

**TEXT VS. COMMENT:  
SOME EXAMPLES OF THE RHETORICAL VALUE OF  
THE DIGLOSSIC CODE-SWITCHING IN ARABIC  
– A GUMPERZIAN APPROACH**

Marco Hamam

**Abstract**

This article deals with the question of the diglossic code-switching in the Arabic spoken language and especially in learned discourses. I aim to explain the rhetorical inherent value in the diglossic code-switching in the Arabic spoken language and I will attempt to show through a series of examples drawn from an Aljazeera episode, how the juxtaposition of standard Arabic and colloquial Arabic can be a vehicle for messages that bear rhetorical / metaphorical values.

**Keywords:** Code-switching; Arabic language; Argumentation; Diglossia; Spoken Arabic mixed varieties.

This article aims to explain the rhetorical inherent value in the *diglossic code-switching* in the Arabic spoken language. I will attempt to show, through a series of examples drawn from a little *corpus* how the juxtaposition of *fuṣḥā* (from now on, F) and *‘āmmiyya* (from now on, A) can be a vehicle for messages that bear rhetorical / metaphorical values.

**1. Introduction**

In the Arabic language there exists a range of mixed linguistic varieties/forms/styles, that are not categorizable nor - or exclusively - as F nor as A. Part of this category - which could be defined in general ‘*mixed varieties (of spoken Arabic)*’<sup>1</sup> – are those

---

<sup>1</sup> I used this general term simply for convenience, like a ‘big container’ where to put, approximatively, the phenomenology of the Arabic mixed forms. This, especially by 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. See § 1.0.

sentences in which speakers move along a linguistic *continuum*<sup>2</sup> through two main mechanisms:

- at an intrasentential level (Holes, 1995:295-303), a hybrid morpho-phono-syntax is produced<sup>3</sup>;
- at an intersentential level (Holes, 1995:283-295), the speakers perform *code-switchings* (from now on, CS) in a same linguistic interaction. The CS that occurs between F and A - called *diglossic CS*<sup>4</sup> - has sociolinguistic, pragmatic and/or metaphorical/rhetorical implications.

These types of mixed Arabic represent a well-attested linguistic fact in the present linguistic landscape of the Arab countries, so much that Boussofara-Omar (2006a:77) considers them “a practice that is increasingly growing in the Arab World.” In fact, such mixed forms are easily recordable in all Arab audiovisual mass media, in university lecture halls, in national parliaments, in mosques and churches and in all those occasions in which one discusses about 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).

### 1.0. *Mixed varieties of spoken Arabic and the terminology issue*

The attention towards mixed forms of spoken Arabic is in constant development, and studies are enhanced with new contributions. In the Arab World, an attempt to analyze the Arabic linguistic *continuum*, is a 1973 work by the Egyptian scholar Badawī (*Mustawayāt al-šarabiyya al-mušāšira fī Mišr*), that soon became a ‘classic’ in this field for it was ‘ahead of times’ and offered a set of guidelines that will be revisited and developed in Western academies. Even today the Arab scientific production, in Arab institutions, is mostly concentrated on the Classical or Modern Standard Arabic - despite a certain space is offered to the study of dialects – so considering mixed Arabic varieties as ‘incorrect forms’<sup>5</sup>. In this regard, mixed Arabic is seen as an ‘incorrect,’ ‘bad spoken’ Arabic, for it is not able to fully realize the standard rule. Badawī’s work had a wide echo in the West and the lines he marked for spoken Arabic have been developed by authors such as Meiseles, Mitchell, Holes, Doss, Mazraani, Bassiouney

---

<sup>2</sup> «With the specific term *continuum* one primarily refers, in sociolinguistics, 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» Berruto 2007:128-129 (translation is mine). See also Berruto 2007:128,130-132

<sup>3</sup> I wondered how much the *koinization* mentioned by Blanc (1960) has to be considered or not in our ‘big container’. Certainly it is mixed Arabic but it passes through (socio)linguistic processes which are its own. Similarly, how to consider ‘oralization of written texts’ which is, too, in the majority of cases, far from Standard Arabic morpho-phonetic rules?

<sup>4</sup> See Mejdell (2006b:419-420). Boussofara-Omar (2006b:634) believes that the first one who used the term is Keith Walters. Moreover, it is interesting to note that even about that term there is no unanimous agreement. In an article (2006a) of her, Boussofara-Omar considers *diglossic switching* as consisting in all those times when F and A interfere. So what others would call *hybrids*, or *intraphrasal code-switching*, or *code-mixing*, are, for Boussofara-Omar, part of the category *diglossic switching*.

<sup>5</sup> Just think about all the *lahn al-‘amma* literature that still exists.

and Mejdell since the Seventies, that is as from the moment in which a social interest for the language arose, especially after Labov's research.

Although neither Ferguson's 1959 article about diglossia nor Blanc's 1960 article represented investigations centered on the subject yet the two works are nevertheless valuable. Blanc made a linguistic analysis<sup>6</sup> of a mixed spoken variety that was eminently characterized by the phenomenon of koineization, while Ferguson (1959) briefly mentioned the possible existence of what he called '*intermediate varieties*'.

From the Seventies onwards, mixed forms of spoken Arabic have been the subject of an in-depth sociolinguistic investigation. According to Mejdell<sup>7</sup>, approaches to modern forms of mixed spoken Arabic have been mainly three: (i) definition of levels and/or varieties within two poles (e.g. Badawī 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. Hary 1996, Elgibali 1993 and Mejdell 2006a); (iii) the use of the concept of CS<sup>8</sup> (e.g. Eid 1982, Bassiouney 2006, Mejdell 2006a and Omar Boussofara 2006a). Attention has therefore been shifted from trying to describe the phenomenon 'grammatically' to interpreting it 'sociolinguistically,' especially after the studies of Gumperz's interational (or interpretative) sociolinguistics<sup>9</sup>.

With Holes' 1993 study, a track already marked by Badawī in 1973 was drawn on. Badawī reflected on the rhetorical or the metaphorical value that *diglossic CS* has in spoken Arabic. While using a terminology typical of his five-levels Arabic sociolinguistic system (which is probably why it has not been used by other scholars after him), Badawī fixed his gaze on the possibility that at the bottom of elocutions, which contain a certain number of CSs, there is an intention to communicate extratextual messages, such as emphasizing the opposition between parts of speech regarded as 'theory,' 'absolute' and 'text' and parts regarded as 'relative,' 'praxis' and 'exegesis' (see Badawī 1973:207-213)

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. Apart from some exceptions, those involved in pre-modern texts are often reluctant or simply in a roundabout way disinterested in studies of contemporary spoken (also written?) Arabic and *vice-versa*. One can therefore speak of two 'traditions' (one pre-modernist and the other contemporary) that have not yet fully met and much work should be done in this direction<sup>10</sup>.

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

---

<sup>6</sup> Blanc (1960) worked in a way which was anything but theoretical – contrary to what Ferguson (1959) did - working on a recorded conversation.

<sup>7</sup> To Prof. Mejdell, I owe long and fascinating conversations about Arabic mixed forms, in addition to the fact that she has revised and discussed with me, with inexhaustible patience, this brief terminological preamble.

<sup>8</sup> Interestingly, the same term as *code-switching* regarding Arabic (and not only Arabic...) has not the same meaning for all scholars.

<sup>9</sup> For a reasoned and comprehensive exploration of the developments of the Arabic pre-modern and modern sociolinguistic, see Owens (2001).

<sup>10</sup> A brilliant attempt to find points in common between the two study currents was carried out by Gunvor Mejdell (2008b).

which deviate from the ‘classical’ norm, we find in English the term ‘Middle Arabic’<sup>11</sup>; in French ‘moyen arabe,’ ‘arabe moyen,’<sup>12</sup> ‘arabe mélangé,’ ‘arabe mixte’ and ‘arabe médian’; in Spanish ‘árabe medio’; in Italian ‘medio arabo’; in German ‘Mittelarabisch’; in Dutch ‘Middel-Arabisch,’ ‘Midden-Arabisch,’; in Arabic ‘al-‘arabiyya al-wustā’, ‘al-‘arabiyya al-wasīta’ (which apparently is taking more and more space) and ‘al-‘arabiyya al-muwallada’.

Perhaps because of an ‘impressionistic’ term<sup>13</sup>, 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 plan or koineized colloquial which is classicized beyond the ‘slightly formal’; *modified classical: classical Arabic with dialectal elements*. El-Hassan (1972), Meiseles (1980) and Mitchell (1986) use the term Educated Spoken Arabic (ESA). Badawī (1973) calls the ‘mixture level’ ‘*‘āmmiyat al-muṭaqqafīn* (*A of well-educated people*). Meiseles (1986) offers two mixed levels: *Oral Literary Arabic* (OLA) and *Educated Spoken Arabic* (ESA). 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). 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 her article is certainly illuminating: ‘*Neither third language nor middle varieties but diglossic switching*’.

In any case, the question of terminology is not yet resolved.

Although I find it useful for non-specialists of the Arabic language to have a glance at the internal debate in the field of the Arab studies about the terminology to adopt for the “diglossic mixing phenomena”, here, I will not try to provide further definitions. Instead, I will follow a functional approach to the mixed varieties analysing them in terms of diglossic CS.

### 1.1. Outline about rhetorical values of CS

I believe that Gumperz’s approach to metaphorical/rhetorical values of CS in bilingual environments is almost totally applicable to our *corpus* too.

The personal opinion of Eid (1980:84) seems to support this impression. She writes:

<sup>11</sup> To get an overview of the meanings and of the use of this term, see Lentin (2008).

<sup>12</sup> About the use of the word ‘arab moyen’ Pierre Larcher (2001:605) 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»». (Italics are mine)

<sup>13</sup> Lentin (2008:216) writes: «Nothing prevents us in theory, as far as the particular nature of oral and written language is taken into account, from regarding Middle Arabic [...] as belonging to a large ensemble that could be labeled ‘Mixed Arabic’».

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* – a relationship that warrants further study in future research. [Italics are mine]

Even a recent study by Boussofara-Omar (2006a:60), conducted using the Myers-Scotton's *Matrix Language Frame Model* (Myers-Scotton 1993), states that the *diglossic CS* "is as linguistically contrained as CS between any pairs of languages in speech of bilinguals". Despite the absence of a comprehensive rhetorical analysis specifically applied to *CS* in spoken Arabic, I will try to show how Gumperz's work confirms that not only certain grammatical *data* of *CS* but also metaphorical / rhetorical values identified in bilingual environments are compatible with the linguistic situation of spoken Arabic.

Gumperz' definition of *CS* is as follows<sup>14</sup>:

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

Seen as mainly interactional in nature, Gumperz coins the term *conversational CS*. This mechanism of spoken language, typical of bilinguals, is thought to bear a number of rhetorical or metaphorical significations or functions<sup>15</sup> 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]. 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. It is a *CS* that is not only socially significant but also metaphorically/rhetorically. In this regard, Gumperz and Blom (1972:424-426) introduce a distinction between a *situational switching* ("the notion of situational switching assumes a direct relationship between language and the social situation" [p. 424]) and a *metaphorical switching* ("the language here relates to particulare kinds of topics or subject matters rather than to change in social situation" [p. 425]).

On a rhetorical level, one would encounter something similar to what occurs, in written texts, with figures of speech, those 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, rythm, construction. 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

---

<sup>14</sup> According to Gumperz (1982:60) *CS* is a uniform interational set: «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».

<sup>15</sup> In their talks, monolinguals as well use rhetorical mechanisms that are not accomplished, however, through *CS* but through some particular prosodic characteristics. Alfonzetti (1998:186) 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.*» (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 A to F is accompanied by a slowdown in expression, hesitation etc.

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, rhetorical meanings of *CS* also 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. At the risk of trivializing the matter, saying ‘Frank is a lion’ in a zoo could mean that Frank is the name of one of the lions present in the cages while but talking about a friend called Frank, figuratively, the utterance is interpreted as ‘Frank is brave, majestic, untamed *as* a lion’. 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 make 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 (1982:5) 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. [Italics are mine]

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 rhetorical vehicle of metaphorical information aiming at achieving the main purpose of rhetoric: ‘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 knowledge which speakers use to convey meaning. Rather than claiming that speakers use language in response to a fixed, pretermind 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].

According to Berruto such functions highlight how “code-switching and the resulting switched discourse are not at all afunctional accidents, chaotic mixing of disparate pieces of language. On the contrary, they have functionality in the development of the spoken interaction, they are mostly provided with *interactional or social meaning and they are governed by principles and restrictions including linguistic restrictions*” (Berruto, 2007:217; translation and italics are mine).

### *1.1.1. Metaphorical/rhetorical functions according to Gumperz*

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

*1.1.1.1. QUOTATIONS* «in many instances the code switched passages are clearly identifiable either as direct quotations or as reported speech» [Gumperz, 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: “He says: *ye hi medsin k̄ontinyu k̄aro bhai* (continue taking this medicine friend)” [p. 76];

1.1.1.2. *ADDRESSE SPECIFICATION* code is switched depending on the person one talks to, an adjustment to the conversation partner(s)’s language<sup>16</sup>;

1.1.1.3. *INTERJECTIONS* «the code switching serves to mark an interjection or sentence filler» [Gumperz, 1982: 77];

1.1.1.4. *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];

1.1.1.5. *MESSAGE QUALIFICATION* one produces in the other language a segment that qualifies or specifies or comments what is said in one language;

1.1.1.6. *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 consider one of the examples set by Gumperz (1982: 81) referring to the latter function of the *conversational CS*, in particular a Spanish/English *CS*. Gumperz states that “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 mine). Spanish is used to express feelings, convey intimate and personal feelings while English is used to convey facts. It appears evident here how *CS* can be a bearer of meaning as much as of lexical choice, for example.

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*»<sup>17</sup>) as the sum of rhetorical uses of commutations. In order to be able to read the steps of this process, both in the oral and in written texts, it is necessary to determine what sense one has to give to the figure of speech. By analyzing the oral language of a Norwegian village, Gumperz (1982:27) believes that this process of ‘interpretation’ is not simply (socio-)linguistic, since it implies also a deep ethnographic knowledge.

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 and Yule (1983:11) write that «the perception and interpretation of each text is essentially subjective.»

<sup>16</sup> I wonder if this function is to be considered rhetorical or not.

<sup>17</sup> Wittgenstein (1958:43).

## 1.2. Rhetorical values of the CS in spoken Arabic

Here we consider the F/A CS which is typical of conversations that deal with ‘educated’ topics and that several authors call *diglossic switching*. Also with regard to Arabic, we can point out how the functions of CS are similar to rhetorical subterfuges well-known to a certain Arabic prose in which some parts repeat, in parallel, the main idea through mechanisms such as synonymy, antithesis or synthesis, the latter acting as ‘comment’ to a part felt as ‘text’ (Beeston 1983).

### 1.2.1. Upward and downward switching in Badawī

At this rhetoric process of spoken Egyptian Arabic, Badawī devotes a brief hint in his *Mustawayāt al-ṣarabiyya al-muṣāṣira fī Miṣr* (‘The levels of contemporary Arabic in Egypt’). In Badawī’s sociolinguistic analysis, one cannot speak of *diglossia*, that is of two oppositional varieties (H(igh)/L(ow)) when one speaks about Egyptian Arabic, but rather of a *continuum*<sup>18</sup> 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 rather than the ‘situation’ one that, according to Ferguson, explains the election of the variety H or L. Badawī 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” (Badawī & Hinds, 1991:VIII). Just because Arabic language use 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 Badawī’s metaphor - where one finds areas where colours are crisp and areas where colours are melted in those immediately adjacent. 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 (Badawī, 1973:92-93). The analysis proposed by Badawī, which recognizes and demonstrates the dynamic nature of spoken Arabic, although restricted to the Egyptian linguistic reality, is considered a good scheme of interpretation of the realities of other Arab countries.

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

1. *fuṣḥā at-turāḥ* (FT) «the linguistic vehicle of the legacy of Islamic high culture and religion» (Badawī, 1991:VIII);
2. *fuṣḥā al-ṣaṣr* (FA) «is the written archive 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» (Badawī, 1973:12; translation is mine);
3. *ṣāmmiyyat al-muḥaqqafīn* (AMθ) «This is the level in which the corruption of the traditional characteristics of *fuṣḥā* reaches such a level that it can no longer be

---

<sup>18</sup> See note 2.



considered within the limits - or the degrees - of *fuṣṣḥā* [...] It is the limit in which ‘*āmmiyya*, moving upwards towards *fuṣṣḥā*, reaches a degree where it becomes able to express, orally, contemporary culture». (Badawī, 1973:148-149; translation is mine);

4. ‘*āmmiyyat al-mutanawwirīn* (AMT) «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» (Badawī, 1973:175; translation is mine);

5. ‘*āmmiyyat al-ḥummiyyīn* (AU) «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» (Badawī, 1973:189; translation is mine).

According to Badawī (1973:151) the level in which F and A ‘mix up’ in oral expression is mainly the intermediate level, the AMθ, which is described as a *tazāwuḡ* ‘combination’ of dialect and standard elements:

وقد تم ذلك عن طريق التزاوج بين صفات العامية وصفات الفصحى، أو بعبارة أخرى بين ما يحسنه المتقنون من صفات الفصحى وهي اصطلاحاتها وألفاظها وطرق الدلالة المجردة فيها، وبين ما يحسنونه من صفات العامية وهو هيكلها البنائي وطرائق تركيب الجملة فيها بصورة عامة. من هذا التزاوج إنذ ولدت لغة الحديث عند المتقنين أو ما أسميناه بعامية المتقنين.<sup>19</sup>

Wa-qad tamma ḏālika ʿan ṭarīqi t-tazāwuḡi bayna šifāti l-ʿāmmiyyati wa-šifāti l-fuṣṣḥā, ʿaw bi-ʿibāratin ʿuxrā bayna mā yuḥsinuhu l-muṯaqqafūna min šifāti l-fuṣṣḥā wa-hiya ṣṭilāḥātuhā wa-ʿalfāzuhā wa-ṭuruqu d-dalālāti l-muḡarradati fihā, wa-bayna mā yuḥsinūnahu min šifāti l-ʿāmmiyyati wa-huwa haykaluhā l-bināʿiyyu wa-ṭarāʿiḡu tarkībi l-ḡumlati fihā bi-ṣūratin ʿāmmatin. Min hādā t-tazāwuḡi ʿiḏan wulidat luḡatu l-ḥadīṯi ʿinda l-muṯaqqafīna ʿaw mā ʿasmaynāhu bi-ʿāmmiyyati l-muṯaqqafīna.

This overview shows already the rhetorical value of this linguistic ‘combination’ (“*to express abstract meanings*”) alongside remarks of linguistic nature (“*its vocabulary [of F]*”; “*structure and syntactic structures [of A]*”).

This hint will be developed by Badawī 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 the embryonic stages - entitled ‘some general questions regarding levels’. In section b. of this appendix (‘the basis of level switching during conversation’, Badawī, (1973:207-213) distinguishes two topics:

1. ‘levels between which one switches’;
2. ‘the direction and the extent of level switching’.

As far as the first point is concerned, Badawī states that, the cultural factor being an essential characteristic of switching, AU is to be considered excluded from those levels

<sup>19</sup> «This has been done through a combination of characteristics of ‘*āmmiyya* and *fuṣṣḥā*, or in other words, of those elements of *fuṣṣḥā* in which well-educated people are competent (lexicon and the modalities through which it expresses abstract meanings) with the characteristics of ‘*āmmiyya* which they master (morphological structure and syntactical mechanisms in general). From this combination stems oral language of well-educated people, which we called ‘*āmmiyyat al-muṯaqqafīn*».

within which switching can take place. This is because, in the badawian scheme, AU represents the lowest sociocultural level. In addition, switching normally does not occur between FT and FA, because the education that the speaker has received - religious or secular - leads him to elige either one (FT) or the other (FA).

With regard to the second point - which is what is especially relevant for our analysis - Badawī outlines two possible chains of CS.

1. FT ↔ AMθ ↔ AMT
2. FA ↔ AMθ ↔ AMT (see Badawī, 1973:208)

According to his pyramid model, Badawī speaks of two switching mechanisms:

1. الصعود في المستويات 'UPWARD SWITCHING';
2. الهبوط في المستويات 'DOWNWARD SWITCHING'.

Regarding the upward switching, namely the transition from AMT to AMθ or AMT to FT or FA, Badawī (1973:208) writes:

يكون الانتقال صعوداً من الثاني [عامية المتتورين] إلى الثالث [عامية المثقفين] أو من الثالث إلى الرابع [فصحى العصر] ويحدث ذلك عندما يصل المتكلم في حديثه إلى نقطة يريد أن يلخص عندها شيئاً مما قاله أو يستخلص منه العبرة.<sup>20</sup>

Yakūnu l-intiqālu šuḥūdān mina θ-θāni [šāmmiyyati l-mutanawwirīna] ?ilā θ-θāliθi [šāmmiyyati l-muθaqqafīna] ?aw mina θ-θāliθi ?ilā r-rābi?i [fuṣṣḥā l-ša?ri] wa-yaḥduθu ḏālika ?indamā yašilu l-mutakallimu fī ḥadīθihi ?ilā nuqṭatin yurīdu ?an yulaxxiša ?indahā šay?an mimmā qālahu ?aw yastaxliša minhu l-?ibrata.

By presenting some examples of upward switching, taken from his *corpus*, Badawī includes among its functions also expressing a *ḥikma*, 'maxim'.

About downward switching, namely the transition from FT or FA to AMθ or from AMθ to AMT, Badawī (1973:208) says:

يكون الانتقال في الاتجاه المقابل أي هبوطاً من الرابع [فصحى العصر] أو الخامس [فصحى التراث] إلى الثالث [عامية المثقفين] أو من الثالث إلى الثاني [عامية المتتورين] في حالات الشرح والتفسير، أي عكس المواقف التي تستدعي الصعود. فقد يذكر المتكلم قضية أو مسألة يعتقد أنها من التركيز والإبهام بحيث تتطلب منه تخفيف هذا التركيز. وفي تلك الحالة كثيراً ما يلجأ إلى المستوى الأدنى ليتخذ وسيلة لتحقيق غرضه.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> «The upward switch takes place from the second level [AMT] towards the third [AMθ] or from the third towards the fourth [FA]. It occurs when the speaker reaches a point where he wants to epitomize something which has been said or to draw a lesson».

<sup>21</sup> «The switch in the opposite direction, namely downward, occurs from the fourth [F] or the fifth [FT] level towards the third [AMθ] or from the third towards the second [AMT] 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».

Yakūnu l-intiqālu fi l-ittiḡāhi l-muqābili ʔay hubūtan mina r-rābīfi [*fuṣḥā l-ṣaṣri*] ʔaw l-xāmisi [*fuṣḥā t-turāḡi*] ʔila θ-θāliḡi [*ṣāmmiyyati l-muḡaqqafīna*] ʔaw mina θ-θāliḡi ʔilā θ-θānī [*ṣāmmiyyati l-mutanawwirīna*] fi ḡālāti š-šarḡi wa-t-tafsīri, ʔay ʔaksa l-mawāqifi llātī tastadʔī ṣ-ṣuṣūda. Fa-qaḡ yaḡkuru l-mutakallimu qaḡiyyatan ʔaw masʔalatan yaṣṡaqidu ʔannahā mina t-tarkīzi wa-l-ʔibḡāmi bi-ḡayḡu tataḡallabu minhu taxfīfa ḡāḡā t-tarkīzi. Wa-fi tilka l-ḡālāti kaḡīran mā yaḡḡaʔu ʔilā l-mustawā l-ʔadnā li-yattaxiḡahu wasīlatan li-taḡḡiqi ḡaraḡihi.

*Aṣ-ṣuʔūd* and *al-hubūṡ fi l-mustawayāt*, as Badawī defines the *diglossic CS*, is not a mere sociolinguistic possibility but it brings in itself clear rhetorical significances.

### 1.2.2. The rhetorical use of variation in Holes

Holes is among those who most reflected about this rhetorical value of *CS* in spoken Arabic. In a famous article of his, he confirmed, through the analysis of a contemporary oral text, the function of the interaction *personalization vs. objectivization* mentioned by Gumperz (see § 1.1.1.5.).

Holes analyzes 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 speeches of the Egyptian *leader* ḡamāl ‘Abd al-Nāṣir might be considered patterns of improvised live dialogues in which the interlocutor (most often the ‘Egyptian people’) was absent. Holes focuses on code changings of some of Nāṣir’s speeches in which he passes, suddenly, from a standard sentence [Modern Standard Arabic, MSA] to a colloquial one [Egyptian Colloquial Arabic, ECA]. Holes explains this sudden change as the differentiation between oral material considered as ‘text’ (in MSA) and material considered as ‘comment,’ ‘exegesis’ of the ‘text’ (in ECA). 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 MSA provides him a *certificate of authoritativeness* (see Mazraani, 2008:669-670).

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 MSA 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 ECA and in a faster way. MSA is used by Nāṣir to express abstract, idealized, metaphoric messages, and without any kind of personalization. ECA 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). Often the two varieties are used in pairs: MSA conveys the abstract aspect of a question and ECA amplifies its effects in

---

It seems that Badawī got confused with regard to the five-level model that we have previously described (Badawī, 1982:89-91). It is not clear (but then everything is understood through context) whether the levels cited by Badawī should be counted starting from AU or FT. In fact, in the pages where he describes the five-level model the first of these is FT and the last is AU. 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 Badawī 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 Badawī does not seem to consider FT at all.

the real world. Holes (1993:33) summarizes this dynamics stating that “the ‘*āmmiyya* organizes for the audience in ‘real time’ the ‘timeless’ *fushḥā* text”.

Not far from the conclusions drawn by Gumperz in other linguistic contexts (see Holes, 1996:37), 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.

## 2. This study

### 2.0. *Speakers and corpus*

The considered *corpus* is the transcription of an episode of a programme of the Qatari based satellite channel *Aljazeera*, rather well known among the Arab public, called *al-Ittiḡāh al-Muḡākis* (‘The opposite direction’), which was broadcast in 2001. The peculiarity of this episode is the fact that the two main interlocutors in the studio start from strong ideological premises: one, Rafīq Rūḡāna (from now on, RR), a Lebanese poet, a native of Ġabal Lubnān, professes himself an enemy of F and defends the exclusive use of A in all the communicative situations, both written and oral; the other one, Naṣr al-Dīn al-Baḡra (ND), a Syrian writer of Damascus, maintains the exclusive use of F, both as written and spoken language, and considers A nothing but a spoken language lacking in grammar rules. The episode lasts 96 minutes and it has for title the *vexata questio*: ‘al-Luḡa al-‘arabiyya,’ ‘the Arabic language’. The one who chairs the debate is the anchor-man, Fayṣal al-Qāsim (FQ), Damascene, well-trained in the spoken use of the standard language and he as well is subject to a certain linguistic ideology because of the linguistic policy of *Aljazeera*: the language which is spoken by anchor-men and anchor-women must be F. The three, RR, ND and FQ, occupy about 70% of the time while the remaining 30% is represented by telephone interventions of guests. The latter will not be considered as one cannot state with certainty that their elocution is spontaneous while it is more likely to assume that they read a written text which they have previously prepared. The analysed *corpus* confirms what Meiseles writes: «Every text embodies an incommensurable amount of variation and shifts alternative between one variety and another, even within the frame of a sentence» (Meiseles, 1980:132). Indeed, the number of CSs exceeds a hundred units.

By the light of the linguistically ideologized positions of RR and ND, one would have expected a series of repercussions on the linguistic level. Theoretically, RR was supposed to speak only colloquial Arabic while ND and FQ only standard Arabic. Yet, many times RR switches to the standard while ND and FQ switches to the dialect. RR is the one who switches most of the time.

### 2.1. *Preamble*

1. No consideration will be given to the ‘ideological’ aspect that permeates the entire debate. The only sociolinguistic *datum* that is concerned is that speakers are educated

and talk about educated topics. The linguistically ideologized speech here can be regarded as an extreme example that confirms the initial hypothesis, which is that the CS in Arabic can be a vehicle for rhetorical significations, as much as it is for bilinguals, even when speakers exclude this value, appealing to the exclusive use of a single code. The contradiction between linguistic ideology and linguistic practice, between linguistic perception and linguistic use, so evident in this *corpus*, deserves an independent analysis. Despite some CSs might have been ‘provoked’ by the subject of the episode itself, and its metalinguistic relative discourse, we think this is not the case of the examples shown in this article;

2. Whenever we will speak about F and A, we actually mean what users *perceive* as F or A. This preamble is necessary since many times what is called F or A presents some hybrid elements which, however, do not affect the analysis<sup>22</sup>. In fact, when we speak here of CS, or, to put it in badawian words, of an "upward" or "downward" movement within the *continuum*, we mean a functional passage from  $\pm$  standard contexts to  $\pm$  dialectal contexts or vice versa. A context can be defined on the basis of many factors. There exists a long bibliography about the so-called "base language" that includes at least three different approaches (see Appel & Muysken 1987:121-122): *psycholinguistic* (base language is the dominant language); *sociolinguistic* (it is the code which is not marked in a particular setting); *grammatical* (it is the code that imposes certain restrictions on the possibility of switching). Sometimes the context is clearly labellable, despite the presence of some phonetic or morphologic elements which are in fact, as said before, irrelevant<sup>23</sup>. Other times, the phenomenon of code-mixing overlaps with CS so that the definition of the context becomes more complex. It is not always easy to label a context as F or A especially if we consider that the very definition of what F is, especially in spoken language, is not clear (see Parkinson 1991, 1993, 1994). Mazraani (1997:39) affirms that “the “MSAness” or “colloquialness” of a passage is related to the cooccurrence of MSA or dialectal elements from the phonology, morphophonology, syntax and lexicon occurring in its component sequences” where “a sequence is the speech between two pauses”, long pauses, we would add. In these cases, referring also to other similar linguistic contexts, such as the Italian one, we 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);

---

<sup>22</sup> A successful experiment in this sense is Dilworth B. Parkinson’s one (1991) who, through a field analysis, tries to provide a picture of the linguistic perception of (Egyptian) Arab speakers. It brings out a continuous interference between an ideal and idealized F and a real F. On the same subject, but from a different perspective (issues on standardization of modern F) see Mejdell (2008a). I would also like to bring a real-life example of how F and A 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 and Wafā’ Kāmil, a member of the Arabic Language Academy in Cairo, took place. Commenting on an Ottoman period text by Yūsuf al-Širbīnī, *Hazz al-Quḥūf fi šarḥ qašīdat Abī Šādūf*, Davies noted the presence of the colloquial form of the geminated verbs at the perfect tense as *lammēt*. Kāmil argued that these forms can by no means be considered colloquial: they are perfectly ‘classical’ because they are considered by Šībawayhī in his *Kitāb!*

<sup>23</sup> Parkinson (1991, 1993, 1994) and Owens (1991, 2001) confirm that for Arab speakers there exist elements that are irrelevant or very relevant in labelling a spoken segment as F or not.

3. We will focus on *Discourse Analysis*, that is on the conversational analysis which is limited to the macrolevel of the elocution. That is to say that we will focus on the meanings of the sequences of *CSs* without penetrating the microlevel of the sentence that, however, as said before, has no influence on the rhetorical values of *CS*<sup>24</sup>. As you will be able to see in detail below, the microlevel of the parts analyzed in this article consists, mainly, of few hybrids, especially morpho-phonetic hybrids, concerning the use of F.

### 2.1.1. Conventions adopted in the transcriptions and the glosses

TRANSCRIPTIONS	GLOSSES	
<i>abCS</i> A segment	1, 2, 3	first, second, third person
<i>abCS</i> F segment	ABL	ablative
« <i>abCS</i> » quotations made by the speakers	ART	article
/./ suspensive intonation	ACC	accusative
/?/ interrogative intonation	COMP	complementizer
!/ exclamatory intonation	DECL	declarative
) conclusive intonation	DEM	demonstrative
/ short pause	DU	dual
// medium pause	DUR	durative
	F	feminine
	FUT	future
	IND	indicative
	M	masculine
	MOD	modal
	NEG	negation, negative
	PART	particle
	PL	plural
	Q	question particle
	REL	relative
	SBJV	subjunctive
	SG	singular
	VOC	vocative

## 2.2. Analysis of samples taken from the corpus

### 2.2.0. Diglossic CS

Gumperz's definition of *conversational CS* is effective to describe what has been called *diglossic CS* that is the presence side by side and one inside the other of F and A which may maintain their morpho-phono-syntactic systems intact or may present a hybrid morpho-phono-syntax.

### 2.2.1. Mechanisms of CS

Inside the *corpus*, we found a number of mechanisms to which one or more rhetorical significations correspond. They are mainly three:

- (i) OVERLAP OF F AND A: in CS F and A overlap;
- (ii) INTERPOLATION OF F AND A: in CS F and A are interpolated;
- (iii) CONTRAST OF F AND A: in CS F and A one follows the other, in contrast.

<sup>24</sup> Mejdell (2006b: 415) notes in this regard, two main approaches or perspectives in the study of CS: «(i) the discourse/pragmatic perspective, with the main focus on social and communicative functions of, motivations for, code switching: why and for what purposes do speakers engage in code-switching?; (ii) the grammatical/syntactic perspective, with the main focus on linguistic aspects, especially morphosyntactic constraints on intrasentential switching: where in a sentence may or may not a speaker change languages?»

## 2.2.2. Mechanism: overlap / recurrence – rhetorical value: emphasis

The first type of CS that we have found the body analyzed is the overlap. This is what Gumperz calls *reiteration* (see §1.1.1.4.): «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); «the alternation takes the form of two subsequent sentences, as when a speaker uses a second language to reiterate his message» (Gumperz 1982:59).

It is a repetition of a part or of the whole statement in a code different from that with which the first formulation is expressed.

According to Koch (1983:47-48), the grammatical structure of Arabic makes repetition a strategy available to the Arabic speakers and it becomes the key towards the linguistic cohesion of many Arabic texts and towards an understanding of their rhetorical incisiveness.

This function is considerable as an ‘overlap’ or a ‘rewriting,’ a ‘translation’ of a given morphophonosyntactic segment<sup>25</sup>.

(1)

RR is asked by FQ to begin speaking and those who follow are the first two phrases that are interspersed with a remark of FQ.

f i r s t  p a r t	1	<i>ʔabəl ma</i> before	<i>žæwb-ak</i> I reply-2SG.M	/	<i>badd-i</i> want-1SG	/	<i>ʔə ʔəzər</i> I apologize		
		<i>men</i> From	<i>nafs-i</i> self-1SG	<i>mətəl ma</i> as		<i>d-dawr</i> ART-turn		<i>əl-ma:đi</i> ART-passed	
		‘Before replying to you, I want to apologize as I did it last time							
	2	<i>min</i> ago	<i>sine</i> year	<i>ʔə ʔəzart</i> I apologized	/	<i>ʔinn-i</i> COMP-1SG		<i>ʔana</i> I	<i>halla<sup>q</sup></i> now
		<i>bidd-i</i> want-1SG	<i>hæ:žem</i> I attack	<i>ləğğa</i> language		<i>w-bidd-i</i> and-want-1SG		<i>ħki:-ha</i> I speak-3SG.F	
	‘one year ago for that now I want to attack a language and I have to speak it.								
3	<i>Ha:ydi</i> This.F	<i>karmæ:l-ak</i> for-2SG.M	/	<i>ʔamma</i> as about	<i>l-manʔe<sup>q</sup></i> ART-logic		<i>kæ:n læ:zem</i> one ought to have		
	<i>ʔinn-i</i> COMP -1SG	<i>ʔana</i> I	<i>ʔħki</i> speak		<i>l-ləğğa</i> ART-language		<i>yalli</i> REL		
	‘I do this for you but logic would have wanted that I speak the language that								
4	<i>bidd-i</i> want-1SG	<i>dæ:feʔ</i> I defend		<i>ʔan-ha</i> from-3SG.F	/	<i>miš</i> NEG	<i>ʔħki</i> I speak		
	<i>ta</i> in order to	<i>hæ:žem</i> I attack		<i>ləğğa</i> language	/	<i>fi:ya</i> in-3SG.F	/		
	‘I want to defend <sup>26</sup> and not speak one to attack it.								
5	<i>Bass</i> But	<i>karmæ:l-ak</i> for-2SG.M	<i>raħ</i> FUT	<i>nəħki</i> we speak		<i>bə-l-fəšħa</i> in-ART-F	)		
	‘Anyway, for you we will speak F.’								

<sup>25</sup> Sometimes this feature is also used as a mechanism of ‘self-correction’ when a code is felt inappropriate. But I do not think it is to be considered as a rhetorical mechanism but rather a mechanism of relational nature.

<sup>26</sup> He means the Lebanese dialect or the ‘Lebanese language’ as RR calls it.

s e c o n d p a r t	6	<i>yaʕni</i>	<i>sa-ʔatakallam</i>	<i>il-fuʕʕa:</i>	<i>ʔakra:m-an</i>	<i>la-ka</i>	<i>fi(:)</i>	
		I mean	FUT-I speak	ART-F	honour-ACC	to-2SG.M	in	
		‘I mean, I will speak <i>F</i> as a tribute to you for conceiving						
	7	<i>taʕni:m-i-ka</i>	<i>li-l-bʔrnæ:meʒ</i>	/	<i>ʔamma</i>		<i>l-ʔuʕu:l</i>	
		conceiving-ABL- 2SG	of-ART- programme	/	as about		ART-principles	
		<i>ka:na yaʕib</i>	<i>ʔan</i>		<i>ʔatakallam-a</i>		<i>l-lubna:niyya</i>	
		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	<i>lla:ti</i>		<i>ʔatakallam-u-ha:</i>			)	
		REL.F		I speak-IND-3SG.F			)	
		‘that I speak’						

The first part of the sample (1) (from (1)1. to (1)5.) is separated from the second part (2) (from (1)6. to (1)8.) by a short question of FQ who asks RR:

Ma:ða	taqʕod	be-ɖ-ɖabəʔ	yaʕni	/?/
what(Q)	you mean	exactly	I mean	?
‘What do you exactly mean, I mean?’				

The question brings RR to change the code.

As you can see in *table 1*, 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 *iʕrāb*.

If you put in parallel the first and the second part of the sample (1) you will notice how RR uses colloquial vocabulary, syntax and morphology in the first part and then ‘translates’ them into standard in the second part.

part 1: A		part 2: F	
raḥ nəḥki bə-l-fəʕʕa (5.)	→	sa-ʔatakallam il-fuʕʕa: (6.)	‘we/i will speak F’
karmæ:lak (3.;5.)	→	ʔakra:man laka (6.)	‘for/as a tribute to you’
kæ:n læ:zem (3.)	→	ka:na yaʕib (7.)	‘it had to’
ʔinni ʔana ʔəḥki (3.)	→	ʔan ʔatakallama (7.)	‘that I speak’
yalli (3.)	→	(a)lla:ti (8.)	‘which (REL)’

*Elements of the first and second parts in parallel.*

As you can see, the intervention (2) of ‘retranslation,’ with a prosody slower than (1), contains the same colloquial morphological elements of (1) ‘translated’ into F (see example (0) in § 1.2.2.). Notice also how *karmæ:l* is translated into F: not *min aḡlik* ‘for you’ as *karmæ:l* normally means in the Lebanese dialect but going back to the classic ‘etymological’ root of the colloquial expression, *ʔakra:man laka*, which has a stronger sense in F (‘in your honor’) <sup>27</sup>.

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 (*ra:h / sa-* ; *læ:zem / yaʕib* ; *ʔəḥki / ʔatakallama* ; *yalli / lla:ti*).

<sup>27</sup> Notice also how the speaker uses a IV form, which is felt ‘more’ standard, rather than a I form *karam(an)* or a II form *takrīm(an)*.



In (1) and (2) the propositions are reversed, the syntax of the pseudo-verb (*læ:zem*) and of the preverbs (*sa-*) changes. The two objective propositions change: *kæ:n læ:zem ʔnni ʔana ʔəhki* → *ka:na yaʔib ʔan ʔatakallama*. So what is expected for bilingual occurs: we are in front of two different grammatical systems that are used both as they are supposed to be used, in an independent yet parallel way.

Moreover, we find three elements: interruption, correction marker (*yaʔni*) and translation. This is true also among bilinguals (see Alfonzetti 1998).

As Gumperz would say, here one translates the message to emphasize it. Taking into account RR's ideology, it appears clear why the change is A → F and not vice versa. He is trying to emphasize the fact that he is obliged to speak F because of language policy of *Aljazeera*, and that, although he is not willing to do that to be consistent (he is defending A!); yet he is perfectly able to handle the language that he intends to attack. As if to say: "I know very well my enemy."

### 2.2.3. Mechanism: interpolation – rhetorical value: interjection / separating context from extracontext

The value of the second type of CS is called by Gumperz *interjection* (see §1.1.1.3). The mechanism is that of *interpolation*: here codes do not overlap but they are embedded one inside another. The interpolation has usually the function of indicating 'service announcements,' expressions that are intended to briefly draw the attention of other speakers towards something which is extracontextual.

#### 2.2.3.1. First example: interruption / extracontextual expression

(2)

1.	<b>ʔal-luḡa</b> ART-language	<b>l-ʕarabiyya</b> ART-Arabic	<b>mawʔu:da</b> existing	<b>qabl</b> before	<b>il-qurʔa:n</b> ART-Quran
	<b>il-kari:m</b> ART-noble		<b>wa-l-luḡa</b> CONG-ART-language		<b>l-ʕarabiyya/</b> ART-Arabic
	'The Arabic language has existed since before the Noble Quran and the Arabic language...'				
2.	<i>ma</i> NEG	<i>ʔa:ʔf-ni</i> you interrupt-1SG	<i>ya</i> VOC	<i>ʔstæ:z</i> professor	<i>ʔl-i</i> to-1SG
	<i>sæ:ʕa</i> hour		<i>ʔa:ʕed</i> I keep (being)	<i>sæ:ket</i> silent	
	'don't interrupt me, sir, I've been silent for an hour!'				
3.	<b>ʔa:ʔa</b> it came	<b>l-Qurʔa:n</b> ART-Quran	<b>bi-ha:ðihi</b> with-DEM.F		<b>l-luḡa</b> ART-language
	<b>fi</b> in	<b>ħæ:lat-in</b> state-ABL	<b>mna</b> from		<b>t-taʔawwor</b> ART-development
	'When the Quran came it brought this language in a state of development'				

As you can see, the CS has divided the standard 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-luġa l-ġarabiyya mawżu:da qabl il-Qurʔa:n*  
 ←←← interruption →→→  
*ʒa:ʔa l-Qurʔa:n bi-ha:ðihi l-luġa fi hæ:latin mīna t-taʔawwor*

### 2.2.3.2. Second example: ‘service announcement’

(3)

1.	<b>ʔal-ʔalfa:ʒ</b> ART-lexemes		<b>ʔašra</b> ten		<b>bə-l-miʔa</b> per cent
	‘Lexicon represents ten percent’				
2.	<i>ha:da</i> DEM.M	<i>mawḏu:f</i> subject	<i>badd-i</i> want-1SG	<i>šraḥ-o</i> I explain-3SG.M	<i>ʔala</i> on
	<i>waʔt-o</i> time-3SG.M	<i>bass</i> but	<i>tʔaḥu:-ni</i> you give.PL-1SG	<i>waʔt</i> time	<i>la-ʔəšraḥ-o</i> to-I explain-3SG.M
	‘This is a subject I want to explain at the right time if you give me time to do that.’				
3.	<b>ʔawwal-an</b> first-ACC	/	<b>al-luġa</b> ART-language		<b>ʔamræ:n</b> thing.DU
	‘First of all, language consists of two things’				

Here, too, one can find interpolation of a colloquial statement in a standard context. It is a ‘service announcement’: *‘I will explain this thing if you give me the opportunity’*. Then, in fact, the explanation comes immediately after in standard. Here we can re-introduce the concept of the ‘organizational speech’ Holes (1993) talks about. A is the code used to organize the main speech made in F. A offers solicitations to the speakers, secondary information to the argumentative speech. Speaking about the *contrast* we shall come back to this aspect.

### 2.2.3.3. Third example: ‘service announcement’

(4)

1.	<b>ʔayḏan</b> also	<b>yaqu:l</b> he says	<b>ʒabbu:r ʔabd in-nu:r</b> Ġabbūr ‘Abd al-Nūr	<b>be-l-muʔʒam</b> in-ART-dictionary	<b>il-ʔadabi:/</b> ART-literary			
	‘Besides, Ġabbūr ‘Abd an-Nūr says in the “Literary Dictionary”’							
2.	<i>ma</i> NEG	<i>baʔa</i> then	<i>bidd-i</i> want-1SG	<i>ʔəzkor</i> I mention	<i>saʔha:-t</i> page-PL	<i>bass</i> but		
	<i>bidd-i</i> want-1SG	<i>yəʔʔfu</i> they know	<i>kəll</i> all	<i>ʔilli</i> REL	<i>ʔam</i> DUR	<i>b-yəsmə ʔu:-ni</i> MOD.PART-they listen-1SG		
	‘I don’t want to keep quoting pages...I just want all those who are listening to me to know’							
3.	<i>kəll</i> Every	<i>zəmlɪ</i> sentence	<i>ʔam</i> DUR	<i>ʔu:l-a</i> I say-3SG.F.	<i>ʔana</i> I			
	<i>msaʒʒal</i> recorder	<i>men</i> from	<i>ʔayya</i> which	<i>saʔha</i> page	<i>ʒæ:yeb-a</i> taker-3SG.F	/		
	‘that for every quote I’ve got the page it has been taken from.’							
4.	<i>fa</i> CONG	<i>ma</i> NEG	<i>ḏayyeʔ</i> I waste	<i>waʔət</i> time	<i>bala:š</i> NEG	<i>ʔəzkor</i> I mention	<i>saʔha:-t</i> page-PL	)
	‘So I’m not going to waste time, I won’t quote pages.’							
5.	<i>b-yʔu:l</i> MOD.PART-he says	<b>«ʔmdama</b> when	<b>tahʒor</b> she abandons	<b>il-luġa</b> ART-language	<b>l-lisæ:n</b> ART-tongue	/, /		
	‘He says: «When a language abandons orality...’							

This is a similar example to the previous one in which RR inserts a service announcement - in A - after starting a quote - in F – that he then completes. As if to say: ‘*It is useless to keep quoting the whole bibliography, just trust me. Let’s go forward with the speech*’.

#### 2.2.4. Mechanism: contrast – rhetorical value: distinguish objectivization vs. personalization

The third mechanism of CS found in the *corpus* is the code contrast. Its goal is distinguishing two opposite parts of the discourse that are perceived as performing different rhetorical and mutually complementary roles.

Gumperz says: “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).

The fundamental combination is ‘text’ vs. ‘comment’ or ‘objectivization’ vs. ‘personalization’ which, in turn, may mean metaphorically ‘dogmatism’ vs. ‘relativism,’ ‘theory’ vs. ‘concrete expression’. Here, a code, usually F, expresses ‘truth,’ ‘theorizations’ that have, therefore, a ‘dogmatic,’ ‘abstract,’ ‘idealized,’ ‘metaphorical’ character. These truths are expressed in a ‘hermetic’ way and are paralinguistically marked by a slow and thought-out elocution. The ‘organizational speech,’ the ‘gloss,’ which is not central to the message, is said in A, it expresses the maxim and serves as exegesis (see § 1.1.1.5 and 1.1.1.6.). It is often the personalization of the ‘truth’ and seeks to what is ‘concrete’ and ‘physical’.

Unlike the previous models, which also aim to create a contrast with a rhetorical function, this kind of contrast achieved by this type of CS is used to mark the internal structure of a narration (see Alfonzetti 1998). Here, more than elsewhere, a code is not significant in itself but its value is strictly dependent on the code used in the surrounding elocution segment.

##### 2.2.4.1. First example: text (quote) vs. exegesis

(5)

- |    |  |   |  |  |                        |                                     |                                     |
|----|--|---|--|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | <b>yaqu:l</b><br>he says<br><b>iṭ-ṭabi:fi:</b><br>ART-natural                      | <b>šəbli: šmayyil</b><br>Šibli Šmayyil<br><b>ʔalla:ði:</b><br>REL | <b>«yaḥṣal</b><br>it happens<br><b>men</b><br>from | <b>il-ʔentexa:b</b><br>ART-election<br><b>nati:žati-hi</b><br>result-3SG |                        |                                     |                                     |
|    | ‘Šibli Šmayyil says: «A natural election takes place whose result is’              |   |  |  |                        |                                     |                                     |
| 2. | <b>mula:ša:t</b><br>annihilation<br><i>yaʕni</i><br>I mean                         | <b>il-ḥudu:d</b><br>ART-borders<br><i>ha:ydi</i><br>DEM.M         | <b>bayn</b><br>between<br><i>radd</i><br>response  | <b>il-luğa:t</b> /<br>ART-languages /<br><i>šala</i><br>to               |                        |                                     |                                     |
|    | ‘the annihilation of the borders between languages». I mean, this is a response o’ |   |  |  |                        |                                     |                                     |
| 3. | <i>ʔnn-o</i><br>COMP-<br>3SG   | <i>fi:-</i><br>in-3SG.M   | <i>ʔšri:n alf</i><br>twenty thousand               | <i>ləgga</i><br>language   | <i>bayn</i><br>between | <i>il-bila:d</i><br>ART-<br>country | <i>il-šarabiyya</i> /<br>ART-Arab / |
|    | ‘the fact that there are twenty thousand languages in the Arab countries.’         |   |  |  |                        |                                     |                                     |

4. *ši(:)      ʔabi:ʕi      il-ʔantxa:b      iʔ-ʔabi:ʕi      b-yxalli      wæħde      /,/  
 thing      natural      ART-election      ART-natural      MOD.PART-it lets      one  
 ‘It’s a natural fact...the natural election lets...’*

RR quotes from a book in F. Immediately after, RR starts to comment on this quote in A: ‘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 (see § 1.1.1.1.). There are many examples of this kind in mosques and churches where sacred texts are read or cited in F and then commented in A. 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”.

#### 2.2.4.2. Second example: theory vs. practice

(6)

1. **ʔal-luġa**      **fi**      **taʔawwuri-ha:**      **yaħʕal**      **maʕa-ha:**  
 art-language      in      development-3SG.F      it happens      with-3SG.F  
**ʔamræ:n**      /      **tuʕbiħ**      **ʔaxʕar**      /  
 thing.DU      /      she becomes      shorter      /  
 ‘Two things happen to a language as it develops: it becomes shorter,’
2. *ʔaʔall*      *kammiyye*      /      **wa-tuʕbiħ**      **ʔaqall**      **qawa:ʕed**      )  
 less      quantity      /      CONG-she becomes      less      rules      )  
 ‘- it gets smaller - and grammar lessens ’
3. *halla<sup>q</sup>*      *ʔza*      *ʕi:t*      *la-tæ:xod*      *luġa*      /,/  
 now      if      you came      to-you take      language      /,  
*ʔana*      *ʔza*      *bidd-i*      *ʕallem*      *bæ-ʕ-ʕæ:m ʕa*      *dars*  
 I      if      want-1SG      I teach      in-ART-university      lesson  
 ‘Now, if you take a language... if you want to teach a course<sup>28</sup> at university’
4. *b-yæ:xod*      *maʕ-i*      *sett<sup>q</sup>*      *sni:n*      *be-l-ʕarabe*      *w-b-yæ:xod*  
 MOD.PART-it takes      with-1SG      six      years      in-ART-Arabic      CONG-MOD.PART-it takes  
*maʕ-i*      *seni*      *ʔaw*      *sentây(n)*  
 with-1SG      year      or      year.DU  
 ‘it will take you six years with Arabic (F) and one or two’
5. *be-l-læbnæ:ne*      *hu:*      *zæ:t-o*      )      *ma*  
 in-ART-Lebanese language      3SG.M      self-3SG.M      )      NEG  
*b-zi:d*      *w-ma*      *b-na<sup>q</sup>eʕ*      *kalæ:m*  
 MOD.PART-it increases      CONG-NEG      MOD.PART-it decreases      speech  
 ‘with Lebanese and it is the same course. I won’t add or remove anything!’

In intervention (6) the interaction ‘text’ / ‘comment’ returns. Here the ‘text’ is the exposition of a theory while the ‘comment’ is the concretization of that theory.

The ‘text’ opens, in F:

*ʔal-luġa fi taʔawwuriha: yaħʕal maʕaha: ʔamræ:n / tuʕbiħ ʔaxʕar / wa-tuʕbiħ ʔaqall qawa:ʕed*

<sup>28</sup> Lit. ‘lesson’.

*ʔA<sup>q</sup>all kammiyye* ‘in less quantity,’ here, overlaps with *ʔaxṣar*. The speaker seems to feel the need to clarify or emphasize ‘in other words’.

After the text in F (1-2), the ‘exegesis’ in A is back again. 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’. Once again, here the A segment acts as an ‘organizational’ speech code against a part that is perceived as the ‘core’ around which the elocution unfolds.

### 2.2.4.3. Third example: analysis vs. summary

In the above examples, ‘comment’ or ‘concrete expression’ followed ‘text’ or ‘theory’ and this has made clear the opposition ‘center’ vs. ‘periphery’. Here the two contrasting aspects ‘analysis’ and ‘synthesis’ are reversed but the rules for the use of codes remains constant.

(7)

- |    |   |  |                                      |                                   |                                     |                                   |                                 |                         |
|----|---|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. | <i>Ya ʔni</i><br>I mean   | <i>ha:ydi</i><br>DEM.M                 | <i>radd</i><br>response              | <i>ʔala</i><br>to                 |                                     |                                   |                                 |                         |
|    | ‘I mean, this is a response to’   |  |                                      |                                   |                                     |                                   |                                 |                         |
| 2. | <i>ʔnn-o</i><br>COMP-3SG  | <i>fi-:</i><br>in-3SG.M                | <i>ʔʕri:n alf</i><br>twenty thousand | <i>ləgga</i><br>language          | <i>bayn</i><br>between              | <i>il-bila:d</i><br>ART-countries | <i>il-ʕarabiyya</i><br>ART-Arab |                         |
|    | ‘the fact that there are twenty thousand languages in the Arab countries.’                              |  |                                      |                                   |                                     |                                   |                                 |                         |
| 3. | <i>ʕi(:)</i><br>thing   | <i>ʔabi:ʕi</i><br>natural              | <i>il-ʔntixa:b</i><br>ART-election   | <i>iʔ-ʔabi:ʕi</i><br>ART-natural  | <i>b-yxalli</i><br>MOD.PART-it lets | <i>wəħde</i><br>one               | /, /                            |                         |
|    | ‘It’s a natural fact...the natural election lets one...’  |  |                                      |                                   |                                     |                                   |                                 |                         |
| 4. | <b>ʔal-luḡa</b><br>ART-language   | <b>la</b><br>NEG                       | <b>tataḡayyar</b><br>she changes     | <b>bi-qara:r</b><br>with-decision | <b>min</b><br>f o m                 | <b>muʔassasa</b><br>institution   | <b>wa-law</b><br>and-if         |                         |
|    | ‘Language does not change by decree even if’  |  |                                      |                                   |                                     |                                   |                                 |                         |
| 5. | <b>kæ:nat</b><br>she was  | <b>il-muʔassasa</b><br>ART-institution | <b>dikta:to:riyya</b><br>dictatorial | /                                 | <b>la</b><br>NEG                    | <b>yastaʔi:ʕ</b><br>he can        | <b>ʔayy</b><br>any              | <b>zaʕi:m</b><br>leader |
|    | ‘it were a dictatorial institution to issue it. No leader of any state of the region [Middle East] can’ |  |                                      |                                   |                                     |                                   |                                 |                         |
| 6. | <b>il-yāw(m)</b><br>ART-day   | <b>fi</b><br>in                        | <b>duwal</b><br>states               | <b>il-manteqa</b><br>ART-region   | <b>ʔan</b><br>that(DECL)            |                                   |                                 |                         |
|    | <b>yaqu:l</b><br>he says  | <b>sa-ʔuḡayyer</b><br>FUT-I change     |                                      | <b>il-luḡa</b><br>ART-language    | )                                   | )                                 | )                               |                         |
|    | ‘say, today: I will change language.’   |  |                                      |                                   |                                     |                                   |                                 |                         |
| 7. | <b>ʔal-luḡa</b><br>ART-language   | <b>tataḡayyar</b><br>changes           |                                      | <b>ʕibr</b><br>through            | <b>il-ḡaya:t</b><br>ART-life        |                                   |                                 |                         |
|    | ‘Language changes through life.’  |  |                                      |                                   |                                     |                                   |                                 |                         |

The A part, that represents the comment to the quote, opens up<sup>29</sup>. After this short analytical part in A, RR switches on F and offers a ‘maxim,’ the synthesis of what he has said so far: *ʔal-luḡa la tataḡayyar bi-qara:r min muʔassasa* ‘language does not change by decree of an institution’. The expression could be a slogan. The maxim that

<sup>29</sup> This example is the continuation of the extract (5). Given the close concatenation of two successive functions I have preferred to divide the two parts.

has just been expressed has got a gloss that goes on in F (see (7)4-5). Then again, a new maxim: *la yastaḥi:ʕ ʕayy zaʕi:m il-yāw(m) fi duwal il-manṭeqa ʕan yaqu:l sa-ʕuḡayyer il-luḡa* ‘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 F which expresses a further maxim: *ʕal-luḡa tataḡayyar ʕibr il-ḡaya: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 F to be felt as a tool to convey this synthesis.

(8)

- |    |  |                    |                           |                  |                  |                         |
|----|--|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. | <i>lamma</i>   | <i>ʕant</i>        | <i>bə-tbaṭṭel</i>         | <i>bak</i>       | <i>təstaʕmel</i> |                         |
|    | when   | 2SG.M              | MOD.PART-you stop         | COMP.2SG.M       | you use          |                         |
|    | <sup>9</sup> <i>awæ:ʕed</i>                                  | /                  | <i>w-bə-tbaṭṭel</i>       | <i>təʕtal</i>    | <i>hamm</i>      | <i>ki:f</i>             |
|    | rules  | /                  | CONG-MOD.PART-you stop    | you bear         | concern          | how                     |
|    | ‘When you stop using rules, you stop getting concerned’      |                    |                           |                  |                  |                         |
| 2. | <i>bak</i>   | <i>ʕfakker</i>     | <i>ʕza</i>                | <i>be-ʕu:l</i>   | <i>ḡamma</i>     | <i>ʕaw</i> <i>fatḡa</i> |
|    | COMP.2SG.M   | you think          | if                        | MOD.PART-you say | <i>ḡamma</i>     | CONG <i>fatḡa</i>       |
|    | <i>ʕaw</i>   | <i>kasra</i>       | <i>ʕaw</i>                | <i>muʕannas</i>  | <i>ʕaw</i>       | <i>muzakkar</i> /       |
|    | CONG   | <i>kasra</i>       | CONG                      | femin ne         | CONG             | masculine /             |
|    | ‘with using ‘u’, ‘a’ or ‘i’ <sup>30</sup> , male or female,’ |                    |                           |                  |                  |                         |
| 3. | <i>sa:ʕit-a</i>  | <i>fi:-k</i>       | <i>təb<sup>9</sup>deʕ</i> | )                |                  |                         |
|    | hour-3SG.F   | in-2SG.M(=you can) | you are creative          | )                |                  |                         |
|    | ‘by then you will be able to be creative.’                   |                    |                           |                  |                  |                         |
| 4. | <b>ʕizan</b>   | <b>la:</b>         | <b>ʕbdæ:ʕ</b>             | <b>bi-luḡa</b>   |                  |                         |
|    | then   | NEG                | creativity                | in-language      |                  |                         |
|    | <b>lam-taʕod</b>   |                    | <b>maḡkiyyi</b>           | )                |                  |                         |
|    | NEG-returns(=not anymore)                                    |                    | spoken                    | )                |                  |                         |
|    | ‘So no creativity with a language which is no more spoken.’  |                    |                           |                  |                  |                         |

Here too synthesis follows analysis. The final statement expresses the natural result of the discourse, it condenses it into a single period which is expressed in F.

If you put together segments having the ‘text’ function, which precede or follow the phrases with the ‘comment’ function, the latter in A, you will notice their apodictical, dogmatic character:

*ʕal-luḡa la tataḡayyar bi-qara:r min muʕassasa (7)4.*

*la yastaḥi:ʕ ʕayy zaʕi:m il-yāw(m) fi duwal il-manṭeqa ʕan yaqu:l sa-ʕuḡayyer il-luḡa (7)5.-6.*

*ʕal-luḡa tataḡayyar ʕibr il-ḡaya:t (7)7.*

*ʕal-luḡa fi taṭawwuriha: yaḡṣal maʕaha: ʕamræ:n / tuṣbiḡ ʕaḡṣar / wa-tuṣbiḡ ʕaqall qawa:ʕed (6)1.-2.*

*ʕizan la: ʕbdæ:ʕ bi-luḡa lam-taʕod maḡkiyyi (8)4.*

<sup>30</sup> *ḡamma, fatḡa* and *kasra*.



story, which is said in A using a typical syntactic construction of A<sup>31</sup>. After the narrative ‘tension’ in F, we have the final ‘relaxing fall,’ in A, which heralds fluent laughs. Or, more simply, the quip would not have made people laugh in F as much as it does in A. It would have seemed almost ‘artificial,’ like a political slogan or a religious prohibition: *wa-lākin ḥyyāka lan tuṣallimahu l-ṣarabiyya*.

### 3. Conclusions

In this article, we tried to show the rhetorical inherent value in the diglossic code-switching in the Arabic spoken language. We first concentrated on a theoretical framework in which we tried to hint at the internal debate in the Arab studies with regard to the issue of diglottically mixed varieties. In particular, adopting the CS approach, we tried to show how the rhetorical functionality of CS has been treated by Gumperz, regarding bilinguals in general, and by Badawī and Holes, regarding the contemporary Arabic linguistic situation, in particular the Egyptian one. From these studies it appears clearly how CS, in creating contrast within the discourse, vehicles significances of a rhetorical or textual type which allow internal argumentative structuring of the discourse.

In particular, in the second part, we analysed a transcription of an episode of a programme of the Qatari based satellite channel *Aljazeera*. The peculiarity of this episode is the fact that the two main speakers in the studio start from strong ideological premises: one, Raḥīq Rūḥāna, a Lebanese writer, defends the exclusive use of A in all the communicative situations, and the other one, Naṣr al-Dīn al-Baḥra, a Syrian writer, maintains the exclusive use of F. Despite their linguistically ideological positions, both speakers switch to the code they “fight”, mostly for argumentative or rhetorical reasons. We tried to highlight how both speakers use F and A alternately to emphasize parts of speech, to separate what are felt as contextual parts from extra-contextual parts, parts perceived as objective from other parts felt as subjective, textual parts from exegetical parts, theoretical parts from practical parts, framing from climax in the process of story-telling.

### References

- Alfonzetti, Giovanna (1992) *Il discorso bilingue: Italiano e dialetto a Catania*. Milan: Francoangeli.
- Alfonzetti, Giovanna (1998) The conversational dimension in code-switching between Italian and dialect in Sicily. In Auer (ed.) (1998), pp. 180-211.
- Appel, René and Pieter Muysken (1987) *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.

---

<sup>31</sup>O: ‘a (in Egyptian Arabic *iw’a* or *uw’a*) is the imperative of the verb *wi’i* in its acception of ‘keep out, far’ (see Badawī & Hinds 1991:948). When followed by an imperfect it work as a negation of the imperative: in Egyptian Arabic *iw’a t’ullu* ‘take care not to/don’t tell him!’. Compared to other possible forms of negative imperatives (Egyptian Arabic: neutral: *ma-titkallim-š*; with the value of a real or laughing threat: *ḥyya:k titkallim* or with a value of request/recommendation: *bala:š titkallim*) has the value of warning.



- Auer, Peter (1998) *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Badawī, al-Saʿīd Muḥammad (1973) *Mustawayāt al-ʿarabiyya al-muʿāšira fī Miṣr*. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif.
- Badawī, al-Saʿīd Muḥammad and Martin Hinds (1991) *A dictionary of Egyptian Arabic: Arabic-English*. Beirut: Maktabat Lubnān.
- Beeston, A.F.L (1983a) The role of parallelism in Arabic prose. In Beeston et al. (ed.) (1983b), pp. 180-185.
- Beeston, A.F.L (1983b) *Arabic literature to the end of the Umayyad Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berruto, Gaetano (2007) *Fondamenti di sociolinguistica*. Bari: Laterza.
- Blau, Joshua (1981) *The emergence and linguistic background of Judaeo-Arabic*. Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute for the Study of Jewish Communities in the East.
- Blanc, Haim (1960) Stylistic variations in spoken Arabic: A sample of interdialectal educated conversation. In *Harvard Middle Eastern Monographs* III: 81-156.
- Blom, Jan-Petter and John Gumperz (1972) Social meaning in linguistic structure: code-switching in Norway. In Gumperz and Hymes (eds.) (1972), pp. 407-434.
- Bousofara-Omar, Naima (2006a) Neither third language nor middle varieties but Arabic diglossic switching. *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 45: 55-80.
- Bousofara-Omar, Naima (2006b) Diglossia. In Versteegh (ed.) (2006), pp. 629-637.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule (1983) *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eid, Mushira (1982) The non-randomness of diglossic variation in Arabic. *Glossa* 16.1: 54-84.
- Eid, Mushira and Clive Holes (eds.) (1993) *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics V*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Elgibali, Alaa (ed.) (1996) *Understanding Arabic: Essays in contemporary Arabic linguistics in honor of El-Said Badawi*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.
- El-Hassan, Shahir (1977) Educated spoken Arabic in Egypt and the Levant: A critical review of diglossia and related concepts. *Archivum linguisticum* 8.2: 112-132.
- Ferguson, Charles A. (1959) Diglossia. *Word* 15: 325-340.
- Gumperz, John (1982) *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Gumperz, John and Dell Hymes (eds.) (1972) *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Garfinkel, H. (1972) Studies of the routine grounds of everyday activities. In Sundow (ed.) (1972), pp. 1-30.
- Ghobrial, John-Paul A. (2004) *Mere Kalam Fadi?: Language and meaning in modern Egyptian history*. M. Phil thesis in modern Middle Eastern studies. Oxford: St. Antony's College, University of Oxford Trinity.
- Hary, Benjamin (1989) Middle Arabic: Proposals for new terminology. *al-ʿArabiyya* 22: 19-36.

- Hary, Benjamin (1996) The importance of the language continuum in Arabic multiglossia. In Elgibali (ed.) (1996), p. 70.
- Holes, Clive (1993) The uses of variation: a study of the political speeches of Gamal Abd al-Nasir. In Eid and Holes (eds.) (1993) pp. 13-45.
- Holes, Clive (1995) *Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions and Varieties*. London/N.Y : Longman.
- Ibrahim, Amr Helmy (1978) Fonction des niveaux de langue dans la communication sociale en Egypt. *Peuples méditerranéens*, October-December 1978.5 : 3-34.
- Ibrahim, Zeinab and Sanaa Makhlof (eds.) (2008) *Language and Linguistics in an age of globalisation*. Cairo: AUC press.
- Khalil, Esam (2000) *Grounding in English and Arabic news discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Koch, B. (1983) Presentation as proof: the language of Arabic rhetoric. *Anthropological linguistics* 25. 1 : 47-60.
- Larcher, Pierre (2001) Moyen arabe et arabe moyen. *Arabica* 48.4: 578-609.
- Lentin, Jérôme (2008) Middle Arabic. In Versteegh (ed.) (2008), pp. 215-224
- Mazraani, Nathalie (2008) Political discourse and language. In Versteegh (ed.) (2008), pp. 663-671.
- Meiseles, Gustav (1980) Educated spoken Arabic and Arabic language continuum. *Archivum linguisticum* 11. 2: 118-148.
- Mejdell, Gunvor (2006a) *Mixed styles in spoken Arabic in Egypt: somewhere between Order and Chaos*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Mejdell, Gunvor (2006b) Code-switching. In Versteegh (ed.) (2006), pp. 414-421.
- Mejdell, Gunvor (2008a) Is modern *fuṣḥā* a 'standard' language? In Ibrahim and Makhlof (ed.), pp. 41-52.
- Mejdell, Gunvor (2008b) Middle Arabic across time and medium/mode – some reflexions and suggestions. In *Actes du Premier Colloque International de l'AIMA (Association Internationale du Moyen-Arabe)*, pp. 355-372.
- Mitchell, Terence Frederick (1986) What is educated spoken Arabic? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 61: 7-32.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993) *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Owens, Jonathan (2001) Arabic sociolinguistics. *Arabica* 48.4: 419-469.
- Parkinson, Dilworth (1991) Searching for modern *fuṣḥā*: Real-life formal Arabic. *al-'Arabiyya* 24: 31-64.
- Parkinson, Dilworth (1993) Knowing standard Arabic: Testing Egyptians' MSA abilities. In Eid and Holes (eds.) (1993), pp. 47-73.
- Parkinson, Dilworth (1994) Speaking *Fuṣḥā* in Cairo: The Role of the Ending Vowels. In Suleiman (1994), pp. 179-212.

Rosenbaum, Gabriel M. (2000) *Fuṣhammiyya*: Alternating style in Egyptian prose. *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 38: 68-87.

Sankoff, David (1998) The production of code-mixed discourse. In *Proceedings of the XVII international conference on computational linguistics in Montreal*. vol. 1. Association for Computational linguistics, Morristow (United States), pp. 8-21.

Silverstein, Michael (1985) Language and the culture of gender: at the intersection of structure, usage, and ideology. In Elizabeth Mertz and Richard H. Parmentier (eds.), *Semiotic mediation*. Orlando. Academic Press, pp. 219-239.

Suleiman, Yasir (ed.) (1994) *Arabic sociolinguistics: Issues & perspectives*. Richmond: Curzon Press.

Sudnow, David (1972) *Studies in Social Interaction*, New York: Free Press.

Versteegh, Kees (ed.) (2006) *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Volume I. Leiden: Brill.

Versteegh, Kees (ed.) (2008) *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Volume III. Leiden: Brill.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1958) *Philosophical investigations*. New York: Macmillan.