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ABSTRACT

Codeswitching (CS) between Standard Arabic (SA) and Dialectal Arabic (DA) is a characteristic feature of Arabic bidialectal speech in a number of contexts. This dissertation focuses on two aspects related to this phenomenon, namely, its syntactic structure and its social functions in Arabic-speaking communities. The purpose of this study was three-fold: first, to examine the applicability of some of the major syntactic constraints on bilingual CS to bidialectal CS between SA and DA; second, to identify the potential syntactic principles that govern CS between the two varieties; and, third, to investigate the sociolinguistic functions of CS in the Arabic sociolinguistic context.

Three sets of naturally-produced data were examined, representing the domains of religious lectures/discussions, political debates/interviews, and soccer play-by-play commentaries. The naturalistic data came from 35 audio- and video-recordings for educated speakers of Arabic. This data was supplemented by two hundred and thirty-five sentences experimentally created to test certain hypotheses about the structure of CS between the two varieties.

The analysis of the syntactic patterns of CS between SA and DA shows that none of the major syntactic constraints on bilingual CS applies in the case of CS between SA and DA. This is explained by the fact that, whereas CS constraints arise as a result of certain parametric incompatibilities between typologically distinct languages, CS between SA and DA eludes these constraints because of the structural similarity of the two varieties. This also supports the view that the constraints on CS vary from one language pair to another.
The findings suggest that CS between SA and DA is structurally regulated by the Sentential Functional Head Constraint, which prevents CS in a single CP between a lexical verb and its functional head(s) and between the functional heads themselves. This constraint operates only at the level of functional heads in the A-domain, that is, on the path from V to C (i.e. C, I, and Neg). Moreover, the data points to the unequal roles and statuses of SA and DA in mixed discourse. Based on the current data, DA seems to shape the structure of most mixed sentences and therefore it serves as the host language, as opposed to the guest language role which SA assumes.

Sociolinguistically, the findings suggest that, unlike its bilingual counterpart, CS between SA and DA is primarily not governed by the immediate context, speech event, speaker or interlocutor, but rather by the link between status and functions of the code itself. CS here serves as a regularization mechanism through which sociolinguistic functions of varying levels of prestige, importance, complexity, and seriousness are encoded and indexed through the use of two codes—a High code dedicated for important, serious, and complex issues, and a Low code designated for less important, less serious, and simple issues.

CS also serves as a marker of the speaker’s attitude toward certain details in the discourse, often indexing his/her positive attitudes toward SA-related functions and negative attitudes to DA-related ones. Lastly, speakers often shift to SA to invoke their pan-Arab or Muslim affiliation. This suggests that SA use here is meant to index their Muslim and Arab identities.

Overall, the study points to a paradoxical polarity in the structural and social roles that SA and DA assume in the context of Arabic bidialectal CS. Although DA is the structurally predominant language, it assumes the functions of the Low code. On the other hand, SA assumes
the functions of the High code, even though it is less influential in shaping the structure codeswitched sentences. The CS patterns therefore replicate the social and acquisitional statuses of these two varieties in the Arabic sociolinguistic landscape. The study suggests that the phenomenon of bidialectal CS should be studied on its own right as independent from bilingual CS.
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## TRANSLITERATION SYSTEM

### CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ئ</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ط</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>ژ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>ς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ه</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>ي</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ج</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TRANSLITERATION SYSTEM

### VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ش</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>ﻩ</th>
<th>ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ع</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ﻤ</td>
<td>aw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻔ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ﻢ</td>
<td>aj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻤ</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>Shortened vowels</td>
<td>ؤ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻖ</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADJ</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>LDA</th>
<th>Levantine Dialectal Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Codeswitching</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Complementizer Phrase</td>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Dialectal Arabic</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Political Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDA</td>
<td>Egyptian Dialectal Arabic</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Religious Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>Gulf Dialectal Arabic</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFL</td>
<td>Inflection</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Soccer Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Inflectional Phrase</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Tense Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERF</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERG</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb Phrase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Study Background:

In sociolinguistic terms, codeswitching describes the speech of bilinguals or bidialectals who juxtapose elements from two or more language varieties in an utterance or a piece of discourse. Although codeswitching (CS) is as old as language contact and has been documented as early as the 14th century (Argenter, 2001), formal studies of this phenomenon have not found their way in bilingual literature until the past century. The early studies on bilingual communities have presented CS as a language deficiency resulting from certain gaps in the lexicon or morphosyntax of bilinguals (Bloomfield, 1927; Weinreich, 1963). The systematic study of CS in the past few decades, however, has brought into scholarly attention the regularized nature of CS in terms of not only its structure, but also its sociolinguistic functions and meanings within discourse.

Mainstream research in bilingualism posits that CS is a systematic process that is governed by different syntactic constraints within the boundary of a single sentence and across sentences (Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Belazi, Rubin & Toribio, 1994; Joshi, 1985; Di Sciullo, Muysken, and Singh, 1986; Bentahila & Davies, 1983; Pfaff, 1979; Kachru, 1978; Gumperz, 1976). The within-sentence constraints specify the sites in which intrasentential switching may or may not occur as a result of certain grammatical principles. The across-sentences constraints identify the location where intersentential switching cannot occur between sentences due to certain discourse-related restrictions (Kachru, 1978; Gumperz, 1976). Some of these constraints
have been claimed to be ‘universal’ in the sense that they apply invariably to CS between different language pairs.

In addition to these constraints, some researchers have presented models of CS that predict the syntactic environments in which CS may or may not transpire. Often, the occurrence or non-occurrence of different types of double-coded constituents or sentences is based on system-related constraints. One of the most influential of these models is Myers-Scotton’s Matrix Language Frame (MLF). The main premise of this model is that, although CS involves two codes, it is only one of these codes (the Matrix Language) that dictates the word order and system morphemes of all double-coded constituents. In this sense, CS represents a process of embedding one code (the Embedded Language) within another (the Matrix Language).

Likewise, researchers agree that CS is a creative communicative act employed for various pragmatic and sociolinguistic purposes (Gumperz, 1982; Bentahila, 1983; Heller, 1988; Myers-Scotton, 1993b; Kachru, 1978; Bhatt and Bolonyai, in press; Blom and Gumperz, 1972; Valdés, 1981; Appel & Muysken, 1987, Clyne, 2003). For example, code-switching is viewed as a mechanism for identity negotiation, situational marking, social-group membership, upward mobility, social solidarity, face management, discursive salience, and linguistic economy (Bhatt and Bolonyai, in press; Bentahila, 1983; Myers-Scotton, 1993b; Kachru, 1977; Auer, 1988; Wei, 1994). As is the case with the universal structural constraints, the notion of the universality of these social functions is often emphasized, sometimes with certain meanings given extra salience in different contexts.
1.2. Research Problem:

A common aspect of almost all of these constraints and social functions is that they were identified in studies on bilingual CS, which involves speakers of typologically distinct languages (e.g., Spanish-English; Moroccan Arabic-French; Italian-French; Hindi-English; Swahili-English). In bilingual speech, the structures and social distribution of the participating languages differ from one another in various respects. For example, typologically distinct languages typically have a range of grammatical variations. Besides, they are dichotomized according to different social functions based on the context in which they operate. In most cases, a foreign language accruing power and prestige from a previous asymmetric, often colonial, relationship is superimposed on a local and low-prestige language. English, for example, assumes the role of the foreign, neutral, and prestige language in the multilingual countries of Africa, often used to avoid the implications of ‘favoring’ one of the local languages over the others (Appel & Muysken, 1987).

The structural and social relationship that characterizes typologically distinct languages is not typical of bidialectal speech communities, especially diglossic ones. The latter often involves two dialects that are historically and somehow structurally related (Ferguson, 1959a). The two varieties are in complementary distribution in terms of their social functions and roles in the speech community. In the Arabic sociolinguistic context, for example, Standard Arabic\(^1\) (SA) or Al-FuSha represents the “High” variety whose use is normally reserved for formal, semi-formal and literary functions, whereas Dialectal Arabic\(^2\) (DA) or Al-\(\text{ʕaamiyya}\) represents the “Low” variety that is used in conversations and other informal communicative exchanges (Ferguson, 1959a). Although they are structurally connected, DA is viewed as a simplified and corrupt version of SA, the complex and eloquent variety (Suleiman, 2004). The somehow unique socio-
structural relationship between SA and DA makes the applicability of the constraints and motivations identified in bilingual speech questionable.

Within the Principles and Parameters framework (Chomsky, 1995; Chomsky and Lasnik, 1993), languages have invariant principles that apply cross-linguistically as well as specific parameters that may apply selectively to some languages and not others. Parameters are universal aspects of language which can take on a limited number of options and which set the distinctive features of different languages. As a source of structural divergence between various languages, these parameters may explain not only the variations in the surface structures of typologically distinct languages, but also the emergence of constraints at specific points in double-coded sentences. By the same token, the structural convergence of DA and SA may mean that a number of parameters are shared between the two varieties. This entails that at least some of the constraints that exist in bilingual CS may not be found in bidialectal CS between SA and DA.

Likewise, sociolinguistic research places much emphasis on context as indispensible for interpreting social interactions (Labov, 1972; Gumperz, 1992; Saville-Troike; 1989). Gumperz (1992, p. 230), for example, argues that “situated interpretation of any utterance is always a matter of inferences made within the context of an interaction exchange...” The context of bilingual CS often involves a foreign and a local language. This local-foreign dichotomy dictates specific social functions for CS based on the social, political, economic, and ideological relationship between the two languages. For example, as part of the CS paradigm in Morocco, French assumes the social functions of prestige and social mobility (Bentahila, 1983). In Canada, however, French lacks this elevated status and switching to it becomes a form of resistance and French national mobilization (Heller, 1992). The relevance of the foreign-local
division lies in forcing asymmetric roles on the participating language. This form of asymmetry is extraneous to the Arabic sociolinguistic context mainly because both varieties are deemed local by their speakers and may therefore alternate in the same contexts without evoking the same social meanings typically triggered by bilingual CS.

Thus, CS between SA and DA is qualitatively different from CS between typologically distinct languages not only because SA and DA share many lexical, phonological, morphological, and syntactic properties (Benmamoun, 2000), but also because their designation as High and Low varieties and yet their co-existence as community varieties is non-typical of bilingual speech communities. In fact, a conceptual problem arises if we ignore the structurally and sociolinguistically different relationship between bilingual and bidialectal varieties, as the analysis of the constraints and functions of CS is necessarily built on this relationship. One can argue that the patterns of CS in a given context may not generalize to other contexts because languages may be structurally convergent/divergent based on their shared parameters and also because the social dynamics that govern the use of these varieties are contextually and historically contingent. Generally speaking, CS in the Arabic sociolinguistic context may not be expected to be as grammatically constrained nor as sociolinguistically marked as is the case in bilingual contexts.

Unfortunately, in the relevant literature, the proposition of a new universal constraint on or social function of CS based on one language pair does not often take into account the structural and contextual differences with other language pairs. It is no wonder that the introduction of one of these cross-linguistically-projected constraints and motivations is often followed by counter-examples from other languages. This lack of consistency in the findings of bilingual CS research necessitates not only re-considering the generalizability of the previous
constraints and motivations, but also revisiting the role of the structural and sociolinguistic relationship between different language pairs in the production of the observed patterns of CS.

To date, no studies have examined the universally-projected constraints and functions of CS within the Arabic sociolinguistic context. Most of the existing research on CS between SA and DA focuses on the immediate Arab context. Thus, the reported findings often lack explanatory power beyond the context in which they occur. The current investigation seeks to fill in this gap by contextualizing the study of CS between these two varieties within the global discussion on CS, but without losing insight of the impact of context on CS patterns.

1.3. Research Questions and Hypotheses:

Keeping in mind the distinction between bilingual speech and bidialectal speech, the three major questions that the current study seeks to address are:

1. Do the universal syntactic constraints on CS often found in bilingual speech apply to bidialectal CS between SA and DA?

2. If not, as I hypothesize, what syntactic principles govern bidialectal CS and how do these relate to CS in general?

3. What are the social functions of CS between SA and DA and how do they compare to those identified in bilingual CS literature?

These questions will be examined in the context of data naturally-produced by eleven religious scholars, thirty-two politicians, and ten soccer commentators. The data is contextualized in
domains of varying levels of formality, ranging from very formal (religious speeches), moderately formal (political debates), and informal (soccer commentaries).

CS between SA and DA is a characteristic feature of Arabic bidialectal speech in a number of situations. For example, in news interviews or debate shows, it is not unusual to find the interviewer using mostly, if not exclusively, SA, while the interviewee(s) use both SA and a regional DA. Unlike the case of most bilingual CS, this form of CS is highly unmarked due to the lexical and structural similarities between the two varieties and the frequency of using both in the same discourse type. Based on this distinction, I hypothesize that:

1. At least some of the syntactic constraints identified in bilingual CS may not apply in the case of CS between SA and DA.

2. The syntactic principles that underlie bidialectal CS will depend on the structural relationship between the two varieties.

3. The functions of CS emanate from the social distribution and roles of SA and DA in the Arabic-speaking communities.

1.4. Significance of the Study:

CS is still a developing field that is sensitive to developments in linguistic descriptions and theories. Within this field of study, claims are often introduced, revised, and countered by others. The conflicting findings about the constraints and functions of CS have left many questions without a definitive answer. One of the major questions that have gone unexplained is the extent to which the major hypotheses about the structure and function of CS are language-specific or universal. For example, does the claim about the universal function of CS as a marker
of solidarity or distance between the speaker and a certain group (Gumperz, 1982) apply to all bilingual/bidialectal contexts or is it specific to some contexts and not others? Likewise, does the constraint on switching bound morphemes (Poplack, 1980) apply cross-linguistically or only to certain language pairs. This also relates to the question about the notion of universal grammar itself. The problem here emanates not from the legitimacy of such claims, but from a failure to specify the context(s) in which they apply. The current study seeks to contribute to the ongoing debate about this particular aspect of CS within the framework of the extant structural constraints and sociolinguistic functions of CS.

Despite the recent increase in the number of studies on CS, the bulk of research in this area has focused on speech communities characterized by the existence of two language varieties of different structural properties and social distribution. Given the common assumption that language varieties subsume both typologically distinct languages and language dialects (Fishman, 1971; Gumperz, 1962), the findings from these studies are presented as naturally generalizable to bidialectal speech communities. This assumption takes into account neither the structural dissimilarity between bidialectal speech and bilingual speech nor the distinct social conditions in which they operate. To verify the generalizability of these findings, empirical studies should be carried out with the fresh assumption that bilingual and bidialectal communities are qualitatively different. A number of scholars have called for independent studies that investigate the applicability of some of the major claims about bilingual CS to bidialectal CS (e.g., Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Khamis-Dakwar & Froud, 2007). The importance of this study lies partly in addressing this need.

Within the Arabic sociolinguistic situation, a number of studies have focused on CS between SA and DA (Eid, 1982, 1988; Saeed, 1997; Boussofara-Omar, 1999, 2003; Bassiouney,
2006, 2009; Soliman, 2008, among others). These studies provide important insights into this phenomenon by shedding light on the constraints on CS between SA and a particular dialect (Bassiouney, 2006; Eid, 1988, 1992), the applicability of certain models of CS to the Arab sociolinguistic context (Boussofara-Omar, 1999, 2003), and the functions of CS in particular domains (Bassiouney, 2006; Saeed, 1997; Soliman, 2008). However, the majority of these studies are narrowly focused with no cross-linguistic dimension beyond the language pair, domain, or interaction type that they investigate. The current study seeks to complement the existing research on CS between SA and DA, while simultaneously broadening the focus (bi-directional switching), scope (e.g., a number of dialects), and context (multiple domains) of the analysis of this phenomenon.

1.5. Typology: Codeswitching, Code-mixing, Style Shifting, and Borrowing:

The literature abounds with terms pertaining to language contact phenomena, including codeswitching, borrowing, code mixing, and style shifting. The loose, overlapping, and inconsistent use of these terms necessitates drawing some kind of distinction between them. Such distinction can be based on structure, context, use, and frequency.

Codeswitching is distinct from borrowing. While in CS “two grammars and vocabularies are used in producing a sentence or a text,” borrowing simply involves the adoption of lexical elements from one language into the lexicon of another language (Muysken, 2000, p. 70). Callahan (2004, p. 5) makes a further distinction by suggesting that borrowed ‘word forms’ become part of the grammar of the receiving language, whereas in CS “the forms from each language, though contiguous, remain discrete in at least some respects.” Callahan identifies three criteria for distinguishing CS from borrowing: structure, frequency, and discourse function.
Thus, borrowing often involves cases where a single word or expression is phonologically adapted by the borrowing language with no salient discourse function. On the other hand, CS goes beyond individual words which retain some of their phonological features and have a pragmatic function in the discourse. While a number of other CS researchers have identified different criteria for demarcating the lines between codeswitching and borrowing (e.g., Myers-Scotton, 1992; Lipski, 2005), the basic distinction between the two terms is generally accepted (Pfaff, 1979; Poplack, 1980).

Unlike the CS/borrowing dichotomy, the fine line between CS and code mixing is often neglected, blurred, or contested. Several authors have indeed used the term code mixing in reference to what has been identified by mainstream studies as codeswitching (e.g., Ho, 2007). A number of other researchers have distinguished the two terms on a functional rather than a structural basis. For example, Auer (1998, p. 16) suggests that codeswitching and code mixing are structurally indistinguishable; both involve frequent alternations between two languages. However, while in codeswitching the alternation between the codes has a conversational function and meaning, the individual cases of alternation in code mixing “receive neither discourse- nor participant-related interpretations.” Still another group has established specific criteria for differentiating the two terms. For example, Kachru (1983) uses the term CS to refer to switches within the sentence and code mixing to shifts across sentences. McCormick (1995) argues that code mixing is often restricted to single words or shorter elements, whereas codeswitching involves the alternation of longer elements of speech. These two accounts increase the possibility of overlap between CS, code mixing, and borrowing. Many authors disregard this distinction altogether (Bokamba, 1989; Eastman, 1992; Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Milory and Muysken, 1995). For example, Eastman (1992, p.1) contends that the efforts to distinguish codeswitching and
code mixing are “doomed.” He stresses that “When people use a mixed language regularly, codeswitching represents the norm” [Italics added]. Eastman’s assertion seems to substantiate the mainstream view of the relationship between the two terms.

The same can be said about the distinction between codeswitching and style shifting. According to Myers-Scotton, codeswitching refers to the alternation between two or more language varieties within the same conversation; language varieties can refer to “different languages, or dialects or styles of the same language” (p. 2). Likewise, Romaine (1995) asserts that from a sociolinguistic and pragmatic viewpoint the distinction between CS and style-shifting is irrelevant, as they both perform specific functions in the discourse. Other researchers have distinguished between codeswitching and style shifting based on the fact that CS is a characteristic of bilingual speakers, whereas style shifting pertains to monolingual speakers (e.g., Labov, 1966; Ervin-Tripp, 2001). Labov uses the term ‘style shifting’ to refer to the consistent changes in the linguistic forms used by a speaker in accordance to changes in the topics, participants, or social context.

Although the distinction between the constructs of code-switching, code-mixing, borrowing and style shifting is still being debated, I will follow Myers-Scotton (1993), Muysken (2000), among others, in adopting the term CS as a cover term that refers to the use of different elements from two languages, dialects, or styles with the same sentence or discourse.

1.6. The Middle/Third Language:

One of the basic theoretical challenges surrounding the study of CS in the Arabic-speaking communities regards the nature of the SA-DA juxtaposition. A number of authors have
conceptualized CS between SA and DA as an instantiation of a *third* or *middle language(s)* (Mitchell, 1982; Mahmoud, 1986; Badawi, 1973). Mitchell (1982, p. 125) defines middle Arabic as “the virtually unregistered ‘mixed’ Arabics that provide the basis for the ‘koineised’ Arabic of intercommunication between Arabs of different countries. It is this ‘inter-Arabic’ *koine* or ‘standard spoken Arabic…’” The logic of this approach rests on the assumption that the frequent *mixing* of elements from these two historically and structurally related varieties, especially at the word and sentence levels, have evolved into an intermediate language.

Following Boussofara-Omar (1999), I question the existence of a *third* or *middle language*. This construct is neither theoretically motivated nor empirically justified. I will situate my argument against the need to postulate this construct within the following examples. The first two examples are from the corpus of data collected for this study and the third example is from Myers-Scotton’s (1993a) Swahili-English data. DA text will be italicized throughout this dissertation:

(1) **haaða S-Sanduuq miin sajjar-u**

   This the-box who move-it

   ‘Who moved this box?’ (LDA/SA, RS10)

(2) **hal ṭad-dawla l-lubnaanijja qaadirā ṣa’la d-difaa’ ṣan ẓal-żanuubah Wein hijji l-ʔasliha?**

   INTERG the-state the-Lebanese capable on the-defense about the-South? Where it the-arms?

   ‘Is the Lebanese state capable of defending the South (of Lebanon)? Where are the arms?’ (LDA/SA, PD7)

(3) **Mmathe wa hiyo hao alikuwa akilia joo vile vitu zi- -me- -spoil-i- w- -a**

   they PERF spoil-0-PASS-INDIC

   ‘The mother of that house was crying oh how things were spoiled [for her]’ (Swahili/English, Myers Scotton, 1993a, p. 103; partially glossed in source).
Sentence (1) contains constituents that involve elements from both SA and DA. For example, both SA and DA contribute to the verb phrase *sajjar-u* (moved it). Thus, SA provides the verb *sajjar* (move) and DA the complement -*u* (it). This type of ‘mixing’ is not exclusive to SA and DA. Similar examples are found in CS literature, where the two varieties contribute lexical and morphological elements to a single word or sentence (as can be seen in example (3), Myers-Scotton, 1993a). Since the relevant mainstream literature regards this type of mixing as CS, and not as middle language, there is no reason not to apply the same logic in similar cases between SA and DA.

The term *middle language* becomes more elusive when we consider elements in the sentence that are expressed only in one variety, as in the NP *haaḍa S-Sanduuq* (this box). Since it is expressed just in SA, this NP may not be considered as part of the language mixing and therefore not part of the *middle language*. Such constituents pose a problem for the *middle language* because they show that it may materialize selectively in some constituents and not others. More problematic still are cases where whole sentences or episodes are rendered in one variety and not the other. In (2), for instance, two separate sentences are produced, each in a different variety. This example of intersentential CS poses an obvious challenge to the notion of the middle language, as the two varieties are not mixed either at the word level or the sentence level. Thus, their grammars are kept intact; their juxtaposition does not create a third grammar. This conclusion is supported by a recent study by Khamis-Dakwar and Froud (2007), who experimentally provide neurolinguistic evidence for separating the two varieties, particularly Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and Palestinian Colloquial Arabic (PCA).
1.7. Delimitations:

The analysis presented in this study is based on a selected number of recordings and is framed within CS between SA and three main dialects of Arabic: Egyptian, Gulf, and Levantine. The study limits its analysis to a number of representative CS constraints and motivational models that have been attested in a number of studies.

1.8. Basic Assumptions:

It is assumed that speakers are rational in their code choice in the sense that they select a particular code because it is reasonable for them to do that at a particular juncture in the discourse. Thus, they employ CS strategically to attain certain communicative advantages or to conform to certain sociolinguistic norms (Gumperz, 1964; Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001). It is further assumed that the speakers whose linguistic output is examined in this study (religious preachers, politicians, and soccer commentators) speak their dialects natively and have at least a functional command of SA. As typical educated speakers of Arabic, preachers, reporters, and commentators often have a strong command of SA and are able to use it proficiently in their speeches. The researcher also presumes that the CS patterns, both structural and functional, displayed by the speakers in the data are representative of those expressed by educated Arab speakers in the same domains under similar circumstances.

1.9. Definitions of Terms:

- Codeswitching is the juxtaposition of elements from two languages or language varieties in an utterance or a piece of discourse.
- **Diglossia** refers to the situation where “two varieties of the language exist side by side throughout the community, with each having a definite role to play” (Ferguson, 1964, p. 249).

- **Dialectal Arabic** refers to a number of Arabic dialects that are spoken natively by speakers of these dialects. In this study, Dialectal Arabic includes the Egyptian, Gulf, and Levantine dialects.

- **Educated Arabic speakers** stand for speakers of the Egyptian, Gulf and Levantine dialects who demonstrate an ability to use SA in their discourse.

- **Intrasentential CS** involves switching within the boundaries of a single sentence.

- **Intersentential CS** involves switching across sentences.

- **Sociolinguistic functions of CS** refers to the role of sociolinguistic factors, such as context and occasion, in the occurrence of code switching. These have been often pinpointed by identifying patterns of occurrence of code switching and the possible social factors that stand behind the occurrence of these patterns.

- **Standard Arabic** is used loosely to refer to the variety of Arabic that is taught at schools and has formal and official status throughout the Arabic World. Standard Arabic therefore covers both Modern Classical Arabic and Classical Arabic.

- **Syntactic constraints on CS** refers to the specific morphosyntactic boundaries/sites at which switching is feasible or unfeasible.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I will present a general overview of the context of the study, including the sociolinguistic situation in the Arab World, the status and distribution of the two varieties under study, and the overarching features of three specific dialects that are targeted in this research. I will also shed some light on the development of CS as a major field of study within bilingualism and sociolinguistics in general and discuss the two dominant approaches to CS. Finally, I will expound the theoretical framework within which CS will be investigated.

2.1. The Arabic diglossic Situation:

As far back as our knowledge of Arabic extends, the sociolinguistic situation of Arabic has always been marked by the existence of multiple varieties that converge or diverge based on geographical and genealogical factors (Zwettler, 1978). The several inscriptions found in different parts of the current Middle East (e.g., those in An-Namaara, Nabataea, Palmyra, Al-Ḥurayba, etc.) point not only to the existence of several varieties of Arabic but also to their interconnectedness under the umbrella term “Arabic” (Versteegh, 2001). More importantly, some of these inscriptions (e.g., the Nabataeans) point to the antiquity of Classical Arabic as a ‘standard’ form of Arabic that was used widely even in pre-Islamic eras (Versteegh, 2001).

Of particular importance to the histories of Arabic dialectology is the distinction between the Southern dialects and Northern dialects, which correspond to the genealogical division between Al-Arab Al-ṢAariba (real Arabs) and Al-Arab Al-MustaṢriba (Arabized Arabs),
respectively (Rabin, 1951). The Southern dialects were spoken by the sedentary populations in a number of civilizations that flourished in what is nowadays called Yemen (e.g., Sabaean, Minaeans, and Qatabanian). The Northern dialects consist mainly of nomadic tribes and the Hijazi tribes in Mecca and Yathrib (later called Medina). In the pre-Islamic era, the latter was considered the linguistic model of Arabic at the time (Versteegh, 2001). Despite some of the distinctive features in the speech of the multiple varieties of Arabic, the mutual intelligibility and “basic linguistic unity” of these varieties is evident in the pan-Arab poetic traditions and commercial centers as well as in the philological recognition of these varieties as Lisaan Al-Arab (the tongue of the Arabs) (Hourani, 1991; Versteegh, 2001, p. 38). According to Versteegh, Classical Arabic enjoyed a superior status and wide use as a means of oral and written communication in the Arabian Peninsula even during that period, although there have been no definite explanation as to why this was the case.

The emergence of Islam in the seventh century A.D. enhanced the status of SA in the existing sociolinguistic situation (Zwettler, 1978). The Qur’an was written in Classical Arabic and the subsequent written scholarship adopted SA as the medium of communication, literature, and jurisdiction. Consequently, SA accumulated more prestige, power, and distribution both inside and outside the Arabian Peninsula (Holes, 2004). Nonetheless, its dialectal variants coexisted, but with less prestige and fewer domains of use (mainly everyday conversation) (Versteegh, 2001). The spread of Islam outside the Arabian Peninsula, which brought the Arab tribes in contact with people with different languages, may have led to significant changes in SA and the subsequent emergence of new spoken varieties, particularly in the cities where Arabs lived side by side with the indigenous people (many of whom were themselves Arabs). Some Arabists trace the origin of Arabic diglossia to this particular period in Arab history (Fück,
Diglossia here simply refers to the distribution of language varieties across different domains of speech based on their social status, use and functions. This situation has persisted till our current time.

In 1959, Charles Ferguson brought this phenomenon into scholarly attention by coining the term *diglossia*. According to Ferguson (p. 435),

> **Diglossia is a relatively stable situation in which, in addition to the local dialect(s) of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, a highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superimposed 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’s definition of diglossia characterizes the two varieties by (1) their structural and somehow historical linkage (2) their disproportionate prestige; (3) their complementary distribution in terms of function and context of use; and (4) their dichotomization in terms of acquisition and difficulty (H is learned and difficult, whereas L is acquired and easy).

The situation of SA and DA was introduced as a prototypical example of ‘diglossia.’ Ferguson argued that the two varieties are diglossic due to their complementary distribution in terms of use and function. SA represents the “High” variety whose use is normally reserved for formal, semi-formal and literary contexts: governance, education, mass media, religious
discourse, arts, formal spoken discourse, and high culture. DA represents the “Low” variety that is used in conversations and other informal communicative exchanges: sports, music, film, and some TV show broadcasts. According to Ferguson (1959), a person who uses the High variety in an informal setting or the Low variety in a formal setting becomes ‘an object of ridicule’ (p. 328) due to his/her violation of the sociolinguistic rules associated with these two varieties. This rigid compartmentalization across the lines of formality-informality therefore negates the possibility of overlap in the functions of the two varieties and their context of use.

Ferguson’s delineation of diglossia was reviewed and reformulated across three main lines of argument. The first line of argument concerns the restrictedness of the model to language varieties that are genealogically related, such as SA and DA. Fishman (1967, 1971) extended the notion to include two separate languages, where the H language is usually used in official or formal settings and the ‘L’ one is used in private or less formal settings. These settings are presented as domains that range from very intimate and private (e.g., home) to very official and formal (office). For Fishman, the most distinctive mark of diglossic communities concerns the availability of “compartmentalized roles [to their speakers] as well as access to these roles” (1971, p. 78). These roles are clearly differentiated “in terms of when, where, and with whom they are felt to be appropriate” (p. 79). The refined criteria correspond to what Fishman describes as occasion, event, and interlocutor. Fishman’s contribution here lies not only in expanding the scope of the term diglossia, but also in specifying the principal contextual factors that determine code choice.

The second line of reasoning concerns the functional distribution of the two varieties in the community. Gumperz (1962, p. 464) argues that diglossia can manifest itself as a ‘communication matrix’ that represents the different functional roles adopted by different groups
of speakers in the community. Since each role has its code or sub-code which “serves as the norm for role behavior”, there exists a “code matrix as the set of codes and subcodes functionally related to the communication matrix” (p. 464). Gumperz suggests that the codes and subcodes can be dialects, styles, or typologically distinct languages. In each case, a code or a subcode can be functionally appropriate for a certain group in the community in a particular context. For example, Sanskrit is part of the communication matrix of certain Hindu communities in India because it has a religious role in their lives, but it is not relevant for certain Muslim groups in the same communities. For Gumperz, diglossia therefore is a marker of functionally differentiated usage of languages, dialects, or registers by large or small groups of speakers in the same or different communities.

A third and last modification is related to the ‘static’ and rigid nature of the model (Badawi, 1973; Hawkins, 1983; Myers-Scotton, 1993). Hawkins (1983), for example, critiques the compartmentalization of H and L in any given context and suggests that the two languages or dialects may overlap and mix in their forms and structures. Thus, an utterance may fall anywhere on a continuum of linguistic variation between H and L. The specific position of an utterance on the continuum depends not merely on the context of the speech, but also on speakers’ variables, such as language proficiency, education, and socioeconomic status. In the case of Arabic, this has in fact resulted in a terminological profusion of intermediary varieties, such as Modern Standard Arabic, Colloquial of the Intellectuals, Colloquial of the Literate, and Colloquial of the Illiterate (Badawi, 1973) and confusion about the exact features of each (particularly with the lack of any empirical studies about these additional varieties (Versteegh, 2001, p. 191).

Although Ferguson’s early delineation of diglossia has been further refined by a number of other sociolinguists, the distinction between the diglossic varieties on the basis of prestige,
functions, and complexity persists in all subsequent accounts. Moreover, even when the two varieties are presented on a linguistic continuum, scholars still acknowledge the disparate domains of the two varieties in different formal and informal contexts.

2.1.1. Standard Arabic (SA):

In this study, Standard Arabic (SA) is used to refer to the variety of Arabic that is taught at schools and has formal and official status throughout the Arab World. This term is selected to avoid the arguable terminological division between Classical Arabic (CA) and Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). The legitimacy of this division rests on the recognition of MSA, which has been widely disputed in the literature (Zughoul, 1980; Bateson, 1967). Rather than being a middle variety, SA therefore covers both CA and ‘MSA’.

While the origins of SA are still in dispute among scholars, the existing records and accounts indicate that SA has enjoyed a widespread currency and esteem as an intertribal medium of communication even before the advent of Islam (Hourani, 1991; Versteegh, 1996, 2001, p. 40). This is evident in pre-Islamic inscriptions (e.g., in an-Namaara, 328 CE), which were recorded in a language that scholars consider identical with SA (Versteegh, 2001). SA is also documented in the pre-Islamic poetry, especially in the seven mu’allaqaat (the suspended poems)⁶, which have been in wide circulation before and after the advent of Islam (Zeidan, 1988). Besides, SA was the language spoken by influential Bedouin tribes, particularly in the Al-Hijazz area. Further, it is documented that several scribes taught people basic literacy skills in SA before and during the life of the Prophet (Zwettler, 1978). This suggests that SA was probably used as a vehicle of reading and writing even in the pre-Islamic era.
The rise of Islam in the 7th century A.D. reinforced the elevated status of SA and ensured its durability for many ages to come. The selection of SA to be the language of the Qur’an is an indication of both its wide presence in the Arab social life at the time and its dateless lofty status among other dialects of Arabic (Ferguson, 1959). According to the Muslim traditions, the Qur’an is the exact Word of God, which contains His last Message to mankind, expressed in the most elevated language. For example, Ibn Katheer, author of the famous commentary on the Qur’an, mentions that the selection of Arabic to be the language of the last revelation is due to the fact that “It is the most eloquent, articulate, profuse, and suitable to convey meanings that can be understood” (Tafseer Ibn Katheer, p. 365). In the minds of many Arabs and those familiar with Arabic, the Qur’an is indeed a stylistically matchless model of SA. By the same token, due to its link to the Qur’an, SA came to be perceived as a superior and sacred language. Ferguson (1959, p. 378) puts forth an argument for the superiority of Arabic, as perceived by its speakers, across the following lines:

*God is all-knowing, all powerful; He knows and can utilize all languages; He chose Arabic as the vehicle of his ultimate revelations to the world; consequently, the Arabic language must be, in important respects, better than other languages* (p. 378).

As Ferguson notes, this attitude toward SA still persists among speakers of Arabic, who often see it as “the best, or in some sense, the only real form of [their] language” (p. 379). The revelation of the Qur’an in SA and the emphasis on its articulate and clarifying linguistic composition and
style (Chapter XII: 2) secured SA not only greater prestige but also wider use among Muslims inside and outside the Arabian Peninsula.

In addition to being linked to the Qur’an, SA was the tongue of northern nomadic Arabs, who traced their lineage to Prophet Ismail and represented the model speakers of SA (Versteegh, 2001). Thus, early Arab grammarians relied on the speech of the nomads for identifying the accurate forms of SA (Holes, 2004). Particularly influential among these tribes was the tribe of Quraish, to which Prophet Mohammad and many early Muslims belong (Hourani, 1991; Versteegh, 2001). The prestige that SA enjoyed as the language of Quraish, the cultural center for pre-Islamic poetry, religion and trade, increased by virtue of its link to the Prophet, who spoke it and used it in his correspondence with the leaders of the neighboring nations, including the emperors of Byzantium and Sasania and the kings of Oman, Bahrain, Yamaama, Abyssinia, and other Arab leaders (Esposito, 2005). Moreover, the Sunnah, which includes the reported words and acts of the Prophet, was recorded in SA. In this sense, SA becomes essential for understanding the Sunnah, which is considered the second most important source of Sharee’ah (Islamic Law).

Two other developments have led to the predominance of SA in the Arab sociolinguistic scene. The first concerns its standardization and adoption as the official language of the new and expanding state shortly after the death of the Prophet (Versteegh, 2001). As a result, SA earned an official status, stability, and fixed orthography and grammar. In addition to its religious importance, SA has therefore become the language of high culture (Zwettler, 1978). Second, the development of Islamic scholarship in Qur’anic sciences, Sunnah traditions, and jurisprudence led to the creation of a large body of SA literature (Versteegh, 2001). This has helped in the
establishment of a definite and lasting link between SA and Islamic theology and law, whose influence is felt even in our current times.

The link between SA and Islamic theology and law has prompted many prominent Muslim scholars, leaders, and Arab intellectuals to consider learning SA as part of understanding Islam. For example, Omar Bn Il-Khattab, the second Muslim Caliph, is reported to have said [in translation]: “Learn Arabic for it is part of your religion.” The same notion is emphasized by Ibn Taymia, a top thirteenth-century Muslim scholar, who said “The Arabic language is indeed part of the religion, and knowing it is an obligation, because understanding the Qur’an and the Sunnah is an obligation, and these two cannot be comprehended without the Arabic language…”

The need for SA in the religious practices of Muslim Arabs became an important factor in determining its role and value in their daily social lives.

Despite the ages of political and economic decline in the Arab history, the belief in the superiority, beauty, and elegance of SA has never been shaken in the minds of Arabs. This belief is in fact reflected in the writings of several contemporary Arab intellectuals and writers. Mustafa Saadeq Al-Rafi’i (2002, p. 17), for example, writes that "The attribute of eloquence in this language [SA] is not in its vocabulary but in its structure, just as the ecstasy and joy is not in the tones but in the ways they are composed. This is the most superb form of art in style which can be attributed to the musical inclination and tones in the letters of this language." Likewise, Taha Hussein states that “The educated Arabs who could not command their language [SA] lack in their education, and their manhood is incomplete and low” (cited in Mubaarak, 1985, p. 17). These overtly-expressed beliefs about the supremacy of SA and the need to acquire it have an undeniable effect on its enduring role as the High variety in the Arab speech communities.
The positive attitudes toward SA are also widespread among the lay Arab public, who admire its beauty, logic, symmetry, complexity, and rich vocabulary (Ferguson, 1959). Ferguson observes that “For many purposes even the illiterate peasant will prefer a classical-sounding, highly literary Arabic which he only half understands to a pure conversational Arabic which he understands perfectly” (p. 376). In fact, even non-Muslim Arabs share the notions of the refinement and sophistication of SA (Ferguson, 1959). In addition, many Arabs often associate SA with education, linguistic sophistication, eloquence, and social status. This is unsurprising if we consider the status that SA enjoys as the official language of Arab governments, education, print publications, and formal and semiformal spoken discourse.

It should be noted that SA is more or less the same throughout the Arab World. Thus, as a code mutually intelligible across the Arab World, SA has come to “be associated with the mission, glory, history, and uniqueness of an entire ‘people’…” (Fishman, 1971, 31). This is why, many speakers of Arabic consider SA as an integral part of their heritage, identity, history, and culture.

2.1.2. Dialectal Arabic:

While SA is the written, formal/semiformal, and literary variety, DA refers to a number of regional dialects that are spoken natively by Arabic speakers in everyday conversations and other informal communicative exchanges: sports, music, film, and some TV show broadcasts. These dialects vary from one country to another and from one region to another. They are often categorized under five main groups: Egyptian, Gulf, Iraqi, Levantine, and Maghribi. In this study, DA refers to the Egyptian, Gulf, and Levantine dialects.
Although many scholars seem to agree that several Arab dialects existed alongside SA before Islam (Zwettler, 1978), the existing records do not provide helpful details about the structure of these dialects, their link to SA, or their evolution into the current dialects (if that is the case). The existing accounts of the old Arabic dialects often present dialectal forms as eccentric accents (*Lahn*) that characterize the speech of the illiterate and common people (*al-‘aama*). For example, in his classic *Al-kittaab*, Sibawayh (760-796 AD) pointed to some dialectal deviations in the context of codifying the grammar of SA. Salama Bn Abdulmalik is reported to have said “The *Lahn* in the speech is uglier than the chickenpox on the face” (in Ibn Qutayba in “Ṣuyūn Al-Akhaār, p. 197). The description of DA as a deviation from SA underlines two important facts about the relationship between SA and DA. First, SA and DA were perceived as different varieties of the same language with DA being a distorted form of the pure and accurate SA model. Second, the negative attitudes to DA seem to be deep-seated in the Arab consciousness and history.

The origin of the Arabic dialects has always been the center of debate between three main camps. The arguments put forth by the three groups will be called the *single-origin* hypothesis; *double-origin* hypothesis, and *multiple-origin* hypothesis. According to the first group, SA and DA come from a single origin, with DA becoming lexically, phonologically and morphologically distanced from SA as a result of language contact and language development in geographically distant areas (Versteegh, 1984; Fück, 1950; Blau, 1977). The early accounts by Arab linguists, historians, and sociologists adopt this position, suggesting that all the Arabic dialects were minimally different so long as they were spoken in territories populated by an Arab majority, particularly in the Arabian Peninsula.
The expanding zones of use in which Arabic found itself after the Islamic conquests led to the emergence of corrupt linguistic forms (fasaad al-lugha) among speakers of Arabic in the conquered territories (Ibn Khaldun’s Muqaddima). The authority of this hypothesis resides in the fact that most of its exponents lived the experience of the conquests and may have had access to the pre-Islamic situation through oral transmission or the then-existing accounts. This position is re-instated in the contemporary literature by Fück (1950), who argues that a common Bedouin variety is the origin of all Arabic dialects. This proto-Arabic is very close to, if not identical to SA. The emergence of the dialects resulted from post-diaspora innovations, that is, after Arabic came to be used by different populations outside the Arab-populated areas in Hijaaaz and the Syrian desert.

Ferguson (1959) refines this position, asserting the monogenesis of the dialects but simultaneously negating their linear link to SA. Ferguson argues that:

Most modern Arabic dialects descend from the earlier language through a form of Arabic, called here koine, which was not identical with any of the earlier dialects and which differed in many significant respects from Classical Arabic but was used side by side with the Classical language during early centuries of the Muslim era” (p. 50-51).

Ferguson suggests that this koine was used in speaking throughout the Muslim world in the early centuries of Islamic expansion—existing side by side with SA as a spoken variety. The modern dialects are a continuation of this koine with the differences attributed mainly to borrowings and innovations. Ferguson traces the origin of the koine to the pre-Islamic era, yet negates a single
source for it. He argues that it developed as a result of “mutual borrowing and leveling among the various dialects” (p. 53). He rationalizes his hypothesis by arguing that “The modern dialects agree with one another as against Classical Arabic in a striking number of features.” (p. 52).

Ferguson identifies fourteen features of the koine that converge with the modern dialects and diverge from SA. He argues that these features cannot be ascribed to an analogous evolutionary process by the different dialects but to a single ancestor. For example, in contrast with SA, all modern dialects have no feminine comparative (e.g., kubra ‘big.f.’). Likewise, all use the suffix –i instead of the -iyy for marking nisbah nouns and adjectives. While Ferguson explains the common origin of the dialects by focusing on such similarities, he suggests that the differences are due to independent processes of development.

The multiple-origin hypothesis suggests that the modern dialects, particularly the sedentary ones, evolved independently from one another and from SA (Corriente, 1976; Zwettler, 1978). Most of these dialects originated in the Arabian Peninsula and spread to several influential sedentary centers before and after the dawn of Islam. The similarities between these dialects resulted primarily from the wide-ranging influence of Classical Arabic, the prestige language. Some of these common features grew out of cross-varietal innovations that were initiated in a number of prestigious centers.

Although the origin of DA is still debatable, scholars generally agree that the widespread negative attitudes toward DA date at least as far back as the early Islamic era (Versteegh, 2001; Zeidan, 1988). Anecdotal accounts often present DA as a language deficiency that characterizes the speech of the common people and necessitates consistent rectification. Arab grammarians have traditionally considered DA as a distorted, debased, and deficient form of SA (Suleiman, 2004; Holes, 2004). The codification of the grammar of SA was partly stimulated by the need to
preserve SA from the *corrupt* DA forms that started to creep into it after the conquests (Ibn Khaldun’s *Muqaddima*). In the codification process, Arab grammarians such as Abu Al-Aswad Ad-Du‘ali, Al-Khalil Bn Ahmad Al-Faraheedi and Sibawayh, shunned the urban populations and sought the judgments of the Bedouins, whose language was thought not to be *contaminated* by the urban DA dialects.

These negative attitudes to DA continue to persist in current Arabic speaking communities. DA is considered as a simplified version of SA, and as an incomplete variety that cannot stand on its own (Mejdell, 2006). Although it represents the mother tongue of Arabs and the normal everyday language, DA has a lower status and is often associated with “colloquial,” “slang” and the language of the uneducated masses. As Altoma (1969, p. 3) observes:

> *In spite of its use as the dominant medium of the spoken word in conversation, and in various cultural or artistic contexts such as songs, stage and movies, the colloquial [DA] lacks the prestige enjoyed by the Classical (SA) and is looked upon, often with a considerable degree of contempt, as a stigma of illiteracy and ignorance.*

Unlike SA, Arabic dialects are not typically written, although a certain amount of literature (mainly drama and poetry) exists in some of them. According to Versteegh (2001), “it remains difficult in the Arab world to arouse interest in the dialects as a serious object of study. Many speakers of Arabic still feel that the dialect is a variety of a language without a grammar, a variety used by children and women, and even in universities there is a certain reluctance to accept dialect studies as a dissertation subject” (p. 132). Further, DA is stigmatized for its
divisive influence (Suleiman, 1994, p. 12). For this reason, several Arab linguists and intellectuals have frequently suggested that DA is a variety unworthy of learning or serious study (Suleiman, 1994).

A few attempts have been made to bring recognition to DA, particularly when various parts of the Arab World were colonized, and to give it an official status alongside SA (Altoma, 1969). The British and French took the lead in promoting Egyptian Arabic through encouraging DA-focused linguistic studies, media publications, literary works, and political discourses (Suleiman, 2004). This movement found resonance among only a few local intellectuals. Salaama Musa (1958), one of the most adamant proponents of the Egyptian identity as separate from the Arab identity, proposed the Egyptian dialect as a substitute for SA because the former is easier, capable of absorbing modern science, congruent with the Egyptian nation, and reflective of Egyptian thought and literature. These attempts found no appeal in the intellectual and literary circles and were resolutely resisted by several intellectuals because of their weakening effects on counter-occupation, pan-Arab, and Islamic movements (Mejdell, 2006). Interest in DA has been recently revived by many scholars and orientalists, mainly from the USA and Western Europe, who have engaged in important studies on the structure of different dialects.

Although they share a wide range of lexical, syntactic, and morphological features, the Arabic dialects diverge in a number of ways, particularly in terms of their lexicons and phonology. As Mitchell and El-Hassan (1994, p. 2) note, “[r]egional differences are lexical (and phonological) before they are grammatical.” Likewise, the relationship between SA and DA is characterized by considerable amount of overlapping in terms of sounds, vocabulary and basic structure. Nonetheless, SA and DA have some clear differences at the phonological, lexical, and
morphological levels (Brustad, 2000). The following brief sketch outlines some of the major differences between the three dialects under study and between these dialects and SA.

2.1.2.1. Egyptian Dialectal Arabic:

Egyptian Dialectal Arabic (EDA, henceforth) is a broad term that covers several local dialects spoken throughout Egypt, and sometimes Sudan. Of these dialects, Cairene is predominant. Not only is the Cairene dialect spoken in the Egyptian capital, but its use is also extending to other parts of Egypt as well (Versteegh, 2001). It is the variety used by many Egyptians in their daily conversations as well as in films, plays, serials, and songs. The written form of this dialect appears primarily in vernacular literature, including plays and, to a lesser extent, novels and poems. It is also understood across most of the Arab World due to the popularity of Egyptian media and movies. Further, it one of the most widely studied varieties of Arabic (Brustad, 2000; Soliman, 2009; Eid, 1982, 1988; Bassiouney, 2006, 2009; Mejdell, 2006; Badawi, 1973; Holes, 1993). The Egyptian dialect will be represented by the Cairene dialect in this study.

Although it shares a large part of its phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical properties with the other varieties of Arabic, the Egyptian dialect still exhibits a number of features that sets it apart from SA and from other Arabic dialects. For example, in Egyptian Arabic, the SA phonemes /q/ and /ž/ are realized as /ʔ/ and /ɡ/ and the diphthongs /aw/ and /aj/ become /ei/ and /oo/, respectively. Morphologically, Egyptian Arabic has no case endings on nouns and a few verb inflectional suffixes compared to SA (dual and feminine plural suffixes are eliminated). In addition, it uses aspectual markers, such as ḥa- and bi-, as verbal markers of tense and aspect. Besides, it adds the the possessive particle bitaaʃ (belonging to) between definite
nouns and possessive adjectives (il-kitaab bitaašu (his book)). In terms of its lexicon, the Egyptian dialect has borrowed a large number of foreign words, which come mostly from Turkish (e.g. dueri (straight); ṭusTa (driver)), French (e.g. aSanSeir (lift); etikeit (etiquette)), English (e.g. boliis (police) vella (villa)), Greek (Tarabeiza (table)); and Italian (spirto (alcohol)).

Concerning word order, Egyptian Arabic contains both VSO and SVO word orders. Some authors identify SVO as the unmarked word order (e.g., Ingham, 1994; Fassi-Fehri, 1988), while others recognize VSO word order as unmarked (e.g., Brustad, 2000). Both groups, however, agree that both are common enough to be considered basic (Brustad, 2000). Among the distinctive properties of Egyptian Arabic is the fact that the participle acquires an important verbal function (e.g., ḍana ǧaarif (I know)). Demonstratives often occur postpositionally (e.g., el-wad da (this boy)). Interrogatives do not undergo movement; they remain in-situ (e.g., ruḥtu fein (you went where?)). Negation of verbs is attained by a negative marker ma- and the enclitic -š (ma ʾrafš (I do not know)), but nouns, adjectives, and predicates are negated by miš (miš faahim (I do not understand)). Egyptian Arabic expresses existence and non-existence by fii and maa fiiš (fii ʾalam ʾala T-Tarabeiza (There is a pen on the table)).

2.1.2.2. Gulf Dialectal Arabic:

Gulf Dialectal Arabic (GDA, henceforth) represents the ‘Bedouin dialects’ of the Arabian Peninsula, whose speakers inhabit Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, and Oman. According to Versteegh (2001, p. 148-49), these Bedouin dialects are “more conservative” than the other Arabic dialects “in the sense that they do not partake of many of the reducing and leveling innovations that are found outside the Peninsula.” For example, they retain
the interdentals /θ/, /ð/, and /ð/. They preserve the use of indefinite markers -an, -un, and -in (e.g. beitin (house)). In addition, they still use the causative verbal form productively (e.g. ?αλλαμα (inform; literally, ‘make someone know’), ?αλλαμα (give a ride; literally, ‘make someone arrive’). For this reason, the Gulf dialect is considered by some Arabic dialectologists the closest to SA (e.g., Versteegh, 2001). This is particularly true of Najdi Arabic, which is spoken in Riyadh and the surrounding areas and sometimes chosen to represent this group of dialects.

Nonetheless, the Gulf dialect has undergone a number of changes that distinguish it from SA. For example, it is characterized by the realization of /q/ as /g/ (e.g. gaal instead of qaal (said)) or as /ž/ (e.g., θižiil instead of θaqiil (heavy)). Like Egyptian Arabic, the Gulf dialect has no case endings on nouns and fewer verb suffixes compared to SA. However, it differs from the Egyptian dialect with respect to the retention of feminine plural morphology (e.g., hin katabnljaktibn (they.f. wrote/ write)). Unlike Egyptian and other Arabic dialects, it does not attach aspectual markers to the verb. In interrogatives, wh-question words, except ?aj (which), can occur either pre- or post-verbally (man tabi?= tabi man? (who do you want?)) (Qafisheh, 1977, p. 172). In Gulf Arabic, both perfect and imperfect verbs are negated more by ma (e.g. ma raah (he did not go); ma jruu (he does not go)) and less by la (e.g. la jidris wa-la yišīsil (he neither studies nor works)). On the other hand, nouns and adjectives are negated by muu(b) (e.g. ?ana muu šeix (I am not a sheikh).

Unlike the rest of the Arabic dialects, the Gulf dialect has fewer foreign words (Qafisheh, 1977). Most of the loanwords words in this dialect have been recently borrowed from English and other European languages, and most are technical terms (e.g. kombjuuter (computer); mitr (meter)).
2.1.2.3. Levantine Dialectal Arabic:

Levantine Dialectal Arabic (LDA, henceforth), also called the Syro-Lebanese dialect (Versteegh, 2001), refers to a number of urban varieties that are used in Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Israel and Jordan. Despite the existence of various dialects in this region, their identification under the Levantine dialect is justified by the notable similarities between these varieties. These dialects are often distinguished from the rural dialects and from the Bedouin varieties that prevail in the Syrian desert, which adopt many features of the Gulf dialect. Among this group of dialects, the variety spoken in Damascus stands out. Like its Cairene counterpart, the Damascene dialect has accumulated prestige as the dialect of the Syrian capital and due to its popularity in plays and serials. Unlike the Cairene dialect, however, the Damascus variety is hardly found in written form. The Levantine dialect will be investigated using the Damascene variety in this study.

The Levantine dialect is closer to the Egyptian dialect than to the Gulf dialect. This means that it has undergone a wider range of innovations, particularly in terms of its phonology, morphology, and lexicon. In terms of phonology, it is characterized by the frequent realization of /q/ as /ʔ/, the substitution of the interdentals /θ/ /ð/ and /ð/ with the alveolars /s/, /t/, /d/, /z/, and /D/, the frequent dropping of /ʔ/ word-internally and word-finally, and the use of /ei/ and /oo/ for the diphthongs that are found in SA, namely, /aj/ and /aw/. Morphonologically, Levantine Arabic has no case endings on nouns and few verb suffixes compared to SA. Like the Egyptian dialect, it lacks dual and feminine plural suffixes. Additionally, it uses aspectual markers, such as ُام and ُ- as verbal markers of tense and aspect (e.g. ُام ُر (he is reading); ُ- ُود ُر (he studies medicine)).
The Levantine dialect displays various syntactic structures that are similar to other varieties of Arabic. Like Egyptian Arabic, it expresses existence and non-existence by the use of \textit{fii} and \textit{maa fii}, respectively (e.g., \textit{fii \'alam \'ala T-Taawli} (There is a pen on the table)). Like the Egyptian dialect, too, it inserts a possessive particle between definite nouns and possessive adjectives, namely \textit{taba\textsuperscript{\textcircled{2}}} (\textit{\textsuperscript{\textcircled{2}}oktaab taba\textsuperscript{\textcircled{2}}}u (his book)). In negatives, \textit{ma} or \textit{mu} is used with nouns as well as with verbs across persons, moods, aspects, and tenses. However, unlike the case of interrogatives in the Egyptian and Gulf dialects, wh-words in Levantine Arabic optionally undergo movement (e.g., \textit{wein raaje\textsuperscript{\textcircled{2}}} (where are you going); \textit{\textsuperscript{\textcircled{2}}uu ismak?} (what is your name?)).

In terms of the lexicon, the Levantine dialect has many words that are borrowed from Turkish (e.g., \textit{\textsuperscript{\textcircled{2}}uuDa} (room); \textit{kindara} (shoes)), English (e.g., \textit{magrifoon} (microphone), \textit{telifoon} (telephone)), French (e.g., \textit{bantaroon} ‘pants,’ \textit{okkazion} ‘special sale,’) that do not exist in SA.

\textbf{2.2. Developments in CS Research:}

The study of CS has been approached from three main perspectives: syntactic/grammatical, sociolinguistic, and psycholinguistic. A grammatical approach focuses on the structural aspects of CS with the goal of determining the syntactic and morphosyntactic constraints on language alternation. A sociolinguistic approach is concerned with the role of social factors in the occurrence of CS, the aim being to determine the social meaning and function of CS within discourse. A psycholinguistic approach to CS deals with the cognitive aspect of CS for the purpose of pinpointing the mechanism through which the language codes are organized in the brains of bilinguals and how this organization affects their language acquisition and production. Studies in second language acquisition often adopt the psycholinguistic framework in order to describe the learners’ language abilities and practices. Since the latter is
outside the scope of the current work, the following review will focus only on the syntactic and sociolinguistic aspects of CS.

2.2.1. The Syntax of CS:

A decades-long debate among researchers on the syntactic aspect of CS revolves around whether CS is structurally constrained and, if so, why it is constrained and how these constraints operate. The different hypotheses about the structural constraints of CS can be grouped under the following categories: (1) CS is universally unrestricted; (2) CS is universally constrained by language-specific, general, or system-based principles; (3) CS is constrained selectively based on the language pair involved. The following overview will present an outline of these three main views and discuss their main arguments.

2.2.1.1. Constraints-Absent Position:

The early accounts of CS negated the existence of any consistent structural patterns for this phenomenon. Labov (1971, p. 457), for example, described CS between English and Spanish as an “irregular mixture of two distinct systems.” Likewise, Lance (1975, p. 143), based on his study of CS between English and Spanish, came to the conclusion that “There are perhaps no syntactic restrictions on where the switching may occur.” A number of CS researchers have continued to adopt this position even after several studies have identified a number of constraints on CS between different language pairs. For example, Bokamba (1989, p. 290) describes the notion of the existence of general constraints on CS as “not only misguided but also unwarranted at this stage of the research.” Often the argument against these constraints is either attributed to
the perceived randomness of CS patterns or motivated by counter evidence against the validity of
the proposed constraints.

This position has been criticized on empirical grounds. A large number of studies have
pointed to the existence of various constraints on CS between different language pairs (Belazi, et
al, 1994; Joshi, 1985; Di Sciullo, et al, 1986; Bentahila & Davies, 1983; Pfaff. 1979; Kachru,
1978; Timm, 1975; Lipski, 1978). Although proponents of this position were able to refute some
of the constraints identified in the literature, they often did so in different contexts, focusing on
language pairs other than the ones associated with the constraints. This position has also been
criticized on theoretical grounds; it lacks a theory that explains how language variation is
resolved in CS. In other words, this position is not grounded within a theoretical framework that
may explain the negation of CS-specific constraints.

2.2.1.2. Constraint-Present Position

Another group of researchers acknowledges the existence of constraints on CS. However,
they follow different approaches in explaining these constraints. For analytic purposes, these can
be classified into three main trends: (1) specific constraints regulate CS; (2) general constraints
govern CS and monolingual speech; (3) CS is controlled by system-based constraints. Below is
an outline of these three positions followed by some of the criticisms leveled at each.

2.2.1.2.1. CS-specific Constraints:

The notion that language alternation is regulated by specific constraints predominates in
the literature. Proponents of this position suggest that CS is structurally different from
monolingual speech and is therefore regulated by independent constraints that are operative at
the intersentential and intrasentential levels (the latter being the focus of the current study). One
of the earliest accounts of intrasentential CS constraints comes from Timm (1975), who suggests
that the constraints on CS involve the main verb as the central element in the sentence; CS
constraints appear between the verb and its auxiliary, pronominal subject and object, infinitival
complement, and negation element. He maintains that other restrictions may apply within NPs,
but with much more flexibility. A number of researchers followed along, pointing to the
existence of different constraints between different elements in the sentence (e.g., Lipski, 1978;
Pfaff, 1978). Most of these early studies share their focus on isolated patterns of CS with no
attempt to explain this phenomenon in universal grammatical terms.

One of the most significant contributions to the study of the structural aspect of CS is
Poplack’s study (1980) on Spanish-English CS. The importance of Poplack’s study lies in that,
unlike its predecessors, it generates two principles that have explanatory power beyond the
context in which they occur, namely, the Free Morpheme Constraint and the Equivalence
Constraint. The Free Morpheme Constraint postulates that “Codes may be switched after any
constituent in discourse provided that the constituent is not a bound morpheme” (p. 585). The
Free Morpheme Constraint explains the ungrammaticality of example (4):

(4) *Eat *iendo
eating  (Spanish/English, Poplack, 1980, p. 586)

This sentence is not permissible because the Spanish bound morpheme *iendo and its host are
from two different languages.
The *Equivalence Constraint* suggests that “Code-switches tend to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of L1 and L2 element does not violate a syntactic rule of either language, i.e., at points around which the surface structures of the two languages map onto each other” (p. 586). Because of the Equivalence Constraint, example (5) is not allowed.

(5) *El man que came ayer wants John comprar a car nuevo.*

‘The man who came yesterday wants John to buy a new car.’ (Spanish/English, Poplack, 1980, p. 587)

This sentence is ungrammatical because the juxtaposition of the English noun *car* and the Spanish adjective *nuevo* ‘new’ in the NP *a car nuevo* “a car new” violates the syntactic rules of English, which typically requires the adjective to come before the noun.

Woolford (1983) utilized X-bar theory to formulate a model that can explain the syntactic constraints exemplified in previous research on English-Spanish CS. According to this model, CS can only occur at the lexical/word level. Moreover, it involves no alteration to the grammars of the two languages; “no hybrid rules of any sort are created” (p. 522). Each of the two grammars can contribute to double-coded sentences by generating independent constituents within these sentences. In the phrase structures created by the rules of one grammar, the terminal nodes can be filled only by lexical items from the same lexicon. On the other hand, the terminal nodes of phrase structures that are common to both grammars can be filled by lexical items from either grammar. Examples (6) and (7) illustrate Woolford’s argument:

(6) [\text{NP Todos los Mexicanos}] were riled up.

‘All of the Mexicans were riled up.’
In example (6), the NP ‘Todos los Mexicanos’ is generated by a rule from Spanish grammar, while the rest of the constituents are generated by English grammar. Thus, each grammar is responsible for generating independent constituents in this sentence. On the other hand, in (7), words from both languages alternate in filling the terminal nodes of the VP because both English and Spanish share the phrase structure rules generating conjoined verbs or verb phrases.

In their study of Arabic-French CS, Bentahila and Davies (1983) argued that CS is possible at all syntactic boundaries above the word level, but “not possible across word-internal morpheme boundaries” (p. 329). Beyond this restriction, CS is regulated by a single principle, the Subcategorization Principle. The Subcategorization Principle states that “All items must be used in such a way as to satisfy the (language-particular) subcategorisation restrictions imposed on them.” (p. 329). This principle makes the occurrence of examples (8) and (9) impossible:

(8) *Un 끼aDim  professeur
    ‘an excellent teacher’

(9) *Ǧad  xSSu  redoubler
    ‘again he needs to repeat’ (Moroccan Arabic/French, Bentahila & Davies, 1983, p. 321-2)

Example (8) is unacceptable because the Arabic adjective ‘끼aDim’ occurs pre-nominally, thus violating the subcategorization rule for Arabic adjectives (which always occur post-nominally). Subcategorization rules are also responsible for the ungrammaticality of (9) because the French
verbal complement ‘redoubler’ is not accompanied by an Arabic inflection for tense and person, as is required by the verb ‘xSSu.’

Based on his study of the switching patterns between Marathi and English, Joshi (1983, 1985) concluded that CS occurs in one direction, namely, from the embedded language to the matrix language. He proposed the Constraint on Closed-Class Items as the only restriction on CS between these two languages. According to this constraint, certain closed class items (such as determiners, quantifiers, prepositions, possessive, Aux, Tense, helping verbs) cannot be switched. For instance, sentence (10) may not occur due to the Constraint on Closed-Class items:

(10) a.*on kā hi khurcyā.
   b.* kā hi khurcyā on
   ‘on some chairs’  (Marathi-English, Joshi, 1985, p. 195)

English has prepositions, whereas Marathi has post-positions. The unacceptability of this sentence can be explained by the fact that the English preposition on, which is a closed-class item, is switched, regardless of whether it occurs before the NP kā hi khurcyā (some chairs) or after it, that is, regardless of whether it follows English rules or Marathi rules.

Di Sciullo, et al (1986, p23) propose that the restrictions on CS mostly “arise from general conventions on language indexing,” which are part of the syntactic theory. They formulate the Government Constraint to account for these restrictions. The Government Constraint stipulates that a governed element and its governor must carry the same language index, following the argument:

a. If L_q carrier has index q, then Y_q^max
b. In a maximal projection $Y^{\text{max}}$, the $L_q$ carrier is the lexical element that asymmetrically c-commands the other lexical elements or terminal phrase nodes dominated by $Y^{\text{max}}$. (p. 6).

The Government Constraint inhibits the occurrence of (11) below due to the government relationship between the determiner and the noun phrase:

(11) * I told him $ki$ raam bahut bimaar hai
       _______ that Ram very sick aux

‘I told him that Ram was very sick’ (Hindi/English, Di Sciullo et al, 1986, p17)

The Government Constraint requires the lexical head of the VP, namely the verb $told$, to spread its language feature throughout the phrase of which it is a governor. However, this stipulation is violated by the head of the Hindi CP $ki$ (that), which does not carry the language feature of its lexical head. This explains the ungrammaticality of sentence (11).

Like Di Sciullo et al (1986), Belazi et al (1994) work within the framework of generative grammar to propose the Functional Head Constraint as a general way to explain the constraints on CS between Tunisian Arabic and French. Belazi et al’s analysis is based on Abney’s notion of the functional head as well as Chomsky’s concept of f-selection as part of the feature checking processes. However, Belazi and his associates extend feature checking beyond the realm of inflectional morphology to the ‘language’ feature. Accordingly, ‘The language feature of the complement f-selected by a functional head, like all other relevant features, must match the corresponding feature of that functional head’ (p. 228). The Functional Head Constraint disallows the occurrence of such examples as (12):
The Functional Head Constraint anticipates the functional head *illi* (that) to impose its *language* feature on its f-selected complement, *il m’a donné* “he gave me.” In (12), however, the Tunisian-Arabic functional head $C^0$ fails to impose its *language* feature on its French IP complement. This explains the unacceptability of this sentence.

Several other constraints can be added to the small subset of constraints presented so far (e.g., Singh, 1981; Halmari, 1997; Sridhar and Sridhar, 1980; Sankoff and Poplack, 1981; Stenson, 1990; Pandit, 1990; Berk-Seligson, 1986; Choi, 1991; Nishimura, 1997; among many others). Although these analyses differ in locating the exact sites where CS is not allowed or in identifying the mechanisms that give rise to different CS constraints, they are all formulated within one of the following frameworks: (1) the grammars of the two languages are kept separate, with an independent mechanism developed to switch between them; and (2) the two grammars are reconfigured into a third grammar, with certain syntactic rules modified (Mahootian, 1993; Chan, 2003; MacSwan, 1999). When examined against different language pairs or different corpora, almost all of them face empirical challenge.

2.2.1.2.2. General Constraints on CS and Monolingual Speech:

Another group of researchers contend that CS is constrained by the same rules that govern monolingual speech (Mahootian, 1993, 1996; MacSwan, 1999, 2008; Chan, 2003, 2008; Aabi, 2004). Although they reject the existence of CS-specific constraints based on the notion that CS is governed by the general rules of Universal Grammar, representatives of this position...
acknowledge the existence of general constraints on CS that apply to both CS and monolingual speech—even though they differ with regard to the mechanism that regulate language alternation.

Mahootian (1993, 1996) argues that CS is governed by the same rules and principles that generate monolingual utterances. Central to her analysis is the assumption that “the language of a head determines the syntactic properties of its complements in codeswitching and monolingual contexts alike” (p. 380). Thus, within a given phrase structure, heads determine the position, category, and features of their complements. This applies to functional and lexical heads alike. For example, in CS involving a VO language and OV language, such as English and Farsi, respectively, the verb in the VP determines the position, category and feature contents of its DP complement. If a Farsi verb is used, then the DP should come before the verb; otherwise, the sentence will be ungrammatical. On the other hand, if an English verb is used, then the DP should come after the verb; as examples (13) and (14) illustrate:

(13) I love xormnlu
     ___ persimmon
     ‘I love persimmons’

(14) *I xornzrihi love
     _ persimmon___
     ‘I love persimmons’ (Farsi/English, Mahootian, 1996, p. 380-381)

According to Mahootian, example (14) is not a possible CS sequence because the Farsi DP “xormnlu’ violates the requirement of its lexical head ‘love.’ This is not unique to CS, since an equivalent structure such as ‘I persimmons love’ may not occur in monolingual speech.
Chan (2003, 2008) and Aabi (2004) follow a similar line of argument, suggesting that “there are no specific constraints on code-switching. Code-switching utterances are constrained by the same grammar, the same set of mechanisms which constrains monolingual utterances as well” (Chan, 2008, p. 1). Both ascribe the restrictions on CS to functional head requirements. Chan argues that functional heads simply determine the word order and category of their complements in pure languages and CS. For example, in CS involving a “C-initial” language X and a “C-final” language Y, the possible CS sequences will be:

(15) a. \([CP \ C_X \ IP]\)
    b. \(*[CP \ IP \ C_X]\)
    c. \([CP \ IP \ C_Y]\)
    d. \(*[CP \ C_Y \ IP]\)  (Chan, 2003, p. 119).

Chan points to the consistency of his predictions with the existing CS literature insofar as previous studies provide no examples that violate this special relationship between functional heads and their complements. On the other hand, Aabi (2004) argues that the selectional properties of functional heads, including categorical selection, morphological selection, and grammatical features, for their specifiers and complements should be met in CS and pure languages. Thus, both complements and specifiers are equally constrained by the requirements of their functional heads.

MacSwan (1999, 2005) examines CS within the framework of minimalist syntactic theory, arguing that CS can be explained by the same mechanisms used with monolingual data without appealing to ad hoc constraints. His main hypotheses are: (1) nothing constrains CS apart from the requirements of the mixed grammars; and (2) code-switchers have the same grammatical competence as monolinguals for the languages they use (p. 22). Following the
Minimalist tradition, MacSwan holds that all languages share the same set of universal principles and yet their variation is due to individual lexical properties, particularly in the realm of morphological features. In CS, items can be drawn from the lexicon of either language, which are then checked for convergence in just the same way as monolingual features are checked. Since these lexical features may generate conflicts in the lexical requirements of words, they themselves account for constraints between different language pairs. He further suggests that CS is impossible within the Phonological Form (PF) component. The PF component contains phonological rules that use its phonetic content to build structure on the basis of specific morphological rules. The order of the rules is language-specific. This order is necessarily violated when the PF components of the two languages are united in CS. In order words, it is not possible to code-switch within a phonological unit because the juxtaposition of phonological rules of two languages, which are ordered differently in different languages, would be unpronounceable.

Using a corpus of naturally-produced and experimentally-created Spanish-Nahuatl data, MacSwan argues that CS is particularly constrained when there is agreement morphology mismatch between the two languages. For example, the use of a Spanish negative marker with a Nahuatl verb that bears agreement morphology is not allowed (as in example (16)). Also restricted is switching between a Spanish determiner and a Nahuatl NP, when the former is marked as feminine.

(16) *No nitekititoc
  No ni-tekit-itoc
  Not 1S-work-DUR
  ‘I am not working’  (Nahuatl/Spanish, MacSwan, 1997, p. 135)
According to MacSwan, example (16) is ungrammatical because of the incompatibility between the morphologically bare Spanish negative marker *no* and the morphologically loaded Nahuatl verb *tekit* (work). Likewise, example (17) is not acceptable because the gender mismatch between the Spanish feminine article *una* and the Nahuatl NP *kalli* (house), which is not marked for gender (assuming that masculine is the default gender). Both examples suggest that the reason for CS constraints reside in individual lexical properties.

These models have a theoretical advantage over the first two as they do not resort to ad hoc mechanisms to explain CS. That is, they derive their generalizations from general principles of the grammar that are independent of CS. Thus, they are grounded in theory that, to some extent, justifies the juxtaposition of the two languages in a single utterance. Despite their theoretical appeal, however, these models face empirical challenges (Schindler, Legendre, Wilson & Abdoulaye, 2008).

### 2.2.1.2.3. System-Based Constraints on CS:

A third view suggests that CS operates within a system that specifies the syntactic environments in which language alternation may or may not occur. A well-known example of these models is the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993a) and colleagues (Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2001; Jake, Myers-Scotton and Gross, 2002). Central to the MLF is the distinction between the Matrix Language (ML) and the Embedded Language
(EL); the former supplies the morphosyntactic framework and the latter potentially inserts/embeds particular codeswitched elements into that framework. A further distinction is made between system morphemes (e.g., quantifiers, specifiers, inflectional morphemes, etc.) and content morphemes (e.g., nouns, verbs, adjectives, prepositions, etc.). While system morphemes have the feature [+Quantification] and necessarily come from the ML, content morphemes typically have the features [-Quantification] and [Thematic Role-Assigner] or [Thematic Role-Receiver] and may come from either the ML or the EL. The MLF specifies three forms of constituents: ML islands, EL islands, and ML + EL constituents. ML islands and EL islands are formed according to their respective grammars, whereas ML+EL constituents (i.e., double-coded constituents) obey the ML grammar.

The MLF, in its most basic form, builds on two main principles that determine the relationship between the above elements:

The System Morpheme Principle  (Myers-Scotton, 1993a, p. 7)

All syntactically relevant system morphemes must come from the ML. In (18), for example, the English verb “spoil” is inflected solely with Swahili system morphemes:

(18) Mmathe wa hiyo hao alikuwa akilia joo vile vitu zi- -me- -spoil-i- w- -a
    they PERF spoil- Ø-PASS- INDIC

‘The mother of that house was crying oh how things were spoiled [for her]’ (Swahili/English, Myers-Scotton, 1993a, p. 103).
*The Morpheme Order Principle* (Myers-Scotton, 1993a, p. 7)

Morpheme order must not violate the ML morpheme order. In (19), for example, the arrangement of elements in the NP *mambo mengi new* (things-many-new) follow the morpheme order of the ML, namely, Swahili:

(19) Mungu anaweza yote muamini ataweza kubadilisha na utakuwa na ma-mbo m-engi new

with CL-things CL-many new

‘God is able to do all [if] you believe he will change you and you will have many new things’
(Swahili/English, Myers-Scotton, 1993a, p. 85)

The System Morpheme Principle requires first an identification of the ML. In her earlier work, Myers-Scotton (1993a) suggests that the ML is the language that contributes more morphemes to the discourse. This vague definition was made more explicit in her later work through the proposition that the ML is fixed within a single CP, but may change at the sentence or discourse level (Jake, et al, 2002).

Myers-Scotton’s MLF has been criticized in the literature for a number of theoretical shortfalls. For example, the MLF model’s distinction between content and system morphemes is based on unreliable criteria. Thus, closed-class items, which are classified as system morphemes, may be re-classified as a content morpheme based on semantic factors (Pérez-Leroux, O’Rourke, and Sunderman, 2002). Moreover, the model leaves the selection of the ML to the dynamics of the conversation, which makes it always unpredictable and open to change. Further, the model has not always held up to empirical testing (Bentahila, 1995; Boussofara-Omar, 2003; Bassiouney, 2009).
2.2.1.3. Constraints-Variant Position:

A number of studies came to the conclusion the constraints on CS apply selectively on different language pairs. In other words, the constraints on CS are not universal, but rather specific to different bilingual communities (Bhatt 1997; Muysken, 1995). For example, Bhatt (1997) presents evidence for the non-universality of constraints on CS based on his study of the codeswitching patterns among different languages pairs, including Kashmiri-English, Hindi-English, Kashmiri-Hindi, Spanish-English, and Swahili-English. Bhatt explains the observable variation in the application of CS constraints among different language pairs by suggesting that languages contain the same constraints but whether the effect of a particular constraint is visible depends on its relative ranking, which varies cross-linguistically. Languages involved in CS have preferences for what constitutes well-formed sentences. These preferences emanate from the assumption that syntax optimizes the well-formedness of double-coded sentences. The interaction of the well-formedness conditions of the two grammars results in the optimal adjustments between items of the two languages in the well-formed option. The constraints on CS are defeasible in just those contexts in which they conflict with a higher ranked constraint (p. 236). Therefore, the restrictions on code-switching among different languages follow from “the different ranking configurations opted by individual code-switching grammars” (p.1).

This view has been criticized for its inability to explain the internal variation in CS patterns within the same language pair (Chan, 2008). According to this view, one language pair (e.g. Japanese-English) may have a constraint ranking different from another (e.g. Spanish-English), and the different constraint-rankings would lead to different syntactic patterns in different language pairs. However, the approach still cannot explain variation of syntactic patterns within the same language pair, although it can explain variation between different
language-pairs. For instance, in Adanme-English, one finds both ADJ N order and N ADJ orders, and therefore one set of constraint-ranking would not explain the variation.

Overall, the controversy concerning the structural aspect of CS revolves around three main axes: (1) whether there are any constraints in the first place; (2) assuming the existence of these constraints, whether they are language-specific or universal; and (3), how these constraints can be explained in general grammatical terms. Further research is needed in these areas because none of these issues seems to be settled.

2.2.2. Social Functions of Codeswitching:

While the syntactic approach to CS focuses on the structural patterns of CS, the sociolinguistic approach focuses on its social functions and meanings within discourse. This approach sets out to answer the basic question of why language alternation occurs. This question transpired in early descriptive studies on bilingual communities. For example, in his study on Mexican Americans in Tucson, Arizona, Barker (1947) was perplexed by the fact that bilinguals alternated between English and Spanish on different occasions “without apparent cause” (1947, p. 186). Barker, however, did observe that these bilinguals often allocate Spanish to intimate interactions with family members and English to formal conversation involving Anglo-Americans. Their language choice, however, was fluctuant in other situations, allowing for the occurrence of each of the two languages. In terms of interpreting the meaning and function of CS, the early accounts presented CS as a means of filling in a language deficiency. For example, Weinreich (1968, p.73) argued that “the ideal bilingual switches from one language to another according to appropriate changes in the speech situation (interlocutors, topics, etc.), but not in an unchanged speech situation and certainly not within a single sentence”. Implied in Weinreich’s
comment is the characterization of bilinguals who switch in “unchanged speech situation” and “within a single sentence” as non-ideal; they have language deficiencies.

Although he was not particularly concerned with CS, Ferguson, in his seminal work on diglossia, set the stage for what was described later as situational CS. Ferguson suggested that in diglossic communities, speakers alternate between the two varieties based on the context of their discourse. In particular, speakers shift to the High variety in formal situations and to the Low variety in informal settings. Fishman (1971) extended Ferguson’s model by proposing his domain theory of multilingualism. Fishman theorized that multilingual speakers use one variety/language based on their perception of the domain in which they find themselves. According to Fishman, a ‘domain’ refers to the particular context in which the use of one language is more appropriate than another, and it involves three main parameters: interlocutors, occasion, and topics. Hence, as Fishman puts it, “Proper usage dictates that only one of the theoretically coavailable languages or varieties will be chosen by particular classes of interlocutors on particular kinds of occasion to discuss particular kinds of topics.” (p. 437). Fishman’s model therefore predicts a straightforward association between linguistic choices and the domains in which speakers find themselves.

Gumperz (1958, 1961, and 1964) presented CS in a new light in a series of studies on the dialects of Hindi by linking it not only to context but also to social class relationships between speakers. Gumperz notices that many speakers in Khalapur (a village in northern India) alternate between village dialects, regional dialects, and standard Hindi in their discourse. For example, the village inhabitants use the village dialects with the local resident, the regional dialects when speaking to people from outside and in small market centers, and standard Hindi in formal settings and in cities. In the socioeconomically stratified community, the elite groups also change
features of their vernacular based on the formality level of their relationship with the listeners. For example, they use one form of a particular vernacular (moti boli) with family members, children, relatives, and servants, and use another (Saf boli) outside these informal relationships and with elders. Even in a single setting, switching is sometimes motivated by social relationships between speakers. For example, speakers change their forms of address depending on the socioeconomic or religious status of their interlocutors (which is not exclusive to CS).

Blom and Gumperz’s 1972 study in Hemnesberget (Norway) represents one of the earliest studies on the social functions of CS in its current use. Blom and Gumperz differentiate between situational CS and metaphorical CS and identify particular functions for each. Situational CS is the result of changes in situational variables, including the interlocutors, setting, and activity type. Like Ferguson (1959) and Fishman (1971), Blom and Gumperz suggest that language choice here is restricted and predictable. Blom and Gumperz noticed that speakers in Hemnesberget (Norway) typically use Ranamal, the local dialect, to identify with the local values of their local community or in ‘heart-to-heart’ talk, whereas they use Bokmal, the standard variety, for official and formal purposes. On the other hand, metaphorical CS is carried out to achieve particular communicative effects, with the situational factors being constant. Gumperz (1982, p. 75-82) grouped these communicative effects into six social functions: (1) quotation; (2) addressee specification; (3) interjection; (4) reiteration; (5) message qualification; and (6) personification vs. objectification. Moreover, he recast the social dimension of CS on the basis of the distinction between the ‘we code’ and the ‘they code’ (p. 66)—a distinction that underlines one of the main social functions of bilingual CS as a tool for showing distance or solidarity with the listener or with a certain group.
Goffman (1981) linked the functions of CS to the notion of *footing*, which refers to the “participant’s alignment, or set, or stance, or posture, or projected self” (p. 128) within the interaction. This self-projection can occur within a single sentence or across sentences, and it is a common feature of daily interactions. A speaker can assume different roles based on his/her projected alignment in relation to the listeners, the actual activity, and content of speech. Although footing is not solely related to language alternation, it often involves CS (p. 128). A consideration of the function of CS for the speaker should involve not merely the context in which shifting occurs but also the frame and mode of the conversation, the assumptions of the interlocutors, and the dynamics of the interaction.

Auer (1984, 1988, and 1998) proposed a sequential approach to CS based on conversation analysis techniques and Goffman’s notion of “interaction order”. According to Auer (1998, pp. 1-2), the analysis of CS “first and foremost requires close attention to be paid to the details of its production in the emerging conversational context which it both shapes and responds to.” In this bottom-up approach to CS analysis, the code choice emerges in the interactional process as a result of the negotiation process between participants. Auer further claims that the sequential structure of language negotiation is “sufficiently autonomous both from grammar (syntax) and from the larger societal and ideological structures to which the languages in question and their choice for a given interactional episode are related” (p. 4). Such an approach pays little attention to the macro-sociolinguistic contextual elements, such as the participants, topic, and setting, and focuses more on the conversational structure. Auer’s sequential approach implies that understanding every instance of CS would require considering the preceding and following utterances, only with secondary attention to other ‘external’ sociolinguistic factors.
Taking insight from Grice’s cooperative principle, Myers-Scotton (1993b) presents her ‘Markedness Model’ to account for the social motivations of CS. The Markedness Model rests on the negotiation principle, which posits that speakers choose a particular code based on the rights and obligations (RO) they seek to establish with other speakers in the conversation and its setting. According to Myers-Scotton, for any communicative situation there exists an expected RO set, determined by the social norms in the community. Three maxims follow from this principle. The unmarked choice maxim directs “Make your choice the unmarked index of the unmarked RO set in talk exchanges when you wish to establish or affirm that RO set” (p. 114). The marked choice maxim states “Make a marked code choice which is not the unmarked index of the unmarked RO set in the interaction when you wish to establish a new RO set as unmarked for the current exchange” (p. 131). The exploratory choice maxim stipulates, “When an unmarked choice is not clear, use CS to make alternate exploratory choices as candidates for an unmarked choice and thereby as an index of an RO set which you favor” (142).

In this model, language choice is governed by the rights and obligations of the interlocutors (assuming that the speakers agree on the applicable RO set). Thus, identification with the expected RO set would lead to unmarked CS, whereas dis-identification with the expected RO set would lead to marked CS. In choosing a particular code, speakers decide whether to follow the normative RO set or to seek a new one. Speakers opt for marked CS “to negotiate a change in the expected social distance holding between participants, either increasing or decreasing it” (p. 132). Marked choices are often accompanied by prosodic features such as pauses or extended commentary on the switch. Myers-Scotton argues that “unmarked CS should not occur at all in narrow diglossic communities (the Arabic-speaking nations of the Middle East, at least, if not the other exemplars included in Ferguson 1959)” (p. 128). Myers-Scotton
bases her argument on the assumption that speakers who alternate between SA and DA do not identify with the normative RO set.

More recently, Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai (2001, p. 1) reformulated the Markedness Model into a more explicitly Rational Choice model. They criticize previous accounts of CS, which ascribe language choices to larger societal conventions, constraints, actors, or discourse structure. Instead, they invoke Rational Choice Theory to propose that “choices lie ultimately with the individual and are rationally based.” As rational beings, speakers assess the possible choices available to them in terms of cost-benefit analysis and choose the one that is most productive to them. In this process, speakers consider the internal consistency of their choice and the best available evidence. For example, Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai notice that, in an interaction between a Hungarian-English bilingual boy and his mother, the boy often shifts to English, even though Hungarian is the preferred language of family interactions. In such a case, the boy circumvents the societal and discursive constraints on CS in order to attain his own subjective goals. Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai do not negate the role of societal factors or conversational structure; these became just one component of the Rational Choice model.

Heller (1992) argues that CS can only be understood within both an interpretive and interactional framework. Within this theoretical model, verbal behavior should be interpreted with regard to the specific social and historical dimensions of a particular setting. In other words, the functions of CS vary from one setting to another based on different social and historical factors. Based on her ethnographic study in Ontario and Quebec between 1978 and 1990, Heller suggests that English-French CS is a political strategy, “especially as a strategy of ethnic mobilisation” (p. 123). CS becomes part of other symbolic resources used to control and regulate access to other forms of power. Heller draws on Bourdieu’s notions of symbolic capital and
symbolic marketplace as well as Gumperz’s concepts of speech economies and verbal repertoires (Bourdieu, 1977; Gumperz, 1982). A distinction is made between conventional CS, which is set to maintain the existing power relations, and anti-conventional, which becomes a form of resistance. Heller shows how after the 1960s, CS was used as a means of French national mobilization. CS here becomes a means of reformulating asymmetric relations of power in terms of re-evaluating the value of French and English, as symbolic resources, and their role in regulating access to other symbolic and material resources. While the corporate demand for French-English bilinguals is perceived by francophones as a way to preserve French language and identity, it provides Anglophones with a means to penetrate the francophone controlled corporate culture, while still laying claim to an Anglophone identity with its associated value in the international market.

Bhatt and Bolonyai (in press) propose an optimality theoretic framework to explain the variation in the CS patterns across different communities. They identify five principles that underlie some of the main functions of CS in different communities. These principles include Faith, Power, Solidarity, Face, and Perspective. In a given community, the socio-cognitive grammar of CS is realized by the optimal output of the process of the ranking of these principles. This ordering is influenced by “speaker motivation and macro-social factors such as group membership, identity affiliations, and the politics of bilingual contact” (p. 5). This suggests that the variation in the functions of CS in different communities is due to how these principles are ordered in relation to one another.

Overall, the literature on the social aspect of CS is characterized by disagreement not only on the social function and meaning of CS within discourse, but also on the appropriate approach to analyze it. While some sociolinguists attribute code alternation to situational factors,
others link it to social conventions, identity negotiation, self assertion, speech accommodation, and politicoeconomic inclinations (Gumperz, 1982; Bentahila, 1983; Heller, 1988; Myers-Scotton, 1993b; Kachru, 1977; Bhatt and Bolonyai, in press; Blom and Gumperz, 1972; Valdés, 1981; Appel & Muysken, 1987, Clyne, 2003; Auer, 1988; Giles and Powesland, 1997; Gal, 1998; Wei, 1994; Milroy & Wei, 1995). Still others suggest that the meaning of code choice resides mainly in the conversation structure and with respect to the negotiation process.

2.3. CS in the Arabic Context:

The bulk of existing research on CS in the Arabic-speaking communities focuses on the alternation between DA and another language (e.g., Bentahila and Davies, 1983, 1997; Nortier, 1990; Belazi et al, 1994; Atawneh, 1992; Safi, 1992; Al-Mansour, 1998; Al-Enazi, 2002; Aabi, 2004; Myers-Scotton, Jake & Okasha, 1996). Only a few studies have examined CS between SA and DA. Eid (1982, 1988) focused on the structural aspect of CS between SA and Egyptian Arabic in an attempt to identify any syntactic constraints on CS between the two varieties. She examined a number of radio and television interviews and panel discussions, involving educated speakers in Egypt. Her analysis was limited to four syntactic constructions: “relative clauses, subordinate clauses, tense and verb constructions, and negative and verb constructions” (p. 54). Her analysis shows that relative clause markers, subordinating conjunctions, tense markers, and conjunctions serve as focal points that largely govern the feasibility of CS. Thus, switching before these focal points is unrestricted, while it is relatively more restricted after these elements. Eid formulates two constraints that govern CS between SA and EDA, the Contradictory Effect Constraint and the Directionality Constraint, which will be explored in detail in Chapter 4.
Another important study that focuses on the syntax of bidialectal CS was conducted by Boussofara-Omar (1999, 2003). The study starts with the assumption that what has been termed as the “middle language,” based on the juxtaposition of SA and DA forms, is a clear case of diglossic switching. The study focuses on the nature of syntactic constraints on this form of diglossic CS between SA and Tunisian Arabic (TA) within the framework of Myers-Scotton’s Matrix Language Frame model. The researcher used seventeen speeches that Habib Bourguiba, former president of Tunisia, delivered between 1956 and 1968. The main finding of the study is that TA serves as the Matrix Language, as it sets the morpho-syntactic frame of SA + TA constituents, while SA serves as the Embedded Language. The findings also point to a number of problems in the MLF model. For example, the model does not predict cases where all the morphemes at the surface structure come from one variety yet the subcategorization rules come from the other; cases where all the morphemes are from one variety but the word order is that of the other; and cases where the system morphemes come from both varieties (rather than just from one).

Saeed (1997) focused on the pragmatic functions of switching from SA to three regional dialects of Arabic (Egyptian, Kuwaiti, and Yemeni) in the formal context of religious discourse. In particular, the study investigated whether CS serves any communicative purposes and sought to identify what these purposes are. In addition, he examined the frequency of shifting to DA in this formal context. He used eight audio and video tapes for three religious scholars from Egypt, Kuwait and Yemen to investigate the first two questions and ten others for the third question. He found that codeswitching occurs with considerable frequency in the speech of the three scholars. His analysis showed that the pragmatic motivations for codeswitching fall into three categories:
1) iconic/rhetorical (e.g. to quote or to simplify); 2) structural (triggered by linguistic structure); and 3) other (e.g., due to linguistic incompetence).

Bassiouney (2006) examined the syntactic constraints on CS between Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and Egyptian Colloquial Arabic (ECA) as well as the social functions of CS between the two varieties. Her data included four speech sermons, four political speeches, and one university lecture. She argued that syntactic factors can explain the sociolinguistic and pragmatic functions of CS. In terms of the syntax of CS, she noticed that the use of MSA negative markers and demonstratives and the lack of ECA aspectual markers is a sign of MSA choice. The syntactic patterns found in her data can be summarized as follows:

(20) MSA=ECA → MSA+ECA demonstratives; ECA negation; b-prefix + MSA verb forms
    MSA>ECA → MSA+ECA demonstratives; MSA negation; b-prefix + MSA verb forms
    MSA<ECA → MSA+ECA demonstratives; ECA negation; b-prefix + MSA verb forms

These findings suggest that b-prefixed MSA verb forms seem to occur irrespective of the dominant language of the monologue. Likewise, MSA and ECA demonstratives are equally likely to occur in all monologues. On the other hand, MSA negative markers appear only in monologues where MSA is the dominant variety.

As for the social functions of CS, Bassiouney found that the speaker is the most important factor in deciding when CS occurs. Moreover, language choice was not always related to a particular discourse function. She, however, found that speakers often state abstract facts in Modern Standard Arabic and then explain them in more concrete examples using the Egyptian dialect. Moreover, SA is used to lend a tone of seriousness and importance to the topic, whereas
DA is used for narration and giving concrete examples. Bassiouney’s conclusions about the social functions of CS between MSA and ECA partially replicate the findings of Saeed’s study (1997).

Soliman (2008) conducted a case study on CS from SA to Egyptian Arabic in the religious discourse of one Egyptian preacher. Since this particular preacher is well-known for his extensive use of Egyptian Arabic, the researcher set to investigate the phonological, syntactical, and morphological features of his speech as well as the attitudes of educated Egyptians toward his use of Egyptian Arabic in his discourse. The findings of the study show that Egyptian Arabic occurred with notable frequency in religious discourse. SA was used for reciting Qur’anic verses, mentioning Prophetic narrations, giving quotations, and supplicating at the beginning and the end of the sermon. The other parts of the preaching were in Egyptian Arabic. Moreover, the surveyed educated Egyptians seemed to have an overall positive attitude toward the use of their variety in religious discourse. This case study, however, does not represent a typical case of religious speech, as the author himself acknowledges.

Research on the psycholinguistic aspect of diglossic CS is limited to Khamis-Dakwar and Froud’s (2007) study on the neural responses to sentences containing diglossic switches from Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) to Palestinian Colloquial Arabic (PCA) and from PCA to MSA. The main purpose of the study was to examine the neurofunctional bases of codeswitching between MSA and PCA. The study used the event-related potential (ERP) technique for observing electric potentials generated by the brain, which indexes online language processing using the electroencephalogram (EEG). Five native speakers of PCA listened to sentences under three experimental conditions: grammatical sentences in MSA or PCA, sentences with a semantically anomalous final word, and sentences with code-switched final word. Two hundred
and thirty-four sentences were presented auditorily in random order, and participants were asked to judge whether the final word was in the same language as the rest of each sentence. The findings showed a significant language processing effect with codeswitching manipulation. In other words, the extended time spent in the processing of codeswitched sentences indicate that PCA and MSA are represented in the brain as two separate languages and that CS is not simply a matter of lexical switching within the same language.

A number of other studies have focused on the alternation between SA and DA in different oral and written forms (e.g., Abdel-Malek, 1972; Abu-Melhim, 1991; Holes, 1993; Mejdell, 2006). In general, studies focusing on CS between SA and DA have made significant contributions to our understanding of the syntactic structure and social functions of this phenomenon. However, most of these studies focus on a single dialectal variety (e.g., Egyptian), an individual speaker (e.g., a preacher), or one domain (e.g., religious speeches). Such limitations make it difficult to generalize the observed patterns to CS between SA and DA in general. For generalizability and comparability purposes, this phenomenon needs both structural and sociolinguistic analysis involving a number of dialects and featuring a wide spectrum of speakers in different domains. Moreover, it is important to explore the implications of CS in the Arabic context to the global discussion on the structural and social dimensions of this widespread phenomenon.

2.4. Theoretical Framework:

The syntactic constraints on CS will be examined within the Principles and Parameters framework (Chomsky, 1995; Chomsky and Lasnik, 1993). The generative theory of grammar developed out of the notion that all normal children have an innate capability that enables them
to acquire their first language. This universal aspect of language acquisition suggests that all human languages have properties in common. Chomsky (1976) developed the theory of Universal Grammar (UG) as a descriptive account of the syntactic similarity between languages. Chomsky argued that the goal of syntactic theory was not only to discover these properties, but also to formulate them in an optimally general way in accordance with UG. However, since languages vary in syntactic structure, it was necessary to provide an account for language variation under UG.

Chomsky (1981) argued that the notable variation among languages can be explained by the fact than certain principles can take on a limited set of values. The different values within a certain principle constitute the parameters of that principle. In other words, parameters allow for a limited number of values for languages to choose from. Therefore, linguistic variation is simply a parametric variation in the universal principles.

The Minimalist Program (MP, henceforth) is the latest reformulation of the Principles and Parameters framework. The MP assumes that UG optimally organizes, ‘computes,’ and processes language and its universal rules. According to Stroik (1996), the MP developed out of the need to discover these rules, specify their representation and constraints, and formulate them in an optimal way, similar to the way they work under UG. The re-orientation of the aim of generative theories allowed the minimalist framework to “govern both the form and the substance of grammar” (Stroik, 1996, p. 1).

The MP rests on a number of assumptions, summarized in Bošković & Lasnik (2007, p. 17) and Stroik (1996, pp. 1-3). The starting assumption of the MP falls within the domain of “virtual conceptual necessity” (Bošković & Lasnik, 2007, p. 17). That is, linguistic expressions are generated in the most economical way. Second, the MP assumes that a given language
consists of a lexicon and a computational system, the former is gained by linguistic input and the latter is endowed by UG. Third, the computational system consists of a fixed set of universal principles as well as a number of language-specific parameters. Fourth, the computational system develops an infinite set of structural descriptions (SDs) for a particular language. SDs are representational pairs \((P, L)\) that satisfy the two interface conditions of Phonetic Form (PF) and Logical Form (LF). In other words, they satisfy the Principle of Full Interpretation and well-formedness conditions, such as Binding, Control, and Case (in addition to the Economy conditions, such as Greed, Procrastinate, and Shortest Move). Fifth, derivations are motivated by morphological properties, which are checked in a Functional Category before they undergo Spell Out at PF.

Another important and relevant feature of the MP is the distinction between Principles and Parameters (which is also part of its predecessor, the GB framework). The distinction is important to account for language variation under UG. “Parameters … involve fixing a value (or resetting a default option) based on experience (i.e., exposure to linguistic data)” (Akmajian, et al, 2001, p. 518). Borer (1983) ascribed parametric differences to the lexicon, particularly the morphological features of individual lexical items. Borer suggests that these parameters are part of the information encoded in the lexical entries of languages, rather than in the principles of UG.

Chomsky (1991, p. 23) adopted Borer’s analysis and argued that “Possibly, as proposed by Hagit Borer, the parameters are actually restricted to the lexicon, which would mean that the rest of the I-language is fixed and invariant…” Wexler and Manzini (1987) suggest that one of the main advantages of this approach is that a given language can display more than one parametric value in different lexical items. Borer’s account of parametric variations falls in line
with Chomsky’\textquotesingle s conceptualization of the lexicon, which, according to him, is “the repository of all (idiosyncratic) properties of particular lexical items. These properties include a representation of the phonological form of each item, a specification of its syntactic category, and its semantic characteristics” (Chomsky, 1995, p. 30). The semantic characteristics include mainly the number of arguments it takes and the semantic relationships between arguments and heads (Schönefeld, 2001, 123). However it is far from clear whether parametric differences between languages indeed reside in the lexicon.

A third important feature of the MP regards the disappearance of the distinction between the deep structure and the surface structure. The MP assumes that PF and LF are the only interface levels needed. Chomsky (1995) argues that the computation of a derivation starts from the lexicon and continues gradually to phrase structures. Derivations are formed by an operation called “Form Chain,” which is governed by the Economy conditions. At the LF, chain formation will project lexical elements into functional phrasal categories, where the elements’ morphosyntactic features are checked, as in (21)

\begin{equation}
\text{(21) } [\text{AGR}_{\text{D}P}\ldots [\text{TP}\ldots [\text{NEG}_{\ldots [\text{AGR}_{\text{O}P}\ldots [\text{VP}\ldots]之外]}]]] \quad (\text{Stroik, 1996, p. 3})
\end{equation}

In example (21), the lexical elements are the constituents of the VP, namely the predicate and its argument. Both will move to morphosyntactic Functional Category (FC) at LF for feature checking. In the \text{AGR}_{\text{O}P}, the agreement features of the verb and its NP-object are checked. In \text{TP}, the tense-features of the verb and the Case features of the subject NP are checked. Lastly, in the \text{AGR}_{\text{S}P}, the N-agreement features of an NP-subject and V-agreement features are checked. If
the final representation satisfies the interface conditions of LF, the derivation would have converged at LF; otherwise, it is said to have ‘crashed’ at LF.

These two specifications of the MP are important for two main reasons. First, if we accept the minimalist account of language variation as caused by parametric variation and if we accept the assumption that parameters originate in the lexicon, then it is possible to identify the source of conflict in double-coded sentences in the different parameters of the two languages. Since parameters reside in the lexicon, we can be more specific that the constraints in double-coded sentences are a manifestation of the conflict of the requirements of lexical items. Second, we have seen that representations that do not satisfy the conditions of LF are said to crash at LF. Since derivation originates in the lexicon and proceeds through the morphosyntactic feature checking at LF, then any ill-formed sentences in CS may be assumed to have crashed at LF. The implications for this study are that the constraints on CS can also be ascribed to the morphosyntactic feature checking. The import of these two assumptions will be further explored in the discussion section.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology that is used in this study to research CS between SA and DA. The methodology of this study is presented in the following sections: (a) research design, (b) target population and sampling procedures, (c) data collection, and (d) data coding and analysis procedures.

3.1. Research Design:

The purpose of this study is three-fold: first, to examine the applicability of some of the major syntactic constraints on bilingual CS to bidialectal CS between SA and DA; second, to identify the potential principles that govern CS between the two varieties; and, third, to investigate the sociolinguistic functions of CS in the Arabic sociolinguistic context.

The study of the syntactic aspect of CS in the current study will be framed within the generative grammar framework (Chomsky; 1995; Chomsky and Lasnik, 1993). Central to this framework is the distinction between Principles and Parameters. Language Principles are the core linguistic values that apply invariably to all languages (e.g., locality principle, structure dependency principle, etc.), whereas the parameters are universal aspects of language which can take on a limited number of options and which set the distinctive features of different languages (e.g., head-directionality parameter, pro-drop parameter, etc.). It is these parameters that make languages different from one another in some respects.
Following the traditions of mainstream sociolinguistic research, the current study adopts a qualitative approach to the study of the social functions of CS. It is grounded in both the “ethnography of communication” method of research (Gumperz, 1968; Hymes, 1972) and Heller’s socio-historical approach to bilingualism (Heller, 1988, 1992). According to Jacob (1987, p. 21), “Ethnography of communication provides an approach and methods for understanding the patterns of social interaction characteristic of a group or groups and for analyzing the consequences of these patterns in observable “outcomes.’” Within this approach, language structure, use, and social meanings are equally important for “theoretical discovery” (Hymes, 1972). Moreover, understanding any form of language output relies primarily on understanding the social context in which it occurs (Gumperz, 1992; Labov, 1972). Further, any generalization about language use, structure, and meaning should be viewed in the light of the framework within which subjects interpret their thoughts, feelings, and actions (Marshall and Rossman, 2006). The addition of the socio-historical dimension is necessary to link language choice to other social and historical processes, such as political struggles, power relationships, and the formation of social identities.

This approach is best suited to answer the research questions because it attends to different factors in the interactional process and situates them within micro and macro contextual factors of the discourse and society. In addition, it allows for an inductive approach, where new concepts, abstractions and hypotheses may emerge from the data, and are not merely dictated by existing research. Three main sources of information about a particular population or phenomenon are at the base of this approach: the living members of the social group, the existing texts (letters, journals, books, etc.), and the recorded social histories of the speech community (Ambert et al, 1995). The current study relies mainly on the analysis of oral recorded material. In
addition, the input of the members of the Arabic-speaking communities will be utilized in the form of acceptability judgments of certain sentences in the corpus as well as other sentences created to test particular hypotheses about the structure of CS.

3.2. Population and Sampling Procedure:

The target population of the current study is educated speakers of the Egyptian, Gulf, and Levantine dialects of Arabic, particularly in the domains of religious discussions/lectures, political debates/interviews, and soccer commentaries. Speakers in these domains speak their dialects natively and often command SA to an extent that enables them to use it frequently in their discourse. These three domains occupy different positions on the formal-informal continuum that is characteristic of the Arabic sociolinguistic scene (Ferguson, 1959). Thus, whereas religious speeches and soccer commentaries fall somewhere toward the opposite extreme ends of this continuum, political debates lie closest to the middle. The inclusion of these three domains in this study is important to reflect, first, the spectrum of social contexts in which CS may occur and, second, the potential change in CS patterns in different social environments.

Patton (1990) suggests that, when studying large and vaguely-defined populations, researchers should purposefully select information-rich cases that can illuminate the phenomenon of interest. As Patton puts it, “The logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in-depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research…” (p. 169). Following Patton’s recommendations, the current study will focus on a small group of speakers who were selected purposefully to elucidate the CS patterns in the domains under investigation. Among the population of interest, speakers vary widely in the extent to which
they use SA/DA in their speeches, ranging from entire-SA users to entire-DA users. The selected subjects were known not to be ‘hard-line’ DA-speakers or ‘hard-line’ SA-speakers.

A total of fifty-three speakers, all male, were included in this study. The speakers were selected by “intensity sampling”—a sampling strategy that targets “excellent and rich examples of the phenomenon of interest, but not unusual cases” (Patton, 1990, p.171). These participants produced sufficient instances of CS that may illustrate some of the main structural and functional patterns of CS. In recordings that involve more than one speaker (e.g., political debates), the speech of all speakers was considered, including the interviewer. As noted above, these speakers represent three dialects of Arabic: Egyptian, Gulf, and Levantine. The distribution of speakers in the recordings was as follows: 23 Egyptian speakers (5 preachers, 15 politicians, and 3 commentators); 11 Gulf speakers (3 preachers, 4 politicians, and 4 commentators); and 19 Levantine speakers (3 preachers, 13 politicians, and 3 commentators).

In addition to the fifty-three speakers in the naturalistic data, eleven bidialectal/bilingual speakers were selected for the syntactic-judgment task. These speakers represented the following language pairs: SA-Egyptian (2), SA-Gulf (2), SA-Levantine (2), DA-English (1), DA-French (1), DA-Hebrew (1), DA-Spanish (1), and DA-Turkish (1). The SA-Egyptian, SA-Gulf, and SA-Levantine informants were all international students at the University of Illinois at the time of the experiment. They grew up and completed their high-school education in, respectively, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Syria. The DA-English speaker is a heritage speaker of Syrian Arabic who was born and raised in the U.S. He is fluent in both Syrian Arabic and English. He was an undergraduate student at the time of the experiment. The DA-French speaker was exposed to French from early childhood through his family and formally at the elementary school. He was a graduate student at the time of the experiment. He describes himself as a proficient speaker of
both French and Moroccan Arabic. The DA-Hebrew speaker was a graduate student at the same university. She is a native speaker of Palestinian Arabic. She was born in a community in Palestine where both Palestinian Arabic and Hebrew are used. She also learned Hebrew formally at school. The DA-Spanish speaker is a heritage speaker of Palestinian Arabic, who was born and raised in the States. His father is Palestinian and his mother is from Columbia (in South America). Although he considers English to be his main language of use, he has a good command of both Palestinian Arabic and Spanish. The DA-Turkish speaker speaks Kurdish natively and speaks Syrian Arabic and Turkish fluently. He lives in a city in Southern Turkey that has a mixture of Kurdish, Turkish, and Arab populations. He also has relatives in Syria, whom he visits from time to time. For consistency purposes, I will use the term “informants” to refer to the participants in the experimental part of the study and the term “subjects” to identify speakers in the naturalistic data.

3.3. Data Collection:

The study uses both naturalistic and experimentally-elicited data for examining the structure and functions of CS in the Arabic context. Labov (1972, p. 180) suggests that sociolinguistic research should use “large volumes of well-recorded natural data” that represents and characterizes the sociolinguistic phenomenon in question. The importance of naturalistic data lies in its potential to reveal spontaneous, unplanned speech. Thus, it reduces the chance of having the speakers change their speech styles or monitor their utterances—a change that may lead to the artificiality of the data. Naturalistic data is particularly important for studying the social functions of CS. On the other hand, the experimentally-elicited data is needed to verify the observed patterns and to test hypotheses that emerge from these patterns. The use of
acceptability-judgment data is an accepted practice in linguistic research and is useful for testing hypotheses about formal structures. Moreover, the need to use experimental data becomes apparent when we consider the different types of speech errors that occur in natural speech. In other words, naturalistic data does not always reflect the speaker’s knowledge about the language or his/her linguistic accuracy.

In this study, three sets of naturally-produced data were examined, each representing one of the domains under investigation. The naturalistic data was collected in two stages. In stage one, a total of fifty-one audio and video recordings were downloaded from Aljazeera.net, Youtube.com, Googlevideo.com, Islamway.com, Islamweb.com, and the websites of selected preachers. These recordings are available for public use. Of these fifty-one recordings, thirty were selected for their information-richness and suitability to the topic. In addition, five DVDs were obtained for soccer games in Egypt (2), Jordan (1), and Syria (2). Thus, the total number of the recordings examined in this study was thirty-five. The distribution of the recordings across the three domains was as follows: 11 religious speeches, 14 political debates/interviews, and 10 soccer commentaries (Appendix A). The duration of the recordings ranged between 30 and 95 minutes. The overall duration of the corpus of the recorded data was about 27 hours. The recordings of the political debates/interviews came from three well-known debate shows on the Aljazeera Channel, namely, ˈl-ʔittijaah l-muʃaakes (The Opposite Direction), ʔakθar min raʔj (More Than One Opinion), and bilaa huduud (Without Limits). The religious lectures/discussions were delivered to local audiences in mosques, only one religious discussion (RS2) was aired on TV. The soccer commentaries were all on recent games played between 2007 and 2010, some are between national teams and some between local soccer teams in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Syria.
The second ten-minute segment was selected from each of the thirty-five recordings and then transcribed verbatim. The corpus of the transcribed data contained approximately 41,100 words. Table 1 shows the number of words in the transcribed data as well as the frequency of switches. In religious speeches and political debates, only switches to DA were counted, whereas in soccer commentaries, only switches to SA were counted. Both the audio-/video-recordings and the corpus of the transcribed data were used to examine the patterns and contexts of CS.

Table 1: Number of Words and Switches in the Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Switches</th>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Switches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape 1</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Tape 19</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 2</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Tape 20</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 3</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Tape 21</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 4</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Tape 22</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 5</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Tape 23</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 6</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Tape 24</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 7</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Tape 25</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 8</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Tape 26</td>
<td>soccer</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 9</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Tape 27</td>
<td>soccer</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 10</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Tape 28</td>
<td>soccer</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 11</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Tape 29</td>
<td>soccer</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the corpus of the transcribed data, a total of two hundred and thirty-five sentences were created at a later stage of the study to test some hypotheses about the structure of CS that emerged from the data (see Appendix B). Out of this corpus, ninety-four sentences were fillers. The experimental stimuli represented forty-seven sentence types, each involving three experimental tokens and two fillers. In compiling the corpus, I relied primarily on my language experience and the input of the eleven bidialectal/bilingual informants who speak the language varieties represented in the sentences. For consistency purposes, the Levantine dialect was used in all of the sentences involving DA, on one hand, and English, French, Hebrew, Spanish, and Turkish, on the other hand.

The experimental sentences were written down on paper and then typed. Three months after the construction of the sentences, the same bilingual/bidialectal informants were presented with these sentences, one at a time, and were asked to judge their acceptability using one of three options: acceptable, unacceptable, or neutral. Since the Arabic dialects are not typically written,
the DA elements in the sentences were transliterated using SA letters (see Appendix B). DA text was also underlined to avoid possible confusion with SA forms. For confirmation and validity purposes, the sentences involving DA and SA were recorded and re-presented for bidialectal-speaker judgment. No change was observed in these judgments.

Before presenting the sentences, I explained to the informants that some speakers who know more than one language or dialect often switch between these languages/dialects, which results in sentences that are sometimes correct and sometimes incorrect. They were further told that the sentences that they were to judge involved this form of switching. The subjects were tested individually.

3.4. Data Coding and Analysis:

Before delving into the issue of data coding and analysis, it is important to clarify how different linguistic forms were categorized as belonging to SA and DA. As noted above, SA and DA overlap not only in terms of their sounds and vocabulary, but also in many of their phonological, morphological, and syntactic rules. The researcher used his own intuition and the judgment of three other native speakers of the Egyptian, Gulf, and Levantine dialects to determine SA words and DA words. In addition, Al-Munjed Arabic-Arabic Dictionary was used as a point of reference for determining SA words.

The current study follows Eid’s (1988) guidelines in determining where a switch is initiated. Eid suggests that the identification of switches should be based on cases where clear SA or DA forms are used. This principle excludes ambiguous cases, that is, language forms that are shared by the two varieties (p. 56). In the current data, for example, the word ‘masřuul’
‘official’ cannot start a switch either to SA or DA because it belongs to both. However, phonological and morphological cues were sometimes used to make a distinction between the forms of the two varieties (e.g., kursi (chair) in SA vs. ƙarsi in LDA). *Intermediate forms*, those belonging to one variety but which are morphologically or phonologically modified according to the rules of the other, are categorized in one variety or the other based on the presence or absence of similar alternative forms for the speaker (pp. 55-56). In the data, a word like ‘raaḥa’ ‘went.3S.M’ is considered a DA form, even though it ends with SA indicative-mood marker, namely ‘a.’ This is because the alternative SA form “ðahaba” was conceivably available to the speaker (just as it would expectedly be available to educated speakers of Arabic in general). It is for this same reason that a word like “ðahab” (went.3S.M.) is counted as SA even when it ends with no past-tense marking (which is characteristic of DA verbs).

The naturalistic data was analyzed using an interpretive qualitative approach (Glesne, 1998). Within this paradigm, “it is possible to understand the subjective meaning of action (grasping the actor’s beliefs, desires and so on) yet do so in an objective manner” (Schwandt, 2000, p.193). The transcribed data was coded following the procedure recommended by Glesne (1998) for data cataloging using analytic codes, categorization, and theme-searching. The first step was to systematically read the transcribed data and then code those segments that are relevant to the research questions. In formulating the codes, both the immediate event in which the speech took place as well as the broader Arabic sociolinguistic context were taken into account. As Heller (1988b) suggests, the employment of an approach that is both top down and bottom up allows for explaining the speech in its relevant setting as well as its sociolinguistic function.
After this basic grouping of data, recurring codes within each group were identified and then labeled into coding patterns. Relevant quotations were grouped with their related codes and then translated into English. To ensure the anonymity of the speakers, pseudonyms were used to identify individual speakers. Lastly, the relationships between coding patterns were sought and then assembled into themes and sub-themes. These broad themes were compared to those found in the relevant literature for cross-referencing purposes. Linguistic analysis followed the coding process and resulted in the findings that will be discussed in the following chapter. Native speaker judgments were used to ascertain the existence of the syntactic constraints.

Insofar as the acceptability-judgment task is concerned, the sentences were coded simply as acceptable, unacceptable, or neutral based on the judgments of bilingual/bidialectal speakers. All sentences that received undecided judgments (e.g., ‘not sure,’ ‘a little awkward,’ etc.) were coded as ‘neutral.’ Neutral sentences were excluded from the analysis. As noted above, the sentences from each of the SA-DA pairs (i.e., the SA-Egyptian, SA-Gulf, and SA-Levantine) were judged by two informants. The criteria for determining the final (un)acceptability of a sentence were as follows:

- For a sentence to be considered acceptable, it should receive two ‘acceptable’ judgments.
- For a sentence to be regarded unacceptable, both informants should judge it as ‘unacceptable’. Unacceptable sentences are marked in the text by an asterisk (*).
- Anything in between these two extremes is considered neutral. Neutral judgments are marked by a question mark (?).

On the other hand, the sentences involving CS between DA, on one hand, and English, French, Hebrew, Spanish, and Turkish, on the other hand, were judged by bilingual speakers.
The sentences from each language pair (e.g., DA-English) were judged by a single bilingual speaker. Hence, sentences were considered (un)acceptable based on the judgment of the bilingual speaker.
CHAPTER 4
MAIN FINDINGS

This chapter is dedicated to presenting the main findings of the study. The findings will be organized under three main sections, each addressing one of the research questions. In the first section, I will examine the applicability of some of the most widely cited universal syntactic constraints on CS between SA and DA as well as the claim that CS is universally unconstrained. In the second section, I will try to identify the principles and constraints that govern CS between the two varieties. In the third section, I will focus on the functional patterns of CS between SA and DA before I discuss their social meanings and functions in the next chapter.

4.1 Universal Constraints on CS:

This section addresses the first research question, namely, *do the universal syntactic constraints on CS often found in bilingual speech apply to bidialectal CS between SA and DA?* As noted above, studies claiming the universality of the structural constraints on CS fall under one of three main hypotheses: (1) CS is constrained by CS-specific rules (e.g., Belazi, et al, 1994; Joshi, 1985; Di Sciullo et al, 1986; Poplack, 1981); (2) CS is restricted by the same general principles that govern monolingual speech (e.g., Mahootian, 1993, 1996; MacSwan, 1999, 2005; Chan, 2003, 2008); (3) CS is governed by system-based constraints (e.g., Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2001; Jake, Myers-Scotton, and Gross, 2002). The following overview will outline the predictions of these three main views and present evidence against the applicability of each in the context of Arabic.
4.1.1. CS-specific constraints:

The premise that CS is governed by CS-specific constraints seems to predominate in CS literature (Belazi, et al, 1994; Joshi, 1985; Di Sciullo et al, 1986; Bentahila & Davies, 1983; Poplack, 1980; Pfaff. 1979; Kachru, 1978; Timm, 1975; Lipski, 1978; Stenson, 1990, among many others). For the sake of exposition, I will focus on five widely cited constraints on intrasentential CS in bilingual speech. I will show that these constraints, which may well apply in bilinguals’ CS, do not apply in CS generated by bidialectal speakers.

Belazi, et al (1994) suggests that the Functional Head Constraint holds true in all speech, and particularly between a functional head and its complement. This constraint makes it mandatory for the functional head and its complement to be in the same language. For example, switching is not permitted between C\textsuperscript{0} and IP, D\textsuperscript{0} and its complement NP, and Nom and its complement NP. However, the data shows that switching does occur between these elements, as (22), (23), (24), and (25) show.

(22) nantaDir  ámb-ahdaaf  ámblii  hija muasıat  wa  halaawat  wa  rawasıat  kurat ámb-qadam
Wait.1p  the-goals  which  it  enjoyment  and  beauty  and  splendor  soccer
‘We are waiting for the goals, which are the enjoyment, beauty, and splendor of soccer’
(LDA/SA, SC9)

(23) ñana  ámb-DaabeT  wa  ka-qaa¿ed  fii  haa¿a  l-waed  laa  ñastaTii¿  ñan  ñatanaSSal  min  haa¿a
I  as-officer  and  as-leader  in  this  the-time  NEG  can.1s  to  withdraw.1s  from  this
‘As an officer and leader at this time, I cannot withdraw from this’
(EDA/SA, PD3)

(24) tna¿sær  daqiqa  mu¿iirah  bein  l-fariiqajn
twelve  minute  exciting  between  the-teams.dual
‘Twelve exciting minutes between the two teams’
(LDA/SA, SC9)
In example (22), the complement IP hija mutṣat wa halaawat wa rawṣat kurat ẓl-qadam (which is the enjoyment, beauty and splendor of soccer) is switched after its functional head illi ‘that.’ In example (23), the D\(^0\) haāḍa (this) is in SA, whereas its complement l-waʔt (the time) is in DA. Likewise, in (24) and (25), the Noms tnaʕšar (twelve) and sabataʃš (seventeen) appear before the NPs daqiqa (minute) and nuqTah (point), with the Noms rendered in DA and the NPs in SA. Although the functional head in each of these sentences, namely C, D, and Nom is in one variety and its complement is in another, these sentences are still acceptable. Thus, the Functional Head Constraints does not seem to be operative in the case of CS between SA and DA.

Di Sciullo, et al (1986) suggests that their Government Constraint operates in all natural languages. This constraint prevents CS between two elements that are tied by a government relationship, such as a V and its complement clause, V and its direct or indirect object, and V and its complement PP. However, the predictions of the Government Constraint are not borne out in the data, as (26), (27), (28), (29), and (30) show:

(26) leih maa tʔul-ʃ li-l-raʔis… ?an jafriDa n-niqaab ʕala n-nisaa? ?
   why NEG say.2s.m-NEG to-the-president to enforce.3s.m the-niqaab on the-women
   ‘Why do not you ask the president to impose the niqaab (face cover) on women?’ (EDA/SA, PD2)

(27) min l-ʔistihalaah ?an jatamakkan haʔda l-ʕarabi l-ʕaDiim l-baTal… ?innu jidaxxal kamira…
   From the-impossible to be able.3s.m this the-Arab the-great the-hero to-he enter.3s.m camera
   ‘It is impossible for this great Arab hero to be able to enter a camera’ (EDA/SA, PD1)
(28) ma ʔdar-š aʔuul haaða
NEG can.1s- NEG say.1s this

‘I cannot say this’ (EDA/SA, PD3)

(29) ʔaajez aʔuul ʔal-ʔaati
wanting say.1s the-following

‘I want to say the following’ (EDA/SA, PD8)

(30) ʔarguu-k ʔan tattaSāl bii-h wa bi-wajri-h
request.1s-you to contact.2s.m with-him and by-other-him

‘I request from you to contact him or someone else’ (EDA/SA, PD1)

Example (26) shows that the SA complement clause ʔan jafriDa n-niqaab ʔala n-nisaaʔ (to impose the niqaab on women) is switched after the DA verb tʔul (say). Likewise, the SA verb jatamakkan (be able) in (27) is followed by the DA complement clause ʔinnu jidaxxal kamira (to enter a camera). Switching also occurs between the DA verb aʔuul (say) and its respective SA objects haaða (this) and ʔal-ʔaati (the following) in (28) and (29). The same can be said of example (30), where the code of the verb tattaSāl (contact) and that of its complement PP biih (with him) are not the same. These sentences demonstrate that V and its various complements (IP, NP, and PP) can be in two different varieties. This suggests that the Government Constraints falls short of explaining the phenomenon of CS between SA and DA.

Joshi (1985) suggests that closed-class items, such as determiners, possessives, negation elements, numbers, complementizers, and auxiliaries, cannot be switched. However, Joshi’s Constraint on Closed-Class Items is not supported in the data, as examples (26) and (27) above show. In each case, a closed class item (i.e., number) from the embedded language undergoes
switching. The following examples further show that closed class items, such as determiners, possessives, negation elements, and numbers can be switched between SA and DA:

(31) haadi l-kura hija l-?axTar munðu bidaaj? l-liqaa?
    this ball is the-most dangerous since start the-match
   ‘This is the most dangerous ball since the start of the match’ (LDA/SA, SC9)

(32) takallam min qalb-a ?an taswiijat ?al-xilaafaat ?al-?arabijja
    spoke.3s.m. from heart-his about settling the-disputes the-Arab
   ‘He spoke from his heart about settling the Arab disputes’ (GDA/SA, PD4)

(33) lli j?athaddað bi-lu?ka naa?ima wa haadi?a wa hiwaarijja maa jaqbaluun-a
    that speaks.3s.m in-language soft and quiet and negotiatory NEG accept.3p.m-him
   ‘The one who speaks in a soft, quiet, and negotiatory language will not be accepted by them’
   (GDA/SA, PD5)

(34) daxala marmaa-h tlaTa?sar hadaf
    entered net-his thirteen goals
   ‘Thirteen goals entered his net’ (LDA/SA, SC9)

In (31), the sentence starts with the DA determiner haadi (this) after which a switch occurs to SA. In Example (32), the whole sentence is rendered in SA with the exception of the possessive adjective –a (his), at which the speaker switches to DA. The same applies to (33), where the negative marker maa (NEG) is expressed in DA. In the last example, the DA number tlaTa?sar (thirteen) is switched. Again, this constraint does not seem to be validated in the data and does not therefore seem to apply to CS between SA and DA.

The fourth constraint, namely, the Free Morpheme Constraint formulated by Poplack (1981) postulates that CS is not allowed between a bound morpheme and its host free morpheme. Example (35) and (36), however, show that the agreement marker -u, a bound morpheme in
Arabic, and its host verbs are not in the same language variety. Likewise, in example (37), the gender and number marker –aat is switched to DA in an all-SA sentence.

(35) baDu-hum jataSawwar-u ?anna l-Sibadaa liwaadiha takfii
       some-them imagine-3.s.m that the-worship by itself suffices.3.s.f
   ‘Some of them think that worship by itself suffices’ (LDA/SA, RS10)

(36) haðihi l-quwa jataSaara-u Sala S-SulTa
    This.f. the-forces struggle-3.p. on power
   ‘These forces struggle for power.’ (LDA/SA, RS11)

(37) ?ar-ragaa? wa l-xawf mutawaazinaat7
    the-hope and the-fear balanced.3.p.f
   ‘Hope and fear are balanced.’ (EDA/SA, RS1)

These three examples demonstrate the possibility of switching between a bound morpheme and its host free morpheme. Therefore, they provide evidence against the extendibility of the Free Morpheme Constraint to CS between SA and DA.

Poplack’s Equivalence Constraint disallows the occurrence of a switch within a constituent generated by a rule from one language which is not shared by the other. This constraint simply requires mixed sentences and constituents to satisfy the word order requirements of each of the participating languages at the surface structure. The following examples are not consistent with this constraint:

(38) l-amwaal di had bi-jaksab-ha
    the-money this someone ASP-earn.3.s.m-it
   ‘This money is earned by someone’ (EDA/SA, PD11)
(39) ?al-quds  di qaDijjah ?islamijjah
   Jerusalem  this issue  Islamic
   ‘This Jerusalem is an Islamic issue’ (EDA/SA, PD8)

(40) nərgați  nišuuf ... l-kuura haadhi fii muntaha  l-xuTuura
   go back.1pl  see.1pl ... the-ball  this  in maximum the-danger
   ‘Let’s go back and see this ball…extremely dangerous’ (EDA/SA, SC3)

The determiner phrase in SA has a D-NP order (haadhi l-haqiibah (this bag)), whereas in EDA it has an NP-D structure (š-šanTa di (bag this)). The DP in (38) consists of the SA noun phrase l-ʔamwaal and the postnominal DA determiner di (this). Since the determiner occurs postnominally, the phrase does not violate the word order of DA. However, it does violate the word order of the SA noun phrase, which should follow the determiner. The same also applies to example (39), where the location of the DA di (this) after the noun phrase l-quds (Jerusalem) violates the word order requirements of SA, but meets those of DA. Example (40) is interesting because the DA noun phrase l-kuura occurs phrase-initially and the SA determiner occurs postnominally—a word order that also violates the requirements of SA.

The equivalence constraint also does not account for sentences where the word order requirements for both languages are met, and yet the resulting sentences differ in their well-formedness, as examples (41), (42), and (43) from the experimental data show:

(41) a. šəlt  haadhi š-šanta (LDA/SA, EXP)
b. *šəlt this š-šanta (LDA/English, EXP)
   carried.1s. this the-bag
   ‘I carried this bag’
In sentence (41a,b), switches occur between a a determiner and its NP complement, both in the correct S-structure position for SA and English. Yet, the switch to SA is grammatical, whereas the one to English is not. The discrepancy appears in (42a, b) as well, but with the verb being switched this time. Example (43a, b) displays the same pattern as a result of switching the preposition and the following noun phrase. Although the S-structure of PPs in DA, SA, and English are the same, a preposition switched to English will result in an ill-formed sentence, while one switched to SA will produce a well-formed sentence. This suggests that word order requirements may not be the only factor needed to explain CS between SA and DA.

Overall, it is clear that none of the five intrasentential constraints examined here apply in the case of CS between SA and DA. This means that these CS-specific constraints do not explain the principles underlying CS between SA and DA. The results fall in line with a number of studies which have shown that these constraints are not extendable to language pairs other than the one in which they were identified (Clyne, 1987; Bokamba, 1989; El-Noory, 1985; Mahootian, 1993; MacSwan, 1999).
4.1.2. General Constraints on CS and Monolingual Speech:

The second hypothesis suggests that CS is constrained by the same rules that govern monolingual speech (Mahootian, 1996; MacSwan, 1999, 2003, 2005; Chan, 2003, 2008; Aabi, 2004). Mahootian (1993, 1996), Chan (2003, 2008), and Aabi (2004) argue that double-coded utterances are generated by the same principles that are responsible for creating monolingual speech. Mahootian’s argument is guided by the notion that, in a given phrase, heads determine the position, category, and features of their complements (Mahootian, 1996, p. 380). Chan (2003, 2008) and Aabi (2004) follow a similar line of argument, but restrict their theories to functional heads. However, whereas Chan argues that functional heads simply determine the word order and category of their complements, Aabi argues that the features of functional categories place restrictions on their specifiers and complements alike. In all three accounts, however, a complement that does not conform to the stipulations of the head will render the sentence ungrammatical. This prediction does not seem to be supported in the data, as the following examples show:

(44) /uni0259n-nu?Ta l-muhimma /uni0294haaðe?jažeb ?an tu?xxað bi-?ajn al-?i?tibaar
     the-point the-important this have to take.PASS with-eye the-consideration
     ‘This important point has to be taken into consideration’ (EDA/SA, RS4)

(45) l-bartamaan g-gdiid haαda mumkin jitkisir bisuhuula
     The-jar the-new this possible break.3s.m.PASS easily
     ‘This new jar can be broken easily’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(46) l-karavittaat ?g-gidiida haαdihi hilwa ?awi
     the-ties the-new this.f beautiful very
     ‘These new ties are very beautiful’ (EDA/SA, EXP)
In Example (44), the complement of the initial DP, namely the DA noun phrase \textit{\text{n-nu?Ta l-muhimma} (important point)}, occurs phrase-initially, thus violating the word order requirement of the SA head \textit{haa\textbeta{\textepsilon}h} (this), but without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence. The equivalent form in SA is \textit{haa\textbeta{\textepsilon}h \text{n-nu?Ta l-muhimma} and in DA is \text{n-nu?Ta l-muhimma di} (where \textit{di} is the determiner). In other words, the functional head does not determine the position of its complement in this sentence, which violates the predictions of Mahootian’s, Chan’s, and Aabi’s theories. A similar situation exists in (45) and (46) with the SA complements \textit{l-bartamaan g-gdiid} (the new jar) and \textit{l-karavittaat og-gidiida} (the new ties) failing to follow the determiners \textit{haa\textbeta{\textepsilon}a} (this.m) and \textit{haa\textbeta{\textepsilon}ihi} (this.f), respectively, as the rules of SA require. In all of these examples, the violation of the head-complement relationships does not affect the grammaticality of the sentences. Thus, Mahootian’s, Chan’s and Aabi’s arguments for the integrity of the functional head-complement constituent are not supported in the current CS data. In fact, Aabi (2004, p. 68) points to the “‘difficulty’ but ‘not impossibility’ of FCs’ [Functional Heads] switching.”

Similarly, MacSwan (1999, 2001, 2005) argues that “nothing constrains CS apart from the requirements of the mixed grammars” (MacSwan, 1999, p. 14). This stipulation implies that CS will be prohibited only at points where the requirements between languages conflict. Examples (38), (39), (40), (44), (45), and (46) are all counter examples to MacSwan’s hypothesis. In each of these sentences, the requirements of the SA grammar are not met (i.e., only those of DA are satisfied), and yet the sentences are well-formed. Moreover, MacSwan (1999) and van Gelderen and MacSwan (2008) argue that CS is constrained by the \textit{\text{PF Disjunction Theorem}}. This constraint rules out the possibility of CS within the PF component because the latter "consists of rules which must be (partially) ordered with respect to each other,
and these orders vary cross-linguistically” (MacSwan, 1999, p. 188). The PF Disjunction Theorem therefore negates the possibility of attaching inflectional/functional morphemes of one language variety to the stem in another variety head-internally. The following examples disconfirm MacSwan’s specification:

(47) zi\jada\d\u00e1tu l-\?as\u00e1\'\u00e1r bi-tuzaw\u00e1d Tab\u00e1\' an l-faqr
    increase the-prices ASP-increase of course the-povery
    ‘The high price of course may increase poverty’ (EDA/SA, PD11)

(48) lam\u0107\u00e1ma b-tawwuu \u00e2\u0131la saraj\u0107r-kum, ta\u0107akkaruu \u00e2d\u00e0\u00e6\u0113a l-hadi\u00e6\u0131\u00e6
    When go.2p to beds-your remember.2p this the-Hadith
    ‘When you go to your beds, remember this (Prophetic) Hadith’ (LDA/SA, RS11)

(49) maa ma\u0107\u0155\u00e6na \u00e2\u0131n tusakkara kul l-ma\u0107\u0155\u015b\u0107\u00e6\u00e6?ila k\u0107\u00e6zza
    what meaning to close.3s.f.PASS all entrances to Gaza
    ‘What does the closing of all of the entrances to Gaza mean?’ (LDA/SA, RS11)

Example (47) has the SA stem tazi\u00e6d (increase), to which the DA aspectual bi- is attached. The attachment of the aspectual marker is responsible for production of the phonologically hybrid stem, which is a mixture of the SA verb tazi\u00e6d and the DA verb bitzaw\u00e1d. Particularly relevant here is the role of the insertion of the vowel -u- in changing the internal structure of the stem. In (48), the SA root sari\u00e6r (bed) (which is not used in LDA) is pluralized by being mapped on a template from DA, leading to the formation of the broken-plural noun saraaj\u0131r (beds). Although broken plurals are formed in both SA and DA through prosodically templatic morphology involving such processes as vowel insertion, vowel deletion, vowel lengthening, degemination, and so on (McCarthy and Prince, 1990), these two varieties sometimes avail different prosodic templates to realize the broken plural. In the last example, passive voice is realized by mapping
the DA stem *sakkar* on the passive voice melody of SA (Watson, 2009). The DA equivalent of this passive verb is *bi-sakruuha* (they close it) or *btatsakkar* (is closed). All of these three examples involve attaching inflectional morphemes head-internally by “inserting” different vowels in the consonantal root.

It is evident then that the predictions of MacSwan’s model are disconfirmed in the current data. In general, the current analysis shows that CS between SA and DA may not be explained by the theories proposed by Mahootian (1996), Chan (2003, 2008) and MacSwan (1999, 2005).

4.1.3. System-based Constraints:

The third hypothesis suggests that the constraints on CS are based on a system of CS, which specifies the syntactic environments in which CS may or may not occur. A well-known example of these models is the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993a) and colleagues (Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2001; Jake et al, 2002). As noted in section 2.4.1.2.3, the MLF builds on two main principles:

*The System Morpheme Principle*: All syntactically relevant system morphemes must come from the ML. (Myers-Scotton, 1993a, p. 7)

*The Morpheme Order Principle*: Morpheme order must not violate the ML morpheme order. (Myers-Scotton, 1993a, p. 7)
The System Morpheme Principle requires first an identification of the ML. According to Jake et al (2002), the ML is the language that contributes more morphemes in a single CP. The System Morpheme Principle predicts that all of the system/syntactic morphemes within a single CP come from a single language, the ML. However, the data in this study suggests that the system morphemes of a CP may come from both SA and DA, as (50) and (51) demonstrate:

(50) haadi l-kura kannat tahtaaž ?ila lamsa
    This the-ball was.3s.f need3s.f to touch
    ‘This ball needed a touch’ (LDA/SA, SC10)

(51) kaana janbaž ?an jumarrir l-kura ?ila zamiil-u
    was. ought to pass.3s.m. the-ball to colleague-his
    ‘He should have passed the ball to Fadi Mirši’ (LDA/SA, SC10)

In (50), all the content morphemes come from SA. However, the system morphemes come from both SA and DA. For example, the determiner haadi (this) come from DA, whereas the tense marker kannat come from DA. Similarly, in (51) tense marker kaana comes from SA, while the possessive particle –u comes from DA. The existence of system morphemes from both varieties not only makes the distinction between the ML and EL irrelevant, but also makes the task of identifying the ML impossible. At the same time, it shows that the System Morpheme Principle is not operative in the case of CS between SA and DA.

The second principle in the MLF model, namely, the Morpheme Order Principle predicts that only the ML sets the morpheme order in ML + EL CPs. The predictions of this principle are not validated in the data, as the following two examples show:
In both (52) and (53), all of the system morphemes come from SA, and yet the morpheme order is that of DA. These sentences are instances of wh-in-situ, that is, the wh-word in each does not undergo movement, as is required by SA rules. This word order is characteristic of a number of dialects of Arabic such as Egyptian (Wahba, 1984). In other words, although SA is the ML, the word order is that of the EL. Thus, the three CPs do not conform to the Morpheme Order Principle.

We can therefore conclude that the MLF framework does not apply to the case of CS between SA and DA. This conclusion confirms the findings of previous studies on the applicability of the MLF to bilingual CS between Arabic and French and bidialectal CS between SA and other Arabic dialects (Bentahila, 1995; Boussofara-Omar, 2003; Bassiouney, 2009). In fact, Myers-Scotton (1993a) acknowledges that her model may apply only to classic cases of CS between typologically distinct languages (e.g., Swahili/English, Hindi/English, Moroccan Arabic/French, etc.).

In summary, it is evident that CS between SA and DA eludes all of the major intrasentential constraints, models and specifications that have been reported in the CS literature. This suggests that none of them accurately identifies the principle(s) operative in CS between SA and DA and, indeed, in CS in general. It should be remarked that these constraints were typically
identified in bilingual CS. The fact that these constraints do not apply in the case of CS between SA and DA suggests, rather unsurprisingly, that the rules of bidialectal CS are essentially different from their counterparts in bilingual CS. It is helpful to remember that bidialectal CS is characterized by the use of two varieties that are historically and structurally related (Ferguson, 1959).

4.2. Universal Absence of Constraints:

A number of researchers have in fact argued that CS in universally unconstrained (Bokamba, 1989; Lance, 1975). The following examples from the experimental data show the fragility of this position:

(54) *haaða l-kalaam sawfa jibʔa ben-na
    This the-speech will stay.3s.m between-us
    ‘This speech will stay between us’ (EDA/DA, EXP)

(55) *lam ?arrab min-na
    NEG come close.3s.m from-us
    ‘He did not come close to us’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(56) *qaabaltu T-Tullaaba llaðiina bizakru fi l-maktaba
    met.1s the-students that study.3p in the-library
    ‘I met the students who study in the library’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

In sentence (54), switching the DA verb jibʔa (stay) after the SA future-tense marker sawfa (will) results in an unacceptable sentence. The same can be said about examples (55) and (56), where
shifting to the DA verb ِعَرْبُ (come close) and IP ِبِيزَكْرُ فِي ِل-مَاكِتَبَةَ (study in the library), respectively, results in ungrammatical sentences.

In fact, the literature abounds with examples underlying the existence of such constraints between different language pairs, as can be seen in the following examples:

(57) *Ktib ُغَاشِرَا ِلِيَوْرَس.  
wrote.3s.m. ten books  
’He wrote ten books.’ (Tunisian Arabic/French, Belazi, et al, 1994, p. 229)

(58) *Yul ُمُتَو َنِي ِالْبَسَسَةَ ِسَنَتَو  
that person is child  
’That person is the boss’s child.’ (Swahili/English, Myers-Scotton, 1993a, p. 109)

(59) *I left ِتَسَلَ ِلِبَر  
this table on  
’I left the book on this table.’ (Hindi/English, Bhatt, 1997, p. 238)

(60) *some chairs ُواَر  
on  
’On some chairs’ (English/Marathi, Joshi, 1985, p. 195)

(61) *Nimis-tlasojtla ِمِن ِتِ  
iS-2Os-love IN you/SING/ACC  
’I love you.’ (Nahuatl/Spanish, MacSwan, 1997, p. 205)

(62) *I went to the house ِشِيْقَيْتَا.  
’I want to the house small,’ (Spanish/ English, Pfaff, 1979, p. 307)

The structural conflict between the two participating languages makes the sentences ungrammatical. It is interesting to note that sometimes sentences were judged unacceptable even
when single words from one of the participating languages are embedded in a sentence rendered in the other language.

### 4.3. Principles of CS between SA and DA:

This section deals with the second research question, namely, *what syntactic principles govern bidialectal CS and how do these relate to CS in general?* The analysis has shown so far that, unlike bilingual CS, bidialectal CS between SA and DA can occur between a functional head and its complement, between a governed element and its governor, between a bound morpheme and its host element, among closed-class items, within constituents generated by a rule from one language which is not shared by the other, among system morphemes, across functional categories, and between different heads and complements. The analysis therefore calls for an explanation of why the syntactic constraints on CS in bilingual speech cannot be extended to bidialectal CS between SA and DA and a specification of the principles governing CS between these two varieties.

To account for the inconsistent application of constraints in bilingual CS and bidialectal CS between SA and DA, I hypothesize that whereas bilingual CS constraints arise as a result of parameter differences between the two participating languages, CS between SA and DA eludes these constraints as a result of the structural compatibility between the two varieties. Chomsky (1995) and Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) propose that, along with the invariant principles that apply to all languages (e.g., locality principle, structure dependency principle, etc.), languages have specific parameters that make them different from one another in some respects (e.g., head-directionality parameter, pro-drop parameter, etc.). The existence of these parameters explains
not only the variations in the structures of typologically distinct languages, but also the emergence of constraints at specific points in double-coded sentences.

On the other hand, the absence of constraints on CS between SA and DA may be resulting from the parametric convergence of the two varieties. In other words, the notable structural overlap between SA and DA makes it possible to switch between them at points where parametric differences would prevent CS in bilingual speech. For exposition purposes, I will focus on three parameters: the pro-drop parameter, head-directionality parameter, and V-V construction parameter (often referred to as serial verb parameter). Bilinguals’ judgments are utilized here to verify the acceptability of these sentences.

The pro-drop (also known as the ‘null-subject’) parameter specifies whether a language can have tensed clauses with phonologically empty subjects (Chomsky, 1981). As a pro-drop language, Arabic allows ‘subjectless’ sentences, whereas French, as a non-pro-drop language, does not. Sentences (63), (64), and (65) are judged unacceptable by Arabic-French bilinguals:

(63) *Elle s’est déménagé récemment. vit bɔ-ɻ-madiini
    She be moved recently lives.3s.f. in the-city
    ‘She has moved recently. (She) lives in the city’  (LDA/ French, EXP)

(64) *Nous possedons une boutique. vendons xɔDra w-fawaaki
     We own a shop sell.1p vegetables and-fruits
     ‘We have a shop. (We) sell vegetables and fruits’  (LDA/French, EXP)

(65) *George est polyglotte. Parle tɿt luwuat
    George is multilingual. Speaks.3s.m. three languages
    ‘George is multilingual. (He) speaks three languages’  (LDA/French, EXP)
In (63), the verbal inflectional morpheme –t in vit (lives) prescribes that the subject is third-person singular feminine ‘elle’. Yet, the sentence is judged ungrammatical because the verb lacks an overt subject (although it is judged as acceptable when the pronoun ‘elle’ is placed before the verb). The same reason stands behind the unacceptability of (64) and (65). According to Chomsky’s principle of recoverability (1981), the subject may be dropped if reference to the subject can be recovered from certain other parts of the sentence. However, this does not seem to be the case in any of the three sentences. Thus, the pro-drop parameter prevents the occurrence of these two examples.

The head-directionality parameter (Travis, 1984) specifies the position of the head in a phrase. For example, Arabic is a head-initial language because the head always comes at the beginning of the phrase, whereas Turkish is a head-final language. While Arabic has a standard SVO word order, Turkish has an SOV word order. (66), (67) and (68) are judged unacceptable due to the difference between Arabic and Turkish in terms of the head-directionality parameter:

(66). *Köpek içiyor majj
dog drank water

‘The dog drank water.’ (LDA/Turkish, EXP)

(67) *Adam kirdi rižl-u
man broke leg-his

‘The man broke his leg.’ (LDA/Turkish, EXP)

(68) *Kız yedi bərətʔaani
girl ate bərətʔaani

‘The girl ate an orange.’ (LDA/Turkish, EXP)
The existence of the DA object *majj* ‘water’ in (66) becomes a point of tension between the requirement of Turkish for an SOV word order and that of Arabic for an SVO word order. This explains why the sentence is ungrammatical. The same can be said of (67) and (68), where switching to a DA object generates a conflict in the requirements of the grammars of Turkish and that of DA in terms of the head-directionality parameter.

The V-V construction parameter\(^\text{10}\) (Sebba, 1987; Baker, 2001) describes the case of a number of languages that allow for the sequencing of two verbs (or verb phrases) without an intervening conjunction. According to Sebba (1987), V-V constructions are characterized by having a single subject; two or more verbs without overt markers of coordination or subordination and with identical tense, aspect, mood, and polarity markings; and underlying actions that occur either simultaneously or consecutively. Newmeyer (2004) argues that the most important property of V-V constructions is that they share a single argument. Despite the wide controversy about the essential features of different V-V constructions (see Newmeyer, 2004), researchers generally agree that different languages behave differently with respect to certain V-V constructions. This is particularly true of constructions identifying the basic structure V (NP) V (NP). Arabic exhibits a variety of serial and quasi-V-V constructions, one of which is illustrated in examples (69), (70), and (71):

(69) a. qum nam (SA)
    b. /uni0294 nam (LDA)
       go/stand.2s.m sleep-2s.m
       ‘Sleep!’

(70) a. taSaala n-Dur (SA)
    b. taSa Come.2s.m Dur see.2s.m (LDA)
       ‘Come see!’
Unlike Arabic, Spanish disallows this type of V-V construction. Hence, sentences (72a,b), (73a,b), and (74a,b) are deemed ungrammatical due to the specific differences between Arabic and Spanish with respect to the V-V construction parameter.

In (72a), the use of the Spanish verb *dormir* ‘sleep’ after the DA verb *ʔuum* ‘stand/go’ results in an ungrammatical sentence, as the Spanish verb needs to be in the infinitive. Even when the Spanish verb *vaya* ‘go’ precedes the DA verb, as in (72b), the sentence is still judged unacceptable. Also unacceptable are sentences (73a,b) and (74a, b), where shifting between Arabic and Spanish is blocked by structural differences resulting from the V-V construction parameter.
The incompatibility between Arabic and the respective languages with respect to the above parameters seems to consistently give rise to various constraints on CS between these language pairs. The specific point of the constraint is predictable based on the type of parametric tension between the participating languages. In theory, the list of constraints on CS can extend infinitely to reflect the number of parametric incongruities that can be found between Arabic and these languages. Since any two living languages are expected to be different in a number of parameters (Chomsky, 1991), we can generalize that the constraints on CS between typologically different languages are inevitably present.

Interestingly, however, all of the switches above are perfectly acceptable if they were made between DA and SA, regardless of the direction of the switch, as sentences (75), (76), (77), (78), (79), (80), (81), (82), and (83) show:

(75) a. Hija ?intaqalat mu?axxaran. Taskunu bɔ-l-madiini
   b. hijji nta?let min kam joom..btiskun fii l-madiinah
   She moved.3s.f recently lives.3s.f. in the-city
   ‘She has moved recently. She lives in the city’ (LDA/SA, EXP)

(76) a. Nahnu namluku ʰaانuutan. nabiiSu ʰɔ Dra ᵃ(w-fawaaki
   b. ʰiθna ʰənna ʰɔkkaan. bɔnbiiɼ xuDaaran wa-fawaakah
   We own.1p shop sell.1p vegetables and-fruits
   ‘We have a shop. We sell vegetables and fruits’ (LDA/SA, EXP)

(77) a. George naaTiqun biʃiddati luʔaatin. jatakallamu tɔt luʔaat
   b. George bιʒhki ʔktar min luwə. bιʒhki ʔlaaʔa luʔaat
   George speaker of more than language. Speaks.3s.m. three languages
   ‘George is multilingual. He speaks three languages’ (LDA/SA, EXP)
The acceptability of these sentences suggests that the constraints on bilingual CS are not operative in the case of CS between DA and SA. This may be explained by the parametric similarity of SA and DA.
The structural overlap between SA and DA is apparent even when parameters are viewed as part of the information encoded in the lexical entries of languages (Borer 1983; Chomsky, 1993, 1995). Borer ascribed parametric differences to the lexicon, particularly the morphological features of individual lexical items. We have seen examples above (e.g., (35), (36), (37), (48) and (49)) where switching at the level of morphological features of different verbs and nouns is possible between SA and DA. Moreover, functional categories, such as C, D, and Nom are readily switchable, as could be seen in examples (22), (24), (25), (31), (34), (38), (39), (40), (45), (46), (47), and (50). Further, switching gender and number agreement morphology is allowed between SA and DA (e.g., (37)).

The parametric congruity between SA and DA presents some evidence for the structural convergence between the grammars of the two varieties. This becomes particularly apparent when comparing Arabic grammar with those of the languages cited above. The postulation of a structural overlap between SA and DA does not imply that they are a single language or that they are represented under a single cognitive domain. It simply means that SA and DA share a significant number of syntactic properties and parameters that CS between the two varieties is often permissible when it is not allowed in bilingual contexts.

However, the notion of the structural congruity of SA and DA may be challenged by other empirically-based accounts which point out to the existence of specific constraints on CS between SA and DA. Particularly relevant for our discussion are two influential studies by Eid (1982, 1988) and Bassiouney (2006). These two studies have proposed a number of constraints on language alternation between SA and DA (particularly, EDA). Bassiouney (2006) focused mainly on three types of structures: b- aspectral prefix + verb; demonstrative + noun; and NEG + noun. Although her study was not particularly concerned with identifying syntactic constraints
on CS between SA and EDA, Bassiouney points to the absence of CS between an SA negative marker and a DA verb in the naturally-produced monologues of her study and underlines the possibility of the existence on a constraint on CS between SA negative markers and DA verbs.

The second study, carried out by Eid (1988), focuses on four structures: relative clauses, subordinate clauses, tensed verbs, and negated verbs. The study shows that the relative markers, subordinating conjunctions, tense prefixes, and negative markers serve as focal points that impose some restrictions on CS between the two varieties. Based on this observation, Eid presents two general principles governing sentences coded simultaneously by SA and EDA:

The Contradictory Effect Constraint (CEC):

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 (p. 74).

The Directionality Constraint (DC):

If the focal point is from SA, switching to EA [EDA] would not be permitted at the position immediately after the focal point (p. 74).

The Contradictory Effect Constraint suggests that, for SA-EDA sentences to be grammatical, the requirements of the different elements and constituents must not contradict each other. Since the meaning of ‘grammatical contradiction’ (p. 76) is mainly explained in the context of negation, we are left to think that it involves a violation of the requirements of at least
one of the participating grammars. If my understanding of this constraint is correct, the data in
this study shows that the Contradictory Effect Constraint does not apply consistently to CS
between SA and DA. For example, as indicated above, demonstratives occur postnominally in
EDA (e.g., l-ʔaTr da (train this); l-hagaat di (things these); etc), whereas they occur
prenominally in SA (e.g., haaḍa l-qiTaar (this train); haaḍihi l-ʔašijaʔ (these things)). In other
words, the requirements of SA and DA (particularly EDA) contradict each other with respect to
the position of demonstratives and their NP complements, as examples (84) and (85) show:

(84) l-ʕarabijjaat l-ʔadiima haaḍihi tusabbibu t-talawwuθ
   The-cars the-old these cause the-pollution
   ‘These old cars cause pollution’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(85) ʔT-Tarabeizaat haaḍihi min nawʕijja faaxira
   The-tables these of quality deluxe
   ‘These tables are of deluxe quality’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

In (84) and (85), the sentences are well-formed despite the contradictory requirements of SA and
DA with regard to the position of the demonstrative haaḍihi (this) and its respective NP
complements l-ʕarabijjaat l-ʔadiima (the old cars) and ʔT-Tarabeizaat (the tables). Such
examples suggest that the Contradictory Effect Constraint does not apply consistently to CS
between SA and DA.

The Directionality Constraint predicts that relatives, subordinating conjunctions, tense
prefixes, and negative markers cannot be followed immediately by a DA element. This constraint
also applies inconsistently to the sentences below.
(86) *qaabaltu T-Tullaaba llaðiina bi-jzakru fi l-maktaba
met.1s the-students who ASP-study.3p in the-library
‘I met the students who study in the library’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(87) *nuriidu l-muðii?ata ?allati bi-rigiib ?fkaar gidiida lil-barnaamag
want.1p the-reported that ASP-bring.3s.f ideas new to-the-program
‘We want the reporter that brings new ideas to the program’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(88) *haaða l-kalaam sawfa jib?a ben-na
This the-speech will stay between-us.
‘This speech will stay between us.’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(89) *haaðihi Ð-Ðawaahir sawfa tibtidi titraagaš
These the-phenomena will start.3s.f decline
‘These phenomena will start to decline’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(90) *lan ha- jibtidi l-faSl hatta s-saaša ðašara
NEG will start.3s.m the-lesson till the-hour ten
‘The lesson will not start till ten o’clock’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(91) *lam ðarrab minna ðabadan
NEG approach.3s.m from-us never
‘He never approached us’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(92) taÐunnu ðanna l-ðajjeil laa jadrusa bižidin
think.3s.f that the boy NEG study.3s.m hard
‘She thinks that the boy does not study hard’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(93) ðaßaqidu ðanna l-ðubiiis bi-haažatin ðila ðiSlaah
believe.1s that the-bus in-need to repair
‘I believe that the bus needs repair’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(94) sa-jata?axxaruuna li?anna l-ðaTr sa-jukkaaduru muta?axxiran
will-be late.3p because the-train will-leave.3s.m late
‘They will be late because the train will leave late’ (EDA/SA, EXP)
The first six examples in this set are all unacceptable because the relatives (llađiina and ʔallati), tense marker (sawfa), and negative markers (lan and lam) are all followed immediately by DA elements. The unacceptability of these sentences supports Eid’s Directionality Constraint and Bassiouney’s argument for the impossibility of switching to DA immediately after an SA negation marker. However, the last four examples are acceptable even when the subordinate conjunctions ʔenna (that) and liʔenna (because) are followed by DA elements. The Directionality Constraint therefore may not be a principle that explains the structure of CS between SA and DA.

An examination of the ungrammatical examples above reveals a common pattern; all of these ungrammatical sentences involve switching between functional heads or between a functional head and the verb. For example, in (86) and (87), the SA relative complementizers llađiina (that) and ʔallati (that) are followed immediately by the DA imperfective verbs tigiib (bring) and jzakru (study). Likewise, (88) and (89) have the SA future tense marker sa- (will) followed by the DA imperfective verbs jibʔa (stay) and tibtidi (start). The same can be said of sentences (90) and (91), where the SA negative markers lan (will not) and lam (did not) are followed by the DA imperfective verbs jibtidi (start) and jiiʔarrab (approach). In other words, all of the ungrammatical sentences are characterized by the presence of a functional head from SA, namely C, T, and Neg, followed by another functional head or verb from DA.

By contrast, in the four grammatical examples (i.e., (92) through (95)), the SA complementizers are followed by a specifiers from DA (not a functional head). At the same time,
the SA functional head complementizers are followed by I, Neg, and verbs from SA. This contrast suggests that switching a specifier after SA relatives does not affect the grammaticality of sentences, whereas switching functional heads and verbs does.

Based on this preliminary observation and on the insights of Eid’s Directionality Constraint, I will propose that the constraint on switching to DA after SA relatives, subordinating conjunctions, tense prefixes, and negative markers is in fact a restriction on switching Complementizers (C), Tense prefixes (T), Negative markers (Neg), and Verbs (V) in mixed sentences. In other words, it is a restriction on switching between heads on the path from V to C. This simultaneously means that there is no restriction of switching specifiers (e.g. subjects) which may appear between these functional heads. Moreover, the hierarchical relationship between the higher nodes, such as C or I, and the lower ones, such as Neg, (106) is that of c-command. A c-command relationship can be defined as follows:

(96) A c-commands B if and only if neither A nor B dominate the other and the first branching node that dominates A also dominates B (Fassi Fehri, 1993, p. 8).

Thus, if, within a single CP or IP, one of these sentence-level functional heads is rendered in SA, then all of the other sentential functional heads that it c-commands should be in SA. For example, if C comes from SA, then T, Neg, and V should be rendered in SA. If T is in SA, then Neg and V should be in the same variety. Similarly, if Neg is in SA, then V should be an SA verb. Examples (92), (93), (94), and (95) are grammatical because all of the language of these functional heads did not undergo switching, even when element immediately following C (namely the specifier) is switched to DA.
Now let's consider the effect of changing the language of one of these functional heads in the above grammatical sentence while matching the language of C and the element following it, namely, the specifier:

(98) *taDunnu ?anna l-walada muš ha-jadrusa biżiddin
  think.3s.f that the boy NEG will-study hard
  ‘She thinks that the boy will not study hard’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

  will-be-late.3p because the-train will leave.3s.m late
  ‘They will be late because the train will leave late’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(100) ?aStaqidu ?anna l-haftala bi-haaga ?ila ?iSlaah
  believe.1s that the-bus in-need to repair
  ‘I believe that the bus needs repair’ (EDA/SA, EXP)
In example (98), the switch to the DA negative and future-tense markers *muš ha* (will not) results in an ungrammatical sentence. The same scenario happens in (99), where shifting the future tense marker *rah* (will) generates an ill-formed sentence. The last two examples lend striking support for the current analysis. In (100), shifting the predicate PP *bi-ħaaga* (in need of) to DA does not affect the grammaticality of the sentence because neither a functional head nor a verb is involved in the switch (rather a PP is involved). Likewise, (101) retains its grammaticality when the predicate adjective is switched to DA. In other words, alternating between the two varieties is possible as long as the sentential functional heads and the verb are not involved, that is, when non-verbal predicates are switched. The last two examples show that, even when the element following the subordinate conjunction (i.e., C) is in DA, the sentences will be grammatical if SA is deployed in T, Neg, or V.

However, this restriction is applicable not only to SA, but also to DA sentential functional heads. Let us consider the following examples:

(102) *šuft  al-ğijaal  ƙlli  jalaɓuuna  bi-š-šaariʃ*

saw.1s. the-kids that play.3p.m in-the street

‘I saw the kids that play in the street’ (EDA/SA, EXP)

(103) *saddeit  ʂa r-raqel  ƙlli  ƙaSlaha l-ʕarabijja*

passed.1s on the-man that repaired the-car

‘I passed by the man who repaired the car’ (EDA/SA, EXP)
In example (102) and (103), the SA imperfective verb jalšabuuna (play) and perfective verb ?aSlaha (repair) are not allowed to follow the DA relative complementizer (o)lli (that). Examples (104), (105), and (106) represent unacceptable sentences involving switches between DA negative particles and their verbs. In (104), the juxtaposition of the discontinuous negative
particle *ma-*š with the perfective SA verb *qaTana* (lived) results in an ungrammatical sentence. The same applies to (105) and (106), where the use the SA imperfective verbs *ju’sarrifu* (acquaint) and *jaquumu* (do) after DA negative particles generates ill-formed sentences. Ill-formed sentences also appear in (107) and (108) due to the introduction of the two SA verbs *juqaabilu* (meet) and *jaqtadi’u* (start) after the DA future-tense marker *ha*-.* The last two examples were also judged ungrammatical because the subordinate clause complementizers *šašaan* (because) and *innu* (that) are followed by the SA negative-verb constituent *laa jastamišu* (NEG listen) and the tense-verb constituent *sa-jusaafiru* (will travel).

The analysis therefore suggests that both SA and DA sentential functional heads are subject to the same constraint, which may be expressed as follows:

(111) *The Sentential Functional Head Constraint:*

*Within a single CP or IP, CS can occur neither between a lexical verb and its functional head(s) nor between the functional heads themselves.*

As Benmamoun (2000) suggests, C, T, and Neg are specified for categorical features that attract heads, such as V. For example, a verb checks its tense features either by raising to T or without raising to T. In the process, it has to check its features with Neg, the lower node. It is possible that the structural relationship between such functional heads as C, T, and Neg and the verb is responsible for this constraint. Aabi (2004) argues that the features of functional categories are the loci of language parameters, which, according to him, are the source of the constraints on CS. However, his analysis extends to functional heads in DPs (e.g., Det.), IPs (e.g., T and Neg.) and
CPs (e.g., Comp). Moreover, he argues that "the selectional properties of heads (FH) for Spec and complement must be met in CS and monolingual constructions alike" (p. 69). The data in the current study, however, suggests that the constraints apply to functional heads in CP and IP only. Moreover, the selectional properties of functional sentential heads are met particularly for complements, rather than Specs.

To summarize, the data analysis shows that CS between SA and DA evades all of the major constraints on bilingual CS. This may be explained by the structural convergence of the two varieties. The only restriction on CS appears with respect to sentential functional heads, including C, T, and Neg, which have to be in the same variety with the verb. The nature of this constraint on sentential heads will be explored in greater detail in section 5.3 below.

4.4. Social Functions of CS between DA and SA

This section focuses on the third research question: what are the social functions of CS between SA and DA? Just as I have hypothesized that bidialectal CS is governed by syntactic principles that are different from those existent in bilingual CS, I will propose here that the functions for CS between SA and DA are, to a large extent, specific to bidialectal communities. In the case of Arabic, the motivations for CS between SA and DA are largely determined by their respective statuses, roles, and functions within the Arabic diglossic situation. I will now consider switching from SA to DA and vice versa, focusing on the motivations for switching in each direction. I will restrict my account to systematic CS patterns that seem to underlie particular pragmatic and sociolinguistic functions. Hence, unsystematic and individual cases will not be reported. Undeniably, some cases of CS may not have special social functions in the discourse.
Moreover, the examples provided here are representative, rather than exhaustive, of the patterns observed in the data.

**Patterns of Switching to SA:**

The data analysis shows that speakers switch to SA for eight main reasons: (1) to introduce formulaic expressions; (2) highlight the importance of a segment of discourse; (3) mark emphasis; (4) introduce direct quotations; (5) signal a shift in tone from comic to serious; (6) produce rhyming stretches of discourse; (7) take a pedantic stand; and (8) indicate pan-Arab or Muslim identity. These will be explained with reference to the status, function and usage of SA in the Arabic sociolinguistic arena.

Probably the most visible pattern of switching to SA concerns the use of formulaic expressions. Wray (2002, p.9) defines a formulaic expression as “a sequence, continuous or discontinuous, of words or other elements, which is, or appears to be, prefabricated: that is, stored or retrieved whole from memory at the time of use.” In the Arab culture, expressions like *masha’a Llah* (what God pleased), *inšaa’a Llah* (if God wills), *subhana Llah* (glory to God), *alḥamdu liLaah* (praise to God), *aššukruliLlah* (thanks to God), *laa hawla wala quwwata illa biLlah* (there is no change nor power/strength except through God), *bismiLlah* (in the name of God), *la ilaha illa Lllah* (there is no deity except God), *Allahu akbar* (God is the greatest), *inna liLlah wa inna ilaihi rajišoun* (To God we belong, and to Him we will return), *astasfiru Llah* (I seek forgiveness from God) and so on are a staple of communicative exchanges. Formulaic expressions are eyed positively in the Arab culture due to their association with piety and God-consciousness. In the current data, these expressions transpired in religious speeches as well as in political debates and soccer commentaries, as examples (112), (113), and (114) show:
A person who drinks wine should repent . . . What God willed. God, glorified is He and exalted, had mercy on us in Ramadan’ (GDA/SA, RS8)

‘Today, God willing, the match is starting in a beautiful way’ (GDA/SA, SC1)

‘And you here, what God pleased, in the Opinion and the Other Opinion are working very beautifully' (EDA/SA, PD8)

Formulaic expressions occurred on their own as in (112) and (113) or as transition points as in (114). The use of these formulaic expressions seems to serve to draw the listeners’ attention to the point under discussion. When used as transition points, these expressions serve as an introduction to larger stretches of SA discourse. This is often referred to in bilingual CS literature as triggering, that is, the use of a certain element to introduce a new code and extend it beyond the triggering element (Clyne, 1967; Bentahila, 1983).

A second important motivation for a speaker to shift to SA is to give an air of importance to a particular segment of the speech. This explains why soccer commentators, reporters and preachers typically begin and end their speeches in SA. The use of SA here is meant to present the speeches or the events within which they are contextualized as significant and worthy of attention. This sense of importance is conveyed not only at the discourse level, but sometimes also at the sentence, phrase, and word levels. Examples (115), (116), and (117) illustrate this point:
In (115), the speaker is addressing the topic of the civil organizations and their developing functions in the Arab communities, particularly the conditions for their proper operation in these societies. In this particular segment of his speech, the speaker shifts to SA to highlight the importance of a particular condition, namely, the credibility of these organizations. Similarly, in (116), the speaker presents a religious view on the importance of having good intentions when memorizing the Qur’an. The speaker here comes to the second idea, "an tu'allima l-qur' aan lisair-ik ‘to teach the Qur’an to others’, whose importance is marked by a shift to SA. The same pattern appears in (117), where the commentator shifts to SA to underlie the importance of a new development in the game, as Al-Wathba team starts ‘a quick dangerous’ counter-attack. In (115), (116), and (117), the speakers seem to upgrade their registers to draw attention to the significance of a particular part of an utterance. This practice is not uncommon in the Arabic sociolinguistic context. For example, Versteegh (2001) observes that Arab informants often
infuse their elicited DA speech tokens with different SA elements due to their perception of the prestige associated with the standard language. Likewise, Saeed (1997) and Bassiouney (2006) found that shifting to SA in their studies largely depends on whether the speaker seeks to introduce a point to which he attaches importance or value.

A third motivation for switching to SA is for the sake of emphasis. Here, the speaker reiterates a previous idea to clarify or stress its message, as is the case in (118), (119), and (120):

(118) eih. ūaal. laa-baʔs
   Yes. Ok. Ok   (LDA/SA, PD7)

(119) laa haida ḳidiʔaaʔ. Nahna miš daabhiin farruuʔ niha bi-lʔbnaan. naḥnu lam naðbah
   no this false claim. We NEG killing chicken we in-Lebanon. we NEG kill
   farruuʔan wa lam naksur zužaaʔan
   chicken and NEG break glass
   ‘No. This is a false claim. We did not kill a chicken. We are in Lebanon. We did not kill a chicken nor broke glass.’ (LDA/SA, PD7)

(120) ma-gibši ?ana t-tahwiilaat  di. ?ana lastu min anSaar  İz-tahwiilaat
   NEG-bring.1s. I the-exaggerations these. I NEG from supporters the-exaggerations
   ‘I do not bring up these exaggerations. I am not a supporter of exaggerations.’ (EDA/SA, RS1)

Since the reiterated word ūaal ‘ok’ is not semantically difficult, the speaker in (118) uses the term laabaʔs ‘ok’ simply to emphasize his consent to his interviewer’s viewpoint. In (119), the speaker responds to his interviewer’s accusation of being involved in bloodshed in Lebanon at one point in his political career. He starts by downplaying his interviewer’s accusations by suggesting that he did not take part in the killing of the innocents (Nahna miš daabhiin farruuʔ ‘we did not kill a chicken’ ≈ we killed no one, not even a chicken), and then he realizes the need to clarify and emphasize the message, which he renders in SA. In (120), the speaker rephrases
his statement in SA, using more emphasis, elaborating on it, and adding a personal tone to it.

This type of switches has been identified in a number of studies on bilingual CS (e.g., Gumperz, 1982; Bentahila, 1983). According to Gumperz (1982, p. 78), such a repetition “may serve to clarify what is said, but often they amplify or emphasize the message.” It was also identified in studies on CS between SA and DA (e.g., Saeed, 1997), even though the direction of emphatic switches in these studies was often from SA to DA—a pattern that was not attested in the data.

This discrepancy is partly terminological, as Saeed identifies emphatic switches with simplification ones—the latter to be discussed in the next section.

A fourth juncture at which switching to SA systematically occurs is direct quoting. The data shows that quoting occurred both in SA and DA, even though SA was reserved for direct quotations and DA for indirect quotations. This differentiated allocation of functions is dissimilar to the one identified in Saeed’s study (1997), where SA is used to quote ‘true examples’ and DA used for ‘hypothetical examples.’ Direct quotations are particularly apparent in religious speech, where a speaker may cite a Qur’anic verse or a Prophetic saying to lend authority and credibility to the argument, as a source material for analysis, or for rhetorical purposes. Direct quotations occurred also in political debates and soccer commentaries, but with less frequency. The following are examples of direct quotes, used in three different contexts:

(121) fikrat ətaxaˈiːjul… bi-taxaiˈjul əl-ʔaˈaʃira di muš wighit-ˈnaDar-i laa laa la? di ideˈa the-imagining…in-imagining the-afterlife this NEG viewpoint-my no no no this wighat-naDar l-ˈqurʔaan…ˈsuufi masalaˈn l-ʔaˈaʃja di. jaˈqulu Llaˈahu tabaraˈka wa-taˈaala viewˈpont the-ˈQur’an see example the-verse this say.3s.m God blessed and-exalted “wa-law ˈtaraˈa ʔiʔ wuˈqifuu ʕala raˈbbiihi” “and-if only envision.2s.m. when stand.3p.m. before Lord-them”

‘The idea of imagining…in imagining the afterlife is not my viewpoint. No. It is the viewpoint of the Qur’an. See for example this verse. Allah, the High the Exalted, says “And if only you envision when they stand before your Lord”’ (EDA/SA, RS5)
(122) *ha-*?ul-lak kalaam ?aal-u nušir fiī wahdu-Gišriin ... qaal “?inna kamp Will-tell.1s-you speech said.3s.m-it published.PASS in one-twenty ... said.3s.m: “indeed Camp David ṭallat yada miSr...”

David shackled hand.dual Egypt...”

‘I will tell you something that he said. It was published in 21... He said, “Camp David shackled the hands of Egypt.’ (EDA/SA, PD12)

(123) ...huwwi ?aal ?abl ʿal-mubaara ?innu jatawaqqaš ʿal-fawz fiī haḏīhi l-mubaara he said before the match that-he expects the-winning in this the-match ‘...he said before the match that he expects to win in this match.’ (LDA/SA, SC10)

In (121), the speaker starts by laying out an argument for preparing oneself for the afterlife and urges his audience to imagine the events of the Day of Judgment. In order to support his argument, he disclaims that the need to imagine the events of the Day of Judgment represents his own viewpoint; rather it is the viewpoint presented in the Qur’an. By citing the Qur’an, the speaker seeks to lend credibility and authority to his argument. Muslims believe that the Qur’an is the exact and unchanged Word of God. Hence, citing it may allow the speaker to validate his point and make it unquestionable. In (122) and (123), the speakers are not in an argument position; instead, the quotes are simply introduced for rhetorical effectiveness (i.e., accuracy and conciseness purposes). This may correspond to what Bhatt and Bolonyai (2008) call the “Economy Principle.” In other words, the speaker is trying to communicate the idea with the minimum number of words, while at the same time avoiding to put the message awkwardly in his own words.

Fifth, switching to SA is used to signal a shift from a comic or light-hearted to a serious tone. Typically, a speaker would shift back to SA after introducing humor in their SA discourse, as examples (124), (125) and (126) show:
In (124), the politician employs sarcasm to indirectly criticize the Palestinian president, who, unlike his predecessor, conforms to the negotiation conditions of the Israelis "fit their mindset, like they want, tailored to their size.'

In (125), the preacher foresees that some of the audience might be listening to the lecture with the expectation of finding an easy way to memorize the Qur’an, and therefore he resorts to humor to suggest that this is not the case. In (126), the commentator seems to pun on the name of
one of the players, Waleed Abd-Rabbuh (literally, ‘neonate of the servant of his Lord’), to break
the monotony of an uneventful game. In all of these cases, the speakers shift back to SA after
introducing humor in DA. Their shift back to SA underlies a more serious tone or a more serious
take on the subject under discussion. Thus, the speaker in (124) closes his humor by posing a
serious question about the reasons behind the halt in negotiations between the two parties.
Similarly, in (125), the humor is followed by an earnest proclamation about the difficulty of
memorizing the Qur’an. In (126), the commentator shifts to SA to introduce a new topic and a
new fact about the referee of the soccer match. Shifting to SA to denote seriousness has been
reported in previous literature on CS between SA and DA (Saeed, 1997).

Sixth, switching to SA is made when the speakers produce rhyming stretches of
discourse, including lines of poetry. This pattern of switching occurred particularly in religious
supplications, but also surfaced in political debates and soccer commentaries, as (127), (128) and
(129) show:

(127) haj hijji l-xasara l-haʔiiʔijji. Allahuma ʔKalna mina n-ʔażiin… wa-ʔKalna mina
this is the-loss the-real O God make-us from the-saved and make-us from
l-ʔaʔaʔiijn…wa-kun maʔana jaa rabba l-ʔaalaamijin
the winners and-be with-us O Lord the worlds
‘This is the real loss. O God! Make us from the saved ones and make us from the winners
and be with us O Lord of the worlds.’ (LDA/SA, RS11)

(128) tdaakkart baitan ʕalamuun-na jjaah w-darrasuuna jjaah mina S-Siba
remember.1s. line (of poetry) taught-us it and-taught-us it from the-childhood
"bilaad-i bilaad-i manaaru l-huda wa-mahdu l-ʔaTulati ʕabra l-mada"
country-my country-my minaret the-guidance and-craddle the-championship through time
‘I remember a line of poetry taught to us from childhood: “my country my country is the
minaret of guidance and the cradle of championship through time”’ (GDA/SA, SC1)
In (127), the preacher concludes his explication of ‘true loss’ as the loss of oneself in the afterlife by praying to God not to be among “the losers.” Following the convention, he renders his rhyming prayers in SA. In (128), the commentator emphasizes his neutrality with respect to the two Arab teams, suggesting that he, as well as the members of the two teams, belong to the larger Arab World. He introduces a famous line of poetry to underscore this point. In (129), the politician also poetically describes, as he sees it, the state of some parties that follow certain leaders blindly. In Arabic, speakers often produce rhyming stretches of discourse in order to generate greater affective impact on their audience. This is also a sign of eloquence and mastery of the language. This form of switching can only be understood if we consider the common perception of SA as the language of ‘purity, clarity, eloquence, chastity, and freedom from speech impediments’ (Suleiman, 2004, p. 58). Because it is considered the ‘eloquent language,’ to many Arabs, SA is the only medium suited for rendering eloquent, high-style, and linguistically complex structures.

Seventh, speakers switch to SA to take a pedantic stand. Here the speaker addresses his audience assuming the role of an expert or an analyst. Although speakers sometimes assume such a didactic role using DA, the data shows that SA is the common code for this purpose. This happens in the religious, political, and sports domains, as the following three examples demonstrate:
In (130), the commentator shifts to SA to proclaim that the Saudi Arabian soccer team gives fame to its coaches (i.e., through its achievement) and not the other way around. To confirm his expertise on this topic, he follows his proclamation by posing a rhetorical question in which he asks his audience to consult history for verifying the truth of his claim. Likewise, the politician in (131) uses DA to accuse his interviewer of ignorance, and then shifts to SA to provide ‘a lesson’ on what democracy is. Lastly, in (132), the preacher switches to SA to correct what he thinks a misconception about the meaning of ‘guidance,’ providing a seemingly superior, informed, or logical viewpoint on the issue. Hence his recourse to SA. This form of CS may be explained by
the fact that SA use in the Arab sociolinguistic context often correlates with education, knowledge, and sophistication.

Lastly, switching to SA is employed to indicate the speaker’s pan-Arab or Muslim affiliation. In such a case, speakers seem to emphasize their Arab or Muslim identity to invoke their relationship with other Arabs and Muslims, as examples (133), (134), and (135) show:

(133) ʔna bistakrib… hal ʔintiqadat. Nahnu, ka-ʔuzaʔ min haðihi l-ʔumma, natawaqqaʃ  
I get surprised. Is these criticisms. We, as part of this the-nation expect  
al-ʕawm min ʔasîqqaʔina fi lduwal al-ʕarabijja.  
help from brothers-our in the states Arabic  
‘I am surprised by these criticisms. We [Palestinians], as part of this nation, expect help from our brothers in the Arab states’ (LDA/SA, PD14).

(134) haadi l-hamli š-ʃawwaaʔ leiʔ? Nahnu musliimuun wa naʃtaz bi-ʒaalek  
This the-campaign sever, why? We Muslims and feel proud by-that  
‘Why is this severe campaign? We are Muslims and we are proud about that.’ (LDA/SA, RS11)

(135) balaaʃ nəʃsi ʔuʔulna w-nigri waraaʔ? Kalaam jusiʔ? ʔila šakl d-duwal l-ʃarabijja  
without nullify minds-our and-run after speech harm to shape the-states the-Arab  
wə-ʃ-ʃuʃuub l-ʃarabijja  
and-the-peoples the-Arab  
‘Let’s not nullify our minds or run after a speech that harms the shape of the Arab states and the Arab peoples’ (EDA/SA, PD1)

In (133), the speaker expresses his astonishment at the criticism that the Palestinian people are receiving from some Arab regimes, as they expect help from these regimes rather than criticism. The speaker here appeals to the Arab national identity to emphasize the obligation of Arab regimes to support, rather than criticize, the Palestinians. In (134) the preacher talks about the recent escalation on Islamic symbols. Then, he shifts to SA to highlight Muslim affiliation and
the pride involved in this affiliation. Likewise, the politician in (135) responds to an accusation made by one of his interlocutors concerning his role as an officier in prison torture. The interlocutor presents a number of pictures showing the forms of torture to which political prisoners are usually exposed. The politician questions the authenticity of the pictures and expresses his astonishment at his interlocutor’s attempt to distort the image of the Arab states and peoples. His shift to SA at this point corresponds with his attempt to demonstrate his sympathy, as an Arab, with the Arab people and states. The data shows SA is the only code employed for activating pan-Arab or Muslim identity. For example, the word “Umma” (nation), which is often invoked in pan-Arab and pan-Islamic contexts occurred in five codeswitched sentences, all of which to SA. This is not surprising, as SA has historically been associated with the collective Arab or Muslim identity. As a code mutually intelligible throughout the Arab World, SA is one of the few important things that Arab communities share. SA is also a symbolic source of unity among Muslims because it is the language of Islamic theology and tradition.

Overall, it seems that the motivational patterns of CS to SA are linked with prestige, importance, eloquence, seriousness, and linguistic complexity. These patterns materialize the very status, role and functions that SA assumes as the High variety in the Arab diglossic situation. None of these CS patterns seems to be tied to a particular context (religious speeches, political debates, or soccer commentaries), speech event, speaker, or interlocutor, as is often suggested in the bilingual CS literature (Fishman, 1971, Gumperz, 1982).

Patterns of Switching to DA:

The foregoing motivational patterns of CS are qualitatively different from those underlying CS to DA. The data indicates that speakers shift to DA for the following nine related
reasons: (1) to induce parenthetical phrases and fillers (2) downplay a particular segment of the
discourse, (3) signal indirect quotes, (4) simplify a preceding idea, (5) exemplify, (6) mark a shift
in tone from serious to comic, (7) discuss taboo or derogatory issues, (8) introduce daily-life
sayings, and (9) scold, insult or personally attack. These types of switches occur in all three
forms of discourse, namely religious speeches, political debates, and soccer commentaries,
which differ considerably in their level of formality.

One of the most transparent patterns of CS to DA relates to the use of parenthetical
phrases and fillers. Parenthetical phrases are implemented to introduce a point that is not
completely part of an utterance, but adds to its message. Fillers are sometimes used for
interrupting the flow of SA and introducing DA discourse. More often, however, they are used
when the speaker seeks to make a rhetorical pause in order to draw the attention to a following or
preceding point that is typically expressed in SA. Examples (136), (137) and (138) illustrate this
point:

(136) al-muntaxab әl-әiraәqi huwa jaʔxuð zimaam l.… jaa salaam laa laa laa әfażbet-a
the-team the-Iraqi it takes control the … how sweet no no no no please-him
s-sәaľfa Basim Abbas әθаani marra jәәmal-hә b-Sәәr digajeg.
the-story Bassim Abbas second time does-it in-ten minutes
‘The Iraqi team is taking control [of the game]…how sweet no, no, no, no, he liked the story. Bassim
Abbas does it for the second time within ten minutes’ (GDA/SA, SC1)

(137) әtәaluu ruʔuus harakat hamaas… ma bәdناʔә nәnsә…wa-miʔlama
assassinated.3p.m. heads movement Hamas… NEG want.1p. forget…and-likewise
әtәaluu ruʔasaaʔ әl-әәbah l-әәbәijja
assassinated.3p.m. heads the-Front the-Public
‘They assassinated the leaders of the Hamas Movement…we don’t want to forget …and likewise
they assassinated the leaders of the Public Front’ (LDA/SA, PD13)
In (136), the commentator uses the filler *jaa salaam* ‘how sweet’ as a way to interrupt the flow of the SA speech and simultaneously introduce DA in commenting on a new event in the game.

In (137), the speaker injects the parenthetical phrase *ma bədnaš nansa* ‘we do not want to forget’ in order to draw attention to the previous fact about the assassination of Hamas leaders.

In (138), the speaker makes a rhetorical pause to draw attention to a following fact, namely, that many Muslims died in the battle of Uhud (which is a landmark event in Islamic history). The designation of fillers and parenthetical phrases to a specific variety in codeswitched utterances has been noticed in a number of studies on both bilingual and bidialectal CS (Bentahila, 1983; Gumperz & Hernandez-Chavez, 1975; Saeed, 1997). In most cases, the less dominant or low variety assumes this role.

Less frequent are fillers used after hesitations, where the speaker is at a temporary loss for words, as example (139) shows:

(139) haaða ʔamr… *jašni… kariib*  
this matter means strange.  
‘This…I mean… is a strange thing’ (GDA/SA, RS7)

In (139), the speaker simply uses *jašni* ‘this means’ for filling up the silence in utterances. It is similar to ‘you know’ in American English. This type of switching has been identified in a number of studies on CS between SA and DA (e.g., Saeed, 1997; Safi, 1992).
A third important reason for switching to DA is to deemphasize a particular part of the discourse or reduce its significance. Consider the following examples:

(140) naqif ſinda haaða l-mawqif wa ḣaawalna qadar l-mustaTaa... Tabʕan ʕal-masʔuul stop.1p. at this position and tried.1p extent the-possible... of course the-official

ʕal-maSri ʕa li waDDah bɔTuulat-a fii maa qaala fii ʔaDonti fii muqaabala the-Egyptian that stated heroisms-his in what said.3s.m in think.1s in interview

tilfizyuunijja ʔaw ši ʔana maa rah rudd ʕalei-ha television.adj or thing I NEG will respond on-them

‘We stop at this position and we tried to as much as possible...[interruption originally in the text] Of course, the Egyptian official who tried to state his heroisms in what he said, I think, in an TV interview, I will not respond to them [his heroisms].’ (GDA/SA, PD4)

(141) wa-li-ðaalik astadrak ʕal-ʔamr w-hasam ʕal-mawDuuʕ bisuʁʕa. Hajda And-for-that apprehended.3s.m the-matter and-resolved the issue swiftly. This

ʕal-mawDuuʕ maa ʔinta taaxd-u ʕala D-Daahor l-ʔiʃlaami the-issue NEG can you take-it on the-appearance the-media

‘And so it apprehended the matter and resolved it. You cannot take this issue on face value as presented by the media’ (LDA/SA, PD7)

(142) qaal “tilka amaanijju-hum” di amaani farwa said.3s.m. “that wishes-their” these wishes silly

‘He [God] said “these are their wishes.” These are silly wishes’ (EDA/SA, RS1)

In (140), the politician speaks about a Qatari-Egyptian dispute over the location of an emergency meeting for the Arab leaders. He uses SA in a lengthy passage trying to justify the Qatari position in this dispute, and then shifts to DA when he sought to underestimate what the Egyptian side had to say on the tongue of one of its officials. He concludes this part of his speech by suggesting that he does not even care to respond to the Egyptian official’s accusations, ʔana maa rah rudd ʕaleiha (I will not respond to them). In (141), the speaker tries to defend an allied party against the interviewer’s accusations. He starts by defending his allied party, using SA, and then
switches to DA to demote a particular piece of discourse, namely, the accusation of the interviewer. The speaker here resorts to DA to deemphasize the point as less important than what has been previously discussed and circulated in the media. In (142), the preacher criticizes people who think that they will enter Paradise based on their religious affiliation (rather than their true belief and work). After citing the Qur’anic response to them, he shifts to DA to belittle their “wishes.” The shift here is not for explaining the quote, which is self-explanatory, but for downplaying what the preacher sees as misconceptions. Saeed (1997) points to a similar switching pattern to DA in his data that marks a ‘negative’ attitude of the speaker toward less important or trivial issues.

Another reason for speakers to switch to DA is for indirect quoting. In DA-expressed quotations, the speaker is not interested in citing the exact words of the person, but rather in conveying the message, or in showing what someone may say about the point under discussion. That is why quoting here becomes a form of paraphrasing. Interestingly, indirect quotations in DA transpired in all three domains under discussion. The following three examples illustrate this case:

(143) hatta l?aan ?al-?umuur laa tasiir kama juriid l-waðba ?allaði qaal… jaðni
  till now the-matters NEG go as wants coach Al-Wathba who said… mean.3s.m.
  …?innu b-jetwaqqaṣ l-fooz la-farii?>.
  …that-he expects the-wining for-team-his
  ‘So far things are not going as well as coach of Al-Wathba wants…who said …you know…that he expects his team to win’ (LDA/SA, SC10)

(144) ?iðaa qadima Ṣala Llah, biguul haaði l-kalma. biguul jaa-rabb-i lō ?inna-k hadeit-ni
  if returned to God, say.3s.m this the-word. say.3s.m o-Lord-my if that-you guided-me
  ‘If he returns to God, he will say this word. He will say my Lord if only you had guided me’ (GDA/SA, RS6)
This peoples resisted the-occupation, came.3p.m. and-said.3p.m. you who are implicating us.

‘These peoples resisted the occupation, so they came and said [to these people] that you are implicating us.’ (LDA/SA, PD14)

In (143), the speaker uses DA to quote the coach, pointing to the apparent contradiction between what the coach has said and the actual performance of the team on the field ground. That is, whereas the coach expected his team to win the game, the reality of the match does not reflect this prediction, as the team is performing poorly. The unaffectionate tone in which the speaker said the quote suggest that it is conceived by him as mundane, unsurprising, and unworthy of attention. In (144), the speaker shifts to DA to reproach those who wish, on the Day of Judgment, that God had guided them (because, according to him, God already did so through His prophets and books). In (145), the speaker satirically quotes governments who cooperate with the occupation and dislike for their own peoples to resist the occupation. He is indirectly referring to some Arab governments that are engaged in this practice. In general, speakers utilize DA in indirect quotations when they are indifferent to the exact wording of the citation or seek to downplay or criticize the content of the quotation itself. This indifference is often reflected in the critical, sarcastic or unaffectionate tone of the speaker. This pattern of CS partially supports findings from previous studies (e.g., Saeed, 1997), where the speaker would use DA for sarcasm or for quoting hypothetical or unlikely situations.

A fifth dominant pattern for switching to DA is for simplification or explanation purposes. Here the speaker may have presented a linguistically or notionally complex idea and assumes that his audience needs further explanation to understand it. In this case, DA is
employed because it is supposed to be the easier code. Examples (146), (147), and (148) illustrate this point:

(146) Qaala n-nabijj… “taʃaahadu l-qurʔaan”  jasni  ʔr-u  ktiir  
said  the-Prophet… “take care of the-Qur’an”  means  read-it a lot  
‘The Prophet said “Take care of the Qur’an,” which means read it a lot.’ (EDA/SA, RS3)

(147) ʔalquds waqf ʔislaami. jasni ʔei  waqf ʔislaami. jasni  miš milk  had  
Jerusalem endowment Islamic.  Means what endowment Islamic.  Means NEG possession one  
‘Jerusalem is an Islamic endowment. What does endowment Islamic mean? It means that no one possesses it.’ (EDA/SA, PD8)

(148) al-qaaʔad  a0-ʔaki  huwa man jaʃraf  ʔajna tabdaʔ al-maʃraka wa-ʔajna tantahi  man-na  
The-leader the-smart he who knows where starts the-battle and-where finishes NEG-it  
ʔistimrarijji  ʔala Tuul wa-ʔilla  ʔiza heik koʃ ma btblaʃ harb maʃ laazm təntihi  
continuation on through and-otherwise if so whenever start war NEG necessary end  
abadan  never  
'The smart leader is the one who knows where the war starts and where it ends. It is not a continuation. Otherwise, whenever a war starts, it will never end’ (LDA/SA, PD7)

In (146), the speaker quotes a prophetic saying that contains the SA verb taʃaahadu ‘take care of’, which is hardly ever used in everyday speech. He therefore re-phrases the idea in DA to simplify a linguistically unusual term. Similarly, in the context of a debate on the current status of Jerusalem, the speaker in (147) resorts to DA to explain what the phrase waqf ʔislaami (Muslim endowment), which he first introduced in SA. In (148), however, the speaker not only re-words his point on war expertise in DA but also elaborates on it to increase its understandability to the audience. This form of explanation targets a notionally complex idea, namely, war expertise. In all of these examples, it seems that the speakers resort to DA to avoid
the possible vagueness of the point. The fact that the direction of simplification switches is always from SA to DA suggests that Arabic speakers may have mental preconception of DA as the simpler code.

It is also for simplification purposes that speakers often switch to DA to refer to numbers, time, and date. The use of DA numerals is an attested pattern in a number of studies on SA and DA (e.g., Parkinson, 1996; Saeed, 1997; Harrell, 1964). This might be due to the complexity of the numerical system of SA, particularly in terms of number-noun agreement. Consider examples (149), (150), and (151):

(149) žašaluuh fi l-ʔihsaʔ li-muddat tọṣaʃTaʃs sana.
Made-it.m. in the-Ihsa for-period nineteen year.

‘They put it in the Ihsa for the period of nineteen years’ (GDA/SA, RS7)

(150) a. ladaina muhaẓzaʔriin mina l-žabal munθu l-ʔaam ʔalf w-tọṣaʃmijjı
have-us immigrants from the-mountain since the-year thousand and-nine-hundred

w-talata w-tmanin liʔajat al-ʔaan
and-three and-eighty till now

‘We had immigrants from the mountain since nineteen eight-three and till now’ (LDA/SA, PD7)

b. wuẓuud ?al-ʔaʃʃal ḍal-μaʃri fi l-jaman laʃiba dawran fi haziimat l-ʔaam sabša-w-stțiın
presence the-army Egyptian in the-Yemen played a role in defeat the-year seven and sixty

‘The presence of the Egyptian army in Yemen played a role in the defeat in the year 1967.’ (EDA/SA, PD3)

(151)  kaafa  bišiddah fi l-ʔasaabiʃ al-ʔaʃiʃal li-jaʃtal al-markaz ət-taani
struggle.3s.m. with-strenght in-the-weeks the-past to-occupy the-position second

‘It [the team] struggled strongly in the past weeks to occupy the second position’ (EDA/SA, SC3)
This form of simplification may be both speaker-oriented and audience-oriented, since it is likely to be beneficial to both. For speakers, it means less time and effort in paying attention to the rules of number-noun agreement, and for listeners it is easier to grasp. Parkinson (1996, p. 92) observed that some of his informants produced numbers in DA to make themselves “accessible” to their listeners. This interpretation may not be extended to the current data because speakers seem to switch isolated numbers, rather than whole sentences. Bentahila (1983) found that Moroccan speakers switch to French when referring to ‘a number, date, or time.’ He argues that this might be due to the fact that French numbers and the European Julian calendar are used in Moroccan schools. This justification does not hold in the data. Although numbers, time, and date are taught through the medium of SA in schools, Arab speakers prefer to use DA when referring to numbers, time and date.

Related to simplification switches are exemplification switches, through which the speaker employs DA to instantiate a point through real-life or hypothetical example. Gumperz (1982) refers to this pattern of CS as ‘personification’ CS, that is, the introduction of a new code when seeking to convey a message with a personal tone. By shifting to DA, the speaker tries to relate to his audience’s everyday life. Examples (152), (153), and (154) illustrate this point:

(152) мафна 1-hidaaja ṭaj d-dalaala. jaʃni waahəd jilgaa-k fi T-Tariig lʔaan
Meaning the-guidance that the-indication. means one meets-you in the-street now
w-jgual-la-k bə-Llah fein maszəd əl-jahja fa-tguul-lah haaɗa tlof min həna
and-says-to-you by-God where mosque Al-Yahya so-say.2s.m-to-him this turn from here
w-təTlaʃ ʧala maszəd əl-jahja
and-go up on mosque Al-Yahya

‘The meaning of guidance is indication. This means that one may meet you in the street now and say to you “please where Al-Yahya Mosque,” so you would tell him to turn from here and go up to Al-Yahya Mosque’ (GDA/SA, RS6)
The mother the-first I personally when be.1s. sitting I and-wife-my then-comes

The mother is to be first. Personally, when I am sitting with my wife and one of our children comes to kiss my hand, while my wife is beside me…the mother should be the first’ (EDA/SA, RS4)

‘God gave you the mind and the faculties. Now if someone gives you a thousand lira, won’t you ask him about what he wants in return?’ (LDA/SA, RS11)
underhanded criticism, as the following examples show:

(155) xaTa? li-maSlahat Waliid ūabd-rabbu, w-ḵolḻ-na ūibaad ūrab- na jaa-walad ūabd rabb-u Lord-his

‘Foul for Waleed Abd-Rabbuh, and all of us are servants for our Lord o son of the servant of his Lord’ (GDA/SA, SC1)

(156) BaS̱D ən-naas jataS̱war…maS̱na l-hidaja jaS̱ni ?anna Llaaha junazzel malak mina

Some people imagine the meaning of ‘guidance’ is that God sends one of the angels, who ties you around the neck and drives you [by force] to the mosque for every prayer’ (GDA/SA, RS6)

(157) lam jakun əS̱rīkən mulaa?iman, əl?aan ?iẔaal-hum əS̱rīk əS̱la gad əS̱gaḻhum zaj NEG was.3s.m. partner suitable now come-them partner on size mind-their like

‘[name omitted] was not a suitable partner. Now a partner who has a similar mind, like they want, and a size similar to what they want, has come (LDA/SA, PD13).

In (155) the commentator shifts to DA to make two puns on the name of the player who obtained the foul. The full name of the player literally means ‘neonate of the servant of his Lord.’ First, the commentator puns on the second part of the name by saying w-kolḻ-na ūibaad rab- na ‘and all of us are servants of our Lord.’ Then he modifies the second vowel of the first name Waliid ‘neonate’ to make it walad ‘child’ so that the modified name becomes walad ūabd rabb-u ‘child of the servant of his Lord.’ This play on words makes the small modifications sound funny. In (156) and (157), switching to DA underlies humor that is mixed with sarcasm and underhanded criticism. Thus, in (156), the preacher is critical of a common misconception about the meaning
of ‘guidance’. He presents a sarcastic example of this misconception about ‘guidance’ (where an angel would tie someone in the neck and takes him/her by force to the mosque). In (157), the politician criticizes the halt in the negotiation process between the Israelis and Palestinians. While he blames the Israelis for it, the speaker mocks the current Palestinian president, who has gone along with the Israelis in most of the things they want despite their refusal to continue the negotiations. The use of humor allows the speaker to create an intimate and relaxing atmosphere with the audience or to soften the effects of his critical words. Similar findings were reported by Saeed (1997), who reports that humor in his study was often rendered in DA and was meant to ‘lessen the formality or seriousness of the atmosphere’ (p. 166).

Seventh, speakers switch to DA to discuss embarrassing or derogatory topics. The speaker avails the casualness of DA to reduce the effect of his utterance or to make his point sound less outlandish. Sentences (158), (159), and (160) illustrate this case:

(158) /un ﻋ0294 ﻋ�0294 ﺟ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0295 ﻋ0295 ﺪ0294 

(159) /un ﻋ0294 ﺪ0294 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 

(160) /un ﻋ0294 ﺪ0294 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﺪ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294 ﻋ0294
In (158), the speaker compares the torturing to which the Palestinians and the Iraqis are exposed in the Israeli and American-run prisons to that inflicted on the common Arabic citizen by the Arab rulers. He argues that, unlike the Israelis and Americans, who are in a state of war with the Palestinians and some Iraqi factions, the Arab rulers torture their citizens even though they are not in a state of war with them. He ends his accusation by using a common cursing *laašniin ḥabuuhun* (they [the rulers] are damning their fathers). In (159), the preacher addresses an embarrassing issue, namely how a man should address his wife in a conflict situation. This issue is embarrassing because it is too personal to be discussed in public, particularly in a religious gathering. Therefore, the speaker switches to DA to attenuate the eccentricity of the words that he uses in this context, namely, *ja habiib-ti w-ja rōhi* ‘my love my soul’. In (160), however, the speaker presents some of the qualities that a man or a woman should seek in their future spouse. Here he expresses his astonishment at how such a prominent figure as the Caliph recommends a woman who is much lower than him in socioeconomic status as a wife for his son. The use of DA to express the condescending sentence *di bayaašat laban* ‘this is a milk seller’ is meant to moderate the negative effect of the sentence. It is striking that in all of these instances, the switches occur at the point where embarrassing or derogatory topics arise.

Eight, speakers switch to DA to induce daily-life sayings. The purpose of introducing these sayings is to relate to the audience’s everyday life and simultaneously allow them to comprehend concretely the essence of an earlier thought. It is also possible that the use of these sayings dramatizes the point under discussion and adds an affective dimension to it. Consider examples (161), (162), and (163):
In (161), the speaker accuses his interviewer of using preemptive questions that are based on rumors or mere speculations in order to prevent him from justifying his own point of view. To concretize his idea, he shifts to DA to give a daily-life saying "You are trying to eat me for lunch before I eat you for dinner." The same happens in (162) and (163), where the speakers shift to DA to introduce folk sayings in order to concretize or elaborate on a certain idea or concept. By doing so, the speakers not only allow the audience to grasp their points, but also appeal to the listeners' emotions and make their messages more compelling.

Lastly, switching to DA is implemented by speakers to scold, insult, or personally attack, as examples (164), (165), and (166) show:
In (164), the speaker responds to one of the participants in a four-person debate, who accused him of not understanding the current political situation in Israel. The speaker first tries to rationalize his viewpoint (haðaa kalaam mawθuuq ‘this is a reliable speech’), and then shifts to DA to counter-accuse his interlocutor of ‘not understanding’ what is taking place. Likewise, in (165), the speaker responds to his interviewer’s accusations that his political decisions are ‘bought’ by those who are funding him. The speaker shifts to DA to criticize his interviewer for his commercial mindset. In the last example, the speaker argues against the niqaab (women’s face cover). He tells his interlocutor that priority should be given to defending the land. Here, he hints at an incident where Israeli planes flew over Syrian territory. He therefore urges his interlocutor to consider defending his land instead of occupying himself with the issue of niqaab.
He ends his suggestion by a common curse in Egyptian Arabic using two vulgar words *l-hibaab* (soot) and *mitnajil* (tarnished).

In general, it seems that DA is brought into the scene in informal, low-prestige, simple, and everyday topics. These topics characteristically reflect the status and functions of DA in the Arabic sociolinguistic arena. Again, these concepts did not seem to be tied to a particular context (since they occurred in religious speeches, political debates, and soccer commentaries), speaker, audience (all are public), or speech event.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Much of the research on CS took interest in the syntactic constraints on language mixing as well as in the social functions of language alternation within bilingual communities. A number of hypotheses have been put forward to explain these two aspects either in language-specific or in universal terms. However, the counter examples presented by other researchers have kept the debate on the structure and functions of CS afoot, particularly with respect to the generalizability of some of the presented models and hypotheses to other languages and contexts. The current study focused on the Arabic bidialectal speech with the goal of examining the possibility of extending some of these universal constraints and functions to CS between SA and DA. In addition, the study sought to identify the syntactic principles underlying CS between these two varieties as well as the social functions of CS in the context of Arabic.

In this chapter, I will discuss the main findings of the study (which were presented in the previous chapter). This chapter will be divided into three main parts. In the first part, I will explain the inconsistent application of constraints on CS between different language pairs. In part two, I will present an account of the frequently unrestricted code alternation between SA and DA, taking into account the structural relationship between these two varieties. In the last section, I will build on the functional patterns of CS that were identified in the study to explain the social meanings and functions of CS between SA and DA. Moreover, I will propose a theoretical model that explains the functional distribution of SA and DA within the micro and macro contexts in which they occur.
5.1. The Parameter Difference Hypothesis:

Research on the syntactic aspect of CS reflects divided views regarding, not only the observably restricted distribution of the participating languages within a single sentence and across sentences, but also the range of contexts to which these restrictions apply. A number of researchers claim that CS is governed by specific syntactic constraints within the boundary of the sentence (Poplack, 1981; Joshi, 1985; Di Sciullo, et al, 1986; Belazi, et al, 1994). The findings from the current study show that none of these constraints apply to CS between SA and DA. Thus, bidialectal CS between SA and DA, unlike bilingual CS, can occur between a functional head and its complement, between a governed element and its governor, between a bound morpheme and its host element, among closed-class items, and within constituents generated by a rule from one language which is not shared by the other. This finding corroborates the results from previous studies, which show that each of these major universally-projected constraints on CS does not apply cross-linguistically (Bokamba, 1989; El-Noory, 1985; Clyne, 1987; Mahootian, 1993; MacSwan, 1999).

The postulation of CS-specific constraints, which often implies that a ‘third grammar’ is at play in CS, has been criticized by a number of researchers (Mahootian, 1993, 1996; MacSwan, 1999, 2005; Chan, 2003, 2008, Aabi). Instead of positing ad hoc mechanisms, these researchers propose that CS is constrained by the same rules and principles that govern monolingual speech. Although they generally agree on the need to eliminate rules and principles that are not theoretically necessary, researchers in this group differ in explaining the noticeable constraints on CS between different language pairs. For example, while Mahootian (1993, 1996), Chan (2003, 2008), and Aabi (2004) attribute CS constraints to violations in head-complement relationships, MacSwan (1999) argues that, due to the PF Disjunction Theorem, inflectional/functional
morphemes of one language variety may not attach head-internally to a stem from another variety. The data analysis points to a number of cases where neither the integrity of head-complement relationships helps in salvaging ungrammatical sentences nor does the violation of these relationships results in degrading grammatical sentences. Likewise, MacSwan’s postulation that CS should satisfy the requirements of the two grammars is not borne out in the current study. Moreover, the morpho-phonological ban on switching head-internally is disconfirmed in the current data. For example, the data points to cases where passive voice is realized by mapping a DA stem on a passive voice melody of SA, leading to inserting inflectional morphemes head-internally.

Myers-Scotton (1993a) and colleagues (Jake et al, 2002) propose a system of CS, which details the permissible combinations into which the Matrix and Embedded languages can enter to produce grammatical switches. This system, called the Matrix Language Frame (MLF), builds on two main principles: the System Morpheme Principle and The Morpheme Order Principle (Myers-Scotton, 1993a, p. 7). The former stipulates that the ML generates all syntactically relevant system morphemes, and the latter requires that the morpheme order must be that of the ML. The predictions of these two principles are not supported in the data as evidenced by the fact that the syntactic morphemes of a single CP may come from both SA and DA and also because some CPs have the word order of one variety but the system morphemes of the other.

The fact that none of the CS-specific, general, or system-based constraints on CS applies to CS between SA and DA may suggest that CS between SA and DA is unrestricted. However, the experimental data points to a number of cases where CS between the two varieties is restricted. This conclusion corroborates the findings from the overwhelming majority of studies which identify certain restrictions on intrasentential CS (Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Belazi et al;
Having established the inapplicability of the syntactic constraints found in bilingual CS to bidialectal CS between SA and DA, I will propose the Parameter Difference Hypothesis as a general way to explain the structural constraints on CS between different language varieties. The Parameter Difference Hypothesis postulates that, although CS obeys the general principles of UG, it is nonetheless constrained at points where parametric tensions between the participating languages or language varieties exist. The number and type of constraints on CS depends primarily on the parametric convergence/divergence of the two language varieties, which is in turn contingent on how structurally related they are. Language varieties whose structures overlap to a great extent, such as SA and DA, may have limited constraints on CS between them (in addition to those that apply to monolingual speech). On the other hand, CS is more constrained between structurally divergent languages, such as Arabic and English.

Since parameters vary among different languages, the constraints on CS vary as well. The Parameter Difference Hypothesis therefore questions the universality of particular constraints on CS based on the variability of the parameters themselves. The remainder of this section will demonstrate the selective applicability of constraints based on the parametric values adopted by different languages or language varieties. I will re-examine the three parameters explored in section 4.3. in the context of CS between Arabic and a number of other languages, including English, Hebrew, Turkish, French, and Spanish. These parameters include the pro-drop parameter, the head-directionality parameter, and the V-V construction parameter. All the examples introduced here were experimentally created for this purpose. Again, bilinguals’ and bidialectals’ judgments were utilized to verify the acceptability of these sentences.
The following examples of CS between Arabic on one hand, and English, French, Spanish, Hebrew, and Turkish, on the other hand, are structurally and semantically analogous:

(167) a. *Sami is always hungry. Eats xams ważbaat bi-ljoom (LDA-English)
    b. *Sami a toujours faim. Mange xams wažbaat bi-ljoom (LDA-French)
    c. *Sami tamid raev. Oxel xams wažbaat bi-ljoom (LDA-Hebrew)
    d. Sami está siempre con hambre. Come xams wažbaat bi-ljoom (LDA-Spanish)
    e. Sami her zaman aç. bi-ljoom xams wažbaat yiyor (order reversed) (LDA-Turkish)

Sami is always hungry Eats.3s.m five meals per day

‘Sami is always hungry. (He) eats five meals a day’

(168) a. *We own a shop. Sell xoDra w-fawaaki (LDA-English)
    b. *Nous possédons une boutique. Vendons xoDra w-fawaaki (LDA-French)
    c. *Yesh bebaalutenu xanut. Moxrim xoDra w-fawaaki (LDA-Hebrew)
    d. Somos dueños de una tienda. Vendemos xoDra w-fawaaki (LDA-Spanish)
    e. Bizim bir dükkanımız var. xoDra w-fawaaki satiyoruz (order reversed) (LDA-Turkish)

We own a shop sell vegetables and-fruits

‘We own a shop. (We) sell vegetables and fruits’

(169) a. *George is multilingual. Speaks tlṭ lusaat (LDA-English)
    b. *George est polyglotte. Parle tlṭ lusaat (LDA-French)
    c. *George rav leshonai. medaber tlṭ lusaat (LDA-Hebrew)
    d. George es multilingüe. Habla tlṭ lusaat (LDA-Spanish)
    e. George çok dilli. tlṭ lusaat konuṣuyor (order reversed) (LDA-Turkish)

George is bilingual speaks three languages

‘George is multilingual. (He) speaks three languages’

Although they represent an identical sentence expressed in different language combinations, examples (167a) through (167e) are judged acceptable or unacceptable based on whether the participating language pairs converge or diverge in terms of a single parameter, the Pro-drop Parameter. While Spanish and Turkish share with Arabic the possibility of dropping the subject, French and English dissociate from Arabic in this respect. This explains why the DA-English
and DA-French instances of CS are judged unacceptable, whereas the DA-Spanish and DA-
Turkish examples are acceptable. This pattern is attested in examples (168a,b,c,d,e) and (169a,b,c,d,e). Hebrew is a moderately pro-drop language in the sense that it does not allow pro-
drop with third-person pronominals and in all cases of present tense (Borer, 1989). This explains
the ill-formedness of sentences (167c) and (168c) and (169c).

Let’s consider the structural differences between these languages with reference to the
Head-directionality Parameter.

(170) a. The dog drank majj
   b. Le chien a bu majj
   c. Hakelev shote majj
   d. El perro bebe majj
   e. *Köpek içiyor majj

‘The dog drank water’

(171) a. The man broke rižl-u
   b. L’homme s’est cassé rižl-u
   c. Haish shavar rižl-u
   d. El hombre rompió rižl-u
   e. *Adam kirdi rižl-u

‘The man broke his leg’

(172) a. The girl ate bɔrɔtʔaani.
   b. La fille a mangé bɔrɔtʔaani.
   c. Hayalda axla bɔrɔtʔaani.
   d. La niña se comió bɔrɔtʔaani.
   e. *Kız yedi bɔrɔtʔaani.

‘The girl ate an orange’

Again, sentences (170a) through (170e) are structurally and semantically identical.
Nonetheless, sentences (170a,b,c,d) are judged acceptable, whereas (170e) is considered
unacceptable. This discrepancy in the acceptability of these sentences can be attributed to the
Head Directionality parameter. Examples (171a,b,c,d) and (172a,b,c,d) are acceptable because Arabic converges with English, French, Spanish and Hebrew in terms of the Head Directionality Parameter. On the other hand, Arabic and Turkish are divergent in terms of the Head Directionality Parameter. While Arabic requires an SVO/VSO word order, Turkish requires an SOV word order. This parametric tension between Arabic and Turkish is also responsible for the unacceptability of (171e) and (172e).

In terms of the V-V construction parameter, Arabic shares with English, French, Turkish, and Hebrew the ability to have constructions of the patterns exemplified in (69), (70), and (71) above. However, it does not share with Spanish this structural pattern. This results in the following sentences:

(173) a. ?u?um sleep
    b. ?u?um dors
    c. ?u?um lishon
    d. *?u?um dormir
    e. ?u?um uyu

    ‘Go sleep’

(174) a. ta?a see
    b. ta?a voir
    c. ta?a tiree
    d. *ta?a ver
    e. ta?a gör

    ‘Come see’

(175) a. ta?a sit here
    b. ta?a assis toi ici
    c. ta?a šev kan
    d. *ta?a sentarse aqui
    e. ta?a otur burda

    ‘Come sit here’
The sentences in (173a,b,c,e) are grammatical because the two languages involved in CS allow this form of V-V construction, whereas example (173d) is ungrammatical because Spanish does not allow it. Therefore, whether these double-coded sentences are acceptable or unacceptable depends mainly on how convergent/divergent they are in terms of the V-V construction parameter. The same applies to sentences (174a, b, c, d, a, e) and (175a, b, c, d, e).

It is evident that it is only when parametric incompatibilities between the participating languages exist that CS becomes unfeasible, and this unfeasibility is restricted to the specific points where the parametric tensions exist. When no such tensions exist, CS becomes allowed, following the general principles of UG. This presents evidence for the non-universality of constraints on CS; the constraints cannot apply cross-linguistically because the structural relationship between different language pairs, particularly in terms of their parameters, is basically variable. This explains why sentences involving SA and DA (section 4.3.) are not subject to the constraints that emerge in sentences formed with elements from Arabic and any of the five languages presented above.\footnote{11}

While a detailed account of the structure of CS in general is out of the scope of the current study, the discussion above reveals two important points about this structure. The first concerns the fact that the constraints on CS are not universal. This falls in line with Bhatt’s (1997) Optimality Theoretic account of CS, which also shows that the restrictions on code alternation vary from one language pair to another. The second, and probably more important, point regards the fact that the variability of structural constraints depends on the structural relationship between different language pairs, particularly with regard to their parameters. CS is expected to be less constrained between language varieties that are structurally related (e.g., DA and SA) than between language pairs that are structurally divergent (e.g., Turkish and DA).
While it is desirable to create a specific parameter-based theory of CS, such a theory would initially require determining the nature of parameters, which is not only highly debated, but also beyond the scope of the current work. These two conclusions provide the basic assumptions upon which the discussion of the patterns of CS between SA and DA will be based.

5.2. The Functional Sentential Head and the Host/Guest Language Division:

The data analysis indicates that CS between SA and DA is not subject to the same constraints found in bilingual CS. The non-extendability of these constraints to CS between SA and DA is explained by postulating that SA and DA are, to a large extent, parametrically overlapping. At the same time, the data shows that CS seems to be restricted by the Sentential Functional Head Constraint. This constraint posits that when a sentential functional head comes from one variety, then all of the other sentential functional heads that it c-commands and the verb should be in the same variety.

The fact that all the heads on the path from V to C (or what has often been called the A-domain; Aoun, Benmamoun, and Choueiri (2010)) come from one variety suggests that only one variety can determine the overall structure of a single CP. In other words, in CS between SA and DA, the overall structure of mixed sentences can neither be based on the two grammars simultaneously nor on a third/middle grammar. This conclusion is consistent with the view that CS does not involve the creation of a third grammar (Jake, Myers-Scotton, & Gross, 2002; Mahootian, 1996; Chan, 2008, MacSwan, 2005). As Jake et al (2002, p.69) have observed, the predominance of the grammar of one variety in a single CP may in fact be “the bilingual instantiation of structural uniformity in a CP.”
By the same token, the abstract boundary between the grammars of the two varieties implies that they are somehow independent. In other words, the derivation of the sentential functional heads and the verb from a single variety suggests that SA and DA may be cognitively conceived by their speakers as two separate ‘languages.’ This lends support to Khamis-Dakwar and Froud (2007)’s study, which has provided experimental evidence for neurolinguistic distinction between Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and Palestinian Colloquial Arabic (PCA). This conclusion can be extended to the three varieties under study, namely, the Egyptian, Gulf and Levantine dialects.

A number of researchers have pointed to the asymmetry in the predominance of the participating languages in bilingual data (e.g., Sridhar-Sridhar, 1980; Bentahila and Davies, 1997; Joshi, 1985; Myers-Scotton, 1993a). Sridhar-Sridhar (1980) makes a distinction between the guest language and the host language, the latter being defined as “the primary language of the discourse” (p. 209). Sridhar-Sridhar proposes the Dual Structure Principle, according to which the host language may accommodate elements from the guest language if they conform to its rules. An additional main feature of the host language in the current data is also its ability to adapt the guest elements to its rules or sometimes to impose its structure when the requirements of the two languages mismatch. This may correspond to what Muysken (2000) describes in his borrowed-verb typology as “inserted verbs” or ‘adapted verbs,” which often undergo certain changes before they can function in the recipient variety.

Bentahila and Davies (1997) contend that the existence of a host language is a natural consequence of “the unequal partnership” (p.28) between the participating codes. Based on the criteria noted above and on the corpus of data examined in this study, it seems that DA generally serves as the host language in CS between SA and DA. In the current study, the concept of the
| (176) | No mean possible tomorrow possible after ten years. I by God NEG know. means we from | "No— I mean— it is possible tomorrow and it is possible after ten years. By God, I do not know. From our side, we always attend a conference if someone invites us to it. I mean we do not sulk as you Egyptians do. Whoever invites us to a conference, we attend. And if we have an opinion we say it at the conference. If someone stretches his hard to us arm-long, we stretch ours a meter. So we cannot...we are not accustomed to moving forward except on a sound foundation. We are ready to move forward to Egypt and stand with Egypt because Egypt is our bigger brother in any issue. But, we have an opinion that they have to listen to and discuss. That is what is required."  

(GDA/SA, PD4) |

 host language captures the fact that, although some sentences may be expressed solely in SA or in DA, most of the double-coded sentences are built on the structure of DA. The following three passages will focus on a number of structural distinctions that characterize the host variety, namely DA. 

The first passage is taken from a political interview in which a Qatari official discusses the Qatari and Egyptian viewpoints with regard to a meeting/conference for the Arab leaders: 

"Laa jaʃni jimkin bukra jimkin baʃd ʃaʃ sniin. ʔana wallah maa ʔaʃrif. Jaʃni ʔiʃna min No mean possible tomorrow possible after ten years. I by God NEG know. means we from ʃaanibna daaʔiman ʔaʃ ʔahad jidʃuna li-muʔtamar nihDar. Jaʃni maa nihrad bi-l-ʔusluub side-our always any one invite-us to-conference attend.1p means NEG sulk with-the-style l-maʃri lli ʃind-kum. ʔaʃ ʔahad jadʃuna li-muʔtamar nihDar. wa ʔiʃna ʃindana the-Egyptian that at-you. Any one invite-us to-conference attend.1p. And if at-us wižhat nADar, naquluha fi l-muʔtamar. ʔiʃna ʔahad jamuddu lana jadahu ʃiʃar san opinion say.3p.m-it in the-conference. If one stretches to us hand-his arm-long namuddu-ha mitr. Fa-maa nastaʃiʃ ʔinno ʔiʃna jaʃni ʔiʃna ʃumurna maa ʃawwadna stretch.1p-it meter. So Neg be able that we means we our life NEG be accustomed.1p ʔiʃnu ʔiʃna nurkuD ʔilla ʔala ʃasaas saliim. ʔiʃna mustaʃiʃduun nurkuD li-miʃr naqif maʃa that we run except on foundation sound. we ready run.1p to-Egypt stand with miʃr liʔanna miʃr ʃaqiqatuna l-kubra fi ʔaʃ mawDuʃ. Laakin ʔiʃna ʃindana Egypt because Egypt sister-our the-bigger in any issue but we at-us wižhat naDAR jasmaʃuna-ha w-nuaʃiš-ha. ʃaada kul l-maTluub. opinion hear.3p.m-it and-discuss.1p-it. This all the-required |
This excerpt contains a number of sentences expressed only in SA or only in DA, where the forms of each variety are left intact. However, a number of sentences are expressed only in SA and yet are influenced by the structure of DA. For example, in ʔiðaa ʕindana wiʔhat naʔDar (If we have an opinion…), the conditional complementizer ʔiðaa (if) is followed by a noun sentence (SVO), a pattern characteristic of DA conditionals. This pattern is different from SA-based conditionals that consist of a conditional particle followed typically by a verb sentence (VSO) starting with a perfective verb (Ryding, 2005). Likewise, the CP ʔiðaa ʔahad jamuddu lana ḥadahu ʔiraaʕan (If someone stretches his hard to us arm-long) consists of the complementizer ʔiðaa (if) followed by a noun sentence, which is typical of DA.

The predominance of DA appears more clearly in sentences involving elements from both SA and DA. For example, ʔihna mustaʕidduuun nurkuD li-miSr (we are ready to move forward to Egypt) contains the SA participial mustaʕidduuun followed by the DA imperfective verb nurkuD (run/move forward). In typical SA sentences, the participial is followed a nonfinite complement clause starting with ʔan (to). In DA, however, a participial can be followed directly by an imperfective verb. Since the combination is made grammatical, it is the rules of DA that are enforced in this case. In fact, it seems that whenever there is a mismatch between the requirements of the two grammars, DA often imposes its rules. This pattern appears at different points in mixed sentences, as the following examples show:

(177) fa-ʔana dah xallaani ʔqtanaʕit
    so-I this made-me get convinced

‘So this made me convinced’ (EA/SA, PD3)
The use of two consecutive perfective verbs is unique to DA. In SA, however, a perfective verb may not select another perfective verb (though it can select an imperfective verb). If it were to follow the rules of SA, the verb xalla would only be followed by an imperfective verb, as in xallaa [someone] jiqtin (made someone convinced). However, it does not; rather, it follows the rules of DA. Example (178) involves the use of a DA verb, namely bi-ħaawel (tries), followed by the SA verb jaSil (reach). Although such a structure may not be found in SA, the insertion of the SA verb is made to function within this unique DA structure. In example (179), the inverted SA predicate mumkin is used without li- (for) which follows it in typical SA sentences. Similarly, the SA imperfective verb jatahaddaθ (speaks) cannot be preceded by another imperfective verb. But, this rules in not observed in this sentence, as the DA verb bijaTlași (appears) allows an imperfective verb to follow it. Thus, the requirements of the DA verb bijaTlași (appears) are met, whereas those of the SA verb jatahaddaθ (speaks) are not.

Let us consider a second passage taken from a religious speech in which the speaker talks about one Attribute of God, namely, being a Muhaymen (Overseeing and Overpowering):
Three words, "We (God) said, 'O fire, be coolness and safety upon Abraham. And they wanted to harm him, but We made them the greatest losers.' Who came to be the overseeing/overpowering? Allah, Glorified and Exalted he is. Did not he (Abraham) say 'His Knowledge about my condition obviates my having to ask Him.' Moses' mother. Show me a mother who can put her son, who is a piece of her, in a box and to cast him in the river. God, Glorified and Exalted he is, commanded her with two things, admonished her against two things, and promised her of two things: 'so cast him into the river,' 'so suckle him and cast him into the river,' these are two commands; 'and do not fear and do not grieve,' these are two inhibitions; the two promises are 'Indeed, We will return him to you and will make him [one] of the messengers.' Who moved this box?' (LDA/SA, RS10)

This passage shows that SA is mainly used in direct quotes, while the commentary is mostly expressed in DA or in a mixture of DA and SA. As the host language, DA seems to determine the structure of most of the mixed sentences. For example, miin muhajmen Tolaṣ? (who Overpowering came to be?) is an example of a scrambled sentence because it positions the verb sentence-finally. The phenomenon of scrambling is not exclusive to DA but is more characteristic of DA structures.
Both SA and DA deploy word orders SVO and VSO word orders. Both orders are unmarked and both are widely used (Benmamoun, 2000). However, while SA sentences often abide by one of these word orders, these word orders are usually modified in DA by moving different parts of the sentences from their base location (Brustad, 2000). Scrambling appears in such cases as subject right-dislocation, object topicalization, subject-predicate inversion, and construct phrase reordering. These cases are an integral part of DA structure (Brustad, 2000). A large number of mixed sentences are scrambled according to these rules, as can be seen in (181), (182), (183), (184), and (185):

(181) xaTTa bawwaabat talatiin fa-zdaada ta?alluqan wa ?ibdaaʃan ?ahmad hasan

*passed.3s.m gate thirty so-increased.3s.m in brilliance and creativity* Ahmad Hasan

‘Ahmad Hasan passed the age of thirty, and so he increased in brilliance and creativity’ (EDA/SA, SC3)

(182) lli bidi Haaðihi l-hamla man?

*that started this the-campaign who*

‘Who is the one who started this campaign?’ (LDA/SA, RS11)

(183) haaðihi l-kutub ?ana δakart fiiha kəl haaðihi l-ʔaʃjaa?

*this the-books I mentioned in-it all this things*

‘These books I mentioned in them all of these things’ (EDA/SA, PD3)

(184) ʔol-marʔa S-Saliha ?aw Saaf-ha ʔeih?

*The-woman the-good attributes-her what*

‘What are the attributes of the good woman?’ (EDA/SA, RS7)

(185) laazim musaanadat d-difaaʃ

*Necessary support the-defense*

‘The defense support is needed’ (EDA/SA, SC1)
The standard SVO/VSO orders are modified in all of these sentences. Thus, in examples (181) and (182), the subjects ʔahmad hasan (Ahmad Hasan) and man (who?) are moved to the right of the sentence (that is, to a position non-typical of SA subjects). In (183), the object haaðihi l-kutub (these books) is fronted to the sentence-initial position with a resumptive pronoun –u (it) holding its original place in the sentence. Example (184) involves the swapping of the positions of the two nouns comprising the construct phrase, namely ʔel-marʔa ʔawSaaf-ha (the woman her attributes). In particular, the possessed is moved after the possessor. The last example underlies the inversion of the predicate laazim (necessary) and the subject musaanadat d-difaʕ (the defense support).

Likewise, the mixed sentence haaða S-Sanduuq miin sajjar-u? in excerpt (180) above is an instance of in-situ wh-question, which is typically used in DA. According to Aoun et al (2010, p. 128), wh-interrogatives in Arabic are formed through four strategies: gap strategy, resumptive strategy, class II resumptive strategy, and in-situ strategy. While the first three strategies are shared by SA and different Arabic dialects, according to Aoun et al, SA does not use the in-situ strategy. Thus, in-situ questions are particularly telling about the role of DA in determining the structure of mixed sentences. This role can be further seen in the following questions:

(186) ʔihna stawradna maaða min-hum?
we imported what from-them?
‘What did we import from them?’ (LDA/SA, RS11)

(187) jaʕni ʔeiḥ mużtamaʕ madani?
means.3s.m what society civil
‘What does a ‘civil society mean?’ (EDA/SA, PD9)
(188) l-xilaaf bada? fein?
the-dispute started where
‘Where did the dispute start?’ (GDA/SA, PD4)

(189) mas?uulijjat l-hukuumaat ?eih li-tadaaruk haaða l-?amr?
responsibilities the-governments what to-redress this the-issue
‘What are the responsibilities of the governments to redress this issue?’ (EDA/SA, PD11)

(190) di muwaţţaha li-man?
this directed to-whom
‘To whom is this directed?’ (EDA/SA, PD9)

(191) mada tažaawub n-naaß maʃak eih?
Extent cooperation the-people with-you what
‘To what extent are the people cooperating with you?’ (EDA/SA, PD9)

In example (186) and (187), the SA object maada (what) and DA object eih (what) are left in-situ, that is, after the verb stawradna (imported) and jaʃni (means). Likewise, the wh-word fein does not undergo movement in (188). The same applies to the wh-words ?eih (what), liman (to whom), and ?eih (what) in examples (189), (190), and (191)—all of which are not fronted to the sentence-prominent position by wh-movement.

Let us consider a third and last passage taken from a soccer match between two local Syrian teams in the Syian League:
The predominance of DA structure appears in the double-coded sentences in this passage. For example, the sentence *Hadaf muu mutwaqqat min hażma murtadda* (a goal not expected from a counter attack) shows the interference of DA in structuring negative sentences. Negation across the Arabic dialects is of two types: verbal negation and predicate negation (Brustad, 2000). Verbal negation is often realized by the use of *maa—š* or *maa*, whereas predicate negation is attained by *miš* or *muu*. In SA, however, predicate negation is expressed by *sajr* or *lajsa*, whereas verbal negation is realized by three tense-dependent particles including *lam* (did not), *laa* (do not), and *lan* (will not), in addition to *maa* (not), which can be used before perfective and imperfective verbs (Ryding, 2005). Coordinated negation in SA is achieved by *laa—wa-laa* (neither—nor). In DA, on the other hand, coordinated negation is realized either by the same method or by combining one part of the coordinated negation with one of the above ways of negation.

The common use of DA negation techniques is indicative of the influence of DA in shaping the structure of codeswitched sentences. This can be also seen in the following examples:
In examples (193) and (194), the DA negative markers *muu* and *muš* replace the SA negative *lajsa* without having an effect on the word order of the sentences. This is because the structures into which they are inserted are available in both SA and DA. In (195), however, the use of the negative marker *muu* interrupts the word order of the sentence. An equivalent sentence in SA would be *nahnu qaDijjituna lajsat šaxSijjia* (our cause is not personal). In examples (196) and (197), the expression *ma fiiš* (there is/are no) is deployed in two different ways. In (196), the insertion of this expression leaves the DA/SA structure intact. This is not the case in (197),
where the use of this phrase prompts the DA-typical use of an emphatic pronoun at the beginning of the sentence. Interestingly, the emphatic pronoun, namely *hum* (they), comes here from SA, which does not support such use of the pronoun. The last example is a case of coordinated negation in which the first part, namely *lāa*, is replaced by the DA *ma*-š. The use of the negative *maa* in this position is possible in both SA and DA. But while it is somehow marked in SA, it seems to be unmarked in DA.

As the host language, DA allows the use of *dialectized* SA forms\(^\text{12}\) that fit within its structure, as in *nāthaddaθ* (we speak) in the excerpt above. The SA verb *nāthaddað* (speak) is modified by shortening the vowel of the first syllable and deletion of the imperfective mood ending *-u*. Other *dialectized* SA elements can be seen in the following examples (*dialectized* forms underlined):

(199) *tāzid ṭənnu lli jāthaddað bi-luراجع* naašima wa haadiʔa wa hiwaarija *maa*
find.2p that that speaks.3s.m in-language soft and quiet and negotiatory NEG

jaqbaluun-a
accept.3p.m-him

‘You find that the one who speaks in a soft, quiet, and negotiatory language will not be accepted by them’ (GDA/SA, PD5)

(200) *bas maa b-nsTaTiʕ nʔuul ṭənnu haada bi-ʔzənni w-haada bi-nnaar*
But NEG ASP-be able say that this in-Paradise and-this in-Hellfire

‘But we cannot say that this [person] is in Paradise and this is in Hellfire’ (LDA/SA, RS11)

(201) *ʔana maa rah adaafīʕ ŝan-hum*
I NEG will defend about-them

‘I will not defend’ (GDA/SA, PD4)
In example (199), the SA verb \(jəṭhaddād\) (speak), which can sometimes be part of the DA lexicon of some speakers of Arabic, is modified by shortening the vowel of the first syllable and deletion of the imperfective mood ending \(-u\). In example (200), the SA verb, which again may be part of the DA lexicon, undergoes initial-syllable vowel deletion and is simultaneously attached to the DA aspectual prefix \(b-\). Moreover, it loses the imperfective mood ending. These three changes make it a typical DA verb. That is why it is, unlike typical SA verbs, is able to select a CP with a null complementizer, namely, \(n?uul \, źənnu \, hāada \, bī-žənni \, w-hāada \, bī-nnaar\) (we say that this [person] is in Paradise and this in Hellfire). In the last example, the DA tense marker \(rāh\) is followed by the SA verb \(adaaffi\) (defend), whose agreement prefix \(u-\) drops its glottal stop and modifies the vowel of the initial syllable, namely \(u-\), into \(a-\). Besides, the mood ending disappears on this verb. This verb may also be part of the DA lexicon of some speakers of Arabic.

These three examples exemplify some of the main changes that an SA element, such as a verb, may undergo in codeswitched sentences. These changes include (1) phonological adaptation, (2) loss of mood endings, and (3) morphological modification. Most of these changes (e.g., initial-vowel deletion/shortening, dropping of mood endings) characterize the major differences between verbs whose roots are shared by SA and DA (e.g., \(jals̱abul(bi-)j̱els̱ab\) (play); \(ʃaribals̱reb\) (drank); \(jaktubuunal(bi-)j̱akbu\) (write); \(rakibat/ṟḵbet\) (rode/got on)). These changes often strip the SA element of its distinctive morphological and phonological features and make it functionally a DA element. This also explains why the appearance of these dialectized SA forms does not violate the sentential functional head constraint in cases where C, I, Neg or the verb come from DA.
In summary, CS between SA and DA seems to evade some of the major constraints on bilingual CS. This can be explained by the structural overlap between these two varieties, especially in the light of the fact they share many morho-syntactic properties, lexical items, and phonological rules. At the same time, CS here is regularized by the sentential functional head constraint, which prevents CS between sentential functional heads and the lexical verb in a single CP or IP. However, DA seems to dominate the structure of most mixed sentences. The predominance of DA appears in terms of its ability to adapt the guest SA elements to its structure, to impose its structure when a mismatch exists between SA and DA forms, and to frame double-coded sentences according to its word order rules. The permeation of DA may be due to its status as the native tongue of the great majority of Arabic speakers. In other words, DA sets the grammatical frame of the majority of mixed sentences because it may be cognitively more accessible to the speakers. The structural role and status of DA as the dominant/host language will be contrasted to its social role in the next section.

5.3. Social Functions of CS:

In addition to examining the syntactic structure of CS between SA and DA, this dissertation focuses on the social functions of CS in Arabic-speaking communities. This part of the study is interested in answering the basic questions of why a certain switch occurs. Admittedly, the study of syntactic constraints on codeswitching is necessary but insufficient to justify CS or pinpoint its discursive meaning and effect (Auer, 1984).

One of the main findings of this study is that the patterns of CS between SA and DA occur in contexts of varying levels of formality, such as religious speeches, political debates, and soccer commentaries. In fact, one can describe the data examined in all three contexts as a
mixture of two codes that is characterized by frequent switching from one variety to another. Despite the apparent mixing of these two varieties at the word, sentence, and discourse levels, the data analysis shows that the patterns of CS from SA to DA are qualitatively different from those from DA to SA. Thus, CS to DA is employed to (1) induce parenthetical phrases and fillers; (2) downplay a particular segment of the discourse; (3) signal indirect quotes; (4) simplify a preceding idea; (5) exemplify; (6) mark a shift in tone from serious to comic; (7) discuss taboo or derogatory issues; (7) introduce daily-life sayings; and (8) scold, insult or personally attack. The patterns of CS to DA can be classified under the following constructs: unimportance, low-prestige, accessibility, and non-seriousness (Figure 1). These constructs reflect the status and functions of DA as the Low variety in the Arab sociolinguistic arena.

*Figure 1: Relationship between patterns of CS to DA and the status of DA*
On the other hand, speakers switch to SA to (1) introduce formulaic expressions; (2) highlight the importance of a segment of discourse; (3) mark emphasis; (4) introduce direct quotations; (5) signal a shift in tone from comic to serious; (6) produce rhyming stretches of discourse; (7) take a pedantic stand; and (8) appeal to pan-Arab or Islamic affiliation. The first seven of these patterns can be classified under the following constructs: importance, high-prestige, seriousness, and sophistication (Figure 2). These constructs mark the status, role, and functions of SA as the High variety in the Arab sociolinguistic situation. In other words, shifting to the High variety, SA, corresponds to important, high-prestige, sophisticated, and serious functions.

*Figure 2: Relationship between patterns of CS to SA and the status of SA*
Interestingly, speakers only shift to SA to appeal to pan-Arab or Muslim affiliation. In other words, only SA is associated with Arab and Muslim identity.

A cursory examination of the patterns of CS to each of these varieties shows clearly a lack of overlap in their distribution. Thus, CS here serves as a regularization mechanism through which sociolinguistic functions of varying levels of prestige, importance, complexity, and seriousness are encoded and indexed through the use of two codes—a High code dedicated to important, serious, and sophisticated functions, and a Low code assigned to less important, less serious, and accessible issues. At the same time, the respective statuses of the two varieties are preserved within this double-coded mixture, irrespective of the context in which they occur. For example, joking is typically associated with DA whether it occurs in religious speeches, political debates, or soccer commentaries. Through CS, speakers can relate the content of their discourse to one of the codes or the other, based on the above criteria.

The very process of streamlining different discursive functions in accordance with the status of the code becomes a tool for preserving the value asymmetry between the two varieties. Through this process, speakers reinforce the historically-endowed High status of SA and the Low status of DA. When a speaker allocates important, serious, and sophisticated functions to SA and less important, less serious, and accessible functions to DA, she/he simultaneously encodes his/her ideological stance and attitude to SA as an eloquent and superior language and to DA as a simplified and inferior variety. This pinpoints the second function of CS in the data as a marker of the attitude of the speaker toward certain details in the discourse. In his study on CS to DA in religious discourse, Saeed (1997) argued that shifting to DA sometimes underscores the negative attitude of the speaker to a particular topic under discussion. In the current data, it is evident that
the very act of switching, based on High/Low functions, becomes a reflection of a change in the speaker’s attitude.

A third important function of CS is to index the speaker’s pan-Arab or Muslim identity. However, this function is restricted to shifting to SA. This is understandable if we consider the fact that SA has always represented one of the deepest anchors of Arabic unity throughout history (Suleiman, 2003). Moreover, SA has historically been associated with a collective Arab or Muslim identity. Unlike DA, which is linked to eras of Arab division, disunity, and weakness, SA evokes memories of the ages of Arab unity, power, and prosperity. Further, as a code mutually intelligible throughout the Arab World, SA is one of the few shared assets that brings the Arab communities together (Fishman, 1971; Suleiman, 2003). SA is also related to Muslim identity because it is the language of Islamic theology, liturgy, and tradition. A number of researchers have pointed to the relationship between the use of a particular language variety spoken by an ethnic group and the expression of ethnic identity (e.g., De fina, 2007; Heller, 1992). In those contexts, CS is often employed strategically to resist the existing social order and redefine the relationship between two groups. However, while previous studies suggest that the expression of identity is often carried out through the local variety, the current study shows that pan-Arab and Muslim identities are expressed by what has been termed the superposed variety (Ferguson, 1959). The link between SA and Arab identity suggests that this variety is viewed, not as a superposed, but a local language that represents the Arabic speaking communities.

The motivational patterns for the distribution of SA and DA in the data present evidence against Ferguson’s early model of diglossia (1959), which allocates SA and DA to prescribed non-overlapping contexts based on the dichotomy of formality versus informality. Ferguson (1959, 328) argues that “in one set of situations only H is appropriate and in another only L, with
the two sets overlapping only very slightly.” The data shows that CS does occur with considerable frequency and in contexts of varying levels of formality—a pattern that has been attested in previous studies on CS between SA and DA (Saeed, 1997; Soliman, 2008; Boussofara-Omar, 1999; Bassiouney, 2006). In other words, the linguistic choices made by the speakers do not depend solely on the formality or informality of the context in which they occur. In fact, the use of one of the varieties or the other depends largely on the function to be performed and its relation to the High or Low code. This means that even in religious discourse, which is the most formal form of discourse, DA may occur if such functions as joking, simplifying, exemplifying, and scolding, are invoked. Thus, the construct of diglossia has to be reformulated—not abandoned—based on the functional, rather than the contextual, compartmentalization of SA and DA (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Functional Diglossia
The findings of this study also do not fall in line with Fishman’s domain theory of CS (1971), which views code choice as predictable on the basis of the domain in which it occurs. Fishman’s predictions mean not only that CS should not occur in the same domain, but also that a change in any or all of the domain parameters would lead to a change in the code. However, the data in this study shows a great overlap in the domains in which the patterns of CS occur. Moreover, CS between the two varieties does occur, even when the interlocutors, general topic, and specific occasion are constant. Hence, CS is not domain-dependent, as Fishman (1971) theorizes.

The literature underscores the role of CS in showing distance or solidarity with the listener or with a certain group, following Gumperz’s (1982) formulation of the social dimension of CS on the basis of the distinction between the ‘we code’ and the ‘they code’ (p. 66). The distance/solidarity distinction does not apply to the data simply because the alternation between SA and DA takes place in the same contexts, speech events, and with the same audience, as example (203) shows:


donot O brother-my to seek with-it status or prestige or rise above the-people qaala rasuulu Llahi… “man tašallama ſilman mim-ma jubtařa bi-hi wažha Llah laa said Messenger God …“who learns knowledge of-what sought with-it face God NEG jatašallamu-hu ſilla li-juŠiba bi-hi ſaraDan mina d-dunia lam jažid ſarafa l-žanna”… learn-it except to-attain with-it a transient thing from this world NEG find smell the-paradise” jašni laa jadxul al-žannah. Leih ja xwani means NEG enter the-paradise. Why o brothers.

‘My brother, do not seek by it [memorizing the Qur’an] status or prestige or rise above people…The Prophet of God, peace and blessings be upon him, said “one who learns a form of knowledge, of the type through which the Face of God is sought in order to attain a transient thing from this world, will not find the smell of paradise,” which means he will not enter paradise. Why brothers?” (EDA/SA, RS3)
Addressing his audience directly, the speaker in (203) repeats the word ‘brother(s)’ one time in SA and another in DA. Although addressing the same audience in the same setting and speech event, the speaker alternates between the two codes to express solidarity. This suggests that neither of the two codes is particularly associated with solidarity (or distance). In fact, an examination of the relevant literature suggests that the solidarity/distance distinction is often restricted to contexts that are characterized by the co-existence of a local variety along with an ‘alien/official’ one (e.g., Hindi vs. English; Moroccan Arabic vs. French; Ranamal vs. Bokmal). In such situations, the use of the local variety marks solidarity, whereas the use of the other variety indexes distance. CS between SA and DA may not be explained by this distinction because both varieties are viewed by the majority of Arabs as local. As indicated above, speakers in this study externalize their belief in the localness of SA by creating a link between themselves, their Arab or Muslim identity, and the use of SA.

Myers-Scotton (1993, p. 128) argues that “unmarked CS should not occur at all in narrow diglossic communities (the Arabic-speaking nations of the Middle East, at least, if not the other exemplars included in Ferguson 1959).” Myers-Scotton bases her argument on the assumption that speakers who alternate between SA and DA do not identify with the normative Rights and Obligations (RO) set. Leaving the problematics of the concept of the normative RO set aside, we can see that CS between SA and DA often resembles the normative way of indexing the different social functions represented by the two codes. In other words, the alternation between the two varieties, based on their preset roles in the community, is typically unmarked because it does not violate the general expectations of the interlocutors. Even if we assume that the alternation between SA and DA is marked, it is still difficult to explain CS between the two varieties in terms of setting favored social distance between different participants in the communicative events. As the data has shown, speakers do not usually employ CS between SA and DA to set the
social distance between themselves and the listeners but to perform certain social functions that
are associated with the two codes. Thus, the predictions of the Markedness Model are
disconfirmed in the case of CS between SA and DA.

Auer (1984, 1988, 1998) proposed a sequential approach to CS based on conversation
analysis techniques. In this bottom-up approach to CS analysis, the code choice emerges in the
interactional process as a result of the negotiation process between participants. Auer further
suggests that “the sequential structure of language negotiation” (p. 8) precedes, though not
excludes, its social meaning as understood by the community members. Auer’s sequential
approach implies that understanding every instance of CS would require considering the
preceding and following utterances, only with secondary attention to other ‘external’
sociolinguistic factors. This assumption, however, is not supported by the data because the
meanings of codeswitched utterances in the data are often independent of their sequential
environment; as noted above, CS between SA and DA is largely dependent on the functions that
the speakers are trying to carry out in relation to the sociolinguistic statuses of the two codes
within the community. In other words, the patterns of CS between SA and DA can only be
understood within the context in which the two codes exist. For instance, if we consider
examples (48) and (49) above, we will notice that understanding the meaning of the switch to
DA to introduce humor into SA discourse depends largely on understanding the association
between joking and DA, the Low variety, rather than on the preceding and following utterances.

Bhatt and Bolonyai (in press) argue that the functions of CS in a given community come
about as the optimal output of the process of ordering different principles. Hence, the functions
of CS differ from one community to another in terms of the order of the principles’
computational hierarchy. Since it shows that the functions of CS in the Arab context are different
from those found in bilingual communities, the study supports Bhatt and Bolonyai’s argument for the variability of the functions of CS in different communities. However, none of the principles identified in their study, namely Faith, Power, Solidarity, Face, and Perspective, can explain the social functions of CS between SA and DA. In fact, Bhatt and Bolonyai acknowledge that the proposed principles “do not necessarily exhaust the repertoire of universal principles/constraints that underlie both the orderliness and variability of CS” (p. 4).

Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai (2001) propose that the functions of CS reside ultimately with the individual, rather than with larger societal conventions, constraints, actors, or discourse structure. Although the speaker’s motives are essential to understanding different CS patterns, the data shows that CS between SA and DA is mainly speaker-externally motivated; the alternation between the two codes is forced by the link between the functions and status of the code itself. For example, speakers may not ‘joke’ and use SA at the same time (although this is theoretically possible) because joking requires from the speaker the use of DA. This way, both CS and the sociolinguistic functions performed through it are inseparable from and restricted by the statuses of the codes themselves.

Overall, despite the overlap in some of the motivational patterns for CS between bilingual and bidialectal CS, the overall sociolinguistic functions of CS between SA and DA in the data are largely specific to the Arab sociolinguistic context. The motivations for CS between SA and DA are mainly code-dependent, rather than dependent on immediate context (in the sense used in Auer’s work), interlocutor, event, or speaker. Speakers alternate between the two codes based on their perceptions of the statuses of the codes themselves and the particular sociolinguistic functions associated with them. These functions are preset rather than emergent during the interactional process. In other words, speakers enter the communicative exchange with
preconceived notions about the code polarity in terms of statuses and functions and about the
role of this polarity in indexing such sociolinguistic functions as prestige/non-prestige,
importance/unimportance, complexity/simplicity, and seriousness/humor. This is different from
bilingual CS, where the alternation between the two codes arises in the interaction process from
interpersonal relationships between the interlocutors or based on changes in certain contextual
factors.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has investigated the structure and functions of CS in the context of bidialectal Arabic-speaking communities. The goal of the study was three-fold: (1) to explore the possibility of extending some of the major ‘universal’ syntactic constraints on bilingual CS to bidialectal CS between SA and DA; (2) to explain the grammatical principles that govern CS between SA and DA; and (3) to examine the sociolinguistic functions of CS between these two language varieties and their relationship to those identified in bilingual CS.

These objectives were pursued using three sets of naturally-produced data that represent three domains: religious lectures/discussions, political debates, and soccer play-by-play commentaries. Speakers in these domains typically speak their dialects natively and have functional command of SA at the discourse level. In addition to the naturalistic data, two hundred and thirty-five experimentally-created sentences were used in an acceptability-judgment task to test some hypotheses about the structure of CS between SA and DA.

6.1. Summary of the Findings:

The findings demonstrate that none of the major syntactic constraints identified in bilingual CS literature — including CS-specific constraints (e.g., Poplack, 1981; Joshi, 1985; Di Sciullo, et al, 1986; Belazi, et al, 1994), language-general constraints (e.g., Mahootian, 1993, 1996; Chan, 2003, 2008; MacSwan, 1999, 2005), and system-based constraints (e.g., Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2001; Jake, et al, 2002) — seem to be operative in the
case of CS between SA and DA. Thus, unlike bilingual CS, bidialectal CS can occur between a functional head and its complement, between a governed element and its governor, between a bound morpheme and its host element, among closed-class items, within constituents generated by a rule from one language which is not shared by the other, among system morphemes, across functional categories, head-internally, and between different heads and complements.

The non-extendibility of these constraints to bidialectal CS is explained by the fact that, whereas CS restrictions arise as a result of certain parametric tensions between typologically distinct languages, CS between SA and DA eludes these restrictions due to the significant structural overlap between the two varieties. Nonetheless, CS seems to be regulated by the Sentential Functional Head Constraint, according to which the sentential functional heads (C, I, and Neg) as well as the verb should come from a single variety (either SA or DA). On the other hand, DA seems to be the structurally dominant language in the sense that it shapes the structure of the majority of mixed sentences.

The analysis shows that certain constraints emerge at points where parametric tensions exist between Arabic and a number of languages, including English, French, Hebrew, Turkish, and Spanish. Since the parameters vary among different language pairs (e.g., Arabic and Turkish, Italian and French, Spanish and English, etc.), the constraints on CS vary as well. This variability does not fall in line with the claim that certain constraints on CS are universal. The notion of the variability of CS constraints across different language pairs is congruent with Bhatt’s (1997) findings.

This study proposes the Parameter Difference Hypothesis as a general way to account for the selective applicability of constraints. The Parameter Difference Hypothesis suggests that, although CS abides by the general principles of UG, it is constrained at points where parametric
tensions between the participating languages or language varieties exist. The number and type of constraints on CS depend primarily on the parametric convergence/divergence of the two varieties, which is in turn contingent upon how structurally related they are. Language varieties with similar or overlapping structures, such as SA and DA, may have limited or no restrictions on CS between them. On the other hand, CS may be more restricted between structurally divergent languages, such as Arabic and English. While it is desirable to create a specific parameter-based theory of CS, such a theory would require exploring the nature of parameters, the values of each in the participating language varieties, and the mutual exclusivity of these values in these varieties (see, for example, Chomsky, 1993)—all of which are beyond the scope of the current work.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, the data reveals that the motivations for CS between SA and DA are to a large extent specific to bidialectal communities and may not apply to bilingual speakers. Unlike its bilingual counterpart, CS between SA and DA is not governed by the immediate context, speech event, speaker, or interlocutor. Rather, it is enforced by the link between the functions and status of the code itself. Thus, speakers switch to the High variety (SA) when performing higher-order communicative functions (e.g., quoting directly, lecturing, etc.) and to the Low variety (DA) when evoking low-order functions (e.g., scolding, joking, etc.). Bidialectal speakers enter different types of communicative exchanges with mental preconceptions about the distribution of SA and DA in terms of prestige/non-prestige, importance/unimportance, complexity/simplicity, and seriousness/humor, and they utilize CS to filter their different sociolinguistic messages through the codes themselves. For example, a speaker may convey the importance or seriousness of an issue under discussion by shifting to SA, and he may downplay another issue simply by switching to DA.
Thus, CS gives bidialectal speakers the communicative advantage of alternating between two codes, but without violating their respective statuses and roles even within small stretches of discourse and in contexts of varying levels of formality. The fact that different communicative functions are assigned to H and L based on their importance, sophistication, prestige, and seriousness may also reflect the attitudinal aspect of CS, namely, the connectedness of SA to *positive* and DA to *negative*. This conclusion is corroborated by the fact that it is only through SA that speakers index their Arab and Muslim identities.

The findings of the current study do not support the conventional compartmentalization of SA and DA within fixed and non-overlapping contexts across the boundaries of formality and informality (Ferguson, 1959). The data shows that CS does occur with considerable frequency and in contexts of varying levels of formality (religious speeches, political debates, and soccer commentaries). In other words, the linguistic choices made by the speakers do not depend solely on the context in which they occur, but on the communicative function to be performed. This necessitates the re-conceptualization of diglossia as functional rather than contextual. Even in the same situation, DA is associated with the functions of the Low variety and SA with those of the High variety.

The findings also do not fall in line with the domain theory of CS (Fishman, 1971), which ascribe CS to changes in interlocutors, topics, or occasion of the speech. The data shows that CS between the two varieties does occur, even when the speaker, general topic, listeners, and specific occasion are constant. Other accounts of CS in terms of sequential environment (Auer, 1998), speaker-internal motivations (Bhatt & Bolonyai, in press), solidarity versus distance (Gumperz, 1982), and markedness versus unmarkedness (Myers-Scotton, 1993b) do not explain the patterns of CS between SA and DA.
6.2. Implications:

The study has several implications on issues related to bidialectalism, the nature of grammar as a cognitive system, bidialectal education, and the social aspects of language. In general, the study of CS is important because it helps further our understanding of the nature of bilingualism/bidialectalism and its social and cognitive dimensions. Such an understanding is necessary to provide bilingual/bidialectal speakers with the type of education that takes into account their linguistic and social backgrounds. The study of CS between SA and DA is particularly important because it sheds some light on the nature of Arabic bidialectal speech, which is often characterized by frequent alternation between two codes in a number of formal and informal situations.

The study shows that, in CS between SA and DA, both SA and DA can determine the overall structure of SA-DA sentences. However, speakers predominantly build up their utterances on the grammar of DA. The influence of DA appears in terms of its ability to adapt the guest SA elements in its structure, to impose its structure when a mismatch exists between SA and DA forms, and to structure most mixed sentences according to its word order rules. This suggests that, as the mother tongue of virtually every speaker of Arabic, DA plays a greater role in building the structure of codeswitched sentences. The speakers’ notable reliance on the grammar of DA might be due to their lack of complete proficiency in SA or as a result of their unequal command of SA and DA. In other words, codeswitchers build their sentences in DA because they have greater competence in this variety, which entails that it may be cognitively more accessible to them (see Branigan & Feleki, 1999 for a review).

This has important implications on language policy in the Arab World, particularly with regard to the teaching of SA at schools and colleges. Most Arab children are exposed to SA from
early childhood at school and through different media channels. Their potentially incomplete command of SA may reflect different problems in SA curricula, teaching materials, teaching methods, assessment and so on. These topics need to be reexamined taking into consideration the specific areas of weakness in the SA language proficiency of adult speakers of SA. CS data is relevant because it points to linguistic areas where speakers struggle the most.

Particularly important for enhancing Arab speakers’ command of SA is the need to reconsider the quality and quantity of language input, that is, the extent of exposure to SA and the systematicity of this exposure. Language input has been reported to be one of the most critical factors in the acquisition of L1 and L2 alike (Krashen, 1985). Language practice is probably no less important for enhancing language proficiency (Salaberry, 1997; Gass, 1997). Thus, speakers may lack full command of SA due to the insufficient opportunities to practice their language skills. It is well-known that many schools in the Arab World restrict SA use to SA-focused language classes. Content-based classes (e.g., geography, biology, history, etc.) are often taught through the vehicle of DA. To enhance the students’ language skills, schools should provide more systematic input in SA as well as more opportunities to practice these skills in the same variety. Schools can extend the opportunities for SA language use by turning SA into the medium of instruction and by encouraging students to use it in their everyday classroom activities and interactions.

However, for students to build up their skills in SA, appropriate resources should be available. For example, it is important to ensure that teachers of SA are not only proficient in speaking the language or understanding its grammar, but also skilled in teaching it effectively through innovative teaching methods. Unfortunately, most of the SA textbooks in the Arab World focus primarily on teaching SA grammar, reading and writing. While these skills are
extremely important, oral language skills, particularly speaking, should receive due attention as well. Focusing on the oral skills is needed to turn SA into a language fluently spoken and effectively used by a wide spectrum of Arabic speakers, not only educated ones, in everyday speech. Eventually, this measure may help turn SA into a language spoken and written in everyday communications, rather than one used in specific domains.

The frequency of alternation between SA and DA suggests that CS is unmarked in different contexts in the Arabic sociolinguistic arena (at least in the three contexts examined in this work). The unmarked nature of CS is visible in media outlets such as Aljazeera and other pan-Arab TV channels. Children in the Arab societies may therefore replicate this form of alternation in their SA language classrooms. Teachers of SA may need to take this fact into consideration when teaching and evaluating students’ proficiency in SA. In other words, students’ use of different DA forms in their SA classrooms should not be viewed as a language deficiency because it reflects a stable social reality in the Arab World. The study of CS may inform educational practice in different ways. For example, educational practices may make use of the similarities between the two codes to facilitate the learning of SA and analyze the differences to devise the best teaching strategies that address them.

The view of CS as a language deficiency is of great consequence for bilingual speakers of Arabic, especially heritage speakers—those born in non-Arab countries to Arab parents (or at least one Arab parent). Heritage speakers often switch between SA and DA in their SA-focused classrooms. Teachers of SA may react to CS unfavorably, considering it as a student-originated error that need to be interrupted through structured correction. This form of correction may be counterproductive in the sense that it may force students to monitor their speech or doubt their ability to command SA. Thus, instead of being an advantage, their command of DA becomes a
limitation. Likewise, some teachers assume, based on their perception of the oral skills of these speakers, that heritage speakers have a good command of SA or at least an advantage over L2 learners in mixed L2-heritage classes. The high expectations from the heritage speakers may put them under continued pressure to outperform their peers. Educational practice should not only accommodate heritage speakers’ knowledge of DA, but also utilize it for enhancing their SA language skills.

SA and DA have an asymmetric relationship in terms of their statuses and roles in the Arabic-speaking communities. The current study shows that bidialectal speakers observe the status/prestige boundary between SA and DA in contexts of varying levels of formality. Thus, CS helps speakers reproduce the division between SA and DA by aligning different functions with one variety or the other based on their importance, prestige, seriousness, and sophistication. In other words, although SA and DA may occur in the same context, the assignment of communicative functions to SA or DA is based on the statuses of the two varieties in the Arabic-speaking communities.

This suggests that SA and DA are compartmentalized functionally rather than contextually. In other words, SA and DA may occur in the same contexts, but their allocation to High or Low functions is maintained. This intra-contextual compartmentalization of SA and DA necessitates revisiting the concept of diglossia as conceptualized by Ferguson (1959) and widely used by researchers dealing with Arabic. The reconceptualization of the notion of diglossia helps us better understand the Arabic sociolinguistic situation and comprehend one of the main functions of CS in the Arabic diglossic context, namely, to maintain the link between the statuses and functions of the two varieties in different situations.
One of the important issues often raised with respect to CS between SA and DA is the emergence of a third/middle language underlying the mixing of the two varieties at the word or sentence levels. The current data shows that, from both a structural and a social perspective, the postulation of a middle language is unnecessary. On a structural level, the juxtaposition of different elements from SA and DA does not blur the boundary between the two varieties. In fact, it is often possible to demarcate elements of the two varieties even within a single word (unless the forms of the varieties are identical), as has been shown in section 1.6. From a social perspective, SA and DA are often associated with non-overlapping functions. The distinctiveness of SA and DA forms and functions suggests that the existence of a middle language cannot be traced empirically at the current stage of research (see also Boussafara-Omar, 1999).

Undeniably, future developments in the Arabic sociolinguistic landscape may bring about hybrid linguistic forms that may constitute what might be then called the third/middle language.

A somewhat related question is whether SA and DA are built on two distinct systems or simply on a single system with different surface realizations. This has been one of the most widely debated issues in Arabic linguistics (Owens, 2007; Versteegh, 1984; Bateson, 2003; Holes, 2004; Ferguson, 1959). According to one view, SA and DA come from a single origin, with DA getting lexically, phonologically and morphologically distanced from SA as a result of language contact and language development in geographically distant areas (Blau, 1977; Fück, 1950; Versteegh, 1984). Another group of researchers suggests that SA and DA may not have the same origin due to their considerable morphosyntactic discrepancies (Corriente, 1976; Holes, 2004; Hopkins, 1984). In other words, the differences between SA and DA are structural in nature.
This study shows that CS between SA and DA is not subject to the structural constraints often found in bilingual CS. If we accept the idea that these constraints originate in parametric tensions between language varieties, we are led to believe that SA and DA are to a large extent parametrically overlapping. Thus, the current study in fact supports the one-system hypothesis, which has been advanced by early Arab linguists and histro-linguists, such as Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406), Aljahez (775-868), and Sibaweih (756-796), as well as several contemporary scholars (Blau, 1977; Fück, 1950; Versteegh, 1984).

The sociolinguistic analysis shows that the functions of CS in the Arab communities are dissimilar to those in bilingual communities. In the Arabic context, CS is tied with the statuses and roles of the two varieties. This highlights the importance of context in the study of CS and other sociolinguistic phenomena. In fact, some researchers argue that context and socio-pragmatic factors play an importance role even in the production of CS (Kecskes, 2006). For example, the processing of CS may be hard because of the social stigma associated with it. Context therefore should provide the background against which the production, structure, and meaning of CS should be evaluated.

The fact that SA invokes pan-Arab and Muslim identity is significant. It shows, first, that SA is still an emblem of Arabic unity and Muslim religious affiliation. This link between SA and identity is the result of the interaction of socio-historical factors (e.g., the relationship between SA and Arab nationalism), formal and informal institutions (schools, media, policy), and the communicative practices of speakers of Arabic. Second, the link between SA and Arab and Muslim identity suggests that SA is viewed as a local language that represents the Arabic speaking communities. In other words, SA is not a superposed variety in the sense used in most
bilingual/bidialectal contexts where a foreign/superposed variety is imposed on the local people due to certain asymmetric power relationships.

Overall, the study suggests that the phenomenon of bidialectal CS should be studied on its own right as independent from bilingual CS. This is not only because the structural relationships between typologically distinct languages versus dialectal varieties involved in CS are different, but also because the sociolinguistic context and the motivations for CS are different as well. Attention should be particularly drawn to the structural relatedness of dialectal varieties and the sociolinguistic situation in which they exist and operate.

**6.3. Further Research:**

The current study has focused on CS between SA and DA in three domains, namely, religious speeches, political debates, and play-by-play soccer commentaries. These domains to some extent epitomize the range of formal-informal contexts in which CS in the Arabic communities occurs. Future research should investigate the distribution of SA and DA in additional interactional forms (not just three domains) so that a better understanding of CS within the Arab sociolinguistic situation can be reached. An obviously missing domain is everyday conversations. This domain was not included in this study mainly because of the difficulty of finding frequent instances and, maybe, consistent patterns of CS in this context. Future studies should focus on this domain in an attempt to investigate the frequency of SA in everyday interactions, functions of SA in this type of discourse, and structure of SA-DA juxtaposition.

The study of everyday conversation is important for different reasons. Since it is subject to the influence of many socioeconomic, political, and historical factors, everyday conversation
allows the researcher to examine the effect of such social factors as social class, education, ethnic background, gender, and religion on the use and frequency of CS between SA and DA. For example, the current study samples educated speakers of the language. It would be interesting to examine the speech of less educated speakers for comparison purposes. Likewise, all the speakers in this study were male. Including the gender factor may reveal interesting differences in the patterns of CS between male and female speakers. The examination of daily interactions is also significant because it may inform us about the degree of lexical and syntactic overlap between these two varieties. This information in pedagogically invaluable for enhancing the teaching of SA and devising the best approaches to teach it in a systematic and structured manner.

The study presents some evidence for the structural overlap between SA and DA. Further experimental work may be needed to explain how the structures of the two varieties converge (or diverge). This is an important question because it has various implications on the nature of bidialectal grammar(s) and the acquisition of DA and SA in naturalistic settings and in the classroom. Moreover, a detailed investigation of the structural relationship between the two varieties may predict the possible direction of the evolution of DA-SA mixing. The current study focused mainly on the principles and constraints of CS between SA and DA as well as on social functions of this sociolinguistic phenomenon in the Arabic-speaking communities. Further research is also needed to investigate in greater detail the structure of CS between SA and DA. For example, researchers may focus on the distribution of DA versus SA prepositions (e.g. mšiit źala s-suuʔ, literally, ‘I went on the market’ vs. mašaytu źila s-suqq ‘I went to the market’) in codeswitched sentences.
Another important question for language acquisition and pedagogy concerns the role of DA in the learning of SA. There is a wide controversy in SLA research concerning whether the relatedness of two languages is an impeding or a facilitating factor in learning a new language (see Brown, 2000; Gass & Selinker, 2008 for discussion). This question presents an important area of investigation in the Arab context, given the long-standing relationship between SA and DA.

Despite the apparent overlap between SA and DA, the structure of most double-coded sentences is DA-based. As noted above, the deployment of DA structure in these sentences points to possible limitations in the proficiency of the speakers. Future studies should investigate whether this is a consistent pattern among educated speakers of Arabic and whether it applies to speakers in other domains.

One of the findings of the current study is that the flexibility of CS between two language varieties depends to a large extent on their structural relationship. It should be noted, however, that the current study has focused on a limited number of structures that exemplify the role of structural (dis)similarity in the emergence of CS constraints. For example, CS between DA and SA seemed to be less constrained than that between DA and Turkish because the former pair is structurally more congruent than the latter. The generalizability of this analysis need be verified through the study of other corpora.

The study postulates that, although CS is governed by the universal principles of UG, it is at the same constrained at points where parametric tensions exist between the participating languages. The exact nature of the parameters was left unspecified due to the lack of enough empirical data on language variation cross-linguistically. Future research should focus on this aspect due to its importance in informing us about the nature of the parameters of UG.
It is also important to note that the conclusions arrived at in this work were based mainly on the relationship between SA and DA as well as between DA, on one hand, and English, French, Turkish, and Hebrew, on the other. Future studies should explore the possibility of expanding these conclusions to different language varieties. Future work may investigate the phenomenon of dialectal CS outside of the Arab World to confirm the applicability of the findings of the current study to other bidialectal contexts.

An important area for investigation would be to conduct a study on the interaction of national identity, on one hand, and DA and SA, on the other. The past century witnessed a number of attempts to bring DA to the front as the language of education, government, and media in a number of Arab countries (e.g., Algeria and Egypt). It would be interesting to find out whether SA or DA is mainly associated with Arab national identity across the Arab World and in these two countries in particular. Another area of research would be to compare the use of SA in religious discourse in the Arab countries and other Islamic countries to see if SA is associated with Muslim identity in both. It might be also useful to compare the reactions of Arab and non-Arab Muslims towards the use of SA versus DA or a foreign language (e.g., English) in the religious domain.
NOTES

1 The existence of a uniform Standard Variety of Arabic has been debated by some researchers (e.g., Badawi, 1993; Brahim, 1997). In this study, Standard Arabic (SA) is used loosely to refer to the variety of Arabic that is taught at schools and has formal and official status throughout the Arabic World.

2 In this study, I adopt the view that the differences between the different regional dialects of Arabic are more lexical, phonological and morphological than syntactic (see Mitchell & El-Hassan, 1994). In other words, the grammars of these dialects are homogeneous to a large extent.

3 see Chakrani (2010) for a more up to date study of language attitudes in Morocco.

4 It should be pointed out that the issue of the historical and genetic relation between SA and spoken colloquial Arabic is still subject to debate and is far from settled. See also Owens (2007).

5 There is a debate about whether all the poems attributed to the pre-Islamic period are authentic or whether they reflect the language of the period when they were written.

6 Nisbah nouns and adjectives, which are often derived from the names of places, indicate origin and affiliation (e.g., qaTar (Qatar) becomes qaTari/qatarij).

7 This example may not be viewed as an error, as it involves non-human plural agreement (which is acceptable in some dialects).

8 The co-existence of the definite article and the demonstrative in a single DP has been treated as a case of double-article, double-demonstrative, determiner-specifier, or grammatical formative-determiner. In Arabic dialects, however, there seems to be a wide agreement that demonstratives function as determiners with articles functioning as grammatical formatives (see Benmamoun, 2000 and Aoun and Choueiri, 1997).
The plural of *sariir* in SA is either *?asirrah* or *surur*. The form *sarrajir* is dialectal also because of the use of the palatal approximant /j/ instead of the glottal stop /ʔ/ (i.e., *sarrajir* instead of *saraaʔir*).

V-V constructions have sometimes been referred to as serial verbs.

The examples provided here are not sufficient to show the structural divergence between Arabic and any of the other languages reported here (i.e., English, French, Hebrew, Spanish, and Turkish), even though they point in this direction.

In her study of Arabic media discourses, Eid (2007) refers to language forms that contain mixed SA and DA elements as ‘hybrid forms’ (p. 410). However, she acknowledges the existence of distinct SA and DA forms in media discourse.
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## APPENDIX A: LIST OF RECORDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Program/Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS1</td>
<td>Tawaazun 1-?amn wa l-Xawf fii Qalb l-Muslim</td>
<td>11-28-2001</td>
<td>Yuusuf Qaradawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS3</td>
<td>Kajfa TahfaDu l-Qur?aani l-Kariim</td>
<td>7-9-2003</td>
<td>Raagheb Sirgaani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS4</td>
<td>?aš-Šamsu wa l-Qamar</td>
<td>9/24/2007</td>
<td>Wagdi Ghunaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>Jawmu l-Qijaamah</td>
<td>4/7/2007</td>
<td>Šamr Khaled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS6</td>
<td>Law ?anna Allaha Hadaani</td>
<td>4-29-2001</td>
<td>Sa’eed bn Misfir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS7</td>
<td>?ašraaTu s-SaaKa (Part I)</td>
<td>9-15-2005</td>
<td>Mohammad Al-Šuraifi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS8</td>
<td>Risaalah ?ila Muhibbi l-?araani</td>
<td>6-5-2008</td>
<td>Ahmad Qattan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS9</td>
<td>?al-?usrah fii l-Qur’aani l-Kariim (Episode 33)</td>
<td>9/17/2008</td>
<td>Mohammad Al-Booti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS10</td>
<td>?ismu Llaahi “l-Muhajmin”</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Mohammad Nabulsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS11</td>
<td>MuhaaDaraat RamaDan</td>
<td>8/2008</td>
<td>Ražab Deeb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD3</td>
<td>Radd Žamaal Hammaad Žala l-žintiqadaati Žala Šahaadatihi li-l-ŠaSr</td>
<td>2/18/2009</td>
<td>Bilaa Huduud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD4</td>
<td>Assijaasa l-Xaarižijjah li-Dawlati Qatar</td>
<td>6/24/2009</td>
<td>Bilaa Huduud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD7</td>
<td>Žištižaaru MaŠrakati l-žintixaabaati n-Nijaabijjati fii Lubnaan</td>
<td>5/20/2009</td>
<td>Bilaa Huduud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC1</td>
<td>Iraq vs. Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>7/30/2007</td>
<td>Youtube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC2</td>
<td>Al-Hilaal vs. Al-ittiţaaad (Saudi Arabia)</td>
<td>12/4/2008</td>
<td>Googlevideo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC3</td>
<td>Al-Hilaal vs. an-NaSr</td>
<td>4/20/2010</td>
<td>Googlevideo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC4</td>
<td>Al-Hilaal vs. Abha</td>
<td>12/11/2008</td>
<td>Googlevideo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC5</td>
<td>Egypt vs. Algeria</td>
<td>1/29/2010</td>
<td>Googlevideo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC6</td>
<td>Al-ţahlj vs. Al-ţismaaţii</td>
<td>1/31/2010</td>
<td>DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC7</td>
<td>Al-ţahlj vs. Az-Zaamalek</td>
<td>1/18/2010</td>
<td>DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC8</td>
<td>Jordan vs. Singapore</td>
<td>3/3/2010</td>
<td>DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC9</td>
<td>Al-Wathba vs. Al-Karaama</td>
<td>2/7/2010</td>
<td>DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC10</td>
<td>Al-Wathba vs. Al-Futuwwa</td>
<td>3/9/2010</td>
<td>DVD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: ACCEPTABILITY JUDGMENT TASK

PART I: DA-SA Stimuli

1. ما يجب هذا البنطرون
2. رح انتقل على هذه الشنة
3. أريت هذة القصة
4. ما يعرف هذا الشخص
5. نحن نجري كل يوم
6. تعال نعود هون

7. سامي جائع دائماً بيأكل خمس وجبات في اليوم
8. هنّى قروّوا تلت نصص
9. انتى وضعت أوا عيك بالشنتا
10. نحن ندرس في المكتبة
11. هؤى يعمل بالدكّان
12. رح روح إلى الضيعة
13. نحن نملك حاوناً فيه خضراً وفواكي
14. تعرفت على شاب دعوته عالعّد
15. هي تتالت من كم يوم يسكن في المدينة
16. البنت أكلت يرتى
17. سامي عطول جوان بيأكل خمس وجبات في اليوم
18. هي انتفقت مؤخراً تسكن بالدينى
19. الرجل كسر رجلو
20. تعا انظر
21. الكارثات الجديدة هذة حلوا أوي
22. استوقفتي المرأة التي كانت تسأل عن البيت مهندس
23. أمني أن أحصل على البيكالوريوس في الكمياء
24. المعلمة تستطيع تروح المدرسة يدري
25. تعرفت غشب عزمنو على الغداء
26. بلست الشغل في نصّ السني
27. سامي عطول جوان بيأكل خمس وجبات في اليوم
28. خط الكرسي فوق الطاولة
أنتوا أمام الكازية.
البريطان الجديد هذا ممكن يتكرس بسهولة.
لكن صغيرة هذا من سكندرية.
الراجل دي يشتري الحز من البقالة.
لا أهتم بالحاجات دي نحن عن دكان يبيع حضار و فواكه
الكلب شرب مي
حترم والديك
جورج ناطق بعدة لغات. يتكلم تلت لغات
الزمني كسر رجله
ليبت أكلت البرتقالية
الحرامي سر الأمور
اللص سرق المصاري
نحن نبرد كل يوم
قم قام
تبع اجلس هنا
زور جديتك
احترم والديك
العربية الأديرة هذه تسبب الثلوث
لكلب شرب ماء
أحب الناس الذين يشتغلوا كويسي
اشترى الملابس التي لأنها في الأكازيون
قابلت الشاب الذي يعملون جيد
لا تحاول تشويك الكورة من هنا
هم يبكون بيدوا حياة جديدة
هو يرغب أن يساعده أبا
أوبوم نم
قابلت المعلم الذي يجب التدريس
الطريقات هذه من نوعية فاخرة
المواد الصغير هذا يملك علما راجحا
العيل دوى فقد محظطه
الأبوه دي منتقلة لعمالها
قم بزيارة ستيك
قالت الطلبة الذين بيزاكر في المكتبة:

62. نريد المذيعة التي تجيب أفكار جديدة للبرنامج.
63. سررت ببقاء الشخص الذي أتلقى أول يومين.
64. أحب العمل مع الإنسان الذي يمزج شويًا.
65. لم أتقنع بالأفكار التي ناقشتها معاً.
66. هذا الكلام سوف يبني بينا.
67. هذه الظروف سوف تبدي تراجع.
68. أخذه ستيججز أرباب أو.
69. ربما سيسافر أبل يوم الحد.
70. ستكرر نفس الخطاً ده.
71. لن حيندي الفصل حتى الساعة عشرة.
72. لم أزّب منا أبداً.
73. لا يشترش من المحل دا أبداً.
74. لا يذهب للأكزاخنة دي.
75. لا يعتمد عخابه.
76. تعال شووف.
77. قابلته لأنى أردت معرفة الحنينة متو.
78. تظن أن التعلي لا يدرس بعد.
79. أعتقد أن الأرتوبيس بحاجة إلى إصلاح.
80. قال إن الحاجات دي لن تتطلب تفكيرا أكثر.
81. أظن أنه يعيش حياة غليانة.
82. أعلم أن الامتحان سيكون جامد أو.
83. سيتأخرون لأن الأطر سجاد متأخراً.
84. حزنت لأن البيت مريضة.
85. أعتقد أن الحياة و الموت مش بايدنا.
86. فرحت أن السرجان سيشر مقاتلي.
87. اكتشفت قليلا لأنى كنت عيان.
88. تظن أن الولد مش حيدرس بجد.
89. أعتقد أن الحافة يحلّة إلى إصلاح.
90. قال إن هذه الامور مش حتتطلب تفكيرا أكثر.
91. سيتأخرون لأن القطار رح يغادر متأخراً.
92. حزنت لأن السيدة عيانة.
93. فرحت لأن الجريدة حانشر مقاتلي.
94.
شفت العمال اللي يلعبون بالشارع
مررت بالرجال اللي أصلح العربية
اتهمت من أريته اللي يقذف السوانة
حتمشي لنتي اللي بترافها في الحافلة
شفت الهيضة اللي عprarها جارتنا
ما قطنش فالمصعد
101. مش حيعرت الست عوجته
102. هوا مش بيقوم بالشغل دا
103. من أدرش أنلاني جائع
104. هوا ما بيسكلش في أمور كهذه
105. جيفافل صاحب البليكان
106. الفصل بحيدا بعد تلت دنام
107. هوا بيطاف الوري مرتجب جيد
108. هيا حتروح إلى القرية المجاورة
109. هوا حياءخ مرتب بعد ثلاث أسابيع
110. خرج من الحلقة عشان هوا لا يسمع للمزيكا
111. سمعت أبو سيفاون لتسردرية
112. أولوي اني طمط سوف تقابل جدتي
113. أريت أنو الحافلات تنتوقف عن العمل في اليومين دول
114. تأكدت أنو راجل أهل للثقة
115. جوز بيحكي أكثر من لغة بيحكي ثلاث لغات
PART II: DA-English Stimuli

1. حطت الورأة الطاولة
2. man this
3. ما بعرف
4. شلنت الشنتا
5. انتي أواعك بالشنتا
6. هو ساكن
7. عندي الام
8. strange
9. car
10. بدي أشترى بالدكان
11. works
12. ثبتت إصص
13. جبيت this
14. حطت الكتاب
15. خالتو
16. رج رووح to the الضيعة
17. بُنتش الشغل in the السنن
18. الكازية
19. Aleppo to
20. studied
21. changed
22. Egypt to left
23. شتبت كتب
24. عملت مع موظفين
25. eggs six
26. clothes tight
27. car new
28. well explaining was
29. تأثب كان بالغابة
30. لابس أواحي
sisters four

31. عدو

32. هو نائم

33. لولاد كان يلعب

34. الزليمي

35. نابت طانية

36. أرابينا

37. هو يمشي

38. الإطاحة كانت

39. البنت لعبت

40. طلع على السطح

41. Sami is always hungry. Eats في اليوم وجبة خمس

42. We own a shop. Sell فواكه وطعام

43. She has moved recently. Lives في المدينة

44. George is multilingual. Speaks لغات تتسع

45. The thief stole السيرة

46. The dog drank نم

47. Respect والديك

48. We run يوم كل

49. The man broke رجلي

50. They are physicians. They work يوم كل بالمستشفى

51. Sit here

52. The girl ate برتقالي

53. Sleep

54. See

55. Visit
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PART III: DA-French Stimuli

1. Nous possédons une boutique. Vendons

2. Nous courrons

3. George est polyglotte. Parle

4. Le voleur a volé

5. Sami a toujours faim. Mange

6. Rendre visite à

7. Le chien a bu

8. Resepete

9. L’homme s’est cassé

10. Ils sont des médecins. Ils travaillent

11. La fille a mangé

12. À dormir

13. Assis toi ici

14. Elle s’est déménagé récemment. Vit

15. Voir
PART IV: DA-Hebrew Stimuli

1. Sami tamid raev. Oxel
   باليوم وجبات خمس
2. Hi avra mipo laaxrona. Gaara
   بالمدينة
3. Yesh bebaalutenu xanut. Moxrim
   فواكي و خضرا
4. Em rofim. Em ovdim
   يوم كل المشفى
5. George rav leshonai. Medaber
   لغات ثلت
6. Kaged والديك
7. Hakelev shote
   مي
8. Haganav ganav
   السيارة
9. Haish shavar
   رجلو
10. Anu ratsim
    يوم كل
11. Hayalda axla
    برتاني
12. lishon
13. Baker
    ستك
14. tiree
15. šev kan
PART V: DA-Spanish Stimuli

1. dormir
2. Se ha mudado recientemente. vive
3. vaya
4. venga
5. Corremos
6. venga
7. siéntense aquí
8. el ladrón robó
9. venga
10. Sami está siempre con hambre. Come
11. Visita
12. Somos dueños de una tienda. Vendemos
13. George es multilingüe. Habla
14. Respete
15. El perro bebe
16. su abuela
17. El hombre rompió
18. Ellos son médicos. Ellos trabajan
19. La niña se comió
20. su padre
PART VI: DA-Turkish Stimuli

1. Köpek içiyor
2. Onlar doktor. Onlar يوم كل بالمستشفى يتار باليوم يتناول كل
3. Adam kirdi رجل
4. Biz يوم كل تناول طعام
5. Kız yedi برناشي
6. Hırsız السيارة çaldı
7. Sami her zaman aç. وجهات خمس باليوم يتناول كل
8. والديك يتناول طعام
9. Bizim bir dükkanımız var. فواكه و خضراsatıyoruz
10. Bizim bir dükkanımız var. ستック من الفواكه و الخضرا
11. George çok dilli. لغات تلته konuşور
12. ออม. uyuu
13. 商. تعا أووم
14. O son zamanlarda taşındı. بالمدينة Jašijor
15. 商. تعا orın
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