

PHONOLOGICAL, MORPHOLOGICAL AND LEXICAL VARIATION IN GHAZAOUET SPEECH

ABDELKADER HOCINI

Department of English, Tlemcen University, Algeria

ABSTRACT

This work sheds light on language variation in Ghazouet speech, an urban coastal area in the extreme northwest of Algeria. Such speech community is known for its speech heterogeneity. It is a context in which two Arabic dialectal forms coexist. Using empirical data collected in spontaneous everyday language interactions, we could show the degree to which some phonological, morphological, and lexical features which distinguish this speech community are increasingly being avoided by native speakers. We also could identify the reasons why men are much more influenced by rural Arabic forms, and why female speakers tend to be largely conservative.

KEYWORDS: Dialect Contact, Language Variation, Lexis & Phonemes

INTRODUCTION

Halliday (1978: 186) advocates that “language change is the symbolic expression of change in society: it is created by society and contributes to society, in turn”. Mutual comparison between language and society can influence the speech community of Ghazouet this influence is the result of the change in the social structure of the community, which led to a change of language resulting in a diversified community with new linguistic forms, especially among the youngsters.

In fact, socio-cultural factors may prove critical for the linguistic change rate. They can help it be fast or slow. In a geographically isolated community or in a remote village, linguistic homogeneity is more probable, whereas heterogeneity is obvious in large cities and, therefore, language change is more identified in such latter contexts, in which various varieties coexist. Whenever two or more language varieties interact, it is typical to influence one another. The influence can move in one way as it can be bidirectional, depending on a number of factors, such as duration and frequency of contact.

Dialect contact can happen in dialect outskirts, between ad stratum dialects with a meddlesome dialect going about as either a superstratum or a substratum. It happens in a variety of wonders, including language convergence, borrowing, and relexification. The results of dialect contact can be perceptible at all linguistic levels. Dialectal variation is mostly noticed at the phonetic/phonological level (i.e. Accent) and the lexical level. These are the two hallways which constitute the major "entryways" to the greater part of alternate parts of the contact-influenced change. At the point when a typical second dialect is found out and utilized by a group of people, they regularly wind up bringing second-dialect lexical items into the discussion with kindred bilinguals in their unique first dialect. Such items alluded to by Weinreich as nonce borrowings (Weinreich et al, 1968:47) appear to constitute the scaffold in different kinds of ensuing linguistic change. In the first place, nonce borrowings are plainly the course for the later reception or reconciliation of these lexical items as

loanwords in the immigrant or minority dialect (Poplack and Sankoff, 1984). Alongside various lexical borrowings, there more often result in phonological changes in the recipient dialect: all the past examinations in this domain demonstrate the two modifications in the phonology of the obtained words and ensuing alterations in the phonology of the beneficiary dialect. Such modifications may incorporate procedures that apply just to the outside root vocabulary, yet may likewise spread to local vocabulary. Phonological change is likewise all around normal for grown-up speakers, however, for social reasons, the "substratum potential" such speakers have is typically extremely restricted. When they do constitute an imperative section of the discourse group, they may have an extremely solid impact in realizing phonological changes that can have sweeping impacts in morphology and sentence structure too. The presentation of remote lexical material conveys phonological stuff, as well as regularly may convey morphological and syntactic items too (Sankoff, 2001:42).

What is considered getting in the discourse group of Ghazaouet is the way that the phonetic impact of the pioneers on the locals is rendered back by the locals on the settlers' posterity. A different line of clarification lies in considering how the transmission of dialect is interceded by social powers. For a certain something, kids secure dialect in view of the contribution of numerous speakers, and these speakers may well have diverse semantic frameworks in light of their own distinctive phonetic histories. It is settled in phonology that kids whose parents have outside accents obtain the assortment of the dialect talked with the local speaker group around them instead of the remote complement of their folks. This likewise holds crosswise over vernacular limits: the kid experiencing childhood in Ghazaouet whose parents originate from Annaba (extreme northeast of Algeria/opposing pole) will wind up talking like a local of Ghazaouet. The ramifications of this are youngsters are planning their linguistic frameworks over a time of years, and the contribution from later in youth (when they hear more from peers than from parents) has a vital impact.

VOWEL ASPECTS OF GHAZAOUET ARABIC

Like the arrangement of vowels in Standard Arabic and many other dialectal varieties of Arabic, Ghazaouet Arabic (hereafter GA) contains three vowels (in addition to their equivalent long counterparts), which are /a/, /i/ and /u/. Table 1 demonstrates the vowel framework in GA. Marçais (1977:12), in his depiction of Maghreban Arabic vernaculars, stresses the significant ruin of the vowel material, a phonological quality which applies to both urban and rural Algerian dialects (henceforth AA). In entirety, it is the drop or the lessening of the short vowel in an open syllable which may be clarified by the general phonological phenomenon called 'the law of the least effort' (Martinet, 1964). We see the lessening in the quantity of syllables in numerous words and the initial consonant cluster, which is an unaccepted pattern in SA. The accompanying cases indicate plainly what is expressed in table 1, sketched below.

Table 1: Vowel Features in GA

Standard Arabic	Ghazaouet Arabic	Gloss
/haraba/	/hrob/	"he ran away"
/qaraʔa/qra/ "he read"	/qra/	"he read"
/ɣaraza/	/ɣraz/	"he went ou"

What can be unmistakably seen is that the short vowels are more influenced by this ruin of vocalic content. Long vowels save their characteristics more than short vowels do. The predominant utilization of an unbiased vowel (ə) is truly commented as well. Such modifications prompt syllabic and morphological variations as are represented in table 2.

Table 2: Morphological Aspects of GA

Standard Arabic	Ghazaouet Arabic	Gloss
/baqara/	/bəqra/	“cow”
/çindaka//qra/ “he read”	/çəndək /	“you have”
/da:rukum/	/da:rkəm/	“your house”

Concerning long vowels, the special case that is liable to variation is the/u:/. It is more often realized as the allophonic variant [œ] of the French words [bœʁ] and [pœʁ] signifying "butter" and "fear" respectively. The accompanying illustrations demonstrate more this substitution:

Table 3: Substitution of the Arabic long vowel /u:/

Algerian Arabic	Ghazaouet Arabic	Gloss
/lu:z/	/lœz/	“almonds”
/blu:za//qra/ “he read”	/ blœza/	“robe”
/lu:h/	/lœh/	“wood”

CONSONANTAL ASPECTS

Dissimilar to other AA varieties, GA was known by the absence of the [k]-[g] contrast for the basic reason that the velar [k] substitutes the Standard Arabic (hereafter SA) uvular /q/ which is thus never acknowledged as the velar voiced [g]. Be that as it may, the social factors associated with this discourse group prompted another reality. Variations concerning this differentiation as well as different variants either developed or vanished from the discourse of this group, for example, /q/ - [k], /k/ - [tʃ], /g/ - [dʒ]. The corpus gathered demonstrates this variation plainly with contrasts as indicated by age and gender. In both genders, senior uneducated individuals tend to protect most of the qualities of their medium of association. Youths are more pulled in by all what is new; they tend to utilize/q/, /k/ and even the velar voiced /g/ in their discourse in numerous words. Give us a chance to think about this correlation:

Table 4: Some Instances of Consonantal Features of GA

Males and Females above 50 Years	Males and Females Under 35 Years	Gloss
/dʒərdʒa:ç/	/gərga:ç/	walnuts
/dʒaʔu/	/gaʔu/	cake
/dʒən/	/gən/	male rabbit

As already said, the velar voiceless [k] replaces SA uvular /q/ in GA discourse. The phoneme /k/ consequently is acknowledged [tʃ] in introductory and average positions or [ʃ] in average and last positions, relying upon the phonetic condition it happens in as exhibited underneath.

Table 5

AA	GA	GLOSS
/karmu:s/	/tʃarmu:s/	“fig”
/mkammal/	/mtʃəmmal/	“very ill”
/mæ:lak/	/mæ:lə/	“what’s wrong with you?”

A few sounds are unfamiliar with Arabic, yet they defacto exist in GA due to the contact with other outside varieties, such as French, Spanish, Italian, etc. These are the sounds /P/ and /v/. The first exists in AA and in GA all alone right; the second experience a slight modification invoicing and is acknowledged, particularly by uneducated individuals as /f/ in numerous events. These two sounds show up in numerous French borrowings, for example [piʒama], [pupiʒa],

[vaksɑ] or [faksɑ], signifying "pyjamas", "doll" and "vaccine" separately. In this regard, Benrabah (1989) states:

These two sounds occur exclusively within French loanwords which have not undergone total assimilation into the Arabic vocal system. The use of /p/ and /v/ by even illiterate people shows how resistant, these two sounds are to a complete assimilation (Benrabah 1989:27)

By the by, since these two sounds (/p/ and /v/) have no equivalents in Arabic, they are substituted by /b/ and /f/ individually. Once in a while they are not assimilated and stay as they are. In the variety under scrutiny, we chose the accompanying illustrations where these sounds are not assimilated.

Table 6

GA	French Gloss	English Gloss
/kuvirtɑ/	"couverture"	"blanket"
/lvɑnɑ/	"vane"	"sluice gate"
/lvi:s/	"vis"	"screw"
/pumpɑ/	"pompe"	"pump"
/plastik/	"plastique"	"plastic"

MORPHOLOGICAL VARIATION

Morphological variation in the discourse group of Ghazaouet is as essential as the former phonological marvels since it displays an unmistakable utilization of a few factors that are regular in this group. The most striking component in the morphological structure of GA is the perplexity in gender orientation, be it plural or singular such a case is applicable to other vernaculars essentially those of Nedroma and Tlemcen. Types of address to both male and female speakers are as per the following

[ʃadʒrɑ] a tree [zu:ʒ ʃadʒrɑ:t] two trees

[radʒəl] a man [zu:dʒ rdʒrɑ:l] two men

In SA, duality is set apart by the utilization of the morpheme suffixes {a:n(i)} or {ain(i)} added to the noun. In any case, this is not the case for colloquial Arabic in which just a few nouns alluding to particular sets apply for this run the show. These things are those alluding particularly to parts of the human body, and that come in twos, for example, [ʒaini:n], [wədnɪ:n], [jəddi:n], [rʒəli:n] signifying 'eyes', 'ears', 'hands' and 'feet' separately (Dendane, 2007:165).

In GA, we find that the utilization of the SA dual marker is not completely rejected. The instance of the nominative subject is settled for a few nouns particularly those which come in twos, for example, the nouns alluded to beforehand and which take {a:n} as a case ending as expressed in the accompanying illustrations: [ʃinæk] "your eyes", [rəʒləj] "my feet", [wədnæh] "his ears", [jəddæha] "her hands". The other method for framing duality in colloquial Arabic inside the Algerian discourse group is by including the cardinal number [zu:ʒ] "two", added to the plural type of the thing. We get for instance.

[ju:m] [ju:mæjən] two days

[li:la] [li:ltæjən] two nights

[ʃhar] [ʃhra:jən] two months

Another element of the morphological structure of GA is that speakers in this discourse group have a tendency to

omit the glottal fricative {h} and debilitate the vowel {u} in the CA affixes [hum] and [kum] when joined to verbs as delineated in the accompanying illustrations.

Table 7

AA	GA	Gloss
[ʕallama+hu]	[ʕallmu]	“he taught him”
[ʕallama+ha]	[ʕallm+a]	“he taught her”
[ʕallama+hum]	[ʕallm+ə̃m]	“he taught them”
[ʕallama+kum]	[ʕallamt+ə̃m]	“he taught you”

LEXICAL VARIATION

It has been demonstrated that lexis constitutes the center of dialect. The term lexis alludes to the entirety of words, furthermore, expressions of a specific dialect. These words are the instruments we use to get to our experience information, express thoughts, and find out about new ideas. The North African vernaculars known as Maghreban or Western Arabic vernaculars are recognized from the Eastern or Oriental Arabic vernaculars at all levels of analysis, primarily lexical. Marçais (1958) states that these distinctions in vocabulary are expected to:

The Berber influences; languages of the black races [...]; Roman languages: Latin (transmitted mainly through the Andalusian language); Spanish and Italian; Turkish mainly in Algeria and in Tunisia; finally French of which the influence is still vivid nowadays (In Bouamrane, 1989:11)

GA has a vocabulary established for the most part in SA, in addition to a significant number of loanwords from Berber, French, Spanish, and Turkish. Like every Arabic dialect and most significantly Algerian ones, this spoken assortment is portrayed by various particular characteristics.

BERBER VOCABULARY IN GHAZAOUET ARABIC

The mountains of Trara, including Ghazaouet, Msirda Thata, and Msirda Lfouaqa were possessed by the Berber clans called "Trara". After the Arabisation process that all the Maghreb experienced, Arabic spread over the locale of the entire Trara Massif. In any case, the variety under scrutiny has held a significantly greater part of vocabulary items of Berber root for quite a while. Maybe this maintenance of a few words was because of the way that these arabised individuals around them did not know their equivalents in Arabic. These Berber words, as yet surviving, for the most part, allude to places, sicknesses, sorts of blossoms, herbs, apparatuses of crafted works and utensils. Among these words, we refer to: [tæsəkra] which is the name of a plant used to channel tainted person's liver. [ʔæjni] alludes to mud secured stones (normally three stones) utilized around the fire to put on bottomed pots for cooking. At the same time, the dark item which shows up on the base of the pot is called [ʔæsəlwæn]. The word [ʔæyæddu] is a wild edible plant. [ʔæjroez] is a kitchen utensil with gaps used to make couscous. [ʔæjdu:d] a malady related with a stomachache, cerebral pain, and regurgitation. [timərʂa:t] is a plant developing on the outskirts of the valley used to cure ailments. There are additionally various Berber names for places in GA, for example, [ʔazarwanən], [ʔakəbbu:z], [ʔarəbbo:z], and so forth there is a nearly happening glottal stop at the beginning of most such words.

Loan Vocabulary from Other Languages

AA is known for its rich utilization of loanwords. It has embraced various words from various dialects all through its history. A loanword is a word that is straightforwardly taken into one variety from another with a phonological and

morphological adjustment. Hudson (1996) affirms that loanwords can likewise be called "borrowings". Following this view, the two terms are utilized as a part of this examination work reciprocally. The colossal foreign linguistic impact onto AA is French which has been the consequence of the long colonial period in Algeria. In this manner, countless obtained words might be seen in GA. These loanwords might be absorbed to a more noteworthy or lesser degree. There might be an adjustment in the frame of a word with the goal that it takes after the AA frame as opposed to the French one. In addition to the French words, some few others have been assumed control from Spanish and Turkish and absorbed into the local framework. All Ghazaouet speakers incorporate such huge numbers of French loanwords in their regular discourse. The following words make up just an example to epitomize this high rate of borrowing from French.

Table 8: Instances of Loanwords in GA

GA realisation	French	English Gloss
mutu:r	moteur	motor
trisinti	électricité	electricity
tabla	table	table
loto	automobile	car

If we were to talk about Arabic as a written standard form and AA as a spoken one, we should state that a diglossic relationship connects the two; the first being the High variety and the second being the Low. Dendane (1993), states that the vocabulary of the Algerian tongues is made out of an awesome number of 'doublets'- synonymous pairs. He additionally clarifies that one of these doublets is utilized as a part of an urban variety, whereas the corresponding item is used in a rural variety. In the following table, we made a correlation between GA, urban and rural vocabulary. Truth be told, Ghazaouet vocabulary is taken from our corpus, while a portion of the urban and country vocabulary is acquired from Dendane's work (1993).

Table 9: GA is an Urban Dialect of Arabic

CA Gloss	Urban Vocabulary	Rural Vocabulary	GA Vocabulary	English Gloss
/ajna/	/fæjən/	/wi:n/	/fæjən/	"where"
/ja?xuðu/	/jʃəbbi/	/jeddi/	/jʃəbbi/	"he takes"
/jaʃmalu/	/jaʃmə/	/jdi:r/	/jaʃmə/	"he does"
/qaʃada/	/gʷʃud/	/zemmaʃ/	/Kwʃud/	"to sit"
/aða:n /	/ada:n /	/aða:n/	/wədda:n/	"Muezzin call"
/kull/	/kəmə/	/ga:ʃ/	/ka:ʃ/	"all"
/ma:ða:/	/ʔəsəm/	/wa:ʃta/	/wa:səm/	"What?"

In parallel with phonological traits of the speech community of Ghazaouet, lexis represents some typical features that are distinct from other varieties of AA. The following examples show some of such lexical particularities.

Table 10

SA	GA	Gloss
/dzami:l+un/	/ʃbi:h/	"beautiful/handsome"
/ʃaɖda/	/hʒəm/	"to bite"
/aħɖara/	/sæk/	"he brought"
/jasi: ro/	/jayli/	"to walk"
/aftara/	/tʃuwʷaf/	"he had breakfast"
/anna:r+O/	/ʃafja/	"the fire"

CONCLUSIONS

The Arabic language is an arrangement of everyday vernaculars, each having imperative phonological, morphological, lexical, and syntactic contrasts that describe it as a particular variety. Along these lines, this research was an endeavor to depict the salient linguistic features characterizing the speech of Ghazaouet. Truth be told, we found that this assortment shares such a significant number of linguistic attributes with numerous Algerian neighboring tongues, above all at a phonological, morphological, and lexical level. What has been expressed in this section could be of incredible help to those affirming that GA isn't Arabic to the degree that they call its speakers "kbajəl" (kabylians) or Berbers. We can see that this assortment shares a lot of regular semantic qualities with all the co-existing AA varieties, regardless of its intrinsic neighborhood characteristics at every linguistic level. However, what is apparent is that Algerian dialects, just like the case with all varieties of any language in this world did and still do experience semantic changes.

REFERENCES

1. Benrabah, M. (1989). A cross- Dialectal Phonetic Description of Algerian Arabic (□. —Consonants).
2. Bouamrane, A (1989). "Remarques Générales sur Les Dialectes ou parlers Arabes", Cahiers de Dialectologie et de la Linguistique Contrastive de L'université d'Oran, Vol. : 1
3. Dendane, Z. (1993). Sociolinguistic Variation in an Urban Context: The Speech Community of Tlemcen. Magister Thesis, Algeria. Oran University, Oran
4. Dendane, Z. (2007). Sociolinguistic Variation And Attitudes Towards Language Behaviour In An Algerian Context: The Case Of Tlemcen Arabic. Doctorate Thesis, Algeria. Oran University, Oran.
5. Halliday M. A. K. (1978). Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language
6. Hudson, R. A. (1996). Sociolinguistics (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
7. Marçais, P. (1977). Esquisse grammaticale de l'arabe maghrébin. Paris.
8. Martinet, A. (1964a). Eléments de linguistique générale. Armand Colin, Paris.
9. Poplack, S. & D. Sankoff. (1984). "Borrowing: The synchrony of integration", Linguistics, Vol.:22, pp.99-135.
10. Sankoff, G. (2001). "Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact", In P. Trudgill, J. Chambers & N. Schilling-Estes (eds.), Handbook of Sociolinguistics, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 638-668.
11. Weinreich, U, Labov, W. and Herzog, M. (1968). "Empirical foundations for a theory of language change", In W. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel (eds.), Directions for Historical Linguistics, Austin: U. of Texas Press, 97-195

