad? tagassad fi gasad ʔinsan ʔaʃaːn yaːqʃal in-niʃma
wa-yaɡʃål il-xalaːːʃ w-il-ʔitiːḥaːd b-allaː wa-yaɡʃal ʔal-xalaːːs min al-mawt wa-ʃuqubatu
wa-l-halaːk šeːʔ? akidː bi-l-nisba li-ʃ-ṭabiːʔaː ʔa-l-bašariyya miːḥ zayy ʔadam baza | ha-yuːʃaːha
w-xalaːʃ yibrə laː yumkin ʔiːl-bašariyya l-gadiːd yaːḥsal-laha
25
1. zayy ma ḥaːṣal liʔaːdam | hal mumkin ʔaːdam ʔiːθ-ʔaːni yiḥsal-lu zayy ma ḥaːṣal liʔadamt
2. ʔilʔawwalʔ yastaḥːiːl wa-hâkâda kama labisnaː ʔaːdam it-tuː... min gasadna ʔaːdam
3. it-turaːbi hâkâza sa-nalbis ʔar-ruːʔaːni min il-maːḥiːya yasuːʔ | tuːʔuːd timaːḥikni ḅaːz
w-tzul-li ṭayyib w-nuskut min in-niʃma ʔarul-lak ruːʔ ʔawwār ʔaːbaːʔ w-ʔiːlli
4. ʔaluːh w-ʔana ʔandi ʔult ktiːr w-kaːtaph ktiːr | miːḥ mawḑuːʕaː ḥadidːi walaːkin mawḑuːʕaː
ḥadidːi leːh il-maːḥiːya tagassad / w-leːh il-maːḥiːya maːt | il-maːḥiːya maːt likay yunhi ʃiʃlən
5. ʔalaː ʔuːquoːbat il-mawt liʔiːn niʃma ʔuʃṭiːhaːna w-yibrə lissːa fiː ʔiːl-xoːf mi l-ʃoːt
w-ʃuqubit il-ʃoːt yibrə antagonizm fiː taʃaːruːd xaːṭ xaːṭ xaːṭ xaːṭ xaːṭ w-ʃaːdiːd | / walaːkin
6. ʔaːwiz yiːzːuːʔ ?il-maːḥiːya ʔiːn il-gasad wi-d-damm btaːʕu
26
1. fiː ḥaːyaːh ?abadiyya qaːdira ʔan taːqiliba l-mawt wa-l-haːwya ʃal-luːhum ?eːh rayʔuku ḅaːza
2. ʔaʃaːn ʔawarraku l-quaːwa lli f gasadi w-dammi geːh ʃaːbl iʃ-ʃaliːb w-iddaːhum ig-gasad
3. wiːd-dammi w-zal-luːhum da ʃiḥya l-ʃaːyaːh il-ʔabadiyya | titʃawwaruːʔ fa-ма ʃamalu yoːm
4. ig-gumʃa huuwːa fi l-ḥaːqiːqa takmiːʔiːn ʔin gaːzat haːziːbi l-kaːlama ʔaw ṭaːqiːq ʔiːmkin tikuːn
5. kalima ʔawqaːʃ ʃiḥya liːha kalima tanyu tayha miːn muxxi bass li-ma faːlala yoːm il-xamːiːs
6. fa-daxal li-l-mawt bi-nafsːu wa-ʔanha ʃalayh liʔiːn daxal luh bi-gasad maːʔit qaːbil
7. li-l-mawt ma na zultiːlku ḥasab asanasyus ʔar-ruːsuːli bi-ʃiːyuːʔ ʔaxad gasad maxluːq
fa:::-mawt il-masi:ḥ takmi:l li-t-tagassud takmi:l li-xami:s il-ḥahd likay
yuṣṭi l-bašāriyya l-gadi:da ma yaḍman xulù:daha wa-ma yaḍman ʕadam suqū:ṭaha
wa-yuṣṭi:ha n-nišma lla:ti bi-la nada:ma yaṣṭi:na nišma bi-la nada:ma miš mumkin
yaxudha yaṣni fī-ma yaqaːf fī: tisːa: w-tisːi:n fiya... fī l-miyya min in-naːs yizul-lak da
l-masi:ḥ zafːla:n minni ya fāmm ma-titgannin-ː il-masi:ḥ miš mumkin yizʃal xalaː ʃ baṭṭal
zafːl [giggles] da huwwa zːaː lə huzn wa-la kaʔaːba ha-tzaːʕal u le: w-ha-thazzinu le:
yizul-lak da zafːla:n minni wa-la yunkim yizʃal minnak ʔiʃlaːqan wa-la yanbaːqiʔin ʔiːn ʔinta
tizʃal ʔiːʃlaːqan li-ʔinn fī l-ḥaziːza ʔinn ma-ʃad-ː yamluk ʕaleːna la huzn wa-la kaʔaːba
wa-la tanahhud wa-la xaṭiyya wa la namuːs xaṭiyya wa la mawt wa-ʔilli bi-yiḥazzin
il-ḥuzn il-muriːːʔilli yiwaʃsaːl in-naːs ʔila l-mawt
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huwwa namuːs il-xaṭiyya il-ʃaːm il l-ʔaːʃdaʔ ʔilli bi-yaḥkum ʕa l-ʔinsaːn yaʃni
tilqaː(ː)ʔiyyan yaʃni ʔukum bi-l-mawt da maːt ʔin-namuːs maːt tizul-li laʔ ya ʔabuːna da
lissa bi-ːyʃiːm fiiya ba-zul-lak bass / ma-ʃad-ː da n-namuːs ʔilli bi-ʃiːm fīk da huwwa di
l-laʃna ʔilli ʃadarit min ʔallaː ʔala l-ʔinsaːn ʔilli ʃallu mawtan tamuːt w-di ntahat xalaː ʃ
gʃ: il masiːh ʔanha ʕalayha bi-mawthi fī-ʃiwaːd il-mawt lissa ha-nudxul fī l-qiyaːma
ʔaʃːtaːna ʔhaːyaː ʔabadiyya wa-ʔaʃːtaːna niʃma bi-la nadaːma tamluk fīː-ːna wa-namluk
fīː-ːha bi-la firaːq ʃ faːnamuːs il-xaṭiyya il-faːʃil fī l-ʔaːʃdaʔ ʔallaːːdī kaːn tilqaː(ː)ʔiyyan
yizul-lak yaʃni da tilqaː(ː)ʔiyyan bi-yaḥkum bi-l-mawt w-xalaː ʃ li-ʔinn kull mawluːd
ʔimraːʔa mawluːd li-l-mawt ʃ [[.........]] ma-ʃad-ː niːmuːs il-xaṭiyya ma-ʃad-ː yamluk ʕala
ʔinsaːn
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ʔil-xaṭiyya tamluk / tamluk ʕala l-gasad w-ha-nsib-laha l-gasad w-nzul-laha iʃbaːi biːh
[xxxxxxx] w-ndawwibhuːlik f it-turaːb w-nuxrug biduːn xaṭiyya li-ʔinn il-masiːḥ lamma
ha-ːyiːgi yaxudna ha-yaːti bi-la mafhuːm xaṭiyya hiyya maktuːba ha-yaːti bi-la xaṭiːʔa ʃa
ṭabːan mafḥuːna ʔinnu ha-yaːti bi-la ʔayy daynuːna min ɡihaːt il-xaṭːaːʔa da gai:y yaʃni
yunaggid ʃ // faːmawt il-masiːḥ ʔanha ʕala ma tabaqqaː min laʃnaː ʔallaː w-ːmin namuːs
il-xaṭiyya r-raːbiːd fī l-ʔaːʃdaːʔ wa-liyak yuːʔakkid ehm ehm daynuːmat ʔaw msugrat /
in-niʃma / msugrat il-xalaː ʃ msugrat il-ḥayat il-ʔabadiyya ʃ ʔanha ʕala l-mawt ʕalaːʃnaː
ma-yaʃbaː-ː il-ːmoːt luḥ sulṭaːn ʕaleːna ʔiːzan fa-n-nilʃma ʔilli/ddahalna xalaː ʃ ʔiza
[ma]ʃkan-ːʃi mumkin ʔabadan li-l-mawt
33
yaʃni yaʔxuzni wa-yaḥrimmi min ʔallaː yibza n-nilʃma ʔilli ddahaːni niʃma ʔigabiyya
w-il-mawt salbi ʃ w-ʃi l-ḥaziːza ʃa lə yumaːn yataqaː ʃa lə yumaːn ʃaʃa baʃː ʔilla f ñaxʃ waːḥid ʔilli
huwwa l-masiːḥ yaʃuːf lizaːlik ma tawaqaːʃt [xxxxxxx] [giggles] li-ʔinn il-masiːḥ ʔilaːh
wa-la yaḥk... wa-la yunkim ʔinnu bi-ḥasab ʒal-kalima ʔaw lahuːtu ʔinnu yimuːt
wa-l-lahu: t `aw l-kalima muttaḥid ?ittiḥa:d kulli / kulli w-kulli di fi l-mafhu:m il-lahu:ti fi
l-mafhu:m il-falsafi kibi:ra `awaw `awaw yaʕni ?il-kulliyya:at di ʃe:؟ ʕagi:b lamma tuẓṣud
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1 `aw miš mumkin ?innu yumsik fi l-mawt yaʕni ma:t talat ʃiya:m lakin ʃili:ʃ riḥtu zayy
2 il-ʕambar ʕaḥla min r:iḥit libna:n li-ʔinn lan yam luk ʃala:yi l-mawt ?iṭla:qan ʃiʔnama
li-ʔinnu la:biš gasad maxlu:q la budda ?an yamu:t fa-ma:t fa-ʔanha ʃala ḥukm il-mawt
bi-qiya:matihi ʃiila l-ʔabad wa-ʔaʃta:na nafs u ʔaʃta:na nafs u bi-l-ʔi:ma:n ʔaʃta:na nafs u
bi-l-kalima ʔaʃta:na nafs u bi-l-ʃiša bi-l-ʃiša ʃ-ʃašxiyya l-ḥulwa ʔaʃta:na nafs u bi-g-gasad
wi-d-damm ʔaʃta:na nafs u bi-kull ma: lahu fi l-maʃimu:diyya min mawt wa-qiya:ma
wa-ɡalaba wa-kullu / ʔaʃta:na bašariyyitu ʔil-muttaḥida bi-l-lahu:tu fa-bi-t-ta:li ʔaʃta:na
kull ʃuq:q ʔal-ʔinsa:n il-gadi:d ʔaw ʔil-bašariyya l-muxallaṣa | / hal ʔanta fi l-masi:ḥ
yasu:ʔ ʔa:ḥ
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1 ya::: li-l-maʃna wa-ya::: li-l-ʃumq! yaʕni ?ana bass yaʕni tuʃwizni ʔil-ʔaya:t غاša:n
yasu:ʃ fa-ḥuwwa xali:qa gadi:da: kull ʃe:؟ qadi:m qad maʃa: kull ʃe:؟ qadi:m maʃa:
l-bašariyya ʃala:ti la yumkin yaḥkum ʃala:yi l-mawt wa-ʃa:n la ʃa:n la ʃa:n la ʃa:n la ʃa:n la ʃa:n la
shan ʔa: ηa ba wa-la la tanahhud wa-ʔinnaha bada:ʔat bi-l-ʃiʃl munḍu yawm il-qiya:ma wa-faγraha ʔinnaha ʃa:i:ʃ
5 il-ʔaʃar il-gadi:da wa-s-sama:؟ il-gadi:da ʔallati la yumkin ʔan yaḥkum ʃale:ha la ḥuzn
9 wa-la ka:ba wa-la tanahhud wa-la mawt | kama:n ya ʔaḥhiba:؟i ehm ehm
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1 ʔattakk ta:ni ʃala ʔinn ʔa:dam ʔaxad kull ma yumkin ʔan ʔaḥlam bi: / kull ma yumkin
2 ʔinta ka-raq:hib tiḥlam bi: min ʃiʃra maʃa: alla: ya sala:m lamma yaʃul-lak [.........] ʔe:؟ da
7 ʔaktar min kida ʔa:dam ka:n fi l-firdo:ʃ la la: tuʃawwib ʔaya:tu ʔaʃya ʃa:ʔiba min
9 il-ʃada:wa ʔil-ʃada:wa ka:nit maqtu:la miš mawgu:d xa:liʃ la be:n wa-la be:n ḥayawana:t
8 wa-la wuːhu:ʃ wa-la wa-la ʔi:la ʔa:ʃiri:hi wa-τaʃa:daq maʃa:hum miš bass kida
w-il-maːlaːʔika ʔaydan miš kida w-bass da ϱaraːq il-gabi:na da ʔit-taːʃab da ma-kan-ʃ
mawgu:d ʔiːʃ-ʃaːgar yanmu: yinzil il-maːtar iʃ-ʃaːgar yanmu li-waːdu /
37

ʔaʕtana:h il-masi:h bi-tagassuddu ?awwalan bi-tagassuddu wa-taʔannusu bi-ḥasab il-ʔingi:l
wa-ʔallahha bi-l-mafru: %+ ?innu ʔidda:ha kull ʔiʃa:t il-λahu:ʔa w-baʕde:n ʔiddahalna
ʔiʃ-ṭabi:ʕa di ʔiddahalna bi-kull ma: fi-:ha | fa-fi l-ḥazi:ʔa
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ʔilli ʔamalu l-masi:h bi-tagassuddu wa-bi-mawtu ʔala ʂ-šalib ʔaw bi-l-ʔahra: fi yo:m
il-xami:s ʔiʕṭa:ʔu l-ɡaḍad wa-d-damm ʔal-ḥa:mul li-kull ʃiʃa:t il-βašariyya 1-gadi:da
wa-mawahibba ʔal-γayr qā:bila li-ʔad-ʔayya:ʕ / / ma hu kan rabbinu ʔa:dir bi-fo:raman
yiraggaʕ ʔa:dam ta:ni kan ʔa:dir bi-fo:raman yiraggaʕu ta:nai bass ka:n ʔe:h illi ha-yiḥṣal?
// [voices from the audience probably saying ‘he would have fall’] ʔasraʕ min il-ʔawwal
ṭabʕan li-ʔinnu xadha [giggles] xad ʔa l-hizar maʕa iš-šiṭa:n / mahu ʔilli ʔilli ʔitfa:him
maʕ iš-šiṭa:n marra ta:ni marra tibza sahla zawi rawi li-š-šiṭa:n ʔinnu yidḥak ʕale:h
fa-ka:n ṣadda:mi yaʕni ʔin kan ʔaθad-lu ʔi l-ʔawwil ʔalfen talattala:f sana maʕa l... fi
l-firdo:s walla yo:m walla miš ʔarfi:n ʕadad zadd ?e walla milyune:n sana walla ʕasara /
ma-ḥna:-ς ʔarfi:n | ka:n saqαt fi muḍda ʔaqall giddan giddan
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wala:kin likay yaḍman lana l-masi:h ḥaya:h maʕa alla: la yumkin fi:-ha r-raqfa wa-la
yumkin fi:-ha s-suqːt liza:lik tagassad ʔalla: ʤahar fi l-gasad likay ʔuʔṭi il-βašariyya
w-taḥmil xiṭṭat irīruqiyy ʔilli huwwa ḥaṭṭaha ka-bi:кра fi: xiṭṭat ir-ruqiyy ʔan yartaqi
l-insa:n likay yazda:d fi maʕriftu l-alla: wa-yaʕi:ʃ maʕa alla: ʔala ʔu:1 faqadh fa-ḥubb
bi-ʔiːzu:lu fi t-taʃbira:t ʔil-sa:?ira l-madaniyya yaʕni ipso facto haqiq⊤a waqaʃa / lahu: References
muttaḥid bi-n-nasusu:ʔan-nasusu:ʔa bi-l-mawt wa-l-ḥahu:ʔa yastaḥi:l
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تَأَسَّفُكُم مِّنْيَةُ الْكَالِمَةِ الرَّحْمَانِيَّةُ، وَالْبَاسِطُ لَمَعْرِضَةَ الْفَيْضِ، وَالْمُعْطَيَ لِلْمَحْيَاةِ الْحَلِيمَةِ، وَالْمُتَّنَبِّئُ لِلْخَلْقِ الْمُحْصُنِ. وَإِنِّي لَكُمْ مِّيْتٌ إِلَّا بِرَحْمَةِ اللَّهِ الْمَلِيِّكَ الْعَظِيمِ، وَالسَّاحِرُ يَا سِحْرُ لَا تَعْجِبُ الْخَلْقَ مِنْهُ وَلَا يَتَرَّمَّضُهُ، وَكَانَ الْخَلْقُ يُقِيلُ: اِلَّا مَنِيٍّ مِّنِيٍّ، فَأَنْتَ مِنِيٍّ. وَكَانَ السُّنَّةُ يَا سُنَّةُ لَا تَعْجِبُ الْخَلْقَ مِنْهَا وَلَا يَتَرَّمَّضُهَا، وَكَانَ الْخَلْقُ يُقِيلُ: اِلَّا ثُورُبٌ مِّنِيٍّ، فَأَنْتُ الْمَلِيِّكُ، وَالْمُحْمَرُ لَا يَعْجِبُ الْخَلْقَ مِنْهُ وَلَا يَتَرَّمَّضُهُ، وَكَانَ الْخَلْقُ يُقِيلُ: اِلَّا مَلْئٌ مِّنِيٍّ، فَأَنْتُ مِلْلِيّةٌ.
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي المترهل في الصورة. يرجى تقديم النص العربي بشكل أوضح.
gasadan
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1 yaʕni ša:l il-xaṭiyya fi ?aʔma:qu ṭiḷtaḥam bi:-ha ṭiḷtiḥa:man wa-ša:ra mustaḥiqqan
2 li-l-mawt | / da mafhu:m huwwa ma-xadha:-ši bunaş bunaş kida ṭamma ṭru:ḥ ša:nand
4 bunaş kida yaʕni | fa-ma-xad-š il-xatiyya kida hadiyya kida fa-šalha ŋala l-xa:... fi gasadu
5 ša l-xašaba da fi: na:s ṣa:raffhum min ḍumn in-na:s ṭillli miš ṭadri:n yifhamu ŋumq ṭillli
8 il-ʔa:ya di miš ša:yiz ṭasmaḥha la bala:š miš ša:yiz ṭasmaḥha ṭallaːh ṭallaːh ṭallaːh ṭallaːh ṭabb ṭana ṭana mustaʃi:idd tilği l-ingiːl kullu ma-tišgiliː:-š di | taːʃa:la kida f ǧitta
9 kida w-ʔabawrizha w-ahuṭṭahā f ʔallayti w-xud l-ingiːl kullu | //
10 da ḥamal xaṭaːya:na fi gasadu ša l-xašaba w-bi:-di ṭaːru:l ṭana miš xaːti yizuːl ʔizzay? ʔaʔuːl
11 ṭi:l-mas:i:ḥ šaːl ŋanni xalaːʂ | // fa-llaːdi lam yaʃrif xaṭiːy... lam yaʃrif šuːf mugarrad
12 il-maʃrifa min guwwa ŋaːlu lam yudrikha lam yaʃrifha lam yumaːrisha ḥaːš fi: ḥadd yiʃraf
13 il-xatiyya min ǧer ma yimaːrisha ya bbaːat?: fa-da lam yumaːris xaṭiyya wa-lam yuːqad fi
14 šammihi ǧiːšš lam yumaːris il-xatiyya li-zaːlik lam yaʃrifha fa-qabalha fi gasadu qubːlan
15 šaːra xaṭiyya šaːra xaṭiyya bass ba-ʁuːl šuːf ʔegenetu / sarek[s [oːɾɛ ṭeːɡɛnɛt] ʔegenetu /
16 amartia [oːɾeːʃ] tiːgiʔ amartia | / šaːra xaṭiyya! šaːra xaṭiyya! fa-na ba-ʃmil ŋalaːmit
tusːwi ṭaːbːan ṭana dayman ragul ŋamali fi laːhuːti miʃ ṭaːgul ṭaːṣari ʔaːbaru ʔaːbaru ṭaːbaru
17 li-ʔinn il-lahuːti n-nažari zayy ma ba-ɾuːl-luku ŋala ṭuːl yitlaːʃ ʔarr l-mawdːuːr w-yibːa
18 gadal wa-niqːaːʃ w-xnaːʔ w-ʔeːʔ?
48
1 wa-ʃaːdaːwa wa-warqara w-xaraːb | ṭana ṭiːl-lahuːt ṭiːlli bi-naːhya bi: ŋamali li-ḥayatna
2 l-yawmiyya | fa-koːnu ṭallaːdi lam yaʃrif xaṭiːyya šaːra xaṭiːyya min ṭaːɡlina ba-ḥuːṭṭ
3 ŋalamat tusaːwi min ǧer ʃaːrḥ w-ʔaːzul ṭiːnnu maːt maːt b-ɪʃtʰːqaːq li-ʔiːnnu xaːtːi maːt
4 badam maːt li-ʔiːnnu xaːtːi w-ʃaːl xaṭiːyyiti da maʃfuːm il-xaːlaːʂ maʃfuːm ṭiːnna ana xiliʃt
5 min xaṭiːyyiti maʃfuːm ṭiːnna ŋaːl xaṭayaːya maʃfuːm ṭiːnna tabarraːʔ maʃfuːm it-ṭabːiriːːr
6 kullu ŋaːzamat il-qiːyaːma baːnit hina ṭiːnna ʔaːm bi-gasad muntahi gasad gadiːd bi-baːʃariyya
7 gadiːda lːaː miʃ lass la taqbal il-xaṭiyya wa-la ŋumkin ṭaːn ṭuːḥkam ŋaleːha lːa maːn qariːb
8 wa-ła maːn baʃːiːd bi-ʔaːy ſhuːmkin kaːna xalaːs ʔiːntaːha | ṭallaːdiːna ŋum fi l-masːiːḥ yasːuːʃ
9 laysu ṭana ẓalabtaːha šwayya [voce dall’auditorio] laːʔʔ laysaː... daynuːna
50

Itaḥamit bi: xaṭiyyiti Itaḥamit bi: w-maːt bi:-ha miš mumkin yimuːt itneːn bi-sabab xaṭiyya

waḥda da l-qanuːn qaḍaːʔi | yizul-lak kida yastaḥiːl ḏan yamuːt ṭitneːn bi-sabab xaṭiyya

waḥda ḏil-qanuːn il-madani / yaʃni ḏiːza tneːn mawwitu waːḥid laːzim waːḥid minhum

ʔilli huwwa šaːḥib il-gariːma w-tادbirha yitšiniːz wi-t-taːni yaːxud muʔabbad ḏinnama

ma-yitšimtuː-ʃ il-ʔitneːn | / fa-l-masiːḥ maːt bi-xaṭiyyiti ḏinta ʕaːwiz baza haːṭakimni ḏana

baza taːniː maː: la yaguːzd qanuːnːan yaʃni ʃuːf qanuːnːan ḏasab il-qanuːn il-madani

wi-l-qanuːn il-madani masruːr min il-qanuːn ir-ruːḥi maː-ʃ ʃak k w-qanuːn il-ʔingiːl |

fa-ʕaẓama ʕaẓama fi l-ḥaqiːqa ḏiːlm l-masiːḥ ḏallaːːdi lam yaʃrif xaṭiyya
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yaqbal xaṭiyyati fi gasadu li-taskun fi: / li-taskun fi: wa-yaːmuːt biː-ha wa-yanhi ʕalayha

leːʔ li-ʔinnu ʕuːqib xalaːʃ ʕiːqaːb moːt / maːt | ʔaːxir ʕuːqibːa li-l-mawt ehm li-l-xaṭiyya

l-mawt maːt li-zaːlik qiyaːmat il-masiːḥ w-ʔiːtaːu l-baʃariyya l-gadiːda l-munazzaha ʕaːn

il-xaṭiyya ḏaydaːn / bi-l-ʔiːdaːfa ḏila l-mawt wa-ma yatbaːfuḥu min ḏawwa ya wa-ʔila

ʔaːxiriːbi bi-yiwarriːna ẓadd ʔeː ʔeːh xiṭṭit il-xalaːʃ di min ḏawwil it-tagassud li-l-qiyaːma /

likay yuʃiːd ʔiːl-xaliːqa l-baʃariyya marra ʔuxra ḏila gamaːl xilqat allaː wa-ʃuːratu li-tahya

fi samaːʔin gadiːda wa-ʔaːrdin gadiːda wa-li-rabbina l-magd dayman ʔabadiyyan ʔamiːn
Transcription of the homily MM-270

0  bi-taštahi nafsi ya ?ahibba:?i / taštahi šahwa / ?an yatf'allam / ?awla:d alla: š-šura:x |
1  [.............] fa-ma ba:lukum yasmaː ti-š-ša:rixi:na ?ilayhi layla nahar:r | // ma-fi:-š / ḥadd |
2  / min ?awla:du / yif'allimu š-šura:x / layla nahar:r // ?imta / ?illi yimši / fi ṭuruqaːt id-
5  zaman ?an nuʃallì fi s-sirr | /
6  1 iḍ-ḍalaːm / qad / laffa 1-kaniːsa / wa-laffa nufuːsana / ṭan nuːr šaḥḥ [xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx] |
7  2 ʃoːt ir-rabb la yusmaː | / ʔal-kaniːsa / taːfis? ʔayyaːm / ḥaziːna / ʃariːsaha ʔaxfa waguː / |
8  la quwwa wa-la ruːh / wa-la ḥayːaːh wa-la mawaːhiːb(b) | ?aqː-qulma / ʔiːṣṭaddat ʕalayna yaː |
9  rabb // wa-nahṣib ʔanfusna / ?annana nuʃalli wa-ʔannana fi kaniːsa / muka… |
10 mutakamaːlma | saːaltu / ehm ʔinsaːn ʃaːʔiš fi 1-xaːːig ʔizzay ḫaːl ik-kaniːsa fi l-
11 xaːːig? zal-li ḥalha ʃaːl ʔawi da k-kiniːsa miʃ zayy ma tisṭadqu / ʔinnaha / ʃaːfiːa fi l-
12 xaːːig |
13 2 ʔabadan / da ʃandina kaniːsa qawiyya xaːliʃ | / da l-ʔawlaːd bi-yiruːhu 1-kiniːsa w-bi-
14 yitnawlu | / w-ʔultiːlu bi-yiːfimilu ʔeː: fi k-kiniːsa? zal-li ya ʔabbi yafni bi-yismaːfu š-šala |
15 ʔultiːlu kull yoːm? zal-li laʔ kull yoːm ḥadd | ʔultiːlu yiːʃrafu ʃarabi kuwayyis? zal-li laʔ / |
16 ma-yiːʃrafuː-ʃ ʃarabi kuwayyis | ʃabb bi-yismaːfu ʔeː?: zal-li bi-yitnawlu | / ʔaːh / huwwa |
17 da ʔilli bi-yuːqaːl ʔanni ḡani wa-qad ʔistaːṅeːt / wa-laysat liː ʔaːɡaː ʔila šayʔ? | ʔiːl-kaniːsa l-
18 ʔaːn / ṭahya fiː ɣaybuːba / ʔismaha ɣaybuːbat il-ɡinaː / wa-laysa laha ḥṭiyaːg ʔiːla šayʔ? | |
19 ṣalawːaːt fi miʃaːdaha wa-ʔadadisiː fi miʃaːdha / waː-ʃiːha naːs kitiːra bi-titmala w-tifda fa-
20 laha |
21 3 maẓhar ʔal-ḥaraːra wa-l-ʃibaːda | / walaːkin waːdīh ʔaḍ-ḍaːʃ fi min il-ʔinquisamaːt wi-l-
22 ʔaḥzaːn wi-l-ʔaʃbaːr ʔilli fiːha / la ʔuːɡad ʔinsigaːm bayn il-gamaːsaːt fi l-xaːːig / maː |
23 bayna gamaːʔaːt il-kaniːsa l-fulaːniyya wa-l-kaniːsa l-fulaːniyya w-da μuṭahazzib fiː da w-
24 da muṭahazzib fiː da / ʔaqː-qulma ʔaḥaːt 1-l-kaniːsa / wa-ʔaʃbaː ḥadiːs is-sirr ya |
25 bbahaːt geːr mugdi / la ṭuqirru [xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx] | la budd min iš-šuraːx la budd ʔan |
26 nis… nas… nusmiʃ ir-rabb šuraːxa quluːbana / ʔana la ʔaquːl bi-šuraːx iš-ʃoːt / walaːkin |
27 ʔaquːl bi-šuraːx il-qaːlb / ʔaːlaːdi ḥatman yulaːzimuhu šuraːx iš-ʃoːt |

6 قالب ماغرم:ہ | یحا / ما-لنا:س قول:ب

kašafa sirruh | fa-ma ba:lamu kum yasmaʃ li-ʃ-ʃariʃa:zi:n | ?ilayhi wa-huwa mutamahhil
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Yaʃa:n yiʃarraxu ʔaktar w- yiʃarraxu ʔaʃa / ?iʃna kaʃaʃna l-le:la sirr min ?asra:r / ?alla: |
wa-la yastagi:b li-ʔann iʃ-ʃura:x yadxul ʔile:ʃ / bi-ʃo:t / gami:ʃ yastaʃib / ?iwaːd / min
in-nom ?illi yaːʃit fi: nunusna w-quluba:na | qa:la:h laa:h wa-huwa muʃirr falayha / wa-
ʔana ka-ʃaːhid / ?ana ʔaʃa:hi... ?astaʃhid bi: / lahu ?әnnahu muḥiibb iʃ-ʃura:x / wa-
layla nahar: | /
10
?aydan sa-yamani / likay yasmaʃha wa-yasmaʃha wa-yasmaʃha wa-yasmaʃha /
?alla:h yastalliiːd / giddan bi-ʃala:t iʃ-ʃura:x li-ʔәnnahu fi l-ʔәazi:na ʃula... ʃala:h bi-l-ʔaːqq |
il-ʔaːql / wa-la taːtiːq in-naʃf ?an tuʃalli bi-hiːduːr? | tahtazz in-naʃf kùllaha min ad-daxiil
11
wa-yәhtaːz laha l-gasad / wa-yaxrug il... / ?aʃ-ʃawt bi-ʃura:x / la yastaːtif il-ʔinsana:na ?an
ʃura:xana / wa-r-raːb yaʃtahi ?an yasmaʃ ʃalaːt iʃ-ʃura:x / | qallaman yaquːna haːdəa l-
kalaːm / walaːkinnana naːhnu bi-ʃaːdaːd / ʃalaːt il-ʔaːqq wa-suːg:id il-ʔaːqq / kayfa naʃriʃ
ʔaːqq iʃ-ʃala:h min iʃ-ʃalaːh illaːti laysat bi-l-ʔaːqq ??illa bi-ʃura:x il-ʔaːql / wa-d-duːmuːʃ /
?allaːti taːsiːl ka-naːnahr? | haːʃab it-tarːtiːla ?allaːti katəbana maːraːsaha | / ?aːh falal-d-
duːmuːʃ ʃindamaː tiːsiːr ka-n-nahr | layaː yaːgad ?agmal min haːdiih saːʃa
12
hiːnamaː / nastawfiːha bi-l-kaːmil / fi dumuːʃ la takuːf | haːdiih hiya dumuːʃ ?al-ḥubb
dumuːʃ iʃ-ʃalaːh allaːti tuqaddam min qalb ʃaːdiːq ?amiːn / li-man yuːhībbuh | / fi haːzih
l-layla ?allaːti ʔaːraːdaːh llaː / ?an takuːn bidaya li-t-taʃarruf / ʃala maːtaːliːb allaːh minna
/ ʃaːθurna ʃala kanz maxʃi fi ʔaːq | ?aʃ-ʃalaːh ?allaːti bi-ʃ-ʃura:x waːːʔallaːti yatamahhal
?alla: falayha wa-l-laytəːgib | ?aːgiːb giddan giddan ?an yasmaʃ haːza min allaː / maʃa
ʔәnnahu maʃruːf / ?aːnnahu saːmif iʃ-ʃalaː:
13
qiː mata laha | / ?aːštahi wa-taːštahi ruːḥi fi ḏaːxili ?anna kull waːḥid min kum / yaðuː qa / 
ʔaːʃ-ʃalaː bi-ʃ-ʃuraː xa / wa-xuːʃuːxan bi-l-layl / ?aːʃ-ʃaː rixiː na ?i lá yhi / w-ḥaṭṭ il-leːl Ẓabl in-nahaː r

18
laylan wa-nahaː ran | law la ?anna r-rabb / yaʃrif tamamːaːn / qiː mat haːdiːhi ʃ-ʃalaː
4 qalb allaː: giddan ?an yasmaʃ ?awlaː dahu yasruxuː na ?ilayhi bi-l-ḥubb / muʃalliː na min
5 ūumq il-qalb | fa-smaʃ ya rabb ʃalaː tana / wa-stagib ūahwat quluː bana / ?an la takuff
8 quluː bana ʃan is-ʃalaː: ?ileː k bi-ʃuraː xa il-layl wa-n-nahaː r | ?amiː n ūistagib
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