Grammaticalization in Urban Hijazi Arabic

Emtenan Eifan

A dissertation submitted to The University of Manchester for the degree of Master of Arts in the
Faculty of Humanities

Year 2017

Student ID number: 9969876

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Word Count:13708

List of Figures

List of Tables

TRANSLITERATION SYSTEM

I followed the the transliteration system used in Arabic dialectology. Below is an illustration of the symbols used in this thesis.

Consonants								
	labial	dental	dental-pharyngealized	palate-alveolar	velar	uvular	pharyngeal	glottal
VI stop	p	t	ṭ	č	k	q		
Vd stop	b	d	ḍ	dž	g	G		ʔ
Nasal	m	n						
Lateral		l			ł			
Trill		r						
VI fricative	f	θ			x		ḥ	h
Vd fricative	v	ð	ḍ̣		ġ		ʕ	
VI sibilant		s	ṣ	š				
Vd sibilant		z	ẓ	ž				
Semi-vowel	w			y				

Vowels

Ī			ū
i			u
	(ə)		ō
ē			o
e		a	ā

6

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS I

1: first person
2: second person
3: third person
DEF: definite article
F: feminine
M: masculine
NEG: negation
PFV: perfective
IMPV: imperfective
FUT: future
PROG: progressive
POSS: possessive
SG: singular
PL: plural

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS II

MSA: Modern Standard Arabic
CA: Classical Arabic
UHA: Urban Hijazi Arabic
HA: Hijazi Arabic
EA: Egyptian Arabic
GPA: Gulf Pidgin Arabic

Abstract

It is believed that the study of Arabic has been always pertained to the maintenance of its fixed artificial syntax categories instead of treating it as a dynamic language (Esseesy 2010). Consequently, old Arabic grammarians used to view the spoken Arabic varieties as language corruption that they seek to eliminate rather than to embrace. In fact, grammaticalization framework provides a better approach to treat languages as it looks at the syntactic categorizations as a "cline of grammaticality" (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 7). Grammaticalization is a process "whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions" (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 18).

It is observed that the spoken Arabic varieties present a higher level of grammaticalization than Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) (Esseesy 2010). Thus, this study attempts to account for the notion of grammaticalization in Urban Hijazi Arabic which is a Saudi dialect through the use of an integration of both synchronic and dichroic approach. A dialectal Arabic questionnaire is used as a tool in order to obtain data.

In light of the lack of publication in UHA in general and the investigation of grammaticalization in Arabic in specific, it is hoped that this study will contribute to the literature with a novel paper that provides a proper linguistic account for the concerned phenomenon in the dialect. This study finds that UHA is indeed rich of grammaticalized cases which conform to some universal change patterns. This also indicates the extent to which it is divergent from MSA, but does not show by any means that it poses a threat to MSA as was perceived since change is a natural course of development in any language.

Declaration

I hereby declare that this dissertation titled 'Grammaticalization in Urban Hijazi Arabic' is my own. No portion of the work referred to in the dissertation has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Intellectual Property Statement

i.   The author of this dissertation (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the "Copyright") and s/he has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.

ii.   Copies of this dissertation, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made only in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.

iii.   The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trademarks and other intellectual property (the "Intellectual Property") and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example graphs and tables ("Reproductions"), which may be described in this dissertation, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.

iv.   Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialisation of this dissertation, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=24420), in any relevant Dissertation restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library's regulations (see http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/about/regulations/_files/Library-regulations.pdf) and in The University's policy on Presentation of Dissertations.

Acknowledgment

First and foremost, praise be to God, Almighty Allah, for all his blessings that he bestowed upon me. After all due praise to God, thanks go to all those who have supported me to reach this today.

My deepest gratitude goes to my supervisor Professor Yaron Matras for all his advice, help, and support throughout the research process. Without his thoughtful guidance, this work would not be possible.

Words fail me to express my appreciation to my beloved parents and sisters for their constant prayers, love, and support during my studies.

Dedication

To Mom and Dad

Introduction

It has been noted that Arabic is diglossic in nature (Esseesy 2010; Ferguson 1959 cited in Alothman 2012) that it combines between a two relatively opposite poles. One is what is considered to be a high variety which is "Classical Arabic (CA) and its descendant Modern Standard Arabic (MSA)" (Esseesy 2010: 1). Scholars like Cuvalay-Haak (1997) suggests that MSA should be learned as a second language for colloquial Arabic speakers in a sense that indicates their diversity. Yet, owing to the fact that they are one language, one can still map some levels in between that are mostly of a functional meaning which in turn accounts for grammaticalization (Esseesy 2010).

However, it is noted that old Arabic grammarians tend to overlook the functional continua that exist between CA and the colloquial Arabic (ibid). This is mainly attributed to the fact that purists try to maintain the traditional syntactic categorization (ibid) which suggests that "continua (N<P, V<Aux, etc.), creates obvious complications for syntactic description" (Haspelmath 1999: 1045). Another factor that plays a major role in neglecting colloquial Arabic by most grammarians is the fact that it is perceived as a language corruption that they aim to eliminate rather than to account for it (Esseesy 2010).

In addition, the fact that colloquial Arabic is mainly orally inherited makes it more likely to develop more grammaticalized forms especially when compared to its standard opponent (ibid). This is to say that the different spoken Arabic varieties present a higher level of grammaticalization than MSA. Moreover, Heine and Kuteva (2002) notes another reason that gives rise to grammaticalization which is language contact. Likewise, Esseesy (2010: 10) reports that the contact between Arabs and non-Arabs may be considered as a plausible reason for the arousal of more grammaticalized instances that do not exist in the Standard variety especially after the so called "territorial expansion outside of Arabia".

This study sheds light on one of the major Saudi Arabic spoken dialects, namely, Urban Hijazi Arabic (UHA) through the investigation of the theoretical framework of grammaticalization. It aims to identify some of the possible evolutionary patterns of some of the grammaticalized

constructions found in UHA. Moreover, it attempts to map the functional continuum that exists between the lexical sources and the functional usages. It also tries to give an adequate linguistic description of the phenomenon under consideration. Lastly, it investigates the extent to which UHA is divergent from MSA.

Although Hijazi Arabic (HA) is considered to be one of the major dialects spoken in Saudi Arabia, it is observed that it has received no much attention especially when compared to other dialects that are of equivalence in Saudi Arabia (i.e. Najdi Arabic). In terms of the written Hijazi grammar books, on can find that there are only two book that deal with such matter. One is Omar (1975) which is a basic course in UHA that is conducted for teaching purposes. Second is Sieny (1978) which is a great contribution to the literature that deals with the syntax of UHA. The other work relevant to the study of HA is mainly related to the phonological aspect of the dialect such as Al-Mozainy (1981), Jarrah (1993), Abaalkhail (1998), and Banjar (2003) in which they look at vowel alternation and syllabification. Moreover, Alzaidi (2014) explores intonation in UHA. However, to my knowledge, there is not any study that has been conducted before to deal with grammaticalization in Saudi Arabic. Thus, it is hoped that this dissertation will contribute to the literature with a novel paper that accounts for grammaticalization in Urban Hijazi Arabic (UHA) which in turn will lend to a better understanding of the dialect. In addition, the fact that UHA has no historical records helps highlighting the significance of this study since it provides a step-by-step evolutionary path of the grammaticalized forms which is mainly based on synchronic data.

This thesis is divided into four main chapters in addition to the present chapter and the final conclusion. The current chapter gives some preliminaries to the linguistic situation of Arabic and states the attitude of Arabic linguists towards colloquial Arabic which constitutes the problem of the study. It also provides the rationale behind applying grammaticalization framework on Arabic dialects specifically. Moreover, this chapter addresses the aims of the study. It also highlights the significance of the study by locating the present study in the literature in an attempt to identify the gap.

Chapter one presents an account of the theoretical framework in order to provide the reader with initial understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. It starts by defining the notion of grammaticalization followed by an overview of the mechanisms of change and the notion of unidirectionality. It, then, provides a brief overview of the historical background of

grammaticalization. The last part of this chapter identifies the research context of grammaticalization in Arabic.

Chapter two addresses the methodological approach and the main data source for the study i.e. Arabic dialectal questionnaire). In doing so, it states the rationale behind utilizing such tool, gives a factual account of the survey, states the limitation and presents the stages in which the process takes place. This chapter also discusses the data analysis approach and gives some additional relevant remarks.

Chapter three introduces the Saudi Arabic dialect by giving a brief overview of its sociolinguistic background. It then presents the dialect under investigation in this study and accounts for the special reference to the city of Jeddah.

Chapter 4 forms the core of the thesis, and it is fairly longer than the remaining chapters. This chapter follows a division that is based on three basic semantic functions that corresponds to the relevant examples. Namely, it looks at tense and aspect, possession, and subordinating conjunctions. It presents only some selected grammaticalized cases under each label. It aims to give an insightful overview of the relevant features of the dialect in addition to the main pathways of change that are mostly evident cross-linguistically.

The last chapter concludes by readdressing the main aims of the study in relation to the evidence provided by the dialect. In addition, it discusses the limitation of the present study. Moreover, it draws attention to some future research recommendations.

Chapter One

Grammaticalization

1.1 The study of grammaticalization

1.1.1 Definition of grammaticalization

Grammaticalization theory can sometimes be a misleading concept that may be perceived to be a language theory or a theory of language change (Heine 2003). As a matter of fact, grammaticalization can be best described as a process that entails a number of implications (ibid). Many different scholars have attempted to propose a definition for such phenomenon. One definition that best defines grammaticalization is by Hopper and Traugott (2003: 18) where they refer to it as a process "whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions." It is a gradual process where a lexicon gradually shifts from being a content word to be more of a grammatical marker (Geurts 2000). The main aim of this framework is to account for changes by providing an insight of why certain grammatical forms emerge and develop (Heine 2003).

Grammaticalization can be treated from two different dimensions. First is the synchronic dimension which sees "grammaticalization as primarily a syntactic, discourse pragmatic phenomenon, to be studied from the point of view of fluid patterns of language use" (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 2). Second is the diachronic dimension which is a historical approach in essence that traces a subset of linguistic changes over a period of time (ibid). This thesis attempts to integrate both approaches in order to provide a proper account for the concerned phenomenon. The fact that grammaticalization is historical in nature gives it the privilege of anticipating some future changes that might occur in a language or assume what can possibly exist in an unknown language (Heine 1995 cited in Heine 2003). This leads to the fact that there are some universal underlying patterns of change that govern most of the grammaticalized cases observed (Heine 2003). Thus, presumably, the change always drives from concrete meanings to more abstract

concepts (Heine and Kuteva 2002). For example, a body part like *back* can be extended to be a locative marker meaning *behind* (Heine 2003; Heine and Kuteva 2002). Yet, both forms may coexist together in a language (Haspelmath 1999). This is to say that the source lexemes do not have to be eradicated from a language if extended in new contexts or developed into new forms.

Heine (2003) points out to the various terminologies used by different scholars in the literature to describe the process of grammaticalization. For example, both Bybee et al. (1994) and Bisang (1996) refer to such process as "path" and "pathway" respectively. Moreover, Hopper and Traugott (1993) use the term "cline" to express the gradation that a particular form go through during the process of change. The lexical noun *back* can be used again as an example that shows how it develops from being a lexical item into a spatial marker and how it is "susceptible to becoming an adverb, and perhaps eventually a preposition and even a case affix" (Hopper and Traugott 1993: 6 cited in Heine 2003: 589). In addition, Heine (1992, 1993 cited in Heine 2003: 589) proposes the term "grammaticalization chain," suggesting an overlapping phase where the original content word might co-exist with the grammaticalized form as shown in (1). Although different terms are used to propose different notions regarding the process, all of the terms employed do suggest that the grammaticalization process represents more of a continuum. To make such realization even clearer and more applicable, a "cline of grammaticality" can be represented as in (2) where a source meaning form strips gradually from its content meaning while having the potential of shifting last into being an affix (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 7). This form of representation is more likely to be a universal recurring pattern of change (Rubin 2004). It should be noted here that both terms, *cline* and *chain*, will be used interchangeably throughout this thesis when referring to the series of changes that are being accounted for.

(1) A > A,B > B
(2) Content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix

1.1.2   Mechanisms of change and unidirectionality

Grammaticalization does not necessarily mean the transmission from being a lexical item into a functional one (Haspelmath 1999). In fact, it drives "a linguistic expression further toward the functional pole of the lexical- functional continuum" (ibid: 1044). The process of change

involves one or more of four rather overlapping stages that can be referred to as mechanisms of change. The first crucial stage and what can be a marking trait for all grammaticalized instances is "desemanticization" or semantic "bleaching" (Heine 2003: 579). This is when a linguistic expression loses its content meaning (ibid) and start developing new semantic uses. Consequently, a form loses its former "categorical properties" (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 3) and acquires new characteristics of new functions. This leads to the second stage of the process which is known as "extension" by which one means the use of a linguistic expression in new contexts (Heine 2003: 579). As a result, a linguistic unit can lose some of its "morphosyntactic properties … ,including the loss of independent word status [as in the case of] cliticization and affixation" which marks the decategorialization stage (ibid: 579; Heine and Kuteva 2002). The last stage of the change is usually marked by the "loss in phonetic substance" which is often called "erosion" or "phonetic reduction" (Heine 2003: 579). In other words, once desemanticization takes place, it becomes more likely for a lexical item to undergo a loss on the phonological level (Rubin 2004: 6).

It is worth mentioning that the above mentioned order does not necessarily imply the actual order of the process of change. Yet, it is more likely to find that erosion is the last phase of the change whereas desemanticization is the first to any of the following changes. It is interesting how all four different mechanisms are technically associated with various aspects of linguistics that each one of them is related to semantics, pragmatics, morphosyntax, and phonetics respectively (Heine 2003). In addition, it is observed that most mechanisms involve a loss (i.e. on a semantic, morphosyntactic, and phonetic level) (ibid). Yet, a gain is also proved which can be seen in the extension stage where a linguistic unit acquires new properties when used in new contexts (ibid).

In accordance with what has been previously proposed regarding the notion of grammaticalization cline and after providing a brief insight to the mechanisms observed in grammaticalization, it seems only logical to second the standard view that says that grammaticalization is a unidirectional process (Geurts 2000). This is to say that the direction of change always goes from left to right where the left end is less grammatical than its opposite to the right (Hopper and Traugott 2003). This view is derived from the observation that functional forms do not develop into lexical ones even if occasional cases might be attested because "they do not lead to the inference that [h] > [x] and [x] > [h]" (ibid: 17). It is only reasonable for a form

to get reduced when its meaning being reduced. It is not likely to have a reduced meaning along with a form extension.

1.1.3 Historical background: a brief review

Grammaticalization is perceived to be a relatively "young sub-field of linguistics" (Narrog and Heine 2011: 11). However, Heine (2003) asserts that some relevant work dates back to the eighteenth-century that was mainly conducted by some French and British philosophers. Yet, the term *grammaticalization* was not established until 1912 by Antoine Millet (cited in Heine 2003) in his French article "L'evolution des forms grammaticales". Many leading scholars in this field lay the basic principles by identifying universal evolutionary pathways (e.g. Bybee 1985; Heine and Kuteva 2002; Hopper and Traugott 2003) which enable other contemporary scholars to apply such patterns cross-linguistically.

1.2 Grammaticalization in Arabic

As a matter of fact, the study of grammaticalization is underrepresentation in Arabic especially when compared to other languages such as English and the European languages which have been studied more extensively (Narrog and Heine 2011). It is, thus, observed that there is a lack of publication in general. Yet, one cannot deny the fact that there is a recent tendency to investigate the notion of grammaticalization across the different Arabic varieties. Nevertheless, one downside to the overall account of Arabic studies is the fact that they mostly revolve around certain scenarios of grammaticalization. Moreover, it seems that there is still no exhaustive or lengthy accounts that are dedicated to this particular field other than Esseesy's (2010) book titled *Grammaticalization of Arabic Prepositions and Subordinators* which will be discussed later in this section.

A well-established phenomenon is the evolution of future markers from constructions that express desire (e.g. want) and movement (e.g. go) which can be found in Kuwaiti Arabic (Al-Najjar 1991), Jordanian Arabic (Alshboul et al. 2010), and Syrian Arabic (Jarad 2014). Another common grammaticalization path that is addressed in the literature is posture verbs giving rise to progressive aspect marker which is traced, again, in Kuwaiti Arabic (Al-Najjar 1991) and Emirati Arabic (Jarad 2013). Moreover, Wilmsen (2013) investigates the Arabic demonstrative

iyya- serving as a pronominal object marker in ditransitive verbs. In addition, the grammaticalization of some Arabic prepositions have been discussed in some special cases in Arabic such as the preposition *fī* being used as a possessive marker in Gulf Pidgin Arabic (GPA) in Bakir's (2014) study and Avram (2012). Another remarking work that is definitely considered as a "modest contribution" to the field (Wilmsen 2011: 373) is the early mentioned Esseesy's (2010) book which deals with both prepositions and subordinators in Arabic. It provides an extensive account for different evolutionary patterns of change by the incorporation of both synchronic and diachronic approach in a very insightful way. Yet, it seems that Esseesy fails to provide a proper account for modern spoken Arabic, although it was considered within the scope of research in addition to Classical Arabic (CA) (Wilmsen 2011). Lastly, Rubin's (2004) study titled *Studies in Semitic Grammaticalization* is also a worth-noting work that deals with Arabic as being part of other Semitic languages. Yet, it does not provide an exhaustive linguistic account of the proposed grammaticalized instances found in Arabic. However, one can take it as a useful point of reference for various grammaticalized examples traced among the different Arabic varieties.

.

Chapter Two

Methodology

In order to investigate and find answers to the questions posed in the present study, the Arabic version of a Romani morpho-syntactic (RMS) dialect survey is employed to serve as a primary source for data set which can be found on http://www.arabic.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/database-of-arabic-dialects/ with a limited access. This study follows a qualitative approach that helps in exploring and understanding the phenomenon under investigation. The first subsection of this chapter accounts for the rationale behind the use of the aforementioned survey. It also gives a descriptive account of the survey and discusses the limitations to its use. Lastly, it illustrates the stages involved in the process. The second subsection of this chapter sheds light on the approach used to analyse data to best meet the aim of the study. The third part of this chapter gives some additional remarks followed to help comparing some of the researcher's observations against native informants' responses

2.1 Arabic dialect questionnaire

2.1.1 Rationale

It is evident that the use of dialectological questionnaire serves as an efficient tool that enables language investigation (Alothman 2012). It helps eliciting the "word order, nominal derivation, definite and indefinite articles, … verb inflection, demonstratives, and many more" aspects that define a language (Anon 1998). Thus, it can be considered as a useful point of departure that helps in exemplifying the dialect under investigation. In fact, such powerful tool can help in tracing certain linguistic items in different contexts, and hence, leads to a better understanding of the different shades that are carried by one linguistic item. In other words, it helps highlighting grammaticalized items throughout the set of data. Moreover, it enables describing and

comparing some specific usages of some specific constructions such as the negation marker in section 4.2.3 by a quick retrieval of the pre-tagged questionnaire.

This survey constitutes the backbone for eliciting the salient features of the dialect. The fact that this survey is available in a number of other spoken Arabic varieties (e.g. Syrian) makes it a useful point of reference to compare between the different dialects when needed. In addition, the fact that this survey is available in MSA helps in exploring the extent to which UHA is divergent from the perceived standard Arabic.

2.1.2 Descriptive account

RMS dialect survey is considered to be "an integrated approach to language documentation and evaluation" (Matras et al. 2009: 346). This tool was first compiled for the investigation of Romani dialects by Yaron Matras and Viktor Elšík in 1999 at the University of Manchester (Matras 2004). In fact, it was mainly composed in the absence of a written documentation for Romani. Thus, it aims to "facilitate structural comparison among" the various Romani dialects (Matras et al. 2009: 329). As a matter of fact, this dialect survey has proven its ability to be carried out and applied to different languages. "In 2008, the survey was translated into Arabic by Matras and Davey to be used in investigating the Coastal Dhofārī Arabic with the aim of presenting a sketch grammar of the dialect" (Alothman 2012: 52). With this being said, the researcher attempts to create an UHA version of the same RMS questionnaire. A detailed mechanism will be discussed later in 2.1.4.

The survey contains 1065 items ranging between lexical items and sentences which enable conducting a systematic linguistic investigation of the morphological, syntactic, semantic, and phonological aspects of a language. However, due to scope limitations, this paper does not give an exhaustive account of the dialect. Yet, it provides a brief insight to the salient relevant features of the dialect where needed in order to give a lucid flow for the reader.

2.1.3 Limitations

It should be noted that the questionnaire was mainly translated by the researcher who is a native speaker of the dialect and who was born and raised in Jeddah. She represents the young

generation of the dialect. In fact, it is almost never the case where all speakers agree on using a specific form in certain cases in any dialect. This is to say that diversity is justifiable here. There are different factors that might come into play when considering diversity among a group of people who are speakers of the same dialect. Age can be a factor. In fact, it is well-known that UHA can sound a bit different in terms of the selection of some lexicon when comparing old versus young generations. Thus, in this paper, the researcher restricts herself to give contemporary expressions rather than trying to role-play old Hijazi speakers. Region can also be a factor as there is a slight difference among the different cities of the concerned dialect. Again, Jeddah is the main point of reference here. However, it is still assumed that the aforementioned diversities do not have any major influence on the purpose of this study.

Although having access to MSA along with different Arabic varieties of the same survey makes it an independent source of deriving examples, some innovative external examples of MSA were drawn by the researcher. In addition, some other specific uses not found in the UHA survey were given by the researcher. It goes without saying that all examples used throughout this paper are based on the survey, otherwise, it is stated in the relevant section in a way that makes it clear to the reader.

2.1.4 Stages

To create the UHA version of the survey, three stages were involved. Stage one involves translating and recording the questionnaire segments in UHA. Again, the researcher was the sole informant in this study as she has tried to give a translation to each segment using her own expressions that she would most likely to use. To record segments, a user-friendly Apple app was used on a MacBook Pro which is called GarageBand. It is built to record high-quality music. It also has a narration-vocal mode which is the one used. Recordings were save as Apple MPEG-4 audio format. All segments were saved and numbered separately to facilitate retrieval when needed instead of recording the survey as a one long strand. Stage two requires transcribing all tokens following the transliteration system and adding them into a pre-tagged and pre-formatted spreadsheet. Finally, stage three constitutes tracing and identifying the relevant instances of the concerned phenomenon.

2.2 Data analysis approach

This study follows a combined approach of diachronic and synchronic analysis of the data. In fact, grammaticalization is considered to be a diachronic approach in nature. Yet, its diachrony is derived from synchronic data. This is observed from the coexistence of some linguistic units that share the same etymology but have different semantic functions. In practice, one element might have a lexical meaning on one hand and a functional one (i.e. grammaticalized) on the other. Thus, in this study, the researcher attempts to trace the functional modification of several linguistic items that occurred over time.

2.3 Additional remarks

Throughout this study, the researcher attempts to make few observations with regard to the extent to which some expressions are used in the dialect. In order to justify the researcher's intuition-based claims and for the sake of acquiring more reliable generalizations, the researcher uses her own network for selecting friends to ask and act as her informants. Due to geographical distance, the researcher utilizes a well-known communication tool, namely, WhatsApp, as a main channel for eliciting responses from informants. In total, informants are 12 friends who are members of a WhatsApp group. They are all native speakers of the dialect who were born and raised in Jeddah. The rationale behind selecting this exact group rather than any other friends group or even family group is that this particular group has diversity in terms of its members. This group imitates society to some extent since most of the participants are from different family names, and thus, guarantees the divergence in the use of different expressions as opposed to when all participants come from one family which would most likely cause repetition of the same expressions. Yet, it must be noted that this method is not applied to more than two instances in the all. It is mainly used to help confirming some observations but not to elicit major data.

Chapter Three

Saudi Arabic

This chapter speaks of why UHA can be an interesting place to explore the notion of grammaticalization. There is a direct link between the location where the concerned dialect is spoken at being a heterogeneous city and the formation of more grammaticalized instances than found in other dialects perhaps. In order to better understand the origin of where UHA comes from, this chapter starts by giving a brief overview of the sociolinguistic background of Saudi Arabic. It, next, illustrates the region where UHA is mainly located. Lastly, it accounts for the diversity of such dialect by exploring the sociolinguistic background of Jeddah.

3.1 Sociolinguistic background

It is evident that Arabic is the official language of twenty different Middle Eastern and African States, amongst which is The Kingdome of Saudi Arabia (Holes 1995). As a matter of fact, none of the states actually use MSA in speaking as their mother tongue. Instead, each country seems to develop its own Arabic variety that is acquired by natives even before the beginning of formal education (ibid). "The variety of Arabic dialects reflects the ethnic and social diversity of its speakers" (Banjar 2003: 2).

Broadly speaking, Saudi Arabia has three main dialects that generate other sub-dialects. Namely, they are Najdi Arabic, Hijazi Arabic (HA), and the dialect spoken in the Eastern coast (i.e. often referred to as *Gulf Arabic* in the literature). Nevertheless, it is observed that all "sub-dialects differ according to region, tribe, Bedouin and urbanity" (Altalhi 2014: 10).

3.2 Urban Hijazi Arabic (UHA)

As mentioned above, HA is considered to be one of the main spoken dialects in Saudi Arabia. It is described as being one of "the most widely understood dialect in the Arabian [P]eninsula" (Omar 1975, p.V cited in Banjar 2003: 11). In terms of its location, HA is mainly spoken in a major part of the western region of Saudi Arabia across the Red Sea coast as illustrated in figure (3.1) as taken from (Alzaidi 2014: 73).

As a matter of fact, HA constitutes two main dialects (ibid; Altalhi 2014). One is Bedouin Hijazi dialect which is the dialect spoken by people who habituate the countryside (Alzaidi 2014). Second is Urban Hijazi dialect which is primarily located in Jeddah, Makkah, Madinah, Taif, and Yanbu (Sieny 1978; Prochazka 1988; Alzaidi 2014). Prochazka (1988) describes UHA in terms of its resemblance to some spoken dialects in Africa such as Sudanese. This will be justified next when discussing the locality of Jeddah.

Figure 3.1: Saudi Arabia. The white highlight represents the distribution of Hijazi region.

3.3 Jeddah: the locality

As stated at the beginning of this study, Jeddah is the main point of reference in this study. Jeddah is a coastal city that is considered to be the second largest city in terms of the population number in Saudi Arabia after Riyadh, the capital (Al-Essa 2009). It has one of the largest and the

busiest trading seaports in the Middle East. Al-Essa (2009) gives an appealing account of the sociolinguistic situation in Jeddah that lends to a better understanding of its residents' heterogeneity which is, in fact, of a direct relation to the fact that UHA seems to be rich of grammaticalized items. As she notes, the importance of Jeddah is attributed to the fact that it is located near the holy places of Makkah and Madinah and being a key point for accessing these holy cities. With that being said, Jeddah is identified as a "cosmopolitan city" that has "a mixture of … ethnic groups" which is mainly due to Muslims from all over the world habituating it after pilgrimage (ibid: 204). Thus, one can find "Arabs from Egypt, Syria, Jordan, [Yemen] and Iraq came to Jeddah to work as teachers, engineers, physicians, nurses and skilled labourers …. in addition to its native inhabitants, most of whom are of non-tribal descent" (ibid: 204). Nevertheless, diversity continues to grow with the coming of immigrants from different non-Arab countries (ibid).

Conclusion

To sum up, this chapter shows how UHA is a dynamic dialect that is mainly affected by the existence of pilgrims of different nationalities settling in the Hijazi region. In other words, it accounts for the observed overlap between UHA and some of the other Arabic varieties, such as Egyptian and Syrian Arabic. This is believed to add up, on its turn, to what has been indicated previously in chapter 1 regarding the influence of the meeting of Arabs with non-Arabs on Arabic.

Chapter Four

Grammaticalization in UHA

This chapter deals with a range of grammaticalized instances that are found in UHA and may occur in some other Arabic varieties. It attempts to trace the general patterns that govern such change which are key to the notion of grammaticalization. In doing so, it tries to account for the diachronic change that has happened over time through the investigation of synchronic data of the dialect under question.

The chapter is divided into three main sub-sections that are mainly labelled by following the semantic categorization of the identified examples. The first sub-section explores some various constructions of the verbal system in UHA that are employed to denote tense and aspect. Four of which are verbs, namely, *gām* 'stand', *gaʕad* 'sit', *žālas* 'sit', and *fiḍil* 'remained', in which *gām* 'stand' marks the inceptive aspect of a verb whereas all the remaining verbs indicate the progressive aspect. In addition, prefixes such as *bā-* which is derived from *abġa* 'want' and *ḥa-* which is derived from *rāḥ* 'went' are also used in the dialect to mark the future tense. Lastly, the particle *gīd* 'already' is used to express the past perfect tense that is found in English. The second sub-section looks at the possessive function of three main Arabic prepositions (i.e. *ʕind* 'at', *maʕ* 'with', and *fī* 'in, at'). Moreover, it demonstrates how some nouns (i.e. *ḥagg* 'belong to' and *tabaʕ* 'belong to') can be utilized to function as genitive exponents and be further extended to function as possession markers. The last sub-section is devoted to only one example of subordinate conjunctions, namely *ʕašān* 'because'.

Moreover, each sub-section starts by providing a brief introductory section that accounts for the semantic category under investigation. It also gives some key aspects that feature the dialect which helps in following the argument.

4.1 Tense and aspect
4.1.1 Verbal system in UHA

The verb paradigm in Arabic, in general, and Hijazi Arabic, in specific, is fairly complex since it can be used to reflect all "aspect, tense, person of subject, voice and object reference" through verb inflection (Sieny 1978: 16). In principle, the verbal system used in UHA is very similar to the one used in MSA. Thus, this brief review accounts for both.

Arabic verbs are "derivational rather than inflectional" (Al-Saleemi 1987: 36) in which "the verbal stem consists of a purely consonantal root of three radicals or more" (ibid). The content meaning is mainly conveyed by consonants whereas vowels come to function as "formative devices" that serve derivational proposes. Arabic has two main simple forms of verbs, past and present in which the former is often referred to as the perfect whereas the latter is the imperfect (ibid). Examples from (1) till (4) are pulled from the Hijazi questionnaire in order to give a clear picture of the nature of the verbs. It is observed that the perfect verbs are usually identical to the verb stem as in (1) where the verb stem for *saʔalt* 'I asked' is *saʔal* 'ask'. Perfect verbs are usually marked by a suffix only as opposed to the Imperfect ones that can be marked by both a prefix or a suffix and a prefix (Alhawary 2009). Examples (2), (3), and (4) show different forms and prefixes of imperfect verbs in UHA in which simple present, progressive, and future tense are all shown respectively.

(1) ana   saʔal-t
    I   ask.PFV-1SG
    'I asked'

(2) Ana   a-sʔal
    I   1SG-ask.IMPV
    'I ask'

(3) Ana   ba-sʔal

I   PROG-ask.IMPV

'I'm asking'

(4) Ana   ḥa-sʔal

I   FUT-ask.IMPV

'I will ask'

Auxiliaries are most often derived from verbs. Such pattern can be found in unrelated languages. In fact, it has been noted that verbs in UHA can develop other uses such as being used as an auxiliary verb which can accompany the main verb of a sentence, forming a verb phrase (Sieny 1978). To be specific, 'motion verbs', posture verbs, and verbs that express 'desire' are common in giving rise to auxiliaries that denote tense or aspect functions (Heine and Kuteva 2002). Auxiliaries are similar to verbs in which they both can be inflected for tense and subject (ibid). Such auxiliaries must be followed by a verb in the present tense (ibid). In addition, auxiliary verbs can differ in the number of other auxiliaries they might allow. Some auxiliary verbs are allowed to be "followed by two other auxiliaries and a standard verb" (Sieny 1978: 27). Another type of auxiliaries can only allow one additional auxiliary and one standard verb. A third type can only allow one standard verb to follow (ibid) which it the type exemplified in the following grammaticalized instances.

It is worth mentioning that the grammaticalized forms discussed in the current chapter mostly take the perfect form. However, they can also take an imperfect form which suggests that they are not fully grammaticalized. This is to say that although verbs under investigation decategorize and become grammaticalized to function as auxiliaries, they can still be conjugated which does not place them on the extreme grammatical side of the spectrum since they are not fixed forms like regular functional items.

4.1.1.1 *gām* 'stand' > inceptive

gām is an intransitive posture verb that means "to get up, stand up, rise" (Clarity 2003: 396) which is shared among all verities of Arabic but with different realizations as they all are derived from the MSA *qām* 'to rise'. *gām* in specific is shared among the Arabic varieties that convert q > g such as Iraqi Arabic (ibid) and Kuwaiti Arabic in addition to UHA. Juge (2006) suggests that

most motion verbs (e.g. *go*) can be extended to be actually used in instances where there is no motion involved. Such new function usually occurs with verbs that are "semantically incoherent with 'motion-for-a-purpose'" verbs (Traugott 2011: 25). It is evident cross-linguistically that motion verbs can give rise to future tense markers, progressive markers, habitual markers etc (Heine and Kuteva 2002). Similarly, the posture verb *stand* is believed to give rise to progressive markers, copular markers, and might even be developed into habitual markers (ibid).

The verb *gām* can demonstrate such a case as it is grammaticalized and come to serve as an auxiliary verb in addition to functioning as a main verb in a sentence. In fact, the lexical item *gām* has become a grammatical marker for the inceptive aspect which basically means "to begin to do something" (Clarity 2003: 396). This can be shown in (5) where *gām* is employed as an auxiliary verb that indicates the initiation of the main verb (i.e. *tiḥakkī*) which is marked by the present tense. *gām* allows one following auxiliary verb (i.e. *badaʔat*) in addition to the aforementioned main verb.

(5) gām-at   badaʔ-at   ti-ḥakkī   ḥikāya   ṭawīla
     stand.PFV-3FSG   start.PFV-3FSG   3FSG-recite.IMPV   story   long
     'She has started to tell/recite a long story'

It is worth noting here that both words, the lexical *gām* and the functional *gām,* coexist in UHA. In order to distinguish the two forms, one can attempt to remove the item from the sentence and see whether it still delivers a meaningful string. Examples (6)-(8) are elicited by the researcher. Examples (6) and (7) clearly show that *gām* is a lexical item where it serves as a main verb followed by a prepositional phrase (i.e. *min alkanaba* 'lit: from the couch') and by a noun (i.e. *alḥammām*). However, the example in (8) is ambiguous where *gām* is followed by another verb (i.e. the perfect verb *rāḥ* 'left') which serves as a main verb. In this sense, *gām* is employed to express the initiation of the main verb *rāḥ* which is reflected in (8a). The second possible meaning of (8) is that *gām* means the actual action of standing up which is shown in (8b). This shows that there is a continuum of different usages of the verb *gām* that ranges between being an action verb and inceptive auxiliary.

(6) gām-at min al-kanaba

stand.PFV-3FSG from DEF-couch

'She stood up after she was sitting on the couch'

(7) gām alḥammām

stand.PFV-3MSG toilet

'He went to the toilet'

(8) gām rāḥ al-masžid

stand.PFV-3MSG go.PFV DEF-mosque

a. 'He initiated the action of going to the mosque'

b. 'He stood up and went to the mosque'

4.1.1.2 *gaʕad* 'sit,' *žālas* 'sit,' and *fiḍil* 'remained' > continuous

The locative verbs *gaʕad* 'sit,' *žālas* 'sit,' and *fiḍil* 'remained' can also be discussed within the grammaticalization framework. They all have the literal meaning of sitting, staying, and remaining (Al-Najjar 1991). However, it seems that all three lexical verbs have developed a shared functional meaning apart from their original lexical meaning that they carry. They all can serve as an auxiliary verb that can only be followed by an imperfect verb (ibid). Such type of auxiliaries is used to indicate the progressive aspect of the following main verb (ibid). This is, in fact, compatible with Heine and Kuteva's (2002: 255) remark on the general process of "process verbs [where they appear to be]… grammaticalized to auxiliaries denoting tense or aspect". In this case, verbs that mean 'sit', 'remain', 'stay' > continuous marker or the durative aspect (ibid).

In order to compare between the lexical item and the grammatical marker, one can compare (9) and (10) in which the former sentence has no other verbs but *žalas*. Thus, it can clearly be indicated that it is the lexical full verb *žalas*. However, *žalas* in (10) can easily be removed from the sentence without affecting the intended meaning. This shows that the combination of both verbs strips *žalas* of its lexical meaning and turns it into an auxiliary. In other words, adjacency alters meaning and function.

(9) žalas maʕa marat-ū ʕla š-šāṭiʔ

sit.PFV with wife-3MSG on DEF-beach

'He sat with his wife on the beach'

(10) žalas-nā   ni-tnāqaš   ʕašān   ni-wṣal   li

      sit.PFV-1PL   1PL.discuss.IMPV   because   1PL.arrive.IMPV   to

      t-tifāg   žadīd

      DEF.agreement   new

      'We continued negotiating in order to reach a new agreement'

All the three locative verbs, *gaʕad* 'sit,' *žālas* 'sit,' and *fiḍil* 'remained' are grammaticalized in the same way and the same degree in which they can be used interchangeably in sentences like (10). They are auxiliary verbs that indicate the "durative aspect" (Cheston 2012; Al-Najjar 1991: 672). Nevertheless, they may be inflected for tense as shown in (11) where *ḥayifḍalu* 'will remain' is attached to the future marker *ḥa-* and thus it is in the future tense. They may also be inflected for subject. For example, *žālas* can be (*žālas* 'he continued, *žālasat* 'she continued,' *žālasu* 'they continued,' *žālast* 'I continued,' and *žālasna* 'we continued').

(11) ḥa-yifḍal-u   yi-t-nāqaš-u   ʕašān   yū-wṣal-u

      FUT-remain.IMP-3PL   IMPV.discuss-3PL   because   IMPV.arrive-3PL

      li   t-tifāg   žadīd

      to   DEF.agreement   new

      'They will continue negotiating in order to reach a new agreement'

4.1.1.3 *abġa* 'want' > progressive marker *bi-/ba-*

As illustrated in before in section in chapter 1, grammaticalization is a gradual process where a lexicon gradually shifts from being a content word to be more of a grammatical marker (Geurts 2000). The transition of a verb into tense marker is a quite common general process (Haspelmath 1999). Moreover, it is observed that verbs that express desire (e.g. want, wish, and desire) tend to give rise to future markers (ibid; Heine and Kuteva 2002). In fact, a very similar case can be traced in UHA but with the distinction of giving rise to progressive marker instead of future (Sieny 1978).

The verb *abġa* 'want' is believed to be the deriving source for the progressive marker *ba-/bi-*. The UHA verb *abġā* is assumed to be derived from the Standard Arabic lexical verb *abġī* 'want' in which the final high front long vowel /ī/ changes into the low open long vowel /ā/ (Holes 1990 cited in Jarad 2013). An alternative hypothesis to the deriving source of *b-* is what Jarad (2013) suggests in an account for the future *b-* in Syrian Arabic. He proposes that "the Standard Arabic verbal noun *bi-wudd-i* developed first into a lexical verb *badd* 'want' and then into a prefix (*b-*) marking the future tense both in main and subordinate clauses" (ibid: 83). Although both proposals are appealing and although UHA has some occasional uses of the Levantine lexical verb *badd* 'want' in the form of *bidd* 'want', the Hijazi *bi-* is postulated to be derived from *abġa* 'want' rather than *bidd* 'want' since the former is observed to be the dominant lexical verb of the dialect.

In the process of change, a phonological reduction usually takes place when a lexicon reoccurs frequently in a language (Heine 2003). The verb *want* is high in terms of usage frequency. Thus, it can be seen that *abġā* is gradually reduced as it becomes *abā* in stage (2) in which it loses its voiced velar fricative /ġ/. A further reduction takes place in stage (3) where the glottal stop is also reduced as in *mābā* 'I don't want'. The suffix *–bā* is "reanalysed as a new stem" (Esseesy 2010: 11). This allows the negation marker *mā* to be agglutinated to the new stem and thus creating *mābā*. The suffix *-bā* is even further grammaticalized to serve as a prefix in UHA that is mainly used to mark the progressive aspect as shown in (12).

Stage 0: MSA *abġī* 'want.1SG'
Stage 1: UHA vernacular *abġā* 'want.1SG'
Stage 2: UHA vernacular *abā* 'want.1SG'
Stage 3: UHA vernacular *mābā* 'I don't want'
Stage 4: UHA vernacular *ba-/bi-* 'progressive marker'

(12) aṣḥāb-i   bi-yistann-ū-ni   hnāk   fi   l-gahwa

     friends-POSS.1SG   PROG-wait.IMPV-3PL-1SG there   in   DEF-café

     'My friends are waiting for me there in the café'

Yet, the reduction of the lexical word *abġā* does not indicate its elimination from the dialect. Both forms *abġā* and *abā* are still equally used in UHA to express the desire of something. When some Hijazi participants were asked, they confirmed that they use both forms interchangeably. This includes the researcher, who is a native speaker of the dialect under consideration.

One final remark regarding the use of the prefix *ba-/bi-* is the observation of its use as a future marker in the Bedouin Hijazi Arabic that was distinguished from UHA earlier in chapter 3. Thus, it is possible to hear an UHA speaker that uses the aforementioned prefix occasionally to indicate futurity. This, perhaps, may be attributed to the influence from the contact between the two dialects. In fact, *ḥa-* is perceived to be the main future prefix used in UHA which will be next discussed.

4.1.1.4 *rāḥ* 'went' > future marker *ḥa-*

The verb *go* can be identified as one of the most common sources for marking the future tense (Rubin 2004). Givon (1973 cited in Al-Najjar 1991) illustrates how future modality can be accounted for cross-linguistically through the evolution from the verb *go*. Similar to this is what Heine and Kuteva (2002: 161) assert regarding the verb go giving rise to future markers creating the general path of "'go', verb > future marker".

Stage 0: MSA *rāḥ* 'went. 3MSG'
Stage 1: UHA vernacular *rāḥ* 'went. 3MSG'
Stage 2: UHA vernacular *raḥ* 'future marker'
Stage 3: UHA vernacular *ḥa-* 'future marker'

Likewise, UHA follow the aforementioned path in which it uses the future prefix *ḥa-* (Sieny 1978) which is presumably derived from the MSA perfect lexical verb *rāḥ* 'went' as shown in stage (0) above. The full lexical verb *rāḥ* is used to indicate the actual motional action of the leaving event which can clearly be seen in examples like (13) and is manifested in stage (1) above. In addition, as suggested earlier, it develops another grammatical function which is mainly marking the future tense as can be seen in (14). The example in (14) shows that there are two verbs in the verbal clause, one is *rāḥ* which functions as an auxiliary verb denoting the future. The second is *ʔalʕab* 'play' which can be considered as the head verb of the clause. Stage (2) and (3) illustrate how *rāḥ* is phonologically gradually reduced by replacing the long /ā/ with a

shorter /a/ first and then dropping the voiced alveolar liquid /r/, resulting in the prefix *ḥa-* that is mainly attached to the imperfect verbs (see 15).

Moreover, it is worth mentioning here that both stages, 2 and 3, do co-exist in the dialect with no difference in terms of meaning. "Causes for this phonological reduction are attributed to the position of the lexical expressions and their semantic relatedness to the verb" (Al-Najjar 1991: 665). Similar evolution clines to the prefix *ḥa-* and the prefix *ha-* can be found in Jordanian (Alshboul et al. 2010) and Egyptian Arabic (Al-Najjar 1991; Jarad 2013) respectively.

(13) abū-ya   w   axū-ya   rāḥ-u   s-sūg   yōm
     father-1SG   and   brother-1SG go.PFV-3PL DEF-market   day

     as-sabt
     DEF.Saturday
     'My father and my brother went to market on Saturday'

(14) rāḥ   ʔa-lʕab
     FUT   1SG-play.IMPV
     'I will play'

(15) ḥa-lʕab
     FUT-play.IMPV
     'I will play'

4.1.1.5 *gīd* 'already' > completive marker

In Modern Standard Arabic, *qad* is a particle that expresses certainty and emphasis when combined with a perfect verb (Al-Saleemi 1987). Yet, it can be used to express uncertainty or doubt when combined with an imperfect verb. Moreover, since Arabic has no obvious past perfect form like in some other languages (e.g. English), the particle *qad* is used in conjunction with the perfect to indicate such tense (Al-Saleemi 1987; Fischere 2002; Wright 1967 cited in Rubin 2004). Rubin (2004: 48) gives (16) as an example of *qad* serving the perfect tense in MSA. However, I would argue that *qad* in (16) denotes certinty only rather reflectin the perfect tense. In other words, the meaning of (16) would be 'he died' instead of 'he has died'.

Alternetively, I believe that the example in (17) is the most accurate structure for *qad* serving the past perfect tense which actually conforms to the MSA structure that Al-Saleemi (1987: 63) illustrates (i.e. "*kana* + the particle *qad* + the perfect form of the verb").

(16) qad   māt-a
      already   die.PFV-3MSG
      'He has/had died'

(17) kan a   qad   māt-a
      be.PFV-3MSG   already   die.PFV-3MSG
      'He has/had died'

Although completive markers are commonly perceived to be derived from verbs denoting the meaning of 'finish' (Heine 2003), the Urban Hijazi case of *gīd*, which is a variant of *qad,* suggests that verbs meaning 'precede' can also give rise to completive markers. Rubin (2004) suggests a potential source for the particle *qad* which is the perfect verb *qaddama* 'to proceed, go before'. He also finds a parallel development of the same source lexeme in some dialects of North-Estern Neo-Aramaic which give rise to the particle *qam-* or *kəm-*.

UHA employs the variant *gīd* the same way *qad* is used in MSA. The typological change of *gīd* is attributed to one of the main features of the dialect where most voiceless uvular stops /q/ appear to be changed into voiced velar stops /g/. In addition, the low open short /a/ is also replaced with a high front long /ī/ in which *qad* becomes *gīd*.

As a matter of fact, *gīd* differs from *qad* in two main aspects. The first remark is related to what has been discussed above regarding how necessary is the adjacency of *kan* and *qad* in MSA to express the past perfect meaning. UHA seems to be distinct from MSA regarding this point as it can express the past perfect tense by the mere use of *gīd* as shown in (18). Yet, it can also have '*kān* + *gīd* + the perfect form of the verb' as shown in (19). It seems that the main difference between the use of *kān* in (19) and the absence of *kān* in (18) is that the presence of *kān* denotes

the past perfect tense while the absence of *kān* reflects the present perfect tense as shown in the English counterpart meanings in both examples below.

(18) ana   gīd   gulta-llak   dā   aš-šayy   min   gabil

I   already   say.PFV-2MSG   this   DEF-thing   from   before

'I have already said this to you before'

(19) kān   gīd-u   rāḥ   gabil   mā

be.PFV.3MSG   already-3MSG   go.PFV   before   NEG

n-ūṣal   hināk

1PL-arrive.IMPV   there

'He had already gone before we got there'

The second difference between *gīd* and *qad* is that the Urban Hijazi *gīd* can take a suffix to indicate person, gender and number while MSA *qad* is a fixed form. This can be clearly shown in (18) where *gīd* is attached to the siffix –*u* that denotes the third person singular masculine. Consequently, UHA can have *gīdu* 'he already'*, gīdaha* 'she already'*, gīdi* 'I already'*, gīdana* 'we already'*, gīdahum* 'they already', *gīdakum* 'you (pl.) already' and so on.

4.2 Possession

Although possession is a well-established category in all languages, one can still find scholars referring to such category as "being inherently vague or fuzzy" (Heine 1997: 1). Linguistically speaking, possessive expressions seem to be meaningless in which a word like *have*, for example, is not semantically competent on its own (ibid). According to Heine (1997) possession is viewed as a concept rather than a fixed linguistic construction. In fact, possession can be expressed in various conventionalized "schemata" across languages (e.g. the Russian Location Schema and the Turkish Genitive Schema) (Herslund 1999: 415). Nevertheless, possessive expressions seem to develop some other non-possessive meanings that convey "relational" and "associative" meanings (Heine 1997: 2). Heine (1997) identifies seven main notions that can be considered under the domain of possession. Namely, they are physical possession, temporary

possession, permanent possession, inalienable possession, abstract possession, inanimate inalienable possession, and inanimate alienable possession.

Possession in Arabic can be expressed through the use of both predicative possession and attributive possession in which the former involves a verbal construction like *have*-constructions found in English whereas the latter refers to the nominal construction (ibid). In MSA, a predicative possession can be expressed in sentences like (20) which is drawn by the researcher for illustration purposes. As shown, the verb *yamlik* 'have' indicates the possessive meaning.

(18)   Ya-mlik-u   Ahmad-un   sayyāra-t-an   džamīla-tan
       3MSG-have.IMPV-M.   Ahmad.NOM   car-F.ACC   beautiful.ACC
       'Ahmad has a nice car'

Such verb is not employed at all in UHA. Rather, attributive possession seems to be more dominant. The formation of such type can be divided into two types, synthetic constructions and analytic constructions (Sayahi 2014). Synthetic constructions are expressed "by juxtaposition of two noun phrases" in which the possessed precedes the possessor as can be shown in (21) (Avram 2012 :44). It is known as the "construct state" which represents what is referred to as *ʔiḍāfa* in Arabic (Sayahi 2014: 182). Another way of expressing synthetic constructions is by the use of "a suffixed pronominal possessor" that is attached to the possessed (noun + pronoun) (ibid: 182) as given in (22) in the word *ummak* 'your mother'. The second type of attributive possession is the analytic construction which seems to be absent from MSA while occurring in most dialects (Harning 1980 cited in ibid: 182). Such construction is expressed through the use of a genitive exponent or a possessive marker that requires a nominal or a pronominal possessor (Sayahi 2014). This type will be illustrated later in this section when introducing *ḥagg* 'belong to' and *tabaʕ* 'belong to' in (4.2.4).

(19)   maktab   bāba   baʕīd
       Office   father   far
       'My father's office is far away'

(20)   umm-ak   daktōr-a
       mother-2MSG   doctor-F.

'Your mother is a doctor'

In light of grammaticalization framework, UHA appears to develop some new usages of some non-possessive linguistic units as a means of expressing possession. This brings us back to the fact that was proposed earlier by Heine (1997: 4) that shows that possession does not only revolve around real possession since there are some other "relational domains" and associations that can be included within the notion of possession. This section aims to account for some linguistic items that are believed to be grammaticalized in UHA and employed to convey the notion of possession. Three of which are *ʕind* 'at', *maʕ* 'with', *fī* 'in, at' which are prepositions that are believed to be "autonomous stem[s]" that can be followed by personal pronouns as opposed to bound stems (Esseesy 2010: 22). Moreover, the nouns *ḥagg* 'belong to' and *tabaʕ* 'belong to' will be addressed too.

4.2.1 *ʕind* 'at' > possessive

The mapping between location as a source schema that is extended to function as *have*-constructions is a well-established pattern of grammaticalization (Heine 1997). Such change can be found cross-linguistically and is attested in Arabic (i.e. in both MSA and cross-dialectal) (Rubin 2004). The preposition *ʕind* 'at' demonstrates how a locative preposition can be used to indicate the abstract domain of possession. The UHA example found in (23) manifests the functional use of the preposition *ʕind*. Although *ʕind* can be inflected for gender and number, it appears to be fixed with no inflection when used in a functional context. However, if the following noun is dropped and *ʕind* is used in a context where it refers to it, then the prepositional *ʕind* can take a pronominal suffix.

(21) as-sawwāg   nzzal-hum   ʕind   ar-raṣīff
      DEF-driver   drop.PFV-3MSG   at   DEF-sidewalk
      'The driver let them down at the side of the road'

In fact, *ʕind* seems to be inflected more often when reanalysed to express possession as shown in (24) where it is attached to a pronominal suffix. In such sentence, *ʕind* seems to be losing the locative sense and, instead, acquires that *have*-construction meaning which is believed to be "a

primary means of expressing possession" (Heine 1997: 6). Hence, it allows inflection. One of the salient features that defines *have*-construction is that it follows the conventionalized pattern of 'X has Y' where the possessor is more likely to be the clausal subject and the possessed is usually the object or the complement (ibid). Example in (24) clearly follows such pattern where *hiyya* 'she' is the subject and the possessor, the locative preposition *ʕind* seems to function as the verb *have*, and *bēt* 'house' is the object and the possessed entity. This is to say that *ʕind* is utilized to function as the predicate of the nominal sentence.

(22) hiyya mā   ʕind-aha   bēt
      she   NEG   have-3FSG   house
      'She does not have a house'

The have-like meaning of *ʕind* allows such preposition to be negated by the negation marker *mā* that is typically used to negate verbal sentences in modern standard Arabic (Alsalem 2012) and across the different dialects including UHA (Sieny 1978). Although Alsalem (2012) argues that *mā* can negate non-verbal constructions in some cases in Kuwaiti Arabic, which can be parallel to UHA as well, it is observed that the general rule for *mā* is the negation of verbal lexemes (i.e. perfective and imperfective verbs).

Based on the Urban Hijazi dialect questionnaire, the verbal negation marker *mā* is used about 135 times. A detailed discussion of such marker can consume volumes which is, in fact, beyond the scope of this paper. However, some observations will be briefly addressed that support what has been suggested above that *ʕind* in (24) is not a preposition but a verb-like item. It should be noted that *mā* has different usages such as the adverbial *mā* which is eliminated in this case as we are looking at the negative *mā* only. *Mā* seems to precede five different forms. The most frequent and the main type is preceding perfective and imperfective verbs which occurs around 109 times in the aforementioned survey. The second most frequent type is what Alsalem (2012) has briefly provided an example for which is *mā* preceding negation pronominal suffixes such as *-nta* '2MSG', *-hum* '3PL', and *-hi* '3FSG' (Sieny 1978). The third type is *mā* preceding prepositions such as *fī*, *lū*, and *ʕadā* in which the first two are believed to be possessive constructions rather than prepositions as will be discussed later in section 4.2.3. In addition, the latter construction *mā* *ʕadā,* is actually a primary construction that conveys the meaning of 'except for' that can be found in both MSA and UHA. The last type that is negated by *mā* is the noun *ʕumr* 'age' that is

usually attached to possessive pronouns to "indicate their possessors' person, gender and number" (ibid: 30). In fact, the noun *ʕumr* is used along with the negation marker *mā* to express the adverb of degree *never* in UHA. In other words, one can say that *ʕumr* is functioning as an adverb rather than a noun.

On the other hand, there is another variety of the negation marker *mā,* which is *mū,* which basically negates non-verbal constructions only (ibid). It is used 11 times only where it negates various linguistic forms such as adjectives which is the most frequent type, prepositions, verbal nouns, etc. Yet, one might argue that in sentences like (25) can still be found in UHA where *ʕindi* is used to express possession but preceded by the non-verbal negator *mū*. However, I would argue that *mū* here is an abbreviated form of *mā* plus the third-person masculine singular pronoun *huwwa* that is merged in the dialect to become *mahu* (Sieny 1978). *Mū* in (25) is a shortened form of *mahu* that can easily be replaced by it (i.e. *mahu ʕindi*). Similarly, *mī* is the shortened form of *mahi* which refers to *mā* plus the third-person feminine singular pronoun *hiyya*. *Mī* can also be used to negate (25) if the case was for a feminine entity that is being referred to.

(23) fēn   al-kitāb?   mū   ʕind-i
      where DEF-book   NEG   with-1SG
      'Where is the book? It is not with me.'

As suggested above, possession is a vague concept that implies various notions that can be delivered through the use of different contexts. The possessive construction *ʕind,* for example, can indicate multiple types of possession. *ʕind* in (24) expresses "permanent possession" (Heine 1997: 34) or what can be called "inherent possession" which denotes a legal ownership (Johnson and Miller-Laird 1976: 565 cited in Heine 1997: 34). On the other hand, in the case of (25), *ʕind* expresses a "physical possession" or a "momentary possession" (Johnson and Miller-Laird 1976: 565 cited in Heine 1997: 34) that is directly linked to a certain period of time which, thus, does not imply an inherent possession. In addition, example in (26) denotes an "inalienable possession" in which the possessed (i.e. *liḥya* 'beard') is perceived to be an inseparable part from the possessor (i.e. *abu alwalad* 'The boy's father') (Heine 1997: 34). While examples in (24), (25), and (26) designate concrete possessions, *ʕind* in (27) and (28) seem to express abstract

notions such as *reasons* in (27) and, thus, is referred to as an "abstract possession" (ibid). Likewise, the example of *ʕind* in (28) expresses an abstract concept which is the ability of running as fast as one could.

(24) abu   al-walad   ʕind-u   liḥya   ṭawīl-a
      father   DEF-boy   have.3MSG   beard   long-F
      'The boy's father had a big beard'

(25) kān   ʕind-i   asbāb   katīr-a
      be.PFV   have-1SG   reasons   many-F
      'I had lots of reasons'

(26) inta   žrī-t   ḥawalēn   al-murabbaʕ   b-ʔasraʕ
      you   run.PFV-2MSG   across   DEF-square   with-fastest
      šayy   ʕind-ak
      something   have-2MSG
      'You ran across the square as fast as you could'
      'lit: you ran across the square with the fastest thing with you'

4.2.2 *maʕ* 'with' > possessive

It is evident that the autonomous preposition *maʕ* 'with' acquires a new function in addition to its basic prepositional function. Such new use is very similar in nature to the new function utilized by *ʕind* in (4.2.1) which indicates possession. The pattern of change of a comitative to possession is not exclusive to Arabic only. Heine and Kuteva (2002: 88) identifies the development of "comitative > H-possessive" in many languages such as Swahili alongside Arabic. By H-possessive, one refers to *have*-constructions discussed earlier.

Rubin (2004) provides Lebanese Arabic as a point of reference to one of the Arabic varieties that uses *maʕ* 'with' in the sense of predicative possession. UHA shares such use too as demonstrated in (29) where *maʕ* acts like the predicate *have* in its English counterpart.

(27) maʕā-hum   kutub-hum
      with-3PL   books-3PL
      'They have their books with them'

Nevertheless, *maʕ* an *ʕind* might be perceived as interchangeable items. This can be true to some extent as there are cases in which they cannot be interchangeable as in the following examples which are not drawn from the dialect survey but driven by the researcher's native-speaking sense:

(28) mā   ʕind-i   bēt
      NEG   have.1SG   house
      'I don't have a house'

(29) mā   mʕā-ya   bēt*
      NEG   have.1SG   house
      'I don't have a house'
      'lit: not with-me a house'

It is clearly shown that (31) is not accurate semantically for two reasons. The primary reason behind this is assumed to be related to the type of possession each word (i.e. *ʕind* and *maʕ*) denotes. It is observed that *ʕind* designates a "general possession" while *maʕ* "refers to immediate possession" (Thackston 1996: 40 cited in Rubin 2004: 87). The second reason is related to the entity possessed (i.e. *bēt* 'house') which cannot be carried away with someone. In other words, it cannot be in one's hand. Thus, such momentary possession cannot be applied in (31).

Lastly, a sentence like (29) can easily form a yes-no interrogative clause that is headed by *maʕ* through rising intonation.

4.2.3 *fī* 'in, at'

It is believed that there is a strong association between body-part terms being a deriving source and Arabic prepositions (Esseesy 2010). The current example of the Arabic preposition, *fī,* is hence proposed to be etymologically derived from the classical Arabic body-part term *fū* 'mouth' (ibid). Such relation is even further emphasized when considering the semantic concept of *fū* being a container-like entity (ibid) which is similar to the basic concept of the preposition *fī*. Yet, the sense of containment ranges between full-containment to non-containment (ibid). Nonetheless, Holes (1990) claims that *fī* is originally derived from the prepositional phrase *fīh* 'in it' which is a combined form that basically breaks to the preposition *fī* plus the third masculine singular pronominal suffix /-h/ which has the literal meaning of 'him'.

The preposition *fī* is expanded to carry various senses that mostly depend on the adjacent lexical item that follows. An exhaustive study has been done on the use of *fī* in one chapter of the Quran, namely, al-Baqara 'The Cow', in which *fī* is attested to give rise to more than twenty five different but interwoven meanings (Esseesy 2010). Four Main senses will be presented based on the instances found in the UHA dialect survey which are found to be of contribution to the general understanding of the different common uses of the preposition *fī*.

The earlier suggested possibility of *fī* being diachronically developed from a body part makes its locative use more visible as the generalization of body-part terms evolving to be expressions that denote a spatial relationship is a well-established concept across languages (Heine and Kuteva 2002). Example (32) below conveys this spatial sense of *fī* as it describes the place (i.e. Muscat) where the two predicates (i.e. *anṭabaʕ* 'been printed' and *atnašar* 'been published) took place. Moreover, spatial expressions can sometimes be developed to take temporal relations (Esseesy 2010). The case of *fī* in (33) manifests such relation in which *fī* is followed by a specific time period of the day (i.e. llēl 'night'). Similarly, *fī* in (34) reflects a temporal aspect as it shows the duration in which the predicate (i.e. *gaṭaʕ* 'travelled') has taken place. In addition, the use of *fī* can be extended to designate "an emotional and mental state sense" which exceeds that physical level to more abstract notion (ibid: 175). Example (35) exemplifies such case in which *fī* describes the psychological state of the speaker (i.e. worried).

(30)　al-žarīda　　　　　an-ṭabaʕ-at　　　　　　wa　　at-našar-at

　　　DEF.newspaper　　PASS-print.PFV-3FSG　　and　PASS-publish.PFV-3FSG

	fī	maṣqaṭ
	in	Muscaṭ

'The newspaper is printed and published in Muscat'

(31)	a-ẓunn-u	wiṣil	ams	fi	l-lēl
	1SG-think.IMPV-3MSG	arrive.PFV.3MSG	yesterday	at	DEF.night
	bass	ma-ni	mitʔakkid		
	but	NEG-1SG	sure		

'I think he arrived last night but I am not sure'

(32)	gaṭaʕ-na	l-masāfa	fi	ṭnaʕšar	sāʕa
	travel.PFV-1PL	DEF.distance	in	twelve	hour

'We travelled the distance in twelve hours'

(33)	wallah	kun-t	fi	galag
	God	be.PFV-1SG	in	worry

'I swear, I was so worried'

Apart from the typical prepositional uses discussed above of the preposition *fī,* it is evident that *fī* can be traced in some other non-prepositional functions in MSA in general and in UHA in specific. In other words, *fī* is grammaticalized and expanded when used in some new ways when compared to its original function. One of which is *fī* functioning as an existential copula which is a well-established use in the literature (e.g. in Gulf Arabic (Bakir 2014) and in Egyptian Arabic (Esseesy 2010). A second use is *fī* serving as a "predicative possession" (avram 2012: 47). Although the former use is not a typical possessive use, it will still be discussed in this section as it falls within the scope of this paper. Consequently, it is observed that the frequency of use of *fī* has gradually increased in Modern Arabic when compared to Classical Arabic (Esseesy 2010).

4.2.3.1 Existential copula

As stated above, *fī* seems to develop some divergent uses of its typical prepositional function. Hence, Essessy (2010) remarks this as a justification for the rise of its textual frequency. The use of existential copula is often referred to as "*there*-constructions" (ibid: 182). As a matter of fact, it is believed that such use has evolved from *fīhi* 'in it' (ibid) or *fīh* 'there is' (Rubin 2004: 92) that is presented earlier in (4.2.3). Consequently, it is phonologically reduced as the third masculine singular pronominal suffix /-h/ is dropped to constitute *fī*. The formation of this existential use follows the general grammaticalization pattern "Locative > exist > copula" (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 99) or "locative > existential" (rubin 2014: 92).

There is a plenty of cases of *fī* being used in the existential sense in the UHA dialect survey. One instance is what is exhibited in (36) where *fī* denotes the existence of a mosque. The fact that *fī* does no longer perform as a preposition explains how *fī* can be negated by a verbal negation marker (i.e. *mā*) as shown in (37) where *fī* appears to lose its syntactic prepositional features. In such case, *fī* can be replaced by the Classical Arabic verb *yūžad* 'Lit: there exists' which indicates the new verb-like properties of *fī*. Yet, it should be noted that *yūžad* is not used in UHA since *fī* replaces it in the dialect. In addition, just to avoid scenario misconception regarding the negation particle used in (37), it should be noted that the CA verb *yūžad* is supposed to take the negative particle *lā* instead of *mā* as *lā* negates imperfective verbs whereas *mā* negates perfectives in CA. On the contrary, in UHA, *mā* is the primary negation particle that is used to negate both perfectives and imperfectives (Sieny 1978).

(34)   fī   masžid   gbāl   al-madrasa
        there   mosque.INDEF   opposite   DEF.school
        'There is a mosque opposite the school'

(35)   mā-fī   šayy   hināk
        NEG-there   something   there
        'There is nothing there'

Moreover, it is observed that *fī* can function as a head of a yes-no interrogative clause with rising intonation as shown in (38) (Esseesy 2010). In fact, this can be applied to (36) and (37) as well.

Moreover, the interrogative clause in (38) seems interesting as it demonstrates three different dimensions of the use of *fī* all in one sentence. The first *fī* manifests the existential function, the second *fī* reflects the locative prepositional sense, and the third one reflects the temporal sense. This shows the coexistence of the different shades of *fī* in the dialect and its ability of occurring in one sentence which emphasizes the fact that it is grammaticalized.

(36)	fī	ay	aḥad	fi	l-bēt	fi	ḍ-ḍuhur
	there	any	body	in	DEF.house	in	DEF.noon

'Is there anybody at home at noon?'

4.2.3.2 Predicative possession

fī seems to develop a new possessive use which can be called as the predicative possession. It can be of equivalence to the have-constructions pattern in English (Avram 2012). It is assumed that it follows the changing pattern of "copula, locative > H-possessive" (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 101). This use is well-documented in the literature, but it seems to be relatively related to the Gulf Pidgin Arabic (GPA) only (e.g. Saudi Gulf Pidgin) (Avram 2012; Bakir 2014) and not with any other Arabic varieties to my knowledge. It is, thus, referred to as an "innovative use in GPA" (Bakir 2014: 418).

However, I believe that such possessive use of *fī* is utilized in UHA too. Yet, it is of limited use only. It seems that *fī* can be used to express *have*-meaning when describing abstract notions only (e.g. some feelings and energy). It is observed that it can never be used to express possession of concrete entities such like the possession of a house the way it is in GPA. Examples (39) and (40) show an abstract possession of having the ability or the strength to do something and having the feeling of being sleepy, respectively. It should be noted here that both examples are generated from the researcher's sense of everyday language use of the dialect.

An additional remark to this use which is similar to the previous mentioned examples is the fact that *fī* can take a pronominal suffix as in (39) and (40) to indicate the speaker's gender, person, and number. In fact, *ʕind* appears to be interchangeable with *fī* in some contexts that indicate possession such as in (40) (i.e. *mā ʕindna nōm* 'we do not feel sleepy').

(37)   mā   fī-yya   ḥēl

         NEG   have-1SG   ability

         'I do not have the ability'

(38)   mā   fī-na   nōm

         NEG   have-1PL   sleep

         'We do not feel sleepy'

4.2.3.3 Clitic

The preposition *fī* is even further grammaticalized in UHA and some other Arabic variesties like Egyptian Arabic in which it cliticizes with the MSA question word *ʔayn* 'where' (Esseesy 2010). Hence, *fēn* 'where' is formed and used instead of *ʔayn* as shown in (41).

(39)   fēn   ḥa-y-ʕīš   ilēn   wagt   aṣ-ṣēf

         where   FUT-3MSG-live.IMPV   until   time   DEF-summer

         'Where does he live until the summer?'

4.2.4   *ḥagg* 'belong to' and *tabaʕ* 'belong to'

4.2.4.1 Noun > genitive exponent

As mentioned earlier in this section, Arabic does not have a "special genitive particle like English 'of'" (Rubin 2004: 75). Thus, it is attested that some nouns are used to denote the genitive relationship instead in some of the modern varieties of Arabic. UHA follows this "noun > genitive exponent" pattern (ibid: 77) and exhibits two words that feature such relationship, namely *ḥagg* 'belong to' and *tabaʕ* 'belong to'. As shown earlier in chapter 3, UHA is influenced by some other spoken Arabic varieties such as Egyptian. Hence, based on the researcher's intuition, the word *ḥagg* is presumably derived from the Egyptian word *ḥāga* which means *need* in Classical Arabic (Woidich1995). However, it is grammaticalized as it is currently used to mean *something* or *anything* in Egyptian Arabic (ibid). This remark makes the function of *ḥagg*

as a genitive exponent more visible as it is believed that most "languages derive their genitive markers from nouns meaning 'property' or 'thing'" (Rubin 2004: 77). On the other hand, the word *tabaʕ* is assumed to be derived from the Classical Arabic *tābiʕ* which means a follower which can imply the meaning of X follows Y which can also carry the meaning of Y is X's. Rubin (2004: 79) suggests that *tabaʕ* is "under the influence of an earlier periphrastic construction *tābi' l-* 'belonging to'".

The alternation between the use of both words, *ḥagg* and *tabaʕ,* is possible as shown in the following examples (which are drawn from the everyday-life use of the dialect for illustration purposes). Yet, based on the researcher's native-speaking intuition, the use of *ḥagg* seems to be the dominant in UHA which implies that *tabaʕ* is not used as often.

(40)   ar-rižžāl   ḥagg   al-maḥal

        DEF-man   belongs to   DEF-store

        'The man who works in the store'

(41)   ar-rižžāl   tabaʕ   al-maḥal

        DEF-man   belongs to   DEF-store

        'The man who works in the store'

Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that *ḥagg* is inflected for gender and number where "the masculine singular can in many cases be used as a generic form" (ibid: 79). Thus, one can find *ḥaggat* for feminine singular and *ḥaggōn* for both masculine and feminine plurals. Rubin (2004) traces the use of *ḥagg* in Yemini Arabic; however, with a slight difference with regard to the feminine plural inflection as it has *ḥaggāt* to denote such inflection instead of *ḥaggōn*.

Parallel to this, the word *tabaʕ* is found in Syrian and Lebanese Arabic (ibid). It can be utilized "in some idiomatic expressions like *huwwe taba' niswān* 'he is a ladies man' (lit: 'he of women')" (ibid: 79). This can also be traced in Egyptian Arabic (Brusted 2000: 82 cited in Rubin 2004: 80). In fact, UHA has a similar idiom but mostly with the use of *ḥagg* instead of *tabaʕ* and with the use of the dialectal term referring to women which is *ḥarīm*.

4.2.4.2 Genitive exponent > possession marker

As proposed above in (4.2.4.1), *ḥagg* seems to be derived from the Egyptian word *ḥāga* 'property' which explains the new function *ḥagg* acquires in UHA. Heine and Kuteva (2002: 245) trace the change of "property ('property', 'possession') > A-possessive" cross linguistically in which A-possessive stands for attributive possession that is similar to the English *of*. As a matter of fact, "genitive exponents … can be combined with pronominal suffixes to form possessive adjectives and possessive pronouns" (Rubin 2004: 80). This is exhibited in UHA in the case of *ḥagg* and *tabaʕ* where they both can be used as possession markers and be inflected for gender and number. See the following examples:

(42)   hadīk-a   l-magāʕid   ma-hi   ḥagg-at-na
        that-FSG   DEF-seats   NEG-3FSG   belonging-FSG-1PL
        'Those seats are not ours'

(43)   dā   al-žakit   tabaʕ-ha
        this.MSG   DEF.jacket   belong-3FSG
        'This jacket belongs to her.'

4.3 Subordinate Conjunctions

Sieny (1978: 41) identifies subordinators as "expressions that precede independent clauses or sentences to make them into subordinate clauses". In his UHA syntax book, he identifies five main functions that are denoted by the use of subordinate conjunctions (i.e. time, place, manner, cause/purpose, and concessive). This section discusses the grammaticalization of the cause subordinate conjuction *ʕašān* 'because'.

4.3.1 matter > *ʕašān* 'because'

It is well-established cross-linguistically that lexical words expressing the meaning of *matter* can give rise to less lexical items such as the subordinator of purpose or reason clauses (Heine and Kuteva 2002). Thus, the change from "matter > cause" (ibid: 210) and "matter > purpose" are likely to occur (ibid: 212). In fact, Arabic is yet another language that manifest such clines.

Esseesy (2010: 199) attests the evolution of "ʕala šaʔn 'on the matter of' > ʕašān 'because of'". In essence, the complex construction ʕala šaʔn breaks down to the preposition ʕala 'on. above' and its compliment šaʔn 'matter'.

Just like the prepositions ʕind 'at', maʕ 'with', fī 'in, at' mentioned earlier in 4.2, the preposition ʕala is considered to be an autonomous stem that can take a personal pronoun. Amongst the aforementioned prepositions, fī and ʕala show the highest frequency of usages (Mehdi 1981). This can account for the fact that both prepositions seem to develop new semantic senses in addition to their locative meaning. For example, UHA uses the phrase ʕala ṭūl 'lit: on length' to denote the meaning of the English adverb *immediately* which, in fact, carries the opposite meaning of ṭūl 'length'.

Esseesy (2010) provides an appealing representation of the diachronic evolution of the subordinate conjunction ʕašān 'because' which accounts for Egyptian Arabic (EA). This is shown in table 4.1 which is adopted from Esseesy but with the alternation of transcription the addition of stage V which is exclusive to the use of UHA.

Table 4.1   Possible Functional Evolution of ʕala 'on, above'

Stage 0 MSA	Stage I MSA	Stage II MSA/ Vernacular EA	Stage III Vernacular EA and UHA	Stage IV Vernacular EA and UHA	Stage V Vernacular UHA
ʕalā 'arose.3MSG'	ʕalā ša'nin 'on' 'affair, matter'	ʕalā ša'ni/ ʕalā šān 'for the matter of'	ʕalašān 'for the sake of'	ʕašān 'because'	ʕašēn 'because'

As shown above, there are five main possible stages identified in an attempt to explain how the preposition ʕalā has changed over time. As expected in any prototypical cline of most grammaticalization processes, a lexical function is assigned to ʕalā in stage 0 on the left side of the spectrum. Nevertheless, ʕalā starts to acquire more abstract functions in stage I and stage II. Paying a closer look at the table, one can see that UHA is only present in two stages (i.e. Stage

III and Stage IV) in addition to stage V which is presumably not considered as an independent stage in the continuum but rather a variant of stage IV. Furthermore, stage III shows how *ʕalā* is agglutinated to its complement *šān* which forms a "tight syntactic [unit] that perform [as a] subordinate [conjunction]" (ibid: 2). *ʕalā* is further grammaticalized in Stage IV where it is cliticized (i.e. *ʕa-*) forming *ʕašān* 'because' which makes the "morphological make-up less transparent when coupled with the decategorization of the preposition in question" (ibid: 5). Stage V, which is unique to UHA, again, is a variant of *ʕašān* where the long low back /ā/ is replaced by a long mid front /ē/, producing *ʕašēn*.

Noteworthy is the fact that all three variants *ʕalašān*, *ʕašān*, and *ʕašēn* coexist in the dialect but with different frequencies. It is observed that the use of *ʕašān* is the dominant in UHA. *ʕalašān* and *ʕašēn* are also used but with little frequencies. In addition, one can find that there is some arbitrariness in the use of the different variants since some individuals show that they combine between the use of one or more variants in their speech generally. Others would just stick to one variant which is in most cases *ʕašān.* In making this remark, I follow what the various responses of informants (see section 2.3 for more details about the informants) suggest.

All in all, the phonological reduction found in *ʕala šaʔn > ʕašān* follows the general observation that associates the high frequency of a particular token with its phonological reduction as a consequence in which the two linguistic unites become realized as a one single unit (Narrog and Heine 2011).

As indicated above, the extension of *matter* to reason and purpose constructions is an evident pattern of evolution. Similarly, this construction comes to serve two interrelated semantic meanings (i.e. cause and purpose) in UHA. Example (44) shows how *ʕašān* comes to act as a "conjunction of reason" (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 210) whereas it serves as a "purpose marker" in (45) (ibid: 212).

(44) ruḥ-t   al-bēt   ʕašān   kun-t   taʕbān

    go.PFV-1SG   DEF-house   because   be.PFV-1SG   tired

   'I went home because I was tired'

(45) ḥa-gaffil   aš-šubbāk   ʕašān mā   yi-gdar

     FUT-close.IMPV   DEF-window so   NEG   3MSG-can.IMPV

     yi-smaʕ-na

     3MSG-hear.IMPV-1PL

     'I will close the window so that he can't hear us'

Conclusion

This research is believed to be a stepping stone to more extensive future research in UHA in the field of grammaticalization. It is, thus, hoped to help filling the gap in the research conducted on the dialect in general and the notion of grammaticalization in Arabic in specific. In light of the absence of historical data of the dialect, this study attempts to identify the evolutionary pathways of thirteen grammaticalized forms available in the data set provided by the UHA dialect questionnaire. Some of the examples identified share the same function and follow the same pattern of change. In other words, they are synonymous. Thus, they are combined under one label, making the total number of the evolutionary pathways identified in this thesis ten rather than thirteen.

This thesis starts by giving a brief insight to the notion of grammaticalization to pave the way of understanding the subsequent main analysis chapter. It also outlines the employed methodology

and provide a brief sociolinguistic background of the dialect to set the picture for the reader to better follow the discussion leads.

The research attempts to achieve different aims. It successfully identifies some of the well-established universal patterns of change in the dialect. It also helps at highlighting some in common uses that are shared with GPA such as the predicative possession function that is illustrated in section 4.2.4.2. Moreover, it helps demonstrating the fact that Arabic dialects do indeed show a continuum of change rather than being fixed to the old perceived artificial categorizations that were put by old grammarians. This shows the resilience and innovation of Arabic (Esseesy 2010). Moreover, it provides an adequate linguistic description of the change observed in each case. Lastly, it shows that UHA seems to develop more functions in certain linguistic items and thus is divergent from MSA even though some forms are still shared in both.

This work is far from a full description of the phenomenon under consideration. A lot of grammaticalized examples could fit in this thesis as there are plenty of examples identified in the dialect but not mentioned throughout the study due to space limitation. Few will be briefly addressed next in the future research suggestion section. Moreover, it is worth mentioning that some major concepts relevant to grammaticalization are out of scope in this thesis (e.g. unidirectionality). In addition, this study is not a comparative dialectal study, so it does not aim to provide examples from different Arabic varieties. However, it draws some useful remarks regarding some of the observed similarities between some dialects such as the ones mentioned in 4.2.4.1.

Again, this study covers a small area only where it could be further expanded in future research (See the points below for more examples). In addition, some dialect-specific examples can be investigated. In other words, it can discuss examples that are not shared in any other Arabic varieties and be exclusive to the dialect.

- ēš 'what': thing > interrogative
- nafs 'soul' > reflexives
- marra 'very': numeral > intensifier
- wāḥid 'one': numeral > Indefinite

References

Abaalkhail, F.M.A.-M. (1998). *Syllabification and Metrification in Urban Hijazi Arabic: between rules and constraints*. University of Essex.

Al-Essa, A. (2009). When Najd Meets Hijaz: Dialect Contact in Jeddah. In R. de J. Enam Al-Wer, ed. *Arabic dialectology : in honour of Clive Holes on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, p. 298.

Al-Mozainy, H. (1981). *Vowel Alternations in a Bedouin Hijazi Arabic Dialect: Abstractness and Stress*. Universityof Texas.

Al-Najjar, B. (1991). Grammaticalization of Lexical Markers in Kuwaiti Arabic. *Folia Linguistica*, 25(3–4), p.665.

Al-Saleemi, E. (1987). *A Contrastive Study of the Verb Systems of English and Arabic*. Durham University.

Alhawary, M.T. (2009). *Arabic Second Language Acquisition of Morphosyntax*. Yale University Press.

Alothman, E.S. (2012). *Digital Vernaculars: An Investigation of Najdi Arabic in Multilingual*

Synchronous Computer-Mediated Communication. The University of MAnchester.

Alsalem, E. (2012). *Negation in Standard and Kuwaiti Arabic*. University of Illinois.

Alshboul, S., Al Shaboul, Y. and Asassfeh, S.M. (2010). Grammaticalization Patterns: Evidence from Future Markers in Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association*, 2010(114), pp.99–110.

Altalhi, H. (2014). *Speech Acts of Thanking and Thanking Responses by Hijazi Females*. Ball State University.

Alzaidi, M. (2014). *Information structure and intonation in Hijazi Arabic*. University of Essex.

Anon. (1998). Romani Project. [online]. Available from: http://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/atmanchester/projects/rmsdatabase.shtml#description%0D [Accessed July 3, 2017].

Bakir, M.J. (2014). The multifunctionality of fii in Gulf Pidgin Arabic. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 29(2), pp.410–436.

Banjar, S. (2003). A Synchronic Study of Metathesis in Eastern Arabic. *Bulletin of the faculty of arts*, 14, pp.1–45.

Bybee, J.L. (1985). *Morphology : A Study of the Relation Between Meaning and Form*. John Benjamins.

Cheston, A. (2012). Will A Graphic Resume Get You The Job? The Experts Respond. [online]. Available from: https://www.forbes.com/sites/work-in-progress/2012/06/28/will-a-graphic-resume-get-you-the-job-the-experts-respond/#6ac4ca1331b8 [Accessed May 17, 2017].

Clarity, B.E. (2003). *A Dictionary of Iraqi Arabic: English-Arabic, Arabic-English*. Georgetown University Press.

Cuvalay-Haak, M. (1997). *The Verb in Literary and Colloquial Arabic*.

Esseesy, M. (2010). *Grammaticalization of Arabic Prepositions and Subordinators: A corpus-Based Study*. Leiden, Boston: BRILL.

Geurts, B. (2000). Explaining Grammaticalization (the standard way). *Linguistics*, 38(4), pp.781–788.

Haspelmath, M. (1999). Why is Grammaticalization Irreversible? *Linguistics*, 37(6).

Heine, B. (2004). Grammaticalization. In B. D. Joseph & R. D. Janda, eds. *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing.

Heine, B. (2003). Grammaticalization. In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics* . Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 573–601.

Heine, B. (1997). *Possession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, B. and Kuteva, T. (2002). *World Lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Herslund, M. (1999). Book Review: Possession. Cognitive Sources, Forces and Grammaticalization. *Journal of Linguistics*, 35(2), pp.414–418.

Holes, C. (1990). *Gulf Arabic*. London, New York: Routledge.

Holes, C. (1995). *Modern Arabic: Structures, Functions, and Varieties*. London: Longman.

Hopper, P.J. and Traugott, E.C. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Jarad, N.I. (2013). The Evolution of the B-Future Marker in Syrian Arabic. *Lingua Posnaniensis*, (1).

Jarrah, A. (1993). *The phonology of Madina Hijazi Arabic: A non-linear analysis*. University of Essex.

Juge, M.L. (2006). Morphological factors in the grammaticalization of the Catalan 'go' past. *Diachronica*, 23(2), pp.313–339.

Matras, Y. (2004). Typology, Dialectology and the Structure of Complementation in Romani. *In: Kortmann, Bernd. ed, editor(s). Dialectology meets typology. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter; 2004. p. 277-304.*

Matras, Y., Christopher, W. and Elšik, V. (2009). The Romani Morpho-Syntax (RMS) database. *Linguistic databases*, pp.329–362.

Mehdi, M.F. (1981). *The Interference of Arabic in the Use of English Prepositions*. Austin: University of Texas.

Narrog, H. and Heine, B. (2011). *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press.

Omar, M.K. (1975). *Saudi Arabic, Urban Hijazi Dialect: Basic Course*. Washington D.C.: Foreign Service Institute.

Prochazka, T. (1988). *Saudi Arabian Dialects*. London: Kegan Paul International.

Rubin, A.D. (2004). *Studies in Semitic Grammaticalization*. Harvard University.

Sayahi, L. (2014). *Diglossia and Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sieny, M.E. (1978). *Syntax of Urban Hijazi Arabic*. Washington: Georgetown University.

Traugott, E.C. (2011). Grammaticalization and Mechanisms of Change. In B. Heine & H. Narrog, eds. *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*. pp. 19–30.

Wilmsen, D. (2013). Grammaticalization of the Arabic Demonstrative Iyya- as a Pronominal Object Marker in Ditransitive Verbs: An Answer to Bravmann. *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 58(1), pp.149–167.

Wilmsen, V.D. (2011). On Grammaticalization Processes in Arabic, the Use of Corpora and the Limits of Theory: Claims and counter claims. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 106(6), pp.365–373.

Woidich, M. (1995). Somes Cases of Grammaticalization in Egyptian Arabic. In J. Cremona, C. Holes, & G. Khan, eds. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of l'AIDA*. Trinity Hall (University of cambridge).