

# Diglossic Shifting in Mosuli Friday Sermons: Multi-Level Shifts from Modern Standard Arabic to Mosuli Arabic

Aws Al Arabw

Department of English Language/ College of Arts/ University of Mosul  
aws\_bayati@uomosul.edu.iq; ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2066-6929>

Ashraf R. Abdullah

Department of English Language/ College of Arts/ University of Mosul  
ashraf.abdullah@uomosul.edu.iq; ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1925-6335>

Submission date: 11/5/2026

Acceptance date: 8/6/2026

Publication date: 29/6/2025

## Abstract

This paper investigates how two Mosuli religious preachers shift from Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) to Mosuli Arabic (MA) in their deliverance of Friday sermons in Mosul mosques. Rather than treating dialectal shifting as a departure from linguistic correctness, the study approaches it as a deliberate rhetorical resource used for convergence towards the audience, emphasis, stance-taking, and identity-positioning within a diglossic speech event. The data comprises 89 instances of MSA-MA shifting, coded into four mutually exclusive categories: lexical, morphosyntactic, discourse-marker, and phonological. Quantitative analysis reveals that lexical shifts are the most frequent, accounting for 52.8% of all shift instances, followed by morphosyntactic shifts at 24.7%, phonological shifts at 12.4%, and discourse-marker shifts at 10.1%. There are two distinct stylistic profiles displayed in the two sermons. The first leans heavily towards lexical shifting, and displays a higher overall density of shifts when considering sermon length, whereas Sermon 2 contains more morphosyntactic and phonological variation. Qualitatively, the shifts function to align the preachers with their audience, reinforce moral points, and dramatize religious narratives through indexicality of Mosuli identity. The paper contributes a four-way coding scheme supported by broad IPA transcription allowing a more precise account of shift depth beyond a simple MSA- dialect contrast. Although based on a small corpus, the paper presents a distinct method in transparent coding procedure and analytical approaches fortified by a documented appendix, making this work reproducible in wider studies of Arabic, and especially Iraqi religious discourse.

**Keywords:** diglossia, code-switching, convergence, Mosuli Arabic, Modern Standard Arabic, Friday sermons

**التحويلات اللغوية المزدوجة في خطب الجمعة الموصلية: تحولات متعددة المستويات من**

**العربية الفصحى إلى العربية الموصلية**

اوس عباس يونس ال عربو اشرف رياض عبدالله

قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/ كلية الآداب/ جامعة الموصل

## المستخلص

تبحث هذه المقالة الانتقال في إطار الازدواجية اللغوية بين العربية الفصحى المعاصرة والعربية الموصلية في خطبتي جمعة ألقاهما خطيبان موصليان من أبناء المدينة. ومن التعامل مع الانتقالات إلى العربية الموصلية بوصفها ذات دلالة تفاعلية، لا بوصفها خروجاً عن معيار صحيح في الأصل، تحلل الدراسة ٨٩ حالة انتقال صنفت ضمن أربع فئات متبادلة الاستبعاد، هي: الفئة المعجمية، والفئة الصرفية-التركيبية، وفئة واسمات الخطاب، والفئة الصوتية. ويبين التحليل الكمي أن الانتقالات المعجمية هي الأكثر تكراراً في

20

Journal of the University of Babylon for Humanities (JUBH) is licensed under a

[Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Online ISSN: 2312-8135 Print ISSN: 1992-0652

[www.journalofbabylon.com/index.php/JUBH](http://www.journalofbabylon.com/index.php/JUBH)

Email: [humjournal@uobabylon.edu.iq](mailto:humjournal@uobabylon.edu.iq)

المجمل بنسبة ٥٢,٨%، تليها الانتقالات الصرفية-التركيبية بنسبة ٢٤,٧%، ثم الانتقالات الصوتية بنسبة ١٢,٤%، ثم انتقالات واسمات الخطاب بنسبة ١٠,١%. غير أن الخطيبين لا يتبعان نمطاً متماثلاً؛ إذ تتسم الخطبة الأولى بغلبة واضحة للانتقالات المعجمية، في حين تتضمن الخطبة الثانية نسبة أعلى نسبياً من الانتقالات الصرفية-التركيبية والصوتية. ويظهر تطبيع الأعداد بحسب طول الخطبة أن الخطبة الأولى تسجل كثافة انتقال أعلى في المجمل، ولا سيما في الانتقال المعجمي، بينما تبدو الخطبتان أكثر تقارباً في معدلات الانتقال الصرفي-التركيبية والصوتية. ويشير التحليل النوعي لأمثلة مختارة، مع نقل صوتي عريض وفق الأبجدية الصوتية الدولية، إلى أن الانتقالات إلى العربية الموصلية تؤدي وظائف تداولية-خطابية متعددة، منها: موامة الجمهور، وإظهار الموقف، والتمثيل الدرامي، وإدارة التفاعل، وتأشير الهوية المحلية. وتجادل المقالة بأن مخطط الترميز الرباعي يلتقط درجات "عمق" الانتقال على نحو أكثر فاعلية من التمييز الثنائي بين الفصحى واللهجة، لأنه يفصل اختيار المفردات عن إعادة البناء النحوي، وإدارة الخطاب، والإشارة الصوتية المحلية. وتعد الدراسة استكشافية لأن مدونتها محدودة وتستند إلى خطب منقولة كتابياً، لكنها تقدم بروتوكول ترميز قابلاً للتكرار وملحفاً موثقاً يمكن أن يدعم الأعمال المستقبلية الأوسع نطاقاً حول الخطاب الديني في العربية العراقية.

الكلمات الدالة: الأزواجية اللغوية، التناوب اللغوي، العربية الموصلية، العربية الفصحى المعاصرة، خطبة الجمعة، الخطبة، العربية العراقية.

## 1 Introduction

There have been lengthy academic discussions about diglossia in Arabic-speaking communities, where there is a "High" variety, realized in Modern Standard Arabic or Classical Arabic, usually utilized in formal situations, coexisting with local dialects used in everyday interaction and categorized as the "Low" variety [1]. There is no simple and neat transition between High and Low in actual speech events though, as speakers use their linguistic repertoires to alternate between high and low, speaking formally, semi-formally, and colloquially according to context and purpose, deeming these movements as socially and pragmatically consequential [2],[3]. A good source for examining such movements is Friday sermons, which are otherwise known as Khutbat Al-Juma'a, a directive and persuasive speech delivered by the Imam to prayers in mosques during Friday afternoon prayer. The Khutbat Al-Juma'a, monitored by the Sunni Endowment Office in Mosul, is hence institutionally formal and ritually recognizable, through which preachers tell stories with morals, explain examples to be benefitted from, warn against haram activity and appeal to a direct or indirect audience [4].

### 1.1 Aims of the Research

This study critically analyses the discourse strategies followed by two native Mosuli preachers in their deliverance of Friday sermons, which are essentially framed in MSA, but likely contain tactful shifts to MA. It is imperative to treat these shifts not as MSA incompetence or accidental code-switching, but rather as a means to converge tactfully positioning the speaker as a religious authority while also being locally relevant, decreasing social distance through proximity, shared local experience, and projection of local identity as found in other sermons [3],[5]. Balancing and alternating between authoritative religious figure and local Muslim brother through lexical, phonological, discursual, and morpho-syntactic choices is the concern of this research.

Consequently, this paper has two related aims. Firstly, and descriptively, it identifies and classifies instances of shift between MSA and MA according to four levels

of linguistic organization; lexical, morpho-syntactic, discourse-marker, and phonological shifts. Secondly, intuitive interpretation of qualitative data compares and contrasts how these shift types are distributed within the two sermons and what social and discourse-pragmatic functions are utilized by the speakers in convergence and identity practices.

### 1.2 Research Questions

The research at hand aims to answer the following research questions:

1. How is code-switching between MSA and MA distributed lexically, morpho-syntactically, and phonologically in Friday sermons delivered by Mosuli preachers?
2. Are there significant discourse-pragmatic strategies utilized in the frequency of these shifts?
3. What are the social and discourse-pragmatic functions served in the delivery and how do they contribute to Mosuli identity practice?

### 1.3 Significance of the Study

There is a myriad of scholarship of Arabic diglossia mostly involving daily interaction or academic discourse, but religious discourse, especially in Iraq, has yet to be explored rigorously. Additionally, Mosuli Arabic within religious discourse is a virgin field of academic investigation. This gap in knowledge is significant as there are two types of pressure imposed on religious sermon deliverers in that they must present themselves as formal and religiously legitimate, expected to maintain a level of rhetorically elevated language, whilst also being engaging, understood in a relative context, and able to sway their audience from religious malpractices and urge them towards good practices. In the deliverance of sermons, deviance from MSA and switching to MA performs more than merely an introduction of informality. They are considered acts of identity reflecting stance taking, or positioning themselves as socially close to their local audience, easing the perception of morals and advice through shared everyday knowledge, or even making moral urgency easier to perceive and act upon. Therefore, a rigorous analysis of MA shifts demonstrates how formality/informality, solidarity, and in-group identity belonging are negotiated [4],[6],[7] through religious performance of a sermon on a single Friday.

It is imperative to state that the size of the corpus is not what reflects the contribution of this study, but it lies in the rigorous qualitative and quantitative analysis. It would be insufficient and immature to categorize all instances of shifting as merely code-switching, as this would overlook significant differences in form, and what they convey in socio-pragmatic function. The four-way method utilized in this analysis allows for the visibility of patterns where there are occurrences of colloquial syntactic structures, interactional particles, or locally salient pronunciation, whether the speaker uses a colloquial lexical item in a largely MSA structured sentence, or moves to lengthy periods of MA colloquialism. Whatever the tactful move or overall strategy, this work links the academic investigation of Arabic diglossic code-switching to broader sociolinguistic concepts like identity and indexicality, in which linguistic choices are perceived and analytically understood in relation to positioning, stance, and relation to addressees, as meanings may vary or have a more powerful effect when they are conveyed through locally recognized lexis [8],[9]. This work is hence meant to be perceived as an exploratory corpus study representative of the population and offering a reproducible

analytical procedure, and a strong reference for future work on religious discourse, particularly in the Iraqi and Mosuli contexts.

#### 1.4 Limitations

It is necessary to acknowledge a number of limitations, particularly regarding corpus size. With just two sermons from two different preachers, al-Shaykh Nafi' Abu Mu'adh, being one of them, and another who prefers to remain anonymous, the results are simply not completely generalizable to the Friday-sermon practice in Mosul as a whole. Although both preachers, as the rest in Mosul, follow the instructions and constraints of the Ninevah Sunni Endowment Office, influencing factors such as the specific topic of the sermon, other factors such as the context of the mosque, the expectations of the listeners, the preacher's unique style, and the momentary speech choices they make may all influence the range and number of MAs that are used.

Another limitation concerns the unit of analysis. It is methodologically convenient to code a contiguous stretch of MA as one instance. However, this practice masks a good deal of internal complexity. Within one long segment, there might be lexical, grammatical, and phonological features all operating at once, and a rule of thumb that selects a single "dominant" feature will necessarily gloss over some of that complexity. The four-way classification is a useful heuristic, but it remains a controlled simplification of more complex speech behavior.

Another limitation regards phonology. Because the analysis was based on orthographic transcription and broad IPA rather than instrumentally measured sound, some locally distinctive pronunciations might not have been coded because they are not reflected in writing, and some spellings might make a feature appear more salient simply because the transcription renders it in vernacular spelling.

Finally, there is the matter of discourse context. Although the appendix transcribes the shift segments, it cannot function as a substitute for a full sequential analysis of the sermons as performances. In future work, it would be beneficial to work with a larger corpus, use audio-based acoustic analysis, explore a wider range of sermon topics, use more finely grained contextual annotation, and use multi-label coding that can indicate multiple overlapping features within one segment. But even in the face of these limitations, the present study offers a useful exploratory starting point because it makes the decisions made during coding transparent, and it provides a structured dataset that others could test, revise, or build on.

## 2 Review of Related Literature

### 2.1 Diglossia and Code-Switching

Diglossia is deemed by Ferguson [1] as a shift between a "High" and a "Low" variety of language with a relatively fixed functional distribution. Contextual situations involving religion, education, and formal writing are associated with the High variety, whereas everyday interaction is a realization of the Low form. More recent academic investigations have critiqued the theory and developed it by adding notions implying that code-switching reflects stance, social positioning, and the intent and ability to shape the meaning of the exchange [10-12]. Discussions on the subject of code-switching usually

involve alternating between different languages, but as popular academic discourse would have it, the particular case of diglossia in Arabic and the ability to cross between a High code and a Low code proves particularly useful in this case. As the linguistic repertoires here are historically connected, sociolinguists deemed MSA-to-dialect switching as diglossic code-switching, also termed style-shifting, or register movement based on identifiable constraints and functions [2],[5],[13].

## 2.2 Arabic Diglossic Switching and Its Functions

Arabic switching studies repeatedly stress the pragmatic and social underpinnings of such phenomena. Albirini [3], for instance, highlights dialect switching functions in Syrian contexts, including reporting speech (quotations), personalization, stance evaluation, and audience involvement, whereas MSA is typically linked to institutional authority and formal contextualizations. What makes these results significant is that they challenge the assumption that dialectal linguistic material is exclusively “unstandardized”; dialect, in fact, is not just “less” standard in a linguistic hierarchy; dialectal varieties do things that formal registers are unable to perform with the same facility. In religious discourse this dynamic emerges particularly clearly. Bassiouney [4] found Egyptian mosque sermon registers to combine MSA and colloquial varieties in order to achieve persuasion, solidarity, and stance positioning. The sermon givers are in a constant dynamic of balancing the authority of the preacher, while simultaneously trying to be locally situated and emotionally engaging. Alaiyed's [5] analysis of Saudi sermons demonstrates similar patterns: she finds that code-switching in Saudi religious discourse is neither random nor meaningless, but instead systematically oriented to pragmatic and interactional concerns. Such works, thus, collectively demonstrate how religious discourse offers an important site to explore the ways that speakers in the Arabic linguistic continuum work to balance authority, local engagement, and relationality through code-shifting and code-switching.

## 2.3 Mosuli Arabic and Phonological Indexing

Mosuli Arabic is part of the northern, or qeltu, zone of Iraqi Arabic. Arabic dialectology positions Mosuli Arabic within larger patterns of regional and social variation, while studies of Mosul document locally relevant phonological variation and change [7],[14]. This has a direct bearing on the present study, because sermon shifts can take place not just through word choice, but also in pronunciation, or through orthographic choices in the transcript that capture pronunciation. Local handling of rhotics and vowels is particularly germane here. A simple phonological cue might index Mosuli identity, intimacy, or alignment[7],[15], and given that in sermons there is constant movement between highly elevated religious registers and direct local appeal, even subtle phonological cues can acquire significant rhetorical force. An adequate analysis of MA-shifting thus must take account not only of vocabulary and grammar, but of phonology as well, or else we will miss part of the locally relevant identity work done through pronunciation.

## 2.4 Research Gap and Analytical Framework

The literature reveals two notable gaps. The first is an empirical one. While we know that Standard-colloquial switching in religious Arabic discourse is patterned and functionally driven, much of that research has concerned itself with different national

contexts and broader functional areas such as quotation, personalization, evaluation, and solidarity. Iraqi sermon discourse has been little discussed, and Mosuli Arabic has been treated rarely as a locally meaningful variety in the genre [3-5].

Second, there is an analytical gap. In much of the literature, dialectal switches are coded indiscriminately as if they form a homogeneous category. In reality, a local lexeme, a colloquial relative clause, an interjection, and a locally marked pronunciation are not functionally equivalent just because all of them deviate from a more standard baseline. They differ structurally and interactionally. Thus, coding for them separately will facilitate a fuller explanation of how dialectal elements are integrated into formal religious discourse.

Here, we employ the term “shift” for single occurrences of a shift to MA, but keep “diglossic code-switching” as the larger sociolinguistic concept. This is appropriate because Arabic is more of a continuum than an opposition between two separate codes. The term shift enables us to focus on the micro-level, while avoiding the impression of a hard boundary between MSA and MA, but also to acknowledge that movement to MA can carry linguistically and pragmatically significant implications[2],[5]. The four categories we identify here represent different degrees of movement:

- Lexical shifts are local words in mostly standard frames.
- Morphosyntactic shifts are deeper clause-structural moves in the direction of everyday language.
- Discourse-marker shifts reveal the ways in which the preacher manages his audience’s attention, his own stance, the pacing of the sermon and his control of the floor.
- Phonological shifts show where local identity is rendered audible (or visible in a transcript), even if lexical and grammatical shifts are minimal.

The framework is also well-suited to the Friday sermon. It is not simply an informational address; rather, it is a ritualized public performance that can incorporate citation, exposition, narration, admonition, and direct moral exhortation, each of which requires a different level of formality. The Friday sermon, therefore, provides an ideal site to observe the recurrence of patterned movements along the MSA–dialect continuum [4],[6], where the question is not simply whether or not MA appears in the discourse, but how far it is able to penetrate and what purpose various degrees of its incursions might serve.

### 2.5 The Friday Sermon as Register Mediation

The Friday sermon is a particularly rich site for investigating diglossic situation, precisely because it is internally heterogeneous: within a single Friday sermon, a preacher might recite or paraphrase scripture, expound on the theological or ethical ramifications, relate an anecdote that exemplifies a moral point, stage a moral scenario, warn of sin, or speak directly to his listeners; and these acts demand different sorts of register. The former activities are more likely to be associated with more standardized forms of MSA, while scriptural exposition and generalized moralization often call for less locally inflected MSA; the latter more readily allow for or encourage speech forms that are more locally anchored. The Friday sermon thus provides a medium in which there are repeated opportunities for the preacher to make calibrated shifts between authority and closeness rather than simply functioning as a neutral backdrop in which switching occurs [4],[6].

This point resonates with recent theorization that speakers do not switch randomly between the linguistic resources that may be available; instead, they tailor their speech to the specific and imagined communities that they address, to the identity types they present themselves as belonging to and seeking to cultivate, and to the social indices that they assume their addressees associate with a particular linguistic repertoire. In the context of the Friday sermon, the speaker addresses a physical congregation from within a context where the authority of the text and decorum of speech are strongly valued; the standard variety can lend scriptural and institutional gravitas, while the vernacular can signal a desire to make a point sound more immediately topical, locally pertinent, or socially accessible[8-9].

This is one reason why the current paper looks at the typology of shift type in preference to simply counting the overall number of MA items in a sermon. The preacher who chooses to insert a local lexical item into an otherwise syntactically MSA sentence is not doing the same kind of work as the preacher who moves into colloquial syntax, who uses a local discourse marker, or who produces a clearly dialectal realization of a particular word. These are not all just interchangeable manifestations of ‘colloquialism’ and are in fact likely to cluster around different communicative tasks. The Friday sermon thus provides an ideal context where distinctions between types of shifts are analytically useful, even in a small-scale investigation such as the one carried out in this pilot study, because the nature of the activity requires the preacher to mediate between levels of elevation and levels of accessibility, between institutional authority and the closeness of social relationship.

### 3 Method

#### 3.1 Data and Unit of Analysis

Our corpus includes two Friday sermons presented by two fluent speakers of Mosuli Arabic; al-Shaykh Nafi‘ Abu Mu‘adh, whose sermon is available publicly, and the second Imam preferred to remain anonymous, but his sermon is available in full in Appendix 1. Each sermon is predominantly in Modern Standard Arabic but also features insertions of Mosuli Arabic. Both were transcribed by listening repeatedly to recordings in their original format. The goal was a full recording of both sermons as produced, including both MSA sections as well as MA code-switches. Sermon 1 (hereafter S1) is a 24:13 min sermon that appeared publicly on Youtube and was downloaded for research purposes [16]. Sermon 2 (hereafter S2) is a 21:26 min sermon that was privately provided to the researchers through WhatsApp after a request was sent asking if the Imam could provide a recording of a sermon for research purposes.

While both sermons were fully transcribed, the coded dataset employed for quantitative analysis was restricted to only the MA components of the sermons. The shift portions in both sermons are what we report on in our results and which we include in Appendix 1. The finished transcripts are saved in both PDF and Word formats for annotation and coding purposes. The unit of analysis is the Mosuli Arabic shift instance. In Appendix 1, a row is each discrete MA segment produced within a broader MSA section. A shift starts with the first Mosuli Arabic element, and ends when the speaker switches back to Modern Standard Arabic. When multiple MA words appear in

continuous form, the segment is still counted as a single shift instance. This unit of analysis resulted in a total of 89 shifts: 62 in S1 and 27 in S2.

### 3.2 Coding Procedure and Reliability

All MA shift instances were assigned into one of four codes. Lexical shifts involved the insertion of Mosuli lexemes or lexical items including but not limited to content words, idiomatic expressions, colloquial interrogatives, or generally familiar words and expressions in the local dialect. Morphosyntactic shifts include grammatical patterns in dialect, for instance, relative markers used colloquially, as well as colloquial negative patterns, clitic forms, pronominal forms, and so forth. Discourse marker shifts include pragmatic and interactional terms including but not limited to attention getters, stance markers, interjections, elongated response items, and the like. Finally, phonological shifts occurred when a shift in pronunciation to dialect was represented orthographically in the video, for example, when orthography was used to represent an /r/ sound with غ.

On some instances, shift segments contained more than one feature that wasn't Modern Standard Arabic, in which case the shift was coded in keeping with the dialectal feature that seemed to be most salient in the stretch as a whole. Thus, if for example a longer segment seemed dominated by colloquial vocabulary despite containing some more marginal morphosyntax features, the shift would be coded as a lexical shift. The 89 MA shift instances were each independently coded by two coders into these four categories. Cohen's  $\kappa$  was used for the calculation of inter-rater reliability for nominal categories [17]. Raw agreement was initially high (91%,  $\kappa = .86$ ). We discussed and resolved all disagreements to achieve the final codings, which are what we report on in Appendix 1 and employ for quantitative analysis.

### 3.3 Analytical Procedure and Category-Assignment Rules

In analyzing the final coded dataset, we applied the following principles regarding our coding procedures. Our unit of analysis consists of the shift instances rather than individual shifts because sermon deliverance tends to bring together multiple cues for dialect use within the course of a given segment. A segment was coded according to the category in which its dominance was most evident. Thus, a multiword stretch dominated by locally used vocabulary was coded as lexical even if it also showed less prominent grammatical or phonological features. A third principle involved discourse markers. This category was confined to items that were primarily interactional rather than propositional; hence interjections, attention-getters, extended response particles and stance markers were coded as discourse markers only when their pragmatic function predominated over their lexical content. A fourth principle involved phonology; the category was deployed sparingly, and only when the transcript indicated a locally recognizable form of pronouncing a word. These principles do not eliminate every potential ambiguity, but they make transparent the rationale for coding, thus making the study replicable.

The numerical data were analysed in three stages. First, total counts were computed for each of the four categories over the entire set of data and separately for each sermon. Next, per-sermon percentages were used to make stylistic comparisons between the sermons—that is, between the two distributions of types of MA shift within each of the sermons. Finally, since the sermons differ greatly in length, descriptive per-minute rates were computed in order to avoid interpreting differences in the proportion of MA to total

MA-shift-free discourse as a direct reflection of overall MA use. The chi-square test cited in the results section was used as an exploratory test of association between sermon and distribution of types of MA shift. Because of the relatively small size of the corpus and some low values for expected frequencies in particular cells, the chi-square test in this context has little inferential power. As a result, the chi-square test should be viewed in the present study only as a means for describing patterns of data and not as a means for making more general claims about the use of MA in Mosuli sermons. As noted above, the textual examples remain the key feature of this article because they reveal how MA-shift types function in context and guard against reducing discussion of sermon discourse merely to descriptive statistics.

### 3.4. IPA Transcription Procedure

The examples discussed in the paper include broad IPA transcriptions. These IPA transcriptions were based on the words used in the transcripts and on published research on Mosuli Arabic [15],[18]. No instrumental acoustic analyses were conducted for the study. As a result, the IPA transcriptions in the article should be viewed as broad phonemic or perceptual approximations and not as narrow acoustic measurements.

### 3.5. Ethical Considerations and Data Management

Careful management of the data was deemed necessary due to the subject of the paper, namely, the nature of religious speech acts performed in a local context. While the transcript of S1 was available publicly in electronic form, S2 was made available directly to the author after the author requested a recording of a sermon that was to be used for research purposes. Because the focus of this paper is on language use, rather than an assessment of the quality of an individual speaker's religious performance, personal identifiers are minimized beyond what is required to specify the nature of the source of the data. Appendix 1 includes excerpts of MA-shift segments rather than full sermon texts, making the data-coding process transparent without gratuitous disclosure of the nature of the speakers and the speakers' setting. The full sermons were preserved for annotation and transcription, while the data presented in the study were limited to the 89 instances of MA shift included in the final coding. This equilibrium between transparency and discretion is an especially relevant factor in studies of the nature of religious discourse, since spoken speech acts performed in a public context may still carry some degree of sensitivity at the local level.

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Quantitative Distribution of Shift Types

Table 1 displays the proportions of MA shift types for both sermons. The dominant shift in the total dataset was lexical, accounting for 52.8% of MA shifts. The proportions for each shift type vary across sermons. In S1, lexical shift was the dominant shift type, making up 61.3% of all MA shifts. By contrast, in S2, lexical shift accounted for only 33.3% of MA shifts, while morphosyntactic shifts accounted for 37.0%, and phonological shift for 18.5% of all MA shifts. Thus, S2 has a more balanced shift-type distribution than S1, which displays a strong concentration around lexical shift.

**Table 1. Distribution of Mosuli Arabic shift types by sermon (N = 89)**

Sermon	Lexical	Morphosyntactic	Discourse-marker	Phonological	Total
Sermon 1	38 (61.3%)	12 (19.4%)	6 (9.7%)	6 (9.7%)	62 (100%)
Sermon 2	9 (33.3%)	10 (37.0%)	3 (11.1%)	5 (18.5%)	27 (100%)
Total	47 (52.8%)	22 (24.7%)	9 (10.1%)	11 (12.4%)	89 (100%)

A chi-square test showed a potential correlation between sermon and shift distribution,  $\chi^2(3, N = 89) = 6.39, p = .094$ ; however, the association did not reach significance at the standard .05. The association was small to moderate,  $V = .27$  [19]. This result should be interpreted with caution, because the small corpus size renders it sensitive to the expected counts in cells with low values, and thus is more indicative of a difference worthy of further testing on a larger corpus rather than a strong, preacher-indicative pattern.

**Table 2. Descriptive shift density by sermon**

Sermon	Duration	Total MA shifts	Total shifts/min	Lexical /min	Morpho syntactic /min	Discourse-marker/min	Phonological/min
S1	24:13	62	2.56	1.57	0.50	0.25	0.25
S2	21:26	27	1.26	0.42	0.47	0.14	0.23

A more revealing way of comparing the two sermons, however, is via a rate comparison, i.e., MA shift occurrences per minute. Here, S1 exhibited an average of 2.56 MA shifts per minute, while S2 displayed an average of 1.26. The disparity was due primarily to lexical shift: S1 had an average of 1.57 lexical shifts per minute, while S2 averaged only 0.42 lexical shifts per minute. The rates of morphosyntactic and phonological shifts were much closer, at 0.50 vs. 0.47 and 0.25 vs. 0.23 per minute, respectively. Thus, the lower total count of lexical shifts (relative to other shifts) accounts for the more balanced, and thus arguably more dialectal, distribution of shift types for S2, while S1 can still be regarded as equally dialectal as S2 in the absolute amount of its grammatical or phonological shifts. The overall most sermon-specific difference thus lies in the frequency with which S1 draws on lexical features.

Given the limitations in the size of the corpus, however, such results should be regarded only as indicative for descriptive purposes, not as an indication of robust patterns of usage. Tables 1 and 2 thus represent different phenomena. While Table 1 indicates the proportions of each shift type in each sermon (distribution), Table 2 represents the intensity of MA usage across time in each sermon (density). While S2 may appear more dialectal than S1 in percentage terms (e.g., having more morphosyntactic and less lexical shifts), this may be attributable solely to it having a lower total count of lexical shifts, rather than to an increase of MA across the entire sermon as S1 does. Thus, the two preachers may be differentiated not only in how they use different MA shift types (the former), but also by the rate and intensity with which they engage in MA in their sermons (the latter).

## 4.2 Qualitative Analysis with IPA-Transcribed Examples

The following examples serve to illustrate the usage and function of each shift type in the sermons. Examples are numbered according to their corresponding number in Appendix 1. “S1” in the example number refers to the speaker Sermon 1, and “S2” to the speaker Sermon 2.

### 4.2.1 Lexical Shifts

Lexical shifts generally involve the occurrence of a colloquial item (word/phrase) surrounded by a formal context. The utility of lexical shifts, then, lies in their efficiency; they do not change the genre entirely but rather make an explanation/evaluation more colloquial/involving. This is similar to earlier findings of a dialectal support for involvement, evaluation and personalization in Arabic diglossia [2],[3].

#### Example 1 (Lexical; S1-005)

Arabic: هذي قديمة المسألة

IPA: /ha:ði qadi:ma l-masʔala/

Translation: “This issue is old”.

The expression frames the matter as something already shared between speaker and listener. The expression does more than simply convey information. This locates the preacher as speaking with the community, not merely speaking at the audience from some detached explanatory register.

#### Example 2 (Lexical; S2-004)

Arabic: ايش؟

IPA: /ʔe:f/

Translation: “What?”

The colloquial interrogative is a micro audience-directed question; it momentarily localizes the text, giving the sermon a conversational character as though the preacher were conducting an improvised question and answer with the listeners. It is short enough to be rhetorically economical: it introduces a local element without committing to a larger syntactic change in style to colloquial speech.

### 4.2.2. Morphosyntactic shifts

Morphosyntactic shifts go beyond lexical ones by introducing dialectal structures into the grammar of the clause, and in so doing they may have a stronger effect than lexical changes on producing speech. In the sermons, they appear in rhetorical questions, dramatized contexts, and direct-address passages in which the preacher temporarily switches to vernacular grammars. This is in line with studies that connect vernacular grammatical choice with personalization and immediate interactionality in Arabic discourse [5],[11].

#### Example 3 (Morphosyntactic; S2-001)

Arabic: منو هو المفلس الي ما عندو فلوس؟

IPA: /minu huwwa l-miflis ʔilli ma: ʕindo flu:s/

Translation: “Who is the bankrupt? The one who doesn’t have money?”

Several dialectal morphosyntactic elements are present here: colloquial interrogative *منو*, the dialectal relative *الي/اللي*, and the dialectal construct *ما عندو* “does not have it”. The rhetorical question is posed in a colloquial style; it doesn’t seem posed in the way

questions are posed by interlocutors in everyday speech, and this shift seems to turn the moral into something that might reasonably be expected as a social question.

#### Example 4 (Morphosyntactic; S1-051)

Arabic: ما نغرق

IPA: /ma: niyraq/

Translation: “We won’t drown”.

The shift here is brief, but the colloquial negation and the imperfect verb construction make it have the effect of direct address. It would lose its effectiveness if expressed at greater length in a formal paraphrase; it has the force of a moral slogan, brief, memorable, and direct.

#### 4.2.3. Discourse-marker shifts

Discourse marker shifts differ from lexical or morphosyntactic shifts in that they are primarily interactional rather than propositional in function; they are used to maintain and direct attention, to mark stance and emotion, or to indicate movement from one proposition to another. These are common items of spontaneous speech, but they may have a marked effect when used in the formal context of a sermon, as they make the discourse seem more interactive and less distant [10].

#### Example 5 (Discourse-marker; S1-032)

Arabic: اوف!

IPA: /o:f/

Translation: “Oof!” / “Ugh!”

The interjection marks emotional stance; in the moment it indicates disapproval, exasperation, or emphasis, and it can be seen to condense a whole range of emotion into a short, audible moment. It is not here used for propositional content, but simply to intensify the speaker’s stance and involve the listeners.

#### Example 6 (Discourse-marker; S2-022)

Arabic: ابيبي

IPA: /ʔe:::/

Translation: “Yees” / “yeah” as a prolonged response particle.

In this token, ابيبي is not a content word, but an elongated response particle derived from اي “yes”; and in a sermon, it is best understood as functioning as a discourse marker to maintain the floor, emphasize a particular point and lead into an explanation rather than being a literal response to a question. In this token the elongation (IPA /ʔe:::/) gives it the effect of being stancesful and audience orienting; something like “yeeees/yeah—listen...”.

#### 4.2.4. Phonological shifts

Phonological shifts are marked in the transcript only if the dialectal pronunciation is indicated in the transcript. In Mosuli Arabic, certain spellings represent dialectal pronunciations, for example, the spelling of /r/ as ر. While such changes may seem small in a transcriptional context, they are often perceptibly local and serve to index regional identity [15].

#### Example 7 (Phonological; S2-003)

Arabic: يغوح وعندو صلاة كثيغة

IPA: /jiyu:ḥ wəʕindo sʕala:h kiθi:ya/

Translation: “He goes to the Day of Judgment, and he has many unperformed prayers”.

The spelling *يغوح* matches the colloquial form *يروح* “goes”; and the same is true of *كثيعة*, “many”. This example shows that localness may be indexed in a word’s pronunciation, even when the utterance is entirely comprehensible in terms of the broader Arabic repertoire.

#### Example 8 (Phonological; S1-060)

Arabic: *علينو*

IPA: /ʕale:no/

Translation: “Upon him”.

The spelling *علينو* is the form of MSA *عليه* “upon him”, and here in the sermon context of ... *رحمه الله علينو* “may Allah have mercy on him”, it is used as a formula. The dialectal pronunciation is indicated by a vernacular pronominal realization (final -o), and a dialectal vowel pattern in that syllable (commonly realized as /e:/ rather than the MSA vowel diphthong).

## 5 Discussion

### 5.1 Main Pattern: Lexical Shifts Dominate, but Style Differs by Preacher

Lexical shifting accounts for 52.8% of all the shift instances, and therefore is the most common shift type overall. This is consistent with previous work indicating that using vernacular lexical items creates immediacy and solidarity without compromising the wider Standard Arabic context [2-3]. The prevalence of lexical shifts in S1 is especially obvious; the preacher uses many MA words and expressions, but the sermon as a whole is still strongly framed by MSA.

Sermon 2, however, displays a slightly different pattern. Overall, there are fewer shifts, but in S2 a relatively larger proportion of these involve morphosyntactic and phonological shifting, which suggests that the preacher is more often drawing on MA at a more fundamental level. This affects not just vocabulary but also clause structures and localized pronunciation. Such behavior is also found in religious discourse, where vernacular terms are used in order to clarify, dramatize, or to involve listeners in the preaching [4],[5]. The difference between the two preachers is not just about using more or less dialect, but rather about how the preacher incorporates dialect into the sermon’s structural make-up and local phonetics.

### 5.2 Function-by-Type: What the Fine-Grained Scheme Adds

The four-way distinction shows that the MA items do not all function in the same way. Lexical shifts tend to be structurally less significant, but more flexible rhetorically. This can allow the preacher to make a statement feel more local or concrete or emotionally charged while still keeping a standard frame. This may explain why lexical shifts in general are the largest category; it allows the preacher to retain authority in the message without sounding distant [2-3].

Morphosyntactic shifts are more significant. They change the structure of the sentence, making the preacher and sermon more akin to natural everyday conversation. In Example S2-001, for instance, a rhetorical question is given a more interactive feel through colloquial question words, a more colloquial way of using relative pronouns and a possession structure with the first-person marker. Here, the preacher does not just use a

local word, but rather adopts a local grammar stance in order to make the ethical point more like a recognizable social context.

The discourse-marker shifts are yet another thing. In S1-032 /وف! and in S2-022 /بيبي /?e:::/, the items are less important for what they actually mean and more important for their interactional role, in that they help the speaker indicate attitude, pause, stress, and orientation. If these items were lumped into the lexical category, this interactional dimension would be lost. Distinguishing discourse markers makes clear the preacher's continuous control over the listener's attention and attitude.

Finally, phonological shifts add yet another dimension. Spellings such as *بيغوح*, *كنيفة* and *علينو* show that even without a full switch to colloquial vocabulary or syntax, it is possible to express local identity. This is important because our study focuses on a particularly locally salient variety of Arabic. A Mosuli speaker, after all, can be understood to be Mosuli not only based on lexical choice, but even by way of pronunciation alone. After distinguishing the four categories, MA is no longer visible as a non-standard monolith; rather, it is visible as a repertoire of heterogeneous resources: lexical items of familiarity and concreteness, morphosyntactic constructions of dialogic immediacy, discourse markers of interactional management, and phonological realizations of local indexicality.

### 5.3 Theoretical Implications of Shift Type

Distinguishing among the four shift types is theoretically significant insofar as it keeps a gradient intact that would otherwise get smoothed out. Lexical shifts may be characterized as relatively shallow ventures into local speech. They allow the preacher to keep the overall MSA framework visible while occasionally sounding familiar, concrete, or conversational. Morphosyntactic shifts represent a more extensive venture, because they change the way in which propositions are formed. Discourse-marker shifts suggest that some ventures into MA are interactional ventures: ones whose main point is floor-holding, signaling evaluation, prompting listener response, or regulating the emotional temperature of the sermon. Phonological shifts, finally, are striking because they may serve to index local identity even when what the preacher is saying is nothing special. The taxonomy thus reveals that “dialect use” in sermon discourse does not describe a single practice, but instead a family of practices of varying structural and rhetorical depths.

On these grounds, it makes sense for there to be a strong contrast between the two sermons. S1 is a sermon where MA is common, often via lexical insertion; it sounds like a sermon that is, for the most part, MSA, yet that often sounds a bit more warm, familiar, or locally resonant by virtue of having used MA words here and there. S2, on the other hand, contains a smaller total number of shifts, and those shifts are more evenly spread across grammar and pronunciation. One plausible hypothesis here is that the two preachers have different strategies for the management of authority and solidarity. The first preacher keeps the standard framework in sharp focus and then occasionally uses local lexical forms to warm up that framework or localize it. The second preacher, at least in the coded material, allows everyday grammatical and phonological forms to do more of the work. This fits nicely with sociolinguistic understandings of audience design and indexicality according to which speakers adjust their style in terms of the imagined

audience they are talking to, the stance they are taking, and the social values that are commonly associated with whatever linguistic forms are at their disposal [8],[9].

Such choices are further accentuated in the sermon genre, as on some occasions a preacher needs to sound elevated, textual, and authoritative, whereas on others he has to sound near, urgent, and unmistakably part of the social world of his auditors. The data show that MA is one resource in a preacher's repertoire that he may utilize to achieve this kind of rhetorical flexibility [4],[6]. This paper is thus a contribution not only to Arabic code-switching but also to studies of how religious speakers negotiate footing, moral address, and alignment during speech. In particular, local wording choices may be far more than mere aesthetic embellishments: the data suggest that they can help a preacher revoicing the sermon from one kind of speech to another, in this case from formal exposition to direct admonition.

#### 5.4 Why Lexical Shifting Can Be Common in Formal Religious Speech

This predominance of lexical shifts, especially in S1, is not merely an outcome of numbers. Lexical insertion is among the most effective forms of localizing sermon speech that does not undermine the higher register that serves to reinforce the religious authority of the genre. In a religious genre that is often grounded in biblical and other religious citation, religious teaching, and moral guidance that seeks to be accepted by the general public, the continuous use of colloquial grammar might not necessarily always be the most desirable option. Therefore, lexical shifts provide a compromise between the high and low register varieties; they can be used by a preacher to approach the religious community in certain instances while keeping his or her use of MSA recognizably intact. This may perhaps be why in this genre lexical shifts may be a phenomenon that coexists and can be found side by side with a highly formal sermon identity that can in no way be described as a colloquial text [2-4].

The percentage-based analysis confirms this interpretation. Not only is S1 higher proportionally in its lexical usage, it also uses the greatest number of shifts in general. This means that this preacher uses frequent lexical shifts throughout the sermon to soften the sermon with more local references while retaining the larger expository framework. On the other hand, S2 has a lower number of total shifts, yet a higher proportion of them are morphosyntactic and phonological. In other words, this sermon reflects a different strategy. Whereas one preacher resorts to frequent, low-cost lexical shifts into MA, the other may have fewer shifts overall but uses some of them to shift into deeper forms of everyday language usage in terms of grammar or pronunciation. The difference, then, is not necessarily in kind, but rather in the rhythmic and stylistic quality.

This is also perhaps a reflection of the demands within the genre of sermon performance. In a sermon, a preacher may often find the need to quickly alternate between elevated moral references and colloquial, everyday speech. It is in such instances that lexical shifts prove to be most useful, since they offer a way to insert local references and a certain sense of familiarity with the audience without the need to significantly change the structure of the entire sentence or clause. A local word, idiom, or short colloquial expression can quickly shift the speech into the audience's social world. On the other hand, morphosyntactic shifts usually have the effect of a more sustained colloquialization, as they change the structure of the utterance altogether and therefore

are often used by preachers to dramatize a certain scene or dialogue that is being reported from a third party or to translate abstract moral or religious issues into an everyday situation that the audience can relate to more readily. Phonological shifts on the other hand occur in smaller units and this is perhaps also the reason for their force; they allow for local reference while minimally interfering with the formal structure of the sermon.

Future research needs to therefore avoid using frequencies as the only means of comparing diglossic behavior in sermons. A larger corpus could be used to determine whether it is more typical for preachers to resort to more frequent lexical shifts to achieve their goals of striking a balance between religious authority and local solidarity, or if this tendency only holds for this specific preacher in the current dataset. Similarly, a larger dataset could be used to determine if particular stages in the sermon (such as narration, warning, expository sections, or closing exhortations) might invite a particular type of shift. Though this study cannot determine the exact frequency of such shifts, it does support a potential working hypothesis that within the religious sphere, lexical shifts might be the most versatile and least risky strategy for a preacher to deploy when attempting to sound local within the religious context, while morphosyntactic and phonological shifts may be most typical for more isolated moments of the religious context that are attempting to make a stronger case for solidarity with the audience and their everyday experiences.

## 6 Conclusion

This article investigated shifts from MSA to Mosuli Arabic in two sermons delivered by native preachers in Mosul. We concluded that these shifts are neither randomly nor uniformly distributed, both in the corpus overall and across the individual sermons. Lexical is the most frequent shift category overall, but a sermon-level comparison reveals more complexity. In S1, preachers rely on a high number of repeated insertions of vocabulary and they use MA more frequently, overall; S2, by contrast, uses fewer shifts overall but a higher proportion of morphosyntactic and phonological shifts. In other words, once the difference in sermon length is taken into account, it is not accurate to say that S2 simply contains more "dialect," but rather that in S1, MA is introduced into the sermon more often by way of local vocabulary, whereas in S2, a higher proportion of MA affects grammar and sound.

The paper's main value lies not only in its descriptive findings but also in its methodology, which suggests how one might distinguish between lexical, morphosyntactic, discourse-marker, and phonological shifts. In doing so, the analysis shows different levels and functions for diglossic movement in one sermon performance. We further argue that preachers in these sermons may turn to MA in order to clarify an idea, to dramatize a narrative scene, to convey stance, to hold and divert listeners' attention, and to mark local identity. The conclusions We draw are necessarily tentative given that our dataset is small and our analysis of phonological shifts relies on written transcription, but the coding scheme presented in Appendix 1 could still provide an accessible framework for further research. A larger corpus of Mosuli Arabic would make it possible to investigate whether similar patterns of shift are evident across more preachers, more sermon content, and more mosque contexts. Future research focusing on

phonetic analysis using recorded speech would refine our understanding of how phonological shifts are being used to mark local identity. Ultimately, we propose that MSA–MA alternation in the sermons of Mosul is best understood not as an alternation between "formal" and "informal" forms of Arabic, but as a layered rhetorical resource.

#### CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

There are no conflicts of interest

#### References

- [1] Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *WORD*, 15(2), 325–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1959.11659702>
- [2] Bassiouney, R. (2009). *Arabic sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9780748623730.001.0001>
- [3] Albirini, A. (2011). The sociolinguistic functions of codeswitching between Standard Arabic and Dialectal Arabic. *Language in Society*, 40(5), 537–562. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404511000674>
- [4] Bassiouney, R. (2013). The social motivation of code-switching in mosque sermons in Egypt. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2013(220), 49–66. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2013-0013>
- [5] Alaiyed, M. A. (2018). *Diglossic code-switching between Standard Arabic and Najdi Arabic in religious discourse* (Doctoral dissertation, Durham University).
- [6] Jones, L. G. (2012). “Rhetorical and discursive strategies of persuasion in the khutba”. In *The Power of Oratory in the Medieval Muslim World* (pp. 87–108). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139149457.004>
- [7] Ahmed, A. Y. (2018). *Phonological variation and change in Mesopotamia: A study of accent levelling in the Arabic dialect of Mosul* (Doctoral thesis, Newcastle University).
- [8] Bell, A. (1984). “Language style as audience design”. *Language in Society*, 13(2), 145–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450001037X>
- [9] Agha, A. (2007). *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511618284>
- [10] Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611834>
- [11] Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198239055.001.0001>
- [12] Auer, P. (Ed.). (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. Routledge. ISBN 9780415216098
- [13] Bassiouney, R. (2006). *Functions of Code Switching in Egypt: Evidence from Monologues*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047417132>

- [14] Procházka, S. (2021). "Arabic Dialectology". In K. C. Ryding & D. Wilmsen (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Arabic Linguistics* (pp. 214–243). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108277327.011>
- [15] Rajab, I. H. (2011). *الدلالات الاجتماعية في بعض المصطلحات الموصلية: دراسة ميدانية في مدينة الموصل* [Social denotations of some Mosuli expressions: A field study in Mosul City]. *دراسات موصلية (Dirasat Mosiliya)*, 34, 61–94.
- [16] Khutab al-Shaykh Nafi' Abu Mu'adh (٢٠٢٤). *خطب الشيخ نافع ابو معاذ*. February 16). *خطب الشيخ نافع ابو معاذ*. [Self-awareness, self-evaluation] [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ljazKZ9Q6jo>
- [17] Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20(1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000104>
- [18] International Phonetic Association. (1999). *Handbook of the International Phonetic Association: A guide to the use of the International Phonetic Alphabet*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9780511807954>
- [19] Cramér, H. (1946). *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400883868>

### Appendix 1

The full dataset contains 89 instances of MA shifts in the corpus, which are indexed according to:

- Shift ID (unique shift identifier for each shift instance in the corpus)
- Mosuli Arabic segment (the corresponding segment of Arabic text as recorded in the transcriptional corpus)
- Shift type (the category of shift identified for the particular instance, where the coding process described in Section 3.3 was applied; lexical, morphosyntactic, discourse-marker or phonological)

For each contiguous segment of the transcript, the coding process will assign a primary shift category (which is listed in the Type column of Appendix 1). Note that certain contiguous segments may contain more than one instance of dialectal shift, but the particular coding process described in Section 3.3 will designate only one category for each.

ID	Segment	Type
S1-001	يعني يعرف اش يعمل	Discourse-marker
S1-002	يعرف اشون يتحاسب معاها ويعرف اش عمل	Lexical
S1-003	خوش كلام، اكو ناس ما يعرفون نفسهم، ما بنجرع حيشاكم وما يعرف يخبط وما يعرف يخرب وما يعرف	Lexical
S1-004	شوف اية الله اش كن جت بالأوصاف، اخلاق القرآن ماشي بيها هو؟	Lexical
S1-005	هذي قديمة المسألة	Lexical
S1-006	هسه بقى الجار، سنتين ما اشوفها، هاي ما تشوفها، سنتين ما تجيها هذا ما حق الجار، حق الجار تجيها، تسرق من المستشفى دوا، اكو كثير من الناس هذي طريقتم لما يتجادلون، تتأذى، تترك احسن لان جدالم مؤذي	Lexical
S1-007	هاي حقوق الجيران؟ ما تزوروني؟	Lexical
S1-008	هاي الما تنغشع مثل هباء	Morphosyntactic
S1-009	الشي البعينو هو ما يشوفو لكن بخويو تمام. الناس ما تشوف اخطاءه	Lexical

S1-010	اهم الوسائل حتى تقيم نفسك ونشوف انت نخليك بخانة الرجال الا بالخانة الاخرى	Lexical
S1-011	انت ترجع تحاسب نفسك على كل حركة وسكنة.	Lexical
S1-012	مثل هاي البهيمة التمشي قدامك	Lexical
S1-013	نزلت عالتراي	Morphosyntactic
S1-014	اذا تحاسبون انفسكم وتغسلون هذي الذنوب المتراكمة ما يظل عندك مشكلة	Lexical
S1-015	اكو ناس ما يخلون امام الله تعالى, ولا هذا العمل مالي قد اعملو بالسنة بيني وبينو, صح الا غلط؟ خلي الله رقيب	Morphosyntactic
S1-016	اكو ناس من كنع ما الناس تنفخ بصورون نفسم خوش اوادم وبالحيقة هيم زفت لكن اغشع اشعندم مسؤولية, عندم مكانة, عندم كم نجمي زيادة عن اللزوم ويجيبون الناس يعجبه النفخ والله هالايم, هاي يجب ويكيل, ماكو مثلك!	Phonological
S1-017	كلما عندي خطأ اسدد, الحم	Lexical
S1-018	من تشتغل مع الله من فوق انت تصلح, من جوا ما تصلح, الا من فوق, الا من رقابة	Lexical
S1-019	والله انا كنت بالجاهلية	Lexical
S1-020	ما عملت شي ما مليح	Lexical
S1-021	والنعم	Lexical
S1-022	كلم متواضعين, صحابة عدول وكلمن تسألو يقالك فلان احسن مني, ما يقول انا	Lexical
S1-023	على ربعك	Lexical
S1-024	نحن ما نحب النفخ, العالم هسه كلو صبغ, يمزرون بالثناء وبالمديح	Lexical
S1-025	ليش ما تمدح ابو بكر وغيغو, ليش ما تمدح	Lexical
S1-026	ايغثو, تعف هذا امير, لما شكى لازم يحقق	Lexical
S1-027	اشعندك تعترض علينا وهو قبيح	Phonological
S1-028	كانما شاف نفسو استعجل	Morphosyntactic
S1-029	البحب يصلح نفسو تشوف يتسقط الاخبار, الناس اشندكر عني؟ يذكرون خير؟ حتى يفرح!	Morphosyntactic
S1-030	تسمع الجيران, اذا الجيران قالو يابة انت خوش رجل مكاتنين ثلاثة اربعة هاذو, انت خوش انسان, هاي وسيلة تقييم هاي	Lexical
S1-031	مضبوط, الانسان لمن ما بحسب حساب, اكو ناس يقولون لاوادم عيب ابني هذا ما بصير هاي سبة علينا, هادي ما لايقة بينا, نحن بيت فلان, نحن سادة, نحن كذا, نحن كذا. يخاف لا يكون الناس تتكلم عليه وهذا من علامات الايش؟ علامات نظافة السلوك.	Morphosyntactic
S1-032	اوف!	Discourse-marker
S1-033	يعني اكو واحد الا عندو جماعة مثلاً بيغضوه, عندو مشاكل معاهم, لكن لمن ما ثت ارباع المجتمع يقولون انت ما مليح, انت ما مليح! لا تتعب نفسك	Phonological
S1-034	العلماء اش يقولون, حتى الناس اللي يتكلمون طبعاً كلام الناس هو لسان الحق, يقولون العلماء مع هذا الناس تذكرك بخير انت هم راقب نفسك	Lexical
S1-035	انت تعرف اشكو داخلك, انت لما تتمدد تعرف اشكو واشكن عملت	Lexical
S1-036	وك يابة هذا شغل فوق محد يعغفو الا الخالق	Phonological
S1-037	شوف هذي كلمات كله	Discourse-marker
S1-038	اكو كلام يقولو سفيان الثوري الامام احمد يعجبو ويذكرو	Lexical
S1-039	والله شفناك, ما شاء الله على الروى الذي الله انعم, بقى الروية الصالحة بشارة للناس	Lexical

S1-040	اشيقول سفيان الثوري؟	Lexical
S1-041	تمام الناس تحبك وتشوفك هذا	Lexical
S1-042	انا اعرف اشكو.	Lexical
S1-043	لقلبك ناس طبيين, اصدقائك يصدقوك ما يجاملوك ولا ينافقون معاك, قلم بالله عليكم اشعندي انا عيوب, العيوب مالي اشني هي	Morphosyntactic
S1-044	انا اذا اكو وسخ ها هنا, خويي يقلي امسح هاي المكان	Lexical
S1-045	حتى يصفي حساباتك ردليلك عالطريق الصحيح.	Morphosyntactic
S1-046	هو يدرس, جا على ريعو بالمجلس, اندعيكم امام الله تعالى	Lexical
S1-047	شرط عليهم شرط, اذا بيبي عيب, تلاميذ وريعو بالمجلس قولوه.	Lexical
S1-048	انت خوش رجل, نحن الما ملاح, انت شيخنا, هاكذ يقولو هذا المعنى.	Morphosyntactic
S1-049	انتم مادام ريعي ان شاء الله سوى نحنا, هاكذ يقول, كونو هيم حولو ويحبو قالم	Lexical
S1-050	يعني كلتم مخلصين	Discourse-marker
S1-051	ما نغرق	Morphosyntactic
S1-052	اخ من هاي السراير, لو الانسان يحاسب نفسو مثل ما الله تعالى رقيب عليه, على هذا القلب, ثت ارباعنا يصير خوش اوادم, نجو ان شاء الله تعالى.	Phonological
S1-053	هاي احنا لمن نعمل ميزان ما نشوف العوام والما ملاح, لا نلقينا ملاح حتى نقران نفسنا بينم, احسن الناس منو؟	Lexical
S1-054	ما نقدر نلحقم ابدأ لأن شافو صاحب الرسالة	Lexical
S1-055	المضبوطين	Discourse-marker
S1-056	نحن بالنسبة للربع الي وقت الرسالة	Morphosyntactic
S1-057	اشقد اكو فرق بين نخلة وجوا اكش بقدونس, هذا الفرق, هذا الفرق بينا وبينم, عمالقة.	Morphosyntactic
S1-058	انا شفت الصحابة	Lexical
S1-059	احنا وين!	Discourse-marker
S1-060	علينو	Phonological
S1-061	الناس الفوق الكبار	Lexical
S1-062	هذي الخطبة حطوها بجبيكم, وين من تقعدون اعطوها هدية, هذي احسن هدية, وين من تقعدون اعطوها هدية مجاناً, وين من تقعدون, حتى الناس تشوف وين هما ووين آل السيق.	Lexical
S2-001	منو هو المفلس الي ما عندو فلوس؟	Morphosyntactic
S2-002	الي ما عندو فلوس	Morphosyntactic
S2-003	يغوح وعندو صلاة كثيفة	Phonological
S2-004	ايش	Lexical
S2-005	شوف	Discourse-marker
S2-006	يعني هو خلص وزع, قبضي حياتو غيبة ونميمة وقذف وشمتم وهمز ولمز وتعددي وظلم, هو يصلي ويصوم عندو عبادة كثيرة	Morphosyntactic
S2-007	بعد ما عندو شي ينطينو	Morphosyntactic
S2-008	هنولي الناس الي ظلم	Morphosyntactic
S2-009	فشفتم اخواني؟	Discourse-marker
S2-010	انت قبيعد وقتحكي على انسان ما موجود ما قبيعد معاك	Phonological
S2-011	نحنا عنقول حق يعني تمام هو هشكل, صحيح نحنا ما قنحكي شي غلط ولا عنفتري علينو	Phonological
S2-012	حتى اذا كان بينو, ما موجود, ما يطيق يدافع عن نفسو	Morphosyntactic

S2-013	يقول والله انا	Lexical
S2-014	بس انا ما احكي، انا ما لية شغل انا بس اسمع	Morphosyntactic
S2-015	قال هو يحكي صديقي واستحي اقلو سكت	Morphosyntactic
S2-016	اثنين فيحكون والنبي سمع	Phonological
S2-017	يعني استهزوا بيينو، قلو شوف اش عمل لنفسو	Morphosyntactic
S2-018	شوفوا الخطورة اخواني، شوفوا خطورة الغيبة.	Lexical
S2-019	اش يعمل؟ اش يعمل؟	Lexical
S2-020	يعني عادي صارت عادي، لا واليعجبك اش يعمل؟ شوف شوف انتبه، يقعد قدامك، والله دقلك فعد شغلة يا ربي لا تجعله غيبة، اي انت عتغاب شنو يا ربي لا تجعله، انت عتغاب حبيبي انت عتغاب، الله اشون ما يعملك اية غيبة اذا انت عتغاب، تخاف الله سكت، لا تحكي.	Lexical
S2-021	قلو اتقي الله وسكت، لا تخليني اكسب اثم معاك، هاكذ بلا مستحي قلو، ما عجبو ديغ غاسك وامشي لا تقعد معانو، حسناتك ما للبيع وحسناتك ما هييني عليك	Lexical
S2-022	ايبيي	Discourse-marker
S2-023	انت عبالك مرات كوي اخواني كلام السيء له آثار، تجي تحكي انت على شخص وتغتابو قدام الناس	Lexical
S2-024	لپش نحنا خلصنا عيوبنا وصلحناها حتى دنهتم بعيوب الناس ومنتقد، مالك شغل	Lexical
S2-025	تتحسر علينا	Phonological
S2-026	استغفر قدامم، سيح قدامم، صلي عالنبي قدامم	Morphosyntactic
S2-027	ونستحي من الناس ونجامل واسكت ومع الاسف بعض الناس حتى ينافق، حتى ينافق، غشع فلان حكي على فلان امبغور هذا يحبو يصيغ معانو، خاف لا يزعل مني، لا خل يزعل منك، احسن ما تبيع حسناتك لغيرك	Lexical