



الدمج الصرفي لكلمات إنكليزية مستعارة في اللهجة العربية الموصلية

م.م. سندس فلاح محمد

في علم اللغة و تدريس اللغة الإنكليزية

الجامعة التقنية الشمالية

sundus.falah@ntu.edu.iq

المستخلص:

تتناول الدراسة الحالية بشكل شامل الكلمات الإنكليزية المستعارة لدى المتحدثين بلغة واحدة، أي الكلمات المستعارة الثابتة، أو المتحدثين بلغتين، أي الكلمات المستعارة العفوية. أصبحت الكلمات الإنكليزية المستعارة أكثر استخداماً في خطاب وكتابة اللهجة العربية الموصلية. لذلك، من المهم معرفة مدى تأثير الكلمات الإنكليزية المستعارة بالشكل الصرفي للغة العربية. تُعتبر المشكلة تحدياً لأن اللغة الإنكليزية واللهجة الموصلية تختلفان تصنيفياً بشكل كبير، وبالتالي يُقال أن دمج العديد من الكلمات الإنكليزية في اللهجة الموصلية يكون أكثر تعقيداً. تهدف الدراسة إلى فحص وتحليل هذه المفردات من المنظور الصرفي. وقد تم جمع البيانات بناءً على نوعين من المصادر ألا وهي: حوارات طبيعية تحدث بين المتحدثين باللهجة الموصلية وكذلك وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي المعاصرة. وتم استخدام المنهج النوعي لتعزيز التحليل الوصفي لمئة كلمة إنكليزية مستعارة كعينة ممثلة باتباع نموذج سالم (٢٠١٥). وقد ظهرت النتائج أن هذه الكلمات المستعارة قد خضعت لتغيرات صرفية كبيرة. قد شملت الأنماط الرئيسية للدمج تعيين الكلمات الإنكليزية المستعارة لتشكيل الكلمات الاشتقاقية والصرفية. مرة أخرى، تم التعامل مع الكلمات الإنكليزية المستعارة كجذور لإنشاء كلمات جديدة أخرى. وقد استخدم الفعل الخفيف مع عمليات الإدراج غير المباشرة لدمج العديد من الأفعال المستعارة بشكل عام، ولوحظت استراتيجيات إضافية كتركيب وتقليص الكلمات. كما تم تكيف الأسماء الإنكليزية المستعارة لتناسب السمات النحوية مثل الجنس والعدد والتملك. وأخيراً، استنتجت الدراسة إلى أن الكلمات الإنكليزية المستعارة تم دمجها بشكل واسع سواء جزئياً أو كلياً، في النظام الصرفي للهجة الموصلية.



الكلمات المفتاحية: الكلمات الإنكليزية المستعارة الثابتة، الكلمات المستعارة العفوية، اللهجة العربية الموصلية، والدمج الصرفي.

The Morphological Integration of English Loanwords in Mosuli Arabic

Assistant Lecturer: Sundus Falah Mohammed

In Linguistics and English Language Teaching

Northern Technical University

sundus.falah@ntu.edu.iq

Abstract

The present study comprehensively tackles English loanwords of monolingual speakers, i.e. established loanwords, or bilingual speakers, i.e. spontaneous loanwords. English loanwords have become more widely used in speech as well as writings of Mosuli Arabic (henceforth MA). Therefore, it is important to know to what extent English loanwords are morphologically affected by Arabic paradigm. The problem of the study indeed is what the morphological changes English loanwords have undergone. This is considered as challengeable since English and MA are more typologically different. Thus, integration of many words from English into MA are said to be more complex. The study aims at investigating and analysing these lexemes from the morphological perspective. Data collection has been based on two genres: naturally occurring conversations of Mosuli Arabic participants and contemporary social medias. Qualitative method has been used to invigorate the descriptive analysis of 100 English loanwords as a representative sample, following Salem's model (2015). The findings have shown that these loanwords have undergone significant morphological changes. Key patterns of integration have included assigning English loan lexemes to derivational and inflectional word-formation patterns. Again, English loan lexemes have been treated as roots for creating new other words. The light verb with indirect insertion processes has been used for generally merging many loan verbs. Additional strategies like compounding and clipping have been observed as well. English loan nouns have also been adapted to grammatical features like gender, number and possessive. Finally,



it has been concluded that English loanwords have extensively been integrated, whether partially or fully, into morphological system of MA.

Keywords: Established English loanwords, Spontaneous Loanwords, MA, and Morphological Integration.

1. Introduction

Two types of varieties that can be used by Arabic speaking populations: the formal variety, known as the high variety, is called Modern Standard Arabic (henceforth MSA) being described as a modernized version of classical Arabic with regard to grammar and lexicon. It is more extendedly used in schools, TV programmes, literature and publications. The colloquial variety, also known as the low variety, is concerned with the Arabic dialect that constitutes the spoken mother tongues of native speakers as a whole. It can be used in informal contexts. In this case, Arabic is subjected to the diglossia phenomenon where two varieties referring to the same language are often used by the same individuals to achieve various communicative functions (Holes, 2004: 3-6). It is important to mention that Arabic can be spoken in different dialects in various regions; some of them are more widely used than others. Moreover, the further apart when moving geographically the less dialects are and less mutually intelligible. A continuum of Arabic dialects being spoken results from “language contact”. Such contact has recently emerged with other neighbouring languages, particularly with those denoting colonial control (Pereltsvaig, 2012: 94). As a result of this, borrowing manifests. According to the “Loanword Typology Project” whose goal was to investigate patterns of lexical borrowing in a representative sample collected from overall languages of the world, 24, 2% was the average rate of borrowing (Tadmor, 2009: 55). It indicates that a quarter of the whole lexemes were approximately loanwords, it is valuable, although a bias exists towards languages borrowing more than others. As far as international influence of English is taken into consideration, Onysko (2007: 10) has presented the notion of “Anglicism” when stated that “the term Anglicism is often used as a generic name to describe the occurrence of English language elements in other languages”. Nevertheless, all the



borrowings are anglicisms but not all the anglicisms result from a borrowing process (Onysko, 2007: 11).

It analyses the perceived attitude of Mosuli people towards their use of English expressions in every life communication. Nonetheless, this study has not been efficiently and sufficiently discussed before.

Concerning significance of the Study, borrowing in MA is an enjoyable and challenge topic because it has not morphologically been tackled before. There is a little, if any, a genetic connection between the two unrelated languages with their structures are also very different. These significant typological differentiations are likely to produce interesting effects when dealing with morphological integration of English loan words. This study is to show how English loanwords are morphologically incorporated into MA, given all the differences that exist between them.

Various typical researches have dedicated their best effort to phonological changes English loanwords have undergone. This study focuses entirely on a certain perspective of the borrowing strategy, particularly, the integration of English loanwords into the morphological domain of MA. It tries to answer these main questions:

- 1- What are the basic changes in which English loanwords, namely lexemes in MA, have undergone at the morphology position?
- 2- How morphologically are English loanwords integrated into MA?
- 3- Why are many English loanwords easier to be integrated than others?

2. Literature Review

This section is going to tackle major issues with regard to the terminologies of borrowing with their definitions and reasons behind the borrowing mechanism. The grammatical categories of loanwords, the morphological integration of loanwords, and some perspectives of MA are going to be discussed later on.

2.1 Overview Terminology and Definitions of Loanword

Language contact almost entails a change of the structural inventory of either one or sometimes both languages (Matras, 2009: 146), to be direct, a structure in one language can be imported into another, this is called "borrowing". It has been argued that a monolingual speaker perhaps does not



realize that a borrowed word can be attributed to a foreign origin, however; borrowing is a totally conscious procedure (Matras, 2009: 146). The concept “borrowing” is greatly adopted as well as most individuals realize what it means. Many synonyms of borrowings are either loanwords or loans. Here, two languages may be employed: Source Language (henceforth SL) from which lexical items are taken and Receptor Language (henceforth RL) into which lexical items are incorporated (Gadellii, 2015: 8). A loanword for Haspelmath (2009:36) is “a word that at some point in the history of a language entered its lexicon as a result of borrowing (or transfer or copying)”. The term “transfer” states that the donor language can lose an element (Haspelmath, 2009: 37). Johanson (2002: 11-18) prefers the term “copying” which consists of two major sorts: global copying, stands for borrowing free forms, and selective copying, stands for borrowing structural categories, usually merged into the RL. Poplack et al. (1988:52) has expanded the definition of lexical borrowing as “the incorporation of L2 words into the discourse of L1, the recipient language, with the possibility of being phonologically and morphologically adapted to obey the rules of that language and occupy a syntactic status”.

Borrowing can actually relies on whether the borrower is a native or a non-native speaker of the RL. When native speakers, i.e. monolinguals, borrow structures from a foreign language into their spoken mother tongue, the process is referred to “adoption”. Furthermore, when non-native speakers, i.e. bilinguals, borrow structures from their mother tongue into foreign language, the process is regarded as “imposition” (Haspelmath, 2009: 36). Some researchers, like Winford (2010: 171), tend to restrict the definition of borrowing with the respect of “adoption” process.

On the other hand, Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 21) have defined borrowing as a diachronic phenomenon in which foreign elements with its structure are brought from one language into another. To compare with, code-switching (henceforth CS) looks like as a synchronic bilingual process as being categorized via the alternation of two or more languages, in similar spoken texts of bilinguals (Clyne, 1991: 161). Lexical insertions in this study follow Muysken (2000:3), where lexical insertion indicates a spontaneous



behaviour of bilingual inserting lexical elements from one distinct language into a structural framework of another one. The basic language supplying the structural frame is referred to the language being matrix, also, the language that contributes supplying inserted items, the embedded language variety (Myers-Scotton, 1993b: 20). From an insertional perspective, Myers-Scotton (1993b: 4) has defined a code-mixing as the selection having been made by bilinguals and multi-linguals of structures or items from embedded language/s in the language being matrix throughout similar conversation. Because of the instability of code-mixing definitions to employ lexical insertions, it entails an interrelation with established loanwords. According to Muysken (2000: 3), the lexical insertion is corresponded to spontaneous borrowing. Furthermore, Auer (1999: 313-14) has classified lexical insertions as instances of code-switching, not code-mixing. For him, two kinds of CS exist, namely; alternational as well as insertional. The former denotes a return after making the noticeable switch into the prior language whereas the latter means the insertion of a content lexical item from one language variety towards the other. Appel and Muysken (1987:173) point out to the distinct boundary between established loanwords and insertional CS; the CS is considered as a bilingual process, while borrowing is as a monolingual process.

It has been assumed that synchronic lexical insertions generate diachronic loanwords (Backus 2014-cited in Salem, 2015: 24). In this case, Lexical insertions are described as spontaneous loanwords and then become established over the passage of time. The concept “loanword” used in the present study covers for all cases of lexemes with English etymology. It also can be applied to other foreign and expressions, i.e. Latin and other European ones, which are found in English, too. Established loanwords denote all English words habitually used by monolinguals as a part of in MA. In another side, spontaneous loan lexemes indicate English components which are integrated in the structural system of MA with the help of bilingual Mosuli speakers so that they can exactly achieve communicative aims. Both “borrowing” and “code-switching” are generally adapted for activities via which established loanwords as well as spontaneous ones are



normally inserted in MA. The integration notion actually designates whatever morphological changeable elements that English loanwords in MA have undergone so as to better merge into the system of dialect of MA. At last, the term MA is regarded as a considerable cover term so as to involve both the colloquial variety and the MSA variety, particularly in Mosul.

2.2 Reasons behind Borrowing

Matras (2009: 150) has given two significant reasons about borrowing; the first one is related to the gaps existing in the constructed inventory of the RL, but the second the global prestige of the SL. Gaps, in a language, occurs when either bilinguals or semi-bilinguals cannot entirely express linguistic elements in their native language. Regarded to this, they allow themselves to adopt structures or forms normally attributed to any specific language. Such gap-fillers are known as cultural loans that can be brought with the aid of new social processes and cultural acquisitions, for instance; community or institutions functions, agricultural or food products and many technical innovations. So, cultural loans reveal a great impact on the lexicon of any language". So, borrowing affected by prestigious factor contains a different technique: speakers looking for suitable approval or social status often tackle linguistic forms of the more dominant community. In the opposite of the gap-fillers having no parallel structures being found in the RL, most prestigious loans involve parallel forms in the RL, which however can lack the specific impact looked for). At last, it is more enjoyable to perceive that social hierarchy should not coincide with a favour of the SL even if the SL can also be less powerful language sometimes conforming to a marginalized group (Matras, 2009: 150-151). An intra-linguistic situation of this, first being noticed by the American sociolinguist, William Labov, has been observed when well-educated individuals intentionally use "bad language" as a result its "covert prestige". Another reason is that Computer-Mediated Communication (henceforth CMC) has improved a modern form of language which is exclusively correlated with the internet, and then informally precipitated an extreme use of English words in the written texts. Inserting words by bilingual speakers from the SL results from several pragmatic, semantic specificity and interactional motivations, for the purpose of gap



filling, either because there is no an equivalent or semi-equivalent of the inserted element in the matrix language, i.e. its semantic meaning is not as accurate as with that of insertion. Another reason is that the bilingual has no capacity to retrieve an appropriate or suitable lexeme from his/her repertoire. Specific topics increase insertions since a bilingual misses particularized or technical terms in his/her native variety (Backus, 2001; Fishman, 1972; and Holmes, 2001-cited in Salem, 2015: 17-27, 28).

Finally, insertions may appear because of some sociolinguistic variables like the setting of social community, the topic of conversation, the functional roles of participants with their relationships, in addition to religion, class, age and gender (Bhatia and Ritchie, 2004: 339-344).

2.3 Grammatical Loanwords Categories

Two distinct methods of borrowing elements from the SL into the RL are: matter (henceforth MAT) as well as pattern (henceforth PAT) (Matras and Sakel (2004)-cited in Sakel, 2007: 15). It is sometimes known as material vs. structural borrowing, respectively (Haspelmath 2009: 38-39). More obviously, Sakel (2007: 15) states that MAT borrowing meaning a replication of morphological elements and its phonological items from one into another language, but PAT means a replication of just patterns existing in that language, i.e. morpho-syntactic or semantic patterns can be borrowed but not the form itself. Borrowing of grammatical elements follows a certain hierarchal status, more entirely built upon frequency, and supplying for a special word class to be influenced by borrowing. A list presented by Matras and Sakel (2007: 61) as follows: “nouns, conjunctions > verbs > discourse markers > adjectives > interjections > adverbs > other particles, adpositions > numerals > pronouns > derivational affixes > inflectional affixes”.

It seems that noun class is the most borrowable parts of speech, in contrast to inflectional affixes. loan nouns occupying the hierarchal position can be elaborated in terms of their referential roles; they occupy the most prominent field for labelling new notions, objects and institutions functions (Matras, 2009: 172; Matras and Sakel, 2007: 65). It appears that the borrowability of lexical words is more than function ones, as represented in the scale of Field’s morpheme type-borrowing (2002:38).



2.4 Morphological Integration of Loanwords

The integration phenomenon hypothesizes that the degree of integration can help determine the loanword status, whether being established or spontaneous (i.e. a switch). According to the criteria produced by Poplack (1980: 584), a foreign word is a borrowed one when it is totally integrated, but it can be highly a code-switch if it is partially integrated or somehow unintegrated. On the morphological integration level, number and gender categories of a loan content noun, as well as procedures required to integrate loan content verbs, can be publically attributed to how a loanword the having been morphologically treated. Matras (2009:172, 173-74) has explained that the morphological manipulation of loan content nouns is circled around: adopting inflectional patterns of the native language, avoiding any integration, adopting the original inflection of the SL, and finally adopting specific integration processes. With regard to applying native inflectional patterns, he has pointed out that languages displaying nominal inflections concerning possessive, definiteness, number, case and gender can add them to loan content nouns as well. Concerning loan content verbs, both Wichmann and Wohlgemuth (2008:89-121) have introduced four major integration strategies that any RL perhaps follow to integrate loan verbs: light verb strategy, direct insertion and indirect insertions, and transfer of paradigm. In the first strategy, light verbs express an auxiliary-like function such as “do” or “make”. They have named this method as the ‘do-strategy’ being as the most frequently used with integration of acceptable foreign loan content verbs inasmuch as multiple language varieties. The second strategy, indirect insertion, is the next in the sample, in which a native morpheme, namely affix, can be applied in order to integrate loan content verbs. Concerning the third strategy, it is to found direct insertion of a loan content verb regardless of any other morphological integration or syntactic one. Lastly, the less workable strategy is transfer of paradigm, linking verbal morphology borrowing with its loan content verb. These can be shown in the next proposed hierarchical value of loan content verb integration: Light verb > indirect insertion > direct insertion > and paradigm transfer. However, Matras (2009:176-180) has supposed that strategies involved in verb



integration is better to be shaped on a continuum aspect. More clearly, some languages can borrow foreign plain verbs free of any perceived integration, as in the case the borrowed Chinese content verbs in Vietnamese. Many other kinds of languages indirectly insert loan content verbs by applying a certain template to them utilized for ‘intensification of actions’. Added to that, there are limited number of languages contain native verbalizing morphemes, i.e. suffixes, for fundamentally integrating loan content forms of verbs.

In loan content adjectives integration, many researches have detected that adjectives can be treated like other native ones existing in the RL. Matras (2009: 188-191) has mentioned instances from some different languages assigning loan content adjectives to a specific native inflectional group. Adverbs, on the other hand, are most often integrated from native content adjectives. Consequently, languages deriving native adverbial forms from content adjectives or content nouns do behave analogously with the loan content adjectives and nouns as well. Some languages, as with the case of English, appoint derivations of lexical adverb that is native to both loan content adjectives and content nouns. Also, it can be really correct with Arabic since it appoints the expression [bišakl] “way or manner” in order to mainly derive native adverbial forms of manner from native content adjectives.

Nevertheless, the degree of integration can be so helpful to determine whether a loanword is established or spontaneous. As apart from integration, the scholars Poplack (1980: 584) have then confirmed that an established loanword, being widespread recurrent in the speech of a monolingual, may not trace the phonological, morphological or syntactic paradigm of the SL. Still, integration phenomenon exploits a failure to directly differentiate between spontaneous loanwords (insertions) and established ones. Auer (1999: 314) claims that integrated items can be completely realized at the morphological stage. For some other scholars both of them should be dealt with alongside a continuum (Salem, 2015: 37).

Morphological integration appears much more complex whenever the languages are in contact, particularly those having two distant systems. In



addition, Winford (2003:48) has announced that morphological integration is more complicated, especially if the loan word contains complicated inflectional and derivational system, in case, number, gender, etc. The study highlights the various changes in morphological perspective that English loanwords have undergone to integrate with the morphological paradigm of MA.

2.5 Some Aspects of Mosuli Arabic (MA)

This section here goes around some basic domains of MA that are going to be beneficial for the reader. In the whole steps of evolution, foreign loanwords merged from various languages into Arabic to be as a strategy of “modernization” (Issawi, 1967-cited in Salem, 2015: 17). These loans are due to various semantic domains like technology, fashion, sport, religion, business and others. Borrowability is ultimately a required mechanism to promote Arabic (Khasarah, 2000: 919). In this modern era, after the revolution of inventory of news and social media such as television, mobile as well as radio, or the political effects, economic and/or scientific impact of multiple foreign languages like English, borrowability seems much more dominant as well as powerful as. English vocabularies have occupied mass media, then into the speech and written forms by straight insertions and loan translations. As a result of controlling the foreign influence on Arabic with widening Arabic vocabulary as well to fulfill modern requirements, language academies have been established in some Arabic countries, like Iraq, Jordan, Syria, Egypt and Morocco. So, the primary duties of such academies have to innovate a certain term for each successive innovation in whole scientific and technical aspects, as well as to preserve the linguistic pureness. To achieve these aims, the institutionalized academies defense a number of technical aspects such as: language revival, semantic expansion of a native element, and Arabicization (Khasarah, 2000: 919-923; Holes, 2004: 44-45 and Salem, 2015: 18). Arabicization is perceived a process of lexical wideness that can be done either throughout creating a new terminology for a modern or new material throughout borrowing process. The non-native form can be used within texts of the standard Arabic after being acclimatized to the patterns of phonological and morpho-syntax of Arabic (Ali 1987:86). In



relation to the MA context, realization of importance and magnitude globalization of English language throughout internet and mass social media, and the appearance of informal written texts in CMC help enhance the incorporation of loanwords of English in MA, particularly among the youngers.

3. Methodology of the Study

This research paper is absolutely qualitative as well as descriptive in its nature. Using just the qualitative method is essential for providing richer and more adequate description of the borrowing mechanism and the integration of English loanwords in the RL by following Salem's model (2015) of morphological integration. The study entirely restricted on MA, and elements of MSA is given a minimal attention. The corpus design involved a selection of about 100 English loan lexemes as a representative sample, collected from two main authentic genres: naturally occurring conversations of MA participants like TV/radio programs, representing spoken domain, and CMC, i.e. contemporary social medias like synchronous Facebook interactions, YouTube, telegram, representing informal spoken-written domain. The analysis also offers both transcription and transliteration of the collected data since the phonology of MA does not typically spread from the phonology of MSA as being represented in writings. The study only is directed to the morphological analysis of mere English loan lexical items in exclusively informal and natural domains of MA. Moreover, the functionalized perspective with regard to the usages of English lexical words in speech and writing aspects has already been neglected. Furthermore, the study focuses on how English loanwords are adapted in MA by analysing word-formation patterns. It has analytically been built upon Wichmann with Wohlgemuth (2008) as well as Matras (2009) to examine how verbs are integrated. It pays particular attention to changes in gender, number and possessiveness. The study relies on the duplication of English words in MA to explore how such words have been modified align with its inflectional paradigm. With this respect, many areas are going to be investigated by adopting Salem's (2015) model: integration linked to processes of word-formation; derivational integration, clipping, loan verb integration, and the



templates of inflectional integration of loan nouns. English Loanwords have been divided into completely integrated, partially integrated or nonintegrated, relying on the scale or degree of morphological changes that a borrowing word had submitted.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion of the Morphological Integration of English loanwords in Mosuli Arabic

This section is to solve the aforementioned questions of what the morphological changes are and about how English loanwords are planned to match derivational paradigms as well as inflectional ones of MA. It describes the material with the methodology used to analyse the corpus. Loanwords that coming in the RL are mostly submitted to typical structures with regard to their morphophonemic structures to appropriately fit into the discipline of the RL. This is true for the English loan lexemes integration in MA. The sub-sequent sections examine various morphological patterns of English loan lexemes' integration in MA regardless of phonological changes, adopting Salem's model (2015). The kind and degree of realized integration have been determined through making a correlation between both the SL (English) model and the RL (MA) replica.

4.1 Derivational Integration

Ryding (2005: 45) has explained that morphology of Arabic lexical mainly consists of a consonant root system intertwining with vowels pattern in order to generate different word stems. To construct Arabic word formation, a root morpheme is f-ʕ-l into which any pattern can fit. Benmamoun (2003-cited in Salem, 2015: 107) has denoted that derivation of a word in Arabic needs three basic components: a consonantal root, a temple with a computational rules which inserts the root onto the pattern. To be more obviously, the formation of a word is usually made by the pattern/template comprising of the consonants and vowels. The Arabic root might be two, three, four or five consonants. He has emphasized that distinctive verbal elements or nominal ones are connected when forming into the pattern contains similar consonantal root, and dealing with a certain semantic notion. To illustrate the idea, the verbal expressions [katab] "he wrote", [yaktub] "he writes", as well as the nominal expressions [maktab]



“office”, [Maktaba (h)] “library” and [kātib] “writer” (Ryding, 2005: 46, 47), are really created from the root k-t-b “write” being tri-consonantal, indicating the same lexical meaning notion which is writing. These expressions are constructed via assigning the root k-t-b to the existing verbal patterns like CaCaC, and yaCCuC, as well as the nominal patterns maCCaC, maCCaCa and CāCiC, respectively.

Similar process can be carried out in the integration of derivations of English lexical in MA. Once again, vast of the English lexical loanwords can be regarded as word-stems from which other further words are generated via assigning the root onto the found patterns. The English loan nouns [čānʃ] “chance”, [fays] “face”, [kuiz] “quiz” and [sikgāb] “scrap” are actually rendered as stems of the following roots č-n-n-ʃ, f-y-y-s, k-w-w-s and s-k-ġ-b, respectively, from which the following perfective verbs [čannaʃ] “had a chance”, [fayyas] “used Facebook”, [kawwaz] “made a quiz” and [sakgab] “made a scrap”, are notably derived. Such verbs are constructed by inserting the root onto the patterns CaCCaC of the quadri-literal perfective roots. In the derivation of further verbal forms, affixes can also be involved. For example, the imperfective verb forms [yčanniʃ] “has a chance”, [yfayyis] “uses Facebook” and [ykawwiz] “makes a quiz” and [ysakgib] “makes a scrap” are derived from the aforementioned quadri-literal perfective roots by the inserting the prefix [y-] being used to ultimately derive the imperfective verbs in MA dialect, to map onto the template yCaCCiC. Also, the English loanwords “television”, “action” and “archive” are basically mapped onto pattern of the verbal noun CaCCaCa(h) so as to derive the words [talfaza(h)] “data televising”, [’akšana(h)] “data acting” as well as [’aršafa(h)] “data archiving”.

Any established loanword can be dealt with as a stem whatever its class is. The English loan adjectives [dabl] “double” and [fūl] “full” was actually manipulated in speech as a quadri-literal root derived from the tri-literal one from which the perfective verb [dabbal] “duplicated” as well as [fawwal] “filled”, respectively, then the spoken active participle form [mdabbil] “duplicating” and [mfawwil] “filling”, respectively, are derived. It is really true for MA to appoint the form [bšekl] “way or manner” for the purpose of



deriving adverbs from English loan adjectives, as in [bʃekl 'otomātīkī] “automatically”.

4.2 Affixation

Relative adjectives are made by adding the suffix [-ī], for feminine [-ya(h)], to words like nouns or adjectives. This “nisba” suffix is widely used to form new terms either Arabic or foreign (Ryding, 2005: 261). English Loanwords involving English suffixes are dealt with differently. In many instances, suffixed English loanwords nouns like “romanticism”, “academics” and “democracy” are not borrowed together with their original suffixes. But, the coincided forms often are taken from the Arabicized forms of adjectives with the aid of inserting the nominalizing suffix [-ī], as a result with [rōmānsī] “romantic”, [ʾakādīmī] “academy” an [dīmuqrātī] “democratic”, respectively. Then, a nominal derivation strategy to derive nouns is applied by adding the Arabic native morpheme, namely the suffix [-ya(h)], to the aforementioned adjectives in: [rōmānsiy-ya(h)], [ʾakādīmiy-ya(h)] and [dīmuqrāṭiy-ya(h)], respectively. Nevertheless, there are instances of English loanwords alongside with their original suffixes like [-ology], [-graphy] and [-dy], which are borrowed as a whole. This is attributed to the complexity of integrating English loanwords without them, in contrary to those involving other different suffixes. To elaborate the point, most of the English suffixes are functionally denoting particular sciences or some fields of knowledge, dissimilar to the function of other suffixes. Therefore, maintaining such suffixes facilitate the integration of the loanwords they are connected to. English loanwords employing such suffixes are generally integrated to derive nouns via directly suffixing the morpheme [ā] to them, as in [taknalōjiyā] “technology”, [juḡrāfiyā] “geography” and [komīdiyā] “comedy”.

More interestingly, this study observes that when inserting some English loan nouns that involve prefixes into MA, the process may reverse: the original prefix is kept, while the main stem is substituted by its Arabic equivalent as in the expression geo-political > [geo-siyāsī].

4.3 Clipping



The process of clipping means forming new forms of words via truncation of the already found forms. Katamba (2005:180) has mentioned that clipping can be called as a process of word-formation that has a clear phonological proportion since the clipped expression might turn into either mono-syllabic or di-syllabic. Though being described as the less productive process of word-formation, clipping becomes mostly beneficial in everyday communication because of people's tendency to a specific subject as well as their preference to facilitate the pronounceable version of the word (Kortmann, 2005:95; Harley 2006:95). There are two types of clipping do exist: fore-clipping means omitting the initial part of the word, and back-clipping omitting the final. Mattiello (2013:76) has explained that compound clipping occurs whenever the compound word is reduced into just one of its fragments, and they almost are related to transportation scope or some parts. Examples of back-clipped English loan compounds are: steering wheel > steering [stērin] and body shell > [badī]. Instances about the fore-clipped English loan compounds are: electrical conductor > [kōndiktār] and air-conditioner > [kōndšīn]. Clipped English loanwords are mostly created by university students. These are geology > [džiyō], mid-term examination > [mid-term/mid], psycholinguistics > [sāykō] and final exam > [fāynal]. Finally, back-clipping compounds are approximately consistent although most of them are right-headed as with the last example where the head (exam) has been deleted.

4.4 Loan Verb Integration

Wichmann and Wohlgemuth (2008:89-121) have discussed four fundamental strategies of verb integration, these are: light verb strategy, indirect insertion, direct insertion and paradigm transfer. When integrating English loan verbs in the corpus, two basic strategies, light verb as well as indirect insertion, are involved. Light verb strategy is likely said to be the most frequently used one; it mainly incorporates in the spoken variety. Further, the most frequent light verb used for integrating many English loan content verbs is [ʔiʕmal] “make or do” with its distinct verbal forms that are innovated via adding verb conjugations, such as [yiʕmal] “he makes”, [ʕəməl] “he made”, [ʔiʕmal] “you make”, [ʔiʕmltu] “I made”, [tʕmal] “she



makes”, etc., the uses of such light verb in [’iʕmal] copy; [tʕmal] mention and [ʕəməl] delete are perceived as some highlighted examples . Once again, the technical use of the light verb [’iʕmal] is realized to incorporate with many English verb participles such as “up/downloading”, “installing” or “scanning”.

With regard to indirect insertion, the corpus matches alongside with what Matras (2009: 176-180) has proposed where loan verbs are inserted into an inflectional template which are clearly used for the purpose of ‘intensification of actions’. The following English loan verbs are dynamically integrated, with the indirect insertion strategy, via constructing the pattern CaCCaC to them as in: save > [səyyav], check > [ʕəyyak], share > [ʕəyyar], connect > [kənnak]

After having been inserted into this template, they are totally inflected as perfect verbs so as to generate other various verb forms. The English loan verb “save” has the imperfective form [ysəyyiv], “check” > [yʕəyyik], and “share” > [yʕəyyir]. But, the English loan verbs “fabricate” and “cancel” are found not to fully fit into the same pattern attributed to them. This indicates that they can be perceived as four pure consonantal Arabic roots as in f-b-r-k and k-n-s-l, respectively.

At the end of this sub-section, it seems rational to treat loan verbs integration as a method alongside a continuum with two noticeable end points, these are: non-integrated spontaneous loan content verbs and completely integrated established loan content verbs. As elaborated above, applying the light verb strategy in order to integrate English loan verbs might have been the first technique for establishing such loan content verbs. So, spontaneous English loan verbs which function as a stem for other further derivations and inflections can lead to be accepted in MA and then gradually become established loan verbs. Transforming from non-integrated spontaneous loan verbs endpoint towards established integrated one, the continuum have to comprise strategies like the employment of light verb and indirect insertions, sequentially.

4.5 The Definite Article



In the standard variety of Arabic, the definite article [al] fundamentally stands for as pre-modifier of both nouns and adjectives as well. Analogous to nouns and adjectives, such a definite article can be prefixed to loan nouns and adjectives as well. Similar to other standard Arabic words, the letter /l/ of the definite article is assimilated to the initial consonant of the loanword if being followed by any sun letter (Ryding, 2005: 40). The definite article can be possibly realized as [el] in the speech of MA, and [al] in the writing. The loan nouns “the captain”, “the mouse”, “the laptop”, and ‘the radio’ are commonly rendered as [elkaptən], [elmaws], [el-laptop] and [er-rādyō] in the spoken MA and as [alkāptən], [almaws], [al-lāptop] and [ar-rādyō] in the written variety.

4.6 Inflection for Gender, Number and Possessiveness

English loan lexemes resort to work with patterns of inflectional integration in MA in accordance with gender, number, with possessive categories. This is going to be illustrated in the three following sub-sections.

4.6.1 Inflection for Gender

Matras (2009:174) has pointed out that gender category of loan content nouns is based via several attributes, firstly; the natural gender referent of the lexical loanword, secondly; the gender of the element in the SL, and finally; the gender of an counterpart or near counterpart in the RL. In the other side, Treffers-Daller (1994:123) has asserted that gender category occurs when the gender system of the RL does not coincide with that of the SL. In accordance with Corbett (1991:74), lexical loanwords can be always assigned to a gender in relation to either meaning or structure, relying on assignment discipline of that borrowing language. In their previous study, Poplack, et al. (1982-cited in Salem, 2015: 114) have investigated gender category in English loan content nouns in both Puerto Rican Spanish with Montreal French. They have found that nouns denoting animate have been appointed to gender on the basis of their biological sex. Other basic factors have been the phonological framework of loan content nouns as well as the semantic analogy of their counterparts in the RL.

The whole loan content nouns in the current sample being assigned to gender are either masculine or feminine. To explain more, there are three



significant factors, each of which can occupy a position to determine the gender category of English loan content nouns in MA, these are; the biological sex of referent, the semantic analogy of the Arabic equivalent as well as the phonological shape of the loan content noun. Really, a small number of loan content nouns are assigned a gender whether masculine or feminine built upon their biological sex. For more elaboration, the English loan content nouns [prɪsn] “prince”, [boɪfrɛnd] “boyfriend”, [mɪstər] “mister” and [kɪŋ] “king” denote masculine, but the English loan content nouns [prɪnsɪsah] “princess”, [mɪs] “miss” and [faʃɪnɪstah] “fashionista” denote feminine, all being built upon their biological sex. Although the English loan noun in [sɪstər] “sister” is assigned a feminine gender in MA, it semantically functions as a “nurse”.

The most crucial factor to specifying the gender of English loan content nouns can be the semantically analogical gender of their counterparts in MA. Many English loan content nouns accurately assign masculine gender since their counterparts in Arabic are indeed masculine. Therefore, the so native counterpart of the English loan lexeme [ˈɪmɛl] “email”, [bərɪd], is actually masculine, as the English loan content noun “email” can be masculine, too. Such criterion is typically true for the masculine English loan content nouns “body”, “oven”, “bank”, “computer”, “file”, “condition” and “router”, indicate to the masculine equivalents or semi-equivalents [dʒɪsm], [furn], [maʃraf], [ħasūb], [malaf], [mukayyif] and [muwajjih], respectively. Similarly, the loan content nouns [kēka(h)] “cake”, [balakōna(h)] “balcony” and [makīna(h)] “machine” are assigned a feminine gender since their Arabic counterparts or near counterparts [kaʃka(h)], [ʃurfa(h)] and [ˈāla(h)], respectively, can almost be feminine. So, the feminine gender of such English loan content nouns has been proved through the use of the Arabic feminine suffix [-a(h)], being an unmarked feminine marker.

The third factor that influences the feminine gender category of English loan content nouns might be the phonological framework. General speaking, in Arabic, English loan content nouns end in [-a/ā] are feminine, being understood like a feminine marker. For example, some English loan content



nouns, such as [kamira(h)] “camera”, [drāmā] “drama”, and [sīnama] “cinema” are attributed to the feminine gender in MA.

4.6.2 Inflection for Number

Number category of lexical loanwords can be recognized as another inflectional factor denoting morphological integration. Thus, In grammar of MSA, a noun can be singular, dual, or plural. Two suffixes are used to assign what is called duality; the suffix bound morpheme [-ān] in the nominative case as in [muḥāsibān] and [muḥāsibatān] “two accountants” as well as the suffix bound morpheme [-ayn] in the accusative case or genitive in [maḥāsibayn] and [muḥāsibatayn], whether animate or inanimate. Concerning pluralization, two types of plural nouns are involved. The first type is the sound plural nouns which are formed by adding the masculine suffixes [-ūn] in [muḥāsibūn] and [-īn] in [muḥāsibīn] in nominative and accusative/genitive case, respectively, or feminine suffixes like [-āt] in [muḥāsibāt]. The second is the broken plural nouns which lead to internal changes to the base nouns as in: [dʒaras] → [‘adʒrās] “bells” and [hāmiš] → [hawāmiš] “margins” (Salem, 2015: 116, 119).

As for MA, number distinction in spoken MA is nearly the same with slight differences. Spoken MA does not contain the [-ān] dual form, instead, it merely uses the [-ēn] form being the colloquial rendering of the standard form [-ayn]. Resulting from this fact, the dual obtains just two morphemes, namely; [-ēn] used for nouns denoting masculine and [-tēn] used for nouns denoting for feminine. Added to that, spoken texts in MA do not adapt the [-ūn] plural suffix used for masculine plural nouns which can be merely substituted by the [-īn] referring to the pluralization process of masculine nouns. Such distinctions existing in MSA and in the speech of MA might be attributed to simplification strategy, a major characteristic of colloquial varieties being uttered in the whole countries of Arab.

Number rules of MA can be applicable to English lexical loanwords. If the loan lexeme refers to masculine, the dual will be built via adding the suffix /-ēn/:

[bās] “bus” → [bāsēn]

[kavar] “cover” → [kavarēn]

[glās] “glass” → [glāsēn]

[mobayil] “mobile” → [mobayilēn]



When the singular loanword denotes feminine referent, it is possible for the dual noun to be constructed by adding the [-tēn] suffix, as in:

[makīna(h)] “machine” → [makīntēn] [duktōrah] “doctor” → [duktōrtēn]
[farmata(h)] “format” → [farmatēn] [warša(h)] “workshop” → [waršitēn]

Most English loan nouns are pluralized with regard to the sound plural nouns. The feminine sound plural can be more globally productive than the masculine one. Within the feminine sound pluralization of loan nouns, loan nouns that end with the sound [o] or [u] are pluralized by adding the [-wāt] suffix, or in a few cases, the [-hāt] suffix. Loan nouns ending with the sound [i] or [ī] can be pluralized via the addition of the suffix [-yāt]. Moreover, it is again parallel with the duality of these loan content nouns being constructed via the use of the [-wēn] suffix. It is necessary to state that acronyms can be turned into plural via matching [-yāt] to the end of English loan noun. Below are some disciplinary examples for the purpose of elaboration:

[dōlār] “dollar” → [dōlārāt] “dollars” [rōbōt] “robot” → [rōbōtāt] “robots”
[rādyo] “radio” → [rādiyowāt] “radios” [stīdyo] “studio” → [stīdyowāt]/[stīdyohāt] “studios”
[sīdī] “CD” → [sīdīyāt] “CDs”, [stōri] “story” → [stōriyāt] “stories”

It is important to shed light on the fact that pluralization with the [-āt suffix] appears to be known as a default procedure, particularly for only spoken English loan nouns in MA that have not been used in the standard Arabic yet. Below are several instances:

[sēt] “set” → [sētāt] “sets” [staydʒ] “stage” → [stadʒāt] “stages”
[diš] “dish” → [dišāt] “dishes”, [kapl] “couple” → [kapalāt] “couples”

Comparing with those entailing the sound plural markers, the English loan nouns receiving the broken plural marker are shown in few instances. Frankly speaking, some of them are old established having been acceptable in the standard language during the passage of time. Thus, applying a broken



plural form for English loan content nouns leads to merging these roots into inflectional patterns. Here are some provided examples in writings and speech of MA:

[kūb] “cup” → [’akwāb] “cups” [film] “film” → [’aflām] “films”,
[tankar] “tanker” → [tanākər] “tankers” [dambar] “dumper” → [danābər] “dumpers”

[kārtōn] “cartoon” → [karāfīn] “cartoons”

4.6.3 Inflection for Possessive

English loan nouns in MA are inflected to display possessiveness. Nouns are normally inflected to express the possessiveness via applying a specific possessive pronoun, such as suffixes, to any noun being owned. To compare with, possessive assignment in MA is slightly dissimilar to MSA. As to be illustrated, Table (1) shows various possessive structures of the noun kitāb “book” in both of the MSA (Salem, 2015: 120) and spoken MA:

Table (1): Possessive in MSA and MA

Person	MSA	MA
1 st	Kitābi	Kitābi
2 nd .Masculine	Kitābuk	Kitābak
2 nd .Feminine	Kitābuki	Kitābki
3 rd .Masculine	Kitābuh	Kitābu
3 rd .Feminine	Kitābuha	Kitāba
2 nd .Dual	Kitābukumā	Kitābkim
3 rd .Dual	Kitābuhumā	Kitābim
1 st Plural	Kitābuna	Kitābna
2 nd Plural. Masculine	Kitābukum	Kitābkim
2 nd Plural. Feminine	Kitābukun	Kitābkim
3 rd Plural. Masculine	Kitābuhum	Kitābim
3 rd Plural. Feminine	Kitābuhun	Kitābim
Person	MSA	MA
1 st	Kitābi	Kitābi
2 nd .Masculine	Kitābuk	Kitābak
2 nd .Feminine	Kitābuki	Kitābki
3 rd .Masculine	Kitābuh	Kitābu
3 rd .Feminine	Kitābuha	Kitāba



2 nd .Dual	Kitābukumā	Kitābkim
3 rd .Dual	Kitābuhumā	Kitābim
1 st Plural	Kitābuna	Kitābna
2 nd Plural. Masculine	Kitābukum	Kitābkim
2 nd Plural. Feminine	Kitābukun	Kitābkim
3 rd Plural. Masculine	Kitābuhum	Kitābim
3 rd Plural. Feminine	Kitābuhun	Kitābim

Established loan nouns, dissimilar to spontaneous loan nouns, inflect to reveal the possessiveness following the possessive patterns in MA. Instances of such inflection in the spoken MA are [mobayli] “my mobile”, [mobaylu] “his mobile”, [glāṣak] “your glass”, [fāylim] “their file” and [‘īmēlkim] “your email”. Another interesting factor is concerned with assignment of possessiveness in some English spontaneous loan lexemes being found in the speech of MA people as being sometimes expressed with the use of the native or dialectal possessive adjective [māl] “belong to” whose position occurs after the intended noun being owned. Therefore, this can be also valid with some established loanwords comprised of two fragments as below:

[el-kōd māli] “my code”, [el-badi mālak] “your body” [es-sīm kart māla] “her sim card”, [el-’intar net mālim] “their inter net”, [paspōrt mālkim] “your passport”

4.7 Degree of Morphological Integration

English Loanwords are classified into three available groups based on how much they are integrated in the RL: non-integrated, partially-integrated, and fully-integrated.

By the way, non-integrated English lexical loanwords maintain their original morphological shape and do not undergo any morphological changes in MA, i.e. neither do they express inflections signifying number, gender, or possessiveness, nor they can be involved in any type of derivational process, like the English loanwords [kuntrōl] “control”, [ful tāym/mārk] “full-time/mark”, [vītō] “veto”, [tātō] “tattoo”, [gud] “good” and [sōrī] “sorry”. Some of them are written in their original spelling. At the morphological level, English lexical loans can be partially integrated in MA via adding suffixes that inflect to indicate the grammatical feature like



gender, number, or possessiveness. Huge number of integrated English lexical loanwords lie under this degree, some of them are: model > [mūdēlāt], chapter > [čāptarāt], seminar > [siminarāt], powder > [bōdarāt], page > [paydžāt], screen > [sijrīnāt], cover > [kavarāt], kilo > [kelawāt], course > kōrsāt and lamp > [lambāt]. These transformations indicate how English loanwords can be partially integrated to morphologically match the linguistic pattern in the RL. Finally, English loanwords are fully absorbed into the morphology of the RL. In other words, they show further derivations and inflections and full inflection for gender, number and possessiveness. For instance, the loan content noun “goal” is treated as a root to create the verb [gawwal] “he scored a goal” and [ygawwel] “he scores a goal”. Added to that, this loan noun is also inflected for gender, number and possession. The same is true with many other examples including [filar] “filter”, [halwasah] “hallucination”, [falsafah] “philosophy” and [talifōn] “telephone”. Provided to that, completely established loanwords have undergone new semantic classifications during the passage of time.

5. Conclusion

Integration of English lexical loanwords has been driven to follow the morphological rules and patterns of Arabic throughout adopting word formation patterns for integrating lexical loans acting as word-stems. These stems mostly correspond to quadrilateral roots applied to templates from which other verbal as well as nominal words can be generated, often CaCCaC in MA. The native light verb [’iʃmal] is more highly used to integrate English loan verbs, especially the newly utilized ones, i.e. spontaneous. English lexemes are regularly adjusted to match the morphological system of Arabic by inserting native shapes or patterns to them for facilitating their pronunciation. This strategy is expressed in the affixation of those refereeing to ideas or scientific titles, as well as the spoken clipped forms of non-established English loanwords referring to objects like cars or university settings. Two distinct definite articles are used in English loan nouns in different contexts. The gender of the Arabic counterpart word or near counterpart can highly be the most effective factor to determine the gender of the English loan nouns. Likewise, rules of duality



in Arabic and pluralization can be applied to English loan nouns, though there are minor differences between MSA and MA. Most English lexical loanwords may express inflections for the feminine sound plural via suffixing [-āt] to them, as a default strategy for spontaneous English loanwords pluralization. Possessive assignment usually can follow the use of native suffixes. In contexts where newly introduced English loan nouns, the already existential native possessive form māl “belong to” generally is applied to.

The ‘continuum’ concept is followed for handling English loanwords found in MA, throughout which the level of integration ranging from spontaneous loanwords to well-established ones. The more deeply a lexical word becomes established in MA, the more significant changes it morphologically undergoes. Established English loanwords tend to exhibit stronger integration, sometimes resulting in words different from their original forms, such as the pluralized English loanword [makāyən] “machines”. It is unfruitful to treat both the ‘established loanwords’ and ‘insertional CS’ as the same phenomenon. The minor distinction among them is related to how firmly they are established in Arabic, which can help determine the level of integration. It is generally expected that new loanwords are more likely to become standardized, although this is not always required. The acceptance of an English loanword into the MSA is a complex matter influenced by linguistic, social and attitudinal factors. English Loanwords usually appear first in informal or colloquial speech, i.e. MA, before being adopted into MSA, more particularly with the constant introduction of terms belonging to the CMC. Based on the above discussion, it has been concluded that language changes and develops, in terms of spread and acceptance English loanwords in MA; moreover, ranging gradually from spontaneous insertions in the speech of bilinguals to more established loanwords, entailing a linguistic change.

References

1. Ali, M. (1987). **A Linguistic Study of the Development of Scientific Vocabulary in Standard Arabic**. Routledge.
2. Appel, R., and Muysken, P. (1987). **Language Contact and Bilingualism**. Amsterdam University Press.



3. Auer, P. (1999). **From Code-switching via Language Mixing to Fused Lects: Toward a Dynamic Typology of Bilingual Speech.** International journal of bilingualism, 3(4), 309-332.
4. Bhatia, T. and Ritchie, W. C. (2004). **Social and Psychological Factors in Language Mixing.** In The Handbook of Bilingualism. Blackwell Publishing.
5. Clyne, M. (1991). **Community Languages: The Australian Experience.** Cambridge University Press.
6. Corbett, G. (1991). **Gender.** Cambridge University Press.
7. Field, F. (2002). **Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Contexts.** John Benjamins Publishing.
8. Gadellii, N. (2015). **The Morphological Integration of Loanwords into Modern Standard Arabic.** Unpublished Bachelor Thesis in General Linguistics, Lund University.
9. Harley, H. (2006). **English words: A linguistic Introduction.** Blackwell Publishing.
10. Haspelmath, M. (2009). **Lexical Borrowing: Concept and Issues.** Loanwords in the world's Languages: A Comparative Handbook. Mouton de Gruyter, 35-54.
11. Holes, C. (2004). **Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions, and Varieties.** Georgetown University Press.
12. Johanson, L. (2002). **Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contacts.** Curzon Press.
13. Katamba, F. (2005). **English Words: Structure, History, Usage.** Routledge.
14. Khasarah, M. (2000). **Al-Mu'arrab wa Al-Dakhil fi Al-Majallat Al-Mutakhasisah.** Majallah Mujama' Al-Lughah Al-Arabiyyah bi-Dimashq. 75 (4): 919- 942.
15. Kortmann, B. (2005). **English Linguistics: Essentials.** Cornelsen Verlag GmbH.
16. Matras, Y. and Sakel, J. (2007). **Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective.** Mouton de Gruyter.
17. Matras, Y. (2009). **Language Contact.** Cambridge University Press.
18. Mattiello, E. (2013). **Extra-grammatical Morphology in English: Abbreviations, Blends, Reduplicatives, and Related Phenomena.** Walter de Gruyter.
19. Muysken, P. (2000). **Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing.** Cambridge University Press.
20. Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). **Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching.** Oxford University Press.
21. Onysko, A. (2007). **Anglicisms in German: Borrowing, Lexical Productivity, and Written Codeswitching.** Walter de Gruyter.
22. Pereltsvaig, A. (2012). **Languages of the World: An Introduction.** Cambridge University Press.
23. Poplack, S. (2020). **Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish y Termino en Español: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching.** Linguistics, 18(7/8): 581-618.



24. Poplack, S., Sankoff, D. and Miller, C. (1988). **The Social Correlates and Linguistic Processes of Lexical Borrowing and Assimilation.** Linguistics, 26(1), 47-104.
25. Ryding, K. (2005). **A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic.** Cambridge University Press.
26. Sakel, J. (2007). **Types of Loan: Matter and Pattern.** Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective, (15):15-31.
27. Salem, E. (2015). **Loanwords in Jordanian Arabic.** Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Manchester.
28. Tadmor, U. (2009). **Loanwords in the World's Languages: Findings and Results.** Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook, 55, 75.
29. Thomason, S. and Kaufman, T. (1988). **Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics.** University of California Press.
30. Treffers-Daller, J. (1994). **Mixing Two Languages: French-Dutch Contact in a Comparative Perspective.** Mouton de Gruyter.
31. Wichmann, S. and Wohlgemuth, J. (2008). **Loan Verbs in a Typological Perspective.** In: Stolz, T., Bakker, D. and Salas Palomo, R. (eds.). Aspects of language contact: New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romanisation processes, 89-122.
32. Winford, D. (2003). **An Introduction to Contact Linguistics.** Blackwell Publishing.
33. Winford, D. (2010). **Contact and Borrowing.** In Hickey, Raymond (ed.). The Handbook of Language Contact, 170-187. Wiley-Blackwell.

JOBS



مجلة العلوم الأساسية
Journal of Basic Science



Print -ISSN 2306-5249

Online-ISSN 2791-3279

العدد الخامس والثلاثون

٢٠٢٦ م / ١٤٤٧ هـ



مجلة العلوم الأساسية
للعلوم التربوية والنفسية وطرائق التدريس للعلوم الأساسية