

Kurdish and Arabic in Contact: Code-Switching among Kurds in Mosul/Iraq

Ibrahim Khidhir Sallo
Gulf University College – Oman

Abstract: *This study investigates a recent sociolinguistic phenomenon (i.e., Arabic–Kurdish Code-Switching (henceforth K-Ar CS). This study attempts to tackle the linguistic and extra-linguistic constraints of Kurdish-Arabic code-switching among the Kurds in Mosul/Iraq. The linguistic constraints of this phenomenon, which is common in bilingual and multilingual speech communities, imply that mixing two languages does not represent a random blending; on the contrary, CS is systematic and follows certain linguistic rules which can be divided into two categories: linguistic and extra-linguistic (i.e., psychological, sociological and academic)¹*

1. Introduction

Speech mixing is not restricted to present speech communities but goes back to the mixing of European vernaculars with Latin in the Middle Ages. For example, Italian was mixed with Latin in the fifteenth century sermons (Ure 1974:228-31). Contemporary mixing is common in speech as well as in written texts. Recently, CS has been studied from psychological and sociological perspective (e.g., the influence of topic, participants and situation on CS). Code-switching studies have also attempted to answer questions related to the functional motivations and the linguistic constraints of CS and the attitudes of people towards it.

2. Purpose of the study

This paper aims at identifying the linguistic and extra-linguistic constraints of K-Ar CS, which will nullify the fact that CS occurs randomly. This false claim has been refuted through carrying out many studies in different multilingual communities that have come up with similar findings, i.e., CS is a programmatic process,

¹ Key to phonetic symbols used in this study can be found at the end of the paper

which has underlying norms (see Hatch 1976; Verma 1976; Di Pietro 1977; Gumperz 1977; Lipski 1977; Nash 1977; Kachru 1978; Poplack 1978; Sallo 1983). The code-switched constructions are contextually coherent. This study is identical in goal to the above-mentioned studies. Following this line, it is expected that frequencies of the inserted Ar items into K vary from one part of speech to another, e.g., lexical items are more frequently used than function words. In addition, the code-switched constructions are expected to follow the linguistic constraints of the host language (i.e., K) and the guest language (i.e., Ar). The host language is used metaphorically to refer to Kurdish language which functions as the host! While the guest language is used metaphorically too to imply that Arabic language functions in this paper as the guest! . In other words, it is hypothesized that this phenomenon is linguistically rule-governed.

3. Definitions of related concepts

1. Code-switching:

It occurs when a bilingual introduces an unassimilated word from another language into his speech (Haugen 1964:40). Diebold (1968:84, 85) defined CS as “the successive alternative use of two different languages, a standard language and a dialect, sociolects of the same language and different written codes”. With regard to this study, a working definition of CS is: it is the alternation between Ar and K, whether for one word or more due to linguistic and extra-linguistic motivations. Code-switching is also referred to as: ‘code alternation’, ‘code-shifting’, ‘code-changing’, ‘code selection’, and ‘triggering’. McKay and Hornberger (2000:56) referred to the types of CS, i.e., (i) Situational CS implies a change in situation, (ii) Metaphorical CS refers to changes in the speaker’s language choice when the situation remains the same, that is, to convey special communicative intent or purpose and (iii) Conversational CS means there is a change in codes in a single sentence. This is a common mode of CS called Code Mixing. Discussing such types in details is beyond the scope of this paper (For details, see Auer 1998:156; Holmes 2001:42, 245; Hudson 1993:56,57).

2. Diglossia:

In diglossic situations, the people have competence in two varieties of the same language, while bilinguals have competence in two languages. So, ‘diglossia’ is a social phenomenon, whereas ‘bilingualism’ is an individual one (Dittmar 1976:177).

3. Interference:

Weinreich (1953:7) defines it as ‘a linguistic overlap, when two systems are simultaneously applied to a linguistic item’. Mackey (1972:569) compares ‘interference’ with ‘borrowing’ as follows: “the former is a feature of ‘parole’; the ‘latter’ of ‘langue’ ”.

4. Bilingualism:

Bloomfield (1976:56) sees bilingualism as “native like control of two languages”.

5. Pidginization and creolization:

A pidgin is a marginal language which fulfils limited functions among a speech community members who do not share mutually intelligible languages. A Creole develops when a pidgin becomes a mother tongue capable of satisfying the communication purposes of its speech community (Todd 1974:1-11).

6. Iraqi Arabic:

It refers to the Ar variety spoken by most of Iraqi people. As for the informants of this study they use this variety.

4. Data collection

This linguistic analysis is based on data collected through observation and tape recording from 100 Kurdish informants in Mosul City (aged between 20–60, 50 females vs. 50 males). The K language covered by the data of this study is a variety of K spoken by the Kurds in Mosul city (a version of Bahdinani K spoken by Kurds in several areas in northwest Iraq).

Following is the linguistic analysis of the tapes and the data collected. As for the impact of the constraints: topic, interlocutors, setting, purpose and mood on CS (for details, see Hymes 1974: 58-65 of which the first three seem to be most influential in the selection of Ar or K or a mixture of them).

The focus of this paper is on K-Ar CS; therefore, the linguistic part will be discussed while the impact of the constraints: topic, interlocutors, setting, purpose and mood on CS

will be discarded. It has been observed that K-Ar CS is more common among the educated Kurdish informants, especially in dealing with academic topics in university domains. On the other hand, it has been noticed that there is less CS among the illiterate Kurdish informants dealing with casual daily life issues at home domains.

5. Types and domains of Kurdish-Arabic code-switching

The factors promoting the use of Ar within K fall into two types: linguistic and extra-linguistic. The former can be either obligatory or optional. The first takes place when the switchers unintentionally ignore the K equivalents of the Ar items, or that CS may take place because K equivalents have not been established yet, especially with reference to English technical and scientific used to refer to new discoveries and inventions, e.g., ghasaala (washing machine); koompyutar (computer); disk (disc); kii boord (key board); printar (printer); interneet (internet); dish (dish); rasiivar (receiver); moobail (mobile); Tayaara (aero plane); Saaruukh (rocket); dabaaba (tank); qumbala (bomb); midfa9 (cannon); mukhtabar (Lab); musajjil (recorder); shareeT (tape). This type of switching is justifiable since the switchers cannot find corresponding K lexical items to express themselves.

The optional type occurs without being obliged to use words from the second language of the bilingual because equivalents are available in the mother tongue, i.e., the Kurdish informants are not obliged to use Arabic lexical items since the equivalents are available in their mother tongue, i.e., Kurdish, for example:

1. 'khalata man ya l Taabaqee shashee, mustashfa 9aam.'
(My aunt is at the sixth floor in hospital).
2. 'yuunis, Taalibaka jaami9e, khoostiya (khatabkar); u chu maHkame da maarbaka (9aqda kho cheeka).'
(Younis asked the hand of a university girl and went to the court for engagement).

Switching to Ar is common in the following domains:

- i) School: qalam (pencil); massaaHa (eraser); daftar (copybook); masTara (ruler); kateeb (book); majalla (magazine); madrasa (school); ?amtiHaan (test); naajiH (successful); raasib (failure); 9arabi (Arabic); taariikh (History); jughraafiya (Geography); rayaadha (Physical Education); 9aluum (Sciences); rayaadhiyaat (Mathematics); fizyaa? (Physics), diin (Religion); rasam (Painting); moosiqa (Music); etc.

- ii) Academic Issues: ?uTruuHa (thesis); maajasteer (M.A.); ?ustaadh (Professor); muHaazara (lecture); ma9had (institute); jaami9a (university); 9ilmi (scientific); qaa9a (classroom); jadwal (timetable); ghaaib (absent); Haadhir (present); shahaada (certificate); baHath (research); waajab (homework); mu9iid (demonstrator); ?ustaadh musaa9id (assistant professor); ?ustaadh mushaarik (associate professor); etc.
- iii) Market: suuk (market); shakir (sugar); ma9juun (tomato paste); mooz (banana); 9aSiir (juice); kaastar (custard); chaay (tea); tuutan (tobacco); baTaaTa (potato); sabakh (dye); farcha (brush); etc.
- iv) Hospital: 9amaliya (operation); saraTaan (cancer); sil (TB); 9ayaada (clinic); mudhamida or mumaridha (nurse); ?isti9laamaat (information office); takhtoor (doctor); kapsuul (capsules); etc.
- v) Sports: Haami hadaf (goal keeper); hadaf (goal); fariiQ (team); salla (basketball); Taaira (volley ball); Hakam (referee); mulaakim (boxer); etc.
- vi) Transportation: 9arabaana (carriage); safiina (ship); Tayaara (aero plane); maTaar (air port); qiTaar (train); maHaTTa (railway station); etc.
- vii) Religion: maSHaf (Quran); ramazaan (fasting month); faqiir (poor); mazluum (oppressed); shahiid (martyr); jaamiHe (mosque); etc.
- viii) Army: qumbala (bomb); Talqa (bullet); jundi (soldier); mashaat (infantry); midfa9iya (artillery); daruu9 (armoured forces); baHriya (navy); samtiyya (helicopter); Saaruukh (rocket); dhad aj jaw (anti aircraft); etc.
- ix) Computer: disk (disc); shaasha (screen); Taabi9a (printer); samaa9a (headphones); maaykrafoon (microphone); Taba9 (typing); khazan kar (saving); vaayroos (virus); etc.
- x) Miscellaneous: Hadiiqee (garden); markazee shurTa (police office); sajnee (prison); mughanii (singer); mumasil (actor); masrahiyyak (play); maT9amee (restaurant); dakaanee (shop); siinamee (cinema); gaziinoo (casino); khaTuuT jawiyya (airways); matra (metre); yarda (yard); buTul (bottle); Taayra (tire); paas (bus); taksi (taxi); qamiiS (shirt); pantaruun (trousers); ribaaT (tie); chaakeet (jacket); etc.

Most of the above mentioned Ar lexical items and many others occur in the utterances of the informants of this study.

6. Linguistic analysis of Kurdish-Arabic code-switching

A linguistic analysis of K-Ar CS shows that certain linguistic restrictions constrain the occurrence of K-Ar CS. This should not

mean that K and Ar are undergoing pidginization as is the case with some other pairs of languages, e.g., Spanish and English (Cf Nash 1977:205). The linguistic constraints that govern K-Ar CS are the following:

(i) Data analysis shows that Ar words used within K have varying frequencies, e.g., lexical items (i.e., nouns, adverbs, adjectives and notional verbs), especially nouns, are the most switchable units since their meanings are obvious and adaptable to CS. Moreover, most of the switched-to Ar items are content items, especially nouns and belong to the technical and scientific field. The rarity of switched verbs is due to the fact that Ar is a Semitic language, which has a tri-consonantal verbal system. Therefore, the supposedly switched-to items cannot fit into the K verbal conjugation. These differences and linguistic problems are not faced in CS and using nouns. Here are some examples of the occurrence of the nouns:

3. ‘ma paankak, u mubaridak, u Tabaakhak, u salaajak krya.’
(We bought a fan, air cooler, stove and a refrigerator).
4. ‘av rayaadhi du madaali haya.’
(This athlete has two medals).

With regard to this point, Sallo (1983:67) found that the English lexical items were most adaptable to switching than function words and nouns were the most frequent items. The averages were as follows: nouns: 72.9%, adjectives: 12.3%, verbs: 3.9%, adverbs: 2.11%, articles: 1.5%, pronouns: 1.45%, prepositions: 4.7%, conjunctions: 1.25%. Some other studies stress the same phenomenon, for example, Sridhar and Shridher (1980:205) mentions that nouns outrank adjectives, adverbs and verbs whereas function words such as articles, quantifiers, auxiliaries, prepositions and pronouns are rarely mixed. They (1980:20) also cite some findings of Poplack’s study of Spanish-English CS. Her statistical numbers are as follows: nouns: 141, adjectives: 49, adverbs: 33, verbs: 13, conjunctions: 16, auxiliary, preposition and determiner 0. Accordingly, this phenomenon seems to be universal especially in the case of registral borrowing and CS. This case is common in many countries where English is the medium of teaching. Verma (1976:163) also observes that “if their (‘speakers’) topic of discourse is technical, their registral items are likely to be from English and the grammatical items are

from Hindi”. Apart from that, the use of Ar substantives may stem from the fact that some topics are easily discussed in one language than in another or the Ar lexical items come easily to mind since they are very often heard in daily life, so they become more stable and less subject to oblivion.

- (ii) Function words such as prepositions, articles, and conjunctions are the least switchable items because they can hardly be assimilated; therefore, the emptiness, boundness, and independence of such linguistic items constrain their transfer between languages (Sallo 1983:105). In this respect, Haugen (1964:66) says “content words are approximately entirely free while function items are nearly absent in code one. Bound morphemes are seldom if ever transferred”. The following are some of the examples which occurred in the data:

5. ‘avi av kateeb daanya l sar meezi’.
(He put this book on the table).
6. ‘Hadki bo taSrufee kho el-Safee daani’
(Put an end to your misbehaviour in the class).
7. ‘Hadiiqa rashaand’
(He watered the garden).

In sentence No. 5, there are two Ar lexical items (i.e., kateeb and meez) which are nouns whereas the preposition ‘sar’ (on) is K. In sentence No. 6, the words ‘Had’ (limit), ‘taSaruf’ (behaviour), ‘Saf’ (classroom) are Ar. Whereas the prepositions ‘bo’ (to) and ‘el’ (in) are K. In sentence No. 7, the word ‘Hadiiqa’ (garden) is Ar; the word ‘rashaand’ (watered) is a borrowed verb from Ar but it is integrated in the K verbal system as far as inflection is concerned.

- (iii) Many Ar nouns are pluralized by using a K cardinal number plus the singular Ar nouns, e.g., chaar muhandas (The reader may see that Kurdish people pronounce this Arabic word as ‘muhandas’ not ‘munhandis’) (four engineers); sad mu9allim (one hundred teachers); du Taalib (two students); see risaala (three letters), etc. The markers of plurality in Ar (i.e., uun, iin, aat), which stand for the plurality ‘-s’ in English, are dropped.

- (iv) K definite and indefinite articles trigger the use of K and Ar nouns, i.e., the K articles are used with either K or Ar items. It can be noticed that K articles are either added to nouns as suffixes or expressed by stress, e.g.
8. mu9allim haat. (The teacher came).
 9. mu9allimak haat. (A teacher came).
- (v) K genitive particles, including /a/ for feminine and /e/ for masculine, are used within K contexts only whether the head is Ar or K, for example:
10. ava khizaan wiya. (This is his wife).
 11. ava mere weya. (This is her husband).
 12. ava sayaara 9aliya. (This is Ali's car).
 13. av qalama 9aliya or ava qalama 9aliya. (This is Ali's pencil).
 14. av sa9at 9aliya. (This is Ali's watch.)

In sentences 10 and 11, 'wiya' and 'weya' stand for 'his' and 'her' respectively. In sentences 12, 13, and 14, 'ya' is used with feminine heads while 'ye' is used with masculine heads. Both of them stand for the possessive '-s' in English. Their use is similar to (of construction) in English.

- (vi) The K relative pronouns occur with Ar or K antecedents, e.g.
15. ?aw qalam ?awe min ditii darkat ya 9aliya.
(The pen which I found seemed to be Ali's).
 16. ?aw mu9allim ?awe darsaa dada min naavi wi aHmada.
(The teacher who teaches me is Ahmad).
 17. ?aw mu9allima ?awa darsaa deeta min naavi we laylaaya.
(The she-teacher who teaches me is Layla).
 18. ?aw kur ?awe daftara wi barza buuya naavi wi maHmada.
(The boy whose notebook was lost is Muhammad).

The K relative pronoun (?awe) stands for (who) or (which). It is used with masculine antecedents, regardless of being singular or plural. Whereas (?awa) which stands for (who) or (which) is used with feminine antecedents.

- (vii) With respect to agreement, the K adjectives can modify Ar or K items, e.g.
19. av seev sheeriina. (This apple is sweet).
 20. av kachak juwaana. (This girl is beautiful).

21. av meez garaana. (This table is heavy).
 22. av sayyara garaana. (This car is expensive).

In sentences 19 and 20, the adjectives ‘sheeriina’ and ‘juwaana’ agree with the K items ‘seev’ and ‘kachak’ in gender, i.e., the adjectives ‘sheeriin’ and ‘juwaan’ take the marker of feminine /a/. But there is no agreement in gender in sentences 21 and 22, that is the form of the adjective ‘garaana’ remains the same regardless of whether the noun is masculine (example 21) or feminine (example 22).

Unlike English language, the adjective agrees with the noun in number (i.e., singularity and plurality), for example:

23. av qalam nuya. (This pen is new).
 24. av qalamat nyna. (These pens are new).

In these two examples, the adjective ‘nuya’ which stands for the English Adjective ‘new’, changes in accordance with the head of being singular or plural.

(viii) Agreement in number between Ar subject and K verb is obvious; the verb indicates whether the subject is singular or plural. This type of agreement is common in English language too, e.g.

25. mu9allim chuu. (The teacher went).
 26. mu9allam chuun. (The teachers went).
 27. mu9allimak haat. (A she-teacher came).
 28. mu9allima haatan. (She-teachers came).

These examples follow the pattern (S + V +)

(ix) After K prepositions, either Ar or K nouns may occur, e.g.

29. ?awi ?aw l sar sare kho kar. (He put it on his head).
 (K prep. + K N).
 30. ?awe av qalam sar meezi daaniya. (She put this pen on the table).
 (K prep. + Ar N).

(x) Arabic adverbs can occur within K contexts, e.g.

31. ?aw saayiq ?ab sur9a haat. (Rarely used).
 (The driver drove fast).
 32. havaale min il maktabey. (My friend is in the library).

33. ?aze ta sa9at chaar bavina. (I will see you at 4 o'clock).

The expressions ‘?ab sur9a’, ‘il maktabe’ and ‘ sa9at chaar’ function as adverbs of ‘manner’, ‘place’ and ‘time’ respectively.

(xi) It has been noticed that Ar words inserted into the K contexts are not affixed with Ar case endings of the nominative, accusative, or dative since such endings are not commonly used in Iraqi Ar. This was expected since shifting occurred between K and Iraqi Ar, for example:

32. 9alii haat. (Ali came).

33. man 9alii diit. (I saw Ali).

34. man salaav il 9alii kar. (I saluted Ali).

(xii) The data analysed show that many Ar lexical items have been assimilated into the K morphological system, e.g.

35. jarrab (tried) ----- jarrabaaandan (trying).

36. saHaq (damaged) ----- saHaqaaandan (damaging)

37. 9amliyat kar (to make an operation).

38. imtiHaan kar (to take an exam).

It is to be noted that Ar nouns plus (-aandan) stand for (-ing) forms (i.e., gerund) as in examples 35 and 36. So, the addition of the K suffix (aandan) is morphological, whereas Ar nouns plus ‘kar’ imply (action) as in examples 37 and 38. Since ‘kar’ is used as an independent item, this process is syntactic.

With reference to the universality of CS, it is obvious that many of the points that are mentioned under ‘Linguistic analysis of K-Ar CS’ are universal since most of them have been mentioned by sociolinguists (see the purpose of this study). Moreover, Sallo (1983:101) stated that the Ar definite and indefinite articles (i.e., ‘?al’, ‘fard’, ‘fadd’); the Iraqi Ar possessive particle ‘maal’ and the Iraqi Ar relative particle ‘illi’ occurred with Ar and E items. The agreement occurred between E subjects and Ar verbs and between E nouns and Ar adjectives.

7. Linguistic versus extra-linguistic constraints on Kurdish-Arabic code-switching

The data surveyed indicate that CS is subject to some linguistic constraints. We found that content words, mainly nouns and

adjectives, were most frequently switched and were adapted to Arabic phonological rules, whereas function words were the least frequent and adapted. The high ratio of code-switched nouns over verbs would be due to scientific, technical and newly coined terms and register and to the difficulty of fitting Arabic verbs to the Kurdish conjugation (Sallo 1983:104-107).

We also found a significant tendency for certain Arabic words to be associated only with other Arabic items in Arabic contexts, whereas the Kurdish equivalents were associated with either Arabic or Kurdish contexts. This finding held for verbs, adverbs, adjectives, prepositions, plural affixes, genitive particles, relative pronouns, and definite and indefinite articles. Non-relative pronouns, and conjunctions, however, occurred only in same-language contexts.

Code-switching most commonly occurred because Kurdish or Arabic equivalents for scientific and technical terms, and new inventions were either lacking or else diffuse and not standardised. For example, informants remarked on the difficulty of giving exact Arabic or Kurdish equivalents for 'mobile', 'receiver', 'dish', 'CD', 'floppy', 'key board', 'monitor', 'scanner', 'chat', 'email', 'bacteria', 'microbe', and 'germ', 'T-square', 'video', 'projector', 'ring', 'email', 'chat', 'internet', 'cassette'. University professors face similar difficulties in lecturing in Arabic or Kurdish without recourse to Arabic or Kurdish dictionaries of scientific and technical terms, and the problems get passed on to the students.

But CS also occurred apart from any lexical gaps or problems, e.g., when Kurdish numerical terms were used to accompany Arabic terms for weights, prices, and measurements, probably by automatic association (Sallo 1983:121). Nobody could complain that Kurdish lacks numbers!

Such linguistic constraints as the ones we found ensure that CS remains meaningful; random switching would be funny, unacceptable, or meaningless. In general, the native language functioned as the 'host code' into which linguistic items from the non-native language got inserted (cf. Hasselmo 1980; Gumperz 1977:2 and Verma 1976:156, 158, 164) claim indeed that CS follows universal underlying restrictions similar to the grammatical rules and style shifts applied by monolinguals. Yet

unlike pidginisation, CS does not produce 'a stable and intermediate language' (cf. Nash 1977).

8. Extra-linguistic constraints of Kurdish-Arabic code-switching

The extra-linguistic aspects of the data need to be considered as well. We found that academic, psychological, and social motives were influential. Iraqi Kurdish people commonly switch to Arabic because it has until recently been the medium of instruction in Iraqi universities in the North of Iraq. It is still used as the language of teaching and expression at the undergraduate and postgraduate level in Iraqi universities. The educated Iraqi Kurdish people use a lot of Arabic lexical items in their daily life language.

Switching to Arabic also depends on the ease of discussing a 'topic' in a particular language, and on the participants in the discourse. Iraqi Kurdish students switch to Arabic much more often when speaking with their colleagues in a university setting. People were observed to switch from Arabic to Kurdish when clarifying, emphasising, or summarising, e.g., by giving a Kurdish term as a gloss for an Arabic term; this may reflect the 'translation method' commonly used for teaching Arabic in Iraq.

Some informants claimed that Arabic is a 'better' language of instruction than Kurdish at the university level. This claim reflects the misconception that some languages are intrinsically better than others (cf. Halliday 1972:160). In fact, any language can be expanded to cope with new concepts (Sallo 1983:114). The use of Arabic lexical items can also hinge on aesthetic factors. Some students asserted that certain Arabic items sound more 'musical' while their Kurdish equivalents sound 'funny'!

Switching from Arabic to Kurdish was sometimes done merely to relieve monotony and add colour, refreshment, or relaxation. Standing Arabic idioms and proverbs could also add colour.

Or again, switching to Arabic could be a way to show off and impress others with being 'educated' (cf. Nash 1977:209). Our university students and physicians like to give the impression of being fashionable and fluent in Arabic. Moreover, Iraqi universities staff members who have continued their studies in

Iraqi universities before 1990 may use Arabic to display their 'elite' knowledge.

As was observed by the author, the 'social prestige' of Arabic leads people to overstate their own proficiency and throw in Arabic words, especially when their socioeconomic status is improving. Many individuals listed Arabic as one of the languages they have mastered despite only being pupils on intermediate or secondary level. Also, people may listen to Arabic songs or wear sweaters with Arabic embroidery, yet do not understand the meaning of the word(s) (Annamalai 1978:241 ; Kachru 1982:146; Sallo 1983:120).

Educated Kurdish people were found to be the frequent users of Arabic, even in situations where use of Arabic may sound incongruent, for example:

39. Haalata wii khaTar

(His case is very dangerous).

Among the English items frequently uttered by Arab and Kurdish doctors were 'needle', 'syringe', 'bandage', 'tablets', 'dose', 'gauze', 'syrup', 'canula', 'dressing', 'chest tube', 'chest X-ray', 'stool', 'blood sample', 'fever', 'gastric wash', 'ABG or VBG (i.e., artery blood gases or veinary blood gases)', 'anti biotic', 'plazma', 'foreign body' and so on. Most of these expressions are used by nurses and doctors in their messages for consultation, e.g., 'arakkab lu CANULA' [fix a canula for him], '?a9malu GASTRIC WASH' [I will make gastric operation for him].

Whereas switching to shared vernaculars like Kurdish, Turkish, or Assyrian by Iraqi doctors or shopkeepers can make patients or customers feel at ease. Switching to Arabic or English may be done to prevent understanding, e.g., doctors consulting with each other may switch to English for esoteric reasons and to conceal medical states or diseases from their patients, e.g. 'I suspect cancer', 'The case is very serious', 'He needs an operation'. Doctors may even have recourse to highly specialised terms, e.g. saying 'neoplasia' lest a patient understand 'cancer', or to abbreviations like 'CA' for 'cancer', 'SY' for 'syphilis', or 'TB' for 'tuberculosis'. On the other hand, they usually write medical prescriptions in English but give the doses in Arabic or Kurdish to make sure patients can understand what to do (Sallo 1983:120).

Switching to Arabic can avoid socially 'tabooed' expressions that could be stressful to utter in the native language,

e.g. saying 'W.C.' and /tuwaaleet/ despite having six Arabic equivalents and the use of dawra shahriya 'Period'. Kurdish people use either the Arabic or English items (Annamalai 1978:242). In our study, English words were popular in lectures dealing with the sexual organs, e.g., in College of Medicine in Mosul or College of Medicine in Dohuk (Sallo 1983:121).

Conversely, teachers teaching in Arabic commonly switch to Kurdish when they get excited or angry with their students. This fits the assumption that people switch to the familiar language when they are extremely fatigued, excited, angry, hungry, tired, astonished, or fed up, and thus indisposed to make the conscious effort of using another language (Stanlaw 1982:188). Or, people may prefer the familiar language to downplay the severity of the criticism or censure they have to make (for similar cases see Sallo 1983:122,123).

9. Conclusion

This study showed that CS obeys two types of constraints. The linguistic ones concern the phonology, morphology, lexicon, and syntax of the two languages. Future 'grammars' might try to incorporate such constraints upon code-switched language (Romaine 1981:102).

This study shows that the phenomenon of CS is linguistically rule-governed, i.e., once the Ar switched items are assimilated into K, whether switching is obligatory or optional, they must conform with the rules that govern K grammar. This systematicity supports the idea that CS is not a random blending of two languages. It has been found that lexical items occur more frequently than function items and that nouns are the most switchable items. Some Ar lexical items are more switchable than others because they come easily to mind; relatively in-frequent items are more subject to oblivion. Kurdish-Arabic CS commonly occurs as a result of the lack of K equivalents for scientific and academic terms which are increasing day by day. The impact of Ar words on K lexicon is considerable. Unlike K purists who maintain that borrowing and CS affect K grammar drastically, this paper has clearly shown that it is only the lexicon which is getting richer, a healthy sign of living languages, while grammar is not seen as susceptible to change at present.

The extra-linguistic ones concern the academic, psychological, and social motivations. Iraqi CS is correlated not just with the degree of fluency in Arabic but with speakers' attitude toward it, especially its prestige in a speech community (Kachru 1978:78). People will use Arabic if they believe that it is essential for access to better socioeconomic status and technological progress. This holds strongly among elite class. But we should distinguish such CS from the use of the assimilated Arabic loanwords by professionals as mechanics, carpenters, oil and railway workers, custom officials, etc.

The study indicates that language choice and CS occurred systematically not randomly as determined by extra-linguistic factors (i.e., status, psychological and sociological). 'Topic', 'participants' and 'setting' have been found to be the most influential factors in switching to Ar or vice versa. Shifting to Ar is more or less limited to the educational, scientific, technical, and religious topics while K is more favoured with casual ones. It has been observed that K-Ar CS does not imply the existence of lexical poverty of the switchers' mother tongue because the inserted items do not mainly fill lexical slots. But, CS maybe due to the switchers' inability to express themselves in the mother tongue or that the item which is ready at the moment of speaking belongs to the second language.

It has also been found out that different types of interlocutors choose different choices of language. K is more used when there is a 'solidarity' or 'power' relationship. Ar seems to be more used in sophisticated, formal and academic situations whereas K is favoured in everyday and familiar settings.

By showing that CS occurs systematically, we can refute the popular bias that mixing languages is utterly unsystematic and random, as implied by pejorative labels like as 'Tex-Mex', 'Spanglish', 'Franglais' etc. (Sallo 1983, 1994, 2004). Conservative Kurdish grammarians reject the use of foreign elements because they believe that language purity mirrors language identity and loyalty, whereas language mixing leads to 'corruption', language shift, language loss, language degradation, Europeanism or elitism. Purists who would wipe out foreign items from Kurdish should take into account that most of the 'switched-to' foreign items are content words that can affect only the lexicon of Kurdish, and are brought into conformity with the rules

of Kurdish. The use of scientific and technical Ar terms by code-switchers is justifiable because the technological development necessitates the use of new terms that would probably be nativised later on. In this connection, the fact that many of the switched-to scientific items are English should be taken into consideration. Also, the technological and technical progress advances faster than new vocabulary can be coined and created from native sources. Arabic vocabulary can thus be regarded as an enrichment for Kurdish (Sallo 1983:132-135).

Written switches in mobile messages and students' notebooks have found to be less frequent and less acceptable than the oral ones. Such written sources did show CS between Arabic and Kurdish or between Standard Arabic and Iraqi Arabic. Yet intriguingly, even the people who freely do it in speaking may reject switching in writing. When the transcript of the data was shown to the informants, they read it with uncontrollable laughter!

Code-switching clearly calls for further studies. Among the outstanding questions to be addressed are: (i) whether CS has universal linguistic constraints, (ii) whether it is related more to competence or to performance; (iii) whether the native speakers and the foreign learners of Kurdish have a similar competence; (iv) and whether the speakers of Arabic have the same competence in the Standard and the Iraqi varieties (Sallo 1983, 1994, 2004). The answers to such questions may profoundly reshape our views of languages in contact, whether in geographic, academic, or professional settings all around the world.

To sum up, this paper does not claim that it covers the whole subject since the area of language selection is fresh and virgin especially in Iraq and there are many aspects which have not been investigated yet. Further studies could be conducted on K-Ar CS in Mobile messages, Chat language and in other countries to have a comprehensive picture about this phenomenon. MA and PhD dissertations may deal with the topic depending on extended data. Courses of CS in email writing style, mobile messages and chat language could be introduced similar to writing courses to enable students to keep pace with the rapid changes and challenges that are happening around us in the wake of globalization.

References:

- Annamalai, E.** (1978). 'The anglicised Indian languages: a case of code-mixing social stratification and language'. *International Journal of Dravidian Languages*, 7(2): 239-47.
- Auer, Peter (ed.)**. (1998). *Code Switching in Conversation*. London: Routledge.
- Bloomfield, L.** (1976). *Language*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Diebold, Richard A.** (1968). 'Code-switching in Greek-English bilingual speech'. In R. J. O'Brien. (ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable Papers on Linguistics 1961-1965*, 49-55. Washington: Georgetown UP.
- Di Pietro, Robert, J.** (1977). 'Code-switching as a verbal strategy among bilinguals'. In Fred R. Eckman, (ed.), *Current Themes in Linguistics, Bilingualism, Experimental Linguistics and Languages Typologies*, 3-131. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dittmar, N. (trans)**. (1976). *Sociolinguistics: A Critical Survey of Theory and Application*. London: Arnold.
- Gumperz, John.** (1977). 'The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching'. *RELC Journal*, 8/2:1-34
- Halliday, Michael, et al.** (1972). 'The users and uses of language'. In Joshua Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, 139-169. The Hague: Mouton.
- Hasselmo, Nils.** (1980). 'Some problems in immigrant bilingualism: quantitative and qualitative constraints'. *Journal of International Studies*, 1/2:15-27.
- Hatch, Evelyn.** (1976). 'Studies in language switching and mixing'. In W McComack & S. Wurm, (eds.), *Language and Man: Anthropological Issues*, 201-14. The Hague: Mouton
- Haugen, Einar.** (1964). *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide*. Gainesville, FL: American Dialect Society, No. 26.
- Hymes, Dell.** (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kachru, Braj.** (1978). 'Code-mixing as a communicative strategy in India'. In James Alatis. (ed.), *International Dimensions of Bilingual Education*, 107-124; 263-77. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown UP.
- _____ (ed.). (1982). *The Other Tongue: English Across Culture*, Urbana: Illinois UP.
- Lipski, John M.** (1977). 'Code-switching and the problem of bilingual competence'. *The Fourth Lacus Forum*, 263-77. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.

- Holmes, Janet.** (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 4th. Ed. England: Pearson Education.
- Hudson, R. A.** (1993). *Sociolinguistics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McKay, S. L. and Hornberger, N. H.** (2000). *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackay, William, I.** (1972). "The Description of Bilingualism". *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, Ed. Joshua A. Fishman. 3rd. pr. The Hague: Mouton. Pp. 554-84.
- Nash, Rose.** (1977). 'Aspects of Spanish-English bilingualism and language mixture in Puerto Rico'. In Adam Makkai (ed.), *Linguistics at the Crossroads*, 205-225. Lake Bluff IL: Jupiter.
- Poplack, S.** (1978). 'Syntactic structure and social functions of code-switching'. *Working Paper No. 2*, n.p. Centro de Estudios Puertorriquenos: CUNY.
- Romaine, Suzanne.** (1981). "The Status of Variable Rules in Sociolinguistic Theory". *Journal of Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 93-119.
- Sallo, Ibrahim Khidhir.** (1983). *A Psycho-sociolinguistic Study of Arabic-English Code-Switching at University Level in Iraq*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Baghdad, Iraq: University of Baghdad.
- _____. (1994). "Arabic-English Code-Switching: A Sociolinguistic Study at University Level in Iraq". In de Beaugrande, Robert, Shunnaq, Abdulla, Heliel, Helmy (eds.): *Translation, Education, and Culture: An Arabic Perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- _____. (2004). A Sociolinguistic Study of Language Choice among Kurdish Students at Mosul University. *IJAES* Vol. 5, pp. 199-206. Beirut, Lebanon.
- Sridhar, S. N., and K. Kamal Sridher.** (1980), 'The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code-mixing'. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 10/1:203-15.
- Stanlaw, James.** (1982). 'English in Japanese communicative strategies'. In Kachru (ed.), *The Other Tongue: English Across Culture*, Urbana: Illinois UP. 168-97.
- Todd, Loreto.** (1974). *Pidgins and Creoles*. London: Rutledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Ure, Jean.** (1974). 'Code-switching and mixed speech in the register systems of developing languages'. *Applied Sociolinguistics: Association International de Linguistique Appliquée*, 2:222-39.
- Verma, K.** (1976). 'Code-switching: Hindi-English'. *Lingua*, 38:153-65.
- Weinreich, Uriel.** (1953). *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

Key to Phonetic Symbols				
A. Iraqi Arabic Vowels				
/i:/	as	in	/di:n/	‘religion’
/i/	=	=	/kita:b/	‘book’
/a:/	=	=	/musa:fi:r/	‘traveller’
/a/	=	=	/qarya/	‘village’
/o:/	=	=	/tho:r/	‘ox’
/u:/	=	=	/khadu:d/	‘cheeks’
/u/	=	=	/tufa:Ha/	‘apple’
/e:/	=	=	/leel/	‘night’
1. Iraqi Arabic Consonants				
/ʔ/	=	=	/ʔalam/	‘pain’
/b/	=	=	/ba:b/	‘door’
/p/	=	=	/parda/	‘curtain’
/ch/	=	=	/chibi:r/	‘big’
/j/	=	=	/ijtimaʕ/	‘meeting’
/d/	=	=	/Sadar/	‘chest’
/dh/	=	=	/dharra/	‘atom’
/dh/	=	=	/ʔadhum/	‘bone’
/t/	=	=	/taHri:r/	‘liberation’
/T/	=	=	/Ta:lib/	‘student’
/f/	=	=	/faraH/	‘happiness’
/g/	=	=	/galub/	‘heart’
/kh/	=	=	/khila:l/	‘during’
/g/	=	=	/lugha/	‘language’
/h/	=	=	/hawa:ʔ/	‘air’
/H/	=	=	/Hub/	‘love’
/k/	=	=	/ʔaskari/	‘military’
/q/	=	=	/qalam/	‘pen’
/l/	=	=	/Tawi:l/	‘tall’
/l/	=	=	/walla/	‘by God’
/m/	=	=	/huju:m/	‘attack’
/n/	=	=	/na:r/	‘fire’
/r/	=	=	/masraH/	‘theatre’
/s/	=	=	/jasu:s/	‘spy’
/S/	=	=	/Sadi:q/	‘friend’
/sh/	=	=	/shamis/	‘sun’
/th/	=	=	/thawra/	‘revolution’
/w/	=	=	/walad/	‘boy’
/y/	=	=	/yo:m/	‘day’
/z/	=	=	/ziya:ra/	‘visit’
/ʕ/	=	=	/ju:ʕa:n/	‘hungry’

