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The Arab world consists of 22 countries that adopt Standard Arabic (SA) as an official language. They have a population that exceeds 420 million inhabitants (World Population Review, 2020), and it is believed that they share a similar linguistic landscape connected with similar cultures and a common history (Toffolo, 2008). However, since this vast population stretches from the Arabian Peninsula and Indian Ocean in the east to the Atlantic Ocean in the west, it is hardly possible to argue that their shared language of Arabic is uniform. Shafik (2017) argues that ‘on the linguistic level little unity exists [in the Arab World]; in addition to the languages of ethnic minorities like Berbers, Nubians, and Kurds, the Arabic language itself has split into a huge variety of local dialects’ (p. 1). Such linguistic diversity within Arabic itself has influenced the dominance of some Arabic dialects over others based on their outreach. The media, in this case, is an effective tool for reaching a wider audience and, as a result, the dialect used in media production is more likely to have a greater influence over other dialects not represented, or which have a weak presence, in the media.

Due to mass media production and its high quality in Egypt, the Egyptian dialect has a clear dominance and is the most recognized amongst other dialects in the Arab world (Amin, 2002). For comparison, in countries like Sudan, Saudi Arabia, Libya, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE), media production is limited to television series and short films (Shafik, 2017). Other countries such as Algeria and Iraq have produced around 100 films, Syria around 150, Tunisia some 130, Lebanon has produced some 180 films, whilst Egypt has remarkably dominated media production with more than 2,500 films (Shafik, 2017). Furthermore, when it comes to quality of production, the Arab world has witnessed fierce competition. For example, the media industry in Syria has excelled in producing high-quality drama series, in Lebanon the media industry focuses on producing music clips and advertisements (Shafik, 2007), and in Dubai a pioneering media city was built to be ‘a focal point of media activity in the region’ (Quinn et al., 2003, p. 6). Nevertheless, media production in Egypt, ranging from talk shows and quizzes to television serials, remains the leading hub for media production in the Arab world (Shafik, 2007). The reason behind Egypt’s superiority in the media relates to its long
history, with the introduction of cinema in 1896, radio in 1926, and TV in 1962 (Allam, 2019). As Shafik (2007) states:

Egypt feeds the numerous channels of other Arab broadcasting stations, in particular those of the Arabian Peninsula. Even more importantly, Egyptian movies with their popular film stars are [...] still screened and aired all over the Arab world.

(p. 5)

The wide-reaching Egyptian media has resulted in the widespread visibility of the Egyptian dialect in the Arab world (Amin, 2002). Awareness and recognition of the Egyptian dialect led to media production in some Arab countries, such as Lebanon, adopting the Egyptian dialect in their productions (Hammond, 2007). Similarly, Egyptian media productions also include several Arabic dialects that reveal the variations within this language and the linguistic identities that each of these variations might represent. An example of this is Khawaja Abdulqader, a popular TV drama set in the Middle East, including the Gulf region.

Khawaja Abdulqader is an Arabic drama consisting of 30 episodes, broadcast in 2012, about Herbert Doperfield, an English man who falls into a depression following the death of his brother and brother-in-law in the Second World War. This depression influences his social and professional life. Herbert moves from London to Sudan to work in a quarry as a stone maker. He is greatly influenced by a religious man, Sheikh Abdulqader (SAQ), then embraces Islam and changes his name to Abdulqader (known subsequently as Khawaja Abdulqader – KAQ). After spending a couple of years in Sudan, Herbert/Khawaja Abdulqader (H/KAQ) moves to Upper Egypt.

While this is a brief summary of the 30 episodes of Khawaja Abdulqader, there are two levels of linguistic identity that are revealed beyond the plot. The first level relates to Sufism. The term ‘Sufism’ (or ‘Taṣawwuf’ in Arabic) refers to ‘a Muslim ascetic who withdrew from the world and attained a high degree of piety and closeness to God’ (Hill, 2019, p. 3). It is also derived from the Arabic word ‘suf’ or ‘wool’, so mutasawif is ‘the person of wool’, referring to wool as the rough piece of cloth worn by ascetics (Hill, 2019). The reference to Sufism is obvious in the use of Sufi-related words and the Arabic poem written more than 1,000 years ago by Al-Hallaj, a Sufi poet of Persian origin (Mason, 1995). The second level of linguistic identity, which is also the focus of this chapter, relates to portraying different identities in the character of H/KAQ through the use of three variations of Arabic: Standard Arabic (SA), Marked Sudanese Dialect (MSD), and Marked Sa’idi Egyptian Dialect (MSED).

This chapter examines how the character of H/KAQ utilizes linguistic resources to reveal the multiple identities of a non-Arab who speaks Arabic as a foreign language. This chapter will, first, introduce the theoretical approach, focusing on Arabic variation and language identity and the extent to which
variation influences intelligibility. It will then draw on five scenes from the
drama, in which three types of codes are used, to argue that, despite the vari-
ation in the Arabic language, the language unifies, rather than creates divisions
in, Arab speakers’ identities.

**Arabic dialects: Issues of variation and identity**

A dialect is a code of language which is associated with a local area and/
or a community of speakers that share sociolinguistic variables (Bassiouney,
2018). Language is associated with a social group through which linguistic
choices show claim to social identities and groups of people (Barber, 2018;
Giles et al., 1991). Many studies have investigated the relationship between
language and identity on both the social and the personal level, which affects
the way individuals interact and communicate (Bucholtz & Hall, 2004).

While social identity can be defined on different levels such as nationality,
etnicity, race, religion, language, geography, history, and ideology (Albirini,
2016), it includes ‘self-definition as a group member in terms of in-group-out-
group differentiations’ (Simon, 2004, p. 37). Personal identities, in contrast,
are ‘based on one-on-one relationships with others’ (Holmes, 2006, p. 167).
Albirini (2016) argues that the relationship between language and identity
has been addressed by different fields such as sociology, anthropology, social
psychology, history, communication studies, political science, and linguistics.
Therefore, different approaches and frameworks such as social construc-
tionism (Kroskrity, 2000), anti-essentialist views of identity (Dervin, 2012),
and group membership (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998) have shaped post-
structuralist discussions of identity.

Joseph (2004) argues that language and identity are ‘ultimately insepar-
able’ and, hence, ‘the entire phenomenon of identity can be understood as a
linguistic one’ (p. 12–13). Moreover, Edwards (2009) asserts that any study
considering identity must also investigate language. To clarify such a relation-
ship, Block (2009) uses the term ‘language identity’ to refer to ‘the assumed
and/or attributed relationship between one’s sense of self and a means of
communication’ (p. 40). Block (2009) argues that ‘language identity’ includes
three types of relationship: 1) *language expertise*, or an individual’s profi-
ciency in a language; 2) *language affiliation*, which denotes an individual’s
attitudes towards a particular language; and 3) *language inheritance*, which
is the language that an individual has learned since birth. These three types
of relationship between language and identity can be seen in the defi-
nition of ‘an Arab’ provided by the Arab League: ‘a person whose language
is Arabic, who lives in an Arabic-speaking country, and who is in sym-
pathy with the aspirations of the Arabic-speaking people’ (Albirini, 2016,
p.122). Nonetheless, such a definition does not fully consider the unique
sociohistorical environment of the Arab world (Suleiman, 2003) and its mul-
tiple identities (Albirini, 2016). Thus, defining ‘one Arab identity’ is neither
viable nor desirable.
Before Islam, ‘Arabs did not form a coherent religious group or a unified political entity, and therefore, the Arabic language was possibly one of the main shared resources linking the various Arab tribes’ (Albirini, 2016, p. 124). In this case, language was used as an identifying feature that distinguished their social identity from the ‘others’ and highlighted any differences (Barth, 1998). Moreover, Arabic was a language of importance, since Mecca held significant religious, commercial, and literary statuses (Albirini, 2016). Therefore, people held a sense of pride in the Arabic language and used the term ‘Ajam’ to describe non-Arabic-speaking individuals (Aldawri, 1984). After the rise of Islam, Arabic gained further significance as the language of Prophet Mohammed and the Quran. This religious feature strengthened Arabs’ sense of identity as a privileged group whose language was chosen to carry the sacred message. Furthermore, after the death of Prophet Mohammed, Arabs led the Islamic conquests beyond the Arabian Peninsula and viewed themselves as the carriers of the message of Islam, which is in Arabic. Arabic also worked as an identifier of Arab Muslims, distinguishing them from the non-Arab Muslims who entered Islam after the conquests (Albirini, 2016).

Arabs’ pride in their language was not only on the individual level but also the state level. Aldawri (1984) points out that, during the Umayyad Caliphate, Arabic ‘drew the demographic and geographical parameters of the Arab nation’ (p. 50), and senior roles in the state were assigned to Arabs. This privilege that Arabs held continued for centuries until the rise of the Ottoman Empire. In the beginning, the Ottomans recognized the importance of Arabic as the language of the Quran and viewed Arabs as their associates in Islam (Makdisi, 1996, 2002). However, at a later stage, the Ottomans adopted a nation-state model and introduced a ‘Turkification’ policy that favoured the Turks over other ethnic groups (Albirini, 2016). As a result, the Arabs revolted against the Turks, and the Arabic language was an identity aspect that unified them. After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the success of the Arabs’ revolution, Arabs desired to establish a nation state in which the Arabic language was its core identity regardless of faith and ethnicity. However, this attempt failed because of colonizing powers which divided the land between them, resulting in different experiences where some countries, such as Algeria, were colonized for a longer period, and others, such as Iraq, for a shorter period, whilst some countries such as Saudi Arabia were barely influenced (Albirini, 2016). Therefore, the Arab world is not a homogeneous place where Arabs have shared the same history and circumstances but rather a heterogeneous place that covers a vast area of land where Arabs’ linguistic identities have been influenced by social factors such as religion, region, ideology, history, and class. As a result, when studying the relationship between Arabic and identity, the unique sociohistorical environment of the Arab world and its multiple identities should be considered (Albirini, 2016; Suleiman, 2003).

Such multiple identities have influenced the varieties of Arabic used across the Arab world and have affected morphemes, phonemes, lexis, and grammar.
For example, at a regional level, many words have different meanings depending on where they are spoken, such as the word /ma:ʃi/, which means ‘no’ in Yemen and Morocco, ‘yes’ in Jordan, and ‘walking’ in Saudi Arabia (Alshargi et al., 2019), and it could mean either ‘yes’ or ‘walking’ in Syria and Palestine, depending on the context. Such differences do not only occur on a country level but also within the same country. For example, on the phonemic level, /fæʤr/ in SA (pronounced /faghr/ in Yemen) means ‘early morning’ in Taizz, south Yemen, while it means ‘poverty’ in Sana’a (Alshargi et al., 2019). These examples illustrate how Arabic varies based on the region.

Religion and identity

Religious identities have also influenced Arabic variations. For example, Abu-Haidar (1991) reported phonological differences between Christians and Muslims in Baghdad, where the former group used the pronunciation /neis/ for ‘people’, whilst the latter group pronounced it as /næs/. Differences were also apparent on the morphological level, where the Christian group used the broken-plural forms in words such as /xababiːz/ ‘bakers’ and /xajaiːl/ ‘tailors’, whilst the Muslim group used the masculine plural form /xabbaziːn/ and /xajatiːn/. Nonetheless, Abu-Haidar (1991) observed that the Christians in Baghdad started to assimilate their dialect to the Muslims’ dialect. Similarly, Holes (1983, 1987), who studied the dialects of the Sunni and Shia groups in Bahrain, observed that the minority Shia population in a Sunni-majority neighbourhood assimilated their dialects to the Sunnis’ dialect. In contrast, when a Sunni population was a minority in a Shia-majority neighbourhood, they would maintain their Sunni dialect. For example, Sunni groups would maintain Sunni-specific sounds such as /ɡ/, /θ/, and /ð/, whilst the Shia groups would not do so with their Shia-specific sounds such as /j/, /l/, and /ɣ/ (Holes, 1983, 1987). Such examples could be explained by the power that Muslims and Sunnis hold in both cases. These dialects represent a ‘social group in which political and commercial power is concentrated, and whose dialect as a consequence has acquired a locally prestigious status’ (Holes, 1983, p. 38). Further, it is worth noting that the influence of religious identities on Arabic variations do not necessarily occur across religions but also on the denomination level within the same religion. These examples further illustrate the complexities of Arabic identities and their influences on Arabic dialects.

The above examples also show how language reflects multi-identities within the same religious group, but, at a more generic level, language reveals an identity that reflects Aljinsiyya or Alqawmiyya (used by Suleiman, 2003 to mean ‘nationalism’) despite belonging to different religions (Zoghbor, 2018a). For example, an Egyptian (whether a Muslim or a Qibti (a minority Christian in Egypt)) will still reveal by his or her accented English his or her belonging to Egypt, reflecting the Arab identity.
with no indication of religion (Alsohaibani, 2016). Despite this view about how language unifies groups of people into one (Arabic-speaking identity), some linguists claim the opposite and argue that Arabic dialects are ‘separate, distinct languages’ (Bassiouney, 2020, p. 28). Such disagreements, according to Albirini (2016), might be attributed to ‘language attitudes’ which he defines as ‘the socio-psychologically evaluative reactions to a certain language or to the speakers of that language’ (p. 68). Here, both Arabic speakers and Arabic linguists tend to have more positive attitudes towards Standard Arabic (SA) (a variety of Arabic that has no native speakers) (Bassiouney, 2020) than of local dialects. SA is the language used in religious sermons, universities, and formal occasions (Bassiouney, 2020), whilst local dialects are often considered as a ‘distorted, debased, and a deficient form of SA […] with many borrowed words and with no underlying system, logic, or rules’ (Albirini, 2016, p. 81). However, when it comes to attitudes towards local dialects, the speakers of such dialects tend to hold more positive attitudes towards their own dialect depending on ‘the context of speech, social appropriateness, personality, group membership, and cultural influences’ (Albirini, 2016, p. 86). Therefore, although Arabs in general hold more positive attitudes towards SA than towards their own dialects, they still view their local dialects as a ‘better form of Arabic’ when compared to other dialects, which shows how a language is not only linguistically defined but also socially constructed.

Variation of Arabic and intelligibility

The term ‘intelligibility’ has been defined differently, but all definitions are linked to verbal communication and the extent to which oral speech can be understood by interlocutors (Smith & Nelson, 2008). Additionally, in verbal communication, pronunciation (rather than any aspects of language) carries identity, as it is more noticeable than other language aspects, such as grammar or vocabulary (Zoghbor, 2016, 2018b).

To distinguish between ‘dialect’ and ‘language’, Edwards (2018) uses intelligibility as the main criteria. For example, speakers of French and English are not expected to understand one another, but English speakers of different varieties are usually able to. Smakman and van der Meulen (2018) consider linguistic borders as the most obvious division between Arabic variations, indicating that the closer the words are (in meaning and how they are related), the thinner the dividing line. These linguistic borders are followed by ethnic borders, identity borders, social connotation borders, and communication-based borders.

The large distribution of Arabic speakers in the world (Anishchenkova, 2020) has caused a rich diversity of variations and dialects. Not only do these variations exist on a national or regional level, but they may also exist in the same small geographical area (Albirini, 2016). In some cases, these variations may be vastly different to the extent that they are not intelligible
to other speakers of Arabic dialects (e.g., the difference between Yemeni and Moroccan dialects). Despite their differences, Arabic dialects are still classified as variations of the same language because they differ on the lexical and phonological levels (Albirini, 2016) rather than the structure (Aoun et al., 2010; Benmamoun, 2000; Soltan, 2007). Such dialects are regularly used ‘in everyday conversations and other informal communicative exchanges: sports, music, film, and some TV show broadcasts’ (Albirini, 2016, p. 13).

In contrast, SA is the same across the Arab world and, therefore, is intelligible to Arabic speakers regardless of their local dialects. Some differences may occur, nonetheless, on phonological and lexical levels due to the influence of local dialects (Holes, 2004; Parkinson, 1991; Schulz, 1981). As SA is mainly used in formal education, print publications, news broadcasts, official speeches, and political announcements (Albirini, 2016), Holes (2004) argues:

[SA] is the language of power and control, as opposed to the language of intimacy and domesticity (the dialect), and it impinges in multifarious and sometimes subliminal ways on the daily life of Arabs of all generations, backgrounds, and educational levels.

(p. 6)

As a result, the choice of SA may work as an identifying factor for the level of education that its speakers have since they use some of its linguistic aspects even when they speak in their local dialects (Bassiouney, 2020; Holes, 2004). The elite status that SA holds is demonstrated in dramatic and literary works, where SA is often used in certain circumstances where no other variety would be appropriate to reveal a neutral identity or hide the origin of the speaker. For example, the Egyptian playwright Mahmud Taymour in his plays Ibn Jalā and Saqr Quraysh in the 1950s (Holes, 2004), and Tawfiq al-Hakim in his plays al-Safqa and al-Warta, used SA for characters whose country of origin was unknown or not important to identify.

The study

The data in this chapter includes five scenes that have been selected from several episodes of the Khawaja Abdulqader series. The scenes were chosen for two main reasons. First, these episodes contained the three main codes of Standard Arabic (SA), Marked Sudanese Dialect (MSD), and Marked Sa’idi Dialect (MSAE) – more information about the scenes is provided in Table 6.1. Second, the scenes speak to the main theme of this chapter and demonstrate that various codes within the Arabic language unify rather than divide Arabic speakers. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) was used to examine the utterance structure, form, usage, meaning, and pronunciation that were employed in the creation of these utterances (Fairclough, 1995). To render actual pronunciation, this chapter uses IPA symbols (Brierley et al., 2016) in transcribing examples and linguistic data.
Findings

The data in this section reveal the types of codes that are used throughout the 30 episodes of *Khawaja Abdulqader* by providing the frequency of the occurrence of each code. Then the five scenes mentioned previously are analysed to consider the context where each code is used, focusing on its linguistic features, particularly the properties. Table 6.2 shows the frequency of scenes where H/KAQ uses each of these codes. It is necessary to draw attention to the fact that the Marked Sudanese Dialect (MSD) is the accented Sudanese Dialect (SD) used by H/KAQ, who uses SD as a foreign language (in Table 6.2 and the rest of the chapter). Similarly, the Marked Sa’idi Egyptian Dialect (MSED) is the accented version of SED used by H/KAQ. In most of the scenes provided in Table 6.2, MSED was predominantly used, then SA, and finally MSD. It should be noted that the borders between these codes were not rigid, as will be shown in the following sections.

The scene in Figure 6.1 is an example of how SA is used to represent H/KAQ’s mother tongue. Most utterances in this scene have equivalent, but not identical, vocabulary in other dialects. Of all the words that are said by H/KAQ in this scene, only two are identical in SA and the Egyptian Dialect, which means ‘I’, and <أموت>, which means ‘I die’. Apart from these two words, all the other words are different in SA and the Egyptian Dialect. In some cases, the same vocabulary with the same orthography is used in both varieties but with different vowel pronunciations (e.g., <هنا>, which means ‘here’, is pronounced as /huna/ in SA and /hina/ in the Egyptian Dialect, and <أنت>, which means ‘you’, is pronounced as /anta/ in SA but /Inta/ in ED).
The SA code (with an Egyptian accent) is even more noticeable in other incidents where SA is used to communicate with English-speaking characters, such as the conversation between H/KAQ and his sister Katy in the scene in Figure 6.2. In this scene, the words in bold are either vocabulary used in the Egyptian Dialect (not SA) or words that are in SA but pronounced with an Egyptian accent. Table 6.3 demonstrates how these words were pronounced differently in SA and ED.

The scene in Figure 6.2 shows two examples of interference from the actor and actress’s first dialect, which is the Egyptian Dialect. The first is the choice of vocabulary, as in ‘no travelling … no Sudan’, where the negation tool /ma/ is used instead of /la/. The second is the use of the same word in SA and the Egyptian Dialect but pronounced differently. In the case of consonants, this can be heard in the pronunciation of ‘very’, where /g/ is used instead of /ʤ/, and ‘keep’, where /ð/ is velarized. In the case of vowels, it can be heard in phrases like ‘I can’, where the vowel in the last syllable is shortened, so it is /i/ instead of /iː/, and the same with the word ‘really’, where the vowel in the first syllable is shortened to sound like /aː/ instead of /aːː/. The phrase ‘his colour’ has a unique modification in pronunciation, where the vowel in the first syllable changes from /aː/ to /uː/, along with the rounded consonant /wː/. The consonant /wː/ is elided and the word sounds like /lunu/ instead of /lawnu/. The scene in Figure 6.2 reveals how SA was used in different incidents and how the code that was produced reflected the characters’ Egyptian Dialect through the choice of vocabulary or pronunciation of words that are identical
in orthography in both varieties but different in pronunciation. The scenes in Figure 6.3 and Figure 6.4 focus on the use of MSD (Marked Sudanese Dialect) and MSED (Marked Sa’idi Egyptian Dialect) when H/KAQ travels to Sudan and then to Upper Egypt.

The scene in Figure 6.3 shows examples of the vocabulary that H/KAQ uses in MSD; e.g., the word ‘what’ (/shenu/) and the negation tool /mal/ (or ‘not’) in ‘not a dream’ (/ma hilm/) and ‘I did NOT see it’ (/maʃuft/). Syntactical and grammatical features in the scene in Figure 6.3 are also noticeable. For example, ‘I saw’, /anaʃaf/ instead of /anaʃuft/, where the former should be used to describe a male third person (he saw), while the /t/ at the end (which
Another example is the demonstrative pronoun /di/ (or ‘this’ in English), which is /haða/ in SA. In this example, /di/ is used as a demonstrative to point at the dream (which is masculine), so, in the Sudanese Dialect, /da/ rather than /di/ should have been used. In Arabic, /anu kan sahā/ (‘I was awake’), one would expect /kant/ to be used instead of /kan/, as the former is used for the first person (I was) and the latter is used with the masculine third person (he was).

The conversation in Figure 6.4 is between H/KAQ and Kamal in Upper Egypt. In this scene, while Kamal is using the Sa’idi Egyptian Dialect (SED), H/KAQ is using the marked version of this code (which is MSED). In this conversation, H/KAQ is trying to tell Kamal the bad news about the death of his father. To reduce the negative effect of this news on Kamal, H/KAQ starts...
to remind Kamal about a Surat in the Quran that talks about souls going to
heaven after death, and the belief that dead people can be met in the hereafter
in heaven, a better place than the current life.

Table 6.4 shows that the utterances of H/KAQ are identical in SD and
SED, but the vocabulary in SA, in the second column, is different either in
pronunciation (as in the word <يلا يقول> or ‘says’, which is /jaquː/ in SA but /
juguː/ in the other two variations) or vocabulary (as in the words <يدتبط إلى
أريد>, which mean ‘to go’, and <أريد>, which mean ‘I want to’).

In Figure 6.5, Margaret is talking in SA to H/KAQ, who is not paying
her any attention and is crying while whispering about Shahwaniya being
murdered. The scene in Figure 6.5 reflects H/KAQ’s spiritual closeness to
God, his purification, and his withdrawal from his surrounding context that
exemplifies God’s characteristics of knowing the unseen realities, which are
all Sufism beliefs and practices. H/KAQ switched from MSED to SA when he angrily replies to Margaret asking her why she followed him to Upper Egypt. What is noticeable in this short conversation is the switch between the two codes, SA and MSED, when H/KAQ is directing his speech at Margaret.
Figure 6.4 Scene where H/KAQ asks Kamal about Surat Al-Fajr.

Table 6.4 Variation in the vocabulary used in SA, SD, and SED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterance by H/KAQ</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(He says)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يروح /jiru:h/</td>
<td>ينقل إلى /jantiqil ila/</td>
<td>يمشي * /yam:j/</td>
<td>يروح /jiru:h/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(He goes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عاوز /ʔa:wiz/</td>
<td>أريد /ʔuri:d/</td>
<td>عاوز /ʔa:wiz/</td>
<td>عاوز /ʔa:wiz/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I want)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * In SA، يمشي (/yam:j/) means 'he walks'.
The scene in Figure 6.5 shows differences in vocabulary and pronunciation between SA and other Arabic variations. The same level of difference exists between the Gulf dialects and other codes. Table 6.5 includes examples of words from the five scenes and the differences/similarities between them in SA, SD, ED, and one variation of the Gulf dialect, the Emirati Dialect, which is used in the UAE. Table 6.5 shows the similarities and differences between the words in each code. One example is the pronunciation of demonstratives, which is /di/ (for a singular feminine) in the Sudanese and Egyptian dialects. In the Emirati dialect, it is /haði/ (for feminine), which is close to the SA / haði/. The word <عاوز> /lawiz/ (‘I want’) is identical in the Sudanese and Egyptian dialects, and the word <أريد> /ari:d/ in the Emirati dialect is similar to that in SA (/?ariːd/), with a difference in the short vowel /u/.

In Table 6.5, another variation for the word <لا أستطيع> (/la ?astatGis/, which means ‘I cannot’) in SA is <لا أقدر> (/?aqder/), which is also used in the Sudanese dialect.
and Emirati dialects, but the /q/ is pronounced as /g/ and the negation tool /ma/ is used instead of /la/. The latter dialect also has another common word to express the same meaning, < /maru:m/>, which does not exist in any of the other codes. The same word is also generated in the Egyptian dialect but with slight changes in sound, so it is pronounced /ma?aqderʃ/ in the Upper Egypt code but /ma ?agderʃ/ in other parts such as Cairo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterance by H/KAQ</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Sudanese</th>
<th>Egyptian</th>
<th>Emirati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﻣﺎ 'Not' / 'No' (negation tool – أداة نفي)</td>
<td>/ma/</td>
<td>/ma/</td>
<td>/muʃ/</td>
<td>/ma/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻋﺎﺰ /?awiz/ 'I want'</td>
<td>/ʔawiz/</td>
<td>/ʔawiz/</td>
<td>/ʔawiz/</td>
<td>/ʔawiz/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻋﺮﻓﻨﻲ /?ata?rifuni/ 'Do you know me?'</td>
<td>/ʔarifuni/</td>
<td>/tiʔrafni/</td>
<td>/tiʔrafni/</td>
<td>/tiʔrafni/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻫﺬه /haðihi/ 'This is'</td>
<td>/di/</td>
<td>/di/</td>
<td>/di/</td>
<td>/haði/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻫﻨﺪ /haði/</td>
<td>/maða/</td>
<td>/ʃinu/</td>
<td>/ʔiːh/</td>
<td>/ʃinu/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﯽ /?awiz/ 'I want'</td>
<td>/ʔawiz/</td>
<td>/ʔawiz/</td>
<td>/ʔawiz/</td>
<td>/ʔawiz/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 Differences/similarities in the vocabulary used in the four codes
Discussion

The dominance of Egyptian media production, described by Shafik (2017), Allam (2019) and Amin (2002) at the start of this chapter, contributed to the enhanced intelligibility of the Arabic varieties in two senses. First, it increased Arabs’ exposure to the Egyptian dialect, making it the most recognized version in the Arab world (Amin, 2002). Second, it allowed for several variations of Arabic to enter the homes of Arabs, including those in the Gulf, as in the case of Khawaja Abdulqader, with SA, SED and SD being used. Thus, despite the large area of the Arab region and the demographical distribution of the Arabs, exposure and familiarity reduces the intelligibility threshold.

Throughout the episodes, H/KAQ uses the Arabic code associated with the social group he is interacting with, thereby claiming the social identity of that group (Barber, 2018, Giles et al., 1991). Religious identity was prominent in revealing the strong linkage between the Arabic language and the religion of Islam. Arabic as the language of the Quran made non-Arab Muslims view Arab Muslims as having a close association with Islam (Makdisi, 1996, 2002). In the scene in Figure 6.4, where H/KAQ refers to Sourate Al-Fajr in the Holy Quran while delivering the news to Kamal about the death of his father, his language choices indicate his wish to belong to Kamal’s ethnic group, and he eventually gains more acceptance and trust during the conversation. Along with language use, the act of Sufi sm appears often as the framework within which multiple identities are revealed through the use of different codes: SA, SED, and MESD.

Despite morphological and phonological differences across Arabic dialects, differences in linguistic properties are not rigid and border lines are grey, allowing overlap of and similarities between the language systems of different codes. Acting beyond differences across codes, the Arabic language, rather than codes, is the main representation of Arab identity. Despite the link between Arabic and Islam (Albirini, 2016), and the positive attitudes towards SA as a prestigious variety of Arabic (Bassiouney, 2020), Arabic in its generic form is an umbrella that represents Alqawmiyya (Arab nationalism) (Suleiman, 2003), regardless of religion, ethnicity, or dialect (Zoghbor, 2018a).

The morphological and phonological analysis of the scenes indicates that SA was used as a neutral language that does not reflect the identity of any specific Arabic region. Considering that SA is a variety of Arabic with no native speakers (Bassiouney 2018, 2020), it was manipulated throughout the episodes to perform different types of identities. SA was used in the episodes by H/KAQ and all the other non-Arab characters (e.g., Margaret and Katy) as their mother tongue instead of English. This indicates that these characters’ identities are not connected to the Arab regions in this drama and do not belong to the Arab communities of Sudan and then of Egypt. SA was introduced as an independent language rather than a variety within Arabic, and ‘intelligibility’ was the criteria that revealed this distinction. As Edwards (2018) states, one of
the definitions of ‘language’ and ‘dialect’ is based on if one understands it or not. Evidence of this was provided in the scene in Figure 6.5, when Margaret tells H/KAQ that she does not understand the language he is using when he is crying and whispering while thinking of ‘Shahwania’. Further evidence that Arabic was considered an independent code is when H/KAQ dreams about SAQ (Figure 6.1) before travelling to Sudan. In his dream, SA is spoken by both of them, but in reality, after travelling to Sudan, SAQ speaks in SD, and H/KAQ, as a user of SD as a foreign language, speaks in MSD.

More evidence regarding the representation of SA as an independent code rather than a variety was provided by non-Arab characters such as H/KAQ. For example, in scenes where H/KAQ is supposed to speak in his native language (which the audience understands to be English), SA is used instead. Since SA in these scenes is performing the role of the first language, it is spoken in the same way a language is spoken by native speakers who show control over the language usage (without grammar mistakes, with a wide vocabulary range suitable for the context, and with standardized pronunciation). Having said this, there may be some interference from the Egyptian dialect, the dialect of the non-Arab actors and actresses in this episode who use sounds such as /g/ instead of /ʤ/, as in the conversation between H/KAQ and his sister Katy. While H/KAQ shows control over SA, as it is used as the character’s first language in place of English, he uses accented SA when reading from the Quran with Kamal. The pronunciation of proper names, such as Abdulqader, is further evidence of the neutral role of SA; /q/ is pronounced as in SA when H/KAQ speaks in SA to an English-speaking character, but the name is pronounced with a /g/ when he speaks in MS or MES with Sudanese or Sa’idi characters.

Conclusion

The chapter has established how different types of Arabic language (SA, SD, and SED) are used to portray different types of identities in the character of H/KAQ in the TV series Khawaja Abdulqader. This chapter analysed the phonological and lexical features in five scenes that represented three Arabic variations – SA, Sudanese Dialect, and Egyptian Dialect – and shed light on the differences and similarities between these and Gulf varieties such as the Emirati dialect.

Overall, the lexicon between the codes used were either completely different or identical in orthography, but different in the pronunciation of consonants or vowels across these variations. As a result, it was revealed that the distinction in phonology and lexicon, which are also important elements in the production of identity, is not rigid but rather overlaps across the variations as well as in the Gulf varieties of Arabic such as the Emirati dialect. This indicates that linguistic features and variation unify, rather than distance, the identities that are produced when Arabic variations are used in communication.
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