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LIST OF SYMBOLS

1st: first
2nd: second
3rd: third

/ /: phonological slashes

[  ]: phonetic square brackets

%: Percentage

[ , ]: closed interval

], [: open interval

[ , [: half-closed/ half-open interval

] , ]: half-closed/ half-open interval

{}: morpheme

∈: set membership

ø: zero article

#: syllable boundary

+: the symbol indicates the presence of one feature

−: the symbol indicates the absence of one feature
### PHONETIC SYMBOLS

#### Contoids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>ORD</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>[bɔrd]</td>
<td>cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f]</td>
<td>[fæ:ɡ]</td>
<td>he passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[ju:m]</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[t]</td>
<td>[bi:t]</td>
<td>room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[l]</td>
<td>[reɡ]</td>
<td>road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>[da:r]</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>[dəw]</td>
<td>light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>[sma]</td>
<td>sky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʂ]</td>
<td>[ʂɑr]</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>[nhaːr]</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
<td>[ŋqar]</td>
<td>I teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>[zi:t]</td>
<td>oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʒ]</td>
<td>[ʒɑr]</td>
<td>east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʒ]</td>
<td>[ʒɑdɪ]</td>
<td>grand-father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[k]</td>
<td>[kɔlma]</td>
<td>word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]</td>
<td>[ɡɔlb]</td>
<td>heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[χrɔʒ]</td>
<td>he went out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɣ]</td>
<td>[ɣi:ra]</td>
<td>jealousy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[q]</td>
<td>[lqa]</td>
<td>he found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>[raːh]</td>
<td>he left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>[sæm]</td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[r]</td>
<td>[særg]</td>
<td>vein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɾ]</td>
<td>[ɾagba]</td>
<td>neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[l]</td>
<td>[luːn]</td>
<td>colour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɭ]</td>
<td>[ɭa]</td>
<td>he ate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>[hrɔb]</td>
<td>he escaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbols</td>
<td>Other (Standard Arabic) Contoids</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[w]</td>
<td>[wɡɑf]</td>
<td>he stood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[j]</td>
<td>[sæjb]</td>
<td>shame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Other (French) Contoids</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[R]</td>
<td>[maʒister]</td>
<td>post-graduation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vocoids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>ORD</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>[yaːdi]</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[iː]</td>
<td>[yiːr]</td>
<td>only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>[tejaːra]</td>
<td>plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɛː]</td>
<td>[syeːr]</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[æ]</td>
<td>[ktəb]</td>
<td>he wrote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[æː]</td>
<td>[nʒæh]</td>
<td>he succeeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>[baːb]</td>
<td>door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[aː]</td>
<td>[bya]</td>
<td>he wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɑ]</td>
<td>[qaːd]</td>
<td>he was able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɑː]</td>
<td>[tɑːb]</td>
<td>it was cooked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>[tɔʁɡɛn]</td>
<td>roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[oː]</td>
<td>[tɔːl]</td>
<td>length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbols</td>
<td>Other (French) Vocoids</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>[ʒẫnti]</td>
<td>gentil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɔ]</td>
<td>[pɔ̃m]</td>
<td>apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>[dɔmɛ̃]</td>
<td>tomorrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɛ̃]</td>
<td>[etɛdR]</td>
<td>switch off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[œ]</td>
<td>[œ]</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[y]</td>
<td>[ʒyʒ]</td>
<td>Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[œ]</td>
<td>[lœR]</td>
<td>their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ø]</td>
<td>[ʒ0nɛs]</td>
<td>youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
History attests that Oran has been always the theatre of local migratory movements which, in the long run, give rise to dialect contactual phenomena. The transplanted dialects at play are genealogically sedentary or bedouin. The observation of such dialects implies that they are all in perpetual contact together with the local dialect which is viewed by literature as originally bedouin. The present investigation aims at displaying genealogical language change via dialect contactual koinéisation which characterises young university Oranees. This fact cannot be undertaken without a careful examination of the fundamental sub-processes for koiné development, namely mixing, levelling, reallocation, simplification and interdialectal process. Focusing is another process which finally interferes as a result of linguistic stabilisation.

On the basis of three research methods: recorded interviews, participant observation and administered survey, an important number of koinéisation processed-linguistic variants could have been genealogically detected and identified as lexical, grammatical or at the level of pronunciation. Many of them have known genealogical alteration under the pressure of bedouinisation and/or sedentarisation. The primary objectives of this investigation have been to synchronically describe these forms and diachronically search for the causal motives beyond their current status.

The main findings confirm the bedouin affiliation of Oran dialect. However, this variety is being koinised in the sense that it witnesses genealogical changes in its linguistic composition. A closer data examination has allowed specifying the degree of genealogical prevalence at each linguistic level: pronunciation displays a mixed case, unlike lexis and grammar which represent more bedouin-type levels. The reason behind this genealogical conflict is the co-presence of bedouin and sedentary dialect-background migrants in Oran. Yet, the migratory majority constitutes the bedouin group.

The results also demonstrate that koinéisation sub-processes are operating in Oran dialect. Mixing is at work on all the linguistic levels; but, it is still minor compared with reallocation and focusing. Stabilised dialectal forms apparently stand in the first position. If internal migration keeps decreasing, a deeper levelling will take place and the speech community members will reach a further agreement on the genealogical composition of their koiné.
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Contemporary English native speakers find it relatively hard to understand Old English. Comprehension difficulties are fostered by linguistic differences between the modern and traditional versions of English. Latin, another widespread language among Europeans in the early ages, is nowadays considered as a dead variety superseded by its descendent languages. Any attempt to understand it necessitates abundant efforts on behalf of a current, say, French or Spanish speaker. Getting familiar with the Latin linguistic system, of course, anticipates and facilitates comprehension of the language. The Arab world is still another context where, for instance, many Algerians experience the same situation when they are confronted to Classical Arabic texts. Although Classical Arabic together with Old English and Latin do not definitely display the same position: the former is still preserved for religious and some formal uses whereas the two latter languages are deemed dead, it happens that the interpretation of Classical Arabic texts could be required in a more recent kind of Arabic. The three outlined situations imply the occurrence of language change. Observable and scientific facts confirm that languages are universally exposed to change through time. History witnesses the various stages of development of every past and/or present language. No linguistic type escapes evolution because change is a temporal rule (Aitchison, 2001; Meyerhoff, 2006).

Language change is then tied to linguistic differences and so is language variation. In fact, languages unexceptionally vary in the sense that they bear linguistic discrepancies in space which could be social, geographical or stylistic. Sociolinguists view language variation as the centrality of language change. Significant linguistic changes generally go through prior variability. Change and variation of language are the outcomes of societal change and variation. In other words, these phenomena are not restricted to the linguistic scale, but their impact broadens to apply to cases outside language. Many linguistic variables are conditioned by extra-linguistic variables. They are, in this case, known as sociolinguistic variables. Region is one extra-linguistic variable that may correlate with linguistic features. Moving from one region to another engenders observation of remarkable differences at the level of pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar. Each region holds at least one language variety known as dialect. Dialectal studies are undertaken within the realm of dialectology. In an earlier era, linguists used to work on dialectologists’ data which might contain variable forms. They singled out stable features which were, for them, uniform, while left those variables on the peripheral because they symbolised disordered cases. Still traditionally, the Arabs stood
long against Arabic variation. It was believed, at their time, that purity uniquely characterised the variety of Prophet Mohammed’s Quraysh tribe where the Koran’s pronouncement took place in that dialect.

There was subsequently a shift in interest from traditional dialectology to urban dialectology following Labov’s language theory (the mid-60’s). Contrary to former linguists, this scholar’s approaches to language are based on variability which he equates to systematic structuredness. He is the first to claim that linguistic variables are in correlation with extralinguistic variables. The increasing collaboration between linguists and dialectologists has given rise to sociolinguistic dialectology. Sociolinguistic Arabic dialectology has been first conducted by Holes Clives in the 70s. Contact dialectology, a sub-branch of sociolinguistic dialectology, covers the linguistic results out of contact between mutually intelligible varieties, or briefly dialect contact. In addition, it also accounts for migration and urbanisation. The three key concepts, dialect contact, migration and urbanisation are interlocked.

Population mobility has a long historical course. The world has specifically known a dynamic permanent rural-urban in-migration as a consequence of industrialisation in many western countries. This type of migration has triggered off urbanisation, on the one hand and on the other, dialect contact. Since the second half of the twentieth century, the Arab world has importantly started to experience the latter two phenomena. Genealogically, two types of Arabic dialects, bedouin and sedentary (following Ibn Khaldounian typology of the fourteenth century), have undergone contact. Sedentary varieties have come out of language contact between mutually unintelligible varieties: Bedouin dialects and other non-Arabic languages. Therefore, language contact and dialect contact go hand in hand and participate effectively in Arabic dialectal emergence.

As one illustrative example from the Arab World, the Algerian Oran city has, through in-migration, known contact between bedouin and sedentary varieties. Oran dialect, which is basically bedouin (Marçais, 1958; Bouamrane, 1991; Miller, 2007), has, therefore, simultaneously experienced parallel processes of bedouinisation and sedentarisation. This has resulted in a genealogical linguistic conflict in Oran speech community. The reason why Oran is a migratory city is related to its coastal attractivity and its industrial and economic centralisation. Those permanent comers to Oran are essentially from the west of the country, such as bedouin Mascara, Tiaret, Mostaganem, Sidi Bel Abbes, Aïn Timouchent, Saïda,
Bechar and Bayad, together with sedentary Tlemcen and Nedroma. During the French colonisation, the city was majorly inhabited by Europeans who held the French citizenship. After the country’s independence, this population evacuated Oran, leaving the space to different genealogical dialect-background in-migrants. In a similar way as other Algerian parts, Oran speech community survives, in addition to dialect contact mentioned above, another parallel contact, namely language contact, and its ensuing phenomena such as diglossia, multilingualism (or bilingualism), code-switching and borrowing.

Our present interest is orientated towards dialect contact which in the long-term causes the growth of a koine: a new form of speech which develops as a result of this type of contact. Koineisation is the migration-succeeding process whereby a koine comes to the fore. It consists of sub-processes, namely mixing (co-prevalence of different dialectal background-linguistic variants used by in-migrating speakers with different origins); levelling (linguistic elements employed by the minority of speakers tend to disappear); simplification (only regular and simple linguistic forms remain to constitute the koine); interdialect (a number of linguistic features originally belonging to neither competing dialect develop); re-allocation (some linguistic variants do not experience levelling, but they remain in the mixture because they are re-assigned new different functional roles). Koineisation processes together with focusing lead to the evolution of a koine. What is meant by focusing is the normalisation of the new dialect as a result of a high level of dialectal agreement between the speech community members. In situations where divergent dialects are in contact, bidialectal speakers appear. Bidialectalism refers to the mastery of more than one dialect. The phenomenon may lead to dialect switching (the alternative use of mutually intelligible varieties) on the one hand and dialect borrowing (the integration of linguistic elements into a given dialect from another one which is distinct) on the other hand.

The motivations underlying the choice of this study are threefold. In-migration is one personal experience that we survived as a result of Algeria’s political instability in the 90’s. We moved with our family to Oran in search of security. As time went on, we started to notice changes in our family members’ speech: new linguistic features were used, others were modified and still others maintained. These changes were more particularly noticeable among our university brothers and sisters. When we turned our attention to university Oranees, we also remarked a considerable degree of variation in their speech. The second motivation is related to our previous post-graduate study on lexical change through dialect contractual accommodation within the same community. The current research accounts for koineisation
which can be a long term accommodatory consequence, and considers the process at more than one linguistic level: pronunciation, grammar and lexis. Our third motivation is stimulated by literature. Many recent voices (such as Miller (2007)) find that a more comprehensive Arabic panorama is still far from reaching within this field. Algerian speech community is an exemplary fertile Arabic ground for language research. This work attempts to provide a sociolinguistic participation in the discipline of Arabic dialectology.

In brief, it is sociolinguistically attested that contact in Oran prevails between immigrants’ dialects, bedouin and/or sedentary, and between these varieties and the originally bedouin Oran dialect. In case a new koine is growing, genealogical koineisation has operated and consequently mixing, reallocation, levelling, simplification and interdialect development have also taken place, together with focusing. A number of issues are raised in this situation. Our present main research question covers the extent to which this dialect contact-incited koineisation has led to genealogical change in Oran dialect. In this study, this question will be tackled, as mentioned, at the three linguistic levels of the variety above (pronunciation, grammar and lexis) and so are the following emerging sub-questions: Which genealogical process exerts more pressure on Oran variety? In other words, which genealogical linguistic features predominate in the dialect? Is Oran dialect still being koineised towards a bedouin-type, or does it tend to change its genealogical linguistic composition towards a sedentary-type dialect? Our principal hypothesis is that Oran dialect has genealogically changed via dialect contact-incited koineisation; however, its linguistic levels are not koineised in a similar way. The first sub-hypothesis supports the occurrence of bedouinsation further more than that of sedentarisation, a fact which leads to the second sub-hypothesis that Oran dialect preserves its bedouin linguistic composition. The current work, more precisely, attempts to (in)validate our hypotheses throughout five chapters organised as follows:

Chapter One is devoted to the literature review which embraces the basic definitions of key concepts. Language change is presented with its various impacts on language. It is then related to language variation which is tackled within the discipline of dialectology. This dialect study has started as traditional dialectology, which later became urban dialectology, and more recently it has been extended into sociolinguistic dialectology under the impact of sociolinguistics. Dialect contact is shown as one manifestation of regional variation. In the long term, dialect contact stimulates koineisation processes, focusing and bidialectalism. Dialect contact koines are distinguished from language contact pidgins. The concept of
migration and its parameters also form part of this chapter together with urbanisation and ruralisation.

Chapter Two covers the research setting and fieldwork. Algeria is introduced geographically, historically and demographically. The examination is then narrowed to involve the Algerian city of Oran. Other key concepts, already defined in the first chapter, are explored in this chapter in relation to the present context, particularly Oran. Internal migration is, for example, raised due to its tight relationship with the city, and more remarkably realised a leap forward after Algeria’s independence. Although language contact is not the centre of attention of this study, it nevertheless holds one whole section of the chapter since the phenomenon is deeply rooted in the Algerian speech community. Conversely, dialect contact which also momentously obtains in Oran, makes up as said earlier the pivot of the current investigation. As regards the present fieldwork, this chapter gives a brief sketch of the study sample and data gathering. The research methods that were used, namely recorded interviews, participant observation and fieldworker-administered questionnaire, are afforded and described together with the way data have been analysed.

The results are provided in the three remaining chapters. Chapter Three tackles the question of genealogical change by koineisation in pronunciation and attempts to analyse the results found at this level. The koineising distribution of genealogically consonantal and vocalic variants is undertaken. We will examine the occurrence of mixing, levelling, reallocation (socio-stylistic and phonological) and interdialect development at this linguistic level, as well as focusing process. The most crucial pronunciation features that will be exploited are the consonants /q/, /g/, /ð/, /θ/, /ɖ/, /ʒ/, /ɣ/, /r/, /k/, /t/, a set of phonological processes, syllabic structure, in addition to vowels and diphthongs. We will see if any feature goes through more than one koineisation process. Many genealogical features are recurrent among Arabic dialects throughout the Arab world. Drawing dialectal comparisons may allow explaining the reasons behind the prevalence of one given phenomenon.

Chapter Four is confined to the analytical interpretations of occurrences of genealogically grammatical features and their relation to koineisation processes. The most crucial variants under analysis are verbs and their different manners of conjugation; participles; nouns; adjectives; adverbs; pronouns; the indefinite article; particles; and possessive relationships. In addition to the various types of reallocation, this chapter sheds light on genealogically grammatical variants which have been simplified and those currently
undergoing the process of levelling. We will check whether grammatical variants have experienced, in a similar way as in pronunciation, more than one koineisation process. Other genealogical features will be verified if focused through stabilisation at the end.

Our last chapter deals with the issue of genealogical koineisation-stimulated change at the lexical level of the dialect under research. We will try to reveal bedouin and sedentary features which have been koineised in the sense that they have survived a mixture situation, re-attributed new functions or levelled out. Like in pronunciation and grammar, some lexical variants have undergone more than one koineisation process. In mixing and reallocation, we will describe the lexical variants that alternate. While they can be in free variation in the former, they are, in the latter, in complimentary distribution. Those which have attained focusing are also displayed in this chapter. We will raise the case of divergence arising between sedentary and bedouin dialects. We will verify if sedentary speakers become bidialectal and/or dialect switchers.
1.0. Introduction

The present chapter attends to the theoretical key concepts of this investigation. Moving smoothly from the most general to specific abstractions, language change is diachronically and synchronically scrutinised until it could be possible to narrow the focus of research, and concentrate on the change of language via dialect contact-processed koineisation (including mixing, reallocation, levelling, simplification and interdialect). Paralleled phenomena, such as focusing, bidialectalism, dialect switching and borrowing, will probably emerge. Sociolinguistic development has scientifically participated and brought into light the linguistic consequences of demographic mobility. In-migration leads to contact between dialects. Any dialect is subjected to variation and constitutes the nucleus of dialectologists’ attention. Dialect contact is distinguished from language contact, and so are koines from pidgins.

1.1. Language Change

Change is unquestionably the norm. It is one absolute rule of nature on account of its timeless persistence. Nothing stands unchanging aside from change. The wheel of life is in a continual non-backward movement towards a new state: animals, plants and humans come into existence. They then grow, evolve and finally die. Physically, human bodies bear changes at different phases of lifetimes; from childhood, throughout adolescence, into adulthood, the physical body is clearly not the same, and subject to natural changes beyond any self-control. Mentally, the human brain evolves enough to start functioning. The way of thinking and perceiving the world inevitably changes over time, continues changing until this body part gradually loses power and, just like plants and animals, experiences death. Language is another exceptionless living thing which is constantly changing; it “…would stand still only if society did. A world of unchanging linguistic excellence, based on the brilliance of earlier literary forms, exists only in fantasy” (Crystal, 2007: 357). Further, the author adds: “[t]he only languages that do not change are dead ones”.

The paragraph above implies two types of change with reference to language; the change is extra-linguistic if it occurs outside language, or linguistic in case it takes place within language. The question arises as whether there is a relationship between the two types. Clearly, Crystal’s quotations entail a linking prevalence between language change and change that affects society. Extra-linguistically, society bears changes as a result of political,
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historical, economic or demographic events. Due to such and further parallel changes that occur at all strata of life, the human requirements in a particular time are not exactly the same as those of another given time. Speakers (or writers), whether consciously or subconsciously, change their way of using language to satisfy their current needs. Historical motivations, such as invasions, are significant illustrations. In the case of England, the country knew firstly Anglo-Saxon then French Norman invasions. Chaucer’s English is unsurprisingly viewed as the merger of both invaders’ languages (Sharpe, 2009). The other major extra-linguistic incident could be demographic. Urbanisation (see 1.3.3) is one demographically specific change that triggers off unavoidably language change. “The trend of people to move from remote country regions to densely populated cities has fuelled this phenomenon” (ibid: 57); the migratory factor, in other words, often incites language change. This could arise out of contact between the migrants’ language varieties. Two major contacts result: language contact (see 1.4) is one cause of language change. Dialect contact is another language change-inducing phenomenon which will be profoundly prospected in this research (see 1.4). Nevertheless, the impact of great urban cities is still highly expected even on regional settings where demographic mobility does not take place (ibid). Sharpe cites the case of Kent County (in England) which once possessed a clearly distinct dialect. Presently, London variety has, there, substituted for this county’s dialect.

Language change, on the other hand, could be traced back to language itself (ibid). Abruptly sometimes and some other times gradually, all linguistic levels go into modifying effects: “New words, new pronunciations, new grammatical forms and structures, and new meanings for existing words are always coming into existence, while older ones are always dropping out of use.” (Trask, 2004: 149). Linguistic change, in other words, incorporates addition of some elements, elimination or replacement of others. Lexically, certain items, which may have not been employed before, appear. Other old items seem needless and slowly cease to be used, and finally lose their places in dictionaries. Still another category remains but the meaning of its items shifts. The case of English is an interesting illustration in the form of the table below. In the third column for instance, the sub-title ‘Modification’ is related to meaning; the word nice meant very earlier ignorant, changed its meaning to fastidious then became equivalent to precise before it acquired its contemporary meaning. How lexical change manifests in Oran dialect (henceforth ORD) will be regarded in Chapter Five.
### Table 1.1: Lexical Change in English Language

In pronunciation, English language went through progressive changes as well. Its voiced labio-dental fricative [v] which was an allophonic variant of the phoneme /f/ in the early times, for example, has then become an independent phoneme /v/. Silent [k], in words such as ‘knife’ and ‘knit’, in Contemporary English language was previously pronounced. And, certain old rules have been presently refunctionalised to turn from phonological into grammatical rules, as shown in the following table,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of change</th>
<th>Addition</th>
<th>Elimination</th>
<th>Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexis</td>
<td>atomiser, laser, transistorise (Aitchison, 2001)</td>
<td>scobberlotch (to loaf around doing nothing in particular); dudder (to deafen with noise) (Aitchison, 2001)</td>
<td>ignorant(\rightarrow)fastidious →precise→nice (Holmes, 2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1.2: Change in English Pronunciation

1 The adjectives voiceless and unvoiced are used interchangeably
Chapter Three, in this investigation, will raise the question of pronunciation changes in ORD. As for the third linguistic level, English grammar has born changes through history. Suffixes are supplied to present-day English language, certain word agreements are abandoned, and further grammatical rules are decreased in their application. A number of examples are gathered in Table 1.3. Is grammar also affected by change in ORD? Our collected data examination will demonstrate this dialectal grammatical change, if ever there is, in Chapter Four.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of change</th>
<th>Addition</th>
<th>Elimination</th>
<th>Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>the <em>able</em>-suffix rule has been added to English language since the early English era</td>
<td>the agreement of adjectives with their nouns in case, number and gender has been lost in Contemporary English</td>
<td>unlike modern times, both auxiliary and main verbs (e.g. in the present simple) took only <em>not</em>, in the 16th century-English, to make negation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.3**: Grammatical Change in English Language (Demers et al, 2001)

The study of language change over time is encompassed within the discipline of historical linguistics. The field could terminologically alternate, following Saussure (1916), with diachronic linguistics. According to this same researcher, non-historical language studies are synchronic. Synchronic linguistics approaches language at a given point in time. Milroy (1992: 01) points out and adds: “It is… true that at any given time a language is *variable*”. If language changes over time, it varies spatially. Language variation is seen through regional (or geographical), social or contextual space. Another question arises as whether there is a relationship between language change and language variation.
1.2. Language Variation

Language change scholars find it paramount to study language variation as the latter is the kernel subject of the phenomenon of language change. It is witnessed that: “Observing variation in language is vital for understanding language change, as, although not all variability in language structure involves change, all change involves language variation”\(^2\). In fact, extra-linguistic change is also related to extra-linguistic variation which is in turn interwoven with variation on all the linguistic levels. Chronologically now, an attempt is made to probe the study of language variation. The examination of the interrelationship between extra-linguistic and linguistic variation will be raised in due course.

The root of this field, in fact, lies in dialectology which is the scientific study of dialects. Literally, the item dialect originates from the compound Greek verb ‘dialégesthai’ converse. The verb principally consists of the prefix ‘dia-’ with each other and ‘légein’ speak. This verb makes up the nucleus of the derived noun dialektos ‘conversation, discourse’ which denotes the notion of ‘way of speaking’ or ‘local speech’, and was assimilated by English through Latin dialectus and Old French (Ayto, 1991). Semantically speaking, the notion ‘dialect’ means the speech habits which characterise a regional area, or a particular social group (Swann et al, 2004). A careful distinction needs to be drawn between ‘a dialect’ and the terms ‘a language’, ‘accent’ and ‘variety’. But first, some differentiation is raised between ‘language’ and ‘a language’ and requires clarification. Swann et al (2004: 162) report that Sapir (1921) defines ‘language’ in general as, “a purely human and noninstinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions, and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols. These symbols are, in the first instance, auditory and they are produced by the so-called ‘organs of speech’”. ‘A language’, on the other hand, is rather sociolinguistic: It is not only a linguistic phenomenon but regarded as political, cultural, social and historical term (Trudgill, 1992). Again, it is the external facts that intervene to specify whether a particular type of language is ‘a language’ or ‘a dialect’\(^3\).

Chambers and Trudgill (1998: 4-5) opt for an alternative technical concept to any specific dialect and language. They say that a variety is “…a neutral term to apply to any particular kind of language which we wish, for some purpose, to consider as a single entity” (ibid: 5). Another distinction is made between dialect and accent and is worth sketching. In

---

\(^2\) In Llamas et al, eds (2007: 219)

\(^3\) See Chambers and Trudgill (1998) for further differentiation between ‘a language’ and ‘a dialect’
British English, “…the term dialect includes only features of grammar and vocabulary, while features of pronunciation are treated under the quite different heading of accent” (Trask, 2004: 75). In American English however, an accent which still refers to pronunciation constitutes, just like vocabulary and grammar, one component of a dialect (ibid). In this study, the American definition is adopted.

Arabic dialectology, particularly, specialises in the study of Arabic colloquial. The colloquial of Arabic is “the variety of Arabic that is used for familiar and informal conversation, which is the primary locus of speech uttered in specific social and situational contexts” (Abboud-Haggar, 2006: 439). Generally on the other hand, the essence of dialectology has, through the evolutionary state of the field, gone from a narrow to, finally reach, this wider definition. From traditional then social dialectology, this dialect discipline has been extended to acquire, as a further signification indicated below, a contemporarily revolutionary terminology and turned into sociolinguistic dialectology.

1.2.1. Traditional Dialectology

It is, also referred to as rural dialectology or dialect geography, related to spatial variation with the utmost objective to map up linguistic atlases displaying the geographical disposition of distinct dialect elements (Britain, 2003a). The accomplishment of such atlases depended on systematic ways of collecting linguistic data. Even though interest in geographical linguistic differences had its roots in the far-flung past, systematic dialect study started only in the second half of the 19th c. Earliest dialect scientists, consciously or subconsciously, issued an opposition to historical linguistics. Their challenge targeted at historical linguists’ neo-grammarians’ hypothesis assuming that sound change from Indo-European to Germanic dialects is regular and that sound laws are exception-free. The realisation of dialectological maps indicated that dialect forms are apparently arbitrarily distributed which is, for them, a sign of the sound change irregularity. Dialectologists traditionally highlighted lexical variation, and change of sounds was observed via this variation. Some of their exemplary questions were: ‘You sweeten tea with…?’; ‘What do you say to a caller at the door if you want him to enter?’ (Britain, 2003a: 1).

It was in Germany that Wenker (1876) pioneered dialectological surveys (reported in Chambers and Trudgill (1998)). Different subsequent dialect works worldwide were inspired
by his studies. His survey consisted of postal questionnaires which embodied a set of sentences written in Standard German. For the purpose of supplying dialectal differences, Wenker required to give back the list of sentences transcribed into the local variety. This dialectologist, as such, succeeded in producing the first linguistic atlases which involved imaginary geographical lines, known as isoglosses, traced over a map to show various linguistic form zones.

The discovery of irregularity in sound change, by traditional dialect studies, rushed subsequent linguists to search for stable, but to elude variable, cases. Stability and variability were seen as two sides of the same coin. While the former was equated with homogeneity, the latter was tantamount to heterogeneity. Homogeneous features were, viewed by linguists at that time as, clear-cut and uniform cases, but heterogeneity impeded linguistic theorising seeing that it entailed chaos and disorder within language. Saussure (1916), the father of modern linguistics, differentiated between the language system (langue) and speech (parole). By separating langue from parole for the researcher, what is social is respectively separated from what is individual and, by the same token, what is essential is respectively separated from what is auxiliary. Similarly later, Chomsky (1965)\(^4\) separated competence (the speaker-listener’s knowledge of language) from performance (the production of actual utterances) and claimed that “[I]linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech-community…” (ibid: 4) (quoted in Wardhaugh, 2010: 3). This speech community, according to him,

“… knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance. This seems to me to have been the position of the founders of modern general linguistics …” (ibid)

Langue, clearly enough, makes the central object of linguistics for Saussure while Chomsky decides for competence. Speech, according to such linguists, varies accidentally. It

\(^4\) Reported in Wardhaugh (2010)
is heterogeneous on account of its variability. All in all, language uniformity concedes, contrary to variability, a structured linguistic description at any given point in time.

1.2.1.1. Traditional Arabic Dialectology

Much earlier before Saussure and Chomsky, the Arabs had long opposed Arabic variation. From the red river to the central plateau of Najd was the central west of Arabia, the source-place of ‘pure’ Arabic (Baccouche, 2006). The ‘purest’ position belonged to the dialect of Prophet Mohammed’s Mekki tribe, Quraysh, where the Koran’s revelation occurred in this variety. The Muslim-Arab conquests (/al futuhaat al islaamija/), conducted by the ‘pure’ Arabic speakers, were accompanied by the formation of Arabised sites out of the Arabian Peninsula in the 7th and 8th c (AD). While the original Arabic centre was considered as being far from any foreign effect, the new non-Arab locations per se were the source of this influence. They were the meeting point of Arab and non-Arab speakers, a fact which escorted to the appearance of new ‘corrupted’ Arabic vernaculars, deviating from the ‘pure’ ones. For fear of further ‘corruption’, the alarm was raised by the traditional rulers who appealed to Arabic grammarians. They believed that any alien effect represented a risk to the purity of ‘faṣāha’ (good usage) of Arabic language which carries Islam principles and rules. As a measure of protection, these grammarians “…started to pinpoint the ‘faults’ (lahn) of the urban speakers and are said to have relied on isolated bedouin speakers to fix the grammatical rules of Classical Arabic” (Miller, 2007: 7). Any foreign interference was then obstructed by Arabic specialists. Their duty, at that time, was to fix and codify the ‘purest’ linguistic Arabic features for the sake of preserving the sacred Koran, in addition to the prophet Mohamed’s speech and Islam religion in general. The study of Arabic dialects at that time is designated today as traditional Arabic dialectology.

1.2.2. Urban Dialectology

Synchronic studies came under heavy criticism from the mid–sixties onwards. A new era of language investigation was inaugurated by William Labov. By turning the linguistic theory upside down, this scientist centralised speech variability in his examination of language. Wardhaugh (2010: 3) reports Pinker’s (2007) view on the fact that despite the

5 See 1.2.2
frequent linguists’ theorisation about a language “… as if it were the fixed protocol of a homogeneous community of idealised speakers, like the physicist’s frictionless plane and ideal gas, they also know that a real language is constantly being pushed and pulled at the margins…” in various ways by different speakers. Wardhaugh (ibid) then comments: “It is just such ‘pushing and pulling’ that interests Labov…” Far from being chaos or disorder, linguistic variability means structuredness within language: parole (or performance) is, for Labov and his followers, ruled by an organised heterogeneity. Certainly, Labov’s language approach has provided a very contributory answer to the question (see 1.1) of whether there is a relationship between extralinguistic and linguistic variation. Linguistic structures (also variables or patterns), for Labov, are systematically conditioned by extra-linguistic elements in society; their study is undertaken only and only if they naturally correlate with some social factors. The linguistic variable could be lexical, grammatical or in terms of pronunciation. A social factor or variable, for instance, may be social class, style, gender, age, or social network (see 1.2.4). Linguistic structures in regular correlation with social variables are known as sociolinguistic variables. This correlation means that there is an organised sociolinguistic variation which paves the way for language change (see 1.1). The treatment of sociolinguistic variation and change has, since then, come under the heading of sociolinguistics.

This discipline has evolved parallel to the advent of technology. Machinery inventions have been increasingly coming out at the expense of manual use. The result has been arithmetic: in noteworthy short time, gigantic amounts and numbers are attained. Machines have saved time and effort by means of their quantifying systems. Sociolinguists have seized the opportunity to take advantage of quantification. Later, dialectologists have, holding sociolinguistic trend out as a model, reappraised their traditional methodology in response to serious objections made, for instance, to their way of collecting data: there were time-consuming surveys due to long questionnaire compilation; questionnaires were generally fixed for eliciting one word-responses for map accomplishment; many surveys required multiple fieldworkers who did not match the same script; the lack of technological materials pushed the fieldworkers to rely on their memory and immediate elicited data transcription. The use of recordings was the solution for dialectologists to stock relaxed and continuous speech for later script and recurrent verification. Examining mindfully linguistic daily variability turned likewise possible, together with economising time, effort and data. In addition, scholars have voiced criticisms of dialectological restriction on collecting data and data collecting only with sole reliance on the regional factor. The informants had to be non-
mobile, old and rural males. Sociolinguistic techniques have allowed dialectologists to promote and pursue their data collection by a subsequent systematic analysis of also mobile, young and urban females’ speech from different social layers. Patently, a shift in interest has taken been towards urban areas, giving birth to urban (or social) dialectology, while rural linguistic production was put aside. Further reasons related to the significance of the scientific investigation within the urban setting (Britain, 2009, 2003b) are outlined as follows,

1. Switch has been to the larger numbers of representatives in urban areas. Attaching a lot of importance to quantification has been also motivated by the fact that “social groups in the speech community may differ from each other not qualitatively, by using completely different dialect forms from each other, but quantitatively, by using different proportions of dialect variants in their speech” (Britian, 2003b: 1).

2. Political attention has been drawn by social issues (such as gender, age, ethnicity) which massively conglomerate in the urban context.

3. Urban areas have been viewed as centres of diversity and contact which lead to linguistic variation and change. By contrast, rural localities are static and isolated areas, and helpless in understanding language variation and change.

In the case of urban Arab world, Arabic urban vernaculars have had a considerable role in the Arabic history (Miller, 2007). What is meant by vernaculars is “…relatively homogeneous and well-defined NON-STANDARD varieties which are used regularly by particular geographical, ethnic or SOCIAL GROUPS and which exist in opposition to a dominant (…) STANDARD variety (…)” (Swann et al, 2004: 327). Since the Arab world is geographically remarkably heterogeneous with its various kinds of urban centres as well as national/ social structures and different language situations (Miller, 2007), labovian paradigm has proved useful in enriching Arabic sociolinguistics with the necessary methods and techniques to deal more objectively with Arabic varieties.

1.2.3. Sociolinguistic Dialectology

Urban dialectologists have been reproached for disregarding the linguistic examination in rural areas and addressing their quasi-total attention to language as it manifests within cities. Abandoning the outer zones by dialectologists has even affected their investigation which lacks connecting dialectological variation to the inner city-spatial factor. Although the
Arab world dialectologists have the most susceptible approach to the inner sociolinguistic city geographies (Britain, 2009) (see below), still very few urban dialectological studies consider geographical variation inside the city. In fact, different studies on urban and rural areas demonstrate that both contexts are subjected to social and linguistic processes-induced change. No difference between the two is absolute, but only quantitative. Britain (2009) confirms that the very identical processes and conflicts (cultural, economic, social and political) can have impact on rural areas in the same way as they influence urban centres; “… our job as social dialectologists is to unpick and deconstruct those forces which are causing language variation and change to operate with different outcomes in different places” (ibid: 238). Counter-urbanisation (see 1.3.3) is an illustration of this. The phenomenon invokes linguistic change via innovations, more rapidly in rural areas in question than it does in their contiguous urban areas (see 1.3.3). It happens also that urban areas could be linguistically as conservative as many rural areas described in the literature. Liverpool is one exemplary urban setting that has been strongly resistant to new linguistic diffusion and levelling⁶ (ibid).

Obviously, urban dialectology has remarkably got inspired from the disciplines of sociolinguistics and rural dialectology which both have and follow different ways when approaching language. Notwithstanding their contrasts, they are still complementary scientific fields since thorough language understanding is not achieved without their combined effort. Their different approaches do not hinder their overlapping objectives either. Trudgill (1999) attests co-operation between sociolinguists and traditional dialectologists for the purpose of a better comprehension of linguistic phenomena. Chambers and Trudgill (1998: 15) add:

“… neither of the positions traditionally assumed by linguists and by dialectologists underwent a kind of radical change that swung it towards the other position. Instead, the rise of sociolinguistics provided dialectologists with natural allies and broadened the constituency studying language variation.”

---

⁶ See 1.4.2.2.2
The meeting point of sociolinguistics and dialectology is sociolinguistic dialectology, a field which, of course, considers both rural and urban areas. Certainly, it has, just like many social sciences, colossally benefited from the growth of highly technological quantitative means which has played a great role in statistical data provision and treatment. Sociolinguistic dialectology was introduced to Europe by Trudgill (1974)’s study on Norwich in England (reported in Britain, 2009). However, “… just over a decade …, and thousands of miles away from England, a tiny island in the Arabian Gulf was given equal prominence in sociolinguistic research, this time at the hands of Clive Holes, then an ‘alien’ researcher in the State”\(^7\). This was the starting point of sociolinguistic dialectological studies in the Arab World. This matter will be more detailed shortly.

In sum, dialectology has gone through different stages during its evolution. It has started as traditional dialectology whereby interest has been in collecting data solely. It has been generally used alternatively with rural dialectology since traditional dialectologists, at that time, confined their work to rural areas. Subsequent dialect scientists have realised the importance of studying varieties in urban settings, within the field of urban dialectology. dialectal approaches to different social variables have led, in urban areas, to another alternative terminology of the field as urban (or social) dialectology. Both branches of dialectology, rural and urban, have been criticised for their geographical restrictions. Rural dialectology has exaggerated the extent of researches in rural areas whereas urban dialectology turned its nearly entire attention to urban areas. Cooperation between sociolinguistics and dialectologists has given birth to sociolinguistic dialectology which presently covers the two disciplines. Sociolinguists use dialectological data for their analysis and dialectologists make use of modern sociolinguistic methods and techniques for data collection.

Although Britain (2009), on the other hand, believes in the non-restriction of linguistic change to urban areas, he recognises that the significant sociolinguistic processes are highly perceptible and intense in those areas. Miller (2007) substantiates the fact that cities constitute areas where contact and heterogeneity prominently occur and where the nucleus of language variation and change study has taken place since the 60s. As part of sociolinguistic dialectology, we are particularly interested, here, in contact dialectology (see 1.2.5) within an urban setting (Oran) (see 2.5.2.2).

\(^7\) Al Wer and Jong, eds (2009: ix)
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1.2.3.1. Sociolinguistic Arabic Dialectology

Although the systematic study of language variation has only started with the emergence of Labovian sociolinguistics in the 1960’s, variation in Arabic language had been, as indicated previously, already evoked in the very earlier times. Arabic language was a highly-sought after phenomenon by various traditional scholars, such as grammarians (like Sibawayh in the 8th c), philosophers (like Farabi in the 9th-10th c), philologists (like Ibn Jinni in the 10th c), theologians (like Ghazali in the 11-12th c), historians (Ibn Khaldoun in the 14th c) and others (see Baccouche, 2006). These researchers left themselves open to several criticisms with regard to their language thinking. Far from doubting their rational aptitude, Baccouche (2006) wonders why such classical scholars were content with only stable Arabic features. He, therefore, holds some reservations about their approach to Arabic variation. His arguments are extracted from the Koran, Prophet Mohammed’s sayings and history.

In response to the highest degree of ‘purity’ supplied to Quraysh’s dialect, the dialectologist evokes the historian fact that the prophet Mohammed was raised by a caregiver from another tribe, known as the tribe “banu: sa’d ibn bakr” for, one among other reasons, the purity of its dialect. Baccouche raises the question of whether or not this tribe’s dialect was purer than that of Quraysh. His second argument is grounded in two prophet’s sayings. The first saying is ‘nazala l-qur’a:nu bi sabʕati ahrufin kulluha: ka:fin ja:fin’ Koran is revealed in seven dialects, all sufficient and satisfactory. The second saying is “χa:tiibu-nna:sa bima jafhamu:na” talk to people by means of what they understand. Obviously, variation is recognised by the prophet, but denied by the ancient scholars. The strongest argument is taken out from the holy Koran; the point is /r iħlatu aʃ-ʃita:i wa aš-ʃijfi/ journeys by winter and summer (verse 2/Quraysh The Quraysh: Surah 106)\(^8\): That is, Qurachites were accustomed to moving to the North in summer and South in winter for the purpose of trade. Their tribe, on the other hand, used to receive pilgrims even before Islam and organise a religious, commercial and cultural fair known as ‘ʕokad’ دكان. Logically, Qurachites were in a constant contact with non-Qurachites, and their dialect in this case stood impossibly isolated or pure.

Additional arguments are given by Owens (2001) against Sibawayh’s view in the latter’s Kitab book (8th c) vis-à-vis linguistic variation. The author (2001), despite the

\(^8\) Translated by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (2000: 554)
opposition of Sibawayh to Arabic heterogeneity, notices a considerable presence of the concept (heterogeneity) in Kitab, and gives his own interpretation in the form of types and categories of linguistic variation. First, he finds that Sibawayh considers variation as internal or external. The source of the internal type comes from Sibawayh’s linguistic theory. He takes as an illustration the topicalised noun and says that it occurs in nominative case; “… but, according to the logic of linguistic rules, it may equally be accusative” (Owens, 2001: 421). The external variation is interpreted by Owens according to its link with different referential groups. These references are outlined as categories which are seven in number. They are,

(a) Areal - tribal variation (hiğāzī vs. tamīmī), e.g. mā al-ḥiğāziyya
(b) Tribal variants, e.g. Banū Sulaym
(c) General group, e.g. “Bedouins”, ‘arab
(d) Unspecified groups, e.g. “some”, “some Arabs”, “someone whose Arabic I trust”
(e) Groups defined by other linguistic characteristics, “those who say x also say y”
(f) Majority groups, common knowledge, e.g. a form is “better known” (’aˇraf) or “more common in speech” (’aktar al-kalām)
(g) Sībawayh(i)’s evaluative criteria, e.g. “good Arabic”, “eloquent Arabs”

Said differently, categories (a) and (b) hold a geographical or social background; (c) recognises the normative presence of bedouin variety; (d) refers to possible idiolects with a normative value; (e) certifies that sets of features could be related to one feature which is stereotypically related to one given group. Here, Owens (2001) comments on Sibawayh’s non-specificity of the point; (f) implies that the degree of numerical expansion can play a decisive role in selecting a given form rather than other ones; (g) shows that Sibawayh opts for Arabic grammar institutionalisation by discarding what he evaluates as negative from what he sees as positive in the language. Another point tackled by Owens (2001) supports Baccouche (2006)’s position in relation to the prophet’s first saying mentioned above: He (2001) finds that traditional grammarians themselves including Sibawayh had the tendency to institutionalise some types of Arabic grammatical variation. Owens illustrates by referring to the several ways of reading the Koran, qirāʾāt.

Still, we may add here other arguments from the Koran per se to join our voice to the above criticisms. The first one is the verse: “And among His signs is the creation of the
Heavens and the earth, and the variations in your languages and your colours: verily, in that are Signs for those who know.” (Verse 22/ Ar-Roum: The Romans: Surah 30)9. Clearly, the Koran identifies language variation as a universal fact which is escaped by traditional works. On the other hand, ancient Arabic scholars were in fact aware of the existence of linguistic variation, but their recognition of the situation was hardly ever proclaimed, for fear of any alteration that may mainly strike the Koranic content. Again, “We have, without doubt, sent down the Message; and We will assuredly guard it (from corruption)”10 (verse 9/Al-Hijr: The Rocky Track: Surah 15). On the basis of this verse, it is strongly believed by most Muslims that no alteration would occur to the Koran, even if Arabic variation is recognised; yet, this fact seems ignored by classical Arabic language books.

The effect of ancient scholars’ Arabic language works has been long-dated upon the subsequent generations. The Arab world has inherited these researchers’ negative perception of linguistic variation. Modern Arabic dialects have been long viewed ‘corrupt’ and stigmatised in reference to traditional Quoraych’s dialect or Classical Arabic (CA). However, their relationship with CA has been at issue since the Arabic renaissance in the 19th c. Two viewpoints have since then emerged vis-à-vis this sociolinguistic situation. Their opposite positions have raised a debate between their group holders. The first group supports CA and tends to pursue the path of ancient purists. They see that any attempts at Arabic dialect promotion threatens the presence of CA, and this is no more than a remote colonial project for the purpose of eliminating the Arab-Muslim identity.

The second group view CA learning as a torture and frustration because of its theoretical complex structures, which are useless in daily life (see 2.5.1.2). They call upon promoting the dialect since it is vital, naturally acquired, and therefore far from difficulty. This group often conceives Arabic dialects and their linguistic self-identification, on the basis of roman vernaculars. Through sociolinguistic studies, describing situations such as diglossia (see 2.5.1.1) has allowed weakening the above debate and reconsidering, rather than divergence, convergence between Arabic vernaculars and CA. This is especially after observing the prevalence of a whole Arabic continuum (see 2.5.1.1) instead of a gap between the Classical and Dialectal Arabic varieties.

---

Chapter One

The pioneering work within sociolinguistic Arabic dialectology was endeavoured by Holes Clives in the 70s. Arabic dialects in Bahrein were insightfully researched by the investigator in terms of language variation and change. His variationist study has become a basic and influential source for many later dialectological researches. Indeed, Arabic dialectology has taken a leap forward since the last decades by the provision of various sociolinguistic studies: some Arabic dialects are identified and described together with other dialectal phenomena paving the way for comparative dialectological analyses. Miller (2004a) explains however that systematic linguistic considerations are not equally experienced by Arab countries, but progressively in the making. A later evaluation by the writer (2007) is related to the international workshop on Arabic urban vernaculars that took place in Aix en Provence (France) in October 2004. This opportunity allowed the meeting of many researchers from different parts of the world. They, all, agreed that despite the scientific efforts, “it was clear that the challenge of reaching a more analytic and synthetic perspective based on commonly recognised firm grounds had still a long way to go before its realisation” (Miller, 2007: 3-4). The continuous scholarly interest in the appropriate linguistic features [foğha] (good Arabic)\(^\text{11}\) maintained the negative attitudes towards linguistic diversity, a fact which slowed down the autonomous prevalence of Arabic dialectology during several centuries.

Subsequently, the long-standing description of CA has proved insufficient, within the field of language variation, without taking the dialect study into account. What sociolinguistic Arabic dialectology has come to provide is complementary data by studying the linguistic levels of vernaculars and their use. Abboud-Haggar (2006) goes further to say given that Arabic colloquial varieties can authentically reflect societal situations, these dialects form the key to understand language as a social phenomenon, and thus gain the position of being the very core of sociolinguistics. Before turning one’s attention to contact dialectology (see 1.2.5), it is worth tackling the correlation between linguistic variation and social variation, which will probably enhance understanding of this field (contact dialectology) and, of course, dialect contact (1.4) processes, the focal point of this study.

\(^{11}\) It refers to CA
1.2.4. Sociolinguistic Variation

A tight correlation is identified between the outer and inner language forms. While a speech community “…is a group of communicating individuals who are potentially able to communicate by their knowledge of language varieties and speaking rules” (Abboud-Hagggar, 2006: 439), difference is highly observed in their language spoken use. No two speakers use their shared language in exactly the same way: every single speaker possesses his own idiolect. Generationally, any young speaker has a distinct way of employing language from his parents who do not speak alike either. At the occupational scale, a doctor differs from a computer scientist or accountant in his language use and speech of each speaker varies in accordance with his place of origin, social class and/or religion. Their way of using language depends, on the other hand, on whether they are at work, home or in the market. All these actual facts make language, which changes over time, variable through space. In brief and as mentioned earlier (see 1.1), language variation is stylistic, social or regional.

Socially, western communities are stratified. Trudgill (2000: 25) defines social stratification as “…any hierarchical ordering of groups within a society especially in terms of power, wealth, and status”. Each social class relates to a variety, or more precisely sociolect. Sociolects supply linguistic clues by means of which the speaker’s social class is identified. In British English, ‘I done it yesterday’ and ‘I did it yesterday’ (Trudgill, 2000) are grammatically different. The first is associated with a lower social background than the second. Another example has to do with /t/-glottaling. /t/ is pronounced as a glottal stop mostly by all working-class speakers. It is less prevalent among lower-middle-class speakers, and much lesser employed by upper-middle-class speakers. Upper-class speakers usually preserve the alveolar fricative pronunciation of the phoneme. Despite the observable linguistic differences among social classes, the idea of incorporating the concept of social stratification in language research was ignored in the past, due to its seeming complexity. Linguists found it heterogeneous, and correspondingly difficult to handle the up-and-down mobility among the members of social classes. As a part of the variationist movement, Labov and his followers have approached the ‘orderly heterogeneity’ of language in relation to social class. This fact has, finally, allowed detecting the linguistic forms that distinguish and correspond to each single social class.

Nevertheless, social classes are not worldwide. While western societies are socially stratified, many non-western communities are not. Arabic societies represent a typical...
example of this: Unlike western sociolinguistics, Owens (2001) observes, social hierarchical approaches are almost non-existent in Arabic sociolinguistics, despite the presence of some very few social class-works (like, Haeri, 1991) (reported in Owens, 2001). The reasons may be various. First, such inapplicability, which is viewed by Dendane (2006) as a challenge for certain primary sociolinguistic concepts, goes back, for the same author, to the way Arabic speaking communities are structured with no patent socio-economic bordered layers. Second, unlike Standard English, for instance, which is daily spoken by many members of British higher social classes, Modern Standard Arabic (see 2.5.1.2) or Classical Arabic is the mother tongue of no member of the Arabic community. As an example, Dendane (2006) believes that if Labov’s theory has effectively participated in displaying some sociolinguistic models in the speech community of Tlemcen “..., in particular those regular patterns of variable (?), ..., in relation to ... age and gender, we have not been able to elicit any social stratification of [?]-use, as is the case with post-vocalic r, for example, in Labov’s work on the speech of New York City (1966)” (ibid: 295-6). The writer concludes that Tlemcenian Arabic speakers’ social position does not correlate with the glottal stop such that it is far from causing any social differentiation on the basis of this variable. Third, the prevalence of diglossic situation (see 2.5.1.1) hinders the formation of sociolects. Fourth, prestige lies in the use of foreign languages (such as French in North Africa and English in the Middle East) (see 2.5.1.2).

Another aspect of language variation correlates with gender. Human race is categorised into either male or female. Physical appearance makes it easy to recognise the individual sex: the man is distinguished from the women, the husband from the wife and the son from the daughter. As a rule, men and women do not behave alike. Their difference in behaviour approves their categorical membership. They think differently, clothe and also speak in a distinctive way. Through socialisation12, their distinctiveness can be developed. They acquire their proper social behaviour, including the linguistic one. In what follows, the term gender will be adopted, indicating male and female categories discerned by virtue of their social role. Sex which distinguishes the human categories on the basis of biological features will be out of use in this study. The relationship between the two concepts is that sex is a biological classification on the basis of reproductive potential while gender is the social representation of this biological notion (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 2003).

12 It is “…the process whereby infants are transformed into socially acceptable members of society” (Wallace and Wallace, 1989: 62)
In fact, gender distinction is exhibited in any human language. Lexically, kinship is reflected in paired terms respectively in French and English: nephew for male and niece for female. In Spanish, brother refers to male and sister is marked for female. Likewise, gender-marking prevails in grammar. In pronouns, you in Algerian Oran Arabic is masculine as opposed to feminine. Other linguistic forms occur, as well, according to gender. Concerning pronunciation, (2000) makes reference to a north-east Asian language called Yukaghir in which the male /tj/ and /dj/ match respectively the female /ts/ and /dz/. Linguistic distinction according to gender constitutes one part of our fieldwork (for instance see 4.5.1).

Still a further social factor worth considering is age. In his Course of General Linguistics, (1916), as indicated previously, propounds language analysis from synchronic and diachronic perspectives. The Saussurean dichotomy is a breakthrough in elucidating the relationship between variation and change of language. The variationist paradigm insists on the dissimilarities of synchronic language states: observing speakers of different generations provides evidence of language variation which, according to apparent time hypothesis, implies language change in progress. The principle of apparent time considers that speakers of different ages belong to different times. A synchronic generational comparison sheds light on language growth over time. (2003: 35) state it differently,

“..., the speech of a 75-year-old of today represents the speech of an earlier period than does the speech of a 50-year-old or a 25-year-old. Comparing these three speakers synchronically allows the researcher to draw diachronic inferences about developments over the last 50 or so years”

Much evidence also comes from conducting a later real-time investigation. Apparent time principle is further confirmed by replicating another investigation on the same generation under study, over a relatively distant time and comparing the results of the two works. That is done by (1988) (reported in Milroy and Gordon, 2003) to confirm his results in Norwich. Indeed, he realised that the centralisation of /ɛ/ preceding /l/ (as in well) which is rising in frequency among one given generation, was before 15 years existent among the
pronouncers of this same generation\textsuperscript{13}. To recapitulate, comparing the speech of a given generation with the one of the same generation sometimes later is a real-time research and may be highly time-consuming. Therefore, apparent time alternative is conducted by variationists\textsuperscript{14} to study within a shorter time lapse language change through generational linguistic differences.

Contrasting the western world, regarding age, with the Arab world (Miller, 2007) demonstrates that, in spite of the major number of the youth in urban Arab society, the Arab family conservatism grants their youngsters less liberty and public appearance. The western family, on the other hand, opts for change via the youth. Nowadays however, observable realities are increasingly revealing the technological influence on the Arab youth’s behaviour. A lot of western world perception carried over the media and internet has been absorbed by the Arab youth. Referring specifically to the Middle East, Arab youngsters survive contradictory patterns swinging between tradition and change (Miller, 2007). The demographic preponderance of the young generation makes it, therefore, interesting to consider the latter’s linguistic behaviour. Which language features are subjected to conservation and which are exposed to change is worth exploring. The reasons behind their synchronic states need also meditation. Frequently, cultural and linguistic patterns in connection with the youth are engrossed in songs, films and literature. “…, but still most sociolinguistic descriptions provide a very conventional and restrictive description of the Arabic urban reality” (Miller, 2004a: 10).

It is, on the other hand, comparatively noticed by Miller (2007) that research on youngsters’ speech is more productive in North Africa than the Middle East. Young North Africans’ varieties are largely tackled in relation to social and cultural factors. Code-switching among the members of this age-group and their lexical creation are widely investigated in parallel with the valorisation of colloquial Arabic (such as Moroccan Arabic) (ibid). The present study is another tentative contribution in North Africa and apparent time research which helps understand koine (see 1.4.1) development among young speakers (see 2.6.1) in Oran speech community.

Social network is a different social factor that is more and more exploited. The idea, which originates from social anthropology, has acquired the multidisciplinary status after widely inspiring non-social anthropologists. It has been advanced since the sixties by

\textsuperscript{13} Children between 10 and 15 years old  
\textsuperscript{14} Linguists who specialise in the study of language variation
language scientists who have extended its use into their domains. Variationist sociolinguistics\footnote{A branch of sociolinguistics which deals with language variation} is a particular discipline which shows a specific interest in the concept. It views the concept as “…the pattern of informal relationships people are involved in on a regular basis” (Holmes, 2008: 194).

Any type of social network is associated with density and plexity. Density lies on the frequency of interaction between the members of a social network. If each member autonomously knows and contacts the other, their social network is dense. Plexity has to do with the number of relationships that connect a person within his network. A multiplex social network affiliates individuals with manifold relationships. Neighbours can be cousins and, at the same time, can be friends who work with one another. In case one-to-one relationships exist, the social network is uniplex. Description of a social network depends on the density and plexity of its type. The more the members interact and establish relationships, the more dense and multiplex becomes their network, and the closer are their knit ties. These individuals are said to belong to a strong social network. Conversely, the less they get in touch and the less they preserve links, the looser are their knit ties and the weaker becomes their network. Generally, social networks exert influence over language use. Strong social networks tend to foster localised linguistic models and withstand different forces coming from outside (Milroy and Gordon, 2003). Weak social networks, by contrast, are more open to external influences and support some language change types (ibid). In the working class zone of Belfast, Ballymacarett, the men’s social network is stronger than that of women. Men work with their relatives, neighbours and mates in the local shipyard, and can therefore maintain their vernacular elements. Yet, women work further in the city with people who are neither neighbours nor relatives but only colleagues. Therefore, their speech is more subjected to change (Holmes, 2008). On the other hand, it is possible that adult speakers have multiple networks, Holmes (2008: 195) explains,

“When adults belong to more than one network, they may signal this by unconsciously altering their speech forms as they move from one context to another. A student, for example, may find she uses more standard forms with her friends at university, and more local, vernacular forms when she
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goes home to the small town or village where her family lives.”

The concept of social network is adopted by variationists because they find it advantageous (Milroy and Gordon, 2003) in

1. studying minority groups in terms of ethnicity, migration, rural speakers and population from non-industrialised communities.
2. understanding the social dynamics that incite language variation and change.
3. observing variation among individuals (Milroy, 1992) rather than groups (Labov, 1972)

Following 1.2.3, it is broadly believed that rurality is related to conservatism while urban centres are described as innovative areas. It is also said that conservatism is the feature of strong networks but the ideas of innovation portray weak networks. Weak and strong networks, again, do not necessarily and respectively match urban and rural areas. Many strong networks, characterising different sub-communities, are encountered in cities.\footnote{16 For further reading see Britain (2009: 232)}

A different social variable is religion (see 2.5.1.1). Religious affiliation can have an important impact on one’s language use. In Ireland, “Catholicism has been shown to be a central marker of group identity and a factor which shapes language behaviour (McCafferty, 2001)” (Swann et al, 2004: 262). The social distance that exists, for instance, between some Indian castes from the same area has induced religious-based linguistic differences (Spolsky, 1998). A second example is that a sectarian differentiation in Bahrain prevails between Si’i and Sunni Bahrainis. The Si’i represent the old inhabitants who speak a sedentary dialect. The Sunni whose dialect is bedouin constitute, as a matter of fact, the bedouin group (Miller, 2004b). Generally speaking, religious groups avoid melting with other distinct groups and this fact keeps their dialects distinct as well. Does religion have impact on evolution of dialectal features in Oran? Tentative answers are provided through our recodings (for example see 3.2.1).

Contextually, language varies depending on the kind of the situation, written or spoken. Language choice is also constrained by the formality of this situation. Different language varieties, known as styles, are found to fulfill the requirements of spoken situations,
according to whether these situations are formal or informal. In each of them, the role of
participants’ relationships, the topics as well as the setting, all, interfere in determining the
style selection. In western speech communities, styles can form a continuum which ranges
from very formal to informal style. A great deal of linguistic differences is discerned among
styles. As an example in English vocabulary, *fatigued* tends to belong to formal style whereas
*tired* is informal and *whacked* very informal. In the grammar of English, formal situations are
more connected to passive forms (Trudgill, 2000). Diglossic communities are also
characterised by stylistic variation. The situation seems however different compared with
western communities. “[B]ecause of the diglossic character of the community, style
differentiation is not reflected along a standard-vernacular continuum as in the case of
standard-with-dialect western communities” (Dendane, 2006: 296)17. Stylistic variation plays
an undeniable role in the Oranees’ koine evolution (for example see 3.2.1)

More importantly in this study, dialectology has long concentrated, as said above, on
the investigation of various linguistic forms across geographical areas. This is probably
because one is much more attentive to regional discrepancies. Many speakers make fun of the
fact that X from one region refers to an object differently from them and Y from another
region names the same object in a further different way. One judges others’ kinds of speech as
similar to his, different or even highly different from it. Some kinds seem usual, some others
appear odd, and still some other kinds seem just different. If ever someone is met for the first
time, it can be easily detected whether one shares the same regional area with him, or this
person belongs to a different region. Wealth of clues is involved in his speech and can help to
answer where he is from. This is because language varies according to region. One linguistic
form which is known as variable could have different regional manifestations. The linguistic
variable is “…a linguistic item which has identifiable variants” (Wardhaugh, 2010: 145). In
pronunciation (Rowe and Levine, 2009), for example, mutually intelligible varieties around
the world possess different variants which meet under one variable. The Mexicans, who speak
Spanish, pronounce /ɾ/ in ‘gordo’ *fat* and ‘hermano’ *brother* with the flap of the tongue
against the alveolar ridge. The Cubans whose language is also Spanish, however, pronounce
/ɾ/ in the items as the lateral liquid variant [l]. In the case of English, the Americans
pronounce *news* as the variant [nuːz]; but, the British pronounce it as the variant [njuːz].
Grammatically, the Americans use the singular verb for collective nouns. The British opt for
the plural verb. Examples,

17 Deeper analysis is found in 2.5.1.1.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American English</th>
<th>British English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The faculty is meeting this afternoon</td>
<td>The USA Division are now hosting their own website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress is in session</td>
<td>The American congress are in session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester United is the champion</td>
<td>Manchester United are the champion British football team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British soccer team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From Rowe and Levine, 2009)

Table 1.4: Grammatical Variation according to American English and British English

Needless to say that variation also manifests as lexical. “Lexical variation concerns different signs for the same concept”\(^{18}\). As an example, a high degree of this variation is noticed in localised regional English dialects. This is the case of the standard form scarecrow to which correspond dialectal variants, such as bogle, flay-crow, mawpin, mawkin, bird-scarer, moggy, shay, guy, bogeyman, shuft, rook-scarer (Trudgill, 2000). If the varieties of such items come into contact, their linguistic levels get also into contact. In the section below, we try to expound the study of contact dialectology (see 1.2.5) introduced previously in order to reach, as already indicated, a better understanding of dialect contact, and more precisely koineisation.

Still regionally within the Arab framework, different settings are identified. Following a number of criteria, such as historical depth, impact of migration (see 1.3), degree of urbanisation (see 1.3.3) and koineisation (see 1.4.2), Miller (2004a, 2004b) differentiates between five principle archetypical Arab settings,

- Capital-cities, including Cairo and lately Casablanca, are famous for their early reception of massive population mobility. From the early 20\(^{\text{th}}\) c at least, their prestigious and well-established dialects have enjoyed a(n) (unofficial) national standard status, and are progressively spreading to adjacent regions. Today, the migratory impact on their urban vernacular development is becoming less important. The dialects are much more affected by [fogha] in their internal structure (e.g. palatalisation in Cairo) or external factors, such as age, gender and education. During

\(^{18}\) In Mesthrie, eds (2011:89)
the stage of urban standard variety acquisition, newcomers maintain and assign their original dialects to familiar home usage, while they employ the urban standard variety in other situations.

- Cities of countries, such as Lebanon and Algeria, have witnessed a recent demographic and political upheaval. The weight of rural and provincial population waves is sharp in such cities. Nevertheless, detecting the effects of recent migration seems to be an uneasy task. Whether the migrants will shift to the present urban dialect, maintain their dialects and participate in dialectal diversity, or contribute in establishing a new dialect is still questionable. Miller (2004a, 2004b) refers to the necessity of further information on these cities. Oran, the region under investigation, could be an illustrative Algerian city. The present study will probably shed light on the extent to which migration helps in the preservation of the original varieties and linguistic variability or serves the koine growth in Oran speech community.

- Old urban cities that know a post-independence-increase in the urban elite in parallel with considerable population renewal. The immediate effect relates to old urban dialects which are consequently decaying. Their linguistic present-day lack of prestige also hinders their acquisition by migrants who rather tend to use the urban koine (see 1.4.1). Many original urban inhabitants tend to become koine users too. They adopt this variety in public settings while confine theirs to home interactions. One reason is attitudinal and links the use of the old dialects to femininity (Dendane, 2006). These varieties are likewise losing their prestigious status among men. North African cities (like Fes, Rabat, Tlemcen and Tunis) are illustrative.

- New springing cities that have a mixed population and developing koine: Amman (Jordan) and Nouakchott (Mauritania) are two examples. The rate of in-migration is dramatic and several dialects coexist. Here, the different newcomers’ dialects will possibly contribute in the urban variety evolution. In the case of Amman, Jordanian and Palestinian varieties prevail simultaneously. While Jordanian men tend to retain their bedouin pronunciation, those from Palestine may shift to this pronunciation for the purpose of veiling their Palestinian identity (Abdel Jawad 1986, Sawaie 1994) (reported in Miller 2004a, Miller 2004b). The consequence is that Palestinian pronunciation will surely interfere. Due to the mix vocalic system, Al-Wer (2002)
(reported in Miller 2004a, Miller 2004b) indicates the emergence of a new urban koine among young speakers of Amman.

- Cities with a sharp rate of non-Arab newcomers: In Khartoum (Sudan), for instance, the non-Arab migrants use various levels of Arabic (from pidgin-creole to regional dialectal varieties). Their speech is said to be overwhelmingly in Arabic, although one can easily note their use of numerous non-standard Khartoum Arabic characteristics (Miller and Abu Manga, 1992) (reported in Miller 2004a, Miller 2004b). The same fact is noticed among their children who were born in Khartoum. Miller (2004a, 2004b) denotes a non-standard Khartoum urban variety in the making. Another example involves the Gulf cities (e.g. Dubai): Gulf Pidgin Arabic is the lingua franca (“A language variety used for communication among groups of people who do not otherwise share a common language, as English is lingua franca of the international scientific community” (Finegan, 1999: 591)) employed between native and non-native Arab speakers (Smart 1990, Wiswell 2002) (reported in Miller 2004a, Miller 2004b). Again Miller (2004a, 2004b) questions the extent to which this kind of pidgin Arabic may have an impact on the local urban vernacular and leaves (the author) the door open for further research.

1.2.5. Contact Dialectology

It mainly explores “…, the linguistic consequences of the contact of distinct but mutually intelligible varieties, …” (Britain, 2009: 238). Within this discipline of contact dialectology, koineisation processes (see 1.4.2.2) are mindfully involved as well as koine formation. In fact, the appearance of contact dialectology as a branch of variationist sociolinguistics is linked to the realisation of fundamental investigations on dialect contact which will be detailed in due course. Before however, one needs to identify the dialectal Arabic types that will be explored in this research. Contact dialectology gives also rise to fundamental concepts, mainly migration and urbanisation, whereby dialect contact emanates.

1.2.5.1. Genealogical Arabic Dialectology
What is meant by genealogical Arabic dialectology the study of dialectal sub-division of Arabic on the basis of Arabic speakers’ blood relationships. The first classification has long been attempted by early Arabic scholars such as Ibn Jinni (10th c), to protect the purest type of ‘Arabic’, as said earlier, from any foreign intrusion. Then, Ibn Khaldoun (14th c) has well developed this classification in his *The Muqaddimah* Prolegomena which has subsequently become the source of inspiration for many works. Literature displays that Ibn Khaldounian typology has been adapted by some dialectologists whereas wholly adopted by others. So, what is the background of this typology? For Ibn Khaldoun, people are either bedouin or sedentary. Who are bedouin people? The answer provided by Ibn Khaldoun is the following: Bedouin people are those individuals who are entirely content with fulfilling the basic needs of their life, those who “…restrict themselves to the necessary in food, clothing, and mode of dwelling, and to the other necessary conditions and customs” (ibid: 158), but certainly not those who reach luxurious possessions beyond their primary need (ibid). The latter people represent the second category of Ibn Khaldounian classification and will be outlined shortly below.

The Bedouins’ choice falls on the desert which is, for them, the most suitable place to meet their requirements. Those Bedouins who succeed in realising better ways of living go, in fact, through a transitional stage which will transform their life from bedouin to sedentary. In other words, the accumulating progress in living circumstances and realisation of more convenient and affluent standing make those people relax and prosper. Who are sedentary people then? They are, according to this writer “…the inhabitants of cities and countries, …. They earn more and live more comfortably than Bedouins, because they live on a level beyond the level of (bare) necessity, and their way of making a living corresponds to their wealth” (ibid: 157). It goes without saying that both Bedouins and Sedentaries are different among themselves too, in terms for example of power, space or population.

It is then evident that Man’s needs are either necessary or auxiliary. Unlike auxiliaries, life is conditioned by the necessary requirements without which this life is only imaginary: The essentials inevitably precede the luxuries and facilities. They are a fundamental prerequisite to comfort and ease which come comparatively in the second position (ibid). Drawing such a comparison between the two Ibn Khaldounian categories leads to the

---

19 He wrote his *The Muqaddimah* in the 14th c. The book was translated by Rosenthal in 1958 (the exact reference is given in the bibliography). This same reference is used whenever *Ibn Khaldoun* is mentioned throughout the present work.
conclusion that Bedouin people are prior to Sedentaries and constitute the essence of city creation (ibid). This means that any civilisation starts first as bedouin then, and through successful provisions of essentials, gradually moves to a sedentary life full of various facilities. In which category do the Arabs fit most? Are they bedouin or sedentary? Ibn Khaldoun describes them as individuals whose life relies on raising camels. The Arabs, for him (p158),

“... wander deeper into the desert, because, the hilly pastures with their plants and shrubs do not furnish enough subsistence for camels. They must feed on the deserts shrubs and drink the salty desert water. They must move around the desert regions during the winter, in flight from the harmful cold to the warm desert air. In the desert sands, camels can find places to give birth to their young ones. Of all animals, camels have the hardest delivery and the greatest need for warmth in connection with it.”

Therefore, the most brutal humans that have ever existed, according to Ibn Khaldoun, are the camel nomads. Unlike the Sedentaries, these individuals “… are on a level with wild, untamable (animals) and dumb beasts of prey. Such people are the Arabs”, the writer (ibid) explains.

If one now turns his attention to the second Ibn Khaldounian category, he realises that linguistically, the type of Arabic spoken in Islamic towns and cities is known as sedentary Arabic. The original non-Arab varieties of these areas got, after the spread of Islam, the status of foreign languages (see 1.2.1.1). Ibn Khaldoun joins the Ancient Arabic grammarians who stand against Arabic variation and change (see 2.5). For him, sedentary Arabic was permanently in contact with these ‘foreign’ languages, a fact which led to its corruption through its ruling modifications and word ending changes despite its semantic resistance to change. The concept is explained and detailed by Ibn Khaldoun (p748) as,

“The (linguistic) habit of the Mudar became corrupt when they (Arabs) came into contact with non-Arabs. ... the generation growing up heard other ways of expressing the
things they wanted to express than the Arab (ways). They used them to express what they wanted to express, because there were so many non-Arabs coming into contact with the Arabs. They also heard the ways in which the Arabs expressed themselves. As a result, matters became confused for them. They adopted (ways of expressing themselves) from both sides. Thus, there originated a new habit which was inferior to the first one"

When reconsidering the Koranic verse (verse 9/Al-Hijr The Rocky Track: Surah 15) (see 1.2.3.1) on the one hand and, on the other, the following Ibn Khaldoun’s view (p473): “It would almost have disappeared, if the concerns of the Muslims with the Qur’an and the Sunnah, which preserve Islam, had not (also) preserved the Arabic language”, the author obviously believes in that ‘corruption’ leading to variation and change in Arabic will not make the language vanish given that it is preserved in the Koran and Sunnah. One wonders again in this case why the phenomenon of language variation and change was not recognised as naturally legitimate by ancient Arabic scholars like Ibn Khaldoun. The answer requires much deeper meditation and research on ancient Arabic works. Due to time restrictions, this modest work will be content with leaving the question open to further investigations. Ibn Khaldoun (ibid) adds that this ‘corruption’ has turned perpetual and constant among sedentary Arabic of cities whereas it has been detached from the type of Arabic, the very sign of Arabism, employed in the desert. This Saharan type of spoken Arabic is called Bedouin Arabic. Quraysh tribe’s dialect which was bedouin was also regarded as the most correct and purest among all the Arabic dialects. For Ibn Khaldoun (p748) this was “… because the Quraysh were on all sides far removed from the lands of the non-Arabs. Next came (the tribes) around the Quraysh, … The Arabic dialects were used … for (linguistic) soundness or corruption according to the (degree of) remoteness … (…) from the Quraysh”.

Quraysh’ location was seen as deeply far in the desert, and as an Arab tribe, it was the production of the desert per se. Non-Arab races showed no interest in the tribe’s way of living nor were they captivated by their circumstances. They opted for keeping their distance with the tribe and this was the primary reason behind the purity of the Arab race (ibid). Ibn Khaldoun believes and adds that far from any mixture or corruption, the Arabs’ predigees are purely and correctly conserved, and this has, for example, to do with Mudar tribes particularly Quraysh. In sum, the source of Arabic dialect typology is language contact. Certainly,
sedentary dialects have emerged as a consequence of contact among Bedouin Arabic varieties. Yet, contact between bedouin dialects with non-Arabic languages has also and mainly caused their appearance. No means of talking then about Arabic dialect contact without referring to language contact (see 2.5.1). This classification is readapted and used by Marçais (1958) to refer to Arabic dialects employed in North Africa as follows: pre-Hilali(ian) dialects spoken by Sedentary Arabs who came for permanent stay in Maghreb, and Hilali(an) dialects, spoken by Bedouin Arab migrants who originated predominantly from the Arab Banu Hilal tribe. Although other adjectives, such as ‘urban’ and ‘rural’ have been, too, used by scholars to give further descriptive differentiation to Arabic dialects, Bouhadiba (1988) finds that urban dialects and rural dialects are generally and respectively equated with pre-Hilalian (sedentary) dialects and Hilalian (bedouin) dialects on the basis of historical considerations.

1.3. Migration

Changing the place of usual residence of an individual from one area to another is migration (Xu-Doeve, 2007). This long-standing phenomenon makes up an essential part of human societal infrastructure. Through history, population movements have gained a lot of intention and importance. Before the nineteenth century, migration was obstructed by many governmental decisions around the world due to its negatively stereotypical upshots. “…societies and communities adjusted to inflows and outflows of people and authorities tried to impose controls on population movements which they considered undesirable for social and economic reasons” (Pooley and Whyte, 1991: 02). Later on however, an increasing investigation on migration has been witnessed among scholars from various disciplines, such as demographers, sociologists, geographers, economists, psychologists, historians, linguists and others. The use of more rigorous and precise measurement of demographic mobility and identification of different migratory processes started to appear in the later nineteenth century as a consequence of statistical evolution such as population censuses (ibid). Pooley and Whyte (1991: 01) tend to ask a number of necessary questions while conducting a research on migration: how many, who, where and why? This fact entails a better understanding of migratory different outcomes (see 2.3). It is also seen worth contemplating these questions in this present study (see 2.2.3), so that the migratory linguistic consequences could be much better understood.
1.3.1. Parameters of Migration

A set of parameters namely space, time, motivation and some socio-cultural factors generally interfere in the exploration of migration. They are found in Lewis (1982) gathered and sub-divided in the form of the table below. Then, each element is sketched out apart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration Parameters</th>
<th>Sub-divisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Temporary migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seasonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>periodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>return migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>circular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Involuntary migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural Factors</td>
<td>Segregationists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.5: Migratory Parameters

As for motivation, population mobility is conducted for diverse and interrelated reasons. Some factors may be socio-economic (for example, work, studies, marriage). Some others are ecological (such as floods, droughts, earthquakes…) or political as in the case of war or national instability. These reasons imply that migration is either voluntary or involuntary (forced) which, both, induce a multilingual situation. Spolsky (1998) illustrates from the world. As for involuntary speakers’ movement:

- the British policy of moving indentured Indian workers to the Fijian sugar plantations, in the nineteenth century, has evoked Fiji’s current split between speakers of the indigenous Fijian dialects and Hindi-speaking descendants of the original plantation workers.

- the Soviet policy of forced population movements in the twentieth century has assured that many of the newly independent post-Soviet countries face a challenging multilingual issue.
Voluntary mobility has, on the other hand, brought significant linguistic changes throughout the world. The United States, one principal destination of voluntary people movements, has turned dramatically into a multilingual community. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the out-migrants were speakers of Spanish, Italian, German, Polish, Ukrainian, Norwegian, Yiddish, Japanese, Chinese, and Greek. (Spolsky, 1998)

Sometimes, it is not easy to know whether migrants move voluntarily or reluctantly. That is, the differentiation between forced and voluntary mobility may not be clearly made, due to the individual’s complex motivations (Kerswill, 2006a). Many traders may move to, what they find, undesired places owing to voluntary tendency to enhance their commercial activities. The remaining parameters are examined below.

1.3.1.1. Space

Migratory drives are usually individual. Moving from one area to a new one heavily relies on the migrant’s own decision which is a reaction to his current living conditions. Considering a total mass of migrants however is the general tendency of many demographic studies in their exploration of spatial interaction models (Lewis, 1982). Studying such spatial modelling aims at identifying, describing and explaining the migratory patterns of functional parameters (ibid). As the table above demonstrates, these parameters are essentially tackled, here, in terms of boundary, distance and direction.

Boundary: defining the term migration is generally associated with administrative borders. Boyle (1998: 34) (quoted in Kerswill, 2006a: 03) refers to this notion (migration) as “movement across the boundary of an areal unit”. Internal migration (or in-migration) indicates the population movement across a boundary within one given country (see 1.3.2). If the move is out of the areal unit (or country), it is called external migration. People who survive the former are in-migrants. Those participating in the latter are out-migrants. Contribution in the growth of capitalism is viewed as one significant consequence of external migration in the western world. Wealth of examples can be representative: In the 19th and early 20th centuries, the phenomenon of emigration to North America from Europe was huge (Pooley and Whyte, 1991). There has been also more recently an enormous degree of labour flows within industrial societies such as Canada and the United States (ibid). At the level of language, out-migrant groups, like in the United States, usually survive multilingualism (see
2.5.1.2) since they need to learn the language of the host country (Finegan, 1999). Another example is that multilingual situations may emerge because of the important foreign prevalence in some particular Arab countries such as Golf States. Kuweit, for instance, is a language community where the number of foreign speakers of various languages (such as Farsi, Filipino, Bengali, Hindi and Urdu) overtakes the one of local speakers (Bentahila, 2008).

Distance: Migration takes place over varying distances. Considering space allows discerning two types of migration in terms of distance: they are short-distance migration and long-distance migration. In contrast with long distance, short distance does not obstruct the preservation of social ties with the place of origin (Lewis, 1982). One associated variable with distance is one’s financial ability (Kerswill, 2006a). It determines whether the individual, who is willing to migrate, can pay his travel over a given distance between the zone of departure and the zone of destination. What is said about social ties can be valid for language behaviour. Remote points of origin possibly loosen dialect maintenance, but those nearby help to preserve one’s variety. On the other hand, distance frequently determines the degree of mutual intelligibility between the varieties: “…the cumulative effect of the linguistic differences will be such that the greater the geographical separation, the greater the difficulty of comprehension” (Chambers and Trudgill, 1998: 05).

Direction: Space implies direction. Migration could be rurally-rurally, rurally-urbanly, urbanly-rurally or urbanly-urbanly orientated. Immigration denotes mobile individuals (immigrants) who get to a region other than theirs. But, emigrants20 are those who leave their region towards another region. A weighty rural-urban migration has been experienced by the Arab world (see 2.2.3). Political events can be one intervening reason that engenders directional mass migration (Kerswill, 2006). After World War II, many Germans, who came from the eastern provinces of the former Reich, resettled in Germany. These migrants’ original dialect was consequently lost (reported in Kerswill, 2006a). Still sociolinguistically, mutual intelligibility can be unequal in both directions. Danes, for example, understand Norwegians better than the latter do the former. The reason is due to the fact that Norwegian is pronounced like Danish is spelt. Conversely, Danish pronunciation bears a more complex relationship to its own orthography (Trudgill, 2000).

---

20 The process is called emigration
1.3.1.2. Time

Needless to say that migration occurs on a range of timescales. A temporal approach to migration involves the degree of permanence: migration tends to be either temporary or permanent. Temporary migration could be split into: daily moves (daily migrants are commuters); periodic moves (spending regular limited periods out of the point of origin maybe for working, for instance); seasonal moves (such as nomad Africans who move following the seasonal changes); return migration (the migrant intends to go back to his hometown, for example, after finishing a work contract or getting retired); circulation (repetitive or rotary movements between the native and host communities in the short-term, such as home-returning for boarder students during the holidays and again going back to their university). As for permanent migration, it has to do with long-term movements (migrants who might not think of rejoining their place of origin). Temporally, this current work covers migration which is permanent.

Language variationist research has displayed effective language alteration led by temporal in-migratory categories. In the case of accommodation (“The process whereby participants in a conversation adjust their accent, dialect or other language characteristics according to the language of the other participant(s)” (Trudgill, 1992: 7-8)), short-term mobile speakers accommodate to the non-mobile speakers for a limited period of time. Long-term movements, however, results in permanent migrant’s accommodation, and thus language change. It is necessary to indicate that the informants under investigation are permanent in-migrants, permanent in-migrants’ children or permanent in-migrants’ grandchildren.

1.3.1.3. Socio-cultural Factors

Migrants are categorised into two classes on the basis of their cultural background and behaviour in the new society. They are either segregationists or participatory group. The first group members support intermarriage among themselves in reaction to the probable extermination of their group, but also restrict external contact via the strategies of segregation and reduction in outmarriage (Coleman, 1997) (reported in Kerswill, 2006a). Here, language maintenance21, a language contact phenomenon (see 1.4), occurs. In the United States, the

---

21 “...the situation whereby a language (often a transplanted minority language) is retained and used by speakers alongside, or instead of, a more dominant language” (In Llamas et al, eds, 2007: 219)
groups that preserve their languages were those whose rights to social life were constrained by discrimination. As an illustration, the indigenous Native Americans and Spanish-speaking immigrants were frustrated from access to jobs, housing and education, but in fact they were also prevented from direct access to English assimilation\(^\text{22}\) (Spolsky, 1998). Another example has to do with the Hopi Indians when allowing a number of Tewa Indians to migrate from the Rio Grande area to the Arizonan mesas (…), they actually induced, among nine that were Hopi-speaking, a bilingual village, Hano (ibid). Participatory group, on the other hand, aims to postpone marriage and emphasise low birth-rate in order to cope, as a minority group, with the difficult living conditions, invoke social mobility and incite material standing\(^\text{23}\); sociolinguistic outcomes arise. As an illustration, the immigrants’ languages and indigenous varieties of the United States faced English empowerment. Most of them were gradually declining given that their younger generation adopted English in the public private domains.

1.3.2. Internal Migration

Unlike subsistence and vagrancy-related migration which decreased from the early seventeenth century to the late eighteenth century, the subsequent migration processes to cities and towns as well as population flows within the countryside were persistent phenomena (Pooley and Whyte, 1991). Rural-urban mobility has, just like external migration, played a vital role in building industrialised societies in Europe during the later eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries. As an example, people’s movements in Scotland were driven by economic changes: “farm amalgamation and the reduction of cottar holdings coupled with substantial population growth in many rural areas were causing movement out of some country parishes ….” (Pooley and Whyte, 1991: 100). The principal industrial localities, such as the old cities of Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Dundee, attracted increasing numbers of countryside-background immigrants (ibid).

Sociolinguistically, population movements, in the twentieth century, from the countryside and small towns to the large metropolitan cities worldwide are seen as one major reason of bidialectal (see 1.4.4) and multilingual manifestations (see 2.5.1.2). In the latter case, this mobility to cities is making “…huge megalopolises, conurbations with populations in the millions, attracting complex patterns of multilingualism, and producing major problems

\(^{22}\) The adoption of English, which is the language spoken by the majority, by minority groups

\(^{23}\) (Coleman, 1997) (reported in Kerswill, 2006a)
for social, economic, and political development” (Spolsky, 1998: 53). This was also observed when large numbers of rural Berber speakers, in Algeria, migrated to large cities such as Algiers, Oran and Constantine after the national independence in 1962.

Regarding internal migration in the Arab world, it is seen as a post-independence phenomenon. During the colonial era, several Arab cities were mostly inhabited by Europeans. The local population constituted only a minority. It was until the second part of the twentieth century that a population renewal was taking place within the Arab settings. The former European inhabitants left but in-migrants who came from different parts of their country settled in cities. Demographic mobility incited the cities’ local inhabitants to rise dramatically. Owing to immense internal migration in Damascus, the number of its population remarkably went up. Following the Central Bureau of Statistics (reported in Hanadi, 2007), the number of city inhabitants was estimated at around 240,000 in 1917 and attained 1,516,000 (or even around 3.5 million including Greater Damascus) in 2002. As a result of in-migration in Casablanca, on the other hand, there was scored a prodigious growth of this Moroccan metropolis’ inhabitants jumping from around less than a million residents during the first half of the twentieth century to achieve more than four million inhabitants nowadays (Hachimi, 2007). The causes behind internal migration were mainly socio-economic and/or political. As for Damascus, the Syrian southern city is known for its large diversified commerce and manufacturing which have usually drawn important labour mobility from other different areas of the country (Hanadi, 2007). In Morocco, Casablanca was promoted as the conducting industrial and commercial port city, a fact that transformed the area to a pivot for demographic in-flows arriving in massive numbers from rural and urban localities (Hachimi, 2007). In Sudan, there was rapid expansion of labour market in some towns and need for labour supply. While the actual socio-economic situation attracted many migrants looking for money and job opportunities in this country, other newcomers however moved because of political reasons. They endeavoured to avoid the civil war in some Sudanese regions and its sequential famine (Miller and Abu Manga, 1992).

1.3.3. Urbanisation

Urbanisation is a process whereby a bedouin or rural migrant adopts a city-like life in the sense that he attempts to follow the norms of the city of his destination. For instance, he becomes city-style housed, obtains a job different from shepherd tasks, agriculture or fishing,
and gradually changes his way of clothing according to the fashion widespread in this new place (see Garnier, 1980). Urbanisation could be alternatively used with sedentarisation. Instead of urbanisation, on the other hand, counter-urbanisation may take place: “the move of (esp. middle class) residents out of metropolitan cities and into the countryside well beyond suburbia”\textsuperscript{24}. To illustrate, rural Northern European and North American countries have been subjected to population increase because of counter-urbanisation, or urban population movements to these places. One linguistic consequence of this process is already raised in 1.2.3 and approved by Britain (2009): External innovations get more fast-integrated in rural areas compared with their contiguous urban areas within one given region. Still, counter-urbanisation has not gained as much investigation and attention as urbanisation has.

On the other hand, ruralisation, alternatively used with bedouinisation, does or does not prevail in parallel with urbanisation. It happens that many rural migrants are described as urbanised for the only reason that they have settled a city. Yet, they in reality stick to their old living modes within the new place. As a consequence, many rural features of their original lifestyle are introduced, at the expense of their urban characteristic acquisition, into this migratory setting. Numerous examples are available throughout Algeria. One can observe that ruralisation has, in Oran for instance, engendered some living ways that seem strange to the Oranees and in many times inacceptable by the city members in their area. For Ibn Khaldoun (p160): “Sedentary people,… , have no desire for desert conditions, unless they are motivated by some urgent necessity or they cannot keep up with their fellow city dwellers”. New streets have penetrated Oran and which hardly ever meet the urban architectural norms. For a rural migrant, his immediate need dictates a house where one can live regardless of its appearance. His financial investment is drawn to the internal rather than external infrastructure. The rural inhabitants’ children happen to be bare-footed outside their big houses and ruralised villas: their favourite game objects are sand and stones. Their grand-father or even father may still wear a /šmaama/ traditional Algerian hat on his head. The rural inhabitant may create a job for himself out of the present city circumstances. His work is probably related to drinkable water distribution in sub-areas which suffer from water shortage. In doing this, he makes use of his old agricultural tractor to transport and sell water. Linguistically, bedouinisation may also widely take place in the Arab world, a phenomenon which will be treated shortly.

\textsuperscript{24} See Britain (2009: 232) for more exact references
Despite this, Ibn Khaldoun (p160) emphasises that sedentary grains are found within bedouin subsistence. It is bedouin life which starts first, as indicated in 1.2.5.1, then paves the way for sedentary life: the hardiness of desert life is prior to the smoothness of city life. Urbanisation is in fact the outcome of the bedouin’s long-term endeavours looking for a comfortable existence. The author (ibid) expounds,

“…, urbanisation is found to be the goal of the Bedouin.... Through his own efforts, he achieves what he proposes to achieve in this respect. When he has obtained enough to be ready for the conditions and customs of luxury, he enters upon a life of ease and submits himself to the yoke of the city. This is the case with all Bedouin tribes”.

In the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} cs, urbanisation has accompanied the prevalence of other different processes in the world. Many developed countries have known this urbanisation as a result of surviving industrialisation at the same time. Industrialised cities in England such as London, Manchester, Liverpool and Birmingham attracted many rural migrant labours. Other countries which have survived decolonisation have also experienced urbanisation afterwards. According to Cote (2005), there has been urbanisation of populations as well as countrysides and minds. Indeed, intensive population mobility has been witnessed to metropolitan cities. Countrysides on their part were the theatre of internal migration. Gradually, they have got humanly and materially greater. The urban ways of living (e.g. food, housing and clothing) have slowly penetrated into countrysides. Larger towns and cities have then appeared and spread everywhere. The movement of mind urbanisation has supervened through daily contacts as in commercial markets, via TV programmes and radio (media in general), through technology and so on.

As for the Arab world, urbanisation has permeated the area since the second half of the twentieth century: there has been a deep demographic transformation from majorly rural to presently majorly urban Arab population. For instance, once the Libyan oil reserves were discovered in 1955, there was an intensive urban area-orientated migration. The in-migrants who were basically bedouin left behind their early life and started a new one in Libyan cities, especially Tripoli. Their contribution was remarkable since it has turned Libya to one of the most highly urbanised Arab states (Pareira, 2007). In 2011 however, a civil war was launched
in the country, and changes have inevitably taken place. Determining these changes requires investigations in different fields, a fact which is out of the scope of this study.

Another case in point is Casa Blanca. The coastal city has been appointed as the economic capital of Morocco since the French occupation in this country. Urbanisation has resulted following the massive urban and rural migration towards Casablanca in the hope of finding more interesting manufacturing jobs (Hachimi, 2007). Although the concept of urbanisation and its characteristics have been investigated in many Arab countries, their linguistic consequences are still insufficiently identified and examined in the Arab World as a whole (Miller, 2007). Cadora (1992) is one among those few linguists who have dealt with this subject. Following Ibn Khaldoun, he argues that the Arab society has gone through different ecological and linguistic transitional phases. This transition covers a structural passage implying a one side-directed evolution from one state to another as follows,

Bedouin→Bedouin-rural→Rural→Rural-Urban→Urban

The author explains that this structural evolution is caused by contactual phenomena proceeding through migratory processes whereby the Bedouins settle near or in rural/urban localities, or rural groups reside near/ in urban areas. Linguistically, this linear development (from bedouin dialects to rural dialects to urban varieties) has been rejected by scholars, such as Miller (2007: 07) “…. given that many Arabic urban vernaculars went through a later bedouinisation process, which continued throughout the twentieth century (…)”.

1.4. Dialect Contact

Understanding dialect contact requires drawing a clear differentiation between this type of contact and language contact. The latter refers to a sociolinguistic situation in which two or more languages co-prevail in one specific area or speech community and this may make speakers of a given language enter (sub)consciously the characteristics of another distinct language into their own. In other words, language contact situations experience contact between genetically unrelated and mutually unintelligible varieties. For instance, many slave traders, from Africa to Americas, transplanted different African language-background speakers who subsequently survived a daily language contact. Still other contacts among traders (Africans, Europeans and Arabs) were on the level of some coasts of Africa (Trask, 2004). By virtue of their non-shared languages, they needed to develop pidgins:

25 In Llamas et al, eds (2006: 219)
instantaneously additional languages which were nobody’s mother tongues for communication purposes. The process whereby the mixing of genetically unrelated language varieties gives birth to a pidgin is pidginisation. In many different contexts, the pidgin varieties may grow to become mother tongues which in this case turn creoles. The process whereby the former is transformed to the latter is known as creolisation. The case of Algerian speech community also and deeply involves other various language contact manifestations mainly: diglossia (see 2.5.1.1), code-switching (see 2.5.1.3), multilingualism (or bilingualism) (see 2.5.1.2), and borrowing (see 2.5.1.4).

The dominant figure in the study of dialect contact is Peter Trudgill in the later 80’s. His widely influential book Dialects in Contact (1986) draws the very attention of sociolinguists, social psychologists, dialectologists and historical linguists, and has in many times led them to deeper investigation and debate within their fields of interest (Siegel, 1993). The source of his inspiration is Weinreich’s Languages in Contact (1953). Trudgill agrees with Weinreich on the assumption that contact leads to change. Nevertheless, he raises the issue of inadequacies in Weinreich’s work such that dialects stand at the centre of any language change which does not basically embody contact between mutually unintelligible varieties (see Kerswill and Williams, 2002). In other words, dialect contact situations entail not languages but dialects in contact: Contact, arising out of communicative interactions, among the speakers’ different but mutually intelligible varieties (Trudgill, 1992). The author (1986) also equates the importance of dialect contact as a research area with that of language contact.

However, Trudgill’s approach to account for dialect contact has been later criticised by Siegel (1993). One of the major weaknesses advanced against Trudgill’s work is that this dialectologist seems “…to be unaware of many previous studies on the topic of dialect contact, koines26, and koineisation27. Reference to several important works on particular koines would have, in fact, added support to his generalisations. For example Ferguson (1959b) …Blanc (1968)…” (ibid: 112) (see 1.4.1). Additionally, Siegel claims that Trudgill does not make an obvious distinction between the two types of, dialect and language, contact. He (1993) in fact believes that the book has remarkably missed covering two essential theoretical points to reach a more exhaustive description of dialect contact situations. The first point has to do with identifying the linguistic system types going through koineisation. The second issue embodies the differentiation between dialect contact outcomes and the outcomes

---

26 see 1.4.1
27 see 1.4.2
of language contact. He, in other words, indicates that Trudgill does not show the way of 
distinguishing the dialect contact consequences and those consequences of language contact 
even though the author (Trudgill) is constantly insisting on the importance of making such a 
distinction. Finally, Siegel acknowledges that inadequacies basically and inescapably affect 
any piece of scientific writing, and Trudgill’s book deserves to “…be praised more for what it 
has accomplished than criticised for what it has not. It has certainly underlined the importance 
of face-to-face contact in language change and provided the starting point for a theory of 
dialect contact with…many thought-provoking generalisations.” (Siegel, 1993: 119)

It is well-noticeable that subsequent dialect contact literature is foremost undertaken in 
the urban contexts of the western world (Miller, 2007). The Arab world is comparatively still 
thin on the ground. Again, this modest research aims at shedding light on some linguistic 
Arabic features that may be used to undertake other longitudinal dialect contact studies, and 
hence contribute to broaden the field above. As already said, if a number of dialects come into 
contact, consequential phenomena emerge. In what follows dialect contact consequences are 
further detailed and discussed.

1.4.1. Koine

Profound explorations which have been conducted by many scholars like Ferguson 
(1959b), Blanc (1968), Siegel (1985), Trudgill (1986), Siegel (1993), Britain (2001) and 
Kerswill (2002), to name but a few of the more basic works, have thrown new and unveiling 
insights into the imprecise definition of the concept koine.

Initially, the notion koine was modelled on the Greek term koinē, standing for 
common, which once denoted one form of the Greek language. During the Hellenistic and 
Roman eras precisely the latter variety functioned as the lingua franca (see 1.2.4) of the 
eastern Mediterranean. Its linguistic characteristics originated from different regional 
varieties, but rested more fundamentally on one of these varieties (Siegel, 1985). A 
subsequent use of the effectual term koine\(^{28}\) has covered a wide range of languages on the 
basis of some, and not all, of the features in common with the original koine. Ferguson 
(1959b), among others, refers to the Ancestor of modern Arabic dialects as Arabic koine for 
the same functional reason, which means that Arabic koine was employed as a lingua franca.

\(^{28}\) Trudgill (1986) and his followers tend to use koine alternatively with new dialect
He (1959b: 619) writes that “… the koine came into existence through a complex process of mutual borrowing (see 1.4.4) and levelling (see 1.4.2.2.2) among various dialects and not as a result of diffusion from a single source”. He (1959b: 617-8) explains that “…the full development of the koine coincided with this expansion, which brought about mingling of the original dialects, caused large numbers of speakers of other languages to adopt Arabic, and required intercommunication throughout the whole world of Islam.” In sum, Arabic koine, according to the writer, is the outcome of a mixture between mutually intelligible Arabic varieties with other mutually unintelligible languages (see 1.2.5.1). One can notice again the parallel occurrence of dialect contact and language contact.

On the other hand, Assyuti (15th c) (in Baccouche, 2006) elucidated the point that despite the widespread belief, among the Arabs, in the purity of CA, it was clear that the Qurayshites used to integrate the best elements of their visitors’ dialects in their own variety, and this was one reason why they were seen the best users of Arabic. The position of Assuyuti, for Baccouche (2006), is a confirmation of the hypothesis that Mekki’s (or Qurayshites’) dialect is a koine elevated by islam because it is the language of Koran. Nevertheless, comparing this variety with the Ancestor of modern Arabic dialects reveals that that they differ from each other with respect to numerous linguistic characteristics including some of its particular reductions on the morphological and phonological aspects (see Ferguson, 1959b). Siegel (1985) holds reservations about the interchangeable use of lingua franca and koine. He views this consideration as very broad and vague; koines basically bear the mixing processes which is not the case of all lingua francas. He insists, therefore, and finds it paramount that a lingua franca deserves the label koine only if it has gone through mixing.

Other scholars tend to employ the term koine when there is a degree of resemblance in form between the original koine and the variety in question. Blanc (1968) opts for the concept as the most appropriate to label the emerging language out of numerous dialects which are transplanted to a new setting. Being nativised, Israeli Hebrew, for him, results from contact between a variety of literary dialects together with diverse substrata, as well as many traditional pronunciations. He denies the presence of any one dominant and available dialect. Blanc (1968)’s use of the label koine has been again challenged by Siegel (1985). Unlike Ferguson’s definition of the term, Blanc describes it very specifically that the latter’s definition turns too narrow. Siegel (1985) stands against the assumption of confining koines to being standard, planned, geographical, secondary, or based fundamentally on one single
dialect. He (ibid) continues saying that if unplanned, nativised, or transported languages survive the mixing of whatever linguistic subsystems including regional dialects, literary dialects, and sociolects, they could be koines.

In brief, Siegel (1985) tends to say that the label *koine* is useful only if it embodies both linguistic and sociolinguistic criteria. He has offered a more thorough definition that has gone through revision and enhancement. Linguistically, features of several dialects constitute a koine that has known simplification (see 1.4.2.2.3) and reduction compared to the original varieties. Sociolinguistically, koines can be lingua francas or be attributed other functions, such as official, standard, first or second languages. It is differently cited by the author (2001: 175) as:

“...a stabilised contact variety which results from the mixing and subsequent levelling of features of varieties which are similar enough to be mutually intelligible, such as regional or social dialects. This occurs in the context of increased interaction or integration among speakers of these varieties”

Siegel (1985) shifts, next, to koine categorisation and finds it needful, too, to differentiate between two kinds of koines: regional koine and immigrant koine. Both arise out of contact between regional dialects. Regional koine is the original and “… remains in the region where the contributing dialects are spoken, although it may be used outside the region as a trade language with other linguistic groups”. While this type of koine does not supersede the prevailing dialects, the immigrant koine frequently becomes the migratory community’s primary language (ibid). It emerges out of contact not in the source areas of the contributing dialects, but another region where massive waves of different dialect-background speakers have permanently settled (ibid). Trudgill (1986) highlights the possibility of growth of a new dialect (or more precisely immigrant koine) within the migratory setting out of contact between two or among several closely related varieties.

Examples of the Arab world koines are numerous: The population movements and contact between mobile individuals has rendered the urban/rural distinction perplexing in contemporary Casablanca where a new dialect is consequently developing (Hachimi, 2007). On the other hand, internal migration to Tripoli, in Libya, has made its Arabic dialect
linguistically hybrid (Pereira, 2007). Libyan migrants in question have been usually rural; their linguistic impact has bedouinised the formerly sedentary-type dialect of Tripoli which nevertheless still holds some pre-Hilalian characteristics. The variety has been recently seen as a more a bedouin type (Tripolitan dialectal) koine (ibid). Another kind of koine, in the Arab world, is raised by Baccouche (2006). Owing to the media, mobiles, internet and other technological means of communication and exchange, Arabic varieties are converging and their mutual incomprehensibility is being reduced. In other words, one new koine is in the making throughout the wide Arab setting. This mainly covers Standard Arabic which is influenced by Dialectal Arabic at all linguistic levels (ibid).

1.4.2. Koineisation

1.4.2.1. Definition and Characteristics

The migration-subsequent process, whereby a koine emerges, is known as koineisation. It “leads to mixing of linguistic subsystems, that is, of language varieties which either are mutually intelligible or share the same genetically related superposed language. It occurs in the context of increased interaction or integration among speakers of these varieties.” (Siegel, 1985: 375-6). This term has been much later employed in the literature compared to the label koine. Its pioneering user was Samarin (1971) (reported in Siegel, 1985), although he was preceded by Blanc (1968) who rather referred to this koine process as koineising. Other former scientific attempts have targeted the concept as a consequence of contact between distinct systems. Siegel (1993: 118) reacts and opts for the term koineisation as better denoting the outcome of contact between subsystems which belong to the same linguistic system.

Although Trudgill (1986) deeply explores koineisation as a result of population movements, migration however is not in some cases imperative in the introduction of this process. A case in point is given by Miller (2007) in relation to the Arab world community. Despite the enormous migratory flows and koineisation processes in some urban centres, according to her, the long-run preservation (over centuries) of a number of old urban linguistic elements reveals that migration induced-dialect contact does not necessarily give birth to the whole process of koineisation in pre-Hilali and qəltu’29 urban dialects. On the other

29 In Mesopotamia
hand, it is also significant to say that the occurrence of dialect contact over a long time, as in North Malaita and Scandinavia (see Siegel, 1985) and old Arab capital cities such as Cairo and Damascus, does not either decisively conduct to koineisation. The aim in this section is not to embark upon a critical analysis of these situations, but rather describe and be content with koineisation as a consequence of dialect contact induced by migration.

According to Trudgill (1986), some settings where long-term accommodation (see 1.3.1.2), in face-to-face dialect-contact situations, develops into koineisation are post-colonial situations (former British colonies: New Zealand, Canada and Australia)\(^{30}\), new town growth (Høyanger in Norway) (Trudgill, 1986; Kerswill, 2006a), indentured labour schemes\(^{31}\), land reclamation\(^{32}\), rapid urbanisation (Britain and Trudgill, 1999) and counter-urbanisation (see 1.3.3).

Contemporary Arab world has been characterised by enormous rural (bedouin) population mobility towards urban centres. The continuous migratory flux has introduced a gradual bedouinisation (see 1.3.3) into the urban life. Linguistically, a type of bedouinised urban dialects has appeared on the one hand: Urban Arabs speak dialects attesting the presence of both bedouin and pre-Hilalian elements, but the former more importantly than the latter. Bedouinisation, in fact, has attenuated the use of old urban varieties in some cities by koineising present-day urban dialects. On the other hand, other cities know a kind of urbanised bedouin dialects. Their varieties have been subjected to urbanisation which has other linguistic characteristics in North Africa. One aspect implies the growing contact with other languages, such as Berber, French, Spanish and English, and the appearance of new language practices (Miller, 2007). Despite this fact, incomplete koineisation is observed in North Africa, “[d]ialectal variety that might lose visibility in the daily life can be maintained through artistic practices, patrimonialisation, symbolic memories, etc” (ibid: 26-7).

\(^{30}\) see Britain and Trudgill (1999) for more exact references
\(^{31}\) see Kerswill (2006a) for more exact references
\(^{32}\) see Britain and Trudgill (1999) for more exact references
1.4.2.2. Koineisation Processes

To recall, the current research question centres around the change of ORD through koineisation. Following Trudgill (2004: 89), the processes: 1. mixing, 2. levelling, 3. Unmarking/ simplification (see 1.4.2.2.3), 4. interdialect development, and 5. Reallocation, collectively form koineisation. The latter and focusing (the sixth process) induce new-dialect formation. However, many other dialect contact situations have not known any koineisation process for a great deal of time. In fact, several extralinguistic criteria may also interfere in determining the destiny of situations where sub-systems are in contact: “The contact status quo may end with certain political, social, economic, or demographic changes which cause either increased interaction among speakers of various linguistic subsystems or decreased inclination to maintain linguistic distinctions” (Siegel, 1985: 366). Kerswill (2002) gives primacy to three points. First, the type and degree of social involvement of the new context holds impact on the speed of koineisation: This process is likely to occur more quickly in a socially homogenous community than in another community that may know sizable social splits (see 1.2.4). Second, children’s direct contact with their peers is essential; free interactions among child speakers or between the latter and older children probably allow them to fix norms while a uniform adult model is absent. Third, the interactants embark on accommodation of which amount will be influenced by the degree of difference between the competing dialects. Other types of extralinguistic interference will be seen below.

1.4.2.2.1. Mixing

Frequently, internal emigration to one location incites, as part of koineisation, linguistic mixing. The process, being the core of a particular language scholars’ attention, is a long-standing term of which identification has not been easily well-determined. Siegel (1985: 357) reports Mühlhäusler (1982:4)’s dissatisfaction with the earlier definitions attributed to mixing: “Having read most of what was published in this area over the last twenty years… I am left with the feeling that it comprises a conceptual mess aggravated by a terminological mess”. Siegel (ibid) specifies that the study of mixing process was, in the past, confined to the result of contact between distinct languages or linguistic systems. More attention is lately however given to the examination of consequences of contact between linguistic sub-systems like regional varieties (Mühlhäusler, 1982) (reported in Siegel, 1985). For this reason, Siegel (1993) has been vigilant to demonstrate that dialect mixing (along with levelling (see
1.4.2.2.2)) has been already tackled before the publication of Trudgill’s book *Dialects in Contact* in 1986.

Here, we shall follow Kerswill and Trudgill’s (2005: 197) definition of the concept which “… refers to the coexistence of features with origins in the different input dialects within the new community, usually because speakers have different dialect origins”. Within the scheme of indentured labour (Siegel, 2001) for example, the destination of over 45,000 North Indian individuals, between 1879 and 1916, was towards Fiji. Their regional dialects were overwhelmingly Hindi: subdialects of Bhojpuri, those of Eastern Hindi (mainly, Avadhi), and subdialects of Western Hindi. The majority spoke the lingua franca of North India (Hindustani) next to their own varieties. There, mixing obtained as an outcome of the immigrants’ retention of their dialects together with Hindustani in their daily conversations. Regarding Milton Keynes (Williams and Kerswill, 1999), it is characterised by a number of features like: unimportant pre-urbanisation population, significant rate of in-migration, and its fast emergence as a new town. This location is consequently affected by high degree of mixing.

In another part of the world, a considerable amount of linguistic variability is noticed in Rabat speech community. In the case of /q/, it is in some environments realised as the old sedentary uvular [q] (with a slight affrication caused by the presence of the pharyngeal ḫ) (Messaoudi, 2002). In other contexts it is pronounced [g] which is originally the rural feature of ZSīr variety, and still in other environments alternation between [g] and [q] (without affrication) is witnessed. Clearly enough, Rabat urban variety experiences mixing in relation to /q/ (ibid) (see 3.1 for more examples within the speech community under study).

### 1.4.2.2.2. Levelling

In his book *Dialect in Contact*, Trudgill (1986) notes that as far as levelling is concerned, elements taking place in a majority of the contributing dialects remain and constitute the new dialect. Siegel (1993) rejects this claim and argues: First, the ‘majority principle’ requires more precise data about the total features from all the competing dialects. The varieties taken as an illustration by Trudgill have, according to Siegel, sub-dialects and the number of features of these varieties, as presented by Trudgill, is limited; the actual
dialectological sub-division opens doors to more important presence of linguistic variation which seems ignored by Trudgill.

Second, several examples demonstrate that many surviving features rely on the number of their users than on the number of their original contributing dialects. On the basis of Trudgill’s example from Hindi in Fiji, Siegel mentions that the –in perfective suffix for third person plural comes from one single dialect, Avadhi; yet, this variety was used among more than a third of the North Indian labourers in Fiji. However, he continues that the ergative past construction for transitive verbs is found in several Western Hindi and Rajasthani varieties which were employed by less than a fifth of the North Indian labourers. This linguistic form does not prevail in Fiji Hindi.

Third, other forms that belong to a finite number of dialects and are used by a limited number of speakers possibly remain as well; Siegel (ibid: 116) gives instances that “…exist in Fiji Hindi, such as the word che ‘six’, found only in the Chattisgarhi dialect whose speakers in Fiji made up only 2.6 percent of the North Indian total (Siegel, 1987: 141). In nearly all the other dialects and subdialects, the word is cha.” Fourth, the writer (1993) also questions the assumption that socially marked variants disappear in dialect levelling. For instance, he reports that one of the two second person possessive forms within Sarnami (Suriname Hindustani) has not disappeared though marked for politeness.

The same sociolinguist (1993: 116) perceives that the mechanisms of dialect levelling rely primarily, not on linguistic but, on extra-linguistic explanations. The forms which will be levelled out and those retained are rather based on the demographic considerations without neglecting information about the social setting. In this work, levelling will be considered as “…the reduction in the number of realisations of linguistic units found in a defined area, usually through the loss of geographically and demographically restricted, or ‘marked’, variants, …” (Torgersen and Kerswill, 2004: 3). The present choice has fallen on this definition because it is more comprehensive, including dialect levelling perception of both Trudgill (1986) and Siegel (1993).

In addition to the examples mentioned above, other cases where this process has been patently existent are numberless. In New Zealand, dialects which came from Scotland, Ireland, East Anglia, and other English locations were all /h/-retainers and constituted the majority during the original mixture of dialects. /h/-dropping, the mirror image of /h/-retention, originated from southeast of England, including London, but represented only a
minor group in the area at that time. It was then levelled out paving the way for /h/-retention to survive in New Zealand English (Trudgill, 2004). Miller (2004a: 255) reports a different example from the Arab world:

“Cairo and Damascus are very old urban centres. Their vernacular developed long ago in a sedentary environment and the historical levelling processes did not seem to have led to radical structural changes. Today there is still a kind of levelling process in the two cities: a number of lexical words, which were specific to the old urban vernacular before the 1950s, have been dropped and replaced by more common pan-Arabic words but this can be considered as a ‘natural development’”.

Another leveller is that Fessi woman who has become Casablancan (Hachimi, 2007). This mobile speaker tends to adopt Casablancan linguistic features, such as [gāl] say and the trilled [r] respectively at the expense of their stereotypical counterparts: [ʔal] (or [qāl]) and the Fessi approximant.

1.4.2.2.3. Simplification

As a necessary constituent of koineisation, simplification (Trudgill, 1986) or unmarking (Trudgill, 2004) is another process different from levelling. It is the one whereby “…even minority forms may be the ones to survive if they are linguistically simpler, in the technical sense, and through which even forms and distinctions that are present in all ingredient dialects may be lost” (Britain and Trudgill, 1999: 246-247). Stated differently, irregular forms, notably in grammar, are much more subjected to omission compared with regular ones. As a case in point, Trudgill (1986: 147) notices that American English appears simpler than British English; that is, contrasting the former to the latter entails the occurrence of simplification in the sense that many American English features have been regularised. Here are two, among others of his, examples indicated below. The first is grammatical and the second is phonological.
1- Needless to say that there is a British English category of verbs which breaks the general past-tense rule of final –ed. It adopts –t instead (e.g. lean, learn, dream, burn (+s) in the present simple correspond to leant, learnt, dreamt, burnt in the past) respectively. The same category is, however, regularised in American English to respectively leaned, learned, dreamed, burned. For Trudgill, this is a typical example of simplification.

2- Phonologically, American English has, compared with British English, known more mergers due to simplification among its vowels and consonants. To illustrate, “the consonants /t/ and /d/ are merged in post-tonic intervocalic position as [ɾ~d], making homophones of ladder, latter”

Britain (2001) provides another grammatical example associated with the system of past Be in the Fens of Eastern England. In parallel with its prevalence in Standard English to indicate person and/or number and polarity (a 4-way system was, wasn’t, were, weren’t), the author’s data demonstrate that the 1900 born-oldest speakers make use of 3-way system. was and were are employed in positive environments “…– though not neatly aligned to person and number-…” (ibid: 29-30) whereas weren’t is devoted to negative situations. More recently, the system has born simplification as a consequence of reducing the paradigm from 3-way to 2-way. Fenlanders show a tendency towards a 2-way was/ weren’t paradigm on the basis of polarity (was in positive environments and weren’t in negative contexts), in the establishment of allomorphs, rather than person and number. Still in another study of linguistic behaviour of Casablanca-born Fessis, Hachimi (2002) has observed that women belonging to this category and who trill [r] and use [gal] of Casablancan dialect, tend to maintain Fessi 2nd person gender neutralisation. Hachimi (2007) explains the phenomenon as a sign of simplification process: Casablanca-born Fessis women tend to retain simple, at the expense of complex, old linguistic elements.

1.4.2.2.4. Interdialect

Through his examination of Trudgill (1986), Siegel (1993) admits the fact that the writer is so widely familiar with dialect contact situations that he could brilliantly present his opinions and remarks with significant data about the previously discussed koineisation processes: mixing, levelling, and simplification. “Even more significant are the original concepts (and terms for them) introduced in this work, especially interdialect and
reallocation\textsuperscript{33} (ibid: 113-4) (see 1.4). Interdialect forms are generated by the individuals who survive the mixed situation. They are “…those which were not actually present in any of the dialects contributing to the mixture but which arise out of interaction between them” (Kerswill and Trudgill, 2005: 199).

Interdialect forms are three types: 1. simpler and regular forms which are absent in all original dialects (Kerwill and Trudgill, 2005); 2. intermediate forms (Trudgill, 1986) which linguistically combine and arise out of two co-existing dialects in the mixed situation; 3. developing forms from hyperadaptation (Kerwill and Trudgill, 2005). The latter is a dialect contact process whereby speakers employ linguistic elements of another dialect and attempt to overuse them in positions where they are actually irrelevant.

On the basis of some sociolinguistic works, Trudgill (1986), Trudgill (2004) and Hachimi (2007) portray interdialect situations. Hachimi (2007) writes that today’s Casablancan dialect has resulted and developed following the extensive bulk of in-migrant speakers who have chosen Casablanca as their destination. In the 50s, the dialect was viewed as hybrid and mixed, but later in the 90s, it was seen generally as interdialect. Still in Trudgill (2004), three French forms of ‘gens’ people (Standard /ʒã/, Picard /ʒẽ/ and Saintongeais /hã/) have manifested in Canadian French and then combined to provide an interdialectal intermediate form (Québécois /hẽ/). In addition to the examples supplied by the authors above and regarding hyperadaptive forms Trudgill (1986), it happens that, in a rhotic English context, non-rhotic English in-migrants overgeneralise the use of [r] and incorporate it inappropiately to pronounce items like calm /kæ:m/ as [kɑːrm]. This is probably because they have heard the sound in items like farm /fɑːrm/ which they natively pronounce as [fɑːm] (for further details and examples see Trudgill (1986)).

\textbf{1.4.2.2.5. Reallocation}

After levelling process, some competing variants from the original mixture of dialects will not vanish but remain. The variants will be complementarily distributed in the sense that each one will serve a different function in the new dialect. Trudgill (1986: 126) elucidates:

“…some variants left over from the original mixture may survive. Where this occurs, reallocation may occur, such that variants originally from different regional dialects may
in the new dialect become *social-class dialect variants*, *stylistic variants*, *areal variants*, or in the case of phonology, *allophonic variants*”

Basically, Britain and Trudgill (1999) identify two main distinct types of reallocation (see 4.2 and 5.2 for more other details): socio-stylistic and phonological.

**a. Socio-Stylistic Reallocation**

Regional variantal refunctionalisation that engenders a new role acquisition in a given context (e.g. urban context) makes it necessary to consider social and stylistic variation. Studies, in this field, will surely allow a better understanding of social interaction and power negotiation processes taking place between the diverse groups (Miller, 2007). The process has been witnessed in post-colonial-situations. At the time of Australia’s settlement by the British Isles, for instance, the originally northern English /æ/ was adopted, as in *dance*, *plant* and *sample*, in parts of Australia, whereas other parts showed tendency to the retention of the original English southern /a:/, in such lexical sets. The two variants then remained in the original dialect mixture in Australian English. After a while, the northern regional feature has been reassigned the low status role while the southern one has been reallocated the high status function in this variety (Britain and Trudgill, 1999).

**b. Phonological Reallocation**

It converts originally regional variants into allophonic variants (Britain and Trudgill, 1999). One can state the example of ‘Canadian Raising’ ([aɪ, au] are raised to become which [ɔɪ, əu]) has been stimulated by reallocation as follows: Before Canadian dialect development, the original dialect mixture included those Scottish-type diphthongs with central onsets [ɔɪ, əu] and diphthongs probably from southern England with open onsets [aɪ, au]. During levelling operations, the two diphthongal types remained and were refunctionalised as new allophonic variants. The diphthongs with open onsets were retained for use before voiced consonants (as in *file* and *load* respectively) and word boundaries, while the occurrence of [ɔɪ, əu] was reallocated to be used before voiceless consonants (as in *price* and *mouth* respectively) (Trudgill, 1986; Britain and Trudgill, 1999).
1.4.3. Focusing

We have seen that in dialect contact environments, many linguistic features disappear as a result of levelling, leaving the scene to their competitive counterparts to survive focusing whereby a high level of agreement is attained by the members of a given speech community. In other terms, focusing is “the process by means of which the new variety acquires norms and stability” (Trudgill, 2004: 88). If the level of agreement is low among the members of speech community, their variety is unfocused (or diffuse). According to Britain (2001), the past BE system in the Fens experiences focusing following the frequency of occurrence of was forms in environments of, what he calls, positive polarity and the percentage of weren’t forms in negatives through apparent time: “Among the group born after 1960 over 90 percent of positive polarity tokens are was and over 95 percent of negative polarity are weren’t. This represents clear focusing across apparent time” (ibid: 24-5). In the Arab world, Miller (2007) points out that certain urban Arabic vernaculars have known focusing, and gone through codification in grammar books and dictionaries, but have not yet sustained any officiality or institutionalisation.

The juxtaposition of koineisation processes and focusing paves the way for a koine rise. For this formation of a new dialect, Kerswill (2002) indicates three stages, identified initially, as he mentions, by Trudgill (1998) (see Table 1.6). These stages are respectively linked to the first three generations of in-migrants and all bear koineisation with its different processes. Focusing (just like koineisation) is expected to operate in Stage II of the first native-born speakers. It could, yet, temporise over several generations of Stage III. Miller (2007) concludes that despite the prodigious population flows, the occurrence of koineisation and focusing in the third stage need a cautious investigation. In 1.4.2.1, her illustration has been raised with regard to this case, saying that certain migratory urban Arab locations could have preserved over centuries various old linguistic forms. And, this fact implies that total koineisation does not always follow the occurrence of migration processes, neither does one vernacular, the author adds, eliminates the existence of all the other contributing dialects. The adult migrants (Stage I) epitomises the ‘pre-koine’ phase (Siegel, 1985) which goes through accommodation process. Further, levelling takes place among first native-born speakers (Stage II). However, the focusing situation in Cairo shows that the second generation who are from non-Cairene in-migrant parents engage in their total daily (non-)family conversations in Cairene variety (Miller, 2004a).
1.4.4. Bidialectalism

Many dialect contact-situations give rise to bidialectalism. A first glimpse of the concept implies proficiency in more than one dialect. This still seems vague given that the idea may carry, at least, two different definitions. The first interpretation is macrosociolinguistic since it entails the prevalence of more than one dialectal variety (Abboud-Haggar, 2006) at the level of one specific speech community. So dialect use, here, is conditioned by the social group. This is the situation of many areas which receive, for whatever reason, a wave of first generation of in-migrants. In the Arab world, the social prestige of the co-present varieties is shaped by the speech community per se. One variety can be attributed a greater standing than the other(s), or all the varieties acquire the same rank of prestige (see ibid). The second definition, however, means: “The ability of a speaker to command more than one dialect of a language, …” (Trudgill, 1992: 12). It concerns, unlike the first definition, dialect use at the microsociolinguistic level such that the linguistic adoption is individual. Countries, like Switzerland and Norway, follow bidialectalism policy which is approved by sociolinguistics and dictates that standard writing teaching to pupils who do not speak natively the standard variety does not prevent the educational system from respecting and preserving the pupils’ non-standard varieties (ibid). In the present work, the second definition is followed (see 5.3.3.2 and 5.4.2.2).

Dialect Switching, together with dialect borrowing, is the result of bidialectalism. Dialect switching, the use of forms from different mutually intelligible varieties within speech, arises usually in communities where the co-occurring related varieties are divergent. Diglossia (see 2.5.1.1) is an illustrative example of divergent dialect situations. In the western

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Linguistic Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Adult migrants</td>
<td>Rudimentary levelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>First native-born speakers</td>
<td>Extreme variability and further levelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Subsequent generations</td>
<td>Focusing, levelling and reallocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.6: Stages of Koine Formation
world like rural northern England or rural Scotland, the phenomenon of dialect switching prevails however to a certain degree (Cheshire and Trudgill 1989) (reported in (Kerswill, 2006b). Switchers may alternate two codes, one code is reserved to school and the other one is used for other environments. The first variety tends to be free from most dialectal phonological features and local lexis (Kerswill, 2006b). Another example is available in 5.4.2.2 with regard to dialect switching in Oran speech community.

As for dialect borrowing, it is the process whereby a given dialect copies a feature or form from another different dialect; convergence may proceed in the long run between the first (recipient) variety and the second (source) one (Hinkens et al, 2005). Dialect borrowing studies aim at shedding light on the global impact of borrowing on the ‘recipient’ dialect (the dialect that obtains features originally from other dialects) and its different forms (ibid). Borrowing is either delayed such that convergence between dialects is resisted, or it results in elements that are exaggerated in the sense that they are found in no competitive dialect; that is, the latter elements come out by means of hyperbidialectalism. This case leads the ‘recipient’ dialect to overdiverge in the direction of the other dialects. Here, this ‘recipient’ dialect probably becomes endangered which means it may be in its way of disappearing (ibid). In the case of sound borrowing, “borrowed sound changes will usually be embedded in borrowed lexical items. Initially a sound change thus adopted will entrench itself in the borrowing dialect in the loan words, before starting to spread in a lexically diffuse fashion” (ibid, 2005: 20).

1.5. Dialect Contact and Language Contact

In the light of what has been seen in this chapter and what will be presented in the next one, a comprehensive comparison between dialect contact and language contact could be drawn as follows. Although they represent different sorts of contact, both hold similarities however. In dialect contact situations, mutually intelligible varieties come into contact. If the subsequent generational speakers become proficient in more than one variety, they are viewed as bidialectal. Their current state allows them to move back and forth between dialects and borrow different dialect-background forms in their ordinary speech. At the same long run time, koineisation processes, such as mixing, levelling and simplification are workable. Interdialectal forms develop as well. The final dialect contactual result is the formation of a koine.
Similarly in language contact environments, contact between genetically unrelated varieties occurs. The following generations who can use more than one language (see 2.5.1.2) are bilinguals. They are able to brilliantly switch codes (see 2.5.1.3) and borrow forms (see 2.5.1.4) in their daily interactions. Long-term language contact results in diverse processes of pidginisation including mixing, levelling and simplification. Interlanguage also manifests. Here, a continuously developing linguistic system arises and involves features originating neither from the mother tongue, nor do they come from the language under acquisition (Swann, 2004). At the end, a pidgin (then creole) is produced. The following table summarises the comparison between the two types of contact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Contact</th>
<th>Dialect Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mutually unintelligible varieties</td>
<td>mutually intelligible varieties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interlanguage</td>
<td>interdialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilingualism</td>
<td>bidialectalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code switching</td>
<td>dialect switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language borrowing</td>
<td>dialect borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language simplification</td>
<td>dialect simplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language mixing</td>
<td>dialect mixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language levelling</td>
<td>dialect levelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pidgin/creole</td>
<td>koine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.7: Differences between Language Contact and Dialect Contact

1.5.1. Pidgins or Koines?

Despite their various similar points, “…, there are some important linguistic and developmental differences between pidgins and koines and the processes from which they emerge” (Siegel, 1993:119). A pidgin comes always out of language contact while a koine is the result of dialect contact. As a consequence, mutual intelligibility is the scope of koines rather than pidgins. Unlike the slow dialect simplification process, simplification associated

34 “…the version of a language produced by a second- or foreign- language learner” (Swann, 2004: 150)
with pidgins is relatively very quick, a fact which leads to a break with the source language. The koine, by contrast, maintains its relation with its source variety. Another difference is that pidginisation arises in an environment of social limitation between users of the languages in contact, while koineisation necessitates continued social interaction between users of the various dialects (ibid). Again, speed prevails differently depending on whether the contact process relates to a pidgin or koine. Siegel (1993: 119) explains that pidginisation is a rapid process to fulfill the urgently communicative needs of different background language speakers. However, koineisation is seen as a gradual process that emerges “…during prolonged contact between speakers of dialects …”. In summary, the differences between pidgins and koines can be represented in the table below,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Pidgin</th>
<th>Koine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variety contact</td>
<td>Language contact</td>
<td>Dialect contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual intelligibility</td>
<td>Mutually unintelligible</td>
<td>Mutually intelligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of relationship with the source language</td>
<td>Break with the source language due to drastic simplification</td>
<td>Still related to the source language due to slower simplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context and use</td>
<td>Social restriction between speakers</td>
<td>Continued social interaction between speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapidity of formation</td>
<td>Rapid process due to immediate communicative need</td>
<td>Gradual process during prolonged contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.8: Differences between Pidgins and Koines

1.6. Conclusion

Change is uniquely marked by constancy. Language can change over time by a means of its variation. It is spatially variable with accordance to extra-linguistic dimensions (such as, age, gender, social class, region, social network and many others). Regional variation is
probably one of the most conspicuous language characteristics. Regionally, language manifests differently on the level of grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary. In other words, different regions hold different dialects: Any regional Arabic variety is genealogically either sedentary or bedouin. Dialectology is the scientific dialect discipline. Sociolinguistic progress has enriched dialectology by the necessary tools to conduct more careful and objective dialect researches. Dialectologists are particularly interested in dialect contact and its outcomes. This type of contact obtains between mutually intelligible varieties. If mutually unintelligible varieties intersect, language contact, instead of dialect contact, results. Koineisation is one dialect process that persuades language change in the long run. It breaks up into sub-processes, namely mixing, levelling, reallocation, interdialectal appearance and simplification. Koineisation is, on the other hand, escorted by focusing. If bidialectalism comes up, dialect switching occurs and also borrowing. The final dialect contactual result is the formation of one stable variety, known as koine. This Chapter has then delineated the theoretical background of the present investigation. The next chapter will be devoted to the contextual and methodological settings.
2.0. Introduction

This chapter maps out the setting where the research in question was conducted. Algeria, the present setting, is demarcated geographically, historically and demographically. Urbanisation has remarkably increased after the country’s independence. Internal migration has accelerated the process and brought about multidisciplinary changes. Algeria is sociolinguistically defined, too, in this chapter. Although the kernel of this research is dialect contact, it is, however, worthwhile sketching language contact as it occurs in the setting at hand. Both language contact and dialect contact prevail side-by-side and overlap. The current location has been particularly restricted to the Algerian city: Oran. Methodologically, our fieldwork stages (informants’ selection, data collection and research methods) are also depicted in this same chapter.

2.1. The Geographical and Historical Setting

The country’s name /al-ʒaza’ir/ (الجزائر The Islands) derives, according to the most common etymology, from /ʒaza’ir banii mazghanna/ (جزائر بني مزغنة, Islands of the Mazghanna Tribe): an old name used by medieval geographers. /al-ʒaza’ir/ or Algeria is, a North African country approximately between latitudes 19° and 37° N and longitudes 9°W and 12°E, bordered on the North by the Mediterranean Basin, on the East by Tunisia and Libya, and by Morocco on the West. To the Southwest, it is bounded by the Western Sahara, Mauritania and Mali, and by Niger to the Southeast. Contemporarily, Algeria stands as the largest country in Africa, as well as the Arab world and the Mediterranean Basin, with a total area of 2,381,741 square kms. It extends about 2000 kms from North to South and 1800 kms from East to West. Moving from the North to the South of the country, one may go through a coastal zone followed by fertile plains extending to the Tell Atlas. A parallel chain of mountains is the Saharan Atlas southward. The two Atlases are separated by the High Plateaux and wide steppe areas. The furthest southern zone beyond the Saharan Atlas is the Algerian desert. Algeria’s capital is Algiers. Owing to its Mers-El-Kebir port, Oran constitutes Algeria’s second largest Mediterranean Sea area (after Algiers) with a long historical maritime importance.

The origins of the country’s indigenous population have been often debatable among many historians worldwide. Particular reference is made to those earliest arrivals coming from areas, such as Northeast Africa, sub-Saharan Africa and certain European lands to settle
permanently within the Maghreb territories (including evidently Algeria). The descendant inhabitants have proliferated and been subsequently designated as Berbers. Different time periods are characterised by different historical events in the setting under study.

With regard to the country’s pre-history, the cave rock paintings found in Tamanrasset (and at least in other Saharan places) provides a wealth of records of the area at that time. Around 900 BC, Phoenician traders, originally from Caanan, attained the North African coast and founded Carthage (in present-day Tunisia) in 814 BC. As their label suggests, their utmost objective was, rather than colonisation, trade. By the 6th c BC (Oliver and Fage, 1995), a group of settlements were set up and expanded by the Carthaginians, along the North African coast, and eventually stood as commercial locations on the one hand, and on the other as anchorages. The Carthaginians’ language was Canaanite, their religion was majorly Canaanite and their cultural effect was huge on the Berbers.

Carthage fell from power owing to successive Roman defeats between the 264 and 146 cs BC in the Punic Wars. Reigned by Massinissa, the first Algerian kingdom of Numedia was set up by the Berbers during these Punic Wars between Rome and Carthage. Numidia was split, after the king’s death, into several distinct sub-states governed by Massinissa’s sons. The other Berber lands were slowly annexed then totally attached to the Roman Empire. Roman rule survived in Algeria around six hundred years: Urbanisation expanded under this empire. Latin, which is Romans’ language, turned employed largely in the coastal cities, but did not completely displace Berber language given that several Algerian areas were still ruled by Berbers. The following invasion, in the 5th c, was led by the Vandals who settled Algeria for a hundred years before being expelled by the Byzantine colonisation (the early 6th c). Both the Vandals and Byzantines followed the Roman administration, culture and modes of life. Latin still acted as the official language of the colony. The Byzantine’s hopes to reestablish the great Roman Empire went up in smoke after the arrival of Arabs who put an end to the expansion of Byzantium.

In the mid-7th c, the first Arab military comers educed the expansion of Islam: a very considerable number of the indigenous population was a convert to this religion. In contrast with the coming of previous religions, the spread of Islam was to going to exert, via Arabisation (2.6.1), long-lasting and widespread impact on the Maghreb. In 670 (during the Umayyads Muslim dynasty lasting from 660 to 750), an Arab army under the leadership of

35 The given dates on this page are found in Dictionnaire Hachette (2009), unless otherwise indicated.
Uqba ibn Nafi founded the town of Al Qayrawan which was his base for military operations. While Tripolitania was his base in Libya, the one in Algeria was in the Eastern side essentially in parts of Constantine. By the Idrissides’ foundation of Fes in modern Morocco and then Tlemcen in Algeria, Arabisation reached the Western Maghreb. All the four cities are linked to Mediterranean coastal ports. Each city constitutes a triangle with two ports: Kairaouan with Sousse and Mahdia, Constantine with Jijel and Collo, Tlemcen with Rashgun and Hunayn, and Fes with Tanger, Badis or al-Basra, which all formed urban poles (Caubet, 2001). The countryside within in each triangle was arabised by sedentary Arab speakers (see 1.2.5.1). Apart from these urban zones, Arabisation was still in its infancy during almost four centuries. After the fall of the Umayyad Arab Dynasty in 751, numerous local Berber dynasties emerged through time in the country under investigation. The Aghlabids, Almohads, Abdalwadid, Zirids, Rustamids, Hammadids, Almoravids and Fatimids were among those principal dynasties. It was until the 11th c that bedouin Arabs (the second Arab out-migrants) arrived in huge numbers to North Africa, specifically to Algeria. The bedouin tribes, with the most important demographic weight, were mainly Banu Hilal (see 1.2.5). Owing to their exile by the Calife Fatimide of Egypt, this new population came to coexist with the Berbers in mountains, high plains and countryside. The two populations shared bedouinity as a common feature which accelerated their amalgamation and merger. Bedouin Arabs provided a lot of Berber dynasties with military troops and played a decisive role in many Berbers’ adoption of Arabic varieties out of the cities (ibid).

On the Algerian coast, the Spanish army captured Mers el Kebir in 1505, took possession of Oran in 1509 and then all the west of Algiers one year later. Still in the 16th c, the Algerians solicited the Ottomans to rescue them from Spain. During the Ottomane Empire, Algeria knew advancement and appeared a distinct state between Tunisia and Morocco (although the Oran remained under Spanish control until 1791 when this city was importantly destroyed in an earthquake). Turkish was the official language of the country. The French occupation of Algeria, beginning in 1830 had a great manifold influence (which is still particularly observable in the present Algeria). Oran was, as a matter of fact, invaded by the French who reconstructed and turned the city into a port of great standing. The Algerians endured 132 years of colonial occupation during which Algeria’s status was declared as an integral part of France. The official language was French until finally the country was claimed

---

36 See Caubet (2001) for further references.
independent in 1962. In sum, Algerian history is more noticeably characterised by “… the spread of Islam, arabisation, colonisation, and the struggle for independence”\textsuperscript{37}.

2.2. The Algerians: Demographic Profile

Dialect contact-inducing speakers are usually in-migrants. Internal migration (see 1.3.2) is a sub-discipline springing out of demography. Once reaching the new destination, the number of immigrants (see 1.3.1.1) affects both the composition and growth of the local population. In addition to the historical and geographical background of the present setting, this study requires a demographic description.

2.2.1. Composition

History witnesses the fact that the Algerians have always been a heterogeneous population in their constitution. On the one hand, “North Africa served as a transit region for peoples moving toward Europe or the Middle East. Thus, the region’s inhabitants have been influenced by populations from other areas”\textsuperscript{38}. On the other hand, different stages are famous for the population mixture in Algeria. During the Ottoman era for example, many Algerian centres were inhabited by the indigenous Berbers together with the Arabs, in addition to

- the Turkish settlers
- the descendants of Andalusian refugees banished from Spain
- the Jewish communities likewise, preponderantly, descendants of refugees from Spanish torture at the beginning of the 15\textsuperscript{th} c and comprised about 140,000 inhabitants before the Algerian revolution
- slaves caught by Barbary Coast pirates
- those who were Africans and employed as labourers and servants\textsuperscript{39}.

The settlers who came to Algeria during the French colonisation could be an additional illustration. They included not only the French but also manifold aggregates of Italians and Spaniards who were unemployed in their homelands and immigrated to the French Algeria in search of work. Many of them were based in critical sectors of cities and

\textsuperscript{37} In Metz et al, eds (1994: 3)
\textsuperscript{38} In Metz et al, eds (1994: 3)
\textsuperscript{39} In Metz et al, eds (1994)
turned their attention to the coastal plain cultivation, industry and trade. Full French citizenship was gained by the European residents in Algeria in the late 19th c. This policy roused this mass of population to multiply amply such that they quadrupled from 26,987 at the beginning of the 1840s to achieve 125,963 the following decade, and then attained approximately 2 million by the end of the century (ibid). The current exemplary commercial and industrial Algerian city is Oran, which is viewed by the literature (e.g. Courderc et Désiré, 1975; Aouragh, 1996) as the most European centre in Algeria (most of its inhabitants were European). The composition of its population is typically largely heterogeneous and contemporarily deeply renewed (ibid).

2.2.2. Growth

This section can be divided into three distinct periods: before the Algerian revolution, during the revolutionary era and finally after independence. During the first pre-independence phase, techniques such as counting the number of tents were used to uncover the nomads’ number. Although the obtained censuses were evaluated at that time as inaccurate surveys, they were beneficial to unveil the rate of population increase. “…, the average annual rate of increase rising from 0.5 percent between 1900 and 1910 to 2.7 percent between 1950 and 1055”40. The second pre-independence phase knew a reduction in the population density as a consequence of war; but inversely, the dynamic demography was rated as very elevated in the last phase. Following numerous censuses, the Algerian population was 10 million in 1962, 12.1 million in 1966, 17 million in 1977, then rose to 23 million in 1987 and achieved 29.1 million individuals in 1998 (Fodil, 1987). In 2002, the whole number of population was estimated at 31.4 million41. The population mobility was one particular stimulus behind this demographic development. It commenced during the first and second phases before independence then sped up in the post-independence era, more noticeably during the following decade (ibid).

The prominent rate of demographic development does not necessarily imply that the Algerian population is equitably dispensed in space. The demographic rise varies from one

---

40 In Metz et al, eds, (1994: 76)
place to another. 87% of the residents occupied 17% of the state’s territory in the mid-1990\textsuperscript{42}. It is the northern part of Algeria which has been the most heavily peopled. Oran city presently embraces the highest number of the western Algerian residents. The farther one gets in a southward direction, the less the population growth is observed. The desert is the least populated in the country and the number of its residents decreases, as mentioned, in the direction of the South. Still in the mid-1990, the population density, with an average of 10.5 inhabitants per square kilometre, recorded a high variation from 2,500 per square kilometre in the capital Algiers to less than one inhabitant per square kilometre in the desert centre\textsuperscript{43}.

2.2.3. Internal Migration

The mid-twentieth century was accompanied by demographic proliferation in many Arab cities as an outcome of internal migration. The decisive departure was the immediate reaction of nearly 1 million Christian Europeans and Jews from Algeria towards Europe after the proclamation of the country’s independence. Those who vacated Oran were assessed at 200,000 Europeans (Brabant, 1975): The former settlers, as implied above, held a French rather than Arab identity. Today, Algeria is inhabited predominantly by Muslim Arabs and Berbers. The huge gap left by these settlers led to inner migration and therefore reconsideration of the demographic distribution throughout the country.

It is already indicated in Chapter One, the orientation of the in-migration is variously shaped: It is rural-rural, rural-urban, urban-rural or urban-urban (see 1.3.1.1). Yet, rural-urban migration has had the lion’s share in the Arab world (Miller, 2004b). If one takes the example of Algeria, he/she realises that all the Algerian regions have been migratory, but some zones have been more attractive or more repulsive than others. The most attractive areas are the coastal zones such as the capital, Oran in the west and Annaba in the east, where industries and economic activities centralise. During the colonial era, they were urbanised (see 1.3.3) and settled by most of the French citizens. Additionally, if one passes over these cities, he finds that the remaining parts of the country were rural (e.g. see Table 2.5). It should be said that Algeria is not only characterised by permanent but, as well, temporary in-migration (daily, periodic, seasonal, return, circulation (see 1.3.1.2)). The available literature,

\textsuperscript{42} In Metz et al, eds, (1994)
\textsuperscript{43} In Metz et al, eds (1994)
nevertheless, has more focused on long-term migration possibly due to its significant quantitative and qualitative consequences.

There are several reasons why many Algerians conduct permanent rural-urban migration (see 1.3):

- In addition to intermarriage that probably takes place among urban and rural individuals, another reason could be socio-economic, when for example looking for a job that can provide better conditions than those left behind, in the region of origin) (see 1.3.1); also, industrial and commercial activities, attracting labourers for higher wages, have been, as said above, in coastal territories. This is particularly noticed among university graduates who do not find a relevant position once back home. Reference is probably made to boarder-students who, at first temporarily, go to an urban area for a university degree, and decide to settle down permanently after their graduation and find a job in this same area.

- A further motivation may have been children schooling (Cote, 2005). Very few children had the opportunity to go to school during the colonial era, and if this happened, they were often urban. The factor of schooling among rural children was still problematic in the first years after independence.

- Other rural Algerians immigrated towards urban zones seeking for security (Hocini et al, 2001). Political instability, in Algeria, was one crucial factor behind rural-urban migration during the 90s. Since Oran was well-perceived as a refuge, it received a great number of in-migrants during this era.

Obviously, in-migration in Algeria is either voluntary or involuntary (see 1.3.1). Unlike the political motive which has frequently engendered involuntary population mobility, the socio-economic requirements stimulate many voluntary Algerian migrants. Distance (see 1.3.1.1) is another factor which exerts control over migration in the sense that the nearer the destination the higher the number of immigrants, but the farther it is the lower their number is recorded. In Oran, the immigrants originate from different Algerian regions. Their greatest rate comes from the west of the country which means that most of them are short-distance immigrants, as will be shown below. This usually allows the new comers to keep social ties with their original place of departure.

Broadly speaking, Algerian demography has experienced four inter-regional migration censuses which have been conducted respectively in 1966, 1977, 1987 and 1998. Net
migration refers to the number of emigrants from one area extracted from the number of immigrants to this area and during a given period. Technically, it shows whether a given areal unit is repulsive or attractive. If the net migration is negative this region is repulsive, but attractive in case the net migration is positive. In repulsive regions, the number of individuals leaving their home areas, unlike the case of attractive regions, is greater than the number of arrivals to these areas.

Tables 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 (see Appendices 1, 2, 3 respectively) exemplify some migratory parameters in Oran (see 1.3.1). They illustrate the migratory direction, the points of departure and arrival and the period of migration. Table 2.1 encompasses the era 1966-1977 and displays that the net migration in Oran is positive (+64385) since the number of different regional background-immigrants (82736) in the city is much higher than the number of its emigrants (18351). If Oran is considered as the zone of destination, the most privileged zone of departure is Mostaganem with 14988 emigrants. The majority of subsequent regions are western: Mascara (15.61%), Tlemcen (14.29%), Sidi Bel Abbes (or Bel Abbes) (13.86%), Tiaret (8.46) and Saïda (5.15%). Others are central zones of departure: Algiers, Chlef, and Tizi Ouzou with respectively less recorded percentages 8.12%, 2.46% and 1.47%. Further less percentages come from eastern regions: Setif (2.88%) and Batna (1.08%). The lowest position belongs to those who arrive from Bouira, another eastern town, with 24 immigrants.

Table 2.2 covers the demographic mobility in 1977-1987. Oran maintains a positive net migration (+14721): 44328 immigrants are recorded against 29607 emigrants. Obviously, the departing western regions still rank first. Mascara (12.61%) holds the primary position followed by Tiaret with 12.49%, then subsequently Relizane (8.03%), Mostaganem (6.22%), Sidi Bel Abbes (5.32%), Tlemcen (5.14%), Ain Temouchent (or Temouchent) (3.99%), El Bayadh (2.14%) and Saida (1.08%). If one’s attention is turned elsewhere, the following percentages are observed: Algiers (5.19%) and Chlef (2.19%) in the central part, and Skikda (1.90%) and Bou Areridj (1.49%) as the first eastern areal sources of exodus. A closer examination of the table demonstrates that no migratory movement to Oran from the southern Adrar has been scored.

In the third inter-regional migration census (1987-1998), the net migration is still positive (+40962) in Oran (see Table 2.3). The number of arrivals (72226), as shown, is superior to the one of those who depart (31264) from Oran. Relizane, Mascara, Tiaret, Mostaganem, Tlemcen, Sidi Bel Abbes, Aïn Timouchent and Saïda (zones of departure) score respectively 22.16%, 12.16%, 11.24%, 6.51%, 4.75%, 4.45%, 3.78% and 1.51%. The
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Algerian centre is represented by Algiers (4.22%), Tissimsilt (3.05%) and Chlef (2.92%). The following regions are southern: Laghouat with 2.43% and Adrar with 1.63%. From the eastern part of the country, Bou Arreridj has the percentage of 3.51% and finally Khenchela (0.05%) ranks last.

Clustering the whole number of censuses in one table (see below) indicates that the total numbers of mobile individuals are 82736, 44328 and 72226 immigrants (respectively against 18351, 29607 and 31264 emigrants) which again respectively correspond to 1966-1977, 1977-1987 and 1977-1998. Obviously, demographic movements continue processing to Oran during every one period; nevertheless, a decrease in number of migrants is, in comparison with 1966-1977 (41.5%), observed in 1977-1987 (22.24%) and 1987-1998 (36.24) (RGPH: 1977, 1987, 1998 (in Fodil (2000)). The number of arrivals has risen in the third period compared with the second.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
<th>Percentages %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966-1977</td>
<td>82736</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1987</td>
<td>44328</td>
<td>22.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-1998</td>
<td>72226</td>
<td>36.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Total</td>
<td>199290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.4: The immigrants’ distribution in Oran, 1977, 1987 and 1998 Censuses

In 1977-1987, there was an economic stability and revision of the demographic distribution throughout Algeria. Rural territories gained more attention as a result of economic and administrative decentralisation. Migration was redirected towards less attractive areas by encouraging investments in agriculture, industry and generating new job opportunities. As for the third period, it was subjected to two new incidents. As reported earlier, many areas of Algeria were unsafe during the 90s due to political upheaval. Numerous migrants decided to leave their places of origin in search of safety (Hocini et al, 2001). The second incident was economic: a sizeable number of job positions was lost as a direct consequence of closing various public enterprises (ibid).
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In summary, Oran is largely characterised by long-run population mobility owing to its remarkable status of attractivity: Being the second metropolis in Algeria, it has benefited from political, industrial and commercial interest. In spite of the change in their order, the zones of departure in the first positions are usually western. They are the nearest to Oran (the zone of destination) and almost the same zones throughout the three intercensitory periods.

2.3. Ecological Development in Algeria

It is evident that the city and the countryside are two distinct sites; however, it is also incontrovertible that their roles are tightly interrelated. The city obtains from the countryside “…its supplies and which (the countryside), in turn, furnishes a market for its (the city’s) manufactured products; as a result, any crisis in agriculture leads to a drop in sales and unemployment for the shopkeepers and manual workers in the city” (Bourdieu, 1962: 60). Despite their different spatial background, urban and rural residents may converge through demographic mobility. The phenomenon of in-migration has not been indeed ecological consequence-free in Algeria. Migratory territories have been the theatre of both conflict and meeting point of the ecological spheres. Contact between urban and rural structures has incited to mutual influence. Multiple ecological processes have sprung up and probably operated simultaneously, and ecolinguistic changes have been consequently engendered. In what follows the settings, rural and urban, will be tackled, with special emphasis on the former.

2.3.1. Urban and Rural Settings

Urbanisation is a very old rooted phenomenon in Algeria. Both Roman and Islamic civilisations are very illustrative with a firm urban foundation. Today’s Algeria has inherited various ruins (Timgad, Tipasa, Djemila) from the Romans in addition to medinas from the Ancient Muslims. But, the rates of urbanisation and urban population have not been temporally constant. They have gone through variation and stages of glory and decay. Before the Arabs’ arrival for example, the Algerian society, which was fundamentally Berber in culture and race, was organised around extended families, clans, and tribes. It was more

44 The adjective *geneo-linguistic* (from genealogical-linguistic) may also be used synonymously with *ecolinguistic*
characterised by rural rather than urban life. During the Ancient Muslim rule however, many Algerian cities such as Bejaia, Tlemcen, Constantine arose. Bejaia, for example, attained 10000 inhabitants when it was the capital of Hammadites (Cote, 2005).

Just before the French colonisation, such cities were more powerful centres and wider locations for commercial exchange compared with their countryside. Their role was relatively active. But this fact did not save Algeria from receding and falling into political disorder. The urban population’s rate was then affected such that it was estimated at 5% in Algeria against 7-8% in Morocco, and 12-13% in Tunisia. The distribution of inhabitants was moreover unequal in the country’s cities at that time. Some city settings had an average size (Algiers and Constantine covered 30000 inhabitants), while others were only small places (Tlemcen, Nedroma, Miliana, Annaba, Tebessa) with 5 to 10000 inhabitants.

During the colonial era, the French followed the Ottomans policy in their reliance on urban nodes. They, yet, developed further port sites whereby the exchanges were facilitated with the Metropolis. They similarly created an urban network composed of a set of cities (Sidi-Bel-Abbes, Setif, Orleansville, Batna) controlling other places but, at the same time, neglected internal cities (Nedroma, Miliana, Mila) which did not fulfill their strategic interests. This policy of urbanisation had barely involved the Algerian population whose rate was, though slow, absorbed by rural locations, whereas cities were majorly inhabited by Europeans. Gradually, a shift in colonial interest led to generate indigenous populated-agglomerations within cities. Except some city centres (like Oran), the number of Algerian inhabited cities went beyond that of cities occupied by Europeans from 1910 (Cote, 2005).

In parallel to the rise in urbanisation there was a remarkable decrease in nomadism. The pre-1830-nomadic Algeria fell into a great decline. Nomadic life was weakened and minimised because (Bourdieu, 1962),

- farming improved at the time when stock raising was gradually disappearing.
- the spread of colonisation resulted in pasture land decrease.
- there was a shortage of relevant techniques providing care and enhancement for the flocks of sheep during drought; the animals’ size was accordingly diminished.
- other means of transportation (railway and truck) developed.

---

45 In Metz et al, eds (1994)
46 "Nomadism makes its appearance when the resources of the natural environment are no longer sufficient for the permanent maintenance of the group... " (Bourdieu, 1962: 65).
rise in the money supply caused barter decline which affected negatively nomad’s monopoly and caravan trade.

In-migration began towards residential locations where nomad arrivals were eventually accepted in these communities by the local rural inhabitants. As seen in Chapter One (1.3.3), urbanisation may lead to ruralisation of urban centres. Likewise, ruralisation may introduce the countryside nomadism, in case the new nomadic inhabitants maintain their habitual modes of living, such as trading by means of caravans loaded with goods or guiding flocks by their shepherds following the vegetal product availability47.

After independence, “urbanisation has occurred in part through population growth, which has converted villages into towns and towns into cities, but urban migration has played at least as important a role”48. The governmental policy was stimulating rapid urbanisation by giving importance to attractive spheres such as trading and schooling. According to the World Bank’s World Development Report (1992)49, the rate of urban Algerian population raised considerably during the post-independence phase: it achieved up to 41% in 1977. The United Nations assessed the urbanised proportion of the population in 1981 at 44%. In 1990, the urban population attained almost 52%. The capital, which was predominantly populated by Europeans (500,000) in 1954, remained as the most urbanised zone of the country. Although most of non-local population vacated the city, Algiers rapidly and nearly obtained a demographic renewed layer estimated at 1 million by 1966. In 1987, the number of Algiers’s inhabitants reached 1,483,000 and was increasing. Other leading Algerian cities were also largely populated between 1977 and 1987. The rate of Oran’s inhabitants rose from 490,000 to attain 590,000. The city ranked second preceding Constantine, Annaba, Batna, Setif and Blida50.

The rates and types of urbanisation were plainly different from one region to another. Some cities were demographically so saturated that they faced, among other things, serious spatial difficulties, a matter of which the authorities were alerted (Cote, 2005). A tentative official reaction targeted counter-urbanisation (see 1.3.3): The process was particularly operating in the country during the period 1977-1987 when, as said earlier, special governmental interests were positioned towards secondary zones, which were principally
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47 In Metz et al, eds (1994)
48 In Metz et al, eds (1994: 79)
49 (ibid)
50 (ibid)
rural. For the purpose of reducing the pressure on urban infrastructure and reconsidering the rural-urban direction, “[g]overnment-sponsored agrarian reform programs… in rural housing were initiated to improve the quality of farm life and thus to stabilise the rural population”\(^{51}\). Numerous smaller villages and towns were thus pushed to enlarge more quickly.

Santos (1971) summarises the way in which Algeria has been urbanised in the sense that he assesses the country’s urbanisation as demographically and economically gone through three phases. In the case of Oran, the city was in the first phase promoted to become a commercial and economic port centre during the colonial era (characterised by the French economic dominance) and was mostly reserved to European inhabitants. After independence, it was the demographic feature which constituted this second phase in Oran: There was a substantial European evacuation, leaving a gap filled afterwards by in-migrants. The third phase, which is the most recent, entails both economic and demographic urbanisation. It is widely affected by the two above phases given that it has taken over the economic activities from the colonial period and demographic influx from the independence consecutive period.

It should also be noted that post-independence Algeria which had previously a rural demographic character, has moved to an increasingly urbanised country through time. As an example, the table below shows the distribution of urban and rural populations in some western regions in the country. Following the 1977 census, the rate of urban inhabitants in Oran (575334) is higher than that of rural inhabitants (116326). However, all the other areas witnessed the fact that the latter was greater than the former. In sum, the western Algerian regions were, except Oran, rural in 1977. In 1987, the situation was different. Other areas: Sidi Bel Abbes with the number of 230809 (urban population) against the number of 215468 (rural population) and Ain Temouchent with the number of 162348 (urban population) against 112642 (rural population), turned urban. Demographic rurality was still in the areas: Tiaret, Saida, Mostaganem, Mascara and Tlemcen. In the final census, the rule was inverted compared with 1977 census: all the other formerly rural regions were urbanised except Mostaganem (with the number of 220943 (urban population) against the number of 410114 (rural population).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oran</td>
<td>575334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>116326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidi Bel Abbes</td>
<td>230809 (urban)</td>
<td>215468 (rural)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ain Temouchent</td>
<td>162348 (urban)</td>
<td>112642 (rural)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{51}\) In Metz et al, eds (1994: 80)
As observed, the quick and growing urbanisation in Tiaret, Saida, Sidi Bel Abbes, Mostaganem, Mascara, Tlemcen and Ain Temouchent has not hindered the demographic mobility from these areas (zones of departure) towards Oran (zone of destination). The factor of attractivity possessed by the city makes it still the foremost metropolis in the western Algeria.

2.3.1.1. Ruralisation of Cities

Despite the divergent effects of the two processes, it could be highly expected that urbanisation and ruralisation (or bedouinisation) intersect in the contemporary city. As a case in point, Oran has been already cited as an illustrative city in 1.3.3 simultaneously surviving long-run impacts of both processes. Chronologically, the Algerian city ruralisation started essentially in the thirties (Cote, 2005); the emergence of oil industry and manufacturing caused agricultural crises and unemployment accordingly. Sizeable number of peasants escaped their tribes and villages moving to urban settings which were archetypally the meeting areas of the above ecological processes. Although, as said above, the post-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Region</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oran</td>
<td>575334</td>
<td>116326</td>
<td>807422</td>
<td>125051</td>
<td>1064441</td>
<td>149398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiaret</td>
<td>127789</td>
<td>279541</td>
<td>275251</td>
<td>300543</td>
<td>478273</td>
<td>247580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saida</td>
<td>56957</td>
<td>86829</td>
<td>115285</td>
<td>120209</td>
<td>191408</td>
<td>88118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidi Bel Abbes</td>
<td>145027</td>
<td>176863</td>
<td>230809</td>
<td>215468</td>
<td>358214</td>
<td>167418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostaganem</td>
<td>103407</td>
<td>257511</td>
<td>165591</td>
<td>340341</td>
<td>220943</td>
<td>410114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascara</td>
<td>139260</td>
<td>268403</td>
<td>217826</td>
<td>349075</td>
<td>353030</td>
<td>323162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlemcen</td>
<td>194402</td>
<td>341405</td>
<td>335354</td>
<td>379508</td>
<td>493258</td>
<td>348795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ain Temouchent</td>
<td>90337</td>
<td>128926</td>
<td>162348</td>
<td>112642</td>
<td>206215</td>
<td>121116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.5: Demographic Urbanisation in Some Algerian Western Regions

independence Algeria was principally rural (see 2.3.1) in its early years, the few urban centres (e.g. Algiers, Oran and Annaba) constituted the destination of massive numbers of rural in-migrants. Likewise, the composition of city population was being renewed by incorporating from 30% up to 70% of in-migrants into its total number (Cote, 2005). Such cities became neo-sedentary in other words. The continuing post-independence-in-migration from the countryside engendered “bidonvilles” shanty towns in the cities of destination, in addition to rural ways of living, behaving, clothing, and of course speaking (Cote, 2005) (see also 1.3.3).

2.3.1.2. The Algerian City

During the Ottoman ruling era, Algerian cities were few (from 5% to 6% Algerians were urban). Yet, they were the centres of many religious, political, military and commercial activities. The major Islamic law courts and institutions of higher Islamic learning were situated in cities. The administrative offices and houses of the Ottoman rulers were located essentially in Algiers. Local military authorities installed in citadels which were found around the urban locations. The latter, moreover, were famous for their business markets where merchandise, from various parts of the world, was handled.

Today, Cote (2005) identifies the Algerian city as four types on the basis of function and characteristic. First, there are Port Cities, of which Oran is an example: Free from any coastal or touristic activities, the port has a functional role to play in terms of trading, importation-exportation, fishing and other specific functions. Second, Inner Cities originally ancient: they enjoy a long-run existence since their foundation goes back to the Ancient Islamic era. Inner cities like Tlemcen, Nedroma and Mascara had the role of controlling, at that time, the internal space of the country, bearing in mind that Algeria relied more on farming than offshore operations. Third, Inner Cities originally colonial: They were established by the French during their colonisation of the country. Their duty was still controlling the agricultural space (such as plain areas and flat lands). After independence, such inner cities as Sidi Bel Abbes, Saida, Tiaret and Relizane were renowned for their local population who kept the city central infrastructure European. Fourth, Saharian Cities: This designation is related to the desert and its climate. Saharan cities are in the form of oasis-places including water and palm groves. The French colonisers neglected the areas and were not interested in urbanising them. Today, the independent state is using many of them as territorial control bases (e.g. Bechar).
2.4. Social Classlessness and Network

Algeria, a demonstrative Arab world-country, has not historically born evident social stratification among its indigenous population. During the Ottoman control, social hierarchy was alien to the Algerian society because “…individual behaviour and action were circumscribed by the framework of tribe or clan”\(^{52}\). In the colonial era, the French grained social discriminations, creating, at least, two layers. Whatever the Algerians’ status (including even Algerian professionals and well-to-do traders), the European settlers were aimed to rank superior to the local inhabitants. This social segregation meant for the Algerians subjugation and humiliation. As a reaction, the indigenous population believed in equality, solidarity and unity among themselves. Being socially stratified was a stranger fact to the Algerian society and colonial idea that any indigenous Algerian had to fight against (ibid).

Contemporary Algeria is still characterised by social classlessness. The society covers wealthy individuals, great merchants, shopkeepers, craftsmen, landowners and intellectuals, and also involves the major number of those who are very average financially or poor. The general societal conviction is egalitarian. Why is it still so despite the multi-faceted changes occurring worldwide? Egalitarianism has been followed by a former and very influential political system presided by Houari Boumediene (1967-1978). The president was himself inspired by the historical incidents indicated above as well as the Islamic doctrine based on fairness, likeness and equality among humans. Similarly at the sociolinguistic level, the parallel societal prevalence of richness and poverty is not mirrored in the Algerians’ speech. The diglossic situation (see 2.5.1.1) survived by the speech community is far from stratifying its speakers into social classes. Dendane (2006: 43) exemplifies: “…: the use of TA (Tlemcen Arabic) glottal stop, for instance, is not associated with rich or poor people in Tlemcen the way Cockney glottal stop and the in’ form characterise lower working class people in London.” Furthermore Standard Arabic, unlike British powerful and highly socially ranked speakers’ mother tongue, is absent from Algerian daily conversations and therefore does not link to any specific social class of individuals in Algeria (ibid) (see 2.5.1.2).

The actual relationship between the Algerians largely depends on the type of their social network (see 1.2.4) which has gone through different states from a strongly structured

\(^{52}\) In Metz et al, eds (1994: 91)
network before French colonisation to a weakly structured network during the colonial era, and then it has further weakened after independence. Rural areas, during the Ottoman command, entailed social organisations based on family ties. The elementary kinship unit was a small lineage of descendants who, through male members, came from one grandfather or great-grandfather. The males preserved mutual economic duties and believed in the collective possession of agricultural lands. They were hardly ever interested in political activities. A broader lineage than one kinship unit encompassed individuals whose origin was from a more distant male ancestor. Larger entities comprised clans and a group of clans formed tribes with common ancestors.

The Algerian social network shrank however during the French colonisation. In the early twentieth, colonial ownership of agricultural land pushed many rural individuals and tribesmen towards cities. Due to such urban factors as overpopulation and housing crises, the comers were dissociated from kinship units that had been their source of unity and security. Their solidarity was gradually dissipating while individually they were looking for a city space to settle down. In the post-independence-era, there has been a further attenuated social network in Algeria. The rapid urban changes and the growing limited incomes have had direct effects on the family structure: families have been reduced into smaller units including husband, wife and their unmarried children, notably in cities. Smaller family units have progressively displaced the extended family entities. In the early 1990s for example, younger generational educated Algerians opted for smaller families compared with their antecedent generations. They favoured fewer children, living in unattached localities and leading an autonomous life.

With regard to Tlemcen, Dendane (2006: 237) describes the linguistic characteristics of its social network in relation to age and gender. Although Tlemcenian males and more particularly the young ones may have a dense social network, they “...only use those features that are characteristic of TA when they feel linguistically ‘secure’ .... Otherwise, the mere presence of a rural speech user in a conversation ... is enough to trigger avoidance of TA idiosyncrasies,...”. In reverse, Tlemcenian women tend to conserve their dialectal usage, no matter their social networking configuration or social contacts (ibid). How do the present informants’ social networks influence the choice of linguistic features? The next chapters may afford some possible answers (for example see 3.5.1.2).

---
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2.5. The Sociolinguistic Profile

That language is flexible is widely admitted by the sociolinguistic community. Algeria has, as seen above, experienced various historical, geographical and demographic incidents which have certainly some impact on the language varieties employed within the speech community in question. The purpose of this sociolinguistic approach is twofold: it will shed light on other aspects of the current setting. It will probably also allow a better understanding of language contact which often accompanies Arabic dialect contact (see 1.2.5 and 1.4).

2.5.1. Language Contact

Human sociability puts instinctively individuals into constant contact. Change, with all its types, is a long-run contact-induced manifestation. Interaction leads to language change because interactants and their speech are subjected to contact. If the interaction members’ varieties are genetically unrelated, it is said, as indicated in Chapter One (see 1.4), that language contact emanates. This contact between mutually unintelligible languages has, through history, gone along with human existence and certainly bears reasons and consequences. Many specialists associate the phenomenon with the various interpretations supplied to Man’s peculiarities. One of them views language contact as conditioned by commercial transactions. Through selling, buying and exchanging goods between different races, individuals interact.

A different interpretation associates it with travelling. Visiting different places allows discovering new areas and exploring formerly unknown things that could fulfill one’s needs. Again, there will be interaction with new speakers. A further interpretation comprises colonisation, whereby domination is transferred to the one who holds more power. Following this process, English, French, Spanish, Dutch, and Portuguese languages have survived contact with many languages in Africa, Asia, Native America, and the Pacific (Finegan, 1999). Last but not least, another interpretation sets up a connection between language contact and demographic mobility (see 1.3): “A much more common origin of language contact, in the recent past and probably in the distant past as well, is the movement of one group into another group’s territory” (Thomason, 2001: 17).
Language contact has been provided with wealth of diverse approaches and fine-tuned studies in the hope that they may cover most of its characteristics. Efforts have fruitfully shown that contact between languages results in the emergence of vital sociolinguistic phenomena. A case in point is the Arab world where language contact enjoys the lion’s share of its general sociolinguistic situation. This speech community is widely described as multilingual (see 2.5.1.2), with members who switch and/or mix codes (see 2.5.1.3) and borrow linguistic forms from one language or another (see 2.5.1.4), within a common diglossic situation (see 2.5.1.1). Since the ultimate aim of sociolinguists is the very daily speech understanding, their actual dealing with language contact unveils the dialectal dynamics under the influence of different genetically unrelated varieties. Language contact investigation, in fact, “…, contributes to the analysis of Arabic colloquial patterns by focusing on the impact of contact with other languages” (Abboud-Haggar, 2006: 440) in the Arab world. Although language contact does not constitute the focal point of this research, it is still paramount to sketch briefly the sociolinguistic situation as it particularly occurs in Algeria. A short description of some basic concepts will be outlined according to the literature and within the framework of language contact. The main involved varieties will be also afforded.

2.5.1.1. Diglossia

“… a relatively stable language situation in which, addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation” (Ferguson, 1959a: 244-5)

A profound literature exploration within the field of Arabic sociolinguistics implies that it has turned customary, before indicating any Arabic speech community, to go through Ferguson’s diglossia. Originally, this sociolinguistic situation is labelled as ‘diglossie’ by the
French linguist Marçais (1930) (reported in Bouamrane, 1986; Benali-Mohamed, 2007) to describe the situation as it prevails in North Africa. Ferguson (1959a) has got inspired by Marçais’s study and introduced the concept as *diglossia* to the English language. He has undertaken a diglossic description of the sociolinguistic situation in the Middle East (see Ferguson, 1959a). His attempt aims at enlarging the scope of this concept to construct a more comprehensive linguistic theory with regard to (not only Arabic communities but) all the diglossic communities around the world.

A watchful analysis of Fergusonian definition allows a distinction between two genetically related varieties; one is High (H) and the other is Low (L). Linguistically, H and L are often contrasted and/or compared at the level of grammar, lexicon and phonology. Grammar is mainly characterised by the absence, in L, of certain grammatical categories already present in H and decrease (if not absence) of inflectional noun and verb markers (e.g. elimination of verbal dual markers) which appear more complex in the H variety.

Lexically, four groups fall under this heading; 1. shared vocabulary between H and L which may vary in a. form (e.g. *he got near* is *iqtaraba* in H but *[garrab]* in Oran L), b. meaning and use (e.g. *ʔaaqa* means *energy* in H but *window* in many Algerian dialects); 2. H technical vocabulary and learnt expressions with no L equivalents (such as */ʔislaam ʔaali/computer science*; */rijaaḍijaat/* *mathematics*); 3. homely items and common expressions found in L with no H equivalents; 4. the presence of items (in H and others in L) which constitute paired terms with different spelling but the same meaning (*he is waiting* is */jANTAḍIR* in H but *[jQAʁɛf]* in Oran L). In phonology, H and L possess one inventory of distinctive oppositions with special interference between these varieties. Additionally, L phonemes tend to replace H ones in H terms if H phonemes do not exist in L. According to the present recordings, the stops *[t]* and *[d]* often substitute for the interdentals *[θ]* and *[ð]* in ORD (see 3.4.2).

A sociolinguistic examination of H and L relationship, on the other hand, rests specifically on stability, prestige and function. For Ferguson (1959a: 240), diglossia is a long standing-situation which “… typically persists at least several centuries, and evidence in some cases seems to show that it can last well over a thousand years”. In diglossic communities, H is also prestigious. Given that it is learnt through formal education, which is not the case of L, it is viewed as superior to low variety, more logical and better expressive. The fact that it is the language of religion reinforces its supremacy. Even speakers with little command of H
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respect the latter and are attitudinally positive to the variety. But L, usually the mother tongue, is subjected to little or no prestige. It is inferior, corrupt and less important. Further, its existence is disavowed by certain speakers. Ferguson (1959a) takes the example of educated speakers of Haitian Creole who often claim that they speak French (H) and reject the presence of L (Haitian Creole).

Moreover, diglossia is associated with the functional distinction between H and L. According to Marçais (1930)\textsuperscript{56}, there exist two related but different Arabic varieties. The first is the language of writing while the second is the spoken medium. More broadly, Ferguson (1959a) believes that H is the language variety of formality and writing, but not of daily speaking. It is appropriate in political and religious discourses, university lectures and serious media broadcasts. The diglossic speech community enjoys weighty heritage of literature written in H. The latter has acquired a fixed grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary and spelling through the codification process. It is preserved in books and dictionaries. However, L is devoted to informal activities; its speakers regard it as the right variety for ordinary interactions. The very restricted number of written domains of L makes the variety open to incessant variation and change. For instance, *carrot* is known as /ʒazər/ in H, but the form is exposed to variation in Algerian L: [sanarija], [zrodija], [karotə] and others. Only a little space is allotted, in Ferguson’s (1959a) work, to intermediate forms which are, following the author (1959a), relatively uncoded and unstable. He says their interference may resolve the communicative tensions coming out in the diglossic situation.

However, many later sociolinguists have held reservations about Marçais’s (1930) and Ferguson’s (1959a) achievements and brought some remedial suggestions. Bouamrane (1986) observes that the two researches have been undertaken in different speech communities; while the first has been in North Africa the second has taken place in the Middle East. He says that no one of them reflects the sociolinguistic situation as it prevails in the Arab World as a whole. Moreover, each investigation describes the occurrence of diglossia at a different time period; and, “…what holds true at a certain period of time does not necessarily reflect the realities of a different period.” (Benali-Mohamed, 2007: 19). Reference to changes that may affect diglossic communities and speakers’ attitudes towards their varieties are also mentioned superficially only. On the other hand, Boussofara-Omar (2006) describes Ferguson’s diglossia as very idealised because it does not show,

\textsuperscript{56} Reported in Bouamrane (1986) and Benali-Mohamed (2007)
-the permanent overlapping between H and L

-contact between H and L in addition to that between these varieties and other genetically unrelated languages.

-the fact that H is no more restricted to privileged literate elites

As for the middle form or variety (which corresponds to Ferguson’s intermediate forms), numerous are those sociolinguists who believe that it deserves revision with regard to its identification by Marçais (1930)\textsuperscript{57} and Ferguson (1959a). Benali-Mohamed (2007: 19) stands against Marçais’ s view about the first form of Arabic as exclusively written: Although this statement, for him, works for official documents, judiciary acts and teaching, it is not the case for certain newspapers of which the written language is neither colloquial nor standard, but indicated as the middle form. As for the Fergusonian delineation of H and L functions, it is no more sufficiently workable to reflect the current sociolinguistic situation in the way it takes place in the Arab World: “Ferguson’s impressionistic and perhaps idealised characterisation of the two varieties as being in complementary distribution functionally is removed from the reality of Arabic-speaking communities.” (Boussofara-Omar, 2006: 630).

Indeed, Ferguson’s definition does not meet the stylistic variation that obtains in Arabic speech community; a whole continuum is observed and relates to a lot of extralinguistic aspects (Abboud-Haggar, 2006) like,

- the setting
- the topic
- linguistic skill and H mastering
- speakers’ emotional state
- the number of participants in the discussion
- discourse function
- the personal relationship with the audience

Often, \textit{Educated (Spoken) Arabic} is the designation employed to refer to the middle variety. Many studies have been conducted to examine and describe the nature of structural mix between H and L, and this has also to do with code-switching (see 2.5.1.3). Despite any criticism, Ferguson (1959a) (on the basis of Marçais’s (1930)\textsuperscript{58} work) has particularly opened doors to more inspiration than disappointment. Any attempt for a theoretical Arabic language

\textsuperscript{57} Reported in Bouamrane (1986) and Benali-Mohamed (2007)

\textsuperscript{58} Reported in Bouamrane (1986) and Benali-Mohamed (2007)
model, as indicated earlier in this section, will go inescapably through Ferguson’s diglossia. The latter concept, which has for a long time bothered politicians, has often been evaluated negatively by sociolinguists. On the contrary, “[d]iglossia need not necessarily be seen as a problem to be solved, denied, or contained; it is a richness that is often dramatically undervalued.” (Boussofara-Omar, 2006: 636).

Different alternative labels have been suggested to specify the type of diglossic situation. Fishman (1967)⁵⁹ has searched for extending the concept diglossia which has become known as Ferguson’s narrow diglossia compared with Fishman’s broad diglossia (communities including genetically unrelated rather than related languages). Triglossia (Swann et al, 2004) is a substitute for broad diglossia: situations where there are two Hs and one L or one H and two Ls. Holmes (2008) finds it more interesting to distinguish two types of diglossia: classic diglossia which corresponds to Ferguson’s (1959a) concept (two contrasting varieties, H and L, co-exist side-by-side), and polyglossia, another situation that involves more than two codes for different purposes. In the Algerian speech community, Bouamrane (1986) rather opts for intralingual diglossia in case the varieties are genetically related (Classical Arabic (H) and Dialectal Arabic (L)), whereas employs interlingual diglossia when the codes are genetically unrelated (Classical Arabic and French or French and Dialectal Arabic). Following the field of sociolinguistics which targets the different manifestations of the spoken form, Abboud-Haggar (2006: 440), nevertheless, writes: “... in order to apply a strictly sociolinguistic methodology, scholars must try to avoid the strong and persistent influence of diglossia, restricting their research to colloquials – Labov’s ‘vernacular’ – …” (see 1.2).

2.5.1.2. Multilingualism

In near past years, the Arab world was still under the European colonial dominance. The idea of getting free was progressively spreading among the Arab populations who have majorly independent states today. Their current self-control has made them face new challenges however. What is the place of Arab countries in the world? They do not seem to forget their yesterday; but at the same time, they endeavour to achieve the western vehicle of progress and prosperity. Their former colonisers are their present multidisciplinary leaders. Between their past colonisation and contemporary independence, the Arab world survives a

double-sided situation in which other paradoxical concepts arise, such as theory and reality, nationalism and internationalism, traditionalism and modernism, and monolingualism and multilingualism. The first concept of each compound phrase is the outcome of the Arab’s history whereas the second responds to globalisation “…which emphasises interconnectedness across the globe and which encompasses a number of significant economic, technological and cultural aspects” (Swann et al, 2004: 125). Unlike monolingualism\(^6\), multilingualism is seen as the use of more than one language by an individual or speech community (Swann et al, 2004). Frequently in the literature, the same sociolinguist specifies that multilingualism is employed synonymously with bilingualism. Therefore, both concepts, bilingualism and multilingualism, are used interchangeably in this research.

Theoretically, one Arab country’s political stability seems conditioned by national unification around one language. Choice has instantly fallen on CA to fulfill the constitutional requirements. The language of the Holy Koran is proclaimed as the best weapon to secure the country against any internal division attempts; “[a]gain and again it has been declared that Arabic (CA) is the key component of Arab identity, the heart and soul of the Arab nation (…)” (Bentahila, 2008: 311). Paradoxically, reality shows that Arab states, the very perpetual spots of language contact (see 1.4), attest interactional complexities among their citizen speakers: Far from being linguistically homogeneous or monolingual, these countries are currently multilingual speech communities. Observable facts also witness the multilinguality (the state of being multilingual) of their community members who officially, as said above, belong to recognised monolingual states. Again, Bentahila (2008) writes that the constitutional and legalistic language pronouncements in the Arab world states do not reveal the high degree of multilingualism among their citizen members.

Traditional political determination of bringing the Arab countries around absolutely one language variety has turned very impressionistic. One country with only one language is a highly idealised speech community. Various globalisation facets incite conspicuous governmental efforts to open their present-day states on the world. The latter reaction replies to the leading process of globalisation. Interlocking across the globe requires proficiency in more than one language, or simply calls upon multilingualism. The perpetual manifold global changes have rendered it paramount (for the Arab rulers) to reconsider the sociolinguistic side

\(^6\) The use of one language at the individual and/or speech community level(s).
of their countries and moderate the application of their related decisions. Some of them have, for example, met their minority groups’ requisites by legitimising the use of minor languages (see below).

The official Algerian affirmations do not predictably differ from those of the other Arab states. The country is politically identified as monolingual. Yet, a complex multilingual situation obtains in reality. As already mentioned, Arabic varieties have been always in contact with other genetically unrelated languages, such as Berber, Turkish, Spanish, Italian and French (see 2.1 and 2.5.1) in the country. These languages have left their, mainly lexical, mark on particularly urban Arabic varieties (Dendane, 2006) (see 2.5.1.4). English (see below), a global language, is slowly infiltrating the Algerian speech community. Below, the chief language varieties will be depicted as they occur in Algeria (and North Africa in general). Following Ennaji’s (1991) methodology, the sociolinguistic description will be based on characteristics, use and attitudes.

Governmental documents promulgate CA as the official and national language of the post-independence Algeria due to the religious and historical status of the variety. As an official language, it is “… used for political, legal and administrative communications….official languages are also taught in the education system” (Swann et al, 2004: 227). CA is a national language because it is perceived as a sign of national identity. The spread of Islam has been escorted with the expansion of the variety (also indicated as Mudar language by Ibn Khaldoun (see 1.2.5.1)); non-Arab Muslims are supposed to get very familiar with the sacred Koran language so that they get able to learn that Holy Book by heart and follow God’s words to the letter. CA is the variety which has transplanted huge amount of inherited Arabic literature. Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) is another modern codified version of CA (Benali-Mohamed, 2007). Being also prestigious, it fulfills and responds to the contemporary global requirements and plays the role of modern medium of a universal culture (Ennaji, 1991). Linguistically however, CA and MSA are different. Unlike CA, MSA enjoys a remarkable flexibility to incorporate extensive amounts of borrowed vocabulary especially from French and English (see 2.5.1.4). It could be scientifically and technologically updated to meet the necessities of current lifetime. Its morphology is simplified because of the many reductions in CA case endings. Syntactically, long contact with European languages, such as French, has resulted in the emergence of a new word order: subject-verb-object which “… is now used as an alternative word order, in addition to the traditional verb-subject-object (Ennaji, 1991: 9).
While CA and MSA (Standard Arabic (SA)) are daily spoken by none, Dialectal Arabic (DA) is natively acquired by the Algerian majority and the variety that holds the first rank in the Algerians’ ordinary interactions. In diglossic terms, SA corresponds to H whereas DA represents L. SA is the means of formal writing but DA is increasingly used in informal written domains, such as newspaper advertisements, folk poetry, intimate letters and SMS messages. Linguistically, DA borrows (see 2.5.1.4) massively from SA, Berber, some European languages (French, English and Spanish) (see below) and Turkish. DA does not morphologically possess SA inflections (e.g. case marking, the dual and feminine plural). As regards pronunciation, a great deal of vowels are eradicated or diminished to a schwa in DA (Ennaji, 1991). For instance, /raki ba/ go up in SA is [rkǝb] in DA. Attitudinally, a growing positive estimation towards DA is taking place after that it has been long stigmatised (see 2.5.2).

Another mother tongue, the original Maghrebin speakers’ language, is mentioned above (see 2.1) as Berber (also called Tamazight). The Berber-speaking population is, nowadays, estimated at 30% (Benali-Mohamed, 2007). Tamazight prevalence has not been recognised by post-independence-language policy makers until only recently. After several incidents, namely the 1949 crisis; the 1964 insurrection in Kabyla; the 1980 Berber Spring and the 2001 Black Spring (see Benali-Mohamed, 2007), Berber has, since 2002, obtained the constitutional recognition and been elevated to the position of second national language of the country.

If DA and Berber are similar in their exposure to regional variation, they contrast with regard to dialect continuum. Unlike the case of DA, scattered areas are those Berber speaking areas which are principally Kabylie, the Aures, the Mzab, the Hoggar in addition to some western zones in Algeria (Morsly, 1986). These Berber speech communities are not homogeneous in the sense that their dialects are non-adjacent but detached by the occurrence of Arabic varieties between at least every two Berber dialects (Benali-Mohamed, 2007): Berber varieties may consequently be dissimilar phonologically and lexically, but still own the same grammar. The present position of Berber could sometimes considerably hinder mutual intelligibility between its varieties (ibid). Although, on the other hand, Tamazight earlier possessed its distinct writing system, namely Tifinagh, no generational effort has been made to regain this original form. The variety is currently shaped in Latin prints. Much opposition has been voiced against latinising Berber writing. Yet,
“...the process was triggered a many time ago and most Kabyle writers, journalists and intellectuals use this alphabet in writing. It would, therefore, be very difficult to replace it by Arabic or Tifinagh prints because of the habit people got used to and because of the potential rejecting reactions that might appear in the Kabyle speech and writing community” (Benali-Mohamed, 2007: 270).

Next, what is the destiny of European languages formerly found in Algeria? The traces of Spanish and Turkish are still existent in the form of borrowed linguistic elements within at least Arabic varieties (see 2.5.1.4). Spanish is taught in public and private institutions as a foreign language⁶¹ revenge on the French colonial rulers for abusing the Algerians’ linguistic and cultural convictions: “... one of the fundamental goals of the colonial policy was to denigrate violently non-French languages and cultures and to impose French as the only official language...” (Dendane, 2006: 81)

- belief in Algeria as an ingredient of the Islamic Arab world and CA as the language that amalgamates all the Muslim Arabs.
- language imposing inflexibility inherited from the colonial policy of French. The placement of (Classical) Arabic has been consciously or subconsciously forceful-like.

The counterpart of Algerian Frenchisation⁶² has been Arabisation of diverse sectors (see 2.6.1). French language, the linguistic symbol of long-standing colonisation and humiliation (as for Algerian language policy makers), has been downgraded to no more than a foreign language by the official dogma.

---

⁶¹ “A language that is not generally spoken in a particular territory” (Swann et al, 2004: 113)
⁶² It is the process whereby the use of French was being extended by colonial language policy throughout the Algerian speech community.
Chapter Two
The Setting and Fieldwork

But again another double-sided situation appears where theory does not correspond to reality. Confining the status of foreign language to French seems so simplified and far from reflecting the sociolinguistic discerned facts. The effect of French is more profound than it has been theoretically perceived. Dendane (2006) furthermore finds it oddly enough that French has more remarkably and largely expanded among the Algerians after the country’s independence. In fact, the officials have encountered a lot of unpredicted barriers in their improvised project of substituting French for SA. One barrier is probably the long contact with the French that has conducted unwillingly the Algerians to share many historical, economic and evidently linguistic facets with their colonisers. Another obstacle is that most of the Algerian politicians and intellectuals received their formal education in French language, so they felt it practically fundamental to keep its use in several realms and institutions (Benali-Mohamed, 2007). The Algerian university is another case in point where it is necessary to keep various scientific fields taught in French. A different case is related to CA, the former fountainhead of science and knowledge, but a language which is today much less useful scientifically and technologically compared to French. Still another fact has to do with Dendane’s observation above. In contrast with the colonial era, every Algerian citizen has obtained the right to schooling, paving the way for the French diffusion within society. Attitudinally, French is ambivalently evaluated among Algerian speakers. One may hear that it is the language of advance and technology and opens doors to civilisation; otherwise, it could be judged by others (just like the former language policy makers) as a sign of dependence and subordination.

Even though Arabisation has not sufficed to quake the importance of the previous colonial language in Algeria for years, French persistence is still under threat. Another European (World) language is softly permeating into the speech community, increasingly competing with French, and positively perceived by secondary school and university youth (Dendane, 2006). It is, as indicated above, the English language towards which officials have also developed a positive attitude. In Algerian schools, for instance, English substituted for French as the main foreign language in 1996 (Crystal, 2001). The reason why English is more officially welcomed (and probably among ordinary Algerian speakers too), than French, is that English is free from any colonial references in Algeria. It is, on the contrary, perceived as the widest linguistic medium that allows achieving international communication, economy, science and technology. English is in its way of dominating the oil sector, computing field and the written realm of science and technology (Bouhadiba, 2002) within the country.
2.5.1.3. Code-Switching

Code-switching (CS) is one language contact-invoked phenomenon that prevails in multilingual situations. It was seen at first as a deviation from the norm but once scholars started to understand its mechanisms, they realised they had to give it much more contemplation. The seeds of its perception as a phenomenon of study in itself were sown in the seventies and eighties. Nowadays, the study of CS witnesses increasing maturity and interest worldwide. The label of the concept covers “... a linguistic or discourse practice in which elements and items from two or more linguistic systems, or codes – be they different languages or varieties of a language – are used in the same language act or interaction” (Mejdell, 2006: 414).

CS could be bilingual or diglossic. Bilingual code-switching, in the Algerian speech community, results from the use of two genetically unrelated languages: DA/F (French); DA/Ber (Berber); Ber/F; Ber/CA; F/CA, or more than two: Ber/DA/F or Ber/CA/F. Given that Berbers constitute a minority group, they have a greater tendency to reach the bilingual state at the level of DA/Ber. They then can communicate with the Arab majority group and switch between the two varieties to meet their daily necessities. The fact that they, as Algerian citizens, join the public educational system, in general and Koranic schools in particular, they turn bilingual at the level of Ber/CA and again CS occurs. Still, French is part of the school curriculum. Teaching the language generates switching as a consequence of Ber/F, DA/F, F/CA; Ber/DA/F and Ber/CA/F bilingualism among the Berbers on the one hand, and DA/F and F/CA bilingualism among the Arabs on the other hand. Dendane (2006: 144) quotes: “With French as a solidly-rooted language in Algeria, code-switching has long become a linguistic tool that many Algerian speakers use in their communicative strategies”. Indeed, the number of Algerian bilingual speakers graduating from the French school before independence is minor compared with the one of those qualified from Algerian schools in the post-independence era (see 2.5.1.2), and likewise is their CS.

As for the second type of code-switching, many non-Arabist sociolinguists think that diglossic situations impede the occurrence of code-switching phenomenon (Mejdell, 2006). However, the author attests that the occurrence of diglossic code-switching is inevitable in such situations. It happens that switching takes direction towards L. The purpose behind this is to avoid communicative misinterpretations and interact in the most relevant way. This
switching can occur in the following situations 1. a knowledgeable man asked by ordinary
speakers (on the phone) about religious matters in a TV programme; 2. speakers involved in a
formal diffused radio discussion. In this case, H and L interchangeably alternate because they
may be in free variation (Dendane, 2006); 3. a secondary school teacher explaining a
scientific subject (e.g. mathematics, physics or chemistry). It also happens that switching
orientation is reversed. Switching from L to H can accompany a shift from an ordinary
conversation for example to a religious or literary topic.

Diglossic code-switching could be equated with domain-based code switching or
situational code switching which characterises strikingly diglossic communities (Meyerhoff,
2006). A domain means “…an empirically determined cluster consisting of a location, a set of
role-relationships, and a set of topics” (Spolsky, 1998: 46). Bouamrane (1986, 1988), on the
other hand, indicates that situational switching has to do with intralingual diglossia if the
codes are genetically linked but interlingual diglossia if the codes are not genetically
connected (see 2.5.1.1). Many other language scholars contrast situational code-switching
with conversational code-switching (or metaphorical code-switching which is the type evoked
by, for instance, change in topic even though the situation stands the same\textsuperscript{63}).

Conversational code-switching can be further classified into two types: intersentential
CS which takes place at the clause boundary, and intrasentential CS which emerges within the
clause. It is also possible to use this second type of code-switching and code mixing
alternatively\textsuperscript{64}. Intrasentential CS has to do with matrix languages and embedded languages,
such that the dialect is represented as the matrix variety embedding ingredients from \textit{fuṣḥā}
(Boussofara-Omar, 2006) in diglossic situations. A matrix variety particularly refers to the
elementary grammatical constructions, and particularly “sets the morphosyntactic frame (like
word order and inflection) for the sentence” (Mejdell, 2006: 416). The embedded one supplies
components or isolated items to be integrated into the matrix variety base (ibid). In addition
to the fact of approaching CS by viewing different morphosyntactic constraints on
intrasentential switching, the phenomenon could be investigated pragmatically by considering
its social, communicative and motivational factors (solidarity: jokes, seriousness: academic
subjects). Miller (2007) assumes that code-switching in North Africa is a reflection of
urbanisation, modern living ways, youth’s behaviour and ‘fun’ employed as a rebelling
humour tool.

\textsuperscript{63} In Llamas et al, eds (2007: 208)
\textsuperscript{64} In Llamas et al, eds (2007)
Chapter Two

The Setting and Fieldwork

For the purpose of searching for the relationship between the middle variety and code-switching and in the light of a number of linguists’ works, Boussofara-Omar (2003) (quoted in Boussofara-Omar, 2006) deduces that what is designated as third language or intermediate varieties implies diglossic switching. She claims that ‘third language’ or Educated Spoken Arabic does not exist as a conventionalised variety. Conventionalisation, for her however, involves those models of switching between the two Arabic types.

2.5.1.4. Borrowing

When languages get into contact, there will be a mutual influence of which borrowing is one resultant type. The phenomenon of borrowing is then another early consequence of language contact and can be defined as “the taking over of linguistic forms (usually lexical items) by one language from another, either temporarily or permanently”\(^{65}\). Although Thomason (2001: 11) insists that “…: all aspects of language structure are subject to transfer from one language to another, given the right mix of social and linguistic circumstances”, borrowing often launches when there is a lexical lack in the receptive language.

Language contact has an ancient appearance in the Arab world (see 1.2.5.1 and 2.5.1) and so is borrowing. In the Middle-East, speech communities borrow from English into MSA since they were formerly conquered by the British; and, they have contemporarily established broad economic relations with the English-speaking countries, chiefly USA (Benali-Mohamed, 2007). As for borrowing in the Maghreb, particularly Algeria, it operates primarily from French. Possible reasons (ibid) are,

- The French occupied that space in the past
- an important number of Maghrebis have an impressive command of French
- the nearby location of France allows a great deal of economic and cultural exchanges.

Ordinary Algerian speakers tend to borrow from, in addition to French, other different languages. One can observe the high bulk of borrowed items in everyday speech due to a relatively long-run language contact in Algeria. Some examples are provided shortly.

2.5.1.4.1. Code-switching or Borrowing?

\(^{65}\) In Wei, ed (2008: 511)
Needless to say, all the world languages, in one way or another, survive borrowing. Yet, the manner in which foreign linguistic elements intrude into one given language complicates in some cases the distinction between code-switching and borrowing. In fact, borrowing implies the adjustment of external linguistic forms to the receptive language make-up, while code-switching interferes if these forms keep their original structure. Following Poplack (1980) (reported in Bouamrane (1986); Benali-Mohamed (2007)), borrowing will be more precisely considered in case the given forms are phonologically, morphologically and/or syntactically incorporated into the receptive language.

Hundreds of examples are found in the current recordings, including code-switches and borrowed cases. Some other instances are provided in the literature to further illustrate the latter phenomenon. Lexical switches from DA to SA have been encountered, as in /qasaman (bi-llaah)/ swearing by God; /taqaaliid/ traditions; /Salaaqa/relation; /Saqiida/ faithfulness; /diimuqraatija/ democracy; /jaziira/ island (jazira channel); /yaaz/ gas; /al?alabijja/the majority; /istiqbaal/ welcome; /burkaan/volcano; other lexical switches from DA to F have been also observed, as in [3y] juice; [3ones] youth; [3y3] judge; [3ap5] Japan; [al3e] Algiers; [3ame] never; [3ati] kind; [bag3] baggage; [pl3] beach; [foma3] unemployment; [vwaja3] travelling; [mena3] household; [sta3] training; [mazisteR] post-graduation; [lo3ik] logic; [obl3e] obliged; [psikolog] psychologist.

As for Borrowing, DA often takes items from Standard Arabic, Berber, French, Spanish or Turkish. Since the informants have gone through the Algerian educational system, they are usually arabised, and borrow and adapt diverse forms from CA/MSA in their ordinary speech, such as verbs: [hdarna:la:l] we attended to it; [nhadro:lhom] we prepare to them; [j?atrau (fli:h)] they influence (him); [j[ja3Su] they encourage; [jsha3mu] they attack him; [tunkri:ha] you deny it (sing fem); [ihadro] they attend; negative formed verbs: [ma:-jhadro:] they do not prepare; [ma:-hdart] I did not attend; [ma:-tobhett] you do not research; [ma:-j?atrau:] (fli:h)) they do not influence (him); participles: [mmatla:] representing (fem.sing); [mnadme:n] organised; [mntaqfi:n] intellectual; [damna:tak] you are guaranteed; [nadman] she guarantees. In the case of Berber and Arabic varieties, borrowing is intensive, as a matter of fact, in both directions for the reasons mentioned earlier in this chapter (see 2.1). Exemplary borrowed items (Guella, 1994) from Berber to DA are, fako:n (plur fka:ran) tortoise; gar3u:me (plur græ:3am) throat; qArqa: frog; jatru:s (plur jta: ras) goat.
On the other hand, those French borrowed forms are numberless in daily conversations. French presence is so deep in the Algerian speech community that nearly no conversation will escape the inclusion of at least some French lexical forms or structures (Dendane, 2006). The same author also observes “… very few Algerian people knew some French at the dawn of colonial rule, and most, if not all, of the French words used were assimilated to a large extent to Arabic phonology and morphology in the earlier stages of contact with the French” (ibid: 138). Morphologically, lexical items are integrated, as in nominal plurals: [ʃwa:fra] drivers; [lwa:ta] cars; [filæ:ʒa:ʃ] villages; [kraːje:n]; French borrowed nouns suffixed to a DA pronoun: [blaːste] his place; participles: [mgaːzi] military; verbs: [jkaːbti] get; [ntaːstu] we test; [jogriːsːu:hum] they attack them; [jziːniːk] he disturbs you. Other examples borrowed from Spanish are nouns: /qaːbsa/ box; /feʃtə/ party; /faːlso/ unreal; /fliːʃa/ arrow; /gostə/ pleasure; /sbetaːx/ hospital; /bəntuːɾa/ paint; /puːlpʊ/ dishonest man; /siməna/ week (Benallou, 1992). Illustrative borrowed nouns from Turkish are: buqræːʒ kettle; tʌbse (plur. tbaːsa) plate; taqʃiːɾæ (plur tqaːʃiːɾ) sock (Guella, 1994). DA is also increasingly borrowing from English, as one may hear computer items prefixed to the dialectal definite article: [ʃi] -flaːʃ disk flash disk; [ʃi] -hardwer hardware; sport nouns, such as [ʃi]-fut foot (football); adjectives, as in [film ʃi]-western western film (lexical and morphological adaptation).

2.5.2. Dialect Contact in Algeria

As a general observation, linguistic contact research has been especially explored within the field of mutually unintelligible varieties. Contact between mutually intelligible varieties relatively receives less researchers’ attention. Language contact researchers are still more numerous than those researchers who work on the phenomenon of dialect contact. Why is that? Perhaps, language standardisation helps rapid language extension to various fields while dialects remain limited to ordinary speech.

One exemplary field is computer science which has effectively served professional human life. Computers rely heavily on standard languages in their software structures which exclude the use of non-standard varieties. On the other hand, a sociolinguistic approach to computer science displays this field has succeeded in penetrating into individuals’ social and ordinary life worldwide. It has established communicative social networks among computer users, regardless of their geographical or social distance. Many interactions between
individuals are carried out natural and spontaneous through computers: they usually take the shape of informal speech. Paradoxically, using skype communications, for instance, can entirely rest on non-standard varieties, a typical case of the Algerian speech community. Algerian computer users can set up virtual interrelationships from all over the country on the basis of conversations conducted in dialects. Different background-dialects in contact is the final outcome. This happens despite the regal reverence theoretically attributed to CA while DA falls into official silence (see also 1.2.3.1).

2.5.2.1. Algerian Dialectology

Following what is previously said in 1.2.5.1, dialect contact has given birth, during the Muslim-Arab conquests (ال فتحات ال اسلامية), to contemporary L varieties. The relationship between the linguistic source of today’s L dialects and CA is presented by Owens (2001:424-5) as follows,

“…the ancestors of the modern dialects did not arise diglossically after c. 700 AD, but rather existed contemporaneously with and contributed to the development of Classical Arabic. Logically, they derive with Classical Arabic from a common ancestor in a yet to be reconstructed proto-Arabic”

Explained differently, CA, which was originally a dialect (see 1.2.3.1), survived simultaneously with other regional dialects in the Arabian Peninsula. Muslim-Arab conquerors at that time formed different-Arabic dialectal background military troops. Arabic dialects, including CA, came absolutely into contact giving rise to modern Arabic dialects. Ancient Arabic varieties together with CA descended from one proto-Arabic language under construction. The question that could arise is: If we rely on this assumption, to which ancient dialectal source shall we refer back in this research in cases where a comparison between ORD and its mother language is required? Given that CA (or SA in general) is the only available ancient written source, and since it is mutually intelligible with old Arabic varieties of its time, it is taken as a reference language whenever necessary in this work.

---
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Dialectally, the Arab world can be perceived either regionally or genealogically. Regional variation distinguishes between eastern and western Arabic dialects (/majrīq/ vs./mayrib/ respectively). Western Arabic dialects can be Algerian. Algerian Arabic dialects are by no means subjected to further regional variation: eastern, western, central or southern. They all have their peculiarities, but still mutually intelligible. Genealogical variation, on the other hand, has been already tackled in 1.2.5.1 as splitting the Arab dialects into sedentary and bedouin.

Few are those linguistic studies on Algerian Arabic dialectology. Some well-known linguists who have actively worked on Algerian dialects are Ibn Khaldoun67 (the 14th c) followed by Marçais, W (1902); Cantineau, J (1937, 1940); Marçais, Ph. (1952, 1958, 1960), Marçais, W (1908); and more recently Bouhadiba, F (1988); Bouamrane, A (1991, 1993); Lakhdar Barka, F (1993); Guella, N (1994); Boucherit, A (2002); Dendane, Z (2006); Bouhania, B (2007). Miller (2007) claims that insufficient information is provided on the effect of recent migration. More particularly, this is regarding dialects such as Oran. She adds: “One is the possible convergence between the different neo-urban koines at the national level. This question remains open for Algeria, due to lack of comparative studies between Oran and Algiers.” (ibid: 22-3). For this reason, we are further motivated to undertake this dialectal research. Miller, however reports that sedentary dialects (such as Tlemcen and Algiers) are relatively more investigated. She explains that old city-vernaculars are in their way of disappearance, being more and more restricted to family network: “The decline of the old urban vernaculars corresponds to the decline of the aristocratic culture and lifestyle symbolised by the Medina, (...) and coincides with the decline of an old urban elite (often from Andalusi origin) ...” (ibid: 19)

2.5.2.2. Oran Dialect: Linguistic Variation

The genealogical affiliation of a given dialect rests on a set of many linguistic features within the fields of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary (or lexis). This work is based on the most eminent features that have been majorly encountered in the recordings (see 2.6.3) or elicited by the administered questionnaire (see 2.6.4). Others have been extracted from

67 In the Maghreb in general and Algeria in particular
literature (see 2.5.2.1) or obtained by means of the technique of the participant observer (see 2.6.5). Bouhadiba (1988) provides an in-depth work on the verbal phonology and morphology of ORD and will be, for us, a source of reference and inspiration. We are also inspired by Bouamrane’s (1991, 1993) works on Algerian dialectal lexis. All these studies will probably allow approaching the data at hand synchronically and diachronically. At the diachronic level for example, an apparent time study through a generational comparison between Bouhadiba’s (1988) results and our data will be undertaken. Such a procedure may help to check if ORD is still bedouin (see 2.5.2.3), or it has undergone sedentarisation.

2.5.2.1.1. Phonological Variation

The present data transcription will be based on Bouhadiba’s (1988) work, unless otherwise indicated. If exemplary data are supplied and extracted from literature, their author’s original transcription will be followed. Some phonological rules in ORD are given below again following Bouhadiba (1988). Processes, such as assimilation (see 3.1.3), labialisation (see 3.1.3), metathesis (see 3.3.4) and others (see 3.5.5b), will be classified and examined according to their genealogical ancestry.

a. Vowels

The dialectal vowel system under study enjoys a high degree of variation in the sense that the short vowels of CA /a, u, i/ are diversely realised in ORD. Table 2.6 shows the most frequent vocalic variants in this dialect (Bouhadiba, 1988).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Vowels</th>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/i/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocalic Realisation</td>
<td>[æ]</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>[u]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[œ]</td>
<td>[œ]</td>
<td>[œ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68 As for diphthongs, see 3.2.2.2.
Table 2.6: Short Vowel Realisation in ORD

As indicated, all the vowels tend to be centralised. Vowel centralisation generally occurs in closed syllables (ibid) (see 3.5.2.1). The sequences of the type CCVC and CVCC are highly attested in ORD, where the schwa represents V. Unlike /i/, /a/ and /u/, the mid-central half-open unrounded vowel /ǝ/ does not seem to occur in final open syllables, neither does short vowel centralisation apply in the environments of velars /χ, ɣ/, pharyngeals /ɦ, ʕ/ or the glottal consonant /h/. It is not observed next to emphatics or /q/ either. Despite the occurrence of a total complimentary distribution between the vowels [i] or [a], and [u] and schwa (see 3.5.2.1 for more details).

In the case of /a/, Bouhadiba (1988) claims that it is a basic vowel, from which other vocalic variants are derived and conditioned as showed in Table 2.7. If /a/ occurs in the context of emphatics or /q/, it is lowered and realised as the short low back vowel with [+UPC] (see below and 2.5.2.1.1b for further details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Vowel</th>
<th>/a/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realisation Rule</td>
<td>/a/ → [a] /χ, ɣ, {a} marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[æ] /ɦ, ʕ, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ə] / elsewhere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.7: /a/-Realisation Rule

The reasons (ibid) why the short low back vowel stands as basic compared with the other vowels in the table above possibly are,

- it takes place not only in Arabic varieties but in many other languages
- unlike /æ/ which is marked in many languages, /a/ is unmarked
- “[i]t is originally the vowel of Classical Arabic which still appears in the dialectal forms that represent cases of classicism” (p 133)
- it stands as the feminine ending marker in nearly all contexts
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- it has an effect in the environments of liquids: /a/ has some backing effect on its contiguous liquids, notably /r/ which manifests as /ɾ/ (and sometimes /l/ as /l/).
- this [+back] vowel has a more frequent prevalence in ORD compared with the [-back] [æ]
- The schwa is considered as a reduced vowel in ORD

The importance of this vowel is further supported by the author (ibid: 145) who asserts that “… /a/ is the most frequently distributed in comparison with /i/ (see 3.5.2.1) and /u/ (see also 3.5.2.1) and it may be considered as the unmarked. If this is so, it would appear in underlying forms where [a] cannot be established as deriving from a particular vowel” (see also 3.1.2.1).

Referring again to /a/-realisation, the basic vowel is reduced to [ǝ] in a set of environments mentioned in 3.5.2.1. As for /a/-lowering (see below), the occurrence of /a/ in the context of /t, d, ɾ/ and /q/ is well detected as [a] in the recordings, as in [tæŋ tɔs (daw)] (light) is being cut off; [talgot] she released; [darboːh] they beat him; [daʃiɾn] lost (plur); [Sewad] instead; [nsadqo] we give alms; [ʃil saq] it gets stuck; [toʃrad] she invites; [tsaqseːne] she asks me; [jsaqsoː] they ask; [qaʃ] clothes; [qad] he was able. The other consonants next to which /a/ does not reduce to the surface [ǝ] are the pharyngeals /h, ʃ, h/ (/a/ is realised as [æ] e.g. [ʰætta] until; [tædbæh] she slaughters; [ruːhæh] himself; [tæhrag] she migrates illegally; [hapusːna] they oppressed us; [hæʃa] thing; [ʃæfriːn] twenty; [tæʃ] of; [ʔælf] (a) thousand; [tnæʃɔ] twelve; [tʃædbi] you suffer (fem); [tæhdar] she talks; [jheːʒu(ha)] they make it exciting; [ʒwaiʃæh] sides; [hæʃəʃ] exciting person; [θæwdi] you come down), and /q, ɣ/ (/a/ changes to [a] e.g. [xasɾat] ’she lost’; [ʃʊɾræʒ] he gets (things out); [xæɾu] they got out; [bya] he wanted; [tænʔabni] you suffer (fem)) (see also 3.1.2.1).

As regards vocalic length, the short vowels /i, a, u/ in ORD have respectively their long counterparts /ii, aa, uu/ (see 3.1.2.2 and 3.5.2.2). Only the short mid-central unrounded vowel /a/ does not have a long counterpart. The table (Bouhadiba, 1988) below denotes the structural environments where vowels can appear according to length. Unlike the symbol –, the symbol + refers to the occurrence of the vowel in the given context. (+) indicates that the context is possibly neutralised (see also 3.1.2.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Short Vowels</th>
<th>Long Vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

69 These phonemes are respectively transcribed by Bouhadiba (1988) as /T,D,S/
Table 2.8: Vocalic Occurrence according to Length (in ORD)

In case of vowel lowering, the short vowels /i, a, u/ respectively appear as [e, α, o] in the environment of emphatics and /q/ (see below), whereas their long vowels /ii, aa, uu/ manifest respectively as [e:, α:, o:] in the same environments. Each short or long plain vowel is complimentarily distributed with its emphaticised counterpart. This means that only the vowels [e, α, o] and their long counterparts [e:, α:, o:] appear in the neighbouring of emphatics and the unvoiced uvular. It should also be mentioned that regarding /a/, Table 2.7 denotes that both [æ] and [a] are usually variants of this same phoneme. Therefore, each variant manifests as [α] next to /t, d, ʂ/ and /q/ (ibid).

b. Consonants

There are twenty five consonantal phonemes in ORD. The following table demonstrates the phonemic inventory according to articulatory features (Bouhadiba, 1988). Certain phonemes, such as the inter-dental sibilant /θ/ (see 3.4.2), are viewed as marginal owing to their very restricted distribution (Bouhadiba, 1988: 88).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>i</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>ii</th>
<th>aa</th>
<th>uu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV##</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCC</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In his discussion about emphatics, on the other hand, as they occur in the dialect under investigation, Bouhadiba (1988) makes a distinction between three categories of segments following a number of feature specifications: /ʈ, ɖ, ʂ/ which are characterised as [+UPC, +LTS]; /q/ featured as [+UPC, -LTS], and /ɦ, ʕ/ and all other sounds described as [-UPC]. Concerning ‘true’ emphatics, the feature UPC stands for *Upper Pharyngeal Constriction*. Here, “… most phonetic accounts agree that tongue shape and position of constriction along the posterior wall of the pharynx are the main articulatory gestures involved in the production of an emphatic sound” (Bouhadiba, 1988: 56). Unlike the /ʈ, ɖ, ʂ/, /q/ affects its neighbouring vowels only. *Lateral Tongue Spreading* (LTS) does not interfere in the articulation of this segment. This feature “… involves an overall gesture where the tongue is laterally spread and centrally hollowed and at the same time retracted” (ibid: 58). In this case, the emphatic effect spreads to the whole word (unless it is blocked for example by a high long vowel). The pharyngeal fricatives, on the other hand, are plain consonants with no emphatic influence over their neighbouring sounds. The following figure illustrates and summarises emphasis rules as suggested by the author (1988),

---

70 Stop is used alternatively with plosive
In this figure, there are three kinds of emphasis in ORD:

1. **Tautosyllabic emphasis (TE):** The occurrence of a segment featured by [+UPC, +LTS], in any position, in a given syllable turns this syllable wholly emphatic, as in [Taːf] *he circled around*. In case the first syllable is of the type ## [+UPC, +LTS] VV _ in a polysyllabic word (whether closed or open), here the second syllable is not affected by emphasis, as in [Taːʃaf] *she circled around*.

2. **Progressive Emphasis (PE):** A polysyllabic word that contains the first syllable closed by a segment featured by [+UPC, +LTS] and the second open or closed syllable witnesses vowel lowering in the two syllables, as in [χaTʃfʊːh] *they snatched him*. Additionally, “[e]ach time they occur in the context of an underlying emphatic, the liquids /l,r/ appear as ‘better carriers’ for the spread of emphasis in the word” (ibid: 80), as in [Talʃbo] *they asked*.

3. **Regressive Emphasis (RE):** The polysyllabic word that has a second syllable with an underlying emphatic or an emphacised consonantal segment turns wholly emphatic, as in [χaːSTaf] *he is* snatching and [namʃaT] *I comb*.

**Figure 2.1:** The Emphatics in ORD

---
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2.5.2.1.2. Grammatical and Lexical Variation

As any language variety, ORD has a grammar. Many Arabic grammatical variables, such as verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, articles and prepositions, are genealogically affiliated as bedouin or sedentary. This is lexically the case too. After conducting, at least, two dialectal investigations, Bouamrane (1991, 1993) has found a high degree of lexical variation among the Algerian western dialects. The various variants in question may indicate kin relationships, animals, implements or other lexical categories. The dialects under his investigation are Oran (ORN\textsuperscript{71}), Temouchent (TMT), Mascara (MKR), Sidi Bel Abbes (SBA), Tiaret (TRT), Bayad (BYD), Biskra (BSR), Bechar (BSR), Mostaganem (MST), Saida (SAD), Nedroma (NDM), Tlemcen (TSN). On the ground of this, what is the lexical variantal genealogy of the present ORD? Chapter Five will provide an attempt to describe genealogically and explain lexical data. Before this, Chapter Four will genealogically classify the grammatical categories available at hand.

2.5.2.3. Dialect Contact-stimulated Koineisation

Dialect contact (see 1.4) started to take place in Oran during the early post-independence era, when enormous numbers of its former European inhabitants put an end to their stay in the area (see 2.2.2). The demographic gap left behind their departure was soon occupied by different dialect-background incomers, mainly from nearby regions. Algerian censuses (e.g. Table 2.5) demonstrate that internal migration has been a non-stop process, which is between acceleration and slowdown. The dialectal transplantation has been consequently incessant and Oran speech community could not survive accordingly a stable linguistic situation. As a matter of fact, dialects have not been individually isolated in the new speech community. Their speakers have been in everyday contact, and therefore dialect contact has occurred. Since the arrivals originate from diverse locations, contact between their dialects is mutual. In order to overcome any case of unintelligibility, interactants certainly accommodate (see 1.3.1.2) in a mutual direction. This mutuality in accommodation leads to a dialect mixture situation, which in turn induces considerable variability in the speech of the present informants.

\textsuperscript{71} We refer to ORN as ORD
According to Miller (2007: 19), city koines (see 1.4.1) in North Africa are mainly the result of mixture with bedouin dialects: “In all the big urban centers (Casablanca, Algiers, Tunis, Oran, Constantine, Rabat-Sale, Nouakchott, etc.), the expanding urban koines exhibit various degrees of mixing with the surrounding bedouin/rural dialects”. Before Miller, Marçais (1960) has talked about ‘une koiné des villes’ city koine which is the outcome of levelling of linguistic discrepancies among urban and bedouin dialects. Bouamrane (1991) explains that post-independence in-migration, specifically from rural to urban regions, has given rise to this levelling (see 1.4.2.2.2 and ). More particularly, Miller (2007) attests that dialectologists consider ORD as a bedouin-based koine. Similarly, Marçais (1958: 376) claims: “Although… the language of… old centres has remained urban, there are others where the Bedouin dialect is almost completely dominant: for instance, in Oran, Mostaganem, Mascara…”. Many authors obviously suggest an answer to our sub-research question. They refer to the composition of ORD as originally and mainly Bedouin.

Does it however correspond to our findings? Do koineisation processes obtain in ORD? If yes, which features are mixed (see 1.4.2.2.1) or reallocated (see 1.4.2.2.5) and which are simplified (see 1.4.2.2.3)? How do interdialect (see 1.4.2.2.4) and levelling (see 1.4.2.2.2) or focusing (see 1.4.3) operate in the community? As for bidialectalism (see 1.4.4), speech accommodation precedes and interferes: As a consequence of generally spontaneous accommodatory processes, the number of bi-dialectal speakers multiplies, especially in continuous regionally contactual sites such as Algiers and Oran (Dendane, 2006). Does dialect-switching (see 1.4.4) appear in that case? Dendane (2006: 139) also raises the concept of dialect borrowing (see 1.4.4), saying that it is mutual between the Algerian dialects, notably in urban settings, where there are different regional background inhabitants. He gives the example of Tlemcen as the regional model. Does dialect borrowing prevail among the Oranees too? These questions will be examined linguistically in the next chapters.

2.6. The Fieldwork

Considerable parts of this research have been devoted to the theoretical implications related to the current study object. Key concepts have been defined in isolation and/or in relation to one another so that their use could be easily and promptly detected when required. Similar investigations have been already done throughout the world. It has been necessary to get an overall idea about the most important scientific achievements to be able to locate the
obtained results by comparison and contrast. For example, ORD could be genealogically identified by comparing and contrasting this variety with other Arabic dialects. The researcher’s reading process has paved the way for inspiration and interrogation about ORD. Hypothesising is the following step spontaneously undertaken. Scientifically, hypotheses are not amply enough for drawing final conclusions. The sociolinguist is expected to conduct some fieldwork so that he confirms or invalidates his hypotheses. He needs to examine some actual speech provided by certain speakers, and then match as much as possible theory with reality. For this purpose, any sociolinguistic research covers data collection via the informants’ participation.

2.6.1. The Informants

176 was the total number of our informants. 71 were males and 105 females, aged between 19 and 27 years old. This representative sample provides an attempt to draw general conclusions about the Oranees72 of this generation only. We are content with the present sample size because “…large samples tend not to be as necessary for linguistic surveys as for other surveys” (Milroy and Gordon, 2003: 28). The authors (ibid: 29) talk about Labov’s generalisations in New York City on the basis of 88 informants, and those of Trudgill in Norwich on 60 (Trudgill, 1974). They add that according to Labov (1966: 180-1), “…linguistic usage is more homogenous than many other phenomena studied by surveys – such as, for example, dietary preferences or voting intentions – because it is not so subject to conscious manipulation” (ibid: 28). 97 informants (34 males and 63 females) were interviewed and recorded (see 2.6.3). The others (37 males and 42 females) were exposed to an administered questionnaire (see 2.6.4).

All the informants are Algerian arabised university students. One is facing here two distinct eras of Arabisation with two different objectives. The first is ancient and related to those two consecutive phases of Muslim-Arab conquests (see 2.1). As entails in 1.2.1.1, Islam-converted populations were increasingly interested in learning CA to read more comfortably and understand the Koran, in addition to get more familiar with other Islamic principles. The second era is much more recent and designates a reactional process followed by the Algerian post-independence-government against the French colonial language policy.

---

72 Any special reference to Oran speech community or ORD is restricted to the generation of the present informants.
In the late sixties, the Algerian government presided by Houari Boumediene was determined to reach a full national Arabisation. The school was one target institution where the process was implemented. Gradually, school subjects were arabised at the primary level. The eighties knew the beginning of secondary school Arabisation. French, however, remained as the principle means of instruction at the university level.

Our informants were encountered at different Oran university sites (within or outside classrooms), namely Essenia and USTO. In the first location, we had our interviewees who specialise in one of the fields: English language, Standard Arabic language, sociology or psychology. The administered survey was however mainly undertaken at the level of the second location. The informants’ specialised fields are technical (such as chemistry, electronics, electro-technology and automatics). Boarders were excluded: Following the objective of the current investigation, our attention was entirely turned to the Oranees only. However, the word ‘Oranees’ does not designate only one category of those who live in Oran. The city’s inhabitants fall into at least four categories,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Generation</th>
<th>2nd Generation</th>
<th>3rd Generation</th>
<th>Indigenous Oranees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 (14%)</td>
<td>47 (48%)</td>
<td>16 (17%)</td>
<td>20 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.10: Our Interviewees’ Demographic Composition

This classification is made following Trudgill (1998) (reported in Kerswill (2002)) (see 1.4.3). The 1st Generation of our interviewees represents the in-migrants in Oran. The 2nd Generation designates those interviewed informants who were born in Oran, with in-migrant parents. The 3rd Generation covers the interviewed informants who were and their parents (or at least the father) born in Oran; yet, the grand-parents are in-migrants in Oran. Last but not least, the indigenous Oranees refer to interviewees with parents and grand-parents (at least the father and grand-father) born in Oran.

From the above table, we notice that the 2nd Generation ranks the first in terms of number, with 48% of our interviewed sample. The last rank goes to the 1st Generation with 14%. The indigenous Oranees are in the second position (21%) followed by the 3rd Generation.

---

73 Its name is the same as the one of the village where it is situated
74 Université de Science et de Technology d’Oran Science and Technology University of Oran
(16%). This order is further confirmed by the demographic composition of our informants who were subjected to the administered questionnaire in the table below,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>1st Generation</th>
<th>2nd Generation</th>
<th>3rd Generation</th>
<th>Indigenous Oranees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08 (10%)</td>
<td>41 (52%)</td>
<td>10 (13%)</td>
<td>20 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 2.11: Our Informants’ Demographic Affiliation - Method 2 |

We conclude that nearly half of the overall number of our informants represents Oranees with in-migrant parents. The composition of the other half is heterogeneous and shared among the 1st and 3rd generations, together with the indigenous Oranees.

2.6.2. Data Collection

Data collection offers the possibility of sufficient concentration while undertaking a later data analysis. Actual linguistic sampling, at hand, provides the investigator with direct observation to examine more than once, then re-consider and re-check data when required. Evidence is likewise present to support or refute one’s hypotheses. Interestingly, data collection also and frequently introduces new ideas to carry out further different researches on the same collected sample. Spontaneous everyday speech makes data. Ideally, investigating sociolinguistic variation means collecting linguistic samples from every community speaker and in every state of use (Milroy and Gordon, 2003). The writers add that the investigator “…would examine every linguistic variable as they relate to every social variable … An endeavor(u) r of such scope is clearly beyond the reach of even the most-talented, best-funded researchers” (ibid). It is on the basis of the available time and resources that the researcher can decide for the width and profoundness of data analysis.

One major problem in sociolinguistic studies however is the way of collecting data: How the sociolinguist can observe individuals speak when they are not being observed. His presence, especially with his recording material, would run the risk of biasing the informant’s speech production. Being aware of his state as the centre of attention, the informant will be more careful with his utterances, a fact that diminishes the spontaneity of his actual language usage. Labov (1972) calls the phenomenon as ‘the Observer’s Paradox’. Although the problem cannot be totally avoided, the author (ibid: 209) suggests that “…we must either find
ways of supplementing the formal interviews with other data, or change the structure of the interview situation by one means or another”.

The present informants’ access was not difficult when the fieldworker adopted a friend of friend approach which is,

“…used by Lesley Milroy (1987) in her study of Belfast working-class speech. Lesley Milroy entered the community as a friend-of-a-friend; her first contact was a member of the community who knew about the purpose of the research and who provided her with lists of friends and acquaintances. She then contacted these people introducing herself as a ‘friend of X’. This helped her quickly to establish relationships of trust within the community” (Swann et al, 2004: 118)

Therefore, the current fieldworker decided not to talk to her informants by herself; other individuals intervened to make the introductions. For the purpose of recording the interviews (see 2.6.3) for instance, the fieldworker was bound to find these research helpers who could be trusted by the students (the present informants). This way, she thought, would serve to lessen the effects of ‘the Observer’s Paradox’. Her choice fell on some university librarians. This category of workers is generally familiar with large numbers of students. They share with them less formal and academic relationships, a fact which could even turn our contact with the informants more flexible and friendly.

The fieldworker was introduced as a post-graduate student. She asked the librarians not to specify the type of post-graduation (doctoral) undertaken so that the informants would not feel under authority to participate, or adopt a formal way of responding (doctoral post-graduation is in many times equaled with university teaching in Algeria. The latter could be related to social distance and respect which in one way or another may influence the informants’ speech spontaneity). The fieldworker was identified as a student in order that the informants feel that she shares their current status, and they consequently more freely express their opinions. The librarians added, following the fieldworker, that her research was about Oran and its inhabitants. She tended not to give more details so that she would not find it
necessary to tell them about the implicit linguistic objective of the research, a fact that may bias the informants’ speech.

As for the administered survey (see 2.6.4), the fieldworker was helped by her sister who asked many of university classmates and acquaintances to participate in the investigation. She was also assisted by a university security guard, a very sociable, easy-going and friendly individual. Both research interveners (the researcher’s sister and security guard) introduced the fieldworker and her research topic in the same way as the librarians did.

In what follows, the research methodology will be outlined. Collecting data sometimes cannot rely on one research method only due to research difficulties (see 2.6.4), in addition to the phenomenal problem of the ‘observer’s paradox’. “These difficulties can be addressed in follow-up research employing alternative approaches with complementary benefits and limitations” (Milroy and Gordon, 2003:73). Anonymity was also adopted to gain further the participants’ trust.

2.6.3. The Interviews

The interview is one sociolinguistic data collection technique whereby long pieces of the informants’ (see 2.6.1) conversational natural speech are elicited. Intrinsically, the investigator aims at observing directly spontaneous language in use. In this research, we attempted to extract as many genealogical linguistic variants (which currently compose ORD) as possible. The interviews were generally administered to groups of two or more informants who were familiar with each other. The average time span devoted to each interview was around twenty minutes.

The advantage of interviewing groups was remarkable. For example, the fieldworker had to start an interview, by asking a brief and precise question. Once the informants grasped the message, the focal subject could be established naturally in the form of a conversation among the group members themselves. The fieldworker could then withdraw leaving the informants involved in the subject. While debating and discussing, each informant took part of the conversation as if he/ she were not observed by an outsider. The interviewer’s intervention was restricted to re-orienting coherently the discussion by asking other questions. Or, she flexibly participated by her regulators (e.g. yes, mm, head shaking…). Due to time

---

75 The number of informants in some groups reached six members.
limitations, she could not rely on group-based interviews only. Some informants were introduced to her individually, and she had to start interviewing them as soon as they came to see her for that purpose. Otherwise, they might have left without coming back. The average interview length at this level was six minutes with each participant.

A ready-made list of interview topics had been already at hand. Many factors, such as, the interview mastery and adjustment, the informants’ humour manipulation and time-restrictions favoured a pre-interview phase for topic selection and preparation. The first question that came to the interview’s mind was on what basis she would have chosen the topics. She did not tend to inform the participants about the real linguistic objective behind her questions for fear that their awareness would bias data. Her attention was drawn to the following Milroy and Gordon’s (2003: 65) writing: if speakers get emotionally involved as in the case of excitement, happiness, anger or fear “…, they are more concerned with what they say than how they say it. Following this logic, interviewers can obtain less self-conscious speech by asking questions that bring about such emotional reactions”.

In the same authors’ work, two criteria (suggested by Labov (1984)) were reported. One criterion deals with the participants’ previous experience while the other one covers their social background information. The fieldworker found it more interesting to focus on the second criterion to gain the informants’ trust. The questions asked were too general, open and free that the respondents would not recognise the objective behind the interview. They were about the Oranees’ customs, traditions and social life. More particularly, the interviewer explicitly interrogated her informants about the way weddings were organised in Oran, and how traditional and Islamic celebrations (such as [ǝl ǝl iːd ǝliːɾ]76 and [ǝl ǝl iːd ǝl kbiːr]77) took place within their city. Then she moved subsequently and gradually to other free-order topics (their choice depended on the informants’ conversation progress), dealing with transport, roads, food, purchasing power, town halls, smoking, football, in addition to the Oranees’ stereotyping in Algeria. She attempted through her questioning to achieve the informants’ emotional involvement.

First, she asked questions that might arise pride (of their traditions and customs) in them and happiness since their general celebrations represent moments of pleasure. She smoothly moved to topics (such as, transport organisation and purchasing power) about which

---

76 An Islamic celebration taking place immediately after the fasting month.
77 An Islamic celebration usually occurring after two months and ten days of the fasting month.
they expressed their regret and disappointment. After that, she tackled those topics which could induce their annoyance, especially when saying that the Oranees were negatively stereotyped in other parts of Algeria. Their reactional defense was mostly angrily spontaneous and highly natural. In many cases, the interviewer was content with the participants’ social background information. In other cases, the number of responses was small, especially when the interviewees were approached individually. She hence integrated the first criterion, by asking them about their childhood and adolescence.

All the interviews were recorded by means of MP4 device. The fieldworker considered this material as very beneficial for it offers the possibility of transferring and safeguarding the interviews in several computer items (such as desk computer; laptop; USB…); in case one of the items was damaged, the interviews were available and ready for listening in other devices. Also, MP4 offered a high computer sound quality. The fieldworker could control the computer volume or simply use headphones. Another benefit of this material is that it is widespread among young Oranees who use it everywhere to listen to, for example, songs. The informants, in other words, were more used to MP4 than a tape-recorder, and this may reduce their hesitation of being recorded. One alternative solution for avoiding the observer’s paradox is by hiding the recording material. However, Milroy and Gordon (2003: 82) react,

“For many researchers the fact that surreptitious recording may be legal does not suffice to license its use; they view this deceptive technique as a violation of ethical principles. Labov has been a particularly strong opponent. During his term as president of the Linguistic Society of America, he established an ethics committee that condemned the practice (see Shuy, 1993)”

For these reasons, the interviewer decided to show the device to the informants. To gain their trust, she invited the informants to listen to the type of questions she would ask and said in case any one of the informants did not feel like that his answers would be recorded and/or interviewed, he/she could easily withdraw. Seven individuals refused to undertake the recorded interviews from the beginning. As for the other vast majority, once listening to the first question and assimilating its content, they accepted to carry on the interviews.
2.6.4. The Fieldworker-Administered Questionnaire

Even though the vast majority of interviewees were relaxed in responding, a number of them were looking at the fieldworker as an outsider who was a stranger to their community. Interviewing them was a more formal task for them. One of the difficulties the interviewer faced with this category of her respondents was the occurrence of ‘the Observer’s Paradox’: their recurrent style shifting from the dialect to CA or French sentences, phrases or vocabulary; she could not account for their total speech because it was partially formal, a fact which does not meet the purpose of this work nor does it discern linguistic contact in informal situations. A further interview limitation is that this method did not cover some important variants mentioned in the literature. It did not comprise either other features that could be daily notably heard among the Oranees. Still another research difficulty was that the frequency of occurrence of a number of linguistic variants, that the interviewer found necessary for this study, was not covered by the interviews. Therefore, she (the interviewer) opted for an alternative data collection method which would complement and overcome the interview restrictions. Her choice fell on addressing a prepared survey or questionnaire.

Questionnaires are traditional methods used by former dialectologists, and are still employed today. They could be written or administered by the fieldworker. Unlike SA, ORD is, like the other Algerian Arabic dialects, unwritten. The fieldworker’s questionnaire was entirely oral. Contrasted with the interviews, it consisted of less adjustable but more rapid and direct structured questions which required brief responses. The fieldworker, in other words, tried to meet the following quotation: “The method is,…, applicable only if the investigator has in mind extremely clear goals that have been well formulated in advance” (Milroy and Gordon, 2003: 57). She attempted via her administered survey per se to detect the frequency of occurrences of certain genealogical linguistic elements which were in a seemingly free variation. Most of them were recurrent in the recordings; others were collected from the literature (e.g. Bouamrane, 1991; Bouamrane, 1993; Caubet, 2001; Heath, 2002) and still others from the fieldworker’s own long-term observation (see 2.6.5). They could be related to pronunciation, grammar or vocabulary.

The fieldworker had her one-to-one survey already established in the form of a table, with predicted responses (lexically, for example, [jæd] and [hkʌm] were seemingly in free variation) and empty squares for supplied extra-variants. She would transcribe the latter on
the spot and did not need recordings in that case. She avoided asking the participants questions in groups so that the group members would not linguistically influence one another, which otherwise may bias data. Unlike the interviews, the administered questionnaire respondents were aware of the current linguistic objective. The researcher decided to inform them because the nature of the questions did not give them time to think and select the variant. Their responses were immediate. In case they supplied more than one variant to the same question, the fieldworker considered only the first since it is probably the most spontaneous. Around ten minutes was spent with each informant. Still, how did the fieldworker ask the questions? She selected various ways to meet that purpose: she relied on translation, giving opposites, explanations, pictures and reading. DA, CA and F were the language varieties used.

Sociolinguistic observations imply that Arabisation weakened many informants at French, although many students still receive today their higher education in that language. The researcher selected, however, some very ordinary French terms which may be daily present in the Algerian speech, either as switches or borrowed words. Indeed, most of the informants translated and gave dialectal Arabic equivalents. In cases where a French term was not grasped by one informant, the researcher tried to explain it in dialectal Arabic or give its opposite. For example, she explained and asked the following, [ki wæh∂ jktb brija fu: jdi:rlha mbaʃd] if somebody writes a letter, what will he do later(according to you)?; she also asked questions, such as: [f∂: huwa ʃæks baːɾad] what is the opposite of hot?

Other variants were elicited by means of pictures (see Appendix 4). The fieldworker aimed by using this technique to make the administered questionnaire more attractive for the informants and keep them non-bored. Indeed, many of them were amused with the pictures selected. Some claimed that they found it funny to provide such dialectal words as [ʃælə] louse, [ʃælʊ] cockroach, [bgra] cow; [gniːna] rabbit; [kbæːʃ] sheep. In reality, the administered surveys, just like interviews, were supposed to be formal methods. The respondents expected the fieldworker to ask them for variants in SA for instance. Surprisingly, it was the very informal style which they had to supply. Finally, another administered questionnaire technique which was used for eliciting some other phonetic variants was Koran verse reading (see 3.4.2).

Like any other sociolinguistic data collection method, the administered survey has its limitations. It is, for example so structured that it is not enough to reflect actual language
usage. Added to this, some participants did not produce any response. The researcher referred to the latter phenomenon as blank, which would be tentatively explained in the next chapters. A third method (see 2.6.5) is suggested to comply with some of the limitations of the administered survey and recorded interviews.

2.6.4.1. The Analysis of Fieldworker Administered-Questionnaire

The statistical treatment of the administered questionnaire under study accounted for the frequency of occurrence of each genealogical linguistic feature. The obtained results varied and ranged between 0 and 79. The following tables (Table 5.24 and Table 5.26 respectively) are examples taken from Chapter Five (see 5.3.1.2 and 5.3.1.4 respectively),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[sə:b]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td>find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentarised</td>
<td>[lqɑ]</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *find*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[ʕʈɑ]</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[mɑd]</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *give*  

The question which arises: On what numerical basis, shall we say that a given variant survives a given koineisation process? The researcher has decided for mathematical intervals. If we use 100% (instead of 79) then the half is 50% and the quarter 25%. 75% is 50% + 25%, and we can get the interval [25%, 75%]. The remaining percentages are restrained either between 0 % and 25% if they are less than the latter percentage (25%), that is [0%, 25%], or

---

78 Table 5.24  
79 Table 5.26
between 75% and 100% if they are higher than the former percentage (75%), that is \(]75\%, 100\%[\). We obtain the following table,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage intervals</th>
<th>Cardinal Number Intervals</th>
<th>Koinneisation Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(]75%, 100%[)</td>
<td>(]59, 79)</td>
<td>focusing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([25%, 75%])</td>
<td>([20, 59])</td>
<td>mixing or reallocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([0%, 25%])</td>
<td>([0, 20])</td>
<td>levelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.12:** Numeral Intervals with Reference to Koinneisation Processes

In other words, our data could be classified into three groups: the first group gathers focused linguistic variants which belong to the interval \([59, 79]\) (or \(]75\%, 100\%[\)). The second group involves levelled linguistic variants found within the interval \([0, 20]\) (or \([0\%, 25\%]\)). The last group is composed of mixed or reallocated linguistic variants belonging to the interval \([20, 59]\) (or \([25\%, 75\%]\)). If we try to classify the lexical variants in the two tables above, we find that [lq] *he found* belongs to the first interval, [sq:b] *he found* to the second one (for further interpretation see 5.3.1.2), whereas [ʃɑ] *he gave* and [məd] *he gave* to the third interval (for further interpretation see 5.3.1.4).

### 2.6.5. The Participant Observer

In some cases, the actual sociolinguistic observations testify the presence of certain linguistic features which are unavailable in both the recorded interviews and administered questionnaire. The sociolinguistic observation is authentic in the sense that it “... entails long-term involvement in a community ...” The principal benefits of participant observation are (a) the amount and quality of the data collected, and (b) the familiarity with community practices gained by the investigator” (Milroy and Gordon, 2003: 68). In addition, this method allows a more factual examination of natural interaction, unlike interviews and administered surveys which are comparatively guiding and controlling. In the above quotation, Milroy and Gordon indicate the method as the participant observation. Although the fieldworker is not a native
speaker of ORD, she is in-migrant\textsuperscript{80} residing for more than 15 years in Oran. Her long permanent staying within the speech community has allowed her to get familiar with the local dialect. The data drawn from this method, thus, is restricted to the reasons mentioned just above. The remaining data is either recorded (in the case of interviews) or treated statistically (in the case of administered questionnaire).

2.7. Conclusion

Algeria, multi-faceted, at least, historically, geographically, demographically and linguistically, makes up a fertile ground for scientific research. History has recorded the subsequent arrival of different races to the Algerian lands and their leaving for traces behind. They have been particularly attracted by the country’s geographical layout. Demographically, they have effectively participated in the heterogeneous composition of the Algerian population. External immigration, in fact, is not the only demographic mobility known by the country. Local migration has also taken place. Oran, for example, was mainly inhabited by Europeans during the French colonisation. After independence, internal migrants occupied the place of the departing European majority. The newcomers originated from different parts of Algeria. They were especially numerous from the nearest regions to Oran. The daily meeting of different regional background speakers has invoked contact between their different dialects. Genealogically, these dialects are classified as either bedouin or sedentary. The coexistence of bedouin and sedentary dialects koineises their linguistic features which get mixed or simplified. Some other features are levelled out or reallocated. If some given linguistic variants reach stabilisation, they turn focused. Chapter Three will unveil how koineisation processes have operated and affected ORD on the pronunciation level.

\textsuperscript{80} This is one motivation behind the choice of the current investigation.
3.0. Introduction

Our first practical chapter deals with pronunciation. Oran accent has long known regional variation due to internal migration. Therefore, ORD shares many similarities with other Algerian dialects on the pronunciation level. Yet, it possesses its own particularities. The present chapter is interested in certain genealogically consonantal and vocalic variants which have gone through koineisation within ORD. Some of them are still in the mixture; some others are converted from regional to socio-stylistic or phonological variants. Still others come out as interdialectal forms. If a set of genealogical (phonological and phonetic) features are stabilised, this means that they have reached focusing. Focused variants arise at the expense of their corresponding levelled ones. Pronunciation levelling, in fact, helps the operation of all the other koineisation processes.

3.1. Mixing

We will attempt in this chapter to check our sub-hypotheses supporting the idea that Oran dialect still conserves its bedouin pronunciation. Inevitably, koinised pronunciation variants have all initially gone through a mixture situation. Mixing (see 1.4.2.2.1) takes place before any other koineisation process. Since the speed of of koineisation (1.4.2) depends also on the nature of the linguistic variant in question, which genealogical pronunciation forms still bear a mixed setting will be revealed below.

3.1.1. Consonants

The pronunciation system in ORD unexceptionally comprises consonantal and vocalic segments. Consonants, similarly with vowels, can all experience koineisation processes, including mixing. The consonant /q/ takes the lion’s share of the mixed situation. Its realisation varies from one case to another.

3.1.1.1. /q/

During our reading stage about the subject under investigation, one particular claim (Cantineau, 1939) allotted to the phoneme /q/ (epitomised as the letter qaaf in CA) has drawn
our attention. If we follow this claim\footnote{After Ibn Khaldoun I, 2/Rosenthal 1958: 1}, we admit the point that the very determining factor of Arabic dialectal genealogy is the phonetic /q/-realisation. According to Cantineau, all sedentary varieties, and only they, attest the unvoiced production of /q/. Bedouin dialects are, by contrast, expected to realise /q/ as voiced. Surprisingly, the recorded interviews showed that these expectations were far from reality in the case of the basically viewed as bedouin ORD (see 2.5.2.3). Rather, our results witnessed the parallel presence of the bedouin and sedentary variants of this phoneme: The informants, who are Oranees, provided both the voiced and unvoiced /q/-articulation. Evidence was detected through various collected and recorded data.

The first impression that one might get once listening to the recordings is that /q/-articulation is entirely subjected to the mixing process. This means that [q] coexists with [g] causing the prevalence of a dialect mixture situation. Both are, interestingly enough, encountered intervocalically as well as in initial and final positions. Initially, [q] may be followed by a vowel, as in [qa:lsuna] they threw stones on us; [qa:es:i] wait (sing fem); [qa:rija] intellectual (she); [qa:ljan] velvet dress; [qa:j] clothes; [qa:dræh] estimating him; [qa:dɔɾ] he is able (sing); [qa:ɾɛʃ] he waited; [qadj:i:n] they are able; [qaɾi:i:n] intellectual (they); [qabɔɾ] she accepted; [qad] he was able; [qaɾɾɔb] it gets nearer; [qaɾlaʃ] he started up; [qaʃa] lie, [qaɾli] before me; [qaʃ] past; [qaʃ:ʃ] around; it could also be initially followed or preceded by a consonant, as in [qaɾa:j] studies; [qwaɾat] documents; [qaʃ] mind; [(ɾaɾbi) mqaɾɔɾha] it is destiny; [qbi:h] horrible; [qbaɾ] before; [iqaɾse] he suffers; [mqalʃi:n(hum)] they are spoilt; [bqaɾ] it remained; [qaɾ] he studied; [jqarɾes] he waits; [lqat] she found; [jqarɾɔb] he gets nearer; [jqes] he throws away; [qaɾ:dru] they respect; [jqalbu] they search for; [tqad] she is able; [qlil] minor; [qri:b] near (sing); [qaɾ:b] they are near; [qbaɾ] he accepted; in finalsyllable positions, [q] is in items as [zaɾ:a] decoration; [bʃjaɾ] floor wash; [waɾt] time; [ʈbaɾ] trousseau; [ʃeqɾ] east; [haɾ] reason; [ʦiʃ] she washed the floor; [sdaɾ] bestowal; [jleːq] you have to; [jaɾlaːq] it gets stuck. Intervocally, [q] prevails in such items as [waɾeːla] perhaps; [baɾeqe] the rest; [sadaɾa]a] charity; [maɾaɾba] cemetery; [zʃəʁa]a] tease; [teɾa] trust; [moɾas] he diminishes; [naɾlaɾa]q] we meet; [naɾeq] he cleans.

As for [g], it is present initially as in [ɡil iːl] humble (from /qaliːl/ little in SA); [ɡalb] heart; [ɡiʃaːl] middle of the day; [ɡalːet] outsider (from /laːqet/ in SA which means somebody with unknown identity); [ɡɛɾoːn] tent; [ɡɛʃæd] remaining (he); [ɡaːdeːn] holding
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(they); [gadbe:n] holding (they); [ga:lat] she said; [gutɔlkum] I said to you; [ga:łok] he said to you; [gult] I said; [golʃu] they removed; [gɔrrɔb (gændha)] he got nearer (to it); [gɔlʃi] take off!; [gɔdmi] come forward (you fem); [gæ:] all; [guda:m] in front of, or [g] is possibly followed or preceded by a consonant, as in [gri:waʃ] (a type of cake); [gla:lei] outsiders; [gwate:n] tents; [jga:blu:hum] they face them; [gra:b] they are near; [gri:b] it is near. Other examples including [g] in final syllable-positions are [tbaq] trousseau; [treːg] road; [soːg] market; [santdɔg] box; [maːgaːg] (traditional cake); [siːg] (Algerian town); [hraːg] he migrated illegally; [nəhrɔg] I migrate illegally; [joːg] he drives; [bliːg] she follows; [tʃafog] she claps her hands; [tɔrdɔg] it exploded; [ilhaːg] he arrived; [fug] upstairs. In intervocalic positions, [g] occurs as in [aŋaːg] (traditional cake); [begaːr] cowboy (synonymous with gallet from bagra ‘cow’); [soːg] driving; [jzɔgi] he shouts; [jɔgulʃu] they remove; [xeːguːna] stupid; [tɔjɔg] very fat.

A more tentative scrupulous data examination, however, allows unveiling other different processes at work; mixing, we deduce, is not the only koineisation process taking place. For the purpose of simplifying this description we suggest to work on data classification. A great deal of our data can indeed fall into three categories,

- Category One has to do with [q] and [g] in free variation: Where the unvoiced production can be replaced by the voiced articulation of the classical qaaf (e.g. [ganf ud] and [qanfud] hedgehog; [ˈaeɡrɔb] and [ˈaqɔrɔb] scorpion; [jgarrɔb] and [jqaːrɔb] he gets nearer; [tbaq] and [tbaŋ] tray; [gɔdaːfi] and [qadaːfi] kadafi (former Lybian president) (see 3.4).

- Category Two covers [q] and [g] in complementary distribution: It arises in cases where one of them takes place, the other does not (e.g. /qalʃi/ start up (sing fem imperative) vs /galʃi/; /gadmi/ go forward vs /qadmi/ present (3th); /fraqbu/ they remote vs /fraːqbu/ they see from the balcony; /fuqna/ we realised vs /fuŋna/ above us; /qalʃu/ start up vs /galʃu/ remove). Here, a third different process (see 3.2.2) operates.

- Category Three embodies [q] as an intermediate form in such items as, [lqal] he found (see 3.3.1)

- Category Four is described as apparently random: it encompasses data which belongs to no category of those mentioned above. Its linguistic elements survive rudimentary mixing. In other words, while the first three categories are possibly explanatory as will be shown below, the case of the fourth category could not be explained. This last category is encountered in
other Arabic dialects as well. Aguadé (1998) comments on the maintenance of unvoiced uvular stop in some bedouin varieties, like Zʕir in Morocco, and says that it is not easy to explain this phenomenon. Likewise, the source of [q]-preservation in some present data does not seem clear, which is the case of the following examples: [zʕæqa] tease; [jzaʕqo] they tease; [nzæʕqo] we tease; [zwa:q] decoration; [jzawqo:ɬ(hum)] they decorate (to them); [tasja:q] floor wash; [tsajqaq] she washes the floor; [qwaʕat] documents; [qa:raʃ] wait (sing masc); [jaq₃u:(ɬ)hum] we wait (for) them; [nqa:reʃ] I wait; [jqa:reʃ] he waits; [jeqaffʃ] he takes drugs; [ptq aflu] they take drugs; [ma:nqarqʒu:ʃ] we don’t worry; [ma:br faqli:ʃ (ʕli:ʃ)] I don’t feel comfortable (with him); [mqalʃi:n(hum) ] they are spoilt; [qaʃo:ʃ] they stole him.

A general remark can be made. All the above categories have certainly experienced a mixture situation. The difference is that the degree of mixing in Category 4 is still the highest. Category 3 knows an interdialectal situation. Category 2 has reached a subsequent process, namely reallocation: In 3.2, it is said that phonemic contrast and socio-stylistic re-orientation take place. The first category includes those elements which are partially, almost or completely levelled out. In this section, we still emphasise the mixing process including, next to /q/, other variables and attempt to uncover the underlying reasons behind its persistence. First, let us try to answer these questions regarding /q/: why could this variable be realised many times as [q] in the pre-supposed bedouin ORD? Why is the voiced velar stop simultaneously maintained?

### 3.1.1.2. /q/-Sedentarisation

ORD could have been sedentarised as a consequence of its contact with CA or other sedentary or bedouin dialects. In the case of CA, while the early Arab grammarians, such as Sibawayh and Zamakhchhari, affirm the /q/-voicing in CA, today’s CA phonology, oddly enough, attests the unvoiced, instead of the voiced, production of /q/. Some contemporary linguists have endeavoured to find explanations. For Cantineau (1960) for instance, CA was mainly spoken by sedentary educated elite who transmitted the effects of their sedentary pronunciation to the variety in question. Now, if we compare CA and ORD, we find that the two varieties converge on account of sharing the bedouin genealogy (1.2.5.1), but diverge in /q/-articulation. CA undergoes an unvoiced mono-realisation of /q/ whereas ORD bears a bi-realisation of the phoneme: Both [q] and [g], as indicated, are co-present in the dialect under
research. Due to its status within the Algerian speech community (and the Arab world in general) (see 2.5.1.2), and owing to this common (bedouin) genealogy with ORD, CA could efficaciously participate in sedentarising ORD via the use of its [q]-variant. The question which presently arises is: Does CA maintain its influential role in explaining the presence of other linguistic features in ORD? Obviously, this question will be answered in due course (see for example 3.2.1).

As far as sedentary dialects are concerned, their pronunciation influence upon ORD might be, rather than through CA, transplanted by these source varieties themselves. This could be another alternative interpretation of the prevalence of unvoiced uvular in the local dialect: many sedentary background migrants have come from their different locations to settle finally in Oran. Through urban dialect contact with ORD, [q] could have been introduced into the variety in question. Illustratively, we have several times come across the utterance [qbi]bad which is originally found in the sedentary dialect NDM (Bouamrane, 1991). The lexical item obviously involves the unvoiced uvular. On the other hand, the prevalence of the sedentary variant in ORD is assigned to another type of dialect contact which is unexpectedly bedouin. The contributing bedouin dialects constitute the major group in Oran and their effect on the local dialect is probably high. The data at hand suggests that these dialects sedentarise ORD in two ways. Similarly to CA, the first way is their impact via /q/-transfer from those bedouin varieties per se to the local dialect which is again then implicitly affected by sedentary dialects.

Many recorded examples are available at hand: the items he asked and he was able are respectively saqsa and qad in western bedouin dialects but [tesqa] and [qod] in the sedentary Nedroma dialect (Bouamrane, 1993). The latter dialect might have had a bearing on the former dialects, which have in turn influenced ORD. The above lexical elements, comprising [q], respectively manifest in different forms within the dialect under investigation: [tesqa(ni)/(ha)] you ask me/her; [tesqo] they ask; [tesqo(k)] I ask you; and [qad] he was able; [tqad] she is able; [qad] he is able; [nqad] I am able; [qadi:ti] you (fem) were able; [ma:nqad] I am not able; [qadi:n] they are able (plur present participle), in addition to other utterances namely [dajqa] narrow (fem) and [dajqo] they made (sth) narrower. The second unpredictable way in which ORD is sedentarised is still through bedouin dialects but when these rural varieties possess lexical items with the [q]-variant while their sedentary counterparts make use of [q]-free equivalents. A more careful examination of some examples (Bouamrane, 1991) may clarify this idea. [tas] (including the segment [q]) throw is found in
various western bedouin dialects (such as MKR, TMT, SBA, BYD, TRT and ORD) (Bouamrane, 1991). Yet, NDM employs [rma] whereas TSN uses [sejjej]. The recordings show that the variety in question sticks to the use of [qaːs] under different forms ([iːcːsp] they throw; [iːcː] he throws; [iːcːs(ː)] you throw (ii)). The section below is devoted to the preservation of /g/ in the mix situation and some possible reasons behind this fact.

3.1.1.3. /g/-Maintenance

If one turns his attention to the voiced velar stop, the question above which he may face may be formulated as: why does ORD still retain this variant? This is possibly because ORD is genealogically bedouin and [g] is associated with bedouinity (see above). One may hear in the local dialect the unvoiced uvular in the lexical item [s̪endʊq] box which comes from sedentary speech (e.g. Algiers dialect (Boucherit, 2002)). Besides, our data entails a high frequency of the item with /q/ realised as voiced velar, [s̪andʊːq]. Another underlying cause of [g]-retention in ORD is related to the perpetual contact TRT, BSR, TMT, SBA, MKR, BYD (and others) and this variety under study (Bouamrane, 1991, 1993). Social networks, the spots of linguistic contact, are probably made up by the speakers of these bedouin dialects. The voiced velar stop is found in lexical forms widely shared among the varieties just mentioned, such as [Trig] road (we also found [froːg] (sing) and [tɔrgan] (plur) in the present data), [galb] heart, [ragba] neck (Bouamrane, 1991). Their sedentary counterparts are [Trig], [qalb] and [raqba] (ibid). No reception of the sedentary items is noticed by ORD in the latter cases.

[g] is then retained above in items already existing in ORD. In other cases, it may happen that ORD acquires this segment within lexical forms which have not prevailed before in the variety in question, but have been adopted from diverse bedouin backgrounds. Following Bouamrane (1991), ORD originally possesses the item [h̥kem] hold; [f̥d̥] originates from TRT, TMT, BYD and MKR, and [g̥bad] comes from BSR. Data demonstrates that ORD has obtained [f̥d̥] and [g̥bad] which are currently in competition with [h̥kem] (see 5.3.1.7). A different example is the use of [niːf̥an] straight in ORD, BYD, MKR and [msegma] straight in TRT. Data includes [m̥segmiːn] they are straight and its related forms: [jtsaɡmʊ] they become straight; [jaɡmu] they make straight; [tatsaɡmʊ] it becomes straight: The source could be the bedouin TRT. Still another example (Bouamrane, 1993), call is employed as ʕajja in TSN, TRT, ORN, BSR, MST, NDM; it is found as lYa in TMT, SBA, MKR and
SDA; zagg is the one used in BYD. Data demonstrates the presence of [jzagi], [nzagu] which could be of course ascribed to BYD.

Whether the genealogical mixing persists over years in ORD, the alternation between [q] and [g] is not unique to this dialect under investigation. It similarly occurs in many other Arabic dialects, as is the case of certain sedentary dialects. /g/, for example, belongs to Rabat Arabic system (beside the sedentaries /q/ and /ʔ/[^162]), as in ḡa “pumpkin”; /mgɔrɔs/ “flattened”; /sɔŋ/ “to overtake” (Messaoudi, 1998). In Algiers dialect nowadays, one can come across the consonant /q/ with a voiced realisation, as in [bra] “cow”, [g ɔrn] “horn”, [gitun] “tent”, [zga] “he shouted” (Boucherit, 2002). As regards the Hilalian-type speech of which [g] is usually typical, the dialect of Casablanca (Aguadé, 2002) comprises this unvoiced uvular stop, as in qil “scarce, slight”; qbeh “to take”; qalleq “to hang”; fūq “on, over”, quddâm “in front of”, qrib “near, close”, bqa “to stay, to remain”. Other illustrative utterances with [g] in the variety, just above, are gmɔl “louse”; bgra “cow” and gāl “to say”.

### 3.1.2. Vowels

In Chapter Two, it has been seen that ORD enjoys a rich vocalic system. “Even the unaware native can be misled by the great number of vowel sounds ….” (Bouhadiba, 1988: 114). The system may also appear “…very complex and confusing at times for the linguist who attempts to investigate it phonologically” (ibid: 114). It also seems very probable that the process of mixing has found its way to the vowels in this variety. Our question is whether the genealogical vocalic features have gone through subsequent koinéisation processes (and if yes, to what extent this happens), or still survive mixing as the sole process.

#### 3.1.2.1. Short Vowels

As expected, different vocalic productions were extensively encountered in the present data (see 2.5.2.1.1a). Genealogically speaking, the researcher’s attention is restrictively drawn to the sounds [i], [a] (as one /a/-realisation), [u] (as one /u/-realisation) and [i] (as one /i/-realisation). The first sound is observed in items as [ɔli] spit; [ktɔb] write; [qraʃ] go out; [nmaʃ] ant; [ɔṁ d i h a] her ears; [plɔʃəb] he plays; [p yla] it becomes expensive; [hkaʃ] control; [slɔt] keep silent ; [hrɔg] migrate illegally; [hɔd] hold grudges; [wɔʃ] stand;

[^162]: Another sedentary manifestation of /q/
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[jɔŋtɔs (daw)] (light) is being cut off; [talˈɡat] she released; [kɔtˈrat] much; [kɔtrija] most; [ktar] it increased (sing masc); [ktar] more; [kbor] he grew up; [fatt] I passed; [matt] I died. Frequently, the schwa could be one realisation of /a/, /æ/ or /i/ (see Table 2.6).

The short low back vowel is found in such items as [ˈχasrat] she lost; [ˈχarɔj] he gets (things out); [ˈtan̥aɾni] you suffer (sing fem); [ˈχarɔj] they got out; [ˈbyːa] he wanted. Yet, /a/ is realised as [a] in those environments where preceding or following [-syl, +cns, -back] (ibid): /b f m t d z s ʃ j ʒ n l r/ are the consonants involved (e.g. [ˈkaθ] write; [d法人 spit; [ˈnumaɫ] ant; [ˈχarɔj] go out; [ˈmyːɫ əːqo] we meet; [ˈgaːht] she said; [ˈqasdar] he is able (sing); [ˈdr ija] children), by [-syl, -cns, -low] (ibid): any of the two segments /w, j/ (e.g. [ˈgriːwɛʃ] (a type of cake); [twɔkkal] you rely; [ˈwafːa] the act of standing; [ˈwʊdniha] her ears; [ˈjɑlɛb] play; [ˈjɔjɛ] it becomes expensive; [tsojjaq] she washes the floor; [ˈgʊsʊq] it gets stuck) or by [-syl, +back, -cnt] (ibid): one of the following two consonants /k, g/ (e.g. [ˈhʊm] control; [skat] keep silent; [kamalt] you finished (fem); [ˈkɑlma] word; [ˈdɑrʊk] now; [twɔkkal] you rely; [hrag] migrate illegally; [ˈhʊd] hold grudges; [ˈwʊɡ] stand; [ˈɡʊdmi] take off?; [ˈgʊdmɪ] come forward (you fem)) (see 2.5.2.1.1a).

The vowel [u] is noticed in elements, such as [ˈkbur] old age; [futt] you passed; [mutt] you died; [kutrat] it increased (sing fem); [kutrija] majority, almost; [turgud] she sleeps; [ma:turɡud] she does not sleep; [nargud] I sleep; [jugʃud] he remains; [tugʃud] she remains; [jguʃdu] they remain; [gutlak] I said to you; [tgulak] she says to you; [gult] I said; [ˈnuɣɾɔj] I go out; [ˈyurba] strangeness. Although [u] and [i] can be only partially distributed, it is obviously highly expected that this vowel obtains, instead of [a], in contexts such as before or after the labials /b, f, m/ and the velars /k, g, ɣ, ʃ/. It is however realised as schwa taking place just after or before non-labial and non-velar phonemes163. On the other hand, the high short back vowel stands in opposition to /a/ and /i/ in the context of CV## (e.g. /ˈχarɔj/ they got out vs /ˈχarɔj/ exit; /ˈtan̥aɾni/ you suffer (sing fem) vs /ˈtan̥aɾnu/ you suffer (plur); /ˈjzagj/ he shouts vs /ˈjzagj/ they shout; [ˈqaditi] you (fem) were able vs [ˈqaditi] you (plur) were able).

The vowel [i] is encountered in items, such as [ˈɡiːla] middle of the day; [ˈyaːdi] will; [darija] children; [kutrija] almost; [ˈɣaːli] expensive. /i/ attests the most restricted vowel distribution; its occurrence is almost limited to final open syllables where [e] and [a] also can prevail, that is in CV## (e.g. [ˈɬɛn ɬabni] you suffer (sing fem); [ˈjzagj] he shouts; [ˈgʊʃi] take off?; [ˈɡʊdmɪ] come forward (you fem); [ˈjʒi] he comes; [ˈræʃti] you became; [ˈxi] my sister).

163 See 3.5.2.1 for further details
No opposition /a/ vs /i/ can be set up because the two phonemes occur in mutually exclusive contexts (ibid) (i.e. [b] does not take place in the word final open syllable (see 2.5.2.1.1a)). Unlike the latter vowel, the short low back vowel can set an opposition with /i/ in this context (e.g. /jäɣla/ it becomes expensive vs /jäɣli/ it is boiling; /wagfa/ the act of standing vs /wagfi/ stand! (fem)).

Following the literature, short vowels tend to constitute a binary system where /i/ and /u/ fuse to produce /ǝ/: This surface neutral vowel stands in opposition to /a/ in bedouin dialects. In sedentary dialects, on the other hand, the /ǝ/-merger of /i/ and /a/ occurs; and, this short central half-open unrounded vowel stands in contrast to /u/ (in Cohen (1970) reported in Boucherit, 2002)\textsuperscript{164}. A closer data approach exhibits the informants’ focusing orientation towards one genealogical opposition. More details on how this pronunciation feature is focused are given in 3.5.2.1.

3.1.2.2. Long Vowels

In addition to short vowels, we came in our data across long vowels as well. There was [aː] in items, such as [χaːtəm] ring; [ɣaːdi] will; [ɣaːba] forest; [gaːlək] he told you; [gaːbdeːn] holding (they); [jgaːbluːhum] they are in front of them; [graːb] they are near; [roːgaːg] (traditional cake); [giːjaːla] middle of the day; [χaːrəz] abroad; [gaːlət] she said; [gaːtlɐh] she said to him; [gaːlək] he said to you; [ɣaːli] expensive; [gaːtli] she said to me; [gaːl] he said; [ɣaːlja] expensive; [qbaːjɔl] Berber speakers; [maː-qraːː:] he did not study; [waːɡfə] standing (she); [ʃvaːr] little (plur); there was [uː] in forms as in [tuːɡəf] she stands up; [sabguːna] they overtook us; [tuːɡəf] she stands up; [nuːɡəf] I stand up; [juːɡfu] they stand up; [jguːlu] they say; [juːm] day; [tgɯːli] you say to me; [luːla] first; [zuːɔ] second; [tgɯːl] you say; there was also [iː] in items, such as in [qbiːh] horrible; [qliːl] minor; [qriːb] near; [grίːb] near; [qədias] you (sing fem) were able; [qədiːn] they are able (plur present participle). Just like short vowels, the informants have seemingly focused their long vowels at the genealogical level (see 3.5.2.2).

\textsuperscript{164} See also Iraqui-Sinaceur (1998)
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3.1.2.3. Diphthongs

Sedentary dialects are often featured by the reduction of a diphthong to a short element, ej passing to ī and ow to ū (Marçais, 1960). Bedouin dialects on the contrary tend to conserve the historical diphthongs ey and ow, or contract them to ē and ō respectively (ibid). This contraction obtains in the bedouin Tripoli dialect in the examples (zēt instead of zayt) “oil”; žēb (instead of žayb) “pocket”; bēn (instead of bayn) “between”; yōm (instead of yawm) “day”; rōşen (instead of rawšen) “window”; dōg (instead of dawg) “taste” (Pareira, 2007).

Another case breaking the sedentary rule is concerned with a general mix situation in the sedentary Maltese still regarding the pronunciation of diphthongs: Bedouinised sedentary diphthongal maintenance is detected in such items as beyt “house”; but, many of its prepositions embody the sedentary long vowel, as in fū? “on” and kīf “like”. Such a feature is shared with old Maghreb sedentary dialects (Vanhove, 1998).

In our present recorded interviews, mixing appears very high among diphthongs. All bedouin and sedentary characteristics occur: Bedouin retention ([aj] and [aw]) or contraction ([e:] and [o:]), and sedentary reduction ([i:], [u:]). For the sake of analysis, we found it more plausible to classify the items according to their diphthongal types. We tried to gather into Class a all the items including the conserved diphthongs and Class b all contracted and reduced diphthongal types. Class c however involves diphthongal alternation. We obtained the following exemplary categorisation,

1. /aj/

   a. this diphthong is retained in items, such as [bajd] eggs; [bajdə] egg; [sajf] summer; [fæjn] eye; [fæjb] shame; [ʃajma] tent; [hoj] wall; [txajri] you choose (sing. fem); [dajqa] they narrow; [dajqa] narrow (sing fem)

   b. this diphthong is contracted to [e:], as in [χeːɾ] good; [deːqa] narrowness; [gæːsl] around or reduced to the sedentarised bedouin [i:] as in [biːt] room; [biːn] between; [liːl] night; [sif] sword; [din] debt, [qritː] I studied; [nsiːt] I forgot; [ʃbiːt] I felt; [ziːtuːn] olive

   c. [aj] varies with [e:] as in, [daif] and [deːf] guest

2. /aw/

   a. the diphthong is preserved, in such items as [hæwʃ] traditional Algerian house; [χawf] fear; [tawʃi] mine; [χawnu] they stole; [nʃæwnu] we help; [ʃawqoːl(hum)] they decorate (to them)
b. the diphthong [aw] contracted to [o:] as in [sɔ:ʃ] or reduced to the sedentarised bedouin [u:] as in [ju:m] day; [lu:la] first; [zu:ʒ] second
c. [aw] varies with [u:], as in [mawt] and [mu:t] death; [hæwma] and [hu:ma] street, or it alternates with [o:], as in [daw] and [do:] light

Obviously, the occurrence of one diphthongal type is refunctionalised such that it is conditioned by its phonological environment; therefore, 1.a, 1.b, 2.a and 2.b will be analytically tackled under the heading of reallocation (see 3.2.2.2). The description of 1.c and 2.c will rather occur under the heading of levelling (see 3.4.2.3). Here, we will try find out those genealogical pronunciation elements that are levelled out, and those which are still in the mix.

3.1.3. Phonological Processes: Assimilation and Labialisation

Our results have hardly ever involved segments affected by phonological processes which decide for their genealogical affiliation. The only influenced forms we have come across represent allophones of the same phoneme, and are obviously in free alternation. As regards assimilation (“[t]he influence excercised by one sound upon the articulation of another, so that the sounds become more alike” (Crystal, 1999: 448-9)), /ɣ/, for example, is realised into two different genealogical allophones in the item /ɣsαl/. We have found the bedouin [ɣ] in [ɣsαl] in free variation with the sedentary realisation [χ] in [χsαl].

On the other hand, labialisation is “[r]ounding the lips while making a speech sound” (Crystal, 1999: 454). In Oran Spoken Arabic, according to Bouhadiba (1988), it takes place before a labial, especially if the latter element is preceded by a velar (e.g. /kbaɾt/ I grew up which is realised as [kʰbaɾt]). Or, it obtains in contexts where a short vowel, mainly /u/, diachronically used to occur. With reference to data, few segments have undergone this bedouin process. The exceptional recorded cases items are mainly [tʰbaq] or [tʰbag] tray; [zʰmæʃa] group; [ɡʷmal] lice which respectively vary with the non-labialised items [bqaq] or [bbag]; [zmaʃa]; [gmal] (there is also [qmal] and [grad]). Are labialised forms still mixed, disappearing or in their way of focusing? We will check their situation in a more accurate way and attempt for possible answers in Section 3.4.2.4b.
3.2. Reallocation

As mentioned in Chapter One, certain regional variants in the initial mixture do not survive the levelling process but are still present. In this case, they go through reallocation in the sense that they are maintained and redistributed a new role. In the present study, their refunctionalisation turns them into socio-stylistic or phonological forms. What are the underlying reasons behind the regional variantal reallocation on the level of pronunciation? We can do no better than suggest approximate explanations in each case.

3.2.1. Socio-Stylistic Reallocation: /q/

Extensive presence of the voiced velar stop has been demonstrated throughout data. There is nothing surprising here since the variety under study is originally bedouin. What is unpredictable relates to those parallel recorded utterances with the sedentary unvoiced uvular. Why do [q] and [g] co-occur in ORD? Why does the urban variant win out in some forms while the rural variant is maintained in others? Possible interpretations could be available in the literature. Many Arabic dialectologists agree that /q/-realisation is constrained by extra-linguistic factors.

The genealogical incompatibility between one feature and the dialect in which this feature may occur does not uniquely characterise ORD. Other Arabic dialects may contain an allophone of /q/, sharing with it a non-common genealogy. Contrary to the long-standing theoretical thinking (see 3.1.1.1), many bedouin dialects embody the bedouin-type variant [g] in alternation with the sedentary [q], a situation which is specifically experienced by Tripoli Arabic in Libya (Pareira, 2007) and Ulad Brahim dialect in Saida (Algeria) (Marçais, 1908). Similarly, sedentary dialects, like Algiers variety (Boucherit, 2002), survive this alternation although [q] is supposed to be their reflex of /q/. Pareira (2007) and Marçais (1908) converge in justifying the prevalence of sedentary [q] in the bedouin dialects they investigated. The position of unvoiced uvular as the sole allophone of /q/ in SA makes it a symbol of formality. It could be a reflection of educational domains\textsuperscript{165} or administrative, religious and legal registers\textsuperscript{166}, which are mostly tackled in CA and/or MSA.

\textsuperscript{165} "...a sphere of activity representing a combination of specific times, settings and role relationships, and resulting in a specific choice of language or style" (Swann et al, 2004: 87)

\textsuperscript{166} The variety used for one specific domain
Inversely, the very informal situations, according to Boucherit (2002), require the bedouin voiced realisation of /q/ in Algiers Arabic. The author explains that the sedentarisation of bedouin populations has got a role: The rural flow to the city of Algiers has payed the way for integrating this variant into the local variety. This bedouin-type allophone has, in fact, sprung from the countryside and is found in rural items, such as [zga] “he shouted” and [gɔrn] “horn” (ibid). Attitudinally, old sedentary inhabitants of Algiers, for Boucherit, have a negative impression on the segment [g]. They use, for example, the utterance [bǝgbǝg] (including the bedouin variant) to refer to a rural outsider who has migrated to Algiers. Using [g], for them, is a rude and vulgar way of speaking, and associated only with peasants and farmers (Boucherit, 2002).

The three authors apparently agree on the underlying socio-stylistic constraints behind /q/-realisation. It could be then said that /q/-articulation is contextually determined. Whether bedouin or sedentary, levelling of neither variant obtains in ORD. Both remain with their status converted from regional into contextual. [q] and [g] are reallocated new socio-stylistic roles. Selecting one /q/-variant turns heteronomous with respect to the degree of situational formality. [q] is re-ascribed to formal situations while [g] is reassigned informal functions.

Formally, data demonstrate that the informants opt for [q] in items related mainly to religion (see 1.2.4), morality, classicism (see Bouhadiba, 1988) and education: religious items, as in [naqsamlak bi-(α)llah] I swear to you (by God); [nsadqo] we give alms; [jarzqah] He endows him; [laeqo:ba] destiny; [mqɑː:bɑɹə] graves; [nyɑːlqɑt] it is created; [(rɑbi) mɑqɑrdɑha] it is destiny; [zɑdq] dowry; [rɑsp] endowment; [mqɑrbɑ] grave; [sɑdɑqa] charity; morality, as in [jqa:dru] they respect; classicism as in [qaftɑ:n] velvet dress; [qɑsɑntɛnɑ] Constantine (an an Algerian city); [qɑsɑntɛneja] dress from Constantine city; [qba:jɛ] Berber speakers; [qba:lija] Berber speaker; [maqrud] traditional cake; education as in [qra:jɑ] studies; [qaːri] intellectual (he); [qaːrja] intellectual (she); [qɑrjǐːn] intellectual (they); [qɑ] he studied; [mcː-qaːrj] he did not study; [qriːt] I studied; [jaqra] he studies; [naqr] we study; [jraqe(hu)m] he supervises (them); [jqajjɑm] he evaluates; [jqajmu] they evaluate.

Sometimes formality can be more tied to urban areas; the countryside provides rather an informal setting. Urban, unlike rural, terms incorporate the variant [q] which may stereotypically reflect the city life. For instance, [qɑd]\(^{167}\) he was able (Bouamrane, 1993) is

\(^{167}\) qad in the author’s original transcription
integral to the verbal repertoire\textsuperscript{168} of Oran speech community. It also constitutes one component of the sedentary Nedroma variety (pronounced as q̪d in ibid). Its maintenance by many informants could have a more urban reference due to its sedentary background\textsuperscript{169}, which includes a voiced velar pronunciation, is its equivalent in bedouin dialects, such as TRT (ibid)). Other derivated forms are detected in the recording: [tq̪d] she is able; [q̪d] he is able; [nq̪d] I am able; [q̪diti] you were able (sing fem); [ma:-nq̪d-] I am not able. The same could be said about the item [sq̪sq̪a] he asked in ORD (and its derivatives: [sq̪sq̪eq̪e:ne] you ask me; [sq̪sq̪eq̪e:(ha)] you ask (her); [sq̪sq̪eq̪o] they ask; [nsq̪sq̪eq̪e:(k)] I ask (you) which is pronounced sq̪sq̪æ\textsuperscript{169} in Nedroma variety.

The voiced velar stop instances in data, on the other hand, are present to indicate informal contexts. The variant is used informally in the sense that it preponderates in very ordinary items that are needed to fulfill Oranee speakers’ daily requirements, such as human body\textsuperscript{170}: [gæl] heart; [gælb(i)] (my) heart; [rægbæ] neck; [ʃærg(æh)](his) sweat; speakers’ daily positions and activities: [gæsæd] remaining (he); [gæsda] remaining (she); [tʊːɡʊf] she stands up; [nuːɡʊf] I stand up; [jʊːɡfʊ] they stand up; [tʊɡʊd] she sleeps; [maː:-tʊɡʊd-] she does not sleep; [nʊrgʊd] I sleep; [jʊɡʊd] he remains; [tʊɡʊd] or [tʊɡʊd] she remains; [ʃʊɡʊd] he sits down; [ʃʊɡʊd] they remain; [sæɡʊd] unemployement; [wæ:ɡfæ] standing (she); [wæːɡfɪː] standing (they); [ʃæɡdɪːn] sleeping (they); [ʃʊɡʊd] they sleep; [ʃʊɡʊd] they remain; [ɡæ:bdeːn]/ [ɡædbeːn] holding (they); terms related to movement: [tɾæːɡ] road; [tɾæːɡ] roads; [ʃʊɡæ] he drives; [sʊɡæ] driving; [ʃʊlæɡæh] she follows him; [ʃʊlæɡæi] you follow; [ʃæɡuːnæ] they overtook us. Items expressing one’s feelings often include [g] as well, as in expressing joy: [ʃʊafæɡ] she claps her hands; [tæɾʊɡæ] you dance (sing fem); [ʃʊɡdæ] a visit to the groom by her relatives after her wedding; [tʊɡʊs] she dances; [tæɡəræ] or expressing hatred: [hʊɡræ] oppression; [næɡræt] she was oppressed; [hæɡrʊ:nɪ] they oppressed me; [ʃæɡæɡræ] he oppresses you; [ʃæɡæɡdʊ] they hold grudges; [tæɡæɡd] she holds grudges.

Expressing the above differently, we can say that informality links to those bedouin forms which meet the very primary human needs. The verb he said is another example which is the very reference to beduinity as indicated in the literature (e.g. Miller, 2007): it comprises

\textsuperscript{168} The mass number of varieties used in a given speech community
\textsuperscript{169} Bouamrane’s (1993) transcription
\textsuperscript{170} [Sq̪l] mind exceptionally involves [q] probably because it is associated with education. The same is said about those items related to [Sq̪l], such as [neːsq̪l] I remember; [Sq̪lɪjɪ] the way of thinking; [Sq̪l] I still remember; [Sq̪lɪn] well-behaved (plural); [ʔaːsq̪lɪ] remember it!(or don’t forget it)
the variant [g] in all its manifestations as in [tgulǝk] she says to you; [jgullu] he says to him; [tgu:li] you (sing fem) say to me; [tgu:l] you say; [ga:l]t she said; [ga:tlæh] she said to him; [gutlǝk] I said to you; [ga:lu:li] they said to me; [ga:lu:k] he said to you; [gult] I said; [ga:li] he said to me; [ga:tlæh] she said to him; [gutalkum] I said to you; [ga:lii] she said to me; [gutlǝk] I said to you; [tgu:li] she says to you; [jgulǝk] he says to you; [ngu:lǝk] I say to you; [ngu:lu] we say; [tgu:l] she says. Additional bedouin examples, in this section, are: [stli:li] humble; [magwæh] he needs force (from /quwwa/ force in SA); [tlægto] (outsiders) came; [gælle:] outsider; [gælle:] outsiders; [si:g] sig (an Algerian village's name); [rægǝ:g] a bedouin dish.

In addition to Boucherit's (2002) suggestion that items including [g], for sedentaries, designate things from the countryside, there are terms, in data, which indicate the bedouin lifestyle and desert. As an illustration, we have [geton] tent; [gwæte:n] tents; [gija:la] middle of the day; [bægga:r] cowboy; [tægæh] his energy and [tæ:jæg] obese. Joining to this list, the form [hærga] could have been used metaphorically, in Interview One, to say illegal migration, but if we refer back to its literal meaning burning, it probably implies the use of heat which in turn entails the idea of desert. Further verbal terms related to [hærga] are available in data: [hræg] he migrated illegally; [tæhræg] she migrated illegally; [næhræg] I migrate illegally.

Some items could have come from other bedouin varieties or been maintained by the local one because they are used by the bedouin dialectal majority. As an example, [ga9] all is widely spread among many Algerian western bedouin dialects (Bouamrane, 1991), and produced by almost all the informants. Other examples may typify the bedouinity (or rurality) of these varieties, as is the case of [msegma] straight (sing fem) which, as mentioned previously, comes from the bedouin Tiaret variety (see 3.1.1.3) and zægga call (Bouamrane, 1993) from the bedouin BYD (the item [zga] he shouted, following Boucherit (2002), symbolises the countryside). Our results also include derivative forms, [liǥm[m in] straight; [tæsægæm] it becomes straight; [nzægæu] we call, shout; [jzægi] he calls (or shouts).

In a number of utterances in ORD, [g] is adopted while [q] totally avoided due to saliency interference. If [ga:l] he said makes clear reference to bedouinity, [qa:l], on the other hand is believed, in the Algerian west at least, to be basically sedentary. The tight link between [ga:l] and the bedouin dialects prevails in the same way between [qa:l] and sedentary

---

171 It is said probably because bedouin people are known for their force and courage.

172 [tægæh] and [tæ:jæg] are related to /ægæga/ in SA which means energy. They are grouped under the heading of desert since the latter is supposed to be the source of energy.

173 Strong stereotypical association of one linguistic form with another linguistic or extra-linguistic element.
dialects. Many transplanted dialects to Oran, from rural regions such as Tiaret, Bel Abbes, El Bayad, Bechar, Mascara, Temouchent, and the local dialect, ORD, are scientifically confirmed to possess [gal] (Bouamrane, 1991). Other dialects (NDM and TSN) from sedentary backgrounds employ the same item but including, instead of [g], respectively [q] and [ʔ]. In fact, the [q]-variant in [qa:l] is viewed as too saliently sedentary that it is completely avoided. It is stereotypical such that it sounds, for example, too Nedrome for the Oranees. The above derivative forms of [ga:l], in data, can easily witness sedentary saliency and so can the following items: If ever [q] is employed instead of [g] in one of them, the item in question sounds very saliently sedentary: [rgud] sleep; [wgɨf] stand; [gʕud] remain and their respective verbal derivative forms: [turgod] she sleeps; [ma:-turgud-f] she does not sleep; [norgud] I sleep; [ra:ɡdi:n] sleeping (they); [jɔr(ə)ɡdu] they sleep; [ju:ɡfu] they stand up; [wa:ɡfa] standing (she); [tu:ɡaf] she stands up; [tæɡud] you remain (sing fem); [jugdud] he remains; [jɑɡud] he sits down; [jɡud] they remain

### 3.2.2. Phonological Reallocation

Many, but not all, pronunciation forms have given up their former regional roles to be reallocated new socio-stylistic functions. Data examination has revealed that other non-levelled variants may have undergone reallocation on the phonological level. They have remained in the mix situation to then survive the phenomenon of phonemic contrast; or, their variantal occurrence becomes conditioned by the current phonological environment. Trudgill (1986) attaches saliency relatively more to the phonemic opposition. Increased awareness, for him, links to those variables that are entailed in the prevalence of phonological contrasts.

#### 3.2.2.1. /q/

a. **Phonemic contrast /q/ vs /g/**

Today, Cantineau (1939)'s first claim (see 3.1.1.2), that the unvoiced uvular is typically pre-Hilalian while the voiced velar is bedouin, does not phonologically hold. Both sedentary and bedouin Arabic dialects may cover a series of minimal pairs based on the opposition /q/ vs /g/. In the pre-Hilalian Rabat Arabic, /ɡ/ and /q/ constitute different phonemes which contrast in the examples, ƣ ɔa/ “pumpkin” vs /qr ɔa/ “bottle”; /mqrərɔs/
“flattened” vs /mqrs/ “pinched”; /sbǝq/ “run” vs /sbǝq/ “overtake” (Messaoudi, 1998). Aguadé (2002) extracts instances from the Hilalian-type dialect of Casablanca qaṣṣa “narrative” vs gəṣṣa “haircut”; sūg “market” vs sūq “drive”; gərn “century” vs gərn “horn”; ġārq “vein” vs ġārg “root”; qallǝb “to search” vs qallǝb “to turn over”. The contrast /g/ vs /q/ also exists in Tripoli Arabic, bugra “cow” vs buqra “The Heifer” (Pareira, 2002). Marçais (1908) provides further examples from the bedouin Ulad Brahim dialect of Saida, where the phonemes /g/ and /q/ in the same term and position differentiate the meaning: gléb “vomit” vs qléb “overturn”; ɣʊrga “leaf” vs ɣʊrqā “piece of paper”; sṛąg “charm” vs sṛąq “steal”; bgā “be very tired” vs bqā “remain”.

As for ORD, Bouhadiba (1988: 12) finds it not necessary that “… [q] and [g] are always variants of one single phoneme in this dialect (ORD). There are still instances of a phonemic contrast /q/ vs /g/…”. Next, he (1988) supplies the following examples: /qla/ he fried vs /gla/ he grilled; /naqqa/ he cleaned vs /nagga/ he peeled; /ʃaqq/ he cracked vs /ʃaggio/ on the other side of. The present data, supported by the method of participant observation (see 2.6.5), reveals that the phonemic contrast /q/ vs /g/ is still highly prevalent in the dialect in question nowadays. One interpretation might be that the regional variants [q] and [g] were originally allophones of the same phoneme /q/. Their reallocation started a long time ago in the speech community in question. The allophone were attributed a new phonological function: phonemic contrast, and therefore became two distinct phonemes until now. Some illustrations are, /qdmat/ she presented vs /gdam/ she approached; /tangus/it gets diminished vs /tangus/ it gets cut; /fuqna/ we woke up vs /fugna/ above us; /gal/gu/they started up vs /gal/gu/ they removed; /gal/gi/ start up! (fem) vs /gal/gi/ remove (fem); /qadmi/ present (sth) (fem) vs /gardmi/ go forward (fem); /jraqbu/ they remote vs /jragbu/ they see from the balcony; /jgalbu/ they search vs /jgalbu/ they turn over; /naqgamlak/ I swear to you vs /nagsamlak/ I divide for you; /jgiis/ he throws away vs /jgiis/ he touches.

b. Phonemic contrast /ɣ/ vs /q/

Marçais (1977) emphasises that many Saharan varieties usually know alternation between ɣ and q. Other bedouin varieties of presaharan regions and High Plateaux of Algeria do not disregard this variation either. Assuming that there are Saharan background-features in ORD, we may suggest that, in many cases, [ɣ] and [q] have been allophones of the same phoneme /q/; different roles have been reallocated to each allophone during mixing: the
Oranees have had, in their repertoires, both variants which, instead of being levelled out, remained as minimal pairs /ɣ/ vs /q/. On the basis of participant observation, some examples are: /bya/ want vs /bqa/ remain; /baayi/ wanting vs /baaqe/ remaining; /taystal/ observe vs /tastqal/ get independent; /yalja/ boiling vs /qalja/ lie; /qaadi/ will vs /qaadi/ judge; /ydar/ he betrayed vs /qdar/ he was able; /qiib/ stranger vs /qiib/ near; /qraab/ strangers vs /qraab/ near (plur).

3.2.2.2. Diphthongs

We recall that in 3.1.2.3, we have classified different items into groups following their diphthongal realisation. As we can notice from 1.a and 2.a within the same section, the production of diphthongs occurs in pharyngeal environments (next to voiced segments such as [ʕæjn] eye; [ʕæjb] shame; [nʕæwnu] we help and [tawʕi] mine; next to unvoiced segments such as [haj] wall and [haw] traditional Algerian house), velar contexts (next to voiced segments such as [ʕajma] cloud and [ʕawtat] she cried; next to unvoiced segments such as [ʕajma] tent; [ʕajri] you choose (sing fem); [ʕawf] fear and [ʕawnu] they stole) or emphatic environments (next to voiced segments such as [baj] eggs and [bajda] egg; [dajqo] they narrow; [dajqa] narrow; next to unvoiced segments such as [squf] summer). From 1.b and 2.b, /aj/ is reduced to [e:] and /aw/ reduced to [o:] in the context of a velar ([ʕe:x] good) or emphatic realisation (next to voiced segments such as [deːq] narrowness; next to unvoiced segments such as [ʔeqː] around and [ʔoːf] wool respectively). Still from 1.b and 2.b, /aj/ is reduced to [i:] and /aw/ reduced to [u:] in the environment of a plain sound ([biːt] room; [biːn] between; [liːn] night; [siːf] sword; [diːn] debt; [qriːt] I studied; [nsiːt] I forgot; [ʕbiːt] I felt and [juː] day)

Following the above instances, we can deduce that all the types of diphthongs have survived in the dialectal mix, acquiring later distinct phonological functions. The diphthongs [aj] and [aw] as well as the monophthongised allophones, emphatic [e:] and [o:] and plain [i:] and [u:], are non-levelled out and reallocated, for each, a specific phonological role in the resulting dialect. The new phonological redistribution confines the true diphthongal articulation to pharyngeals, velars and emphatics. Cantineau (1941) (reported in Bouhadiba, 1988) comments on the situation and says that the total unconditioned preservation of old diphthongs, in Maghrebi dialects, is highly rare or even inexistent. He confirms however this diphthongal maintenance in contexts such as following pharyngeals in most of spoken
varieties. In our examples above, true diphthongs can occur in emphatic environments, and if we follow Trubetzkoy (1939)\textsuperscript{174} the Arabic segments /χ, ɣ, q, h, ʕ/ behave as emphatics; therefore, they witness true diphthongal presence, as well, in their environments. In cases where old diphthongs are contracted in these environments, their monophthongisation results in [e:] and [o:] respectively. Why the diphthongs are, in some cases, monophthongised in the above contexts is not clear. We suggest that true diphthongs and their contracted monophthongs still survive mixing.

We know, on the other hand, that diphthongs are not only preserved or contracted but also have in parallel their corresponding plain monophthongs in the original mix of dialects. In case of the monophthongal counterparts [i:] and [u:], they are phonologically reallocated another different environment, taking place more exactly in the neighbouring of plain sounds. The three allophonic realisations (original diphthongs, contracted diphthongs and plain monophthongs) have undergone such new role attributions that are usually admitted among the members of Oran speech community. In the neighbouring of pharyngeals particularly, Bouhadiba (1988: 149) writes that “…one might set up a phonological rule which would derive long vowels … from underlying diphthongs, … . At the same time, a condition would be imposed on such a rule in order to prevent its application in the context of pharyngeals”:

\[
\begin{align*}
  /\text{aj}/ & \rightarrow [i:] \\
  /\text{aw}/ & \rightarrow [u:]
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{ Condition C } \neq \left[ \begin{array}{c} -\text{syl1} \\ +\text{back} \\ +\text{low} \end{array} \right]\]

**Table 3.1**: Plain Monophthongal Realisation of Diphthongs

We assume that the bedouin feature of diphthongs (see 3.1.2.3) becomes salient in the environment of plain sounds. The bedouin diphthongal markedness paves the way for [i:] and [u:] (unmarked diphthongs) to win out in this context at the expense of [aj] and [aw] respectively.

\textsuperscript{174} Reported in Bouhadiba (1988)
3.3. Interdialect

Usually, the new and mixed variety attests the survival of major variants used by the greatest number of speakers (see 1.4.2.2.2). A different varietal experience may emerge with regard to interdialectal development. In 1.4.2.2.4, it has been explained that forms originating from neither non-ORD background-dialects may contribute in the natural creation of koines. The formation of interdialectal elements in ORD may rely on (non)-existing linguistic variants or hyperadaptation. We have perceived, in the pronunciation under examination, certain variants interdialectally formed. Are they regular, intermediate or hyperadapted elements? Let us explore below some results.

3.3.1. /q/

The uvular phoneme experiences various koineisation processes and situations. We have seen in this same chapter that it has born rudimentary mixing in some cases and reallocation in some others. Still, it has gone through levelling as will be discussed in due course. In a different situation the realisation of this phoneme can give birth to an interdialectal sound. If we examine the dialectal items corresponding to find (following Bouamrane (1993)), we notice one item known as lgæ in ORD and in many other bedouin varieties of the regions Temouchent, Biskra, Tiaret, Belabes and Bayad. In the sedentary dialects belonging to the regions Nedroma and Tlemcen, it is employed as ʒbar. Despite the high frequency of the concept find in data, the recordings, surprisingly, show a total absence of the old lgæ in ORD. Instead, the lexical variant [lqɑ] takes place all the time to express the idea of finding. It is plausible that the allophone [q] substitutes for [g] in the item. The table below demonstrates that the resultant utterance as such comes from neither bedouin nor sedentary varieties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialects</th>
<th>Bedouin Dialects (ORN, TMT, BKR, TRT, BSA, BYD)</th>
<th>Sedentary Dialects NDR, TSN</th>
<th>Interdialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variant</td>
<td>lgæ</td>
<td>ʒbar</td>
<td>[lqɑ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.2: Interdialectal [lqɑ]**
The actual substitution has sedentarised the bedouin lexical item. In the new [q]-environment, the emphatic vowel [ɑ] has displaced the former vowel to meet the new phonological condition. The question that could be raised is: Why did the informants adopt a sedentarised bedouin form instead of using the already existing sedentary item ʒbal? The reason why the variant was avoided is possibly because it seems salient, very sedentary and alien to the Oranees’ daily speech. Other various derivational forms in our data are as follows: [talqe] you find (sing fem); [jəlqa] he finds; [talqa] you find (sing masc); [plqo] they find; [ma:-lqw-f] they did not find; [nəlqa] I find; [lqa:t]’she found. This type of interdialect is intermediate since it linguistically amalgamates and comes out of the co-prevalence of bedouin and sedentary dialects in the mixture.

3.3.2. /t/

Here are examples from our data. Let us examine the /θ/-realisation, and then discuss:
The phoneme is produced as an unvoiced dental plosive [t] which occurs in the initial-syllable position, followed by a vowel; [θta: [a:t] three thousand; [θl 3] snow; [θlt (as-snin)] three (years); [θtqqa] it slows down; [(man)tømma] from there; [θta:ni] also; [θtanik] also; [θmtøm] immediately; initially followed or preceded by a consonant, as in [θni:n] Monday; [θla:t]a Tuesday (or three o’clock); [θna:s] twelve; [θma:n:i:n] eighty; [θmøma] eight; [θmøma tæx (ə)n-nas] eight people; [θma:n:i:n ðælf] eighty thousand; [θla:tø:n] thirty; [θla:t (wøæfri:n)] (twenty) three; [θtar] it increased; [θqe:l] slow; [θla:t (χwa:tømha)] her three rings; [ktar (man)] more (than); in the final-syllable position : [θtiri:] majority (or almost); [θtu:]a especially.

In fact, sedentary varieties could be opposed to bedouin varieties by means of /θ/-realisation: The Bedouins maintain [θ] (Bouamrane, 1989; Ferrando, 1998). As examples, the varieties of Ulad Brahim (Algeria) (Marçais, 1908) and ZSr (Morocco) (Agudé, 1998) are [θ]-preservers. In ZSr dialect, the unvoiced interdental sibilant prevails in items, such as t-tålta “the third”, ktɔr “more than”, tɔwr “bull”, t-tɔn “the second”. Yet, the Sedentaries realise the interdental sibilant phoneme as a dental plosive (Marçais, 1960; Ferrando, 1998), as in the group of sedentary Arab dialects which is composed essentially of the Muslim variety of Mostaganem (Cantineau, 1940). Some, if not many, sedentary varieties opt for realising the interdental sibilant as an affricated dental, mainly [tʰ]. The feature tends to characterise more noticeably old Maghrebi sedentary dialects, such as those spoken in Fes,

In the case of Algiers, however, Boucherit (2002) reports that the dental affrication is, more recently, employed in Algiers by old (female) speakers only. She explains that [ť]-pronunciation that was widely attested at the beginning of the 19th c in Algiers has relatively disappeared (Boucherit, 2002). The feature is nowadays seen as a regional characteristic which distinguishes between its users originating from the capital and the recent arrivals (non-[ť]-users) to the city of Algiers. Due to intensive language contact in Algeria and Morocco, sedentary dental affrication may be sometimes attributed to the influence of neighbouring Berber varieties (Marçais, 1902; Grand’Henry, 1972).

Interestingly, the unvoiced interdental sibilant could be also conserved in some sedentary dialects, as in old Tenes, Miliana, Medea, Cherchell175, and Dellys (Cantineau, 1937; Grand’Henry, 1972; Boucherit, 2002). According to Cantineau (1960), this bedouinised sedentary [θ] has not been preserved but rather restored as an outcome of abstratal bedouin dialectal influence. He justifies by denoting some sedentaries’ hesitations in using dental or interdental pronunciations in their speech. This situation, in his view, confirms the above assumption. Nevertheless, Grand’Henry (1972) rejects this claim and states that this preservation rather characterises the archaic pre-Hilali Andalusi Arabic, and is caused by the Andalousi immigration to North Africa. Still another factor which can effectively influence these dialects and contribute to their maintenance of the unvoiced interdental sound is, we think, CA interference (see 2.6.1). Contrary to what is expected from a bedouin-type dialect, on the other hand, the sedentarised bedouin dental plosive is also found in many bedouin varieties, such as Tripoli Arabic (e.g. tlātā “three” (Pareira, 2002)). Similarly, our examples above demonstrate the presence of [t] at the expense of [θ].

If we specifically investigate the sedentary [t], it is very probable that the sedentary [ť] is older than this segment (see above). It could be suggested that the dental plosive is an intermediate form which has resulted out of confusion between [ť] and [θ]. [ť] is, in fact, composed of the sounds dental plosive immediately followed by dental sibilant; yet, [θ] is one interdental sibilant. The place of articulation is similarly shared among the latter three segments whereas the manner of articulation is common between two of them only. Choice has fallen on the features dental and plosive which both merge to form an amalgamate

175 Grand’Henry (1972) provides the example of tīm “garlic”.
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segment. The resulting intermediate [t], even though many times referred to as sedentary\textsuperscript{176} (Pareira, 2002, 2007), carries bedouin and sedentary features. It appears that the interdialectal development of [t] has also already started in other dialects. The genealogical fusion might have then been in Oran, the migratory setting and the meeting point of sedentary and bedouin dialects; or, it could have been carried to ORD by a number of transplanted sedentary dialects. Attitudinally, the interdental sibilant is associated with bedouinity in contrast with the affricate which is considered too sedentary. However, the interdialectal dental plosive is seen as more neutral (than sedentary) and accepted in the pronunciation system of the speech community under study.

3.3.3. /ɖ/

After the examination above of the unvoiced dental plosive, the researcher has turned her attention to the voiced emphatic dental plosive. We deduce that the interdialectal development of [ɖ] occurs as importantly as in the case of [t]. Our examples witness the presence of the latter segment in different positions: initially followed by a vowel: [deːf] or [dajif] guest; [dahrək] your back; [dalma] darkness; [do] or [daw] light; [dahk] laughter; [daiʃi:n] lost (plur); [darbohum] they beat them; [darbu:h] they beat him; [deːq] narrowness; [darwək] now; followed or preceded by a consonant, [dlaːm] he oppressed; [ndarreːti] you (sing fem) were in pain; [ndaːf] clean (plur); [djaːf] guests; [dharha] her back; [dbaːb] fog; [ndalam] dark; [idoːɾ] he turns; [ndalo] we remain; in the final-syllable position, [mard] illness; [Nɔrd] width; [bajd] eggs; [maqrod] (the name of traditional Algerian cake); [slajad] salads; [maʃroːd] invited; [haːfada] he learnt (it) by heart; [tnoːd] she wakes; [nnoːd] I wake; [inoːd] he wakes; [taʃrad] she invites; [jafrad] he imposes; [nagbad] I hold; [mreːd] (he is) ill; [(məa) baʃd] (with) each other; [baʃd(hum) baʃd] one another; [Veːwad] instead; [bajad] Bayad (Algerian city’s name); intervocally, [tnoːde] you (sing fem) wake; [nado] they woke; [inoːdo] they wake; [iḍahku] they laugh; [nadahku] we laugh; [jadarboːni] they beat me.

Emphatic segments, as seen by Marçais (1950) (reported in Vanhove, 1998), are less clearly articulated (in XX’sc of course) by the sedentaries than bedouins. This fact has temporally led emphasisation to be a more bedouin process but the opposite one, disemphsisation, more sedentary. Emphaticness, just like many other features, has been

\textsuperscript{176} [t] is indicated alternatively as sedentary and/or interdialectal in this the present study
affected by language change. The ancient bedouin emphatic lateral fricative  ض has totally disappeared from contemporary Arabic varieties, leaving its place to other sounds. In its early positions, the emphatic interdental fricative ظ appears, in some bedouin dialects nowadays. This tendency of emphatisation is one of the characteristics of bedouin hassaniya and Z Ŧīr speech (Aguadé, 1998). In sedentary dialects the plain dental plosive may take place instead (Bouhadiba, 1988). In the sedentary Algiers variety, the plain [d] is found in items, such as [ḥɔdra] “vegetables” (Boucherit, 2002).

Neither the above bedouin nor sedentary features characterise ORD; another segment [d] develops interdialectally out of merger of the plain dental plosive and emphatic interdental fricative. It shares plosion as a manner of articulation with the sedentary form and emphasis as a place of articulation with the bedouin sound. This new intermediate segment [d] has arisen during contact between bedouin and sedentary dialects in the area under study. It goes without saying that, just like the interdialectal unvoiced dental plosive, [d] has not peculiarly emerged in ORD but long appeared in other varieties, probably also due to dialect contact in their corresponding regions. So, [d] may have been transmitted, among other linguistic features, to Oran. But again, this does not hinder the interdialect process to be at work in ORD, between Hilalian and pre-Hilalian varieties, and participate in the spread of [d] in and out of the area.

3.3.4. Metathesis

Our recordings attest that Arabic dialectal items corresponding to hold are in a great deal of variation in Oran: [ʃǝd]; [ḥkǝm]; [gbad]; [gdab] (see 5.3.1.7). Bouamrane (1991) provides the regional and genealogical affiliation of these features, as well as other supplementary items which are absent in data. He says that [ʃed] is employed in TRT, TMT, BYD, MKR; [keʃ] reflects SBA speakers’ speech; [ḥkem] belongs to ORD; [ʔbaT] is produced by TSN speakers; [qbaʈ] is used in NDM; [gbad] is part of BSR linguistic system. Obviously, [gdab] is an additional item prevailing in data and does not show any particular regional membership, if we follow the same author. Let us restrict our attention to the last three lexical features and see their relationship with this variant. Apparently, [gdab] could be
an interdialectal consequence which rises out of the processes of metathesis\textsuperscript{177} (“[A]lteration in a normal sequence of elements, especially sounds” (Crystal, 1999: 455)),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialects</th>
<th>Sedentary Dialects (TSN, NDM)</th>
<th>Bedouin Dialect (BSR)</th>
<th>Interdialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variant</td>
<td>[ʔbaT] or [qbaT]</td>
<td>[gbad]</td>
<td>[gdab]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: The Interdialectal [gdab]

If we examine carefully Table 3.3, we can notice that the first and last sounds (respectively glottal stop/uvular and dental) in the sedentary items are unvoiced. The last one is also emphatic. By contrast, the first and the last segments (respectively velar and dental) in the bedouin item are voiced and plain. It appears that the second segment, /b/, and the last one in the third item have undergone metathesis, giving birth to a new form [gdab]. Unlike its occurrence in the sedentary and bedouin utterances, the labial stop obtains in the last position of the emerging item. The intermediate variantal dental conversely takes the ex-position of /b/ and shows a hybrid combination; it shares emphaticness with the dental sound in the sedentary items, whereas voicing with the dental segment in the bedouin utterance. Obviously, the interdialectal [gdab] genealogically combines features from both sedentary and bedouin sources. Since the item includes the bedouin [g], we will view it presently as bedouinsed.

3.4. Levelling

This section is mainly concerned with levelling (see 1.4.2.2.2). However, its relation to the other koineisation processes is plausible. If a given feature is not levelled out, it is surely reallocated or focused. Otherwise, it still survives a mixture situation. Our discussion, therefore, will not be only confined to levelling; focusing, reallocation and mixing will be unavoidably, even though less frequently, treated. It is also important to mention that the

\textsuperscript{177} See Bouhadiba (1988) for more details on metathesis in ORD.
variants under examination here have prevailed in free variation in the original mix. Our purpose is to detect their frequency in order to know which features are or not levelled out.

3.4.1. /q/

Both Hilalian and pre-Hilalian /q/-realisations alternate in certain utterances in our data. Alternation is observed in items, such as [bagra] and [baqra] cow; [gada:fi] and [qada:fi] kadafi (Libya’s former president); [gri:b] and [qri:b] near (sing) (their related forms also alternate: [gra:b] and [qra:b] near (plur); [garrab] and [qarrab] it/ he got nearer). All these items, in addition to others, will be presented and accompanied by their corresponding percentages. The results show that there are, at least, four cases that need treatment, with regard to this variable. Case One is sub-divided into two other cases. Case Two is further sub-divided into two as well.

Case 1

Case 1.a consists of three utterances /qaʈ/ cat, /b aqra/ cow and /qanfuud/ hedgehog. The results, very plainly, indicate that the realisation of /q/ as [g] preponderates (between 98% and 100%) in these utterances. The [q]-variant is, by contrast, (quasi-)totally absent (between 0% and 2%). We can say that the voiced velar is focused while the unvoiced uvular is levelled out in the present items. Or, the number of bedouin variant-pronouncers belongs to ]59, 79] whereas the number of those who pronounced the sedentary variant relates to the interval [0, 20[. Table 3.4, followed by its representative bare-graph, groups all the utterances with their proportions,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[gəʈ(ə)]</td>
<td>[qət]</td>
<td>cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bəgra]</td>
<td>[baqra]</td>
<td>cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 (99%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[gənfuːd]</td>
<td>[qənfuːd]</td>
<td>hedgehog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above percentages corroborate the functional role (see 3.2.1) of the voiced articulation of /q/ as a reflection of rural and/or informal settings. The present utterances are, in fact, names of domestic animals adopted by man to share his daily life. Many Algerian houses witness the presence of cats as members of the family. Peasants, in the countryside, are not content with cats’ category, but can extend their animal adoption to hedgehogs at home and cows in their farms. These items have, as seen earlier, born the process of reallocation. After that, their use has turned stabilised through focusing. Now, let us examine Case 1.b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>Other utterances</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[q]</td>
<td>[q]</td>
<td>[pu]</td>
<td>louse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[glanda] / [gra:da]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77(98%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[qni:n(a)]</td>
<td>[qni:na]</td>
<td>[rnəb] / [ʔrnəb]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5: Levelling and /q/-Realisation – Case 1.b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>76(97%)</th>
<th>0(0%)</th>
<th>2(2%)</th>
<th>rabbit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[grɔ lu]</td>
<td>[qarwaːlu]</td>
<td>[ʃanfuːs] / [kafaːr(a)]</td>
<td>cockroach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[grɔ lu]</td>
<td>74(93%)</td>
<td>1(1%)</td>
<td>4(6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃæggrab]</td>
<td>72(91%)</td>
<td>[ʃaqrab]</td>
<td>[skoRpjɔ̃]</td>
<td>scorpion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃærg]</td>
<td>77(98%)</td>
<td>[ʃærq]</td>
<td>[vɛn]</td>
<td>vein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[mgaːbɔːl] / [gbaːlɔt] / [gudaːm]</td>
<td>67(84%)</td>
<td>[mqaːbɔl]</td>
<td>[ɑ fas dɔ]</td>
<td>in front of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6(8%)</td>
<td>1(1%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, this second case is not very far from Case 1.a, and still indicates that the bedouin production of /q/ is victorious. This result prevails in the focusing interval ([59, 79]), unlike the disappearing sedentary variant which belongs to the levelling interval ([0, 20]). However, Case b is separated from Case a due to another column added to Table 3.5 including non-dialectal items which are rather traced back to diglossic switching (see 2.5.1.3), as in [ʔarnab] rabbit; diglossic borrowing (whereby the speaker uses elements from one diglossic variety in another one), as in [rnb] rabbit; language contact switching (as in [pu] louse; [lapɛ] rabbit; [skoRpjɔ] scorpion; [vɛn] vein; [ɑ fas dɔ] in front of) or language contact borrowing (as in [kafaːr] or [kafaːr] cockroach). Their percentages rank very low (between 1% and 8%), and therefore join the interval of Column Two. The following graph illustrates further these results,
This further confirms the tight relationship that links the voiced velar with the Oranees’ casual life. Another domestic animal’s name ([gni:na] or [gni:n] rabbit) is added, supported by indications to different insects ([fi:mla] or [gra:da] louse; [gul] cockroach; [gægrab] scorpion) that can be found within or around the house circle. The insects are in many times associated with the desert as seen earlier. They make their appearance, there, particularly during the hot season when desert inhabitant speakers often refer to them. Unlike the [q]-variant which is frequently eliminated in these environments, the bedouin pronunciation, in such items, has reached stability and permanence.

However, the table above does not involve only animals or insects’ names, other bedouin prevailing utterances are worth exploring. What is particularly noticeable is that these items have conducted to the same results. To begin, [gærg] vein was uttered by 77 informants against one informant who produced [gærq], in addition to the utterance [vën] which was articulated by another informant. Less remarkably in the item in front of, [g] was realised by 67 informants, while [q] was uttered by 6 of them. The same number was scored with regard to the French item [ə fas ðø]. With reference to our mathematical intervals, [g]-production has again triumphed, reaching thus focusing ([75%, 100%]) while its sedentary counterpart has been notably reduced if not eliminated ([0%, 25%]). For more clarification, the following graph represents the different percentages attained in the case of the item vein,
In addition to domestic animals, we have already mentioned, in our present analysis (see 3.2.1), that [g] manifests in other very informal utterances that meet Oran speakers’ everyday needs. We have given, from data, some illustrative items which refer to human body parts ([galb] heart; [galbi] (my) heart; [ragba] neck; [ṣærg(æh)] (his) sweat). All the examples, as seen, include the voiced velar instead of the unvoiced uvular. [ṣærg] vein is another additional bodily name that participates in corroborating the informality of bedouin /q/-articulation. Meanwhile, 98% of the informants were [q]-levellers. As for the prepositional utterance, the table above is supported by a bare-graph for further elucidation,
Although the prepositional item is commonly employed in everyday speech, our results show that it is obviously still less salient to casual situations compared with domestic animals and body parts’ names.

Case 2

This case is subdivided into a and b because in a, the table comprises two columns whereas in b, it is composed of three. Consider the following table (Case 2.a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin [g]</th>
<th>Sedentary [q]</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[jgarrrab]</td>
<td>[jqarrrab]</td>
<td><em>he gets nearer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57(72%)</td>
<td>22(28%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[gri:b]</td>
<td>[qri:b]</td>
<td><em>near</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52(66%)</td>
<td>27(34%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jagtadom]</td>
<td>[jagtadom]/[jqatadom ru:haeh]</td>
<td><em>he introduces himself</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49(62%)</td>
<td>30(38%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6: Levelling and /q/-Realisation – Case 2.a

Just like Case 1, Case 2 has to do with /q/ analysis. What makes the difference between the two cases is the type of koineisation process involved. As seen, Case 1 is interpreted with especial reference to focusing and levelling. Yet, the next case highlights mixing and/or reallocation. Despite the higher [g]-proportions (72%, 66%, 62%) in the three items respectively against the scores in favour of [q] (28%, 34%, 38%), the overall results are involved in the interval [25%, 75%] (or [20, 59]), denoting mixing and/or reallocation. We opt here for mixing more than reallocation process since the variants are more patently in free variation. Their current occurrence does not seem to be contextually constrained. The genealogical elements, in other words, still survive a mix situation. Below is the representative figure,
Let us, now, consider Case 2.b,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>Other utterances</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[g]</td>
<td>[q]</td>
<td>[3aly:ma] / [balSu:m] / [3ala:qa:m] / [haelq]</td>
<td>throat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[gar3u:ma] / [gar3u:m]</td>
<td>[qar3u:ma] / [haelqo:m] / [hla:qa:m] / [haelq]</td>
<td>56 (71%)</td>
<td>17 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tbaq] / [tbaq]</td>
<td>[tbaq] / [tbaq]</td>
<td>[3n3:] 2(3%)</td>
<td>tray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bag] / [bag]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[salla] 1(1%)</td>
<td>2(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 (63%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS (Not Said)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 3.5:** Levelling and /q/-Realisation – Case 2.a

**Table 3.7:** Levelling and /q/-Realisation – Case 2.b

Case 2.b is, according to Table 3.7, composed only of the two items *throat* and *tray* but characterised by relatively high lexical variation. Given that we are merely interested in two
pronounced segments ([q] and [g]), we have gathered all the items including the voiced velar in the first column, all those including the unvoiced uvular in the second column, and the remaining items without either of the two features in another column. With regard to the Hilalian realisation in the first item, the scores still attained the highest position (71%), immediately followed by the pre-Hilalian [q] (22%). These results call upon two different intervals. [g], unlike Case 2.a, makes reference to reallocation due to its affiliation to [25%, 75%].

Indeed, the item [garʒu:ma] *throat* is another bodypart name informally and frequently used, for example, in winter. Many individuals, at that time, start complaining about the cold weather which invokes uneasiness at the level of this part of their body. The unvoiced realisation is just another confirmation about what is said above. [q] is contextually, here, not required. Therefore, its relation to the interval [0%, 25%] is not haphazard, but this means that the segment is in its way of being levelled out in such environments. In Column Three however, we notice a low presence (5%) of other dialectal utterances ([ʒarʒu:ma]/[bəlʕuːm]) which include neither [q] nor [g]. They have been probably transplanted through their users’ mobility to Oran. They are being eradicated as well. The same is said about the low percentage of the French utterance [goRʒ]. Since Algeria is a multilingual community, language contact interference is encountered in many informal occasions.

As for the second item *tray*, [g] ranks again the first (63%) and [q] scores in the second position (31%). In contrast with the item *throat*, both results compose the interval [25%, 75%]. We assume that [g] and [q] still survive mixture. Despite the item, at hand, is customarily used in informal celebrations, such as marriage, formality sometimes interferes, for instance, when the bride’s family gives a tray (full of presents) to the bridegroom, in order to show her (and her family) a lot of importance and estimation. The wedding is clearly an overlapping setting. Which one, the informal [g] or formal [q], will win out is a matter of time. Other very low results are recorded. The prevalence of [ʃəla] (3%) is, similarly explained as in the case of the item *throat* ([ʒarʒu:ma]/[bəlʕuːm]), due to internal migration. [salla] (1%) on the other hand is the result of diglossic borrowing from CA to ORD. We finally observe that two informants did not provide any utterance. They told the fieldworker that they had no idea about what the concept, *tray*, meant. The following graph gives a clearer picture about the overall result of Case 2.b.
Case 3

If the rural variantal occurrence previously scored higher than the urban uvular, the results, in Case 3, tipped inversely the balance in favour of [q]. 8% of the respondents realised *kadafi* with [g] ([gada:fi]) against the majority (92%) who produced the item with [q] ([qada:fi]). These results are not surprising. The utterance is a former Libyan president’s name. Formality stands as a norm in the context of political leaders and governors, and the variant [qada:fi] sounds more formal than the bedouin [gada:fi].

Concerning the second item *stick*, two differently pronounced utterances, both including [g], were produced by the informants. Others were supplied involving, instead of the velar, the uvular. The total percentage scored by [lʂɑːq] / [ltsɑːq] is 18% against 81% which is the overall percentage realised by [lʂɑːq] / [tlɑːsaq]. On the whole, such an item is employed in educational settings. Already in the primary school, as an illustration, whole sessions are devoted to manual activities for children. Glue materials (/lisaaq/) are often used in this situation. The fact of hearing, grasping and producing this item from an early age may affect the Oranees’ dialectal variantal forms: [lʂɑːq] *stick*, [lʂɑːq] *to stick*, [tlɑːsaq] *to be sticked*.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>Other utterances</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[gadaːfi]</td>
<td>[qadaːfi]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>kadafi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>73 (92%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[lsaq]/[lzaq]</td>
<td>[lsaq]/[tlasaq]</td>
<td>[tkoːla]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (18%)</td>
<td>64 (81%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>stick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8: Levelling and /q/-Realisation – Case 3

The following bare-graph corresponds to the table above,

Graph 3.7: Levelling and /q/-Realisation – Case 3

We notice, another time, the interference of language contact in the form of a French borrowed equivalent [tkoːla] which was uttered by one participant only.

Case 4

Up-to-now, all the items, that we have analysed, are concerned with /q/-realisation as bedouin [g] or sedentary [q]. We came, exceptionally but interestingly, across another realisation which is still sedentary but different from the unvoiced uvular. This took place when we asked the informants to supply the dialectal translation of the sentence (given in
French) *you kill me*. Only three participants said [tugt̪əni]. 76 out of 79 of them were [tukt̪əni]-producers or uttered other derivational forms ([kt̪əni], [kt̪əlt̪əni], [kt̪əlt̪ək]) (see 2.6.4). Plausibly, the majority provided, instead of the unvoiced uvular [q], the unvoiced velar [k]. No [q]-production was recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[g]</td>
<td>[k]</td>
<td>you kill me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tugt̪əni]</td>
<td>[tukt̪əni]/[kt̪əni]/[kt̪əlt̪əni]/ [kt̪əlt̪ək]</td>
<td>76(96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9: Levelling and /q/-Realisation – Case 4

However, Bouhadiba (1988: 13) arises the point of /q/-realisation as [k] and says: “…the shift from the uvular to the voiced velar stop is much more frequent than that of the uvular to the voiceless velar stop”. By and large, he regards the realisation of /q/ as [g], a typical feature of ORD while those pre-Hilalian productions (/q/ as [k] or /q/ as [ʔ]) characterise other Algerian varieties, such as Jijel and Tlemcen respectively. In our current example, [k] appears, in Oran speech community, as an intermediate form, exceptionally realised in this item, which shares the same place of articulation with [g] and unvoicing with [q]. Bouamrane (1991) adds that [ktel] *kill* widely exists among many bedouin Algerian dialects. This indicates that [k] is interdialectally formed (just like [t] and [d]) not only in ORD, but it is widespread in other contributing dialects found in the original mix. The following figure illustrates the table above,
3.4.2. Interdentals

Very few interdental articulators are those we encountered in our interviews. The vast majority of respondents produced /θ/ as the indicated interdialectal [t] (see 3.3.2) and /ð/ as the focused [d] (see 3.5.1.1). In spite of their rarity in our recordings, we have decided to exploit the idea of their little presence and see if they are maintained in the context of Koranic recitation. Muslims believe that the Koran is an indiscutable reference; therefore, they often justify their ordinary deeds by reciting Koranic verses. Precision and vigilance are supremely recommended while reading the Koran. It is true that this holy book is not recited only in one variety, following the prophet Mohamed’s saying that there are seven different ways of reading the Koran (Baccouche, 2006) (see 1.2.3.1). However, this variation in Koranic recitation is only limited and determined. And, going beyond this limitation is not religiously allowed. Even if their dialectal system is different from the system of Mudar language (see

Graph 3.8: Levelling and /q/-Realisation – Case 4

178 The terms recitation, reading and production will be used interchangeably.
2.5.1.2), today’s Muslims have, nevertheless, to respect every single Koranic linguistic feature so that meaning deviation does not take place.

Between theory and practice, we tend in this section to shed light on one dialect contactual consequence by checking whether the Oranees, who are Muslims, preserve the interdentals in their daily Koranic production, or they extend the use of their dialectal counterparts. Therefore, we gave the informants, as part of our administered survey, the following four Koranic verses for the purpose of extracting their phonetic articulation of both unvoiced and voiced interdental sibilants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interdental Sibilants</th>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/θ/</td>
<td>/ʔinaaʔaʕtaajnaaka al-kaw0ara/</td>
<td>To thee have We granted the Fount (of Abundance)</td>
<td>verse 1/ Abundance: Surah 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ʔalhaakumu at-taka0uru/</td>
<td>The mutual rivalry for piling up (the good things of this world) diverts you (from the more serious things)</td>
<td>verse 1/ The Piling Up: Surah 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ð/</td>
<td>/ʔajnaaka al-kaw0ara/</td>
<td>To thee have We granted the Fount (of Abundance)</td>
<td>verse 1/ Abundance: Surah 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ʔalhaakumu at-taka0uru/</td>
<td>The mutual rivalry for piling up (the good things of this world) diverts you (from the more serious things)</td>
<td>verse 1/ The Piling Up: Surah 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/sajašla naaran ɗaata lahabin/</td>
<td>Burnt soon will he be in a Fire of blazing Flame!</td>
<td>Verse 3/ The Plaited Rope: Surah 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ʔihdinaa ag-siraata al-mustaqiima ʂ-siraata ɭ-lađiina anʕamta ɭalajhim ɭajri al-mayďuubi ɭalajhim wa laa ɭaaliina/</td>
<td>The way of those on whom Thou hast bestowed Thy Grace, those whose (portion) is not wrath, and who go not astray</td>
<td>Verse 7/ The Opening: Surah 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.10: Interdental Sibilants in Some Koranic Verses

As a hypothesis, we initially thought about stylistic reallocation: Interdental sibilants and dental plosives existed simultaneously in the original dialect mixture. In our opinion, the
informants used them alternatively depending on the situation. We expected them to retain their interdentals in their Koranic verse production, while they would shift to dental plosives once switching to non-Koranic speech. Our attention was drawn to the occurrence of /θ/ in /kawθar/ abundance and /takaaθur/ piling up respectively from the first two verses and the realisation of /ð/ in /ðaata/ of and /laðiina/ those from the second two verses. The objective behind giving two verses for each sibilant was to verify the results arrived at.

3.4.2.1. The Unvoiced Interdental Sibilant /θ/

While reading the Koranic verses, surprisingly, only an inferior number (18 informants) was recorded with regard to sibilant production. A sizeable proportion of respondents (61 informants), instead, extended their use of plosives into this holy context. So, our hypothesis was invalidated at that level. Let us further examine the table below,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[θ]</td>
<td>[t]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (23%)</td>
<td>61(77%)</td>
<td>Abundance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.11: The Unvoiced Interdental Sibilant Realisation 1

The sibilant realisation in /kawθar/ Abundance is seemingly being levelled out. [θ] scores are found within the interval [0, 20[. The reverse result shows that the plosive realisation in /kawθar/, it appears, survives focusing (61∈[59, 79]). The motive behind [θ] levelling could be the fact that /kawθar/ Abundance makes special reference to paradise. Traditionally, the Oranees, as Muslims, employ this figurative utterance, among others, as a common female name. Given the fact that they usually speak dialectal Arabic, their intense use of /kawθar/ is adapted to the pronunciation system of ORD. The marginal state of the unvoiced interdental sibilant in this dialect (Bouhadiba, 1988) causes a spontaneous shift by the informants to the unvoiced dental plosive, even in the most holy text. Only a minor
number of our participants make a stylistic differentiation and preserve [θ] for Koranic recitation. Consider again the following table,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[θ]</td>
<td>[t]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[taka:θur]</td>
<td>[taka:tur]</td>
<td>The Piling Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27(34%)</td>
<td>52(66%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.12: The Unvoiced Interdental Sibilant Realisation 2**

A number of 27 informants produced [θ] in /taka:θur/ *The Piling Up*. This is another result which confirms the insignificance of [θ]-articulation in the respondents’ recitation of Koranic verses, and reinforces our hypothesis invalidity. It clearly seems that such verse reading has been sedentarily dialectalised by the informants at this level, in the sense that the dialectal plosive [t] has been employed, at the expense of [θ]. However, the unvoiced interdental sibilant scores a little more importantly in the second item than the first, and is encountered within the borders of [20, 59]. Our percentages in the two tables above are represented in the following overall bare-graph for clearer comparison.

**Graph 3.9: /θ/-articulation**
It could be observed that the second item prevails out of the Koranic recitation; yet, it is also and only used in other contexts treated in Standard Arabic. For instance, scientific fields, such as biology, use this term /takaaθur/ The Piling Up. The informants certainly got familiar with it during their educational process in Standard Arabic language. This might have played a considerable role in associateing the segment [θ] with /takaaθʊr/ more than with /kawθar/.

3.4.2.2. The Voiced Interdental Sibilant /ð/

The variable /ðaata/ of was our subsequent focus of attention. It was extracted by means of exposing the participants to the third verse. We aimed to examine all the manifestations of the voiced interdental sibilant in this item. The results obtained followed the quantitative genealogical path of /θ/-realisation. The bedouin feature (24%) was much less realised than the sedentary [d] (75%). [ð] is apparently preserved by a quarter of the informants only. However, it still belongs to the interval [0%, 25%[, indicating that the feature is possibly being removed. The huge majority, who presents the interval ]75%,100%[, tended to alter the original pronunciation. Their own pronunciation seemed in its way of focusing. Those informants opted, just like [t]-pronouncers, for sedentary dialectalisation. They were 59 who realised the phoneme, under examination, as a dialectal feature.

The interference of ORD in the respondents’ Koranic recitation was then intense. Why was it so? A possible interpretation that lies behind the inferior prevalence of [ð] in data is the segment bedouinity. Uttering the bedouin sound in everyday conversations, for an Oranee, is a sign of backwardness and stigmatisation. It is true that one may hear the sound in other sedentary dialects, such as Dellys and Cherchell (Cantineau, 1937; Boucherit, 2002), and not encounter it in other certain bedouin dialects, such as Bel Abbes and Temouchent varieties (Bouhadiba, 1992). In Oran however, the [ð]-user is saliently seen as someone coming from the countryside or other surrounding regions such as, Saida, Tiaret and Bayad (Bouamrine, 1991) which are, even though in their way of urbanisation, relatively still rural and attitudinally backward compared with Oran. For all these reasons, our respondents majorly chose to avoid pronouncing this sound. The minority who maintained the bedouin realisation
could be concerned with stylistic reallocation in the sense that they confine the interdental sibilant for Koranic production and usually employ [d] in their speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>Other utterances</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ð]</td>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ðaːta]</td>
<td>[daːta]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(24%)</td>
<td>59 (75%)</td>
<td>1(1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.13: The Voiced Interdental Sibilant Realisation 1

The third column in the above table is indicated as blank (1%). The informant in question did not provide any verse recitation. He might have hesitated in choosing one of the sounds, bedouin or sedentary. Or, he was rushing to leave or simply tired. He, otherwise, forgot to recite this verse. Whatever the reason, the blank score is so minor that it could be unconsidered. Let us next have a careful look at the following table. It has to do with the fourth verse which is intended to check the results obtained in the previous table. More exactly, we give special attention, in this verse, to the utterance /laðiːna/ *those* in which we examine the bedouin realisation. Then, we compare the frequency of the sound in this item with that in /ðaːta/ *of*. We follow, here, the same steps seen in 3.4.2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>Other utterances</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ð]</td>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td><em>of those</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[laðiːna]</td>
<td>[ladiːna]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21(27%)</td>
<td>57(72%)</td>
<td>1(1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.14: The Voiced Interdental Sibilant Realisation 2

In this table, 21 utterances (27%) included [ð] against 56 (72%) which involved [d] instead. Only one participant did not produce the verse. This result is again presented as *blank*.
for the same possible causes given above. The introduction of a dialectal plosive takes also and again place in this verse. Sedentary dialectalisation again reigns and this is no more than a confirmation of the results summarised in Table 3.13. Stylistic reallocation also emerges but among, as said earlier, a minority of participants. The latter conserve the bedouin segment for Koranic reading while use the sedentary one in daily interactions. Even if our hypothesis is validated as for this minority, it is by contrast invalidated for the enormous majority of our participants. Here is the bare-graph that embodies and examplifies the tables with respect to /ð/.

If we combine the results obtained with regard to the unvoiced interdental sibilant, and do the same with respect to the voiced interdental sibilant, we get the following overall table and figure,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[ða:ta]</th>
<th>[da:ta]</th>
<th>blank</th>
<th>[laði:na]</th>
<th>[ladi:na]</th>
<th>blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ð]</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.15: The Bedouin Interdental Pronunciation
It is clear from a global view of our results above that the percentages are very low with regard to our voiced and unvoiced interdental sibilants. We detect a quantitative convergence in their articulation. Around a quarter of the interviewed population only maintained the bedouin production (25% for [θ] while 28% for [ð]). We have tried above to provide some probable interpretations behind this minor preservation of each interdental sibilant. Another factor may come into play: Dialectalisation may obtain due to the general lack of reading witnessed among the informants’ generation worldwide. Algeria, particularly, has been subjected to new ways of spending spare time. Technological devices, internet and fashionable materials have largely substituted for reading. Koranic recitation is no exception.

3.4.2.3. Vowels: Diphthongs

While listening to our recordings, we picked out remarkable diphthongal and monophthongal variation. We obtained true diphthongs occurring alternatively with their long emphatic or plain monophthongal counterparts. We have already justified, in 3.2.2.2, the prevalence of cases 1.a, 1.b, 2.a and 2.b.\footnote{See also 3.1.2.3} We have said that the simultaneous survival of these sounds is traced back to the process of phonological reallocation. Cases 1.c and 2.c (see 3.1.2.3), by contrast, entail free variation. Which genealogical features are being reduced and...
which ones remain in the mix? Three sub-cases, Case c.1.a, Case c.1.b and Case c.2, are found out and analysed below.

Case c.1.a

Analysing this sub-case rests on considering the following,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[deif]</td>
<td>[deːf]</td>
<td>guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77(98%)</td>
<td>2(2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[daw]</td>
<td>[doː]</td>
<td>light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68(86%)</td>
<td>11(14%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.16: Levelling and Diphthongal Realisation- Case c.1.a

Here in this table, the results are related to the frequency of true diphthongs in alternation with their long contracted monophthongal counterparts. The two Hilalian types of true diphthongs (/aj/ in [deif] guest and /aw/ in [daw] light) prevail. The emphatic influence is propagated within the latter syllables as a consequence of /ɖ/-occurrence in the initial position. This validates the assumption that the sounds above occur in the neighbouring of emphatic segments. But apparently, it is the long emphatic monophthongs (/eː/ and /oː/ in the lexical variants respectively) which experience reduction: [deːf] records 2(2%) and [doː] scores 11(14%). Both results represent the levelling interval [0, 20]. On the contrary, the diphthongised items achieve stability and remain in the emphatic context. We deduce that in such environments, bedouin true diphthongs are probably more frequent than sedentary long emphatic monophthongs. The following graph clarifies further the results discussed.
Case c.1.b

The following table shows one type of true diphthongs in free variation with its plain long monophthongal counterpart. That is, the Hilalian /aw/ in [lawz] almond alternates with the pre-Hilalian /u:/ in [lu:z] almond. All the informants in the administered questionnaire however are exclusively [lu:z]-producers (100%). /aw/ is completely reduced to /u:/ in the environment of plain sounds, a fact which corroborates our assumption in 3.2.2.2. In brief, the current monophthongisation has been focused in the plain context. We say again that diphthongs are avoided in the neighbouring of plain segments because they could be stereotyped as bedouin in these environments. Like all the previous tables, our table below is supported by a bar-graph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[lawz]</td>
<td>[lu:z]</td>
<td>almond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>79(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.17: Levelling and Diphthongal Realisation- Case c.1.b
Case c.2

If we explore the table below, we see that in Case c.2, /aw/ occurs in free variation with /oː:/ in another item. The former segment appears in [hawma] *street* which was uttered by 50 (63%) participants. The other informants (29 (37%)) provided the latter segment in [hoːma] *street*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[hawma]</td>
<td>[hoːma]</td>
<td><em>street</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 (63%)</td>
<td>29 (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.18: Levelling and Diphthongal Realisation- Case c.2

It seems clear that [aw] is attenuated to [oː:] in the context of the pharyngeal /h/. The condition under which this diphthong is monophthongised, as seen in 3.2.2.2, in these contexts is not easy to discern. What is plausible is that the global results obtained in this sub-case belong to the interval [20,59]; that is, the variants (the true diphthong and its long emphatic monophthongal counterpart) are still found in a mixed situation. Possibly, the bedouin /aw/
will win out at the end in the neighbouring of the pharyngeal /h/. As a consequence, the sedentary [ho:ma] may gradually disappear.

**Graph 3.14: Levelling and Diphthongal Realisation- Case c.2**

### 3.4.2.4. Phonological Processes

**a. Assimilation**

One assimilatory process that deserves presently our interest exerts influence upon the segments of consonant clusters that agree in voicing (Bouhadiba, 1988). And, “[t]his frequently applies to obstruents which constitute a natural domain for voicing contrasts. The sonorants do not generally participate in this process”\(^{180}\) (ibid: 101). In the table below, two variants prevail. [ysal] _wash_ was produced by 47 informants (60%). The other informants (32(40%)) were the suppliers of the second variant, [χsal] _wash_. The results appear different; however, both make reference to the same interval [20, 59]. This means, we assume, that the two forms still experience the mixing situation.

---

\(^{180}\) Obstruents are “[t]hose in whose production the constriction impeding the airflow through the vocal tract is sufficient to cause noise…” (Gimson, 1989: 34), whereas sonorants refer to “…those voiced sounds in which there is no noise component…” (ibid)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ɣsǝl]</td>
<td>[χsǝl]</td>
<td>wash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(60%)</td>
<td>32(40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.19**: Assimilation and /χsal/-Realisation

The literature suggests the genealogical membership of each variant. In Cherchell dialect, as in other sedentary varieties such as those of Fes, Tlemcen and Algiers, Grand’Henry (1972) notes that h can represent the classical ġ in the root G S L “wash”. Other forms could be derived, such as ɣhısǝl he washes. Dendane (2006:163) further explains that, in Tlemcen dialect, “... the drop of the vowel, often leading to consonant clustering, results in cases of assimilation of the neighbouring consonants”. He then illustrates by saying that /Gasala/ is, in this variety, realised as [Xsǝl] he has washed in which /G/ becomes [X]. This is the consequence of regressive voicing assimilation such that /ɣ/ exhibits voicing loss before the unvoiced fricative /s/, following the vowel elimination. Also, Bouamrane (1991) indicates that [ɣsǝl] is mainly in bedouin western Algerian dialects while [χsǝl] is sedentary.

**Graph 3.15**: Assimilation and /χsal/-Realisation

More accurately, [ɣ] and [χ] are velar fricatives characterised by released air friction between the soft palate and the tongue back. They, however, differ in terms of voicing. Voice assimilation could occur in non-homorganic consonants. “[N]on-homorganic voiced segments become devoiced when they are followed by a voiceless segment provided the phonotactics allow for the clustering of these segments” (Bouhadiba, 1988: 110). As an illustration, he says, on the same page of his work, that /razq/ is realised as [rasq] ‘possession’ and /kabʃ/ turns [kɔpʃ] ‘sheep’ in ORD. Yet, this type of assimilation is not realised by all the informants. As seen above, a lower number did it. Possibly, the two types of pronunciation prevail intra-individually: many informants use both of them in free variation; and, voice assimilation is attenuating through time as a result of the impact of SA (/yasala/) on the speech of our informants who are arabised. That is why, we opt for the bedouin [ɣsǝl] to win out and the sedentary [χsǝl] to recede.

b. Labialisation

We have mentioned in 3.1.3 that our recordings include a number of labialised items, such as [ɾʷbaq]/[ɾʷbag] tray and [ʒʷmæǝ] group which occur in free variation with their non-labialised counterparts [ɾbaq]/[ɾbag] and [ʒmæǝ] respectively. Labialisation is a bedouin feature but its non-occurrence is sedentary. To check the frequency of these items, the above utterances were part of our administered questionnaire. We also decided to add another labialised item [kʷbaʃ] sheep with its non-labialised counterpart in the survey to verify further the results attained. The following table summarises the scores,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedouin</th>
<th>Sedentary</th>
<th>Other utterances</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[kʷbaʃ] 5(6%)</td>
<td>[kbaʃ] 74(94%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[gʷmal] 4(6%)</td>
<td>[gml]/[qml]/[grad] 74(93%)</td>
<td>[pu] 1(1%)</td>
<td>lice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɾʷbaq]/[ɾʷbag] 4(5%)</td>
<td>[ɾbaq]/[ɾbag] 70(89%)</td>
<td>[ʃne]/[ʃølla]/NS 5(6%)</td>
<td>tray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results obviously demonstrate that the production of all labialised items recorded much lower proportions compared with the production of their non-labialised counterparts. For the first item sheep in the table, the labialised variant [kwbaʃ] was supplied by 5 out of 79 respondents against 74 (who uttered its labialised counterpart) out of the total number of our informants. Here, we witness the presence of one bedouin labialised variant and one sedentary non-labialised variant respectively. For the three other items, lice, group and tray, their corresponding realised variants exceed two.

In the third column, the utterances are, even though provided by a very few number of participants, the result of language contact ([pu]; [grup]) and diglossic borrowing ([sla]) respectively. Adding to this, the second line of the table includes one labialised variant and three non-labialised variants. We have decided to gather the latter elements within one column because we confine, in this table, our attention to the presence or absence of labialisation in the required environment. We have intended to do the same in the following line: labialised items are grouped in the same column (Column One) and non-labialised ones in another column (Column Two).

The third column, however, comprises not only the diglossic borrowed variant [sla] but also another variant [sne:], probably coming from other regions (and which is not concerned with labialisation). NS (Not Said) in this same column indicates that the concept is not known to the informants and therefore no corresponding variant is existent in those informants’ verbal repertoire. Utterances in the last column score the lowest; their results make reference to levelling interval [0, 20]. Similarly, all labialised utterances are being exterminated. It is those non-labialised forms which have the highest scores. They belong to [59, 79] and are in their way of being focused in the environments where labialisation has been supposed to obtain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[ʒmæʃa]</th>
<th>[ʒmæʃa]</th>
<th>[grup]</th>
<th>group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13(16%)</td>
<td>63(80%)</td>
<td>3(4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.20:** Levelling and Labialisation
3.5. Focusing

It is repeatedly denoted in this work that mixing, levelling and reallocation are paramount processes for the growth of a koine. The whole process of koineisation witnesses the emanation of a single set of uniform norms through focusing (see 1.4.3). Focused segments, like consonants and vowels, can appear in different syllable positions. Syllable structures and phonological processes are also concerned with genealogical focusing. Because of saliency, certain allophones are definitively avoided by the Oranees in question. In what follows, a number of illustrative focused forms will be detailed.

3.5.1. Consonants

3.5.1.1. /ð/

Dialectologists, like Ferrando (1998) and Marçais (1977), tend to generalise the fact that the voiced interdental sibilant seems to be lost in all North African pre-Hilali dialects, while the Hilali dialects have mostly preserved the segment in the area of North Africa. [ð]-loss in sedentary varieties is linked to the fusion of this interdental sibilant with the dental plosive [d] (Marçais, 1960; Bouamrane, 1989). In bedouin dialects, such as ZˇSir variety in

Graph 3.16: Levelling and Labialisation
Morocco, the segment represents the same interdental phoneme of Classical Arabic (Aguadé, 1998; Messaoudi, 2002). Its presence is the most peculiar to the variety.

However, the bedouinised sedentary interdental sibilant is another case which actually exists. It has to do with the dialectal conservatism, in some Algerian cities like old Tenes, Cherchell, and Dellys, of the voiced interdental segment (Cantineau, 1937; Boucherit, 2002). Grand’Henry (1972) provides the example of ḏrāʿ “arm” (the author’s transcription of [draːʕ]) which is used in Cherchell dialect. We have already mentioned in 3.3.2 that some linguists do not regard the interdental presence, including [ð], in certain sedentary varieties as maintenance but restoration owing to the abstratal bedouin impact, while other writers rather view it as preservation and trace it back to Andalousi immigration to North Africa.

Apart from Koranic recitation (see 3.4.2) and contrary to what we can expect from a bedouin-type dialect, our data attest that Oran Arabic has mostly focused the sedentary dental plosive rather than the bedouin interdental sibilant when initially followed by a vowel, as in [dæhbāk] your gold; [dɔɾija] children; [nækdɔb] I lie; [maːnækdɔb-ʃ] I don’t lie; [tɔɾɔbdɔi] you (fem) withdraw; followed or preceded by a consonant [dɔæb] gold; [dɔæbhum] their gold; [dɔæbha] her gold; [dɔbiːha] slaughter; [kɔbb] he lied; [wɔn(ha)] (her) ear; [nɔdb hu] we slaughter; [ɪdɔːci] he tastes; occurring in final-syllable positions, as in [ʒɔdrɔ] root; [wɔdniːha] her ears; [haːd (swɔːlæh)] these (things); [mɔzdɾiːn] native (plur); [jʊdɔb ak] he denies what you say; [tɔɾɔbdɔ] she withdraws; [tɔʃɔdbi] you (femenine) suffer; [tɔdbæh] she slaughters; or intervocally found, as in [ʃædɔb] he tortured; [haːda] this one (masc); [lɔdab] liar; [ʒaːb(ː)d (ʁuːhæh)] he is withdrawn; [nɔtʃædɔb] I suffer; [maːdɔbiːa] I would like; [ʔida] if. The dental plosive, in ORD, is seen as a sedentarised bedouin feature. This is the case of many other bedouin-type varieties, such as Tripoli Arabic (Pareira, 2007), where the voiced dental plosive substitutes for the voiced interdental sibilant. The author illustrates with items such as dhɔb “gold”, xde “he took”.

3.5.1.2. /ʒ/

The phonemic representation of the Classical Arabic (CA) letter jiim (⼦) is /ʒ/. [ʒ], [dʒ] and [ɡ] could be its very known reflexes in modern Arabic dialects. In sedentary eastern Arabic dialects, the articulation of /ʒ/, mainly in Cairo, central and northeastern Delta, Fayyūm and Beni Swēf areas, is ɡ (Palva, 2006). Western dialects, such as Algerian varieties,
could also attest the voiced velar in regions, including Nedroma and Tlemcen, in some items, such as [ʒguːti] my mother-in-law; [ɡazzar] butcher and [ɡəns] race. Nevertheless, Maghrebi pre-Hilali dialects majorly involve the affricated pronunciation [dʒ], which is heard in Tlemcen; Tênès; Cherchell; Mèdèa; Miliana; Blida; Algiers; Dellys; Mila; Constantine; Moroccan Djbala ((Marçais (1902); Marçais (1908); Marçais (1960); Grand’Henry (1972); Marçais (1977)). Conversely, the de-affricated articulation of /ʒ/ is realised in Hilali dialects (Vicente, 1998). It is current in the bedouin varieties of Algerian saharian regions; the dialect of Ulad Brahim (Marçais, 1908); Casablancan dialect (e.g. žār “neighbour”; žbıl “mountain”; žənn “genius” (Aguadé, 2002)) and others.

On the other hand, we find that the bedouinised sedentary segment and its sedentarised bedouin counterpart are also existent. In the sedentary Eastern Arab world, [ʒ] is used in Lebanon and Israel dialects (Rosenhouse, 1984). [dʒ] is common in many bedouin Algerian varieties of the plains (Marçais, 1977). In the case of the present research, our recording includes the focused bedouin pronunciation of /ʒ/, which occurs in the initial syllable position followed by a vowel, as in [ʒaːd] grandfather; [ʒiːha] side; [ʒənna] paradise; [ʒədra] root; [ʒaːlaːba]; [ʒəmfa] Friday; [ʒiː:b] pocket; [ʒaːzajːɐ] Algeria; [ʒaːmæʃ] mosque; [ʒaːja] (she is) coming/it seems; [ʒəjbiniːn] they are bringing; [ʒa] he came; [ʒiːt] I came; [nətzaw ʒiːn] married (plur); [ʒaːbob] she brought; initially before or after another consonant, as in; [ʃʒaːb] strange; [ʒəməʃa] group; [bʒaːja] Bejaia (an Algerian town’s name); [rʒaːl] men ; [ʃʒur] trees; [ʒwaːjæh] sides; [ʒwariːn] neighbours; [ʒdud] new (plur); [wʒuːh] faces, [ŋʒæh] he succeeded; [ʒiː] he comes; [ŋʒiːb] I bring; [ʒɔmæʃ] he sits; [ʒədəad] he renews; [rʒæʃtıː] you became; [ʒwaːjæh] around; in the final-syllable position: [ʒaːrəʒ] abroad; [təːʃ] snow; [zʒaːʒ] marriage; [hwaːʃəʒ] things; [burl] Bordj (an Algerian town’s name). [hæjəʒ] exciting person; [ŋwʳəʒ] I go out; [zəwə ʒ] he got married; [ŋtʃaːrəʒ] she watches; [zʊːʒ] two; [zaːːʃ] second (masc); [ʒaːrəʒ] abroad; and intervocally, as in [ŋæzə] thing; [ræːʒ] man; [darəːʒa] wheel; [ŋwɔːʃiːn] dishes; [hwaːʒəb] eyebrows; [ŋæsu] they made a pilgrimage; [ŋæsu] they became excited; [ŋuːʒəm] he can; [ŋuːʒəm] he could; [ŋʒəbdıː] you attract; [naːʒæh] succeeded person; [ŋləːʒaːl] because of/for. We can assume that the young Oranees majorly constitute a social network (see 2.4) in which they share many bedouin characteristics. /ʒ/ is seemingly one exemplary feature which is commonly widespread among these bedouin social network members.

183 The author transcribes it as dj
3.5.2. Vowels

3.5.2.1. Short Vowels

Tripoli Arabic possesses a sedentary-type short system, a fact which at this level sedentarises this bedouin-type variety. Its short vowels are /ǝ/ and /u/ such that /a/ merges with /i/ to give birth to schwa, and /u/ stands in isolation. The two resultant short vowel phonemes (/ǝ/ and /u/) can be determined by means of contrasting minimal pairs. For instance /xǝšš/ “he has come in” vs /xušš/ “come in”; /fǝkk/ “he has released” vs /fukk/ “release”; /tǝgg/ “he has knocked at the door” vs /tugg/ “door knocking”; /gǝss/ “he has cut” vs /guşš/ “cutting” (Pareira, 2002). How about the vocalic system of the dialect under study? Does it preserve the bedouin opposition, or is it sedentarised?

Our recordings apparently entail no contrast between /ǝ/ and /a/. Short vowels on the contrary reveal that the classical triangular system has evolved into a binary system which tends to confound the old /a/ and /i/ but preserve the autonomy of the old /u/. The confusion of /a/ and /i/ has to do with their centralisation in syllables closed at least by one consonant (Bouhadiba, 1988). This vowel reduction has probably gone through the focusing process.

Concerning [u] and [ǝ], free variation can prevail on the one hand, as in [turgud] and [turgǝd] she sleeps; [tugudd] and [tugǝd] she remains; [ǝrg ud] and [ǝrgǝd] I sleep; [jurgud] and [jurgǝd] he remains; [jǝgud] and [jǝgǝd] he sits down; [jǝɣrǝ] and [jǝɣrǝd] he goes out; [tǝgud] and [tugud] she remains; [rgud] and [rgǝd] he slept, [skun] and [skǝn] he lived; [gǝd] and [gǝd] it remained; [jurgud] and [jǝrgǝd] he sleeps; [jǝskǝn] and [jǝskun] he lives. Whether the variants above are undergoing mixing or levelling will not be considered in this study because, in this case, these variants do not represent either bedouin or sedentary genealogy. We are, however, more interested in the contrast between /ǝ/ and /u/, which is also recurrent in our recordings.

As already mentioned in 2.5.2.1.1a, Bouhadiba (1988) assumes that the vowels [i] and [ǝ] are in total complementary distribution with [ǝ] while [u] is in partial complementary distribution with the schwa. Given that the short high back vowel can stand in free variation with the latter segment in the case of CVC and —CC contexts (see the examples above), the opposition of these two segments (/ǝ/ and /u/) is not total: /ǝ/ can represent the vowel /a/ or /i/ in contrast with /u/ as indicated recurrently in this study. The centralisation has mainly to do
with /a/ (rather than /i/), since /i/ has only a limited number of occurrence in ORD. All in all, we can say that the sedentary vocalic opposition is partially focused in ORD. Here is a number of examples, /kǝtrǝt/ much vs /kutrǝt/ it increased (sing fem); /katrija/ most vs /kutrija/ majority; /ktǝr/ more vs /ktur/ it increased (sing masc); /kbr/ he grew up vs /kbur/ old age; /fǝtt/ I passed vs /futt/ you passed; /mǝtt/ I died vs /mutt/ you died.

3.5.2.2. Long Vowels

Long vowels, just like short ones, know many established rules already discussed by Bouhadiba (1988). Vowel length is a case in point which is determined by the environment of its position in the dialect under investigation. The author offers some generalisations in relation to length in addition to reduction of vowels in ORD. First, vowel duration is neutralised in CV## environments: at the end of words before a pause. No opposition long vowel vs short vowel is established at the word ending, which means that vowel duration in this environment is phonetically neither long nor short.

Second, a syllable closed by one consonant only can involve a long vowel. A set of a geminate vowel next to a geminate consonant form a constraint, however. That is, this variety rejects the occurrence of ViViCjCj whether or not the consonants are the same. The geminate vowel changes to one vowel if such cases emerge. Vowel Truncation Rule is: ViVi → Vi / -- CCS. What happens in fact is that, assuming there is no constraint which disallows the reduction to [ǝ], long vowels are first reduced, then attenuated, i.e. ViVi → Vi → [ǝ] in the environment of _C(C). However, (C)CVVC$ is admitted in this dialect, e.g. /ʂɣaar/ small (masc plur). Here, a contrast between short vowels and long vowels may take place, given that the short vowels /a/ and /u/ are encountered in a syllable closed by one consonant (ibid). The method of participant observation (see 2.6.5) has allowed us to generate these examples, /rǝaal/ men vs /rǝal/ foot; /hraam/ sinful vs /hram/ it became sinful; /zmaal/ camels vs /zmǝal/ camel; /ǝbaal/ mountains vs /ǝbal/ mountain; /ǝdǝam/ bones vs /ǝdǝam/ bone; /kbaaǝt/ old (plur) /kbar/ he became old; /fǝrab/ beer vs /fǝrab/ he drank; /ǝdǝud/ new (plur) vs /ǝdǝud/ grandfathers.

For Cohen (reported in Boucherit, 2002), short vowels and long vowels, in the Maghreb, contrast only for two phonemes: /ā/ - /a/ in the case of bedouin dialects and /ā/ - /u/ for sedentary dialects. No one of the two types of dialects possesses a similar system to the
one of Classical Arabic where the three long vowels /ī, ū, ā/ stand in opposition to the three short vowels /i, u, a/ respectively. Since the short vowel [a] is the most highly attested distributionally among the other short vowels in ORD, the bedouin contrast that obtains between this vowel and its long counterpart might have been the most focused consequently. In addition to the examples above we have the following ones provided by the same method, /ʒaːr/ neighbour vs /ʒaːr/ pull; /ʒamaːʕ/ mosque vs /ʒamaʕ/ he sat; /ʒaːna/ he came to us vs /ʒaːna/ paradise; /kaːmal/ complete vs /kaːmal/ he finished; /ʃaːm/ year vs /ʃam/ uncle; /ʃaːb/ he became old vs /ʃaːb/; /laːm/ he blamed vs /laːm/ he gathered; /qaːbla/ she has accepted (part) vs /qaːbla/ praying direction; /ʃaːm/ bar vs /ʃama/ henna; /ʃaːf/ he saw vs /ʃaf/ he hurt; /ʃaːl/ wealth vs /ʃaːl/ he got bored; /ʃaːni/ terminated vs /ʃaːni/ my art.

3.5.3. Saliency

In some cases, our informants’ production tends to be genealogically neutralised as a result of saliency. This happens when there are two variants and only one of them genealogically has an affiliation (either bedouin or sedentary); the genealogical variant is salient while the other is neutral. The informants’ avoidance of the salient form assumes that they aim to appear as neither bedouin nor sedentary.

3.5.3.1. Salient Bedouin Features: /ɣ/

The realisation of ghayn as q could occur in bedouin dialects (Caubet, 2001). We have seen in 3.2.2.1b the prevalence of [ɣ] and [q] which are reallocated phonologically to form a phonemic contrast. The phonological reallocation implies certain cases only. In other cases, there is no opposition between /ɣ/ and /q/. Free variation between /ɣ/-allophones does not occur either. [q] has been levelled out, paving the way for [ɣ] as the only segment within one given item. Initially, for example, we have found [(ʔaːl]ah ɣaːʃb] (God) powerful; [ɣudwa] tomorrow; [ɣadəθum] they felt sorry about it; [(ʁaː]k ɣaːlɔt] you are wrong; [ɣalːa] mistake; [ɣaːli] expensive; [ɣurjaːn] child; [ɣurba] strangeness; [ɣarbi] west; [ɣiːr] only; [ɣaːɾsiːn] planting (they); [ɣaːja] good; [ɣabɾa] dust; [ɣaːba] forest; preceded or followed by a consonant [ɣlət] it became expensive; [ɣyanu] they sing; [ɣiːɾi] you feel jealous; [ɣaːɾfræh] she asks him forgiveness; [myːɾteːnas] they make him misunderstand; [ɣarba] he filter; [ʃyɛɾ] small

184 Its genealogical affiliation is not clear perhaps because the feature is already koinéised.
(masc); [yːbiːna] sufferance; [myːɾba] people from Morocco; [yːsiːl] washing; in final positions there is, [tuːwaʃ] crying; [madaːɣ] Madagh (the name of an Algerian western beach) and intervocally we have: [jzaɣaɾtu] they ululate.

In fact, the voiced velar fricative has gone through the focusing process and reached stability. Pronouncing any item above with [q] instead of [ɣ] is felt very bedouin, sharp and uncivilised. So, it is completely avoided by our participants. This avoidance does not, however, mean that they would use a sedentary segment instead. [ɣ] stands, as a unique realisation of /ɣ/ and neutral variant, with no special genealogical affiliation.

3.5.3.2. Salient Sedentary Features

a. /r/

The non-trilled post-alveolar [ɾ] is a typically old sedentary segment. Marçais (1977) claims that it is common among pre-Hilali varieties, such as Fes, Tlemcen, Nedroma, Cherchell and Djellidjelli. Grand’Henry (1972) is more accurate in his observations, saying that the sound is only exceptionally found among some Cherchell speakers. More lately, Hachimi (2002) has attested the prevalence of [ɾ] in Fes dialect. As far as she knows, and contrary to Marçais and Grand’Henry’s remarks, the non-trilled post-alveolar “… is not found in any other dialect in Morocco or elsewhere in the Arabic speaking world” (ibid: 380). She continues, “… non-trilled [ɾ] is a feature that is highly stereoptyped as Fessi. … the interviews conducted with Fessis and non-Fessis show a heightened degree of awareness that this feature sets the Fessi dialect apart from the non-Fessi dialects” (ibid). This is confirmed by the author through dialect performance and overt commentary on the Fessi dialect by the interviewees. Hachimi presumes that the frequency of this feature throughout the Arabic dialects has diachronically diminished to be recently more restricted to Fessi dialect.

Hachimi’s claim is supported by our findings in ORD; no trace of [ɾ] is supplied in data. Instead, the trilled alveolar [r] is genealogically neutral, sharply focused in data and encountered in all positions: Initially followed by a vowel: [ɾasq] bestowal; [ɾabi] my God; [ɾaːʒa] man; [ɾagba] neck; [ɾagdiːn] sleeping (they); [ɾagaːg] (bedouin dish); [ɾaɾʒuːh] they transform it; [ɾabʃiːn] forty; preceded or followed by a consonant: [qqa] he studied; [hrəg] he migrated illegally: he burnt; [ɾiːt] I bought; [truːhi] you go (sing fem); [griːwʃ] (a type of cake); [ɾaɾʃ] I knew; [ɾəgɔ] he danced; in intervocalic positions: [ʃaɾəɔ] abroad; [darija]
The postpalatal sound /k/ knows many sedentary alterations in Northern Morocco (as in Taza and Ouagha), Western Algeria (as in Traras), Northern Constantine (as in Djidjelli): the segment bears palatalisation k[y], affrication to k[ʃ] or mutation to t[s] (Marçais, 1977). In Djidjelli-city, k is affricated or palatalised; /k/-affrication could allocate the phoneme /k/ to any position and next to all the segments, except u and w (Marçais, 1952). The affricated /k/ could be particularly heard more or less clearly in items, such as k[y]a-yêrqed “he sleeps”; bark[ʃ]aret “stop it”; rêžlî[ʃ] “your feet” (ibid). The palatalisation of /k/, on the contrary, occurs when it is immediately followed by u or w, as in k[u]-nêktob “I write”; farkâ[k][ʃ] um “stop it” (ibid). In Djidjelli-countryside, /k/ is affricated and rather pronounced as ġ (tʃ). This sound is frequent in Djidjelli in items as babâ[ʃ] “your father”; b-êl-ê[ʃ] “all”; ćifê[ʃ] “how” (ibid). /k/-affrication ġ and /or palatalisation k[y] which exist(s) mainly in a certain number of Maghrebi varieties (as seen in Djidjelli) seem(s) unknown in Cherchell where [k] is entirely plosive. The place of articulation depends on the neighbouring segment: front in kîr “soufflet”; back and velo-palatal in khâl “black” (Grand’Henry, 1972).

Just like Cherchell dialect, ORD knows neither affrication nor palatalisation of /k/. The sound is in all the environments completely focused into the genealogically neutral and plosive [k]: In initial position, as in [kamalti] you finished (fem); [ka:nɔt] she was; [ka:nũ] they were; [kutrija] almost; [kɔlma] word; [ka:jɔn] there is; [kuhli:n] dark (they); preceded or followed by a consonant: [ktob (rabi)] destiny made by God; [ktar] more; [tku:n] it is; [tkarrahna] she makes us hate; [kboɾt] I grew up; [kaɾb:k] book; [ku:nũ] you are (fem); [jkaɾbɔk] he denies what you say; [ktar] it increased; [rkɔbtaɾ] I took it (the bus); [nkɔmlu] we finish; [kdab] he lied; [kboɾ] he grew up; in final positions, as in [tɔmma:k] there; [dãhk] laugh; [ɾa:k (yaɾlaɾ)] you are (wrong); [da:k] that (masc); [di:k] that (fem); [darwok] now; intervocalically as in [twɔkɔl] you rely; [ta:kul] she eats.
3.5.4. Syllabic Structure

Syllabic structures could be genealogically affected. The bedouin and sedentary characteristics of syllables manifest in different ways in different Arabic dialects. In bedouin varieties, such as the Lybian Tripoli Arabic and some Algerian Saharan Arabic dialects, the scheme CvCCvC (as in taʕraf “you know” or meslem “muslim”) admits a vocalic suffixation (or the addition of a suffix with a(n initial) vowel). This scheme, in this case, retains the same syllabic structure by changing the second short vowel to an ultra-short vowel. This vowel allows the realisation of three successive consonants. As an illustration, tɑʕraf “you know” + u (plur ending) = tɑʕrafu “you know (plur)”; rukbā(t)i “knee” + i “my” = rukbi-ti “my knee”; yesrah “he makes something (sing) appear” + u (plur ending) = yesrahu “they make something (plur) appear” meslem “muslim” + a(t) (fem mark) = meslama “muslim (fem)” (Pareira, 2002). We did not come across such a bedouin feature in our recordings.

What we encountered, however, is the following: once a suffix with an initial vowel is added to the third person feminine singular perfective of the sound verb, the bedouin vowel lengthening of the index /-aːt/ to [aːt] arises. As examples, the suffix /ak/ you is added to this type of verb, as in [rɑʕdɑ:tɛh] she carried you; [dɑɣlɑ:tɑk] she got you in; [yɑrɡɑ:tɑk] she got you out; [qɑbɑ:lɑ:tɑk] she accepted you; [yɑlba:tɑk] she won you. In case the suffix is /ah/ him, we get [fɑʕdɑ:tɛh] she let it boil over; [ɡɑʃɑ:tɛh] she removed to him; [kɑtba:tɛh] she wrote it; [hɑɛdɑ:tɛh] she spoke it; [yɑsɑ:lɑ:tɛh] she washed it; [ɡɑsɑma:tɛh] she divided it; [kɑtɑ:lɑ:tɛh] she killed him; [zɑwqa:tɛh] she decorated it; [ɡɑwɑnɑ:tɛh] she sole it/him; [ɡɑbdɑ:tɛh] she withdrew it; [ɡɑsɑma:tɛh] she drew him; [yɑbɑnɑ:tɛh] she disturbed him; [nɑbɑ:tɛh] she cooked it. The bedouin Zʕir variety is also characterised by such vowel lengthening, as in ʕǝṛfɑːtu “she knew him”, wūggfɑːtu “she got him standing”, ẓɑbdɑːtu “she attracted him”, ẓɑtlɑːtu “she killed him” (Aguadé, 1998).

On the other hand, sedentary gemination (Caubet, 2001) also exerts influence on syllabic structure in ORD. The imperfective is formed by geminating the second consonant of the verbal scheme CvCCvC when suffixed to /u/ (plur ending) as in, [ʃʃ s ɑknu] they live; [ʃʃhɑɛdɡu] they hold grudges; [p tɑɡdɡu] they sleep; [ʃʃfɡdɡ u(ha)] they go to see (her); [ʃʃfɪrβu] they drink; [ʃʃɡɑʃlu] they remove; [ʃʃfɑːɾdɑ] they invite; [ʃʃmɑmšu] they wipe; [ʃʃfɑːɾdɑ] you invite; [ʃʃdɑɬɑku] they laugh; [nɑdɑhɑku] we laugh; [ʃʃdɑɬɑrɒni] they beat me; [ʃʃʃɛɾfu] he knows him; [ʃʃʃɛɾmʊ] they go out; [nɑɣɣɜ] we go out; [ʃʃʃɑqdu] they sign the marriage certificate; [ʃʃɑɣɑɾɑɾu] they ululate; [ʃʃhɑɛdru] they speak.
Gemination, nevertheless, may not take place in ORD nouns with the same scheme above when suffixed to /i/ my. This is rather a bedouin feature as in [sahbati] my friend; [qahwatì] my coffee; [hædrati] my speech; [kothati] my writing; [raghatì] my neck; [zubzati] my bread; [zæzati] my tree; [kobdatì] my liver; [lowsati] my clothes; [zadmåti] my work; [lahjåti] my beard; [lomåti] my word; [hæzåti] my stone. Some of these examples are recorded; some others are extracted via the participant observation method. Other pre-Hilalian characteristics, such as the addition of the verbal prefix /ka-/ for the imperfective formation, such as ka-yekteb “he is writing” (Marçais, 1958) did not occur in our recordings.

3.5.5. Phonological Processes

a. Assimilation

Assimilation arises in some cases, but is absent in others. Genealogically, the phenomenon is either bedouin or sedentary depending on the context of its emanation. According to many bedouin varieties, if /ʒ/ and another sibilant occupy the same word, assimilation ensues. For instance, /ʒæzæzætʃ butčer becomes [zaːzaːr]185. This bedouin feature186 is not found in our examples, [zuːʒ] second; [zæzæjar] Algeria; [ʃur] trees; [zwaːʒ] marriage; [zzawɔːʒ] he got married; [zaːwɔːʒ] second (masc); [nɔdʒæzæar] I am being dragged; [ʃæzæti] my tree; [ʒæzæ] trousseau; [ʃʊzɔːsæθa] her mother-in-law; [zæzæ:jri] Algerian; [ɔdʒɔː] married (sing fem); [ɔdʒɔːz iːn] married (plur); [nɔdʒɔːzɔː] I get married; [zɔwɔːʒ] second (sing fem).

What happens if the article {l} is found next to /ʒ/? Is it assimilated or not? In a number of sedentary varieties such as Tanger (Heath, 2002), assimilation manifests in the form of /ʒ/-affrication. Hassaniya and bedouin Maroccan central-type dialects, on the other hand, experience de-affrication when germination comes out, and this is also the case of ORD. Examples from data are selected as follows, in the initial position we find [ʒʒamiʃa] instead of [dʒamiʃa] university; [ʒʒiːl] instead of [dʒiːl] generation; [ʒʒiːha] instead of [dʒiːha] side; [ʒʒimʃa] instead of [dʒimʃa] Friday or intervocally as in [ɾaʒʒæʃ] instead of [ɾadʒæʃ] he turned something into.

185 Sometimes metathesis takes place instead of assimilation, as in [zaːzaːr]
186 Metathesis is also absent in our recordings
Another type of assimilation operates in suffixal pronouns, Caubet (2001) shows that if a word ending in ʕ or ḥ is suffixed to a pronoun starting with h, the bedouin assimilation proceeds and the two segments are realised as [hh]. Possessive pronouns are subjected to this assimilation. For instance, [tæħħa] hers (sing) is the outcome of /tæʕ/ of suffixed to /ha/ her; [tawæħħa] hers (plu) is composed of /tawaʕ/ of and /ha/ her; [tæhħum] theirs is the realisation of /tawɑ/ of to which /hum/ their is added; [tawæħħum] things (plur) theirs results from /tawaʕ/+hum/. This also occurs with reflexive pronouns, as in [ru:ħha] herself → /ruuʕ+/ha/; [rw æ:ħħum] themselves → /rwaah/+hum/. Some nouns connected to a suffix pronoun are no exception [ʂwa Bush] her things → /ʂwaalaʕ+/ha/. And, the same is applicable to verbs: [jǝglæħħa] he removed it → /jaglaʕ+/ha/; [jǝsmæħħa] he listenend to it → /jasmaʕ+/ha/.

b. /h/ in Suffixal Pronouns

It is genealogically pre-Hilalian that the drop or extreme weakness in articulating the -h- occurs in some suffixal pronouns (Vanhove, 1998). In Tanger dialect, the pronunciation of suffixal pronouns of the 3rd person /ha/ and /hum/ manifests as follows once fixed to another form, dyāl+ha=dyāla; mön+hom=mønnom; bønt+ha=bønta; ržəl+ha=ržəla; smαʃ+ha=smαʃta; tloq+ha=tloq; išūf+hom= išūfom (the author’s transcription) (Iraqui Sinaceur, 1998). The same is witnessed in the sedentary Anjra dialect in Morocco. The suffixal personal pronoun of the third person plural is ʔaŋ /; examples, /mønɔm/ “of them”; /hαqqɔm/ “their part”; /ʃaʁfɔm/ “you know them”; /dyālɔm/ “theirs” (Vicente, 1998).

As for ORD, the pre-Hilalian /h/-attenuation or disappearance in suffixal pronouns does not prevail in our recordings. Examples are: 1. form + /ha/: [[ju:hu] ʕændha] (they go) to her place; [jdiru:lha] they do for her; [bəlɔ absor] she wears it; [jglæʕʕə́] he removes for her; [ŋlabha] I become; [χwa:smha] her rings; [mașnaθa] it means; [jzi:ɓəlha] he brings to her; [jrabto:lha] they tie to her; [həni:lha] henna her; [nrdu:umlha] we take them for her; [ma-ʕændhæ:-f] she does not have; [tgu:lha] she says to her; 2. form + /hum/: [[bina:hum] between them; [mæʃhum] with them; [ŋhɔlhum ʕl qəva] they make (coffee) for them; [ʕli:lhum] for them; [jgu:lhum] they say to them; [jdi:ru:hum] they do for them; [ŋqo:hum] their mind; [mqalʃ:n(hum)] they spoil them; [jatalə:hum] they release them; [jɡæblu:hum] they take care of them.
3.6. Conclusion

In Chapter Two (see 2.5.2.3), we have seen that a number of dialectologists indicate the bedouin composition of ORD. At the level of pronunciation, our findings have, indeed, showed the intense prevalence of bedouin features in ORD. However, they have also demonstrated that a non-neglectful number of sedentary forms obtain within the same dialect. Both genealogical characteristics have undergone koineisation processes at different degrees. The sedentary regressive voicing assimilation of /ɣ/ to [χ] alternates with the bedouin /ɣ/-realisation to [ɣ]. In our example, the bedouin [ɣsǝl] and sedentary [χsǝl] survive a mix situation. Cases of /q/-articulation witness genealogical alternation. Sedentary [q] and bedouin [g] coexist and experience rudimentary mixing.

In other cases /q/-variants are reallocated distinct functions. Socio-stylistically, [q] is refunctionalised to denote formal contexts, such as morality, religion, classicism, education and urbanity. By contrast, [g] is informally retained. Informality reflects the elementary individuals’ requirements (e.g. daily positions and activities). Phonologically, the sedentary unvoiced uvular and the bedouin voiced velar co-occur, re-acquiring the phonemic contrast /q/ vs /g/. Still phonologically, bedouin diphthongal production, on the other hand, is circumscribed to the neighbouring of emphatics, as well as pharyngeals and velars (behaving as emphatics). Their sedentary monophthongal counterparts are, however, re-assigned the environment of plain sounds. Clearly, bedouin diphthongs and their sedentary monophthongs co-prevail in ORD. Interdialectally, intermediate forms which are neither bedouin nor sedentary have developed and are attitudinally neutral.

Exploration of elements in apparent free variation has also allowed unveiling the consequences of levelling process, and confirming hence the outcomes of other koineisation processes mentioned above. The sedentary [q] is levelled out in informal and rural settings whereas [g] knows levelling in formal situations. Bedouin diphthongs are extremely reduced in the context of plain sounds while sedentary monophthongs are eradicated in the environment of emphatics, pharyngeals and velars.

As for focusing, the genealogical features that are stabilised are the bedouin de-affricated /ʒ/-realisation; the sedentary dental plosive articulation of /ð/; the sedentary short vocalic opposition (/ǝ/ vs /u/ only partially) and the bedouin contrast /a:/ vs /a/. Syllabic
structures are particularly focused with respect to three consonantal words. When the third person feminine singular perfective of the sound verb is linked to a suffix with an initial vowel, the bedouin vowel lengthening of the index /-ət/ to [aːt] obtains. Sedentary germination also hits ORD syllabic structures of the type CvCCvC in the imperfective suffixed to /u/. However, if the same scheme represents nouns and is suffixed to /i/, germination does not occur, a fact which is bedouin. As regards /l/ next to /ʒ/, germination takes place with bedouin de-affrication. Again, bedouin assimilation operates when a word ending in a pharyngeal is suffixed to a pronoun beginning with /h/. In sum, ORD is a genealogically mixed variety on the pronunciation level.
4.0. Introduction

In the present chapter, we probe into genealogically grammatical forms that have gone through koineisation processes. After surviving the mix situation, many pre-Hilalian and Hilalian features have been retained as a result of reallocation. Two different types of this process have emerged with respect to the current linguistic level: socio-stylistic reallocation and grammatical reallocation. Other pre-Hilalian and/or Hilalian features have been levelled out, leaving the ground to their genealogical counterparts. Simple elements remain at the expense of those with a more complex structure. At the end, grammatical focusing takes place in parallel with the operation of the above koineisation processes.

4.1. Mixing

We have hypothesised in this study that bedouin features outweigh sedentary ones in Oran dialectal grammar; and, we tend in this chapter to validate or not this implication. Just like pronunciation, ORD has exhibited a mix situation at the level of grammar. It happens that a great deal of bedouin and pre-Hilalian features presently alternate. Sometimes this alternation is indeed due to mixing, but some other times grammatical features are just seemingly mixed. In fact, they alternate as a consequence of other koineisation processes, such as levelling or reallocation. Mixing, does not necessarily lead, as a process on its own, to the development of a koine. This section allows to withdraw the most analysable grammatical elements from our data, examine and classify them, then finally explain and interpret their current state.

4.1.1. Defective Verbs

Defective verbs, also known as 3rd radical semi-vowel verbs, do not have the same pre-Hilalian and Hilalian structures. The pre-Hilalian construction is based on diphthongised forms of the type [lqaw] they found in the suffixal conjugation (or perfective), and [blq aj] you find (fem); [nslqaw] we find; [blqaw] you find (plur fem and masc); [bilq aw] they find (fem and masc) in the prefixal conjugation (or imperfective). According to Boucherit (2002), defective verbs in Algiers dialect are characterised by the pre-Hilalian conjugation as in the examples: [bqā] he stayed; [bqa-w] they stayed; [nā-bqa] I say; [nā-bqa-w] we stay; [bkā] he cried; [bka-w] they cried; [nā-bki] I cried; [nā-bki-w] we cried. In Rabat and Fès dialects, the
regular verb may be conjugated as a defective verb; the second person of the plural past, where the morpheme (plur ending) is /u/, could be diphthongised and realised as, for example /ktǝbtiw/ “you have written” (Messaoudi, 1998; Aguadé, 1998).

The Hilalian defective verbal structure, on the other hand, has forms of the type [lqo] they found in the suffixal conjugation, and [blqe] you find (fem); [nlqo] we find; [tlqo] you find (plur fem and masc); [hqo] they find (fem and masc) in the prefixal conjugation. In Tripoli dialect, the verb conjugation is bedouin (Pareira, 2007). In the prefixal conjugation, the following forms occur: telgi “you find (fem)”; nešru “we buy”; telgu “you find (masc and fem)”; yebdu “they begin (masc and fem)”. In the suffixal conjugation, it is found šru “they bought (masc and fem)”. In the plural, the second person presents the ending {-tu} as in Hassaniya (Aguadé, 1998).

Some Arabic dialects, alternate pre-Hilalian and Hilalian features. As for the sedentary Maltese variety (Vanhove, 1998), it generally has the so-called sedentary and innovating form of singular of the perfective (the diphthong ey expected in Maltese instead of the long vowel i in 1st and 2nd pers): mšeyt “I have walked”; mleyt “I have filled”; mši ǝt “she walked”; mli ǝt “she has filled”, and has not, contrary to the bedouins, regularised the plural with –u: mšew “they have walked”; mlew “they have filled”. As for the plural of the imperfective, the same bedouin type form is applicable to the verbs with final Y. The ending of the plural is invariably –u (instead of –īu in sedentary dialects), such as yimšu “they walk”. There is also alternation of sedentary and bedouin features in the Hilalian Casablancan dialect (Aguadé, 2002) klīna “we ate”; klītu “you ate”; klāw “they ate”; nāklu “we eat”; tāklu “you eat”; yāklu “they eat”; źīna “we came”; źītu “you came”; źāw “they came”; nźīw “we come”; dźīw “you came”; yźīw “they come”.

Our recorded data also demonstrate that there is co-appearance of sedentary and bedouin features. Bedouin type examples are [nǝbyu] we like; [nwlalu] we become; [naqdu] we accomplish; [nʃru] we buy; [nzag] we shout; [nʃalu] we leave; [naqo] we clean; [n3u] we come; [nwlulu] we come back; [naqr] we study; [nsw u] we deserve consideration; [tǝbyu] you want; [tnaqo] you clean; [jǝbyu] they want; [jʃalu] they leave; [jyanu] they sing; [jaqr] they study; [jæhku(li)] they tell(me); [jǝbnu] they build; [jalo] they pray; [jǝbk] they cry; [jʃru] they buy; [jwlu] they become; [jkm u] they smoke; [j3ru] they run; [j3u:ni] they seem (to me); [j3u] they come; [jbd u(ha)] they start (it); [jǝthlu] they take care; [jnaqo:(ha)] they clean (it); [jʃalu(hum)] they leave (them); [ma:-jǝswu:-ʃ] they do not deserve.
4.1.2. The Possessive Relationship

The possessive relationship is probably an important criterion to make a genealogical distinction between Arabic dialects. It manifests under two structures, one of which is expressed in the form of synthetic(al) (possessive) construction. Other alternative terminologies are used in the literature to designate this form, such as synthetic structure, synthetic genitive, constructed state of annexation, constructed expression of annexation, direct annexation, and others. This construction embodies usually two nominal forms: one form is followed and determined by a second form which is often accompanied by the definite article. The synthetic genitive is known in Standard Arabic as ‘iḍāfa (Marçais, 1977). Syllabic and assimilatory modifications can be evoked by this construction. It is very common in Tripoli Arabic: āxar-ān-nḥār “the end of the day”; tatīb-āl-lḥām “the cooking of the meat”; lḥām-lā-xrūf “lamb meat”; żow-āl-lamma “the atmosphere of the meeting”; tunẓrtālmerqa and māṭān-āl-marga “the sauce bowl”; ḥōs-zadd-i “my grandfather’s house” (Pareira, 2007). The author also supplies synthetic constructions which involve nouns connected to suffixal pronouns: lō-nah “its colour”; īdē-ya “my hands”; xāl-i and ʕɑmm-i “my uncle”; baṭn-ək “your belly. Generally speaking, bedouin dialects privilege this construction.

The other type of possessive relationship has been attributed many designations in the literature as well: analytic(al) (possessive) construction, analytic(al) structure, analytic(al) genitive, analytic(al) state of annexation, expression of annexation and indirect annexation. It tends to associate two terms, by relating the second to the first by means of a genitive particle (mainly /djal/ of) to indicate possession. Unlike other sedentary dialects, the particle is usually singular in Rabat dialect since it does not take the plural form /dyawl/ (Messaoudi, 1998). When suffixes are added to the sedentary genitive particle, /dyāl/ is employed, for example, as /dyālu/ his and /dyālək/ your (as in the Moroccan sedentary Anjra dialect (Vicente, 1998)). In addition to /djal/ and /djawl/, /təʃ, mtaʃ, ntaʃ…/ and their respective plurals /tawaʃ, mtawaʃ, ntawaʃ…/ can appear as linking exponents to express possessive relationships. The
analytical structure, which is viewed as sedentary, does not exist in Classical Arabic, but constitutes a dialectal innovation (it is rather originally Hispanic) (Marçais, 1977).

The possessive conrtuction could also be either bedouinised sedentary or sedentarised bedouin. According to Grand’Henry (1972), despite the apparent full decline of the synthetic possessive structure in some sedentary dialects (Djedjelli, Tlemcen, Fès) and the increasing use of analytic possessive structure, the former construction is still frequent as a bedouinised sedentary feature in Cherchell dialect. The bedouin dialect, Ţèir (Aguadé, 1998), on the other hand, opts for tāʕ, ntāʕ and their corresponding plural tāwʕ, ntāwʕ to express the analytic expression of annexion, as in brārəd ntāwʕ az-zhər “bottle for rose water”; tāwb ntāʕu “a clothing item of his”; lqūʕ ntāʕ əl-xə’ma “tent furniture”; lə-mgāʕəf tāwʕə ʃ’ēkūk “couscous spoons”.

Our recordings cover a huge amount of possessive contracted instances, which appear for the first time in a genealogically total mixture. There are pre-Hilalian expressions in which the second item could be employed with the indefinite article ə, such as [fa:l təʕ ɣi:r] a good sign; [blad təʕ ʒurba] a foreign country; [brada təʕ məngu:] one earring; ə'[ʃ]-ʃə:ra təʕ wæhrən] the girl from Oran; [mra təʕ da:r] housewife; [tlæ:ta təʕ ʃi:ja] three o’clock in the afternoon; [swəlduna təʕ dəbi:ha] our tools for slaughter; [əl ʃərs təʕ ʃi:ra] a girl’s wedding; [ʃæda təʕ ʃækri] inherited tradition; [ʃne: təʕ qahwa] tray for coffee; [ʒæməsa təʕ ʃə:bi] the band of my friends; [blæ:d təʕ ʃæra] a foreign country. Or, this second item may be used with əl in case it is a definite noun, as in [wəqt təʕ əl fə:thə] the day of religious marriage; [rækba təʕ əl bæær] the sea transport; [təgæra təʕ ʃə-ʃi:ra:t] the girl’s evening celebration; [ræbəʃa təʕ əʃ-ʃæbə:ʃ] four o’clock in the morning; [læhæna təʕ əl-bənt] the girl’s henna; [ʒæmsa təʕ əʃ-ʃæ:] five o’clock in the morning; [ʒæmsa təʕ əh-ʃi:ja] five o’clock in the afternoon; [tlæ:ta təʕ əh-ʃi:ja] three o’clock in the afternoon; [əl hæna təʕ ʃə-ʃi:ra] the girl’s henna; [əl wæhda təʕ əl-li:l] one o’clock at night.

A specific example is noticed in which the definite article /la/ substitutes for /əl/. This occurs before the feminine form /ʃruusa/ bride, as in [ʃne: təʕ əæreʃrəsa] bride’s tray; [dfuːʃ təʕ əæreʃrəsa] bride’s money; [ʃflət təʕ əæreʃrəsa] bride’s lunch. We have also found out some analytic structures in which the particle təʕ/ is linked to a suffix, as in [ʃæktəb tæʃkəm] your destiny (plur); [əl fə:thə tæʃhæ] her religious wedding; [əl kəʃʃ təʃna] our sheep; [ʃə:kətə] their men; [ʃdzəq tæʃhæ] her bridegroom’s gift.

As seen above, we notice that the article {la} sometimes substitutes for {ɬ} in more than one synthetic construction, ([ʃroːɡa] *bride*; [χmːis] *Thursday*). This is another kind of syllabic modification. Yet, no article is sometimes placed before the second item, as in [bant wæhrǝn]; [wlaːd wæhrǝn] *the Oranees*; [naːs wæhrǝn] *the Oranees*; [shaːb wæhrǝn] *the Oranees*. The question that should be raised is: Are all these possessive expressions really mixed or do they experience other processes and situations? If we try a more careful examination of data, we notice that the genealogical constructions are in complimentary distribution because they are reassigned different functional roles. We will analyse this case in 4.2.3 in a greater depth.

### 4.1.3. The Indefinite Article

Many pre-Hilalian dialects tend to employ the article *wāḥad “a”* to express indefiniteness, a notion which is sufficiently implied by an undefined and isolated noun (free from any determiner) in bedouin dialects (Marçais, 1958). The sedentary article could be accompanied by the definite article /al/ still to express indefiniteness, as is the case of Tlemcen dialect (the indefinite article is indeed composed of the noun of number *wâḥad*, followed by the definite article above). Another indefinite article *hal* can be also used; the *l* of this article may go through assimilation with the next sound: *ḥarrâjel*, a man; *hannâs*, some people; *ḥaqqâhwâ*, a coffee; *ḥakkursi*, a chair (Marçais, 1902). *ši* and *wâḥ(ǝ)d* are the two indefinite articles which alternate in the Arabic dialect of Casablanca. Examples including *ši “a”* are: *ši mʃa “a woman”, ši ḥaːza “something”, ši ǝʃrâyn “about two months“ (Aguadè,
2002). Another example which involves wāḥ(ǝ)d is kān wāḥd ǝl-mātš dyāl l-kūra “there was a soccer match” (ibid).

As a bedouin variety, Tripoli Arabic embodies the indefinite article Ø, as in bīr “a well”; ṛāžǝ “a man”; žrānǝ “a fog”; ḥāžɑ “a thing” (Pareira, 2002, 2007). In the west of Algeria, the bedouin Ulad Brahim dialect in Saida possesses the sedentarised bedouin article yāḥd –el (Marçais, 1908). Again, although this phrase is indefinite, it is composed of the form yāḥ(ò)d which is invariable and always followed by the definite article el, as in yāḥd-errāzel “a man”, but never yāḥôd râţel (ibid). The same author reports from other works that a noun preceding the indefinite article and provided with a possessive affix is encountered in the dialect: yāḥôd sâḥbi “a friend of mine”. Here the definite article that follows yāḥôd is not used.

The data at hand demonstrates an alternation between the sedentary and bedouin forms. The indefinite article, in ORD, can be marked by the pre-Hilalian article [wæh], as in [wæh yurja:n] a child and [wæhda saḥbat] a friend (girl) of mine, or the pre-Hilalian article [wæh] followed by ãl (assimilated or not), as in [w æh ʃi:ba:ni] an old man; [wæh ǝ r-razol fejat] a man passing. Although the use of [wæh] is remarkable, the indefinite article ø also exists, as in [ʃi:ra jru: ʃi:ra] a man gets engaged with a woman; [lqe:ti ʃi:ra] you found a woman; [yarrazolhum si:f] he showed them a sword; [saḥbat] ga:tli] a friend of mine told me; [jo3bød ʃudmi] he shows a knife; [nʃu:fu dar kbi:ra] we look for a big house; [tdi yodra] she takes some vegetables; [ndi:ru dra:hom bina:tna] we club together. We hypothesise that the indefinite article in the present dialect is either reallocated or simplified. We will verify our suggestion in due course.

4.1.4. Other Genealogical Features

Our results of the recorded interviews were full of linguistic forms. However, we were unable to find out any colour adjectival diminutive or dual of names of bodyparts through this method. Therefore, we decided to include some questions in our administered survey in an attempt to extract this information missed in the recordings. As a result, we could obtain percentages that would be examined and analysed under the heading of levelling. The questions were wh-questions, such as [kifa:ʃ tsami ba:b ʂve:rt sfor] how do you call a small

213 Although the author finds that the variety is genealogically mixed, he often refers to it as bedouin
yellow door? There were also affirmative sentences which required blank filling, such as [ʕændna jød waēda bəsah zu:ʒ….] we have one hand but two….

4.2. Reallocation

Grammar bears koineisation processes in a similar way as pronunciation. It happens that certain bedouin and sedentary grammatical features still coexist in ORD, just like in many other Arabic dialects. Both genealogical forms are non-levelled because they are required to fulfill different new roles. They are, in other words, complimentarily distributed; that is, where one grammatical structure takes place, the other one relatively does not. Sometimes, the occurrence of one genealogical characteristic has more than one interpretation.

4.2.1. Grammatical Reallocation: Defective Verbs

In Chapter One, we have come across Britain and Trudgill’s (1999) identification of two types of reallocation: socio-stylistic and phonological. In Chapter Three, we have, indeed, found pronunciation elements which are covered by these two types. Unexpectedly in the current chapter, we have faced a third type not considered by the authors above, and to which we refer as grammatical reallocation. Some genealogical characteristics are maintained, but change their functional position within the field of grammar.

This is the case of defective verbs. We have seen that both genealogical types of defective verbs remain in the dialectal mixture. Their alternation is not haphazard in fact. Categorical features are reallocated grammatical functions in the sense that the Hilalian construction is maintained for the imperfective while the pre-Hilalian structure is conserved for the perfective. The Hilalian prefixal conjugation is specifically apparent (for feminine and masculine) with the first person plural, second person plural and third person plural. The pre-Hilalian suffixal conjugation is mostly plain with the third person plural (masc and/or fem). We have not encountered any bedouin suffixal conjugated verbs like, [lqo]; [bdu] or [byu]. Table 4.1 shows the bedouin conjugation of defective verbs in the imperfective with the 1st pers plur (masc/fem).
In Table 4.1, defective verbs are conjugated with the 2nd pers plur (mas/fem) in the imperfective. The conjugation is still bedouin,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Defective Verbs</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Person Plural (masc/fem)</td>
<td>[nǝbyu]</td>
<td>we like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[nwɔlu]</td>
<td>we become</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[nzagu]</td>
<td>we shout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ŋɔalu]</td>
<td>we leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[naqo]</td>
<td>we clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[naqdu]</td>
<td>we accomplish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[nʒu]</td>
<td>we come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[nwɔlu]</td>
<td>we come back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[naqru]</td>
<td>we study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[nǝswu]</td>
<td>we deserve consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[nǝtlɑ:qo]</td>
<td>we meet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Bedouin Defective Verbal Imperfective-1st Pers Plur

In Table 4.2, defective verbs are conjugated with the 2nd pers plur (mas/fem) in the imperfective. The conjugation is still bedouin,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Defective Verbs</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Person Plural (mas/fem)</td>
<td>[tsǝbyu]</td>
<td>you want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[tnaqo]</td>
<td>you clean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Bedouin Defective Verbal Imperfective-2nd pers plur

The following table deals with the bedouin prefixal conjugation of defective verbs with the 3rd pers plur,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Defective Verbs</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[jɔbyu]</td>
<td>they want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[jɔalu]</td>
<td>they leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[jyanu]</td>
<td>they sing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[jaqru]</td>
<td>they study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[jæhku(li)]</td>
<td>they tell(me)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Third Person Plural
(mas/fem)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Defective Verbs</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ʒəbnu]</td>
<td>[ʒəbnu]</td>
<td>they build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jfaqo]</td>
<td>[jfaqo]</td>
<td>they pray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jəbkə]</td>
<td>[jəbkə]</td>
<td>they cry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jəfru]</td>
<td>[jəfru]</td>
<td>they buy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jwalu]</td>
<td>[jwalu]</td>
<td>they become</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jəkmu]</td>
<td>[jəkmu]</td>
<td>they smoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jəzmru]</td>
<td>[jəzmru]</td>
<td>they run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[j3u:(ni)]</td>
<td>[j3u]</td>
<td>they seem (to me)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[j3u]</td>
<td>[j3u]</td>
<td>they come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jəbdə:(ha)]</td>
<td>[jəbdə:(ha)]</td>
<td>they start (it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jəθəlu]</td>
<td>[jəθəlu]</td>
<td>they take care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jnaqə:(ha)]</td>
<td>[jnaqə:(ha)]</td>
<td>they clean (it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jəlu:(hum)]</td>
<td>[jəlu:(hum)]</td>
<td>they leave (them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[məjaswə:]</td>
<td>[məjaswə:]</td>
<td>they do not deserve consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jwalu]</td>
<td>[jwalu]</td>
<td>they come back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jəmhu:(hum)]</td>
<td>[jəmhu:(hum)]</td>
<td>they rub (them)out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jəzhu]</td>
<td>[jəzhu]</td>
<td>they enjoy their time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jqəru]</td>
<td>[jqəru]</td>
<td>they teach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.3**: Bedouin Defective Verbal Imperfective-3rd Pers Plur

The table below covers however the sedentary suffixal conjugation of defective verbs with the 3rd pers plur (masc/fem),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Defective Verbs</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Third Person Plural
(mas/fem)     | [ʒaw]           | they came   |
|             | [lqaw]          | they found  |
|             | [bdaw]          | they started|
|             | [byaw]          | they wanted |

**Table 4.4**: Sedentary Defective Verbal Perfective-3rd Pers Plur
4.2.3. Socio-Stylistic Reallocation

In addition to grammatical refunctionalisation, certain genealogical features are retained in the original dialectal mix, at the level of grammar, because they are reallocated different socio-stylistic tasks. Indeed, possessive relationship types have been, just like some pronunciation features, plausibly affected by socio-stylistic reallocation. The definite article and negation are concerned too. Formality may come into play in adjudicating which grammatical structure is actually employed. Defining this concept is not easy to discern since it entails many sub-factors such as politeness, seriousness, social familiarity and distance, and others. Speech is likely less spontaneous in formal situations and controlled by careful socio-stylistic rules. In informal situation, by contrast, the speaker is more relaxed and his utterances bear less social restrictions.

4.2.3.1. Possessive Relationships

I. Analytic Construction

As mentioned earlier, the analytic construction is made by means of a particle. According to Harning (1980)\(^{214}\), the particle /mtāʕ/ forms should have appeared in North Africa much earlier than /dyāl/ exponents. One main indication behind this fact is that /mtāʕ/ and its derivatives were present in Spanish Arabic varieties which paved the way for the prevalence of this particle in North Africa. /dyāl/ exponents, on the contrary, was not found in Spanish Arabic. But /d-/ for example, must have, for the author, emerged not later than in the 14\(^{th}\) c as it was mentioned by Ibn Khaldoun at that era. In the urban dialects of Morocco and Algeria, Harning (1980)\(^{215}\) adds, the analytical state of annexation is the usual form of talking about the genitive. Semantically, it is restricted as it is a stylistic complement to the synthetic genitive. Indeed, style, in our data, reigns as the norm which determines the role of each type of the possessive relationship. Regardless of whether its second item is definite or indefinite, the sedentary analytical structure seems to fulfill more formal ways of talking about a given subject, such as wedding, number or pairs, location, moral customs and traditions.

\(^{214}\)Reported in Ferrando (1998)
\(^{215}\) Reported in Ferrando (1998)
a. Wedding

When answering the question related to the way weddings are celebrated in Oran, the informants used the sedentary analytical method to formally express the possessive relationship. Letting them know that the interviewer is not from Oran, the informants were attentive to give their hearer a positive image about one of their most traditional ceremonies; their way of talking was more thoughtful. They described the wedding itself and how it prestigiously should take place. One or two days before this event, the bride’s female relatives, neighbours and friends meet, the interviewees said, to spend and enjoy some time singing and dancing. Our informants used the analytic construction to cover this pre-wedding phase,

\[\text{tagsera tæs af-fira:t}\]

the girls’ evening celebration

They also said that the wedding celebration goes through two stages. The bride’s family organise the first stage during which they invite the family of the bridegroom, in addition to their relatives and acquaintances. Our participants referred to the event as,

\[\text{ol-fær tæs fi-ra}\]

a girl’s wedding

They indicated the bride as [læ-fro:sa] in alternation with [læ-bant] or [af-fira] (which both mean girl). Whenever they associated a wedding situation or object to this person, they used such analytic constructions as,

\[\text{sne: tæs lae-fro:sa}\]

bride’s tray

\[\text{firo:r tæs lae-fro:sa}\]

bride’s lunch

\[\text{dfur tæs lae-fro:sa}\]

the bride’s money

\[\text{æhl tæs lae-fro:sa}\]

bride’s family

\[\text{ol-hæna tæs ol-bant}\]

the girl’s henna

\[\text{ol-fær tæs af-fira}\]

the girl’s wedding

\[\text{ol-hæna tæs af-fira}\]

the girl’s henna
The second stage of this celebration is yet arranged by the bridegroom and his family, who in turn invite the bride’s relatives, their neighbours and friends to take part in the wedding. The indirect annexation is again employed,

\[\text{[ǝl-ʕærs tæʃ ǝʃ-ʃi:r]} \quad \text{the man’s wedding}\]

If we turn back our attention to the pre-wedding phase, it is not, according to the interviewees, restricted to the bride’s family circle only; people come to the bridegroom’s house to congratulate him and anticipate the wedding celebration. The analytical genitive selected by the informants to denote the occasion, as in

\[\text{[ǝl-ʕæma tæʃ ǝʃ-ʃi:r]} \quad \text{the man’s engagement}\]
\[\text{[la-mlǝma tæʃ ǝʃ-ʃi:r]} \quad \text{the man’s pre-wedding party}\]

Other analytical states of annexation are found in our recorded interviews with reference to the guests or the wedding itself. These situations were viewed by the informants as formal which is the reason why they opted again for the use of sedentary type of possessive relationship, as in

\[\text{[tǝʃwar tæʃ (ǝ)l-ʕærrasa]} \quad \text{the departure of guests}\]
\[\text{[gwalh tæʃ (ǝ)l-ʕærs]} \quad \text{the equipment of the wedding}\]

**b. Number**

Far from any intimacy or informality, giving numbers is generally performed objectively. In some instances, our interviewees tended to give determined numbers, as in the following example where the item denoting number ten, [ʕæfra], occurs in the first position of the utterance.

\[\text{[ʕæfra tæʃ ǝn-nas]} \quad \text{ten people}\]

The same position is occupied by two further exemplary numeral items. However, the first form [farda] is determined and implies number one, while the second one [ʒmæʕa] is more general and entails the meaning of group of people.
As observed, the informants selected the analytical, instead of the synthetic, possessive construction in all the above cases.

c. Time

This section (c) is not totally distinct from the previous one (b). *time* is one illustrative type of the notion of *number*. Numeral items take the first position of the analytical construction when indicating time. This reference is concerned with any part of the day: morning [ʂbɑːh], afternoon [hʃiːja], evening [hʃiːja] or night [liːl]. Our recordings include a number of instances, such as

-four o’clock in the morning
-five o’clock in the morning
-five o’clock in the afternoon
-three o’clock in the afternoon
-half past three in the afternoon
-one o’clock at night

The sedentary possessive structure is also present in case the notion *time* is denoted in its general sense. Consider the following example,

-the time span of religious marriage

The construction refers to the period devoted to religious marriage. It starts at a given (un)specified point in time and ends at another point also (un)specified.
d. Location

Location is a further idea which may underlie objectivity. The Oranee does not need an informal way to transmit such a notion. The analytic structure is considered as relevant to fulfill this situation. In data, we notice that there are two types of this sedentary construction. In the first type, the item referring to location is found in the first position. The Oranee intends to specify the exact location he is indicating, as in

[blaːd tæʃ ɣurba]  
*a foreign country*

[blaːd tæʃ bãːɾa]  
*abroad*

Yet, the second type involves the item denoting location in the second position. Here, the Oranee tends to talk about someone or something in relation to a given place.

[ʃəʃiːɾa tæʃ wɜːhɾən]  
*the girl from Oran*

[læ-ɾəs tæʃ wæhrən]  
*the wedding of Oranees*

[rækba tæʃ əb-ʃær]  
*the sea transport*

e. Moral Customs and Traditions

Moral customs and traditions are still highly esteemed by many members of Oran speech community. Their description needs a formal style which in turn requires the sedentary expression of possessive relationships. Traditionally, it is, for instance, an inadmissible fact that a guest is received by someone at home without welcoming and making him some coffee. A related expression is,

[sneː tæʃ qahwa]  
*tray for coffee*

Housewives are also traditionally viewed by many Oranees as those women who take care of their families by, for example, preparing food for their husbands and children and cleaning their houses regularly. They have tasks which are often associated with the house,

[mɾa tæʃ daːɾ]  
*housewife*
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Regarding customs, they are transmitted and preserved through generations as expressed in the following indirect annexation,

\[ \text{ʕæda tæʃ bəkri} \quad \text{inherited custom} \]

Some analytical structures are inherited from father to son and carry the notion of optimism. This implies they idea that any human alive should believe in hope,

\[ \text{fa:l tæʃ xi:r} \quad \text{a good sign} \]

II. Synthetic Construction

Marçais (1977) believes that the constructed state of annexation ordinarily prevails in Libya and Tunisia. However, the more one gets towards the west, the less synthetic occurrence takes place. In some cases, it is, in this area, limited to a particular number of genitive relationships. If ever it occurs according to Buret (1952) (reported in Iraqui-Sinaceur, 1998) and Pareira (2007), it tends to express intimate narrower relationships, such as kinship, bodyparts, essential parts of clothes and household tasks. Examples from Tanger dialect (Iraqui-Sinaceur, 1998) are: \( \text{sāmm-əd-dɔbbag} \) “the uncle for tanner”; \( bīt-əd-dyāf \) “the room for guests”; \( bāb-əl-bīt \) “the door of the room”. In other words bedouin constructed states hold the roles that are not fulfilled by analytic structures. Regardless of whether their second item is definite or indefinite, they rather constitute informal styles.

a. Kinship

Indeed, we came, in the corpus, across synthetic constructed examples which cover kin relationships, such as \( [\text{ma:li:n əl-ʃri:s}] \) bridegroom’s family; \( [\text{mali:n-ʃroṣə}] \) bride’s family; \( [\text{mut-ʃroṣə}] \) bride’s mother; \( [\text{mut-la-ʃri:s}] \) bridegroom’s mother; \( [\text{æhl-əl-ʃri:s}] \) bridegroom’s family. Here is a special construction (Iraqui-Sinaceur, 1998) to express (doubling) kinship relationships in Tanger variety: \( \text{xtō-d-l-ūzir} \) “his sister of Uzir (Uzir’s sister)”; \( bābāh d-lo-ʃroṣ \) “his father of the bridegroom (the bridegroom’s father)”; \( yəmmāh d-ər-rāzəl \) “his mother of the man (the man’s mother)”. These constructions are not present in our data. There is, however, a frequent occurrence of synthetic structures in which the second
term is not determined by a definite article but rather linked to a suffix; or, the Hilalian direct annexation embodies one term only related to a suffix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hilalian Construction</th>
<th>instead of</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[daːr ʒǝdi]</td>
<td>[daːr tǝʃ ʒǝdi]</td>
<td><em>my grandfather’s house</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[faːθæt ɣti]</td>
<td>[faːtha tǝʃ ɣati]</td>
<td><em>my sister’s religious wedding</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[waːldi]</td>
<td>[waːld tǝʃi]</td>
<td><em>my son</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[raːli]</td>
<td>[raːzǝl tǝʃi]</td>
<td><em>my husband</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[nsaːbha]</td>
<td>[nsaːb tǝʃha]</td>
<td><em>her husband’s family</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɣʒuːzaθha]</td>
<td>[ɣʒuːza tǝʃha]</td>
<td><em>her mother-in-law</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[waːldi:n]</td>
<td>[waːldi:n tǝʃǝh]</td>
<td><em>his parents</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bǝnt ɣaːli:]</td>
<td>[bǝnt tǝʃ ɣaːli:]</td>
<td><em>my maternal cousin (fem)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɣɕeør wǝldha]</td>
<td>[ɣɕeør tǝʃ wǝldha]</td>
<td><em>her son’s wedding</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[wlaːd ɣaːli]</td>
<td>[wlaːd tǝʃ ɣaːli]</td>
<td><em>my maternal cousins</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʒǝdaːtæh]</td>
<td>[ʒǝda tǝʃǝh]</td>
<td><em>his grand-mother</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʒǝdaːti]</td>
<td>[ʒǝda tǝʃi]</td>
<td><em>my grandmother</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[wlaːd ɣǝm]</td>
<td>[wlaːd tǝʃ ɣǝm]</td>
<td><em>my paternal cousins</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɣmaːmi]</td>
<td>[ɣmaːm tǝʃi]</td>
<td><em>my paternal uncles</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɣwaːli]</td>
<td>[ɣwaːl tǝʃi]</td>
<td><em>my maternal uncles</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[mma]</td>
<td>[mu tǝʃi]</td>
<td><em>my mother</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bujǝ]</td>
<td>[bu tǝʃi]</td>
<td><em>my father</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[malι:h]</td>
<td>[malι:n tǝʃǝh]</td>
<td><em>his family</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Informal Synthetic Construction and Kinship

**b. Body Parts**

There is also a frequent occurrence of bedouin constructed structures including suffixed body part naming terms,
Table 4.6: Informal Synthetic Construction and Bodypart Names

We did not find out in our data any formal synthetic constructions except a very few instances which were rather employed metaphorically, such as [rəs-əl-ʕajn] the head of the tap; which is the name of a street (location) in Oran and [rəs-əl-harma] the head of the band denoting the leader of a group of thieves (leadership implies formality).

c. House

The bedouin synthetic genitive also occurs in combination with the lexical item /daːr/ house which is one of the most (if not the most) informal and intimate human setting(s). The item could compose the first part of the structure as in the following instances,

[daːr-(ə)-ʕris] the bridegroom’s house
[daːr-əʃ-ʃraʃ] the court building

Or, it may constitute the second part within the same construction,

[ʃəb-əd-daːr] (instead of [ʃəb tæʃ daːr]) the house owners

---

216 We also notice that the first part of the two examples involves a bodypart name ([fəs]) which may be another cause of using the synthetic construction in these contexts.
[wəld-ød-daːr] (instead of [wəld tæs daːr])  
a member of the house

[mul-ød-daːr] (instead of [mul tæs daːr])  
the house owner

Last but not least, it may obtain in one of the following constructions: /daːr/ + second item + suffix or /daːr/ + suffix, as in

[daːr ʒǝdi]  
my grand-father’s house

[daːr raːʒǝlha]  
her husband’s house

[daːr ʕʒuːzǝtθa]  
her mother-in-law’s house

[daːrθa]  
her house

[daːrhum]  
their house

[daːrgeh]  
his house

[daːrhum]  
their houses

d. The Day

The bedouin-type synthetic structure is, on the other hand, noticed to informally link the word /nhaar/ day to the exact name of that day,

[nhaːr-la-ɣmiːs]  
the day of Thursday (on Thursday)

[nhaːr-at-tlaːta]  
the day of Tuesday (on Tuesday)

[nhaːr-la-rǝb⁵a]  
The day of Wednesday (on Wednesday)

or informally associated with some events, even those related to the wedding, as in

[nhaːr-ǝl-ɣʊnba]  
the day of engagement;

[nhaːr-ǝl-faːtha]  
the day of religious wedding;

[nhaːr-ǝl-ʕærs]  
the day of the wedding;

[nhaːr-ǝl-hænna]  
the day for henna;

Still with those related to the feast

[nhaːr-ǝl-ʕiːd]  
the day of the religious feast
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We also encountered the example, [ɣudwa-əz-ʒǝmʕa] tomorrow Friday in which /ɣudwa/ refers to the day that comes after that day. Another example is [li:la-t-əs-səbʕa w ʕæfrin] the night of the twenty seventh (of Ramadan) which concerns one part of that day (the night).

e. Denominations

The Oranees are accustomed to employing some appellations in their very informal everyday conversations. These are combinations of fixed lexical forms which refer to a specific object, place, or others. The bedouin direct annexation is used to fulfill this kind of situation.

[kɑʕɑʈ-əz-zja:da] birth certificate
[ɣatam-əl-kałma] the ring of one’s word
[daːr-əʃ-fraʕ] the court building
[raːs-əl-ʕæjn] the head of the tap (location)

f. Metaphor: Friendship

Metaphors usually mark a sizeable presence in ordinary interactions. They serve the user to transmit his oral messages in a more interesting way. Crystal (1999) refers to the notion of metaphor as a figurative structure whereby one idea is specified in terms generally related to another idea. Our data include examples; the informants in question used metaphorical expressions in which, for example, they linked their ideas to the notion of friendship via comparison. Indeed, friendship (or /ʃaab/ friends) is another concept which, just like house, family and neighbourhood, implies informality. Our participants selected metaphorical structures constructed synthetically. One idea expressed by the interviewees has to do with work. People who work in the market sell their goods in the area and are frequently seen there. They look loyal to the market just like friends are faithful to one another,

[ʃaːb-əʃ-soːɡ] The market friends (the market workers)
Still the idea of work, market sellers or any other workers elsewhere earn a living in recompense, for instance, for their effort or product. If the amount of money they get is more than considerable, they turn wealthy and do not feel the financial shortage,

\[\text{Money friends} \quad \text{(wealthy people)}\]

Regional origin is another idea carried by bedouin direct annexations in which the term /shaab/ friends is still used in the first position. Individuals (or inhabitants) can be as close to their (native) regions as friends are close to one another,

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Sha:b- ad-dza:jar} & \quad \text{Algiers friends} \quad \text{(people from Algiers)} \\
\text{Sha:b- ab-b3a:ja} & \quad \text{Bejaia friends} \quad \text{(people from Bejaia)} \\
\text{Sha:b- as-si:da} & \quad \text{Saida friends} \quad \text{(people from Saida)} \\
\text{Shaeb waehran} & \quad \text{Oran friends} \quad \text{(people from Oran)} \\
\text{Sha:b- al-marso} & \quad \text{Port friends} \quad \text{(the port inhabitants)}
\end{align*}\]

Other ideas in which closeness is expressed similarly with the one among friends may exist between the house and its owners,

\[\text{Sha:b- ad-da:r} \quad \text{The house friends} \quad \text{(the house owners)}\]

It could be also encountered between the wedding and its organisers,

\[\text{Sha:b- al- vaers} \quad \text{Wedding friends} \quad \text{(wedding members)}\]

### 4.2.3.2. The Indefinite Article

Genealogical indefinite articles are co-present in the original dialectal mixture. This is particularly noticed in event-reporting which goes through steps. The people or objects involved are usually unknown for the first time. The reporter starts by introducing them. Introductions imply a social distance which requires formality. Formal styles are fulfilled by using the pre-Hilalian indefinite article /wahad/ as in,

\[\text{wae}(\ae)d-\aj-\jiba:ni] \quad \text{an old man}\]
Once the hearer gets familiar with the individuals or objects in the event, this social distance gets increasingly reduced. The reporter uses a more informal style dispensing with the indefinite article /waḥad/. He is content with the Hilalian indefinite Ø article in retelling or describing the subsequent steps of the event. Here are some illustrative examples,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples with the Hilalian Article</th>
<th>instead of the Pre-Hilalian Article within the Examples</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[χarrəzəlhum si:f]</td>
<td>[χarrəzəlhum waḥd si:f]</td>
<td>he showed them a sword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ṣahbəti ga:ti]</td>
<td>[waḥda ṣahbəti ga:ti]</td>
<td>a friend of mine told me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jəzbad ɣudmi]</td>
<td>[jəzbad waḥd ɣudmi]</td>
<td>he shows a knife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[nəfru kəpʃ]</td>
<td>[nəfru waḥd-(ək)-kəpʃ]</td>
<td>we buy some sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[da:ʃra ʂalsla]</td>
<td>[da:ʃra waḥd-(əs)-salsla]</td>
<td>she has a necklace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[_flutter ɬənguʃ]</td>
<td>[_flutter waḥd-(əl)-ɬənguʃ]</td>
<td>you have one earring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[jaːhtaːʒ ɦæːza]</td>
<td>[jaːhtaːʒ waḥd-(əl)-ɦæːza]</td>
<td>he needs something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃoːhaːq ɗraːhæm]</td>
<td>[ʃoːhaːq waḥd-(əd)-ɗraːhæm]</td>
<td>he needs money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃæm truːh w ʃæm maː-truːhʃ]</td>
<td>[waḥd-(əl)-ʃæm truːh w waḥd-(əl)-ʃæm maː-truːhʃ]</td>
<td>one year she goes and one year she does not go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ˈtadi ʒodɾa]</td>
<td>[ˈtadi waḥd-(əl)-ʒodɾa]</td>
<td>she takes some vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃiːr truːh jɔːtɔb fiːɾa]</td>
<td>[waḥed ʃiːr truːh jɔːtɔb waḥda ʃiːɾa]</td>
<td>we club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[lqəti ʃiːɾa]</td>
<td>[lqəti waḥda ʃiːɾa]</td>
<td>a man gets engaged with a woman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: The Hilalian Indefinite Article and Informality
During our data examination, we have also come across other examples including the Hilalian indefinite article, but they are different since they denote future plans. Here, the hearer is supposed to know already the subject under discussion and does not need formal introductions. The speaker reveals informally his plans,

\[\text{nju:fu da:r kbi:ra}\]  \[\text{nju:fu waehd-(\text{o}d)-da:r we look for a big house kbi:ra}\]
\[\text{ndi:ru dra:hem bina:tna}\]  \[\text{ndi:ru waehd-\text{o}d-dra:hem we share money among us bina:tna}\]

4.2.3.3. Negation

Our recordings cover one widespread genealogical form expressing negation and which will be exploited in 4.5.6. Exceptionally, we have perceived an alternation in indicating negation between \[\text{ma:-naeraf}\] and \[\text{ma:-naeraf}\] to say I don’t know. The –enclitic /-ʃ/, which is suffixed to \[\text{naeraf}\] I know and marks negation together with the initially prefixed /maa-/, occurs in the first utterance. But, it is absent in the second one. This can be again explained in terms of socio-stylistic reallocation. The two negative expressions above are reallocated socio-stylistically in the sense that the formal function is reassigned to the first construction while the second one fulfills the informal function. Formally, the speaker is more attentive to respect completely and give the original grammatical structures, such as \[\text{ma:-naeraf}\]. Conversely, one is more spontaneous in informal situations and feels more flexible to utter grammatical forms in their partial structures, which is the case of \[\text{ma:-naeraf}\]. Heath (2002) considers the first negative expression including the –enclitic /-ʃ/ as more sedentary and the second as more bedouin.

4.3. Levelling

Unlike pronunciation (see 3.4) and lexis (see 5.3), our recordings bear only a little free variation among its grammatical structures. Except demonstrative pronouns, we did not at first notice any significant genealogical alternation at the level of grammar. We, as said above (see 4.1.4), relied on our administered questionnaire to extract some specific features, such as nominal duals and adjectival diminutives which were absent in the recorded interviews. Our
purpose was to reveal which genealogical grammatical variants were levelled out and which of them remained.

### 4.3.1. Duals: Nouns

We were content to incorporate questions in our second research method to extract two nominal duals with reference to bodyparts: /jad/ hand and /wdan/ ear in the singular form. Their_duals are respectively the bedouin [jǝd:i:n] and [wǝdn:i:n] on the one hand and on the other the sedentary [jǝda:jn] and [wda:jn]. Our table below demonstrates that, unlike the present sedentary feature [jǝda:jn] which was entirely levelled out, our seventy nine informants produced the bedouin dual [jǝd:i:n]. Not far from these results, the second bedouin dual [wǝdn:i:n] two ears reached 78 out of the total number against only one sedentary utterance. Evidence comes from the fact that [wda:jn] was articulated by a female participant originally from Tlemcen. She claimed that she was born in Oran but her family maintained the sedentary TSN at home. Needless to say that the bedouin nominal duals [jǝd:i:n] two hands and [wǝdn:i:n] two ears have presently gained a complete focusing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bedouin dual</th>
<th>sedentary dual</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[jǝd:i:n]</td>
<td>[jǝda:jn]</td>
<td>hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 (100%)</td>
<td>00 (00%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[wǝdn:i:n]</td>
<td>[wda:jn]</td>
<td>ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78(99%)</td>
<td>01(01%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Levelling and Nominal Duals

The same bedouin phenomenon is witnessed by Pareira (2007) in Tripoli Arabic. With regard to bodypart names, his examples are several and illustrative: [wudnēn] two ears; [īdēn] two hands; [drāčēn] two arms; [kurvēn] two legs; [nzłēn] two feet; [kētēn] two shoulders. Due to time restrictions, we could not elicit more nominal body duals. A further research in this field may give a clearer picture of genealogical (non)-levelled duals.
4.3.2. The Adjectival Diminutive

Cantineau (1939) believes that diminutives are more frequently used in the pre-Hilalian dialects. Trilateral colour adjectives follow the pattern $C_1C_2i:C_2aC_3$ to form their sedentary diminutives. If they meet the pattern $C_1C_2jj\text{a}C_3$, they form their bedouin counterparts. Our results break with both rules: the vast majority of respondents did not provide any diminutive structure of the colour adjective /ʂər/ yellow. They refuted the existence of such grammatical patterns when asked if they heard about [ʂfɪ:jjər] or [ʂfɪ:fər] little yellow. They simply said the two items were not said (NS) in ORD. These respondents’ number exceeded 85% which is, in other words, representative of the interval of focusing ([75%, 100%]). Only seven (09%) of them supplied the bedouin feature [ʂfɪ:jjər] and three (04%) opted for [ʂfɪ:fər]. Both diminutive structures were levelled out among the informants.

This case may refer to the emergence of an interdialectal situation in which neither the bedouin nor the sedentary forms prevail in the dialect. The informants appeared genealogically neutral given that they did not reveal any dialectal tendency towards colour adjectival diminutives. The table below provides the results and is followed by its corresponding bare-figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[jədi:n]</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[j̪də:jin]</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[wədni:n]</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[wda:jin]</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3. Demonstrative Pronouns

We noticed in our recordings both inter-individual and intra-individual variation with regard to the production of the demonstrative pronoun this in terms of gender (/hada/ masc and /hadi/ fem) and number (/hadu/ plur). What occurred within given phrases was that /hada/-realisation alternated [hæda] and [hæd]; /hadi/-articulation alternated [hædi] and [hæd], and finally /hadu/ was realised as [hædu] or [hæd]. We used the phrases below, including our demonstrative pronouns, in the administered questionnaire. We tended to examine this free variation and how levelling took place,
Our findings show that more than 80% of the informants tended to reduce the singular masculine demonstrative pronoun [ḥæda] to [ḥæd] this, in cases where it combines with a definite noun, such as [ḥæd-ǝr-rǝʒa:l] this man. The same result was recorded with respect to the realisation of the construction [ḥæd-lǝ-mra] this woman where the singular feminine demonstrative pronoun [ḥædi] gains neutralisation (81%). We notice in both cases that the present percentages belong to the focusing interval ([75%, 100%]). The other productions are the levelled utterance [ḥæda] this (masc) (14%), the very reduced [da] this (masc) (01%) and the utterance [ḥædi] this (fem) (19%).

The other results concern the plural demonstrative pronoun [ḥædu] these. Likewise, the major percentage (68%) is held by the the neutralised pronoun [ḥæd] in combination with the plural of the above masculine noun: [ḥæd-ǝr-rǝʒal] these men. However, this percentage is comparatively inferior to those obtained with respect to the neutralised singular masculine and feminine cases. While the former is part of the interval [20, 59] which denotes mixing or reallocation, gender neutralisation is obviously focused because its results are within the interval [59, 79]. Since [ḥæd] scores higher than [ḥædu] these, number is, we say, like but more slowly than gender, in its way of neutralisation. We did not elicit any utterance from one informant due perhaps to the fact that he was rushing or tired. Or, he might have also in that case generalised the demonstrative pronominal neutralisation [ḥæd] and avoided repetition for the third time (in the third phrase). All in all, we can say that the demonstrative pronoun this is undergoing simplification process, which is sedentary, in gender and number.
In Maghrebi Arabic according to Marçais (1977), there is, in gender and number, a very general use of an invariable form of the demonstrative pronoun,  hād (hād), designating close people or objects. So, ORD has already possessed a reduced grammatical structure of this kind, and simplification is not a new process in the dialect. Dialect contact may reinforce a long term occurrence of this process in the region. Gender, here, receives more simplification than number. This implies the idea that the demonstrative pronominal plural relatively survives a mixing situation and is in its way of slower simplification. Gender neutralisation is originally pre-Hilalian. Simplification is then here pre-Hilalian as well.

4.4. Simplification

In Section 1.4.2.2.3, simplification has been defined, saying that the process occurs specifically in grammar. As a matter of fact, the present work witnesses the importance of this koineisation process within the grammatical framework. At the level of pronunciation and lexis in ORD, simplification is not encountered. The simple grammatical forms that are observed in the corpus mainly cover the participial gender distinction, the future tense and the indefinite article.
4.4.1. Participial Gender Distinction

Two participial types, active and passive, characterise ORD. Trilateral verbs have active participles which follow the pattern /R1aaR2aR3/. Person, gender, and number are the result of suffixation of these participles (Bouhadiba, 1988). The third person plural formation obtains following this procedure (ibid),

Root < fïbs> : idea of stopping  
Stem : /fiabas/ [fiæ:bɔs] (sing masc)  
Suffix /iin/ : /fiabsiin/ [fiæ:psi:n] (3rd plu masc)  
Suffix /aat/ : /fiabsaat/ [fiæ:psa:t] (3rd plu fem)

Nevertheless, an apparent time data approach leads to new results: the active participle of the third feminine person plural is no more formed by suffixing the trilateral verb to /aat/. Indeed, the participants tended to extend the use of masculine suffixation to also include that case, a fact which induces gender neutralisation. Our conclusion is that participial simplification arises in ORD. Neutralising gender, as already mentioned, is originally performed by sedentary speakers. This phenomenon is noticeable in Algiers dialect (Boucherit, 2002): The masculine and feminine participial plurals fuse and the resultant form is eventually masculine as in džeqin “(they are) coming (plu)” and raḥin “(they are) going (plu)”. Gender distinction is rather more bedouin. The young Oranees simplify their participial plural production by omitting suffixal gender differences. Our illustrative examples can be outlined as follows,

[wæ̯hdi:n zu:ʒ fïræt…ka:nu zaʁle:n] (instead of [wæ̯hdi:n zu:ʒ fïræt…ka:nu zaʁla:] — there were two girls...they were drugged)  
[bna:t sæmti…gæ̯di:n] (instead of [bna:t sæmti…gæ̯da:t]) — my paternal cousins... are still unmarried  
[fïræt jʒu:ʁwaɾfi:n] (instead of [fïræt jʒuʁwafa:t]) — girls get easily afraid
Other additional examples cover active participial plural forms in isolation,

[nqajii:n] (instead of [nqaja:t]) \(\text{they are} \) tidy
[nqase:n] (instead of [nqasa:t]) \(\text{they are} \) reduced
[χaɾzi:n] (instead of [χaɾza:t]) \(\text{they are} \) going out
[3aɾbi:n] (instead of [3aɾba:t]) \(\text{they are} \) bringing
[qaɾji:n] (instead of [qaɾja:t]) they are intellectual
[qabli:n] (instead of [qabra:t]) \(\text{they are} \) accepting
[ga:bdɛ:n] (instead of [ga:bdɑ:t]) \(\text{they are} \) holding
[ʕaɾqli:n] (instead of [ʕaɾqla:t]) \(\text{they are} \) well-behaved
[ʕaɾɖɛn] (instead of [ʕaɾɖɑ:t]) \(\text{they are} \) inviting

We notice that the same active participial construction is used with the first plural feminine,

[(raːna) 3aɾjii:n] (instead of [(raːna) 3aɾja:t]) \(\text{we are} \) coming
[(raːna) baɾjii:n] (instead of [(raːna) baɾja:t]) we want
[qadriːn] (instead of [qadraːt]) \(\text{we are} \) able

Still regarding trilateral verbs, the passive participle has the pattern /m+ R1R2uuR3/ and follows the same path of the active participle of this root. The construction of passive participles of third person plurals requires the prefix /m/, and suffixing operations for person, gender and number as shown below (ibid),

Root <nsf> : idea of blowing
Stem : /mansuuf/ [mənsuːf] (sing masc)
Suffix /iin/ : [mənsuːfiin] (3rd plu masc)
Suffix /aat/ : [mənsuːfaat] (3rd plu fem)
The passive participle of third person plurals is also simplified at the gender level; no suffixal distinction is noticed in the recorded data between feminine and masculine forms. Sedentary gender neutralisation hence substitutes for bedouin gender differentiation as a consequence of simplification.

\[\text{my sisters are married}\]
\[\text{her sisters are married}\]

Other further passive participial instances are,

\[(\text{they are) sitting}\]
\[(\text{they are) shocked}\]
\[(\text{they are) spoilt}\]
\[(\text{they are) invited}\]

We again notice that the same passive participial construction is used with the first plural feminine,

\[(\text{we are) preparing}\]

### 4.4.2. Expressing Future

There seems no specific genealogical grammatical structure to express the future tense in Arabic varieties. The active participle of some movement verbs plays the role of future marker. In the absence of any temporal item of the type tomorrow or next year, it is the context which locates the action in the future. In the case of pre-Hilalian Algiers dialect (Boucherit, 2002), the future tense may be formed by using the active participle of the verb \[\text{rāḥ “go”}\] which is employed as an auxiliary with another verb, as in \[\text{rāḥ ḥēb “it will be cooked”}\]. \[mša\] is another verb of movement, just like \[\text{rāḥ}\] and often indicates the future tense in the pre-Hilalian Tanger dialect (Iraqui-Sinaceur, 1998). These forms then play a double role: They can be verbs that express displacement or auxiliaries that function as temporal determiners when preceding another verb. The active participial \(\text{yadi “going”}\), on the other hand, is a derivative form of the bedouin verb \(\text{yda “go”}\) which makes reference to the future tense. It prevails in other several Moroccan dialects (Heath, 2002).
This defective verb is also heard in ORD in its different conjugated forms: It is [ɣda] he went in the perfective with the third person singular (masc), [nuyda] I go (in the imperfective with the 1st pers sing) or [nuydu] we go (in the imperfective with the 1st pers plur), the active participial plural [yadj:n] going, and many others. Our data is full of instances which illustrate the future tense. The future paradigm consists of the active participle [yadi] going (sing) followed by the imperfective. Our examples cover the future tense with respect to

the 3rd pers sing (masc) as in,

[ɣadi jziːd] he will add
[ɣadi jsoːg] he will drive
[ɣadi jʊqijəm] he will estimate
[ɣadi jʊylәʃ] he will be payed

the 3rd pers sing (fem) as in,

[ɣadi dʒi] she will come

the 1st pers sing (mas/fem) as in,

[ɣadi ngulәk] I will tell you
[ɣadi nәkbәr] I will grow up
[ɣadi nәłqә] I will find

the 2nd pers sing (fem) as in,

[ɣadi tәɾi] she will buy
[ɣadi tʃәffәs] she will tread
[ɣadi tәllәsna] she will rise our status

the 1st pers plur (mas/fem) as in,

[ɣadi nguʃdu] we will remain
and the 3rd pers plur (mas/fem). In the last four examples, the second part of the compound construction is suffixed to an object person pronoun which is given in brackets.

Again, simplification has occurred: there is a tendency among the informants to enlarge the use of the pre-Hilalian gender neutralisation with reference to the future paradigm. Regardless of whether they are masculine or feminine, all the pronouns are positioned next to one single future marker [ɣad i] going. Similarly, there has been, among our participants, a general adoption of the singular masculine active participle [ɣad i] to express the (first, second and third person) plural, and simplify the use of future paradigm in this context.

Unlike ORD, a general agreement obtains between the subject and the active participial auxiliary ɣadi (the future marker) in terms of gender and number in some Moroccan dialects: ɣada (sing fem) and ɣad-át (plu fem) (Heath, 2002). In bedouin Morrocan Zʕir Arabic, however, expressing the future necessitates the active participle forms, in addition to ɣādi (sing masc), the sing fem ɣāda and plu masc/fem ɣādyīn.
4.4.3. The Indefinite Article

The indefinite article has been a recurring grammatical feature in this chapter, simply because its occurrence could be interpreted from different angles. As a matter of fact, we tackle it here in relation to simplification process. /wahad/, just like the future marker /yadi/, is often employed invariably in gender and number: we notice a very frequent absence of agreement between the indefinite article and its noun. In other words, neutralisation is noticed at the level of masculine and feminine, together with singular and plural. The following examples illustrate the production of /wahad/ with

the 3rd pers sing (masc) as in,

[wæhd-ɔf-jibæni] an old man
[wæhd-ɔr- raʒǝl fæjat] a man passing

the 3rd pers sing (fem) as in,

[wæhd-ɔχ-yatra] (instead of [wæhda-ɔχ-yatra]) once upon a time
[wæhd-ɔl-hædra] (instead of [wæhda-ɔl-hædra]) a way of speaking

and the 3rd pers plur (fem) as in,

[wæhd-ɔg-swalǝh] (instead of [wæhda:ɛt-ɔg-swalǝh]) some things

Long before our research, Marçais (1902) attested that the indefinite article wâhad (-el), in the pre-Hilalian Tlemcen dialect, was invariably used in: sing masc (e.g. wahderràjel (or wahad ėrra¿el) a man), sing fem (e.g. wahdèlmrà (or wahad ėlmrà) a woman), and masc and fem plur (e.g. wahdènnàs (or wahad ėnnàs) some people) (the author’s transcription).

In case a sing fem or plur noun is inflected by possessive suffixation in ORD, or precedes a synthetic structure of possessive relationship or a sentence, /wahad/ is no more invariable; the latter can acquire either a feminine counterpart /wahda/ or plural one /wahdiin/
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respectively. For example, [wæhda šahbati] a friend of mine (fem) is one utterance found in data. The same illustration is given by (Marçais, 1908) as for the bedouin Ulad Brahim dialect: ūhda šahbti (the author’s transcription). If we examine the following examples on the other hand,

[wæhdi:n zu:ʒiʃraːt] (instead of [wæhdaːt zu:ʒiʃraːt]) two girls
[wæhdiːn (ʃiʃraːt) jɔstæelu] (instead of [wæhdaːt (ʃiʃraːt) jɔstæelu]) some (girls) deserve it

we clearly notice that the indefinite article [wæhdiːn] is in agreement with the plural noun [ʃiʃraːt] girls. Both agree in number but gender is still neutralised. We deduce in the cases above that gender differentiation occurs in the singular form only. The plural is simplified since it prevails in one (masculine) single form for masculine and feminine.

4.5. Focusing

A significant number of grammatical features, such as verbal gender distinction; plural formation; nouns of number; duals; colour nouns (or adjectives); pronominal gender distinction; interrogative/ relative/ suffixal pronouns; particles; negation, and others (see below), have terminated focusing (see 1.4.3). Before being focused, these features have endured koineisation processes. Through the process of levelling, individual grammatical candidates have been stabilised to finally characterise the dialect under study.

4.5.1. Verbs

4.5.1.1. Verbal Gender Distinction

As a bedouin-type variety, Tripoli dialect makes a gender differentiation in the 2nd pers sing of the verb inflection for perfective (klēt (masc)/ klēti (fem) “you have eaten”) and imperfective (tžīb (masc)/ tžībi (fem) “you bring”; dīr (masc)/ dīri (fem) do) (Pareira, 2002, 2007). In the Hilalian Casablancan dialect (Aguadé, 2002), the regular trilateral verb has, yet, the following inflections for the perfective in the 2nd pers sing common (fem and masc) šrəbti “you drank”, butn still for the imperfective in the 2nd pers sing masc: təʃrəb (2nd sing masc) and tʃərbi (2nd pers sing fem). The sedentary dialect Anjra, however, does not distinguish
gender for the 2nd pers perfective and imperfective (Vicente, 1998), and so is the case for the pre-Hilalian Rabat dialect (Messaoudi, 2002). Some other bedouinised sedentary dialects, on the other hand, make this 2nd pers sing verbal gender distinction. In Algiers dialect, indeed, the feminine is distinct from the masculine in the 2nd pers sing. For example, the perfective is formed as [ktb-t-i] “you (fem) have written” while it is [ktb -t] “you (masc) have written” (Boucherit, 2002).

Evidence from our interviews implies that a focused bedouin gender distinction operates at the level of 2nd sing perfective and imperfective, and constitute our dialectal conjugation system. Like in other bedouin-type dialects, the feminine is differentiated from masculine by adding the feminine suffix {i} to the verb in ORD. We can cite examples as follows: the 2nd sing masc in the perfective, [(nta) d] you did; [ma:-ɔbti] you did not bring me anything; [lafa] you went up; [ma:-lqe:t-f] you did not find; [fakkar] you have reminded me; the second sing fem in the perfective: [qadi] you were able; [hsɔbti] you thought of me; [kamɔlti] you finished; the 2nd sing masc in the imperfective: [txdɔm] you work; [tuɔrɔ] you go out; [tɔlq] you find; [ma:-tɔlqa:-f] you don’t find; [ddi:r] you do; [tsagad swa:lhæk] you regulate your matters; [tsagam swa:lhæk] you regulate your matters; [tba:nl] it seems to you; [ma:-tqra-f] you do not study; [tgu:la] you tell him; [ɔdɔmrah] you push him; [ɔskun] you live; [to:sal] you get to; [ddi:r] you do; [thawwɔs] you look for; [truh] you go; [tba:t] you spend the night; [trɔdhumla] you give them back to him; the second sing fem in the imperfective, [tala:gi dɔb] you put gold on; [taroɔ] you dance; [tʃlq] you find; [ndarət] you were in pain; [mo:de] you wake; [tɔρɔɾɔ] you go out; [bɔhur] you escape; [bɔ ɔɔbdi] you attract; [təuβi] you start your day; [tɔkbi] you take (the bus); [tukni] you are; [tawd] you come down; [bɔhædi] you talk about; [tvi] you feel jealous; [tɔ:fr] you ask forgiveness; [toʃa] you need; [tɔlæhgi] you follow; [ə ɔɾf] you know; [ə ɔɾw] you steal; [ɔtw æh] you miss; [tawli] you say to me; [truh] you go; [tfawt] you spend; [tʃi] you live; [tɔami] you think; [tɔwɔdi] you repeat; [ma:-tfawt-f] you do not spend; [ma:-tɔml]-f you do not finish; [tɔufdi] you see; [tyajri] you choose; [takli] you eat.

Concerning the imperative, literature dictates that the Hilalian Tripoli dialect also makes a gender distinction in the 2nd pers sing (Pareira, 2007). The bedouin-type Casablanca dialect similarly shows imperatival gender differentiation in the same person šrəb “drink (masc)” and šərbi “drink (fem)”; dxül “come in! (masc)” and dúxli “come in! (fem)” (Aguadé,
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2002). The imperative in the pre-Hilalian Rabat dialect, on the contrary, shows gender neutralisation in this 2nd sing pers (Messaoudi, 2002) which is the same case for the pre-Hilalian Anjra dialect (Vicente, 1998).

Data, at hand, shows that bedouin gender differentiation has been normalised and focused as regards the 2nd pers sing imperative which is clear-cut in these examples: the 2nd pers sing fem imperative, [ʕʕɑqli] remember; [ku:li] eat (fem); [golši] take off, remove; [gədmn] come forward (you fem); [fæmrni:ha] fill (record) it; [fæhmni:ni] make me understand; and the 2nd pers sing masc imperative, [hrɔz ru:ḥæk] be careful about yourself; [ʔæhdn] speak; [ʔærwe]h] come; [təbæs(ni)] follow me; [ʔærwe]s] wait; [smaε̇h(li)] excuse me; [ddi:ɾ(ha)] do it; [ddabbar ʔla ru:ḥæk] you manage on your own; [di:ɾ] do; [zi:b] bring. There are some exceptions in which the imperative formation is common between the 2nd pers sing, both masc and fem: [ʔoʃte(ni)] give me!; [xæni nehdn] let me speak !. However, the feminine imperative is generally formed, just like the feminine perfective and imperfective, by suffixing the feminine {i} to the verb (used in the masculine).

4.5.1.2. Participle Formation

If we turn our attention to active participles, we specifically detect that in Caubet (1998), the pre-Hilalian-type active participle of the verb źa “come” is formed as māzi “coming”. This feature is constructed in the same way as the model māši “going” which characterises many pre-Hilalian dialects: Tanger dialect is an example of this (Irɑqui-Sinaceur, 1998). The bedouin ORD focuses the active participle of this verb as [ʒəj] (he is) coming. It does not adopt the pre-Hilalian form.

4.5.2. Nouns

4.5.2.1. Plural Formation

The following plurals are the usual focused patterns in ORD. The first plural type is R1wāR3vR4 or R1wāR3iR4: The singular trilateral noun with a long vowel between R1 and R3 and a long vowel between R3 and R4 is of the type R1uR3oR4. In Maghrebi Arabic (Marçais, 1977), its plural varies between the bedouin-type R1wāR3iR4 and sedentary-type R1wāR3vR4, depending on the genealogical affiliation of the variety in question. In the following
Marçais’s examples, the first singular item is followed by its sedentary then bedouin plurals: ḥānūt “shop”, ḥwānät, ḥwānīt; ṭājīn “heavy saupan”, ṭwājōn, ṭwājīn; mīzān “scales”, mwāzōn, mwāzīn. The data at hand shows that the trilateral nominal plural has a bedouin-type plural,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[mæ:ʕu:n]</td>
<td>[mwæ:ʕi:n]</td>
<td>utensil(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[hæ:nu:t]</td>
<td>[hwæ:ni:t]</td>
<td>shop(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tæ:ze:n]</td>
<td>[twæ:ze:n]</td>
<td>dish(es)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ge:to:n]</td>
<td>[gwa:te:n]</td>
<td>tent(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.11:** Focusing in Bedouin Nominal Plural

The second plural type is $R^1R^2\ddag R^3vR^4$ or $R^1R^2\ddag R^3\ddagger R^4$: The singular quadrilateral noun with a long vowel between $R^3$ and $R^4$ is of the type $R^1vR^2R^3\ddagger R^4$. Still in Maghrebi Arabic (Marçais, 1977), the plural formation of this noun is similar to the previous type: $R^1R^2\ddag R^3vR^4$ in sedentary type varieties, such as Algiers variety: [srādǝk] “cockere ls” (Boucherit, 2002). In the bedouin varieties however, the vowel - $\ddagger$ – takes place instead between $R^3$ and $R^4$, $R^1R^2\ddag R^3\ddagger R^4$. Therefore, the singulars ḥläḥāl “foot ring”, ḥrōnōs “burnous”, bärmiš “barrel” have respectively the sedentary-type plurals ḥlàḥhāl, brāms, brāmōl and the bedouin-type plurals ḥlàḥhīl, brānīs, brāmīl. Our informants actually provided the bedouin plural of the type [mla:ji:n] *millions* for the singular [mļu:ŋ] *million*. Other nouns are originally trilateral but actually meet the quadrilateral scheme, by redoubling the medial redical. This is the case of the singular [galle:t] *outsider* which has the bedouin plural [gla:le:t] *outsiders* and found in our data.

Other quadrilateral examples with the bedouin plural pattern are adopted in Tripoli Arabic (Pareira, 2007); the singular is followed by its plural counterpart: mfātī “key”, mfāṭī “keys”; muṣmā “nail”, muṣmīr “nails”; šbābīk “window grids”. As for ORD, bedouin quadrilateral plural adoption also predominates in the available data. Singulars such as [sba:be:t] *shoe* and [dwa:wi:r] *small village* adopt respectively the plurals [sba:beː:t] and [dwa:wiː:r].
Another fact is that Marçais (1977) raises the case of compound plurals or the plural of plurals. It is constructed by means of suffix addition –āt to the plural of singulars. For instance, the singular dāmea “tear” has the plural dāme “tears” and the plural of plurals dāmeāt “floods of tears”; the singular yūm has the plural ēyyām and the plural of plurals ēyyāmāt or yāmāt “sequence of days, period of time”; the singular qūs “arch” has the plural qwās and the plural of plurals qwāsāt “succession of arcades”. These compound plurals are encountered in Morocco and Algeria, particularly in sedentary varieties as in Tlemcen dialect; Marçais (1902) sustains this fact by giving further examples from the latter dialect: ḥūmāt “amount of meat”; šūrāt “long months”; qbūrāt “tomb”. Their formation, on the other hand, can take place by –āt suffixation, in the form of –wāt or yāt as in, the singular ḥūfā “hole” which has the plural of plurals ḥūfāwāt “holes”; the singular ḥūf “legal adviser” which has the plural of plurals ḥūfwāt. These plurals are frequently witnessed in bedouin varieties of Algerian Saharian regions (Marçais, 1977). With regard to our findings, the following examples are extracted. In this case, they follow the sedentary formation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Plural of Plurals</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ʕærs]</td>
<td>[ʕrə:s]</td>
<td>[ʕrə:saːt] or [ʕrə:saːt]</td>
<td><em>wedding</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bḥær]</td>
<td>[bhuːrɑ]</td>
<td>[bhuːrɑːt]</td>
<td><em>see</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[juːm]</td>
<td>[lijaːm]</td>
<td>[lijaːmaːt]</td>
<td><em>day</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12: Focusing in Sedentary Nominal Plural of Plurals

The suffix–āt could be added to those nouns which do not have a plural as is the case of the singular qmḥ “wheat” which has only its compound plural qmḥāt “a lot of wheat” (Marçais, 1977). Our data covers the singular noun [dḥæb] “gold” and its compound plural [dḥubːaːt]. [dhub] is, by contrast, non-existent.

4.5.2.2. Nouns of Number

The numbers from *eleven to nineteen* are contracted structures, and composed of numeral nouns which are followed by the item /ʕaʃar/ *ten*. The decline of the classical final /r/ of this latter item is widespread in Maghreb dialects (Marçais, 1902; Marçais, 1908). The
utterance is more reduced to [əʃ] in pre-Hilalian dialects, which is the case of Rabat dialect (Messaoudi, 1998). This author mentions the fall of ç in Tnaš (her transcription). In Temecen dialect, it seems that /ʕ/ decline has affected the subsequent vowel which has become long and lower than /a/. This vocalic type, in its turn, influences its preceding dental d or t and emphasises it respectively to ḍ or ṭ (e.g. ḥōḍåś “eleven”, sba’ṭåś “seventeen”) (Marçais, 1902). Finally these secondary emphatics could further influence their neighbouring sound(s): şoṭtåś “sixteen”.

In bedouin Maghrebi dialects, on the other hand, the element /ʕaʃar/ عششر often conserves its /ʕ/ within the ending [–aʃ]. In Ulad Brahím dialect, Saida, for example, it is remarkably present, preceded by a long vowel (Marçais, 1908). Whether sedentary or bedouin, the numerals fifteen (ḥomståś, ḥomståš, ḥomståæaš), seventeen (sæbetåś (sbætåś), sabetææaś), eighteen (tæntåś, tæntåš, tæntææaš), nineteen (tsætåś (tsætåš), tætæææaš) have, obviously, a similar radical structure (Marçais, 1977). The syllabic group, however, varies according to the variety (even internally within the same variety): It is either R1vR2R3 – or R1R2v R3 (ibid). A close observation to our data reveals the focused bedouin preservation of /ʕ/ in the following numerals and its effect on the neighbouring sounds,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>num</th>
<th>word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[tnaːsaʃ]</td>
<td>eleven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[rbæʃtaːʃar]</td>
<td>fourteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[zmasṭaːʃar]</td>
<td>fifteen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5.2.3. Duals

Broadly speaking, language dual implies the concept pair (Grand’Henry, 1972). There is no one single final dual-type in Arabic varieties (in spite of deriving all from the classical -aini): it structurally manifests according to the genealogical affiliation of a given Arabic variety (ibid). The bedouin type dual is usually composed by linking the suffix {–i:n} to the vast majority of nouns. Pereira’s (2002, 2007) observation falls on the fact that any noun can involve a bedouin dual agreement in the Tripoli dialect: šrubt gḥwtēn “I drank two coffees”, šbaḥt sjiːrtēn “I saw two cars”, ftaḥ bābhēn “he opened two doors”, grot ktābēn “she read two books”. On the other hand, -aʔen is the morpheme suffixed to pre-Hilalian nouns to make the dual (Marçais, 1958) and here this formation concerns only certain restricted nominal classes:

---

218 See also Marçais (1958)
names of time, measure, mother-father pair and those indicating double body parts (Grand’Henry, 1972; Marçais, 1977). For example, sedentary Cherchell variety possesses the final –ain for certain names of number: ān ṭṭāin “twice” and time: yōmāin “two days” (Grand’Henry, 1972). Our corpus presently comprises the first dual type.

We have gone through names of units of time, units of measure, the name of mother-father pair in Method One, and names of body parts in Method Two (see 4.4.1). Let us confine ourselves to the first method. Comparatively, Pareira (2007: 87-8) explores the names of units of time in Tripoli Arabic and cites examples in which the noun is suffixed to the bedouin -ēn: dgīgtēn “two minutes”; yōmēn “two days”; šahrēn “two months”; sāʕtēn “two hours”; ĵāmēn “two years”; lēltēn “two nights”. In our case, we have come across a general similar remark, in the sense that the dual is formed by relating this type of noun to the bedouin morpheme {i:n}.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[jumî:n]} & \quad \text{two days} \\
\text{[ʕæ:mii:n]} & \quad \text{two years} \\
\text{[sa:mil:n]} & \quad \text{two hours} \\
\text{[ʃæ:ri:n]} & \quad \text{two months} \\
\text{[simænti:n]} & \quad \text{two weeks}
\end{align*}
\]

The name of mother-father pair parents is mentioned above since it is frequently tackled in the literature: Its bedouin-type predominates in all the Maghreb (Marçais, 1977; Pareira, 2002, 2007). Indeed, the presence of the item [waldi:n] is confirmed in our results. Also, Pareira (2007) investigates the names of units of measure in Tripoli Arabic. He illustrates his findings by draʃēn “two cubits”; mītēn “two hundred”; ālfēn “two thousand”. The current recorded interviews include the bedouin [miti:n] two hundred. The dialectologist Pareira (2002, 2007) adds that, in Tripoli dialect, a plural noun preceded by the numeral zōz “two” can replace the dual. For instance, [zōz ḥūtāt] “two fish”; [zōz bībān] “two doors”, [zōz knāsə] “two brooms”. We have encountered such cases in our data. The numeral /zuuzz/ added to a plural noun substitutes for the dual: [waḥdi:n zu;z firar:t] two girls and [zu;ʒ fæs] two candles. Genealogically, this form is neutral.
4.5.3. Colour Nouns (or Adjectives)

The plural for colour nouns or adjectives (depending on the position and function of the item in a given context) is genealogical. The classical form /fuʕal/ وعأل is pre-Hilalian whereas /fuʕliin/ وعاليين derives from the Hilalian origin. In the pre-Hilalian Rabat Arabic, Messaoudi (2002) finds that the plural of the adjectival colour zreq “blue” is zureq. “In all the cities, the plural of nouns of colour admits of a prolongation of the vowel u, … e.g. hūmor “red” …” says Marçais (1958: 377) about the Algerian pre-Hilalian dialects. In the Hilalian Casablanca dialect conversely, the colour adjectival or nominal items follow the pattern {12ǝ3} and their plural with -īn. As an illustration, the singular adjectives: kḥāl “black”, byād “white”, zrāq “blue”, xḍār “green”, ṣfর “yellow” have respectively the following plurals: kāḥlīn, bīḍīn, zārqīn, xāḍīn, ṣfrīn (Aguadé, 2002). Our data demonstrates that colour nouns (or adjectives) form their plurals exclusively in the bedouin-type,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[zdur]</td>
<td>[zdure:n]</td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ḥmar]</td>
<td>[ḥumri:n]</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[kḥel]</td>
<td>[kuhlı:n]</td>
<td>black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13: Focusing in Bedouin Colour Nouns/ Adjectives

4.5.4. Pronouns

4.5.4.1. Pronominal Gender Distinction

The 2nd sing pers pronoun in ORD admits gender distinction: you is [nta] for the masculine and [nti] for the feminine. In sedentary dialects, gender is usually neutralised in these pronominals (Heath, 2002). Such gender neutralisation exists in Rabat dialect (the masculine nta “you” is employed for both 2nd sing persons) (Messaoudi, 2002). Sedentary Tanger dialect (Iraqui-Sinaceur, 1998) opts for the common 2nd person singular pronoun [nṭīna]. The same pronoun manifests in the pre-Hilalian Maltese dialect (Vanhove, 1998). In bedouin dialects however, the 2nd sing independent pronominal distinction in gender is the norm (Caubet, 2001). There is the bedouin-type gender differentiation in Tripoli Arabic in
these independent pronouns (Pareira, 2002, 2007). This is the case of the bedouinised sedentary Algiers dialect. The feminine is distinct from the masculine in this second person singular of personal pronouns: [ǝnti] “you (fem)”; [ǝnta] “you (masc)” (Boucherit, 2002). We deduce that ORD has reached bedouin focusing at this pronominal level.

4.5.4.2. Interrogative Pronouns

A number of interrogative pronouns are also genealogically classified as Hilalian or pre-Hilalian. Some of them have been focused and taken place in our data. As an example, [winta] when could be considered as Hilalian since it characterises some of the main western Algerian bedouin dialects: MKR, BYD, TMT, SBA, TRT (Bouamrane, 1991). Sedentary TSN however covers, instead, the variant [fawa?] and the same term is found in sedentary NDM, except that the final glottal stop sound is rather articulated as [q] in the latter variety: [fawaq] (ibid). According to the author, [winta] features Oran dialect too. Indeed, our informants’ speech contained this bedouin pronominal form. [win] where is another interrogative pronoun possibly regarded as bedouin because it is also employed by the major Hilalian dialectal group above. [fajen] and [fejn], on the other hand, are sedentary Tlemcenian or Nedromian features respectively (ibid). Our findings reveal the presence of the bedouin [wi:n] in ORD.

mǝn “who” is a further interrogative pronoun, used to ask for someone, in the Maghrebi bedouin varieties (Marçais, 1977). It is often followed by personal pronouns such as, hũwwa (hu) he, hiyya (hi) she, hum (hûma) they for more specification. Sometimes, it prevails as the bedouin [ām] in the western Algeria. Other variants such as, mnu, mni, mǝnhum are encountered in Libya (ibid). Maghrebi (a)škun (in SA /ajju /aj? jakuun/) is a sedentary alternative which consists of aš “what?” and y-kun “it is” (Heath, 2002). It is sometimes reinforced by the singular masculine hũwwa (hu, u), the singular feminine hĩjja (hi, i), or the plural hum (hûma) to form a combination with the meaning who is it? (Marçais, 1977). It can be preceded by prepositions, as in b -škûn, mēškûn, b - škûn (ibid), which mean respectively with whom (1st structure), for whom (2nd and 3rd structures). In Oran dialect, Bouamrane (1991) affirmed the existence of the sedentary interrogative pronoun, a fact which is corroborated by the current recordings.
4.5.4.3. Relative Pronouns

Due to assimilatory processes, the basic form of the relative pronoun /allaḍi/ who/whom/what has been subjected to several transformations. Vicente (1998) explains this change by the influence of Berber substratum (In Rifain, the pronoun isānni/ or /ān/). Other dialectologists provide other interpretations. Sedentary derivatives, such as, /a/iddi/ or /a/iḍdi, for example, seem part of Andalusi Arabic (Ferrando, 1998). Grand’Henry points out their existence in sedentary Djidjelli, Tlemcen, Taza, Fes and Jbala. In the pre-Hilalian Anjra dialect, the relative pronoun is /d/ (sometimes /d/ by assimilation). When it is used with the personal pronoun of the third person, it becomes /dān/ as in, /dān hūwa/ or /dān hu/ the one who (Vicente, 1998).

Most Hilalian dialects opt for the derivative form lli “who” (Aguadé, 2002). The bedouin-type Casablancan dialect (ibid) possesses this relative pronoun as in, l-bant lli šaft “the girl that I saw”; n-nās lli żāw “the people who came”; ḥād š- ši lli kā-ygālu “that is what they say”; l-mādrāṣa lli kont kā-nāqra fiha “the school in which I studied”. The same is said about the bedouin ZSīr variety (Aguadé, 1998), as in lli ġaddu ši ġār “anyone who has a hole”; yži wāḥd mān dūk lli xǝržu “one of those that have gone out”; llišābha “the one who found it”. Likewise, the present results involve numerous and illustrative bedouin-type examples of which some are given below,

[kajn la-rafrọsa (ə)lli ddi:r əl (ṣaers)] some brides who celebrate the wedding

[kajn lli tābyi karā:ku] there is the one who likes karaku (a kind of traditional clothing)

[yi 33amṣa lli nrājeh fi:ha] I relax only on Friday

[(ə)lli ra:hum j3u] those who come

[(ə)lli ta:nlāk di:ha] do what seems suitable to you

[hædú:k (ə)lli jdi:ru] those who do

[gæf (ə)lli jgu:lk] all those who tell you

[wha:rna huma (ə)lli māfī mlæh] the Oranees are the ones who are not good

[hædú:k (ə)n-na:s (ə)lli ṭa:fi mənhum] those are people of whom you get afraid

[kajn…(ə)lli la:qe ḍadma] there is the one who finds a job

[ana (ə)lli tugtəni…] what kills me is...
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[((ǝ)lli ʕændhum hna]  
what they have here

[ʃku:n hædi (ǝ)lli tæhdaɾ]  
who(fem) is talking?

[hna (ǝ)lli qri:na]  
we who have studied

[ka:jn (ǝ)lli jdi:ru ʕœrs wæhød]  
there are those who celebrate the wedding together

[ma:ka:n hætta wæhød ǝlli naʃʃarʃæh]  
there is nobody whom I know

Preceded by prepositions, [ǝlli] forms complex elements, [b-ǝlli]; [f-ǝlli]; [mn-ǝlli], in ORD as in other bedouin dialects. Examples from our data are:

[ʕla ba:li balli lɔ-blæd wɔlæt …]  
I know that the country has become...

[næʃʃaf… bælli ma:kan hætta wæhød]  
I know ...that there is nobody

[ga:lku bælli gæf (ǝ)-nna:s ŋahi tʃki]  
one says that all people are complaining

[mælli bda]  
since he has started

[…mælli nʃalqat…w hijja kajn]  
it has existed since its creation

A possible genealogical combination can be made. Marçais (1977) indicates that /āškun, ʃkun/ can change their function from the interrogative to the relative form: mā-naʃʃaf- ʃ āškun ja “I don’t know who has come”, with especial reinforcement ofǝlli (ǝddi) can be afforded: āškun ǝlli (ǝddi). A sedentarised bedouin example from data is:

[jku:n (ǝ)-li ra:h ʃqaːse....yi [ʃʃæb]  
the only ones who are suffering.... are people

4.5.4.4. Suffixal Pronouns

Pre-Hilalian dialects usually attest the pronunciation of the 3rd person sing masc suffixal pronoun as [u] after a consonant. The same suffixal pronoun is rather formed as /ah/ in bedouin dialects (Vanhove, 1998). This bedouin-type feature appears in Tripoli dialect. One nominal example from the dialect is the utterance within, ǝl-xāl fi xër lēn yukbur l-a-wuld-uxt-ǝh “the uncle is fine until his nephew has grown up” (Pareira, 2007). Marçais (1958) claims that this suffix is also one feature of Oran dialect. In our data, it is indeed added to nouns,

[ʃala:tæh]  
his aunts
[χwata:taeh]  
his sisters

[Sædtaeh]  
his tradition

[hæntæh]  
his henna

[wla:daeæh]  
his children

[ru:hææh]  
his spirit

[ʕæqæh]  
his mind

[tæqtæh]  
his energy

[Værgææh]  
his sweet

[haqah]  
his right

[ʒibæh]  
his pocket

[jæddææh]  
his hand

It could be also suffixed to adjectives as in,

[wæhdaæh]  
alone

Regarding verbs in the perfective, the indirect object personal pronoun in the 3rd sing masc in the sedentary-type Algiers dialect is -lu (Boucherit, 2002). Perfective verbs in ORD are, still however, suffixed to /ah/,

[dærbu:lææh]  
they stole from him

[hærnæææh]  
we attended for him

[gæʃu:lææh]  
they removed from him

[ʒa:wæh]  
they came to see him

Pareira (2007) adds that /ah/ is rather articulated as a lengthened [ā] in the Hilalian Tripoli dialect when another suffix is added. As an example, māgāl l-ā-š “he did not tell him”, a fact which does not correspond to our data. /ah/ could be added to verbs in the imperfective too,

[jægæʃu:lææh]  
they remove from him

[jæʃærfu:lææh]  
they know how to talk to him
[tæʕælmæh]  
*[she informs him]*

[jdiːræh]  
*[he does it]*

[ndiːruːlæh]  
*[we do for him]*

[tɔlæhɡæh]  
*[she follows him]*

[tæʕæʒbaeh]  
*[she pleases him]*

[jaːsqah]  
*[He endows him]*

/ah/ suffixation is also undertaken as follows,

Active participles + /ah/ as in,

[jaːjfaːtæh]  
*I know him by sight*

[zaːbdiiːnaeh]  
*[he is attracted]*

[qadræh]  
*[he is respected by him]*

Passive participles + /ah/ as in,

[maqduːræh]  
*his capacity*

Particles + /ah/ as in,

[tæʕæh]  
*his*

4.5.5. Particles: of

It has been shown in 4.1.2 that the preposition /taʕ/ of is employed in the pre-Hilalian analytical structure to express the possessive relationship. Despite this fact, the preposition in isolation is originally Hilalian and used as a counterpart of the pre-Hilalian prepositions, [di; eddi; djal], found in sedentary Arabic such as Rabat dialect (djal) (Messaoudi, 2002). The bedouin /taʕ/ is the focused preposition in ORD²¹⁹. Unlike in the bedouin-type Tripoli dialect about which Pereira (2007) , on the other hand, reports that in this variety the particle mtāʕ is

²¹⁹ Examples are already given in Sections 4.1.2 and 4.2.3.1
followed by the first person plural independent pronoun *ḥne*, the particle [tæʕ], in ORD, is followed by the first person plural suffixal pronoun [–na]: [tæʕna].

4.5.6. Negation

Negation is according to Bond (2007: 39): “... a superordinate category present in every language. A negative construction is minimally defined by the presence of a negative morpheme or morphemes, but is commonly indicated by a combination of morphemes”. The author continues and explains that despite linguists’ identification of negative structures in association with affirmative constructions, affirmation is nevertheless considered as overtly marked in opposition to negation. In other words, structural markedness is tightly related to negation, which is not the case of other grammatical categories (such as affirmation). Following Heath (2002), as mentioned earlier, the construction of negation in verbal sentences is pre-Hilalian and formed by the binary combination of the negative particle *ma*...*š*: /ma/ “no(t)” is prefixed to the verb which is also suffixed to the second part of the particle /ʃ/ (a reduced form of the item ‘jay?’ (thing) (Lakhdar-Barka, 1993)).

In ORD, Bouhadiba (1988) comments that verbal negation is inflected by /maa/-prefixation to the beginning of a stem and /ʃ/-suffixation to the last part of the stem in case this stem is suffixed. He adds: “Thus, if any other suffix is added to a form, the suffix constituent of the negative marker /maa...ʃ/ always occupies the last position in the word” (ibid: 399). The above details plausibly imply that the negative structure in ORD is pre-Hilalian. The local use of this focused negative construction is confirmed by its recurring appearance in the corpus. Instances are,

- [ma:-jbyi-ʃ jhassal fi blædæh] he doesn’t like to accuse his country
- [ma:-ʕa:ba:na:-ʃ jʕa ka:jn mbæʃd] we don’t know what comes later
- [...(o)-li ma:-qra-ʃ wæhdæh] the one who did not study on his own
- [ma:-nɔkdɔb-ʃ ʃli:k] I don’t lie to you (to be honest with you)
- [ma:-ʃhædru-ʃ msa baʃðhum baʃd] they don’t talk to one another
- [ma:-nsamų-ʃ bɔ-nna:s] we don’t listen to people (we don’t care about what people say)
- [wha:rna...ma:-jɔamu:-ʃ ʃl-ɔ-bʃi:d] the Oranees...don’t think about the future
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The single expression of negation /maa/ together with the verb (/maa/ + Verb) is, however, the combination followed in bedouin-type dialects in verbal sentences, as indicated earlier. The corpus does not incorporate such a construction except one bedouin example that we have encountered: [ma:-næʃrǝf-ʃ] I don’t know which alternates with [ma:-næʃrǝf]. We have already related this alternation to reallocation (see 4.2.3.3).

4.5.7. Saliency

a. Salient Sedentary Features: Independent Pronouns

There are some pre-Hilalian independent pronouns which seem very salient in the sense that they are easily recognised as being associated with one particular area. Take the case of: [jana] I; [nți:na] you (sing musc and fem); [ntuman] you (plur) and [human] they. They are frequently employed in pre-Hilalian dialects, notably the first person independent pronoun (Bouamrane, 1989). Maltese dialect shares the use of the latter pronoun (the author’s transcription is yiǝn) (Vanhove, 1998). Cherchell dialect is highly characterised by the 2nd and 3rd person plural: ǝntūmǝn “you (plur)”, hūmǝn “they (plur)”. In Oran, such terms can be easily identified with Tlemcen variety which is seen as highly idiosyncratic in the western zone of Algeria. Even Tlemcenians are generally conscious of such linguistic saliency; this is approved by “…the frequent use of a non-TA variety from the part of native speakers of Tlemcen speech variety who tend to avoid salient features of TA and stereotypes…” (Dendane, 2006: 124). In other words, “… a number of linguistic features of Tlemcen speech, particularly the glottal stop and some morphological and lexical items, sound ‘effeminate’ and are thus avoided by men in constrained interaction situations …” (Dendane, 1993 reported in Dendane, 2006: 128). So, this may justify the regular absence of such stereotypical sedentary features in our recordings.
b. Salient Bedouin Features: Adverbs

If we take the case of adverbs of time, Cantineau (1939) believes in the usage of the item [al-baːræ] "yesterday" in sedentary dialects in contrast with the bedouin dichotomous [jaːmos]. Caubet (2001) confirms the bedouinity of [jaːmos] (āmos in her transcription). Other derivative bedouin forms are: wūnnāmos “before yesterday”; wūnnāmseyn “three days ago” (Aguadé, 1998). The sedentary Rabat dialect involves the utterance lbāreh (Messaoudi, 2002). The latter item is sedentarised bedouin in the Hilalian Casablanca dialect (Ibāræh) (Aguadé, 2002). [jaːmos] and its derivatives are highly salient features avoided by the respondents who are probably aware of their bedouin origin. As earlier said, bedouinity could be sometimes equaled with backwardness in Oran context. The sedentary [al-baːræ] "yesterday" constitutes the norm in the dialect in question. Our data also include, instead of [wunaːmos] "before yesterday", the sedentary derivative form: [wulbaːræh] "before yesterday".

With regard to the adverbs of manner, yāsør “much/ many”, it predominates in many bedouin varieties of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Fezzan (Marçais, 1977). Some of them use the item as a variable adjective depending on gender and number: yāsør; yāsra (fem); yāsrīn (plur masc), yāsrāt (plur fem) (ibid). It is another salient bedouin feature which is nonexistent in data.

4.6. Conclusion

Reallocation is highly attested among grammatical variants which are genealogically recognised in ORD. In accordance with Britain and Trudgill’s (1999) typification, socio-stylistic reallocation has been, in our findings, identified in relation to possessive relationships. The sedentary analytic construction reflects formal and objective ways of tackling topics about, for example, moral customs and traditions, weddings, locations, numbers (or pairs) and time. Bedouin syntactic direct annexations, in contrast, are stylistically informal. They make reference to kin relationships, body part names, the term /daaṭ/ house (very informal and intimate context), the term /nhaar/ day (informally used and connected to day names or social events); and denominations (very informal ordinary conversational appellations).

As for the indefinite article, the use of pre-Hilalian /wahad/ and the use of Hilalian Ø differ, too, in their degree of formality. /wahad/ is involved in formal introductions, when the person
or object is unknown. Ø is informal and refers to people or things already introduced. With regard to socio-stylistic reallocated negation, the user of sedentary suffixed [ma:-na$ra$f-$ʃ] employs the latter in its formally thorough construction, whereas reattribute the bedouin reduced and non-suffixed [ma:-na$ra$f] to informal situations.

Other genealogically grammatical variants have, however, survived reallocation, but in a different way. Being neither socio-stylistic nor phonological, reallocation, according to our corpus, could also be denoted as grammatical. Grammatical reallocation has affected defective verbs. It is the process whereby the sedentary structure is retained for the suffixal conjugation while the preservation of bedouin structure relates to prefixal conjugation. Simplification is another koineisation process which exceptionally operates at the grammatical level in this investigation. Plural participles are simplified through sedentary neutralisation in gender. The future tense and the indefinite article know further simplification by sedentarily neutralising them in gender and number. Genealogically, grammatical features experience only a little free variation compared with the other linguistic levels.

Focusing has apparently reached the bedouin-type grammatical predominance: gender distinction is stabilised at the level of 2nd sing pers perfective, imperfective, imperative, together with 2nd sing pers pronoun; trilateral and quadrilateral nominal plurals are focused following the schemes C^1wa:C^3:i:C^4 and C^1C^2:a:C^3:i:C^4 respectively; dual formation is regularly based on suffixing the morpheme {i:n} in the case of names of units of time, units of measure and mother-father pair; there is a permanent [ʃ]-retention in numerals; colour nominal and adjectival plurals usually adopt the suffixal morpheme {i:n}; the focused pronouns [winta] when, [wi:n] where, and [(ǝ)lli] who prevail in ORD, and so is the regular particle /ta$ʃ/ of.

A limited number of sedentary grammatical features, such as the pronoun [ʃku:n] who, the negative structure and the adverb [al-ba$raeh] yesterday occur in data as a consequence of focusing. Our findings admit the fact that ORD is genealogically mixed, but bedouin focused elements preponderate in grammar. Our hypothesis that Oran has a bedouin Arabic dialect is corroborated at this linguistic level.
5.0. Introduction

Actually, we have so far explored koineisation induced-pronunciation and grammar in Oran speech community. In an attempt to draw a more thorough picture on genealogical koine and its formation in ORD, we have found it paramount to add another chapter on lexis. This linguistic level has unexceptionally known various koineisation processes including mixing and reallocation. Special attention is given to semantic reallocation. Another great number of lexical variants which have already been in genealogical alternation have attained focusing. The notions of bidialectalism and dialect-switching are also raised in this chapter.

5.1. Mixing

Whether current Oran dialectal lexis is genealogically bedouin or sedentary will be uncovered in the present chapter. Regionally however, language survives variation at all its linguistic levels, as already said (see 1.2). Perhaps, lexical variation is the most observed and plain (Trudgill, 2000). Due to internal migration, ORD has born, next to pronunciation (see 3.1) and grammar (see 4.1), a high degree of lexical variability. The participants tended to display lexical utterances variably in the sense that this variability was either inter-individual or intra-individual. Inter-individual lexical variability refers to the prevalence of different lexical variants produced by different individuals. If several lexical variants are provided by the same speaker, variability in this case is intra-individual. Lexical variation (see 1.2.4) results from a chaotic situation which is characterised by mixing, the initial koineisation process.

Relying on our recorded interviews, we have extracted, from data, all the possible current lexical variants and drawn a comparison between them and those mentioned in literature. In case other genealogical variants have been missing in the first research method, we could hence complete, on the basis of previous works, our lexical lists. The latter will be presented here in the form of tables including three columns. In the first column, we mention the genealogical source of lexical variants. The second column will gather all the bedouin items, on the one hand, and all the sedentary ones on the other. In some cases the lexical variants are indicated as bedouinised or sedentarised. In others, their genealogical affiliation is not explicit. In any of these case, the fieldworker will try to justify her choice of each genealogical terminology. Column Three is confined to glosses. There is obviously lexical
alternation between bedouin and sedentary features (see 1.2.5.1). As previously demonstrated, this alternation does not guarantee the persistence of mixing. Sometimes, it implies the occurrence of other koineisation processes (levelling or reallocation) which will participate in the new dialectal composition.

5.1.1. Some Basic Verbs

We have based our present research of course not on all verbs in ORD, but only on those which are very elementarily employed in ordinary life and have a genealogical identification. Our recorded interviews cover lexical variants which correspond to: be able to, find, get down, give, go and hold. Other verbal variants which alternate genealogically are taken from literature: hide, lie, pick up, rain fall and send.

5.1.1.1. BE ABLE TO

Four lexical verbal variants, with the meaning be able to (or can), have emerged, in our recordings, as a result of regional lexical input into the dialect mix. An apparent time data observation (see 1.2.4) will display the occurrence of any lexical change in ORD. Let us consider the following table.
Table 5.1: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning be able to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance$^{220}$</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[nɔʒʒǝm]</td>
<td>be able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[tɑːɡ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[qad]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[qdr]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Bouamrane (1993), the first two verbal items are bedouin. Different derivative forms of [nɔʒʒǝm] prevail in data, [jnɔʒʒǝmu] he is able to; [ma:-jnɔʒʒǝm] he is not able to; [mɔʒmi] you (sing fem) are able to; [ma:-nɔʒʒǝm] he was not able to. As for [tɑːɡ] he was able to, it is the only present form. If we follow the interpretation provided in Chapter Three (see 3.1.1.2), we consider [qad] he was able to as a sedentary variant. Similarly with [mɔʒǝm], it takes place in the original mix, together with its various derivatives$^{221}$: [qaditi] you (sing fem) were able to; [tqad] you (sing masc) are able to; [jqad] he is able to; [nqad] I am able to; [ma:-nqad] I am not able to. Following Heath (2002), [qdr]$^{222}$ is presently viewed as pre-Hilian since it is majorly used by sedentary areas in Morocco. It has been well-observed in variation, in data, with the above lexical items. We have also come across [qdr] derivatives which are [ma:-nqdar] I am not able to; [taqdr] you (sing masc) are able to; [jqadru] they are able to. The question that could be raised: which one of these items predominates? Is it bedouin or sedentary? What is the final destiny of each variant within koineisation frame? Tentative answers will be tackled in 5.3.1.1.

5.1.1.2. FIND

The next lexical variants have the meaning find. Our recordings involve alternative items which are two in number as displayed in the following table,

---

$^{220}$ Following the table, the author transcribes the three first items respectively as nɔʒʒǝm, tɑːɡ and qad.

$^{221}$ Although the examples have been already given in Chapter Three (see 3.3.1) they are purposefully repeated here because the approach is lexical whereas in the third chapter it has been rather related to the pronunciation of these items.

$^{222}$ qdr in the author’s transcription
Data attest a low degree of occurrence of the bedouin variant \[\text{ʂɑ:b}\] he found, and so are its derivatives. In fact, only one form \[\text{sɑbt}\] you (sing masc) found has been detected and taken out. By contrast, the second lexical variant and its derivatives have been highly witnessed in data, \[\text{lqɑ}\] he found; \[\text{tɔlqɑ}\] you (sing masc) find; \[\text{tɔlqahum}\] you (plur) find; \[\text{jəlqɑ}\] he finds; \[\text{jəlqo}\] they find; \[\text{lqɑ:t}\] she found; \[\text{jlqo}\] they find; \[\text{mə:-lqaw-f}\] they did not find; \[\text{nəlqɑ}\] I find. Following 3.3.1, the variant \[\text{lqɑ}\] is an interdialectal outcome in pronunciation. To recall, we have said that the original pronunciation of \[\text{lqɑ}\] involved the bedouin voiced velar instead of the sedentary unvoiced uvular. We shall keep the same genealogical identification of the variant and its derivatives. They are, in other words, sedentarised. \[\text{lqɑ}\] seemingly preponderates in the recordings. We will try below to check by means of the second research method (administered questionnaire) the genealogical quantitative and koineising state of the variants in question.

### 5.1.1.3. GET DOWN

Consider the following table in which three lexical realisations prevail,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[sɑ:b]</td>
<td>find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentarised</td>
<td>[lqɑ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning find

---

223 respectively \text{nzəl}, \text{hwəd}: \text{hwəd}, \text{ḥbat} in Heath’s (2002) transcription
Table 5.3: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning *get down*

We regard [nzɔl] as bedouin because it is encountered in the form of /nazala/ in bedouin CA. [tnɔzlɪ] *you (sing fem) get down* is its derivative form found in the corpus. Similarly, [hæwɔd] is realised in other forms in CA (Heath, 2002). So, we refer to it as bedouin as well. It also obtains in our recordings as [thæwdɪ] *you (sing fem) get down* and [nhæwdu] *we get down*. The third variant [hbat] is more urban (sedentary) (Heath, 2002). [t hæbɪ] *you (sing fem) get down*, one of the latter derived structures, is also encountered in data. Whether one or more variant(s) is/are (non-)levelled out will be explored shortly.

5.1.1.4. GIVE

The following concept *give* has got two lexical variants in ORD as demonstrated in the table,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[stå]</td>
<td><em>give</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[mad]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning *give*

We consider [stå]\(^{224}\) *give/ he gave* as bedouin since it is majorly widespread among bedouin dialects (ORD, TRT, MST, SBA, BYD, MKR, TMT, SAD, BSR) in the Algerian west (Bouamrane, 1991). It is also used in bedouin CA as /ʔaʃta/. Its derivative forms appear in our corpus as [jaʃteːni] *they give me*; [jaʃteːni] *he gives me*; [ståw(ah)] *they gave (him)*;

\(^{224}\) [9Ta] in Bouamrane’s (1991) transcription
they gave (us); [ja[to:ha)] they give (her); [sta:hum] he gave them. [mæd]225 give/ he gave however comes from the sedentary region of Nedroma (Bouamrane, 1991). We have come across one of its derivative forms which is [jmæd] he gives. Which lexical variant, [sta] or [mæd], outweighs will be revealed in due course. As first impression, the recordings display a greater frequency of [sta]-occurrences compared with those of the other lexical element. This supports the idea that we need a different research method to validate or not the results at hand.

5.1.1.5. GO

Here is the greatest number in lexical items that we have seen so far in this chapter. We have [raːh] in variation with [rawwaːh], [ɣda] in variation with [ɣwda], in addition to [mʃa] and [ʃawwar]. All these lexical items alternate with one another. The genealogical lineage of the items is demonstrated as follows,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[raːh]</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[rawwaːh]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ʃawwar]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ɣwda]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[mʃa]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning go

Currently, not all of the above utterances are extracted from our recordings. Some of them are particularly found in previous works. More precisely, [raːh] he went is recorded in its various forms, such as, [jruːh] he goes; [nruːh] I go; [rahu] they went. The same could be said about the utterances [ɣwda] and [ʃawwar] and the derivatives of the latter form: [ʃawwar] he went;

225 [med] in Bouamrane’s (1991) transcription
[jʃawru] *they go* and [ʃawwar] *we went*. On the other hand, [rawwah] and [mʃa]⁴²⁶ are different lexical variants which are rather removed from Bouamrane’s (1993) investigation. As for the genealogical classification, the table above follows the frame of this same work and shows that bedouinity is related to the items [raːh], [rawwah], [ʃawwar]⁴²⁷ and [ʃ(ʷ)da]. [mʃa] is viewed as sedentary (ibid). Do the variants still survive mixing or do they experience other processes? Our administered questionnaire (see 2.6.4) will probably respond to this question which will be taken up later in this chapter.

5.1.1.6. HIDE

A number of lexical ingredients that have been certainly transmitted to Oran by population movements have been at first missed due to their unavailability in the recorded data. This is one research difficulty, which entails the impossibility to discern all the important features by one research method (interviews) (see 2.6.3). Special reference is made to those lexical features alternating genealogically. More specification is again required to involve merely the lexical items that are usually and commonly employed to fulfill the basic needs of speakers. Such features have been certainly present in ORD and gone through koineisation processes, in which mixing is the starting point. The verbal element *hide* may be one of those items which hold these characteristics. We shall turn to other similar cases in the remainder of this chapter. In fact, we have followed the list of lexical variants which are encountered in Bouamrane (1993) and have included them in our administered questionnaire. They are: [ʃzǝn]; [dǝs]; [drǝg]; and [tsxǝbbǝ] (respectively xǝn, dǝss, drǝg, tsxǝbbǝ in Bouamrane’s (1993) transcription). Genealogically, they are categorised following the table below. The percentages reached by means of the administered questionnaire are detailed and analysed in 5.3.1.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[ʃzǝn]</td>
<td>hide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[dǝs]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[drǝg]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²²⁶ mʃǝ in Bouamrane’s (1993) transcription
²²⁷ raːh, rawwah and jawwar in Bouamrane’s (1993) transcription
5.1.1.7. HOLD

Unlike hide, a set of lexical variants have been recorded with the meaning of hold (as seen in 3.3.4). Their prevalence \([\text{id}], [\text{hk} \text{m}], [\text{g} \text{b} \text{d}], [\text{g} \text{d} \text{a} \text{b}]\) appears at random, especially with their respective derivatives \([\text{id}] \text{ he held}; [\text{n} \text{f} \text{id}] I \text{ hold}; [\text{hk} \text{m}] \text{ he held}; [\text{na} \text{h} \text{km}] I \text{ hold}; [\text{gb} \text{d}] \text{ he held}; [\text{ng} \text{b} \text{d}] \text{ I hold}; [\text{ja} \text{gb} \text{d} \text{a} \text{h}] \text{ they hold him}; [\text{ga} \text{b} \text{d} \text{e} \text{n}] \text{ holding (they)}; [\text{gd} \text{a} \text{b}] \text{ he held}; [\text{ja} \text{gd} \text{a} \text{b} \text{d}] \text{ she holds}; [\text{ja} \text{gd} \text{a} \text{b} \text{u} \text{h}] \text{ they hold}; [\text{ja} \text{gd} \text{a} \text{b}] \text{ he holds}; [\text{gd} \text{a} \text{b} (\text{li})] \text{ he holds (for me)}; [\text{g} \text{a} \text{d} \text{b}] \text{ they hold}; [\text{g} \text{a} \text{d} \text{b} \text{e} \text{n}] \text{ holding (they)}. More details are supplied in the table below,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>([\text{id}])</td>
<td>hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([\text{hk} \text{m}])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([\text{g} \text{b} \text{d}])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedouinised</td>
<td>([\text{g} \text{d} \text{a} \text{b}])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning hide

Such variants are uttered inter-individually sometimes and intra-individually other times. We notice the absence of sedentary features. \([\text{f} \text{d}], [\text{hk} \text{m}]\) and \([\text{g} \text{b} \text{d}]\)\textsuperscript{228} alternate as bedouin variants (Bouamrane, 1991), which is not the case of \([\text{g} \text{d} \text{a} \text{b}]\). We have suggested previously that this lexical feature could be seen as an intermediate item occurring in neither contributing dialect (see 3.3.4). It is interdialectal as a consequence of its exposition to metathesis. We have also said that its composition makes it converge more to a bedouin

\textsuperscript{228} respectively \([\text{f} \text{d}], [\text{hk} \text{m}]\) and \([\text{g} \text{b} \text{d}]\) in Bouamrane’s (1991) transcription
affiliation, and we have opted for the adjective bedouinised to describe it genealogically. Does [gdəb]-emergence escorts the focusing of the item over the other variants, or is it only temporary and in its way of disappearance? What is the position of the other variants? Shortly, tentative responses will be outlined.

5.1.8. LIE

Another wide range of lexical variants, almost entirely uncovered by our recordings, is gathered in the table below. Relying primarily on the key items suggested by Bouamrane (1991), we can note the lexical variability below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[tkøssəl]</td>
<td>lie down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[tməd]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[mbəṭəḥ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[(t)warək]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning lie down

As seen in the table, the bedouin lexical features are [tkøssəl], [tməd] and [mbəṭəḥ]. The other items [twarək] and [warək] alternate and come from sedentary areas. We incorporated all these verbal elements in our administered survey since they are basic in daily life. Their occurrence (or at least of some of them) was highly expected. We tended to reveal the predominant item, those items which were expected to remain and those which seemed in their way of eradication. We supposed that the informants would supply additional lexical variants with the same meaning lie down. We will identify the regional origin of each feature in 5.3.1.8. This may give a clearer picture of dialectal transportation to Oran via demographic mobility, and the consequence of long-run dialect contact within the community.

---

229 respectively [tkessel]; [tmed]; [mbaTah], [twarek] and [warek] in Bouamrane’s (1991) transcription
5.1.1.9. PICK UP

The following table groups other genealogical categories. [rd] and [talla$] are Hilalian in contrast with [s$lli] which is used by pre-Hilalian dialects. The first two items are expected to alternate and, in turn, are in variation with the third item. Just like hide and lie, pick up is encountered the literature (Bouamrane (1993). Our attention has been to enrich our administered survey by selecting as many fundamental lexical items as possible in order to elucidate the lexical situation in Oran. Certainly, the variants in Table 5.9 have known koineisation processes (at least mixing). Percentages will accompany each element in 5.3.1.9. Our second research method possibly allows a more scientific reinforcement of our recorded findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance\textsuperscript{230}</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[rd] / [talla$]</td>
<td>pick up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[s$lli]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table 5.9: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning pick Up}

5.1.1.10. RAIN FALL

Let us examine the table below,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance\textsuperscript{231}</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[ts$] / [ts$]</td>
<td>the rain falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[te:h] / [tanzal]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{230} respectively rd, talla$ and s$lli in Bouamrane’s (1993) transcription

\textsuperscript{231} respectively ts$bb · ts$bb, ti:h, nzal in Heath’s (2002) transcription
Still extracting, from literature, other lexical elements in variation, the structure the rain falls is genealogically expressed differently (Heath, 2002). The author refers to urban areas in Morocco where the items [tɛ:h] and [tɛŋzəl] co-occur. In bedouin regions, he suggests, [tsab] and [tsob] alternatively take place. According to our observation, these lexical variants are frequently heard in ordinary conversations in ORD. They are used to talk about the weather, and more constantly in winter and autumn. Therefore, we found it useful to integrate them in our second research method. The proportions corresponding to their presence will be demonstrated in 5.3.1.10.

### Table 5.10: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning the rain falls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[rsǝl]</td>
<td>send</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[zaɪ/eːfɑʈ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[ʃeːfɑʈ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, the lexical variants above escaped our recordings. We then decided to refer in our work to the genealogical typology proposed by Bouamrane (1993) with regard to the verbal item send. According to the author, [ʃɛ:ʃɑʈ] and [zaɪʃɑʈ] are in regional variation: The regions to which they belong are bedouin. [ʃeːfɑʈ], on the other hand, obtains in sedentary areas. Clearly, the genealogical difference is not always lexical but sometimes phonetic, if we compare the bedouin [ʃeːfɑʈ] and [zaɪʃɑʈ] to [ʃeːfɑʈ]. The resemblance is

---

232 rsǝl, zaɪfɑʈ, ziʃɑʈ and siːfɑʈ in Bouamrane’s (1993) transcription
perhaps traced back to a dialectal contactual effect of which the genealogical shift will be treated in due course. Unexceptionally, we will examine the frequency of each item following the results of the administered questionnaire (see 5.3.1.11).

5.1.2. Kinship Terms

As a matter of fact, the sole incorporation of basic verbs in our administered survey was not sufficient to get a more thorough lexical description within the current koineisation framework. We found it important to add other sub-field terminologies related to kinship, animals, implements and others. The main sources of inspiration were the works of Bouamrane (1991), Bouamrane (1993) and Heath (2002) in which the latter linguist conducted a dialectal approach confined to Moroccan speech. Leaving aside for the moment the other above sub-fields, this immediate section is circumscribed to terms linked to kinship. Due to time limitations, we were content with two genealogical items which are the concepts child and wife, in addition to their lexical variants.

5.1.2.1. CHILD

A significant illustrative variation is provided by Bouamrane (1991) as for the item child. [bǝz], [ɣurjan], [Tfa] and [wǝld]\textsuperscript{233} are all lexical variants which designate this concept.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[bǝz]</td>
<td>child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ɣurjan]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Tfa]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[wǝld]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Table 5.12: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning child}

\textsuperscript{233} respectively [bazz]; [ɣurjan]; [Tfal] and [wlejed] in Bouamrane’s (1991) transcription
[bǝz], [yurja:n] and [tfel] come from bedouin dialects. Only [wǝld] is sedentary. Actually, the writer refers to the latter item in its diminutive form ([wlo:jəd]). Since we have seen in Chapter Four (see 4.3.2) that the diminutive structures\(^{234}\) are levelled out, we have used the item in its normal shape, [wǝld]. On the other hand, these items can together convey two different meanings: the first is a kin item which implies someone’s child; one may hear in ORD expressions such as, [må:jı:j; ra:hı lə:hıa...sændha lə-bzu:z/ yraji:n\(^{235}\)] she won’t come...she is busy with her children. The second meaning is more general and indicates any child without any special reference to his/ her kin relationships. We, of course, work presently on the variants as kinship terms. Does their frequency converge or diverge? This is the first question which comes to our mind once hearing the different lexical variants employed in the very daily life in Oran. Unexpectedly, they were absent from our first corpus, a fact which confirms again the importance behind using another complementary research method: the administered questionnaire (see 2.6.4).

5.1.2.2. WIFE

Another kin item is represented in the table below. We encountered in data [mart] the wife of. Bouamrane (1991) says in his article the term raises out of a bedouin source. Its sedentary counterpart, according to the same author is [mrat], as clearly shown in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance(^{236})</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[mart]</td>
<td>wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[mrat]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.13:** Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning wife

\(^{234}\) According to the participant observation, levelling is not confined only to adjectival diminutives but also nominal ones.

\(^{235}\) Plurals of [bǝz] and [yurja:n] respectively

\(^{236}\) respectively [mart] and [mrat] in Bouamrane’s (1991) transcription
We notice that the process of metathesis has been at work. The vowel /a/ and the consonant /r/ have exchanged positions. The question that could be raised which item has been affected by metathesis: The bedouin one to give rise to [mrat] or the sedentary element to produce [mart]? According to our daily observation, the occurrences of the bedouin variant outnumber those of the sedentary variant. The administered questionnaire will (in)-validate this assumption.

5.1.3. Animals

Some animal items show genealogical antecedents. Due to time restrictions, again, we will limit our approach to two animal categories. The concepts horse and cockerel group lexical variants that meet this lineage.

5.1.3.1. HORSE

The genealogical typology of the lexical variants associated with horse is found in Heath (2002). His informants believe that [ʕæwd] is typically rural in reverse to [ħʂɑ:n] which is an urban indicator. Let us work on this suggestion in the administered questionnaire and see if the bedouin or sedentary lexical element is mostly used in Oran speech community. On the other hand, Heath (2002) reports, on the basis of other studies, that [ʕæwd] existed in CA (see 2.5.1.2) and meant old male camel. There was a diachronic semantic shift of the term to acquire the contemporary meaning of horse. Nevertheless, a more recent adaptation with regard to [ħʂɑ:n], for the same linguist, derives from MSA (see 2.5.1.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance(^{237})</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[ʕæwd]</td>
<td>horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[ħʂɑ:n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.14: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning horse

\(^{237}\) respectively ŋəwd (phonetic ŋəwd) and ħsan in Heath’s (2002) transcription
5.1.3.2. COCKEREL

Regarding the lexical variants that correlate with the concept *cockerel*, [diːk] and [sərduːk] have a bedouin ancestry, unlike [fərruːʒ] which is descendant of sedentary speech (Bouamrane, 1993). This variantal group was not caught by our recorder. Given that we tended to sustain the results obtained within the sub-field of animals, we again called upon Bouamrane’s work mentioned above for more accurate data. As part of our second research method, the informants were asked to supply the dialectal name of *cockerel* presented, to them, in the form of a picture. The results were reported for a later analysis which would be handled in 5.3.3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[diːk]</td>
<td><em>cockerel</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[sərduːk]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[fərruːʒ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.15**: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning *cockerel*

5.1.4. Implements

Implements are among the very homely tools that could be denoted in usual interactions. Those implement names which have a genealogical typology are not numerously known. On the basis of Bouamrane (1993), we were able, however, to realise the presence of, at least, the genealogically identified names of two implements *spoon* and *well* in ORD. They were surely transplanted to the new linguistic situation via the in-migrants’ distinct varieties which finally came into contact.

5.1.4.1. SPOON

respectively diːk, sərduːk and fərruːʒ in Bouamrane’s (1993) transcription
From the same article written by Bouamrane (1993), the lexical variants which indicate the concept *spoon* are outlined in the following table, together with their genealogical lineage. Further regional information will be added in 5.3.4.1. As for the genealogy, [muɾuɾ] is a bedouin-type while [mʃilqa] is in sedentary alternation with [mʃilʔa]. Relying on our long-term in-migrant’s observation, we think that [muɾuɾ] has been focused for a considerable span of time in ORD. Validation by means of a more meticulous method is still useful (see 5.3.4.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[muɾuɾ]</td>
<td>spoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[mʃilqa]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[mʃilʔa]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning *spoon*

5.1.4.2. **WELL**

The *well* is an old-fashioned homely implement in the Algerian society. Nowadays, it is usually linked to the countryside, but many urban houses, not flats, still possess one. *Well*-reference is, then, part of everyday Orane’e’s life. Examining the table below allow perceiving a number of points,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[ʰæːsi]</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[biːɾ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

239 respectively mʊɾʊɾof, mʃilqa and mʃilʔæ in Bouamrane’s (1993) transcription
240 respectively ʰæːsi and biːɾ in Bouamrane’s (1993) transcription
Table 5.17: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning well

Still withdrawing from Bouamrane’s (1993) study, the lexical utterance [ĥæ:si] is genealogically more bedouin-type whereas the item [bi:r] is more sedentary-type. If we account again for our daily observation, we get the impression that the two lexical variants are equally employed by the Oranees. They seem, in other words, in a mixed situation. We need consequently to check their proportions more objectively later in the present investigation (see 5.3.4.2).

5.1.5. Other Miscellaneous Terms

_all_ and _hot_ are seen as miscellaneous items because their lexical variants do not seem to fit any one of the categories above. We have found it important to leave one section devoted to these variables given that they, we think, would contribute importantly in displaying the genealogical development of ORD.

5.1.5.1. ALL

Other genealogical key concepts such as _all_ are, as said, worth exploring in the study in question. Its variant [gæʕ] is widespread in our first corpus. It prevails with its counterpart in the following table,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance(^{241})</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[gæʕ]</td>
<td><em>all</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[kamɔl]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning _all_

\(^{241}\) respectively [ga9] and [kamel] in Bouamrane’s (1991) transcription
From the table we notice that the bedouin origin is attributed to the variant \[gæʕ\] found in data. The second term [kamal] is taken from Bouamrane’s (1991) research which denotes it as sedentary. Although the sedentary-type variant does not obtain in our recording, one may however perceive it in Oran’s street and/or elsewhere in the city. Evidence is therefore required from a more scientific and objective method of investigation. We gave the informants the item in French /tu/ all and asked them to provide its equivalent in their dialect. Which one of the variants is levelled out and which one remains will be revealed shortly.

5.1.5.2. HOT

Examining the table (Bouamrane, 1993) below permits to make the following remarks,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance 242</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[hæ:mi]</td>
<td>hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[sxu:n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.19: Mixing and Lexical Variants with the meaning hot

The lexical variant [hæ:mi] hot descends from Hilalian-type varieties whereas [sxu:n] hot marks its pre-Hilalian-type ancestry (ibid). The two adjectival items do not prevail in data. In ordinary interactions, however, they are heard among ORD-speakers, with special frequency of the bedouin item. Both appear related to CA, /haami/ and /saayin/ respectively. Just like the above items, the immediate lexical variants will be subjected to verification, through the administered questionnaire, by asking the respondents about the opposite of /baarǝd/ cold.

5.2. Reallocation

It seems, in some cases, clear from the first glance at the recordings, that reallocation has taken place. This clarity in other cases does not prevail. Our administered questionnaire has allowed to find out other reallocated features, together with elements undergoing mixing

---

242 respectively hæ:mi and sxu:n in Bouamrane’s (1993) transcription
and levelling. But before dealing with the results of this survey, two clear-cut recorded verbal cases, *sit*, *sleep* and *stab*, are treated just below.

### 5.2.1. Semantic Reallocation: Some Basic Verbs

In addition to grammatical reallocation encountered in Chapter Four (see 4.2.1), we have confronted a further unexpected emerging type not mentioned by Britain and Trudgill (1999). Semantic reallocation has been discovered while tackling the phenomenon of genealogical variation at the lexical level. Certain regional variants have been retained to be reattributed different meanings as will be seen below. The variantal equivalents of *sit* and *sleep* are genealogically affiliated. Which new functional roles are reassigned to sedentary features and which ones are reascribed to the bedouin/bedouinsed ones constitute the focal point of this sub-section.

#### 5.2.1.1. SIT

Let us examine now one frequent lexical alternation that we have come across in the results of our first research method. *sit* has manifested in different forms. The most recurring item that could have been perceived in the recordings is *[ʒǝmæʕ]* he sits, followed by *[jǝgʕud]* in alteration with *[jugʕæd]* he sits. The following table classifies the lexical variants genealogically. Bouamrane (1993) assigns *[ʒǝmæʕ]* to bedouin regions, *[jǝgʕud]* to sedentary areas, and then again *[jugʕæd]* to bedouin regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance243</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td><em>[ʒǝmæʕ]</em></td>
<td><em>sit</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedouinised</td>
<td><em>[jǝgʕud]</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>[jugʕæd]</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

243 In Bouamrane (1993), the above items are provided in their perfective as *[ʒǝmæʕ]*, *[gʕæd]* and *[gʕæd]*
We follow the author in viewing the first variant [ʒǝŋmæʕ] as bedouin which occurs mainly in the varieties of ORN, TMT and SAD. However, we genealogically see the two other items in a different way. The Algerian capital is originally sedentary (Boucherit, 2002); if someone visits the region or listens to TV films/serials or radio programmes diffused in Algiers dialect, he/ she may easily grasp the recurrent production of the item [qʕǝd] sit and its derivatives. Comparatively, the perfective form of [jǝgʕud] ([gʕǝd]244) and the one of [jugʕǝd] ([gʕǝd]245) possess the bedouin [g] instead of the sedentary [q]. We suggest that the lexical structure [gʕǝd] (or ([gʕǝd])) is originally sedentary, but has gone through bedouin phonetic modifications in the long run. Therefore, we opt for viewing this lexical variant as bedouinised.

In our corpus, the form above is realised in various constructions, such as [ɲg ʕud] or [jugʕǝd] he sits; [tǝgusdi] you (sing fem); [ma:-tuguʃi-ʃ] don’t sit (sing fem); [jagusdu] they sit; [naguʃdu] we sit. Derivatives are also witnessed with respect to the bedouin item such as, [ʒǝŋmæʕ] he sits; [dʒǝmɛʔi] you (sing fem); [jʒǝmu] they sit. Apparently, forms with the meaning of sit are in striking competition. But in reality, they are not in many times. What happens, in fact, is that reallocation has frequently come about. The bedouin and sedentary items are retained in ORD given that they have been reassigned distinct semantic roles. [ʒǝŋmæʕ] and its derivative forms keep the meaning of sit. However, [gʕǝd] which still alternates with [gʕǝd] has acquired the meaning of remain. Therefore, when examining more scrupulously the semantic functions of the recorded bedouinised variants, we have realised that their corresponding derivatives often convey the meaning as follows, [jəgʕud] or [jugʕǝd] he remains; [təgusdi] you (sing fem) remain; [ma:-təgusdi-ʃ] you (sing fem) do not remain; [jəgusdu] they remain; [nəgusdu] we remain.

5.2.1.2. SLEEP

We, now, deal with the variants corresponding to sleep. The table below is based on Bouamrane (1991)’s research.

---

244 According to Bouamrane (1993), this lexical variant regionally belongs to TSN and NDM.
245 According to the same linguist, this lexical variant regionally manifests in TRT, BSR, SBA, MKR, MST.
Unlike \[n \text{ʕ} \text{æs}\], our current recordings entail the occurrences of \[rg \text{ud}\] in alternation with [rgud], as well as their derivative structures, such as \[\text{j(egd)}\text{ugdu}\] they sleep; \[\text{turgud}\] she sleeps; \[\text{ma:-turgud-j}\] she does not sleep; \[\text{nargud}\] I sleep. The two lexical variants (indicated by the author as [rged]) arise from bedouin dialects which are mainly TRT, ORN, TMT, SBA, BYD and MKR (ibid). The third utterance, \[n \text{ʕ} \text{æs}\] sleep (given and transcribed by the author as [n9es]), flows from sedentary NDM. This sedentary utterance is broadly heard in ORD, but manifests actually in a different meaning. Again, reallocation, we suggest, supervenes. The genealogical variants are redistributed in terms of semantic functions. The bedouin terms maintain the meaning of sleep as shown above in their various recorded manifestations. The sedentary \[n \text{ʕ} \text{æs}\], conversely, persists in the mix, abandons the old meaning of sleep and through time captures the new one which is feel sleepy.

5.2.1.3. STAB

The two lexical variants in this table are found in our recordings. On the ground of his genealogical dialectal typology in the west of Algeria, Bouamrane (1991) finds that the following lexical variants correspond to the concept stab,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance 246</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[deg]</td>
<td>stab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

246 respectively [deg] and [drab] in Bouamrane’s (1991) transcription
Table 5.22: Semantic Reallocation and Lexical Variants with the meaning stab

| Sedentary | [drab] |

The Hilalian-type is largely and mainly spread among the bedouin dialects TRT ORD TMT SBA BYD or MKR. Comparatively, [drab], in the sense of stab, idiosyncratically takes place in TSN. Because of the greatest number of its speakers, the bedouin variant predominates. The reason why [drab] is not employed is two-fold; it is on the one hand initially brought to the new regional destination by solely a minor group of TSN-speakers; and on the other hand, the item [drab] is reallocated, perhaps long ago, another meaning, beat. For the Oranees nowadays, [dǝg] means stab while [drab] has the meaning of beat.

5.3. Levelling

The process of levelling (see 1.4.2.2.2) is not merely limited to one linguistic level. We have seen in the previous chapters that it can affect pronunciation and grammar. In this chapter, we will make sure that it can have impact on lexis too. The lexical variants have at first appeared in free variation in the initial mix, indicating that they have been employed interchangeably without affecting meaning. After some time, changes have risen: many of these utterances have been gradually reduced in their number until they have been levelled out. Their counterparts should have been, on the contrary, focused. If the number of the competing variants converges, this means, as in the case of grammar and pronunciation, that these variants still bear mixing or they have been subjected to reallocation. Therefore, this section will emphasise levelling and, at time, will consider its tightly related koineisation processes.

Unlike the three tabled-columns in Chapters Three (3.4) and Four (4.3), we have realised that the nature of the present linguistic analysis requires the inclusion of five tabled-columns, instead, in this chapter. In addition to the three columns mentioned earlier in 5.1, two others are supplied between those of utterances and glosses. One of them represents the third column of the table in which the frequency of occurrence of a given utterance is provided. The other column is the fourth one of the table and offers the corresponding
percentages to the frequency of occurrence of each utterance. As for our way of analysis, it meets the criteria of the one already detailed in Chapter Two (see 2.6.4)

5.3.1. Some Basic Verbs

In 5.1.1, we have listed some basic verbal variants being in genealogical alternation. Some of them, we said, were recorded, and some others were removed from literature. Here, we will check the number of observations and remarks presented at that section, and then give some tentative answers to the questions raised before.

5.3.1.1. BE ABLE TO

While conducting our administered questionnaire, we asked the informants to translate the French item /puvwaR/ be able to to their dialect (ORD). The four lexical variants found in the recordings were, indeed, uttered by them as a response to the second research method. The results obtained are tabled as follows,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[nǝʒʒǝm]</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>be able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[tǝ:g]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[qǝd]</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[qǝdǝr]</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.23: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning be able to

The bedouin [nǝʒʒǝm]-producers (47) greatly outnumbered those who produced the bedouin [tǝ:g] (01). The number of [qǝd]-articulators (22), on the other hand, outweighed that of the participants who articulated [qǝd] (09). Comparatively, it is the bedouin [nǝ ʒʒǝm] which ranks first in the table, followed by the sedentary [qǝd]. With reference to our established intervals however, the latter rural and urban items respectively belong, both, to
The other two features, [ʈɑːɡ] and [q ş̣ər], are being levelled out (their interval is [0, 20]). Why are they in their way of eradication? A possible answer is that because [ʈɑːɡ] and [q ş̣ər] are still, even though not very highly, salient. [ʈɑːɡ], compared with [n ʒ̣ə ʃ̣m], is further associated with rural areas, such as TRT and BYD, and sounds more bedouin. Already in Chapter Three (see 3.2.1), we have assumed that the items [ʈʃtæh] his energy and [ʈʃʃ̣ʃ̣ ] obese make reference to /taaqa/ energy in SA (see 2.5.1.2). We have also said that their origin possibly springs out of the desert which is the source of energy.

As demonstrated by the results on the other hand, [q ş̣ər] is the least used by the respondents, probably since it is still viewed as an alien item coming from other parts of Algeria, such as sedentary Algiers. Another interpretation is that the variant [q ş̣əd] borrowed and classical. It derives from the SA feature /qadira/. In the case of [n ʒ̣ə ʃ̣m] and [q ş̣əd], the explanation is quite different. The bedouin item production overtakes the sedentary one given that the former characterises the major social network (see 2.4) of in-migrants’ speech (BSR, SBA, MKR, SAD, MST). Yet, [q ş̣əd] is originally part of ORD\(^{247}\) (Bouamrane, 1993). It also features the sedentary NDM and TSN in different forms (q ş̣əd and ?ədd respectively (ibid)). [n ʒ̣ə ʃ̣m] seems more quantitatively and attitudinally influential and acceptable by Oran speech community. It is used by the majority of current speakers in Oran and seen as more genealogically neutral.

Despite these differences, [n ʒ̣ə ʃ̣m] and [q ş̣əd], we say, are still competing lexical variants within the mix. They may be produced intra-individually (see 5.1) in everyday conversations because they form part of the Oranees’ idiolects. If no significant extra-linguistic changes (such as other in-migration processes) occur in Oran, we expect [n ʒ̣ə ʃ̣m] to win out and reach focusing. The following bare-graph illustrates the table above,

---

\(^{247}\) It also originated from TMT (Bouamrane, 1993), possibly because TMT was part of ORD in the near past.
5.3.1.2. FIND

The informants were required to supply the dialectal equivalent of the French item /truve/ find. The two recorded lexical variants were the same provided by this population. Their results are provided in the table below,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[ʂɑːb]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td>find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentarised</td>
<td>[lqa]</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.24: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the Meaning find

Indeed, [lqa]-preponderance in the recordings is further substantiated by our administered questionnaire. The almost total number of the first item-levellers (99%) translated the French verbal item into the interdialectal [lqa]. Only one informant said [ʂɑːb] which forms part of the levelling interval [0%, 25%]. The sedentarised item (see 5.1.1.2),
according to Bouamrane (1993), comes from TRT, BSR, TMT, SBA, BYD, and is already prevalent in ORD (in another form lgɛ). MKR, MOST and SAD are characterised by the bedouin [ʂɑ:b]. The use of the interdialectal form, in fact, has been reinforced by the number of internal migrant speakers who have come to settle Oran permanently. It ranks in the first position in ORD which still currently preserves the lexical form. It is, in other words, a stabilised lexical feature, in this koineising situation ([lqɑ] ∈ [75%, 100%]). Our present table is illustrated by the bare-graph which immediately follows,

---

**Graph 5.2**: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *find*

---

5.3.1.3. GET DOWN

The next French item that was translated by our respondents into dialectal Arabic was /desâdR/ *get down*. As shown in the following table, the bedouin-type [hæwɛd] preponderates with the percentage of 75%. It is followed by [nɔl], the second bedouin-type variant with the percentage of 24%, while the sedentary variant ranks last (01%). More than one lexical variant, in this range, are levelled out: [ɛl] and [hbat] belong to the interval [0%, 25%].

---

248 See 3.3 for more details
249 ʂɑ:b in Bouamrane’s (1993) transcription
Although [hæwɔd] belongs to the interval [25%, 75%), it is apparently in its way of attaining focusing. Why is the latter item preponderant? Why are [nzəl] and [hbət] being exterminated? The most likely interpretation would seem to be that [nzəl] and [hbət] are more avoidable and stotypical items among the Oranees. The bedouin [nzəl] reflects CA /nazala/ which is frequently heard in formal settings, such as political institutions, educational places, and TV or radio news. The sedentary [hbət] on the other hand may, for many Oranees, typically characterise the Algerian capital’s dialect. It happens that the young ORD-speakers tend to make fun of Algiers dialect; so, they imitate its users by ironically employing their typical vocabulary. [hbət] (or more exactly [hbət]) could be one of this funny vocabulary. [hæwɔd] is, comparatively, more dialectal and less stereotypically marked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[nzəl]</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>get down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[hæwɔd]</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[hbət]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.25: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning get down

The following figure gives perhaps a more obvious picture of the lexical variantal situation,
5.3.1.4. GIVE

Consider the following table and its corresponding graph,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[ʕʈɑ]</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[mǝd]</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.26:** Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *give*

The result of translating the French term */done/ give* into ORD was two lexical variants in number: the bedouin-type [ʕʈɑ] with 61%, scoring before the sedentary-type [mǝd] with 39%. The two items prevail in our first corpus. The obtained results corroborate our first impression indicated in 5.1.1.4, saying that the bedouin variant is more victorious than the sedentary one. Nevertheless, the frequency of their occurrences is not so divergent since they, both, belong to the same interval, [25%, 75%]. We think that the participants use intra-individually these lexical variants which are in free variation. The young Oranees have the freedom to select the
variants from their verbal repertoire, regardless of the difference in genealogical and/or variantal structure. The one item which will win out would be supposedly the bedouin one owing to its greater social network: in-migrants and local users (see 2.2.2).

5.3.1.5. GO

The seemingly striking amount of lexical variability, in our recordings and literature (see 5.1.1.5), regarding the variable go did not exactly match the results achieved by means of the administered survey. Four out of five lexical variants were supplied by the informants in their translation of the French term /paRtiR/. A total absence was noticed of any production of \( [\gamma^{(w)}da] \) (00%). In contrast, the occurrences of [ra:h] well-markedly reigned the variantal group in terms of frequency (95%). Neglectful were finally the results attributed to the rest of lexical features: [rawwæh] (03%), [jawwar] (01%) and [mʃa] (01%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[ra:h]</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[rawwæh]</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[jawwar]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([\gamma^{(w)}da])^{250}</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[mʃa]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.27: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning go

All the above lexical features have been realised by the in-migrants’ and local individuals’ speech: [ra:h] is found in TRT, ORD, MKR, MST, SAD; [jawwar] is involved in BSA; [rawwæh] is used by TMT; [mʃa] is witnessed in TSN and NDM (Bouamrane, 1993). Table 5.27 implies that all the lexical variants have gone beyond the mixing stage. The above items have been exposed to levelling, except the preponderant [ra:h] which is solely focused.

^{250} This variant is bedouin according to Heath (2002)
However, the bedouin \([\text{fawwar}]\) and the sedentary \([\text{mʃa}]\) (the outcome of fusion between \([\text{mʃa}]\) and \([\text{mʃæ}]\)) are in fact not disappearing, but re-ascribed other semantic roles. \([\text{fawwar}]\) conveys the meaning of *leave* whereas \([\text{mʃa}]\) actually manifests as *walk*: Semantic reallocation then emerges again. The remaining utterance \([\text{rawwæh}]\), originally employed by TMT, has undergone the process of simplification (see 1.4.2.2.3) to finally turn into \([\text{raːh}]\) and reinforces the frequency of its occurrences. The graph below illustrates further the results,

![Graph 5.5: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning go](image)

5.3.1.6. HIDE

As expected, the lexical variants found in Bouamrane (1993) were all articulated by our participants once required to supply the translation of the French item /kaʃe/ *hide*. Yet, their proportions were not exactly alike. We can group \([(n)ðəs] [drəg]\) and \([t(s)χəbba]\) because they all represent the interval \([0, 20]\). One variant, \([χzən]\), stands in isolation since it belongs to \([59, 79]\). More precise numeral results are shown in the following,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>([χzən])</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.28: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *hide*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[(n)dǝs]</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[drǝg]</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sedentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[t(s)χǝbb]</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corresponding graph to the table is below,

Graph 5.6: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *hide*

Apparent time observation demonstrates that the bedouin-type [χǝn], in Bouamrane (1993), has already existed in the lexical system of ORD, in addition to its presence in at least TRT, TMT, MKR and MST. The speakers, in-migrants and local inhabitants, of the rural dialects at hand constitute the major social network (see 1.2.4) in Oran speech community. Minor variantal groups are the other lexical items: Bedouin [(n)dǝs] is encountered in BYD, BSR, SBA; SAD makes use of the bedouin [drǝg]; [t(s) χǝbb] is sedentary (TSN and NDM). We can conclude that the victorious variant is being focused as it knows a great number of
users. The other bedouin and sedentary variants are under the impact of disappearance since the group of their levelers is obviously sizeable.

5.3.1.7. HOLD

All the lexical variants encountered in the recordings were elicited from the respondents in their translation of the French conjugated verbal word /il tē/ he holds. The original sources of [ʃǝd], [hkǝm], [gbǝd] are detailed in Chapter Three (see 3.3.4).

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[ʃǝd]</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[hkǝm]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[gbǝd]</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedouinised</td>
<td>[gdǝb]</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.29: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning hold

The table entails that the interval [25%, 75%] involves [ʃǝd] on the basis of the percentage of frequency of this variant (54%). The bedouin [hkǝm] and [gbǝd] as well as the bedouinised [gdǝb] mark their affiliation to the interval [0%, 25%]. Let us now give an attempted interpretation to this lexical situation. The local [hkǝm] is being more and more reduced (13%) under the threat of [ʃǝd] which has been transmitted to Oran via huge numbers of internal migrant populations towards the city (see 2.2.3). [gbǝd], on the other hand, may be still subjected to gradual metathesis (see 3.3.4 and 5.1.1.7), and will probably end by disappearing. [gdǝb] however is gaining ground; yet, it is being reallocated another semantic function: It is increasingly being manifested as catch (e.g. to catch a means of transport: car, bus, train…). In brief, two lexical variants are being maintained; the bedouin [ʃǝd] with the meaning hold and the bedouinised [gdǝb] with the meaning catch. Although the two variants
belong to different intervals, we predict semantic reallocation to lead to their convergence in frequency through time.

Graph 5.7: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *hold*

5.3.1.8. LIE

Examine the table below,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[tkassal]</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>lie down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[tmad(ǝd)]</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[mbq[ah]</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[(t)warǝk]</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>[rəjjaеh]</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>07%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[(a)lag (ruhæh)]</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[twǝka]</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[maʃtale]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[taraх]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nearly ten lexical items were provided by the participants. This number overtakes the one expected before undertaking the administered questionnaire (see 5.1.1.8). Bouamrane (1993) attests that [tkɔsɔl] is natively existent in ORD and simultaneously used in TRT and MKR. [tmad] emanates from BSR, BYD, SBA (one informant uttered the item as [tmaḍad]). The sole sedentary variant [(t)warɛk] springs out from TSN and NDM. [mb qaʃæh], coming from bedouin TMT, is a totally absent utterance in our second research method. The remainder of items has no clear genealogical source. [tmad(ød)], [rajjaæh], [(u)lag ruhæh], [twɔka], [maʃtele], [tɔrah], [qajæ ruhæh] are inter-individual utterances, increasingly levelled out. They realise respectively the percentages (02%), (07%), (10%), (04%), (01%), (01%), (01%), which all refer back to the interval [0%, 25%]. The enormous amount of variability keeps temporarily the bedouin [tkɔsɔl] in the mixing interval, [25%,75%]. This complexity is a typical kind of dialectal mixture situation survived by the Oranees. The large gap between the results obtained by the latter and the other variants implies long-term focusing of the lexical variant [tkɔsɔl]. It is, on the other hand, clear that the participants have not succeeded yet in entirely eliminating the minor variants which are still at times taking place. The graph below corresponds to the above table,
5.3.1.9. PICK UP

In response to the translation of the French /Ramase/ pick up, the informants’ dialectal utterances were [rvǝd], together with [la:m] in alternation with [la:jǝm]. Unlike our expectations, the items [tallal] and [sǝlli] were not produced. The following table indicates the genealogical lineage of the variants together with their numeral results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[rvǝd]</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[tallal]</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[sǝlli]</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>pick up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>[la:(jǝ)m]</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.31: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning pick up
The bedouin-type [rfad] (which manifests as [rvad] above), according to Bouamrane (1993), emanates from ORD, TMT, BYD and MKR. The other bedouin-type variant, [tallɑʕ], originates from TRT, SBA, SAD and MST. The sedentary-type [ʕǝlli] comes from TSN and NDM. We perceive from the table that 08 informants uttered items between [la:m] and [la:jǝm]. The genealogical and regional sources of these utterances are, to the best of our knowledge, not clear. They will possibly disappear since the number of their occurrences does not go beyond the boundaries of the interval [0, 20]. As regards [rd], it was articulated 71 times which means that it meets the conditions of the focusing interval [59,79]. This variant will end by stabilising and fulfilling the meaning *pick up*. Here is the bare-graph illustrating the table above.

![Graph 5.9](image)

**Graph 5.9:** Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *pick up*

### 5.3.1.10. RAINFALL

52 informants varied inter-individually their production between [tsab] and [tsob]. 24 out of 79 opted for [tʃe:h] and 02 participants provided [tənʒal]. One informant did not give any response however. Obviously, the bedouin-type [tsab] / [tsob] and sedentary-type [tʃe:h] belong to the same interval [20,59] whereas [tənʒal] is in its way of levelling. These were the results of our participants’ translation of the French utterance /il plø/ *the rain falls,*
The rain falls

Table 5.32: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning the rain falls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[təsəb]/ [təsɔb]</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>The rain falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[ttɛːh]</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[tənzɔl]</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason behind the differences in frequency of occurrence could be attitudinal. As indicated earlier (see 5.1.1.10), [nə], the perfective form of the imperfective [tənzɔl], is related to CA /nazala/, which sounds relatively formal; therefore, it is increasingly avoided in informal settings. The more informality takes place, the less this variant is used. The same could be said about its derivatives, such as [tənzɔl]. In the case of [ttɛːh] and [təsəb] (or [təsɔb]), they are, apparently reallocated. The reason why the second variant ranks before the first, in terms of frequency, may be because it stands as the first candidate which can win out with the meaning the rain falls. Yet, [ttɛːh] is being reattributed another semantic role, fall down (person, animal or object). Finally, the blank is probably due to the participant’s hesitation in supplying one of the lexical items. Or, he could have been tired or rushing, as said earlier. The following graph probably demonstrates more clearly the results,
5.3.1.11. SEND

Levelling, a key mechanism in the new-dialect formation, is currently at work. \([\text{ze:fat}], [\text{se:fat}]\) and \([\text{b\'æt}]\) realise percentages within the interval \([0\%, 25\%]\). The phenomenon of vowel diphthongisation is totally absent between the first and second consonants in \([\text{ze:fat}]\). The number of producers of these variants (\([\text{ze:fat}],[\text{se:fat}]\) and \([\text{b\'æt}]\)) does not exceed five. The opposite process, focusing, is at operation for \([\text{rs\'el}]\) which was provided by much more than three quarters of the total number of our participants. Its numeral affiliation to the interval \([25\%, 75\%]\) entails that the variant is achieving stability. The results above correspond to the informants’ translation of the French verbal utterance /âvaje/ send. Let us consider the table and its bare-graph below,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>([\text{rs'el}])</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([\text{ze:fat}])</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([\text{z'afat}])</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>([\text{se:fat}])</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td>send</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.33: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *send*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
<th>[bʕæt]</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Graph 5.11: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *send*

Originally, ORD (together with TMT and SBA) (Bouamrane, 1993) possessed the bedouin-type *[zeːfat]*. As noticed, one ORD-participant tended to produce the initial voiced sound in *[zeːfat]*, instead of the initial voiceless sound, as it occurs in sedentary dialects such as TSN and NDM ([*ʃeːfat*]). However, the item *[zeːfat]* (01%), like *[ʃeːfat]* (01%), is nearly levelled out in our participants’ speech, leaving the ground to the giant percentage realised by *[rsɔl]* (94%). This highest percentage reflects the frequency of occurrences with respect to an item initially coming from TRT, BSR, BYD and MKR (ibid). Aguadé (1998) mentions that the same verbal item is used in the Moroccan bedouin-type *Zʕiːr* dialect. How about the remaining genealogically unknown item? What is its position compared with the predominant variant? Although *[rsɔl]* and *[bʕæt]* reflect respectively CA /ʔarsala/ and /baʕaθa/, the latter seems more formal than the former in Oran speech community given that the bedouin-type *[rsɔl]* is employed by the vast majority of arrivals to Oran.
5.3.2. Kinship Terms

Our two ranges of lexical variants corresponding respectively to the concepts *child* and *wife* have been deeply affected by levelling and its related koineisation processes. The main results are methodologically presented in the same way as it has been the case in the previous sections.

5.3.2.1. CHILD

Our participants supplied all the expected lexical varietal equivalents of the French item /ãfã/ *child*: [bǝz], [ɣurja:n], [ʈfɑl] and [wǝld]. The regions, for Bouamrane (1991), which correspond to these items are as follows: [bǝz] is held by the lexical system of ORD, TMT and SBA; [ɣurja:n] is employed in MKR, [ʈfɑl] is possessed by BYD, and [wǝld] features NDM (see 5.1.2.1). All the uttered lexical variants are present within the interval of levelling, [0%, 25%[, except [bǝz] which rather prevails in [25%,75%]. The percentages of each item are given in the table below,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[bǝz]</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td><em>child</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ɣurja:n]</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ʈfɑl]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[wǝld]</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.34: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *child***

As said above, the bedouin-type [bǝz] has been the focused lexical form denoting the concept *child* in ORD. Due to internal migration, this variant has lost its primitive status and entered in competition with other regional as well as genealogical variants. Probably, [bǝz]
has consequently changed its interval from [75%, 100%] to [25%, 75%] and is currently experiencing a mixing process. The results above may predict that the preponderant utterance will regain its focused position, following the colossal interspace between its realised percentage and those percentages attained by its lexical counterparts. The following representation exemplifies the results in the form of bare-graph,

**Graph 5.12:** Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *child*

### 5.3.2.2. WIFE

Let us examine the table below,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[maṛt(i)]</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>(my) <em>wife</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[mṛa (tae[i])]</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[mrat(i)]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.35:** Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *wife*
When asking the informants to supply the dialectal translation of /fam/ *wife*, they uttered [mra] *woman*, because the French item carries two meanings: wife and woman. We then explained to them that we meant *wife* by adding the object pronoun [i] *my*. We finally got three forms [marṭ(i)] *my wife*, [mṛa (tæʃi)] *the wife of mine*, and [mṛati] *my wife*. The almost total absence of the sedentary feature, [mrat(i)], which flows from TSN and NDM, is ascribed to levelling. The same could be said about [mṛa (tæʃi)] which may be also considered as sedentary due to its analytic structure. It was obtained at a very low level of frequency (02%). On the other hand, the synthetic construction [marṭ(i)] which may have been metathesised (see 3.3.4) in the majority of bedouin-type dialects (ORD, TMT, SBA, BKR, MKR, SAD, BYD and MST) (Bouamrane, 1993) apparently meets the conditions of the focusing interval, [59,79]. As many lexical items, [marṭi] *my wife* existed in ORD and still prevails in the dialect as it is heavily employed by bedouin-type dialects transplanted to Oran via their in-migrant users. The following bare-graph is related to the table above,

**Graph 5.13**: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *wife*
5.3.3. Animals

Even though levelling does not involve every single lexical variant, it is indeed the primary cause of focusing and other koineisation processes. This is also the case of genealogical animal items obtained via the fieldworker’s administered questionnaire.

5.3.3.1. HORSE

We recall that ORD has been the theatre of transmission and contact between mutually intelligible varieties. The resultant dialectal mix-situation paves the way for the formation a koine (new dialect) via koineisation processes. Through levelling, huge numbers of lexical items from distinct varieties in the mixture are diminished. At the end, single variants are retained. In the case of horse, two lexical utterances were elicited from the respondents: [ʕæwd] seems focused and forms part of the interval [59,79], but [ħʂɑn] is being nearly levelled out. The question is: Why is [ʕæwd] conserved while [ħʂɑn] almost lost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[ʕæwd]</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[ħʂɑn]</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.36: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning horse

We have mentioned above that SA makes use of both lexical variants in different forms. Relatively speaking however, the bedouin-type [ʕæwd] is archaic and has gone through semantic modifications (see 5.1.3.1). The sedentary-type [ħʂɑn] is more recent and usually encountered in MSA: /ħiʂɑn/. The informants are likely aware of the actual status of the second item; so, they may find it associated with formality unlike the first utterance which is comparatively more dialectal. It is then obvious that in informal situations, the Oranees tend
to use [ʕæwd] much more frequently than [ħɔn], if not almost totally. The bare-graph of the
table above is as follows,

![Graph 5.14: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning horse](image)

5.3.3.2. COCKEREL

The lexical variants in the table below could be classified into two groups: the first
category which is being eliminated and the other one embodying a single variant which is
exposed to focusing. Those nearly lost lexical features depend on the minority of their users
and/or dialects to which they originally belong (see 1.4.2.2.2). For example, the utterance
[ʊrdʊ:k] (03) is limited to the speech of MST among the main Algerian western dialects
(Bouamrane, 1993). Likewise, [ʃrɛ:ʒ] (01) is localised within sedentary TSN and NDM. On
the contrary, the focused item, [di:k] (74), is broadly widespread among the bedouin-type
varieties indicated by the author (ORD, TRT, TMT, SBA, SAD, MKR, BKR, and BYD).
Blank is explained in the same way as in 5.3.1.10.
Table 5.37: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *cockrel*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[diːk]</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[sərdʊ:k]</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[fərռuːʒ]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, the number of levelled items is present within \([0,20]\) whereas the stabilised utterance has its number within the borders of \([59,79]\). We join Trudgill (2004)’s hypothesis that, at lower numbers \([0, 20]\), minor linguistic elements are seen as idiosyncracies which might have been randomly generationally transmitted.

Graph 5.15: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *cockrel*
Lexical idiosyncracies, like [sərdu:k] and [ʃruː ʒ], might have been used by certain bidialectal informants (see 1.4.4) within a restricted setting (e.g. family house), a fact which is not enough for their diffusion.

5.3.4. Implements

In our examination of the results obtained in the case of the implements spoon and well, we have detected that not all the variants have born levelling process. Analysis is proceeded in the following two sub-sections.

5.3.4.1. SPOON

The participants’ responses were not exactly compatible with our prepared list of lexical variants. Compared with Table 5.16, compatibility occurred with regard to the bedouin-type [muɣruf], although some respondents opted for [muɣrufa]; and, the sedentary-type [mʕila] was rather merely uttered by two questioned informants in the administered survey. The difference, however, is the total absence of the sedentary-type [mʕilʔa], but the unexpected presence of [tiflud], which is a non-Arabic item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[muɣruf(a)]</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[mʕila]</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[mʕilʔa]</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>[tiflud]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.38: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning spoon
As regards sedentary utterances, our respondents avoided the variants stereotypically indicated as sedentary, such as [mʕilʔa] in which the glottal stop is a stereotype associated with TSN (see Dendane, 2006). Also, the variant [mʕilqa] (originating from NDM) is very weakly realised by its native users in ORD, and this is not sufficient for the Oranees to grasp and involve it in their verbal repertoire. It manifests in a low frequency, within the interval [0, 20]. [tiflud] is a Berber element produced by one Berber speaker (see 2.5.1.2). The latter is bilingual and fluent in ORD, but this fact does not prevent him from using Berber vocabulary, out of his family environment, with Arabic dialect speakers. Finally, the bedouin-type [muɣruf(a)] occurs with the highest percentage (96%). It has reached focusing because it does not escape the general trend that the dominant item is employed by the immense majority of speakers. It comes from ORD, TRT, MKR, BSR, MST, SAD, BSA, and TMT. Clearly, the lexical feature already prevail in the local dialect, then it has been further reinforced by other contributing dialects employed by the major group of speakers. We supply the following bare-graph to the table just above,

![Graph 5.16: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning spoon](image)

5.3.4.2. WELL

Unlike spoon, the results corresponding to well are compatible with our prepared list of lexical variants in the administered questionnaire. The numerals indicate that both lexical
variants are present within the borders of the interval [25%,75%]. The items at hand are
typical examples of a dialect-mixture situation. Still surviving the process of mixing, it is not
easy to decide which one of them will overtake the other, which one will disappear and which
item will achieve focusing. The informants may presently display idiolects (see 1.2.4) with
remarkable *intra*-individual variability. Said differently, one Oranee may possess the two
items within his verbal repertoire and use them interchangeably in his very ordinary
interactions. The bedouin-type [hæssi] and sedentary-type [bi:r] are, we notice, converging in
their frequency. This fact substantiates our assumption in 5.1.4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[hæssi]</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[bi:r]</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.39**: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *well*

The table above corresponds to the graph below,

**Graph 5.17**: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *well*
5.3.5. Other Miscellaneous Terms

Since the lexical elements *all* and *hot* are exhibited to genealogical variation, it is worth treating the two variants statistically in order to predict more objectively the final destination of bedouin and sedentary features as a consequence of koineisation.

5.3.5.1. *ALL*

At first glance of the informants’ translation of the French element /tu/ *all*, we get the impression that there is a high variability in their production: [gæʕ] alternates with [kæʕ] and [kulʃ] alternates with [kulʃi], and that all the items are in simultaneous variation. However, numerals imply a different interpretation. [kæʕ] is articulated by one informant only. [kulʃ(i)] is a genealogically unknown item which is apparently composed of [kul] and [ʃ(i)]. It may have been acquired under the effect of SA and adopted dialectally. We can then consider it bedouin. The other bedouin-type item [gæʕ] is realised by 52 out of 79 informants. The table demonstrates a plausible competition between the two bedouin-type variants. They belong to the same interval [20,59], which refers here to mixing at work. A possible prediction is that [gæʕ] and [kulʃ(i)] may bear a future reallocation whereby the first item will be retained for informal conversations and settings while the second one will be conserved for formal situations. We also suggest that the sedentary-type [ka:mal] has been removed very early in the mixture owing to its extreme localised status. The table below is followed by an illustrative bare-graph,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[gæʕ]</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[kæʕ]</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[ka:mal]</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>[kulʃ(i)]</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.40: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *all*

| Graph 5.18: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *all* |

5.3.5.2. HOT

Consider our last table in this section and its illustrative graph,

| Table 5.41: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *hot* |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[hæːmi]</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td><em>hot</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[sʔuːn]</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All our respondents realised the opposite of [bæːrəd] cold as the bedouin-type [hæːmi] hot except two of them who said [sχuːn] hot, the sedentary-type. As observed in daily life, the bedouin item occurs much more frequently than the sedentary one. This is perhaps because [sχuːn] is confined rather to TSN. The item could have insufficiently prevailed in the dialect mix to be retained later. It has not been present in plentiful quantities to become part of the informants’ speech. When checking the participants’ information on their social background, we have realised that the informant providing the sedentary element is originally from Tlemcen. In short, the ultimate end point of the bedouin-type [hæːmi] is seemingly focusing while levelling covers its sedentary counterpart.

Graph 5.19: Levelling and Lexical Variants with the meaning *hot*

(Bar graph showing 98% for [hæːmi] and 2% for [sχuːn])

5.4. Focusing

While undertaking our first research method, it was plausible for certain recorded lexical features, Hilalian or pre-Hilalian, that their frequency of occurrence did not need to go through verification, given the fact that their recurrently appeared as individual elements in the recordings. No significant competition prevailed between them and other lexical candidates. These utterances have, in fact, attained the final stage which occurs simultaneously with the koine-development process. They have been, in other words, crystallised because of focusing (see 1.4.3).
5.4.1. Some Basic Verbs

Not all the elementary genealogical verbs are still undergoing koineisation processes; many of them have already reached the final step in which they have turned stabilised. In this section of focusing, we will be content with this genealogically verbal category because it is relatively the most exhaustive.

5.4.1.1. COME IN

In his article *A propos du parler Arabe de Tripoli (Libye). Un parler mixte*, Pareira (2002) gives the genealogical classification of a number of lexical items, among which the corresponding lexical equivalents of *come in* are outlined as follows,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[χɔʃʃ]</td>
<td><em>come in</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[dχɔl]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.42: Lexical Variants with the meaning *come in*

In the case Tripoli Arabic, the author specifies that both categories co-prevail in their various manifestations. He cites, on the one hand, the bedouin-type *xaʃʃ “he came in”* and *ɪxuʃʃ “he comes in”* and then provides the sedentary-type *dxaʃ “he came in”* and *yudxʊl “he comes in”* (the author’s transcription). In our findings, we came across the latter-type derivatives, such as *[dɔχlu] they came in*; *[j(o)dʌχlu] they come in*; *[nʌdɔχul] I come in*; *[jʌdɔχul] he comes in*; *[tʌdɔχul] you come in*. Bouamrane (1993) generalises the focused use of the sedentary-type item in many Algerian western dialects, both bedouin (except BYD which entails *χæʃʃ*) and sedentary varieties. Our recorded interviews attest the constant sedentary retention in our participants’ speech.

---

251 respectively *xaʃʃ, dxaʃ* in Pareira’s (2002) transcription
252 This table and the other subsequent ones include our transcription
5.4.1.2. LOVE, WANT, DESIRE

Affectionate verbal items could be also lexically basic. Love (and its equivalents, such as want and desire) is sedentarily realised as ḥebb (Caubet, 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[bya]</td>
<td>love, want, desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[ḥhɔb]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.43: Lexical Variants with the meaning love, want, desire

The bedouin Tripoli dialect, in which lexis is mixed, contains the two genealogical derivatives (Pareira, 2002): the bedouin-type [bya] is realised as ba or ḥḥā “he wanted, loved, desired” and yāba or yeḥḥi “he wants, loves, desires” and the sedentary-type ḥabb “loved” and iḥḥabb “he loves”. As mentioned, the sedentary verbal item carries solely the meaning of love. As regards ORD, The bedouin type verbal variant was the only utterance produced by the participants, in its various derivative forms, such as [tɔbyi] she love, wants, desires; [jɔbyu] they love, want, desire; [nɔbyu] we love, want, desire; [tɔbyu] you (plur) love, want, desire; [byaw] they loved, wanted, desired; [nɔbyyi] I love, want, desire; [ma:-jɔbyi-ʃ] he does not love, want, desire. The bedouin lexical variant [bya] is therefore crystalised in ORD as a consequence of focusing.

5.4.1.3. RETURN

Pareira’s (2002) genealogical classificatory list of items involves the following variants corresponding to return,
The author aims at showing the important role of mixing played in the bedouin-type Tripoli Arabic. The variety exhibits the coexistence of the bedouin variant wallâ “he returned” and its variants, such as iwulli “he returns”, together with the sedentary ržæʕ “he returned” and its variants, such as yeržæʕ “he returns” (the author’s transcription). In the Algerian west, Bouamrane (1993) almost agrees with Pareira’s genealogical list. He relates the presence of wɔllæ he returns with bedouin dialects (as he calls them), such as ORD, TMT, SBA, MKR, BSR, MST and SAD. The sedentary-type rʒæʕ is, still according to him, rather found in NDM. However, he adds that the bedouin dialects TRT and BYD are characterised by the occurrence of the sedentarised variant rʒæʕ, in contrast to TSN which exhibits its possession of the bedouinised wɔllæ. Examining our first data validates the prevalence of the bedouin item in ORD. This variety possesses and still maintains the same genealogical variant out of focusing. It is again the high number of its users which has reinforced its stable occurrence in the dialect in question. When carefully listening to our recorded interviews, the fieldworker could extract the following bedouin forms, [nwɔlu] we come back; [jwɔlu] they come back; [wullaw] they came back.

5.4.1.4. SEE, LOOK

Another lexical item is worth mentioning. See (or look) has genealogically two lexical corresponding variants; šāf is a typical Meghrebi bedouin item (Caubet, 2001). ra, on the other hand, forms part of the sedentary lexis in the Maghreb (ibid).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[ʃa:f]</td>
<td>see, look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[ra:]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sedentary Meghrebi variant is shared with other pre-Hilalian dialects, such as Andalusi Arabic rā? (Vanhove, 1998). As for the bedouin-type Tripoli dialect (Pareira, 2002), both genealogical items are present and so are their several sedentary and bedouin-type derivative forms. However, its bedouin variant is different from the bedouin variant given in the table [ʃaːf]. Instead, Tripoli dialect witnesses the presence of šbah “he saw, looked”; yešbah “he sees, looks”. It is also reported, by the author, that the pre-Hilalian verbal variant [ra] “see, look” is confined in this Arabic variety to the 1st and 2nd pers perfectives. In the case of Bouamrane (1991), he refers to the bedouin-type faʃ “see, look” as widespread among many Algerian western dialects, whether bedouin (ORD, TMT, TRT, MKR, BSR, SBA or BYD) or sedentary (TSN and NDM where the item is perhaps bedouinsed). Indeed, the typical Maghrébi [ʃaːf] is encountered without competitor in our interviews in its various forms, [ʃuːfi] you (sing fem) see, look (fem sing); [ʃətti] you (sing fem) saw, looked; [ʃuːfu] we see, look. The observable sociolinguistic reality shows the absence of sedentary variant in Oran speech community, a fact that is corroborated by our above findings.

### 5.4.1.5. TAKE (AWAY)

One helpful method to know the genealogical lineage of our lexical features can be proceeded by comparing our participants’ speech features with data in Caubet’s (2001) work. take (away) is, according to the linguist, realised as,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[dda:]</td>
<td>take (away)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[ʃəbbə]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bouamrane (1993) confirms ḏḍǟ-prevalence among a number of Algerian bedouin dialects: ORD, TMT, MKR, BSR, SBA, BYD and TRT, and that ṣabbǟ exists in sedentary TSN and NDM. The bedouin focusing is noticed throughout data provided by our recordings: [jəddu] they take; [naddu] we take; [ddaw] they took. As noticed, the item in question has already been in the original variety, next to the above derivatives. They all have not been displaced from their lexical position in spite of the recurrent internal migration to Oran. On the contrary, the demographic mobility has helped their preservation by bedouin speakers. Indeed and as mentioned earlier, items such as [ddːː] and its derivatives have a great number of users from different regional backgrounds. The sedentary ṣəbbie, on the other hand, could be known among some few Oranees, but not understood among many others. This variantal unintelligibility is probably the cause of rarity of the sedentary item in our findings.

### 5.4.1.6. THROW

According to Bouamrane (1991) throw is majorly realised as the bedouin-type [qas] in the Algerian western dialects such as, ORD, TMT, MKR, BSR, SBA, BYD and TRT; yet, it manifests as the sedentary-type [sejjeb] in other few dialects such as TSN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[qaːs]</td>
<td>throw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[səkkeb]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.47: Lexical Variants with the meaning throw

We could have extracted the following derivative utterances from the recorded interviews, [jəqːəˈʊ] they throw; [jəqːə] he throws; [təqːəˈʊ(ha)] she throws (it). As clearly seen,
this bedouin verbal form (in addition to its derivatives) is unique in the recordings. The reason behind the total absence of [ṣjjāb] on the contrary may be explained by the fact that it has been probably used by TSN-migrant speakers at the initial contact but the item, via levelling process, has gradually disappeared from the dialect mix due to its localised status.

5.4.2. Some Salient Basic Verbs

The Algerian sedentary populations are well-known for their conservatism of social and linguistic traditions. Their tendency may even affect immigrants and get them involved in their sedentary way of living. Linguistically however, certain sedentary features sound too much salient that could likely make a non-sedentary hearer react unfavourably (by for example making negative comments, laughing or showing miscomprehension).

5.4.2.1. DO

This lexical feature is a very basic verb in ordinary life. According to Caubet (2001), this verbal item genealogically falls into two lexical variants, bedouin dār and sedentary ᵃᵐˡ. In Tripoli dialect, Pareira (2002) mentions that the two genealogically variants take place, in their different derivative forms, the bedouin-type dār “he did”, iḍīr “he does” and the sedentary-type ᵃᵐˡ “he did”, yaⁿˡ “he does”. In Bouamrane (1993), dӕːr is, indeed, the variant employed by the bedouin Algerian western dialects, such as ORD, TRT, TMT, MKR, BKR, SBA, BYD, MST and SAD. Yet, the variant ᵃᵐˡ belongs to sedentary TSN and NDM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[dæːr]</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[ᵃᵐˡ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.48**: Lexical Variants with the meaning *do*

Our recordings corroborrate the existence of the bedouin variant in ORD as the sole uniform dialectal equivalent to *do*, in its widely derivative forms, as in [dær] *I did* ; [ma:-
I did not do, [ddi:ru] you (plur) do; [jdi:ru] they do; [dæ:ru] they did; [ndi:ru] we do, [ma:-ndi:ru-ʃ] we do not do; [dærna] we did; [jdi:r] he does; [ndi:r(æh)] I do (it). We did not encounter the sedentary form; its absence was almost absolute. Lexical localised utterances, such as [ʕməl], may acquire saliency due to their partial or total unintelligibility by the major group, including in-migrants and local population. The occurrence of mutual unintelligibility accelerates levelling process whereby variants causing comprehension difficulties are lessened. Otherwise, sedentary speakers turn dialect switchers (see 1.4.4) depending on the contextual situation. They reallocate the sedentary features such as [ʕməl] restricted uses with those who share with them the same dialectal system, but the same sedentary users change their way of speaking as soon as they meet bedouin speakers. Here, sociostylistic reallocation takes place.

5.4.2.2. GET UP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typology</th>
<th>utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedouin</td>
<td>[noːd]</td>
<td>get up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
<td>[qoːm]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.49: Lexical Variants with the meaning get up

In addition to dialect-switching, the participant observation (see 2.6.5) implies that, in Oran, many TSN or NDM migrant speakers (and their children), especially males significantly become bidialectal speakers (see 1.4.4) as a consequence of avoiding their negative linguistic assessment or miscomprehension by bedouin interactants. They opt for their native dialect within the family circle or with other speakers with whom they share their dialectal system, but use ORD when conversing with Oranees or other non-sedentaries. They, in other words, decide for “…the maintenance of the two systems as separate rather than constituting points on a continuum…” (Trudgill, 2004: 90). This is the case of the lexical variant qôm “get up” which also occurs in the pre-Hilalian Tanger Arabic (Iraqui-Sinaceur, 1998). In ORD, such a feature is avoided by young sedentary speakers who are careful with
whom to use it. Instead, we have broadly come across [nɔːd] *he got up* in its different forms within the corpus, such as [tnɔːd] *you (sing masc) get up*; [tnɔːdə] *you (sing fem) get up*; [nɔːdɔ] *they got up*; [jnoːdɔ] *they get up*; [nnoːd] *I got up*; [jnoːd] *he gets up*. Heath (2002) says that these verbal forms are generally considered a mutation of CA (√nhd). Therefore, we regard them in this study as bedouin.

5.5. Conclusion

Internal migration has engendered a high degree of linguistic variation mostly noticeable at the lexical level. Sociolinguistic observations, confirmed by the present findings, indicate the prevalence of both intra-individual and inter-individual variability in everyday interactions. However, different genealogical lexical variants undergo koineisation processes at different degrees. Some originally bedouin and sedentary elements are still surviving rudimentary mixing. A case in point is the bedouin [nɔʒʒɛm] *be able to*, [ʕʈɑ] *well* which experience the above koineisation process simultaneously and respectively with the sedentary [qad], [mad], [biːr].

Some other genealogical lexical forms have gone beyond mixing to reach semantic reallocation. Many bedouin and sedentary items still co-exist, acquiring however new semantic functions. The most significant examples encountered in this investigation are the bedouin [rgɔd] *sleep*, [dag] *stab*, [raːh] *go*, [ʦ(o)h] *rain falls* which co-prevail with their sedentary counterparts [nɛs] *feel sleepy*, [drab] *beat*, [ʃɔwɔr] *leave* (in addition to the item [mʃa] *walk*), [tuːh] *fall down*. However, the bedouin [jɔmɔs] *sit* and [ʃad] *hold* co-occur respectively with the bedouinised [ʃud] *remain* and [gdoʊ] *catch*.

Despite of this seeming genealogical lexical variability, many items are in their way of focusing, or have already achieved stabilisation. Meanwhile, their lexical counterparts have born eradication. Clear-cut recorded cases are the following; except the focused [dʒɔl] *come in*, all the other sedentary lexical elements are levelled out: the focused Bedouins are [dæːr] *do*, [hæwɔd] *get down*, [nɔːd] *get up*, [χɔm] *hide*, [tɡɔsɔl] *lie*, [bya] *love, want, desire*, [ɾvɔd] *pick up*, [wɔlla] *return*, [ʃaːf] *see, look*, [ɾsɔl] *send*, [dɔː] *take away*, [qoːs] *throw*, [bɔz] *child*, [mɔt] *wife*; [diːk] *cockerel*, [ʃɔwɔd] *horse*; [muːɾʊf(ə)] *spoon*; [gæs] *all*, [hæːmi] *hot*. Their respective levelled counterparts are [ʃmɔːl], [hɔt], [qoːm], [t(s)ʃɔbba], [(t)warak], [hɔb],
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During mixing and reallocation, both bedouin and sedentary forms are retained. In the case of extermination, one of the genealogical elements is levelled while the other is generally stabilised. In the current research, focused lexical variants constitute the major group and are obviously bedouin. Therefore, the bedouin composition of Oran dialect is further substantiated at the lexical level.
GENERAL CONCLUSION

Change constancy is recognised by the scientific community as an inescapable phenomenon; life is incessantly changing and so is everything in it. Difference results from change over time just like the world in the 90’s differs from what it was in the 60’s. Neither tomorrow is like today nor is yesterday similar to tomorrow. What happened in summer last year is also different from what will occur this year in this same season. Difference is also evoked by variation through social, contextual or geographical space. Women differ from men and adults from children. Formal situations require different behaviour from informal ones, as it is easy to differentiate between regions. Since language is part of the whole, it is, at the same time, changeable and variable. Geographically, language dynamicity is obvious when contrasting different states of regional varieties or dialects in different points in time. Dialects are also different in the same point in time because they are exposed to variation. The scientific study of regional varieties is known as dialectology.

Sociolinguistic dialectology studies dialects on the basis of sociolinguistic principles. Genealogical Arabic dialectology is one sub-field that is interested in Arabic dialect types with reference to their speakers’ blood ties: In his The Muqaddimah Prolegomena (14th c), Ibn Khaldoun conceives the humans as bedouin or sedentary. The Bedouins are generally satisfied with the basic living necessities of food, clothing and housing for surviving. Going beyond the level of such fundamental human demands provide them with better conditions and lead them to a relatively more moneyed and restful life. They become sedentary cities’ inhabitants and represent clearly therefore the Sedentaries’ antecedents. Said differently, life starts as bedouin then gradually evolves to turn sedentary. The Arabs who are, for Ibn Khaldoun, originally Bedouins have bedouin varieties as well. The Muslim-Arab conquests (/al futuhaat al islaamija/) have paved the way for extending the use of bedouin Arabic into many cities out of the Arab peninsula. In these new environments, the impact of language contact has changed the perception of bedouin Arabic varieties which have acquired the designation of sedentary Arabic dialects.

The position of Ibn Khaldoun does not differ from the Ancient Arabic grammarians who say that long-term contact between bedouin Arabic and non-Arabic languages has evoked the emergence of sedentary Arabic under the umbrella of corruption. The bedouin Quraysh Arabs’ dialect, for them, is the purest and most correct. The other Arabic dialects are valued in accordance with the degree of remoteness from this tribe. The shorter the distance
from this dialect, the sounder is viewed the non-Quraysh variety, but the longer is the
distance, the more this variety is regarded as corrupted. Numerous succeeding researches have
got inspired by Ibn Khaldoun’s genealogical classification which is readapted by Marçais
(1958) with reference to the dialectal situation in North Africa. The French dialectologist
indicates sedentary dialects as types of pre-Hilali(ian) Arabic whereas Hilali(an) Arabic as
bedouin dialects principally springing from Banu Hilal tribe. According to Bouhadiba (1988),
Urban Arabic is equated to the former while rural Arabic is bedouin.

The co-prevalence of bedouin dialects and their sedentary counterparts has always
taken place due, for example, to demographic mobility. In-migrants change their place of
residence in the hope of finding better living conditions. Those who migrate from different
regions, within the same territory, to a new region get into contact, and consequently dialect
contact emerges. In the Arab world, internal migration has in many times led to genealogical
dialect contact. Language change has resulted and new dialects or koines have constantly
sprung up via koineisation processes. The first process is known as mixing whereby distinct
dialectal background-linguistic features coexist. Another koineisation process is levelling
through which linguistic variants restricted to minority speakers are in their way of
eradication. Simple forms however persist at the expense of their irregular counterparts
through the koineisation process of simplification. At the same time, interdialectal elements
may develop without affiliating to any contributing dialect. Those linguistic variants which
are non-levelled out remain in the mixture to fulfill new functions. If a koine stabilises, it has
inevitably survived koineisation together with focusing. Bidialectalism may arise in divergent
dialectal situations. Bidialectal speakers get proficient in more than one dialect and alternate
these dialects through dialect switching. They can also borrow features from one variety and
integrate them into another dialect.

A diglossic situation is a specific example where divergent dialects are at play. In the
Arab world, such a situation embodies Classical Arabic (high variety) which is originally a
bedouin dialect and today’s genealogical Arabic dialects (low varieties). The effect of
bidialectal phenomena is remarkable such that the latter varieties stand under the pressure of
Classical Arabic and/or its modern version (Modern Standard Arabic). It is also urged by
multidisciplinary Arabisation which has been followed by the Algerian policy since
independence. As for language contact, it has often accompanied dialect contact, particularly
during and after the Muslim-Arab conquests. More recently, Arabic dialects have been under
a heavy influence of the varieties with which they are mutually unintelligible. In Algeria, the
source of this influence comprises the indigenous Berber varieties as well as European languages (such as Turkish, French and Spanish). Sometimes, this foreign impact is so intense that it becomes difficult to study dialect contact without considering language contact.

Holes Clives is known as the originator of sociolinguistic Arabic dialectology in the 70’s. He accounted for language variation and change in relation to Arabic dialects in Bahrain. Subsequent Arabic works have been highly influenced by the author’s variationist approaches. Many Arabic dialects have been increasingly identified and described throughout the Arab world, preparing the ground for important dialectal comparative works. Nevertheless, there is still a great deal of Arabic varieties non-exploited within their territories, a fact which slows down Arabic dialectal generalisation and theorising processes. Contemporary scientific calls claim further and more solid descriptive researches on Arabic dialects upon which our present work is a tentative contributory study.

Following the objectives of the current research, and despite the tight relationship between dialect contact and language contact, we have particularly confined our attention to genealogically dialectal features. Our principal research question has entailed the extent to which genealogical change has been engendered by dialect contact-induced koineisation at each linguistic level of Oran dialect. Our hypothesis suggested that the dialect contact process of koineisation has produced genealogical change in Oran dialect but at different linguistic degrees. We have also raised the sub-question of whether bedouinisation or sedentarisation has had more pressure on the dialect under study. We hypothesised that the impact of first genealogical process is more intense. Another sub-question has been if Oran dialect presently maintains or not its genealogical affiliation. The second sub-hypothesis is for the bedouin preservation. In an attempt to test our hypotheses, we undertook some fieldwork in which data was collected on the basis of three research methods: recorded interviews, administered questionnaire and participant observation. We varied the methods of research for the purpose of verification and complementarity: The recorded interviews certainly allowed elicitation of many linguistic features that could fulfill the present study objectives. However, we found it paramount to check the presence of some data and add some other data which has not been detected by our recorder. An administered questionnaire was the second research method that we selected to meet the two points above. In case some other data was missing, the participant observation, our third method, was supplied.
It is also important to indicate that we have come across a number of difficulties while undertaking this research. The fieldwork is a case in point. Concerning the recorded interviews, nine of male and female informants refused to get engaged in. Four females did not justify the reasons behind their refusal. Two other females did not accept the idea of recording whereas one said she was against being interviewed at all. The latter seven female informants were boarders who came from rural areas. They were perhaps culturally conservative individuals who considered interviews and/or recordings as an outer component of their family beliefs. Two other male informants related their refusal rather to psychological factors. The first said he was tired while the second was not in a good mood to provide information. As for the recordings, some of our interviews conducted in university classrooms were subjected to noise coming from other interactional students’ groups within or outside these rooms. Another number of interviews undertaken outside these classrooms were exposed to occasional wind which caused difficulties during our later data analysis: When trying to detect some recorded linguistic features, the latter were not very easily and clearly grasped. As regards the administered survey, it was not easy to find informants since it was the academic period of examination. Some of those who accepted to be questioned did not supply answers to all the questions due to rushing or fatigue. Even the fieldworker was very tired at a point in time of questioning the informants individually and thus found it more relevant to carry on the survey the following day, a fact that made the administered questionnaire time-consuming. Despite these research difficulties, our subsequent data analysis has allowed many possible observations and conclusions on each linguistic level.

As for pronunciation, our findings demonstrate a genealogical mix situation survived by assimilated features. Sedentary [χ] and bedouin [ɣ] alternate as a result of regressive voicing assimilation of /ɣ/. In /ɣsɔl/ wash particularly, [ɣsɔl] is realised in variation with [ɔsɔl]. Given that our informants’ generation is arabised, the bedouin feature is expected to finally triumph under the effect of SA (/ɣasala/). In the case of /q/, the phoneme enjoys various koineisation processing impacts on its articulation. It is produced as either sedentary or bedouin following certain conditions. Originally viewed as bedouin (Marçais, 1958; Bouamrane, 1991; Miller, 2007), ORD still maintains [g] as a possible consequence of bedouin dialect contact; many new [g]-items are obtained from other bedouin areas and integrated into the local dialectal system. [q]-sedentarisation of ORD still emanates due to other varietal effects such as SA, sedentary dialects and even bedouin dialects, where the unvoiced uvular already prevails.
In many cases, free variation between sedentary [q] and bedouin [g] is observed. The two genealogical variants, in fact, either still experience mixture or know reallocation. According to Britain and Trudgill (1999), there are two types of reallocation: socio-stylistic and phonological. Socio-stylistic refunctionalisation converts genealogical variants from regional to contextual forms. [q] is widely used in formal situations. Topics about morality, religion, classicism, education and urbanity favour the unvoiced uvular articulation. In cases where informality arises, the use of [g] is highly required. Informal situations cover the primary human needs. The names of human body are daily denoted together with ordinary verbal positions and activities. Regarding its presence in the naming forms of domestic animals and insects, the voiced velar variants could have originated from the countryside and/or desert.

Sometimes, variantal interchangeability is prevented by saliency in the sense that if one of the two phonetic elements is contextually employed instead of its counterpart, it sounds inappropriate. Some non-levelled variants, on the other hand, have been re-allocated new phonological, instead of socio-stylistic, functions to give rise to the phonemic contrast /q/ vs /g/. Phonological reallocation is not only circumscribed to the /q/-sounds, it also extends to affect diphthongs. In the context of emphatics, the bedouin diphthongal production proceeds. Pharyngeals and velars, which can also behave as emphatics, opt for this diphthongal realisation in their environments. Yet, their sedentary counterparts, which are the monophthongs [i:] (corresponding to [aj]) and [u:] (corresponding to [aw]), are restricted to the environments of plain sounds.

Interdialect evolutions, which have taken place in ORD relate to koineisation. Data at hand cover the interdialectal insertion of the unvoiced uvular in the item [lqa] find. Originally, the same concept is realised as [lga], with [g] instead of [q], in many bedouin dialects (including the local dialect) in contact in Oran. In sedentary dialects, like TSN and NDM, a totally different lexical item is used ([ʒbar]) which is genealogically salient among the Oranees. Obviously, [lqa] is initially neither bedouin nor sedentary, the genealogical mixture has led to its prevalence as a neutral intermediate form in ORD. Another interdialectal element is the unvoiced dental plosive [t] which is an intermediate resultant segment out of merger between the sedentary affricated dental [ts] and the bedouin fricative interdental [θ]. Despite of this probable interdialectal emergence of the unvoiced plosive dental, it is often indicated as sedentary in the literature. In this research we have used both adjectives sedentary and interdialectal interchangeably to refer to this segment.
The voiced emphatic dental plosive [ɖ] is also an interdialectal feature which is a consequential fusion between the sedentary plain plosive dental [d] and the bedouin emphatic fricative interdental [ḍ]. A further interdialectal variant is the metathesised [gɖab] which is formed by a hybrid combination of genealogical features. The appearance of the above [t] and [d] is a sign of interdental sibilant levelling in ORD. Even the sacred Koranic verses included in the young Oranees’ everyday conversations do not escape interdialectal development. They are being dialectalised since the bedouin interdental sibilants are being replaced by sedentary dental plosives. The young Oranees do not seem to consider the legitimitised Koranic pronunciation. If they persist in their articulation, [t] and [d] may, in the long term, stabilise in a such context. The phenomenon does not restrict to ORD, it is observed in many Algerian dialects, a fact which is still open to further scientific studies.

Still talking about stabilised features, bedouin variants seem to have enjoyed the lion’s share of focusing. /ʒ/-production has been de-affricated in ORD in which the phonemic contrast /aː/ vs /a/ is established as well. The three consonantal syllabic structures in the dialect in question witness the vowel lengthening of the index /-ət/ to [aːt] which takes place in the 3rd pers fem sing perfective of the sound verb suffixed to a morpheme starting with a vowel. Bedouin germination does not occur in syllabic structures of the type CvCCvC suffixed to /i/, whereas affects the definite article in the neighbouring of /ʒ/. Another bedouin process, assimilation, obtains in the environment of a word with a final pharyngeal suffixed to a pronoun with the initial /h/. A minor number of sedentary features has been, nevertheless, focused in ORD. Our research attests the voiced dental plosive /ð/-realisation; the partial short vocalic opposition (/ə/ vs /u/); the germination in syllabic structures of the type CvCCvC in the imperfective suffixed to /u/.

In brief, pronunciation of ORD has undergone four out of five koineisation processes. Most of the analysed data has gone beyond mixing while a little number of features has developed interdialectally. The majority of the remaining counterparts are refunctionalised new roles. Reallocation is socio-stylistic or phonological. The levelled ones have paved the way to focusing of their counterparts which seemingly hold the first position. Unlike the suggestion of our second sub-hypothesis, pronunciation of the dialect under investigation seems genealogically mixed.

In grammar, some genealogical counterparts have simultaneously survived but altered their functional roles. Interestingly, there have been remarkable reallocated forms which have,
compared with pronunciation, proceeded differently at this linguistic level. In addition to the socio-stylistic type suggested by Britain and Trudgill (1999), we have encountered another different type, namely grammatical reallocation. Socio-stylistic reallocation is observed in possessive relationships: moral customs, traditions, weddings, locations and numbers (including pairs) are formal situations which call for the sedentary analytic construction. On the other hand, bedouin synthetic structures are informally employed, especially when talking about kinship, body parts, settings (including particularly the item /daar/ house), days (including particularly the item /nhaar/ day) and denominations (very informal interactional appellations). As far as the indefinite article is concerned, the sedentary /waħad/ is more formal while the bedouin Φ article is eventually more informal. With regard to negation, the sedentary suffixed [ma:-næʕraf-j] is more carefully uttered (corresponding to formal contexts) compared with the bedouin non-suffixed [ma:-næʕraf] which is relatively more spontaneous and corresponding to informal contexts. The second type of re-functionalisation detected at this linguistic has to do with defective verbs. The latter are reallocated grammatically entails that the bedouin monophthongal structure is conserved for the imperfective whereas the sedentary diphthongal construction is retained for the perfective.

Unlike pronunciation and lexis, the current study demonstrates that grammar in ORD is particularly characterised by sedentary simplification. Active and passive plural participles have been neutralised through this koineisation process which also affects and simplifies, on the other hand, the structure of the future participial marker. This refers to the invariable use of the marker [yadi] going (will) not only in gender but also in number. The same is often observed for the indefinite article /waħad/ which does not agree with its noun neither in gender nor in number. We remark, specifically as for the demonstrative pronoun /hada/ this, that neutralisation takes place more rapidly in gender than in number. This is probably because simplification, as a sedentary process, is mainly concerned with gender. In all the above genealogical cases, number, and more importantly, gender distinction is being increasingly levelled out.

Only a little free variation is noticed in grammar which has been apparently more subjected to genealogical focusing in ORD, compared with pronunciation. Again, bedouin-type features predominate. Gender distinction is clearly noticed in second singular person verbal conjugation (perfective, imperfective and imperative), together with the second singular person pronoun. Concerning trilateral and quadrilateral nominal plural formation, it follows respectively the bedouin schemes C₁wa:C₃i:C₄ and C₁C₂a:C₃i:C₄. As for the dual, it is
made on the basis of the Hilalian morpheme {i:n}-suffixation; this includes names of units of time, names of units of measure and those of mother-father pair. Similarly, the plural of colour nouns and adjectives requires this bedouin suffixation. Numerals preserve the segment /ʕ/, which is also bedouin, in their internal structure. Finally, the particle /taʕ/ of and the pronouns [winta] when, [wi:n] where and [(ə)lli] who are all bedouin and occur in of the dialect in question. In spite of bedouin focusing, grammar, just like pronunciation, covers some sedentary forms, such as the pronoun [ku:n] who, the adverb [əl-ba:ʁe], yesterday and negation.

In short, four out of five koineisation processes have occurred in the grammar of ORD: Mixing, levelling, reallocation and simplification. All the analysed features have exceeded the mix situation. The genealogical counterparts have been maintained for the purpose of fulfilling different functions. Reallocation is detected as socio-stylistic or grammatical. If one of these counterparts only has been retained, the other variant is surely levelled out. Most of the grammatical variants in data have reached stabilisation. Simplification has obtained neither in pronunciation nor in lexis. It has been totally grammatical in this study. As we have hypothesised, the preponderance of genealogical features in grammar is apparently bedouin.

In the last linguistic level under investigation, we have realised that genealogical lexical counterparts undergo bi-retention or mono-levelling. They are bi-retained through mixing or reallocation. Those features which are mixed survive free variation and can be used interchangeably. In this case, they are produced inter-individually or intra-individually. Inter-individual production implies that the same concept is expressed differently among the members of the same community. Conversely, there could be individuals who are intra-individual if they possess different items referring to the same concept within their verbal repertoire. Our data covers the following mixed lexical counterparts: bedouin [nəʒəm] and sedentary [qad] be able to; bedouin [Sta] and sedentary [mad] give; bedouin [həess] and sedentary [bi:ɾ] well. If reallocation interferes instead, the variants experience complimentary distribution. They are re-functionalised such that these forms become semantically different. The most obvious genealogical examples from data are: bedouin [rgəd] sleep and sedentary [nʃæs] feel sleepy; bedouin [dəg] stab and sedentary [dɾab] beat; bedouin [ra:h] go; bedouin [ʃəwːəɾ] leave and sedentary [mʃa] walk; bedouin [tʃ(o)b] rain falls and sedentary [tʃe:h] fall down. Yet, the bedouin [ʒəmæʃ] sit and [ʃa] hold coexist respectively with the bedouinised
[jɔgSud] remain and [gədəb] catch. This reallocation, which is not accounted for by Britain and Trudgill (1999), is designated here as semantic reallocation.

In the case of mono-levelling, one of the genealogical lexical counterparts recedes while the other one is stabilised via focusing. Examples from our corpus represent the bedouin focused items: [dæ:`r] do; [hæwɔd] get down; [no:d] get up; [ɣɔɔn] hide; [tkɔɔsa] lie; [bya] love, want, desire; [rvɔd] pick up; [wɔl]a] return; [fɔː] see, look; [rɔl] send; [ddæ] take away; [qas] throw; [bɔz] child; [mart] wife; [di:k] cockerel; [ɣæwɔd] horse; [muɣru(f)a] spoon; [gæ] all; [hæ:mi] hot. Their sedentary levelled counterparts are respectively [smol]; [hbat]; [qom]; [t(s)ɔõbba]; [(t)warɔk]; [habb]; [fɔlli]; [ræs]; [ra]; [sefut]; [ɔbba]; [sejeb]; [wal]; [mrat]; [fɔru:]3; [hson]; [mSil(q)a]; [kamol]; [ʂu:n].

Briefly, three out five koineisation processes, mixing, levelling and reallocation, have been lexical. Although we have come across genealogical variants which are under the pressure of mixing, their number is still inferior. The set of reallocated features seems more important. We have encountered only one type of reallocation that we have referred to as semantic reallocation. Lexical focusing also predominates. Many of the features in lexis are focused because their counterparts have been eradicated. Lexical features in ORD could be majorly Bedouin, a fact which validate our second sub-hypothesis.

While the techniques of elicitation and observation have been synchronically helpful in collecting data through various research methods, comparing the current results with those findings previously realised in ORD (e.g. Bouhadiba (1988), Bouamrane (1991, 1993)) has diachronically allowed us to identify which genealogical linguistic features have been temporally maintained, and more importantly, which ones have changed. Confirming our main hypothesis, our present research has demonstrated that Oran dialect has been subjected to change in which dialect contact-incited koineisation plays a fundamental role. All the koineisation processes have participated in determining the present genealogical composition of ORD. Mixing still operates at the three linguistic levels but to a much lesser degree compared with reallocation and levelling. Interdialectal development is confined to pronunciation while simplification is associated with grammar. Variantal re-functionalisation has been vital although it has not affected all the linguistic levels in the same way. All in all, it has manifested as socio-stylistic, phonological, grammatical or semantic. Likewise, levelling has been concerned with a great deal of genealogical features leaving the ground to focusing of their counterparts. Grammatical focusing probably ranks first among all the linguistic
levels. The focused linguistic ingredients in our findings emerge majorly, as indicated, as a consequence of levelling.

We think, on the one hand, that levelling is the koineisation process which exerts more pressure on ORD. On the other hand, the dialect under study is likely to have attained Stage Three following Trudgill (1998) (reported in Kerswill (2002)). At this stage, koine formation is the most highly expected to be completed. Actually, the city of Oran seems to reach migratory saturation and demographic mobility is eventually remarkably decreasing. If this situation persists, further levelling will supervene leading to more focusing in genealogical linguistic features. In these conditions, Oran dialectal koine may be firmly established. Between bedouinisation and sedentarisation, the present ORD survives a genealogically mixed pronunciation, together with bedouin grammar and lexis. It could be said, on the whole, that the variety under study preserves its genealogical affiliation, a fact that corroborates the claims of dialectologists, such as Marçais (1958), Bouamrane (1991) and Miller (2007) in addition to our second sub-hypothesis. Concerning the social network in the speech community in question, the Bedouins are more numerous than the Sedentaries in terms of origin. This is traced back to a higher degree of in-migration from rural areas to Oran. As a consequence, bedouin, including local, speakers form the major social network within the community. Adding the above situation to this fact will probably lead the established koine to remain a long run bedouin variety.

Understanding the internal composition of dialectal Arabic can open the doors to multi-disciplinary benefits. Globalisation has turned the world into a village where different-linguistic background speakers can meet and cooperate. Algeria is one country receiving a vital number of long-term foreign investors, many of whom are monolingual and their language varieties are mutually unintelligible with Arabic varieties. Learning Standard Arabic confines them to formal setting whereas Dialectal Arabic is used in informal situations. The present work can participate in helping those foreigners learning the required dialect in different ways, to meet their basic everyday needs.

Collaboration between dialectologists and computer specialists is one way for integrating dialects in translation machines. Such technological tools can render foreigners’ Arabic dialectal learning easier. Since contemporary mobiles are equipped with automatic translation software, dialectal machine translation allows, for instance, finding, on the spot, the relevant dialectal item for the immediate given situation. As for educational curriculum,
sociolinguistic observations demonstrate that many Algerian learners are far from getting proficiency in the official language of the country, Classical Arabic. The present research, among similar other works, may contribute to account for dialectal interference in learning this standard variety. Sacred texts such as Koran is a case in point in which linguistic alternation is only limited. Making comparison on the one hand and on the other contrast between Classical Arabic and one given dialect, say Oran dialect, will probably facilitate the ways of teaching Koran recitation to the native speakers of this dialect.

Further longitudinal researches are needed to enlarge the current findings by considering genealogical koineisation in other Algerian Arabic dialects. Although Oran is highly characterised by internal migration, the latter process is not restricted to this city; many Algerian areas are well-familiar with demographic mobility towards their territories. This indicates that genealogical conflict, between bedouinisation and sedentarisation, is also present in other Algerian speech communities. Has dialect contact-induced koineisation also stimulated language change in other Algerian Arabic dialects? Has it followed the same path of ORD or has it adopted another one? Are other Arabic dialects changing their genealogical affiliation as a result of koineisation? It is finally important to add that technological devices such as television, radio, mobile phones, computers (including tablets and laptops) and internet have dramatically decreased distances between the Algerian speakers. They have turned interactions easier through space and time; hence, the Algerian interactants are increasingly getting familiar with various dialects throughout the territory. Does this familiarity lead, in the long run, to bedouin and/ or sedentary convergence between Algerian Arabic dialects? Is one Algerian koine in the making?
## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: Table 2.1  Net Migrants, Oran and the Remaining Regions, 1966-1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Immigrants to Oran %</th>
<th>Emigrants from Oran %</th>
<th>Net Migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Mostaganem</td>
<td>14988</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>+12638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Mascara</td>
<td>12911</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>+11070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tlemcen</td>
<td>11823</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>+9563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Sidi Bel Abbes</td>
<td>11465</td>
<td>4122</td>
<td>+7343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tiaret</td>
<td>7003</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>+6435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Algiers</td>
<td>6720</td>
<td>2269</td>
<td>+4451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Saida</td>
<td>4264</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>+3164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Setif</td>
<td>2384</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+2336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Chlef</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>+1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Bechar</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>+37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tizi Ouzou</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>+1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Batna</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>+818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Bejaäa</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>+639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Biskra</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>+617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tebessa</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>+545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Annaba</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>+421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Blida</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>+150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Guelma</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>+352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Laghrouat</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>+110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Constantine</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>+226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Ouargla</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-M’sila</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Jijel</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Oum El Bouaghi</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>+75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Males (%)</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Skikda</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Adrar</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Medea</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Djelfa</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tamanrasset</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Bouira</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>82736</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RGPH, 1977 (in Fodil (2000))
**Appendix 2: Table 2.2** Net Migrants, Oran and the Remaining Regions, 1977-1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Immigrants to Oran %</th>
<th>Emigrants from Oran%</th>
<th>Net Migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Mascara</td>
<td>5588</td>
<td>3295</td>
<td>+2293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran- Tiaret</td>
<td>5538</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>+3877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Relizane</td>
<td>3559</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>+1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Mostaganem</td>
<td>2759</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>+948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Sidi Bel Abbes</td>
<td>2359</td>
<td>2634</td>
<td>-275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Algiers</td>
<td>2299</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>+997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tlemcen</td>
<td>2279</td>
<td>3656</td>
<td>-877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Aïn Temouchent</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>-338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Chlef</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>+447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-El Bayadh</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>+536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Bechar</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>-233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Skikda</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>+613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Bou Areridj</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>+400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Saïda</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>-533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Constantine</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>-488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Nâama</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>-378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Bejaïfa</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>+104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Batna</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Setif</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tebessa</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>+53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Blida</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>-401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Ouargla</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>+34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Laghouat</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>+63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tizi Ouzou</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>-165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tissemsilt</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>+82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Annaba</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>+25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Aïn Defla</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Medea</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Souk Ahras</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Djelfa</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Biskra</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tipaza</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Boumerdes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Jijel</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tindouf</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Ghardaïa</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Oum El Bouaghi</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Khenchela</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Guelma</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Bouira</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Mila</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tamanrasset</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-El Tarf</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-El Oued</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Illizi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-M’silal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Adrar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Foreigners</td>
<td>7788</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44328</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RGPH, 1987 (in Fodil (2000))
Appendix 3: Table 2.3  Net Migrants, Oran and the Remaining Regions, 1987 -1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Immigrants to Oran</th>
<th>Emigrants from Oran</th>
<th>Net Migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Relizane</td>
<td>16002</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>+14565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Mascara</td>
<td>8784</td>
<td>3796</td>
<td>+4988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran- Tiaret</td>
<td>8121</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>+6888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Mostaganem</td>
<td>4705</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>+2590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tlemcen</td>
<td>3428</td>
<td>3153</td>
<td>+275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Sidi Bel Abbes</td>
<td>3211</td>
<td>2741</td>
<td>+470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Algiers</td>
<td>3048</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>+1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Aïn Temouchent</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>3488</td>
<td>-757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Bou Areridj</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>+2152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tissemsilt</td>
<td>2205</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>+1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Chlef</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>+1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Laghouat</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>+1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Adrar</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>+534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Saïda</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>+311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-El Bayadh</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>-206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Bechar</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>-298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Bejaïa</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>+169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tizi Ouzou</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>+177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Aïn Defla</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>+459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Blida</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>+347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Nâama</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>-414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Medea</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>+311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Batna</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>+169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Setif</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>+154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Jijel</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>+195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Constantine</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>+147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Male (%)</td>
<td>Female (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tamanrasset</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Skikda</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Djelfa</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Ghardaïa</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Annaba</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Bouira</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Ouargla</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Boumerdes</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Oum El Bouaghi</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tipaza</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tebessa</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Biskra</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Mila</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Tindouf</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Guelma</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-El Tarf</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Mila</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Illizi</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-El Oued</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Souk Ahras</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-Khenchela</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran-foreigners</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>02.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72226</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 4: Pictures

Figure 2.2 : Body Parts

Figure 2.3 : Food
Figure 2.4: Animals
Figure 2.5 : Tools
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