



**International
Journal of Society, Culture & Language
IJSCL**

Journal homepage: www.ijsc.net
ISSN 2323-2210 (online)

Revisiting the Arabic Diglossic Situation and Highlighting the Socio-Cultural Factors Shaping Language Use in Light of Auer's (2005) Model

Abdelaadim Bidaoui¹

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received June 2017
Received in revised form August 2017
Accepted September 2017
Available online September 2017

KEYWORDS:

Diglossia
Intermediate codes
Endoglossic forms
Exoglossic forms
Socio-cultural factors

Abstract

In the field of Arabic sociolinguistics, diglossia has been an interesting linguistic inquiry since it was first discussed by Ferguson in 1959. Since then, diglossia has been discussed, expanded, and revisited by Badawi (1973), Hudson (2002), and Albirini (2016) among others. While the discussion of the Arabic diglossic situation highlights the existence of two separate codes (High and Low), Auer's (2005) model acknowledged the significance of intermediate and exoglossic forms. The comparison of the two models shows that Ferguson's defining features of diglossia were essential to the understanding of the Arabic sociolinguistics situation; nevertheless, they may not reflect the overlap between the two codes and the insertion of exoglossic forms as it is happening in daily communication among speakers of Arabic. Based on the data from *Al-Jazeera* network along with two complementary studies and in light of discourse markers in Arabic, this paper shows how Auer's (2005) model fits the current Arabic linguistic situation and highlights the importance of socio-cultural factors.

© 2017 IJSCL. All rights reserved.

¹ Assistant Professor, Email: abidaoui@bsu.edu

Tel: +1-765-7604706

^a Ball State University, USA

1. Introduction

The linguistic situation in the Arab world cannot be clearly understood without referring to the sociolinguistic situation termed diglossia (Ferguson, 1959, 1996). According to Ferguson (2005), diglossia is defined as the co-existence of two varieties, each with its own specified social domains; these varieties are divided into High and Low (henceforth H and L) with the H variety as the code used by educated people on formal occasions, while the L is used by all members of the population for everyday functions. I am using Ferguson's distinction L and H as this is how it is referred to in the literature; however, I do not endorse the idea that dialectal Arabic is a Low variety and Standard Arabic is a High variety. For further discussion of the current status of what is referred to as H and L varieties consider Sayahi (2014). Due to social changes such as urbanization, modernization, and breakdown of class boundaries, diglossia, as described by Ferguson, may no longer exist (Pauwels, 1986). The complexity of the linguistic situations examined in diglossia has led many linguists such as Badawi (1973), Meiseles (1980), Ferguson (1996), Hudson (2002), Sayahi (2014), and Albirini (2016) among others to suggest revisions and reformulations of Ferguson's original work. These revisions allow us to expect that a given speaker of Arabic may use elements not only from the H and L varieties of Arabic but also intermediate elements (Auer, 2005) between the H and L in addition to elements from a foreign language such as French or English.

Contrary to Ferguson's (1959) claim that Standard Arabic (SA) is "not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation" (p. 245), this paper indicates that it is part of daily conversations. Furthermore, the mixing of codes is not limited to SA and Dialectal Arabic (DA), but may include French or English. Since Ferguson's (2005) model did not include cases where the H variety is used in ordinary daily conversation, it seems necessary to use a different model to account for the Arabic linguistic situation. In this paper, I argue that the types of mixing found in the data reflects what Auer (2005) refers to as type C diglossia in his model, where the dialect is infiltrated by standard and exoglossic forms. Thus, in this

paper Auer's (2005) model, which was introduced to account for the linguistic situation in Europe, is presented to help us understand the Arabic linguistic situation.

This paper argues that Auer's (2005) model fits well for the current Arabic linguistic situation. The goal of this paper is to revisit the Arabic diglossic situation and present Auer's (2005) model as a substitute for Ferguson's (1959) model. This is by no means meant to undervalue the big contributions of Ferguson to Arabic linguistics. The claims in this paper are supported by evidence from a big project conducted on discourse markers (DMs) of elaboration and causality in spoken Arabic in light of speakers representing three dialects of Arabic: Algerian, Egyptian, and Moroccan. The project entails newly published data collected from *Al-Jazeera* outlet and the results of already published data of two complementary studies, one on elaboration DMs (Bidaoui, 2016a) and the other on causality DMs (Bidaoui, 2016b). Combining different types of data is meant to provide a holistic view of language use by native speakers of Arabic. In addition to that, collecting data from different dialects is crucial to the understanding of language use in the Arab world as it was clearly stated by Wierzbicka's (1985) who focalized the importance of cultural norms in linguistics,

Cultural norms reflected in speech acts differ not only from one language to another, but also from one regional and social variety to another. There are considerable differences between Australian English and American English, between mainstream American English and Black English, between middle class English and working class English, and so on. (p. 146)

Wierzbicka's (1985) seminal paper gave birth to studies focusing on contextual factors across cultures. In light of cultural norms, we may predict that language use of the speakers may vary from one nationality to another.

DMs are chosen to be the focus of the studies in this paper because their use is not random but as discussed by Blakemore (2002) they encode a general instruction "to go ahead with the inferential process involved in the derivation of cognitive effects" (p. 147).

Whenever a speaker selects a given DM, he or she intends to encode both cognitive and social meanings. DMs are words or phrases such as *oh, well, now, then, you know, and I mean* which are used in a conversation to serve different functions in discourse. DMs have been the focus of many linguists, a good definition of a DM was provided by Fraser (2006):

For a sequence of discourse segments S1-S2, each of which encodes a complete message, a lexical expression LE functions as a discourse marker if, when it occurs in S2-initial position (S1-LE+S2), LE signals that a semantic relationship holds between S2 and S1 which is one of: elaboration, contrast, inference, or temporality. (p. 191)

In light of DMs, we will have an idea on which codes may be selected and what types of code mixing are allowed.

This paper is organized as follows. Section one provides a general introduction. Section two provides the theoretical framework for the discussion of diglossia and is divided into two sub-sections. The first subsection presents the defining features of diglossia based on Ferguson's (1959) paper followed by early critiques. Subsection two presents Auer's (2005) model. Section three presents the methodology followed by section four which presents the results. Section five provides room for discussion. Finally, section six offers concluding remarks.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Diglossia: Ferguson's Model of Diglossia and Early Critiques

Ferguson's (1959) model was based on four languages: Arabic, Modern Greek, Swiss German, and Haitian Creole. As the first step toward understanding diglossia, it is important to stop at the following quote where Ferguson

(1959) clearly defines diglossia:

Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standard), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of literature either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learnt 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. (p. 245)

Ferguson's (1959) definition of diglossia revolves around three essential points: diglossia is described as a stable linguistic situation, binary, and multi-functional. The stable situation in diglossia is seen in the sense that it is not considered "a stage which occurs always and only at a certain point in some kind of evolution, e.g., in the standardization process" (p. 233). On the contrary, diglossia as presented by Ferguson may last for years or even centuries without losing its defining features. The second point highlights the binary aspect of diglossia. This is seen in the fact that diglossia is based on divergent varieties of the same language. The binary relationship in diglossia for the defining languages in Ferguson's (1959) paper is illustrated in Table 1. It is important to point out that status is an essential parameter in the division of the two codes. This means that the H varieties should always occupy an H status compared to the L varieties. The third point concerns the fact that the two codes should serve different functions. Ferguson (1959) noted that in Arabic, for instance, a speaker is likely to use the H variety when reading a newspaper to others and switch to the L variety when discussing the issues in the paper.

Table 1
Diglossia in the Defining Languages

	H(igh)	L(ow)
Arabic	Standard	Dialect 'addarij'
Greek	Katharevusa	dhimotiki
Swiss German	Standard German	Swiss 'Schweizerdeutsch'
Haitian Creole	French	Creole

Diglossia for Ferguson (1959) did not happen haphazardly but was the product of a particular linguistic situation. He pointed out that diglossia occurs when the following conditions exist in a given speech community (p. 247):

- 1- There is a sizable body of literature in a language closely related to (or even identical with) the natural language of the community, and this literature embodies, whether as source (e.g., divine revelation) or reinforcement, some of the fundamental values of the community.
- 2- Literacy in the community is limited to a small elite.
- 3- A suitable period of time, of the order of several centuries, passes from the establishment of 1 and 2.

Fishman (1971) extended the definition of diglossia to capture cases in “multilingual societies which officially recognize several ‘languages’” (p. 74). Fishman (1971) distinguished between the two perspectives in the sense that “bilingualism is essentially a characterization of individual linguistic versatility whereas diglossia is a characterization of the societal allocation of functions” (p. 74). Fishman (1971) presented the interaction between diglossia and bilingualism in four scenarios. The first one captures cases where bilingualism occurs with diglossia. Fishman (1971) exemplified this case with the situation of Paraguay where half of the population speak both Guarani and Spanish. The second scenario concerns cases where diglossia exists without bilingualism. This is the situation of speech communities sharing the same political, economic, and religious status but which differ in their sociocultural affiliations. This scenario happens in a situation where interaction between the social groups is missing. Fishman (1971) exemplified this situation by the Danish, Salish, Provençal, and Russian communities in pre-WWI Europe. The third scenario is characterized by the occurrence of bilingualism without diglossia. Due to the individual characteristics of bilingualism, this scenario occurs when the individuals in a speech community do not abide by the social norms governing where, how, when and with whom certain codes would be favored over others. The fourth scenario concerns a situation where neither bilingualism nor diglossia exists. Fishman

(1971) stated that this type is rare and is hard to find. He added that this type may exist in small groups lacking interaction with other speech communities. The contribution of Fishman (1971) to the understanding of diglossia lies in the fact that the diglossic situation is extended to include languages which are not structurally related. Another contribution lies in the distinction between intragroup versus intergroup communication, in the sense that a certain code might be used for intragroup whereas the other code might be used for intergroup communication.

In response to the bulk of work dealing with his original work, Ferguson published a sort of self-criticism. Ferguson’s (1996) paper is considered an acknowledgement of the weaknesses of his original work as well as a disapproval of the direction that work on diglossia has taken. To start with the last point, Ferguson (1996) disapproves of extending diglossia to incorporate cases of creole continuum such as the case of the basilectal and acrolectal varieties in Jamaica. The former is a variety used for daily conversation and the latter is used as an H variety. Ferguson (1996) also disapproves of extending diglossia to situations of standard-with-dialect, the case of Italy is a good example of this situation. Ferguson (1996) justifies this by the fact that he did not want diglossia to include cases where the H variety is used in ordinary daily conversation or used as a mother tongue, or cases of creolization where the acrolectal variety is used for daily conversation. Ferguson (1996) added that diglossia does not include this type of creolization because the boundary between H and L is stronger than the boundary between acrolectal and basilectal varieties in creole continua. Ferguson (1996) clarified that the defining features of diglossia were meant to capture cases where the H variety is both acquisitionally and functionally superposed. By being acquisitionally superposed, Ferguson (1996) referred to the fact that the H is not acquired as a first language, while being functionally superposed referred to the fact that the functions of the H variety do not involve cases that are included in the first language.

With regard to the weaknesses of his original work, Ferguson (1996) posited that he should have made it explicit that in describing diglossia the focus was on describing speech

communities rather than languages. Ferguson (1996) defined a speech community as “a social group sharing features of language structure, use, and attitudes that functions as a sociolinguistic unit for the operation of linguistic variation and/or change; it may be monolingual or multilingual” (p. 55). He also acknowledged that the absence of discussions about register variation is also a weakness of his original work. Another weakness is the distance between H and L varieties. Ferguson (1996) explained that this weakness was due to the fact that this issue was not one of the concerns of linguists in the period of his original article. Another limitation was that he did not provide strong evidence that diglossia should be limited to languages that are closely related. Ferguson (1996) excluded cases like Spanish and Guaraní in Paraguay as the H language is unrelated to the L. He simply accounted for this exclusion by the fact that outcomes of diglossia as he specified in the original work would be different from cases where the languages involved are unrelated. Although Ferguson (1996) raised important issues to deal with limitations and weaknesses of diglossia, further points had to be discussed.

Hudson (2002) summarized the theoretical debate on diglossia and offered new perspectives. Hudson focused on three major points: (a) what should be in and outside the scope of diglossia, (b) the utility (or not) of structural relatedness in distinguishing between H and L varieties, (c) the focus on direction of change instead of the study of diglossia as a stable situation. In terms of the first point, Hudson (2002) argued for the need to limit the scope of diglossia to the conditions outlined in Ferguson’s original article. He explained that diglossia and societal bilingualism differ in “social origins, evolutionary courses of development, and resolutions over the long term” (p. 2). Thus, for him including the two phenomena under the same label will only obscure linguistic theory. Hudson added that what makes cases of Swiss German, Arabic, and Greek distinct from standard-with-dialects and from societal bilingualism is the fact that the defining cases are genuine instances of register variation. Another feature that distinguished the defining cases from other cases is compartmentalization. The latter refers to the fact that the H and L varieties stand in a complementary distribution

(Ferguson, 1959). A final feature distinguishing diglossia from other cases is acquisitional priority. This lies in the fact that the role of L variety starts as a native language whereas the role of H starts later as a non-native language.

The second major point in Hudson’s (2002) article concerns the debate on structural relatedness between the H and L codes. The debate centered on showing how the situations in the defining languages differ in terms of structural relatedness from cases such as Spanish and Guaraní in Paraguay, and Spanish and Nahuatl in Mexico. Hudson disfavored any effort that uses structural relatedness to distinguish between what may or may not be considered part of diglossia. Thus, he considered diglossia as characterized by Ferguson (1959) to be a sociological rather than grammatical concern.

The last point in Hudson’s (2002) article concerns stability. This feature for Ferguson was essential to the understanding of diglossia. Instead of arguing in favor of or against stability in diglossia, Hudson (2002) recommended focusing on the study of the direction of change in a diglossic situation. He posited that while the direction of change might be toward the H variety for societal bilingualism, it might be in the direction of the vernacular in the cases of diglossia. Thus, the extension of the vernacular to a high variety in a diglossic situation according to Hudson (2002) may be characterized by “the admission of the vernacular into domains formerly reserved exclusively for the high variety” (p. 30). He also admitted that even in some cases of diglossia the direction of change might be toward the standard as is the case for Arabic-speaking countries where as discussed by Abdulaziz (1986), mass media such as radio, television, and cinema “have greatly helped to spread the knowledge of MSA and the urban forms of spoken Arabic” (p. 16).

2.2. From Diglossia to Diaglossia: Auer’s (2005) Model

After presenting Ferguson’s model, this subsection offers an overview of Auer’s model. Before introducing this model, it is important to define the terms dialect and standard as used by Auer. The term dialect for Auer (2005) is “a purely relational concept” in the sense that “without a standard there would

be no dialect” (p. 7). Moreover, Auer (2005, p. 8) characterized the standard variety by the following features: 1) it is orientated to by speakers of more than one vernacular variety, 2) it is looked upon as an H variety and used for writing, and 3) it is subject to at least some codification and elaboration.

Auer used the third feature to exclude very old H-varieties. The term standard according to these features is a variety of a language which follows the norms but does not need to be the norm itself. This can be explained by the case of Standard Arabic which is a simplified version of classical Arabic. The norm in this case is classical Arabic, and Standard Arabic is a variety that follows the norm.

Auer (2005) focused on the emergence of national standard varieties in Europe, where endoglossic refers to the first language of a particular country or community. Instead of arguing for a stable linguistic situation in the same way as Ferguson, Auer (2005) suggested a diachronic perspective to capture the diglossic linguistic situation in Europe. He then divided the linguistic situation in Europe into five types. The first type, labelled type zero, describes the diglossic situation in medieval Europe. Type zero repertoires include a standard variety plus vernacular varieties (no endoglossic standard: exoglossic diglossia). Auer (2005) called this type “diglossic” following the “initial and restrictive” sense of Ferguson’s (1959) term. It is important to point out here that unlike Ferguson’s distinction, Auer used the term diglossia to refer to varieties that are structurally unrelated (as per Fishman’s 1971). During this phase, the non-vernacular varieties were exoglossic standards. The exoglossic standard varieties were Old Church Slavonic as in Romania, Arabic as in Southern Spain and Latin in most other areas. Auer (2005) posited that though there was no direct contact between the standard and the vernaculars, there was still some kind of influence. A good example of the influence of the standard on the vernacular is the case of Andalusian Spanish.

Type zero diglossia lasted in minority language communities until the twentieth century in Europe. In a way to compete with the standard exoglossic varieties, new endoglossic standard varieties emerged. A

good example of this case is the linguistic situation of Basque in Spain. Within Basque community, standard Basque (a non-Romance language) was created to compete with Castilian Spanish. The latter is considered exogenous within the Basque community since it is Indo-European. It seems that Auer (2005) focused on genetic relatedness to distinguish between endoglossic and exoglossic varieties. Auer’s (2005) distinction between endoglossic and exoglossic will be further discussed in the next subsection.

The second type in Auer’s (2005) model is labeled type A repertoires and refers to diglossia with an endoglossic standard. In other words, instead of the exoglossic standard which characterized type zero repertoires, type A witnessed the emergence of an endoglossic standard. This type resembles Ferguson’s definition of diglossia as mentioned in Auer (2005):

- (a) the two varieties are clearly delimited from each other in the perception of the speakers, (b) the varieties are genetically closely related to each other, (c) the standard represents the H-variety and is used for writing and (if spoken at all) for formal situations, whereas the dialect as the L-variety is not (usually) written, (d) the H-variety is not the language of primary socialization (first language acquisition). (p. 12)

The third type is labeled spoken diglossia or type B. It is important to note that type 0 and type A oftentimes precede type B. In England, for instance, the transition to type B took place between the 15th and 17th centuries. Type B is characterized by the fact that standard varieties gained spoken functions. Auer explained that not all the standard varieties reached this type of diglossia. Occitan, for instance, despite having a written standard, did not extend its functions because of the influence of French. Another feature that characterized type B diglossia was related to codification problems.

Type C, diaglossia, is known by the existence of intermediate variants, regiolects, between the standard and base dialects. To illustrate this type Auer referred to the phonological standardization model for German, which comprises two processes. The first one took place from 15th to 17th century and is called

uberschichtung (superimposition of acrolectal strata). This is characterized by the emergence of a standard that affected morphology and syntax while phonology and lexicon remained dialectal. According to Auer (2005), the second process took place during the 19th century and early 20th century and witnessed the creation of a new standard or modern standard “on an already existing standard-dialect repertoire” (p. 23). The new standard is considered intermediate and less prestigious compared to the old standard. This linguistic situation created a non-diglossic repertoire structure that Auer (2005) called type C.

Auer (2005) argued that in diaglossic repertoires as in diglossic repertoires the endoglossic standard variety competes with an exoglossic standard. He exemplified this with the case of Catalonia/Spain where Standard Catalan competes with Standard Castilian. Within Catalonia, Catalan is considered endoglossic whereas Castilian is considered exoglossic. Auer (2005) also added that “the relationship between dialectal and standard Catalan is diaglossic, while the relationship between Castilian and dialectal Catalan is diglossic” (p. 24). Though Auer (2005) claimed that he is using Ferguson’s (1959) restrictive definition, he considers the relationship between Castilian and Catalan to be diglossic though the latter is part of Iberian Romance and the former is part of Gallo-Romance. It might be because he considers them to be genetically related as they are both Western Romance languages. The distinction between diaglossic and diglossic repertoires lies in the fact that in the former the dialect is infiltrated by standard characteristics, whereas in the latter the dialect is kept in a conservative fashion. An example of diaglossia is seen in the case of Cyprus where a variety called Cypriot Standard Greek can be seen as an intermediate form between base dialects and the Standard Greek (Arvaniti, 2010).

Auer’s last type, Type D, is characterized by dialect loss and is divided into two types: type D/1 (from diaglossia to dialectal loss) and type D/2 (from diglossia to dialect loss). In type D/1, the diaglossic situation, the dialect at the base of the continuum maybe lost and replaced by regiolects that become the base. Type D/2 is characterized by not handing old dialects to next generations which leads to their loss.

Auer (2005) exemplified this type by cases where the middle classes may avoid base dialects which are stigmatized as they index lower class and lack of education. This is the case for Hungarian and Spanish base dialects where many dialects are stigmatized. Auer’s (2005) model of dialect-standard constellations is argued to encompass the whole situation in most of Europe. The most widely spread types in Europe are type C diaglossic repertoires and type D, which is characterized by the loss of the base dialects. In light of the data presented in this paper, I argue that Auer’s (2005) model may be used to account for the Arabic linguistic situation as well.

3. Methodology

This paper is based on three complementary studies: one main and two supplementary studies. The main study consists of online data taken from the news outlet Al Jazeera, while the supplementary studies consist of data collected during face-to-face interactions and published in Bidaoui (2016a) and Bidaoui (2016b). For the main study, data was taken from Al Jazeera’s program *Shahid ġala ġas’r* ‘A witness of a period in history’, a program where a political figure is invited to shed light on important events in the history of his/her country. This program is run by the famous journalist *Ahmed Mansour*. The data discussed here is from three interviews with speakers from Morocco, Algeria, and Egypt. The participants are the Moroccan military air force officer *Saleh Shahad*, the ex-Algerian foreign minister *Ahmed Taleb Al Ibrahim*, and the Egyptian doctor and ex-parliament member *Khalid Al Hanafi*. A total of two hours and fifteen minutes of data was collected. The three interviews were held by the same interviewer and lasted for 45 minutes each.

It is important to point out that the main and supplementary studies are part of a project that focuses on the use of DMs serving the meanings of elaboration and causality. The supplementary data is based on two studies: elaboration and causality studies. Each study included three types of interactions: one-on-one, same nationality, and multi-nationality interactions. The same participants took part in the two supplementary studies. The participants are members of an Arabic diasporic community in the U.S. and represent the same

dialects in the main study: Algerian, Egyptian, and Moroccan dialect. What explains the difference between Al Jazeera data and data in the supplementary studies is the fact that the latter is in a formal setting and targets audiences from all the Arabic speaking countries, whereas the former is in both informal and formal settings.

4. Results

For the main study, one DM was selected for

Table 2

Results of Elaboration and Causality in the Online News Outlet Al Jazeera

Variant	Algerian		Egyptian		Moroccan	
	count	%	count	%	count	%
<i>yaʕni</i>	5	100 %	105	100 %	151	100 %
<i>liʔanna</i>	11	100 %	12	85.72 %	8	100 %
<i>ʕafan</i>	0	%	2	14.28 %	0	%

The results of Al Jazeera show that speakers from the three nationalities opted for Standard forms to express clarification and causality with the exception of the Egyptian participants who opted for a dialectal DM, *ʕafan*, but its use was restricted to two instances. This finding may suggest that though *yaʕni* is not borrowed from Standard Arabic (Owens & Rockwood, 2008) it has gained some prestige and formality. I believe that the fact that *yaʕni* is shared among the dialects of Arabic, a feature that characterizes Standard Arabic, has led to its gaining the status of a formal expression in addition to its informal use.

Table 3

Results of Elaboration DMs Broken Down by Nationality

Variant	Algerian		Egyptian		Moroccan	
	count	%	count	%	count	%
<i>yaʕni</i>	55	71.42 %	157	99.7 %	140	84.84 %
<i>zəʕma</i>	16	20.77 %	0	%	15	25.15 %
<i>c'est-à-dire</i>	3	3.89 %	0	%	0	%
<i>je veux dire</i>	2	2.59 %	0	%	0	%
<i>ça veut dire</i>	1	1.29 %	0	%	0	%
<i>I mean</i>	0	%	1	0.93%	0	%

(Reprinted from “Discourse Markers of Causality in Maghrebi and Egyptian Dialects: A Socio-Pragmatic Perspective”, by A. Bidaoui, 2016b, *Open Linguistics*, 2, p. 543. Copyright 2016 by Open Linguistics. Reprinted with permission).

Like the elaboration study, the causality study (Bidaoui, 2016b) indicates the use of multiple DMs: *liʔanna*, *liʔannu*, *hit*, *lahqaf*, *ʕafan*, *parce que*, and *because*. The endoglossic DMs

each meaning, *yaʕni* for clarification and *liʔanna* for causality. Al Jazeera is known for its use of Standard Arabic. Thus, the guests who participate in Al Jazeera’s programs are expected to use a specific register. It is, then, no surprise that the data shows definitely no use of exoglossic variants to express clarification, only shared DMs were used by all participants: *yaʕni* for elaboration and *liʔanna* for causality. The results are summarized in Table 2:

The results of the supplementary studies show the use of multiple DMs. The elaboration study (Bidaoui, 2016a) indicates that elaboration is expressed by multiple DMs *yaʕni*, *zəʕma*, *ça veut dire*, *c'est-à-dire*, *je veux dire*, and *I mean*. The DMs used to express the meaning of clarification “*I mean*” are two endoglossic DMs and four exoglossic DMs. The endoglossic DMs are: *yaʕni*, *yəʕni* and *zəʕma*, while the exoglossic ones are: *ça veut dire*, *c'est-à-dire*, *je veux dire*, and *I mean*. The results of elaboration are shown in Table 3.

are *liʔanna*, *liʔannu*, *hit*, *lahqaf*, and *ʕafan*, while the exoglossic ones are: *parce que*, and *because*. Consider Table 4 for the results of causality DMs.

Table 4
Results of Causality DMs Broken Down by Nationality

Variant	Algerian		Egyptian		Moroccan	
	count	%	count	%	count	%
<i>liʔanna</i>	6	6.32 %	43	75.44 %	20	44 %
<i>liʔannu</i>	35	36.48 %	0	%	0	%
<i>ħit</i>	0	%	0	%	22	44 %
<i>laħqaf</i>	0	%	0	%	6	12 %
<i>ʕafan</i>	0	%	13	22.81 %	1	2 %
<i>parce que</i>	53	55.79 %	0	%	0	%
<i>because</i>	1	1.05 %	1	1.76 %	1	2%

(Reprinted from “Discourse Markers of Causality in Maghrebi and Egyptian Dialects: A Socio-Pragmatic Perspective”, by A. Bidaoui, 2016b, *Open Linguistics*, 2, p. 599. Copyright 2016 by Open Linguistics. Reprinted with permission).

The supplementary studies show that the realization of DMs is shaped by nationality, education, type of interaction, and by individual and socio-cultural choices. The fact that all the Algerian participants opted for a new exoglossic DM, *parce que*, is, as pointed out by Kumbalonah (2013), an indication that language use reflects “the need to express a new communal experience” (p. 109). The results vary from one nationality to another which shows that language use is shaped by both individual and socio-cultural factors.

5. Discussion

In light of the findings displayed above, this section discusses why Auer’s (2005) model fits very well for the Arabic linguistic situation. The first reason that makes Auer’s (2005) model a good fit for Arabic is his new definition of standard forms. According to this new definition, SA is seen as a variety that is in use, and does not refer to classical Arabic, a variety that “is associated with pre-Islamic poetry, the sacred texts of Islam, later commentary on both of these and the works of medieval Arabic philologists” (Rabin, 1955, p. 20). In other words, if diglossia for Ferguson refers to the complementary distribution of classical Arabic and L varieties, the codes in Auer’s are SA and dialectal Arabic. The use of *yaʕni* in formal settings in Al Jazeera data is an indication that the complementary distribution is not between classical Arabic and L varieties but rather between SA and L varieties. SA is different from Classical Arabic as it may incorporate elements from the dialect. As discussed in Owens and Rockwood (2008) *yaʕni* is considered to be Lebanese, not a Standard Arabic borrowing. Owens and Rockwood (2008) also listed some dictionaries

of Dialectal Arabic such as Yemeni, Gulf, Libyan, and Moroccan Arabic dictionary where *yaʕni* is defined as “that is, in other words” (p. 5). Though *yaʕni* is an element from dialectal Arabic it does surface in formal settings and assumes some of the functions linked with SA. This finding may suggest that though *yaʕni* is not borrowed from Standard Arabic it has gained some prestige and formality. I believe that the fact that *yaʕni* is shared among the dialects of Arabic, a feature that characterizes Standard Arabic, has led to its gaining the status of a formal expression in addition to its informal use as the supplementary data shows. Here is an example of the use of *yaʕni* taken from Al Jazeera data by the Moroccan speaker:

(1) Context: The Moroccan speaker describing the protests that resulted when Mohamed X, the previous king of Morocco, was exiled in 1953-1954.

- 1 xarazna wa ħtafalna bi-ruzuʕ l-malik
 Left.us and celebrated.us with-return the king
 “We went out and asked for the return of the king”.
- 2 wa qatʕaʕna l-ʔaslaak wa ʔaʕʕalna n-naar
 And cut.us the-wires and burnt-us the fire
 “And we cut wires and burnt fire”.
- 3 *yaʕni*, qumnaa bimudʕaharaat ʕaniifa
 DM stood.us with-protests violent
 “I mean, we led violent protests”.

In example (1), the DM *yaʕni* in line 3 and all the words in the utterance are in Standard Arabic. The words in line 1 and 2 are also in Standard Arabic. This may be an indication that the speaker may be using *yaʕni* as a choice of being formal, i.e. as an Act of Identity (Le

Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985), to display his familiarity with the formal context of Al Jazeera, which is seen by viewers all over the Arab world. In this case the Moroccan speaker opted for *yaʕni* and for Standard Arabic in the rest of example (1) as a way of identifying with the audience. In other words, selecting Standard Arabic as a choice serves to identify with the Arabic speaking people all over the Arab world. It seems that language use here reveals an acceptance of the standardized norms at least in a formal setting. Another evidence in favor of the claim that the complementary distribution is between SA and L varieties is shown in the following example from the Egyptian speaker:

(2) Context: The speaker explains the reason for joining the 2011 revolution in Egypt:

- 1 *ʕili xalani ʕafarik fi l-ʕasʕl nidaaf lwaazib*
That leave. me participate in reality call the-duty
“What made me take part in the revolution is the call for duty”.
- 2 *Yaʕni, nidaaf lwaazib di l-watʕan bitaʕna*
DM, call the-duty this the-nation of us
“I mean, the call of duty stemming from our own country”.

What is interesting about this example is the use of both Standard Arabic and dialectal Arabic. Contrary to the other participants, the Egyptian participant code switched between Standard Arabic and dialectal Arabic. This may be due to the fact that both the guest and the animator are Egyptians. What reinforces the claim that the speakers opt for standard/formal DMs, is the use of *liʔanna* by the three participants. Consider the use of *liʔanna* by the Algerian speaker:

(3) Context: the speaker explains why he intends to specialize in psychology

- 1 *kuntu ʔanwi ʔan ʔataxsʕasʕ fi l-amraadʕ n-nafsija*
was.2s intend.1s specialize.1s in-disease the-psychological
“I was intending to specialize in psychological problems”.
- 2 *liʔanna, fi l-ʔamraadʕ n-nafsija hunaaka jamʕ bajna l-ʕilm wa l-ʔadab*
DM in the diseases psychological there addition between science and the-literature

“Because, dealing with psychological problems involves knowledge about science and arts”.

The second reason in favor of adopting Auer’s model concerns the inclusion of languages other than the structurally related ones. The inclusion of Western languages is essential to the understanding of the Arabic linguistic situation. The presence of exoglossic forms in Arabic is discussed by linguists focusing on code-switching (Bentahila & Davies, 1983). The results of the supplementary studies (e.g., Bidaoui, 2016a, 2016b) provide evidence of the incorporation of exoglossic forms in daily speech. As shown in Tables 3 and 4, exoglossic DMs are used along with Arabic DMs to express the meaning of elaboration and causality. The following example shows the use of the French DM, *parce que*, and the use of French in general along with Algerian Arabic:

(4) Context: A3 explains the difficulty a person from Saudi Arabia faced when he tried to understand Algerian Arabic.

- 1 *bdina nhadru avec une rapidité terrible*
Start.3mp talk. 3mp with a speed terrible
“We started to talk with high speed.”
- 2 *hadak Saʕudi qaʕd jʕuf qalina: “samhu li ʔafmən luyə katatkalmu?”*
that Saudi stay look.1s told.us excuse me what from language talk.3mp
“That Saudi guy was looking and asked us: Excuse me, what language were you speaking?”
- 3 *Parce que, hna luyə taʕna tellement était rapide yqul wahed 40% kant Français*
DM we language of. us very was fast Say.3ms one 40% was French
“Because our language was so fast and one can say 40 % was in French”.
(Bidaoui, 2016b, pp. 602-603)

Example (4) provides a clear evidence of the inclusion of exoglossic forms along with endoglossic forms.

The third reason for extending Auer’s (2005) model to the Arabic linguistic situation is related to its ability to extend Ferguson’s (1959, 1996) model to more than two poles. In addition to H and L codes, Auer’s (2005) model adds intermediate forms. These forms are neither standard nor dialectal, but stand in

between. The results of the Algerian speakers illustrate very well the three poles system. While *li?anna* represents the standard form, *li?annu* represents the intermediate form. Here is an example of the use of the intermediate form *li?annu* by an Algerian participant:

(5) Context: A1 explains that the city of Tlemcen differs from other cities in Algeria due to the fact that its inhabitants were once people who resided in Spain during the rule of the Muslims.

- 1 *Tlemcen ?andha status special djalha*
Tlemcen has.it *special status* of.it
“Telemcen has a special status of its own.”
- 2 *li?annu, bhukm t-tarix Tlemcen huma nas harbu min ?ispanja*
DM with-role the-history Tlemcen they
people fled from Spain
“Because, according to history the people of Tlemcen fled from Spain” (Bidaoui, 2016b, p. 605)

It is important to note that the dialect form *fxater* might be replaced by the exoglossic form *parce que*. That means that instead of the two levels H and L claimed by Ferguson (1959, 1996), we need to see it as three level situations as the results of Bidaoui (2016b) has shown.

After providing evidence for the need to find a substitute to Ferguson’s (1959) model, I move on to discuss some caveats in diglossia as described in Ferguson (1959). These caveats are related to the three main defining features of diglossia: being stable, binary, and multi-functional. Ferguson (1959) argued that diglossia is not a stage but rather a stable linguistic situation. Certainly, this view helped in capturing the linguistic situation of the speech communities categorized as being diglossic back in the 1950’s. However, as explained in Auer (2005), the diglossic situation is dynamic as it is prone to change due to different factors such as education and urbanization. A similar view is expressed by Pauwels (1986) who argued that “societal changes such as modernisation, urbanisation, [and] the breakdown of rigid class barriers have made diglossic situations as described by Ferguson (1959) rather rare” (as cited in Hudson, 2002, p. 42). Ferguson himself was

aware that the stability feature is problematic as he acknowledged that tensions may result from diglossia. As a resolution to these tensions in Arabic diglossia, Ferguson (1959) suggested the use of “unstable, uncodified, intermediate forms” (p. 240). Though Ferguson (1959, 1996) acknowledged the existence of intermediate forms, he did not incorporate them in his binary model.

If we look at the binary feature of diglossia, we notice that it does not capture the idea of co-occurrence of H and L varieties and keeps the two codes separate. In fact, H and L varieties are not separated by a wall and speakers may code-switch between the two varieties (Albirini, 2011, p. 542). As a result of this co-occurrence new intermediate varieties emerge. Badawi (1973) and Meiseles (1980) proposed intermediate levels between H and L varieties to better account for the linguistic situation in the Arab world. Badawi (1973) proposed five levels: heritage classical, contemporary classical MSA, colloquial of the cultured, colloquial of the basically educated, and colloquial of the illiterate. The colloquial of the cultured and that of the basically educated are the ones which introduce intermediate variants. Badawi (1973) argued that education as a social factor can account for access and use of the varieties mentioned above.

The third caveat concerns the functions of the two codes. It is true that the H variety primarily serves in formal settings and the L in informal ones. However, there is a growing flexibility in this regard which has led to the mixing of H and L. This mixing of dialect and standard in terms of functions has led to a mixing in language use in general (Albirini, 2011, 2016). This can be clearly seen in the speech of educated speakers who use an intermediate variety where both dialectal and standard forms are used (Badawi, 1973).

There are also other aspects of diglossia as described in Ferguson (1959), which may be problematic. Ferguson distinguished between H and L in that the latter is acquired whereas the former is learned. However, acquisition of H and L varieties is not always as systematic as it was described in Ferguson (1959), with L being acquired as a mother tongue, and H being learned solely through formal education.

Children in Morocco, for instance, may have exposure to the H variety at an early age before school. This happens through passive exposure to the H variety. Media is also another channel through which input from the H can be delivered to children since many children's programs are in Standard Arabic. Early exposure to standard varieties explains why speakers born in Arabic speaking countries may incorporate elements of Standard Arabic into the L variety. This factor may contribute to the mixing of the two varieties and the creation of new intermediate codes.

6. Concluding Remarks

The comparison of Ferguson's (1959) model with Auer's (2005) model brought new ideas to the surface and presented new ways to understand the complexity of the Arabic linguistic situation. This paper has provided three pieces of evidence in favor of applying Auer's (2005) model to the Arabic linguistic situations. The evidence is provided in light of the results of the study of DMs in spoken Arabic based on data from Al Jazeera in addition to data from Bidaoui (2016a) and Bidaoui (2016b). The first reason in favor of Auer's (2005) model is the new definition of standard forms. According to this new definition, SA is seen as a variety that is in use, and does not refer to classical Arabic. SA is not seen as a static H variety but rather as a dynamic standard as it is used in daily life. This is seen in dialectal forms gaining prestige and becoming part of the standard forms without losing their dialectal functions as is the case of *yaʕni*. The second reason for extending Auer's (2005) model to the Arabic is its inclusion of exoglossic variants. This means that the H and L are not necessarily structurally and genetically related. With the structural-relatedness suggested by Ferguson (1959) as a requirement for the diglossic situation to take effect, it is impossible to capture the linguistic situation in the Arab world. The third reason for extending Auer's (2005) model to the Arabic situation is its inclusion of intermediate forms between the standard and dialectal variants. This claim captures the linguistic situation as it gives room to more than the two poles suggested by Ferguson (1959, 1996). Type C diglossia illustrates best the Arabic linguistic situation

as it is based on the existence of intermediate forms between the H and L. The fact, that standard forms, as is the case of *liʔannu*, are incorporated in the dialectal varieties is evidence of the existence of intermediate forms discussed by Auer (2005). The existence of intermediate forms between the codes in diglossia was acknowledged in Ferguson (1996). Though Ferguson made this claim, it was not clear how intermediate forms should be viewed in a diglossic situation limited to two poles. By using a model that goes beyond the two poles, we may be able to capture the complexity of language use in the Arab world today. Ferguson (1996) was aware of this limitation and acknowledged as a weakness the inability of his model to account for diglossia as part of a larger picture. He provided as an example the case of Lebanon where people use an H, a local dialect in addition to an exogenous language, English or French. In fact, this is a feature that characterizes language use in many Arab countries not only in Lebanon.

References

- Abdulaziz, M. (1986). Factors in the development of modern Arabic usage. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 61, 53-64.
- Albirini, A. (2016). *Modern Arabic sociolinguistics: Diglossia, variation, code switching, attitudes and identity*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Albirini, A. (2011). The sociolinguistic functions of code-switching between standard Arabic and dialectal Arabic. *Language in Society*, 40(5), 537-562.
- Arvaniti, A. (2010). Linguistic practices in Cyprus and the emergence of Cypriot standard Greek. *Mediterranean Language Review*, 17, 15-45.
- Auer, P. (2005). Europe's sociolinguistic unity, or: A typology of European dialect/standard constellations. In N. Delbecque, J. van der Auwera, & D. Geeraerts (Eds.), *Perspectives on variation: Sociolinguistic, historical, comparative* (pp. 7-42). Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Badawi, E. (1973). *Mustawayat al-'arabiyya al-mu 'asira fi misr*. Cairo: Dar al-Ma 'arif.
- Bentahila, A., & Davies, E. (1983). The syntax

- of Arabic-French code-switching. *Lingua*, 59(4), 301-330.
- Bidaoui, A. (2016a). Discourse markers of elaboration in Maghrebi and Egyptian dialects: A socio-pragmatic perspective. *The International Journal of Arabic Linguistics*, 1(2), 19-45.
- Bidaoui, A. (2016b). Discourse markers of causality in Maghrebi and Egyptian dialects: A socio-pragmatic perspective. *Open Linguistics*, 2, 593-610.
- Blakemore, D. (2002). *Relevance and linguistic meaning: The semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers* (Vol. 99). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferguson, Ch. (1959). Diglossia. *Word*, 15, 325-340.
- Ferguson, Ch. (1996). Diglossia revisited. In A. Elgibali (Ed.), *Understanding Arabic* (pp. 49-67). Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.
- Fishman, J. (1971). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(2), 29-38.
- Fraser, B. (2006). Towards a theory of discourse markers. *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 1, 189-204.
- Hudson, A. (2002). Outline of a theory of diglossia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 157, 1-48.
- Kumbalonah, A. (2013). Caliban's meaning: The culture of language. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 1(2), 104-116.
- Le Page, R. B., & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to ethnicity and language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meiseles, G. (1980). Educated spoken Arabic and the Arabic language continuum. *Archivum Linguisticum*, 11(2), 117-148.
- Owens, J., & Rockwood, T. (2008). Yaʿni: What it (really) means. *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics*, 21, 83-111.
- Pauwels, A. (1986). Diglossia, immigrant dialects and language maintenance in Australia: The case of Limburgs and Swabian. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 7(1), 13-30.
- Rabin, Ch. (1955). The beginnings of classical Arabic. *Studia Islamica*, 4, 19-37.
- Sayahi, L. (2014). *Diglossia and language contact: Language variation and change in North Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1985). *Lexicography and conceptual analysis*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.