CHAPTER ONE

1.1. Introduction

Languages evolve. They hardly remain stable although language change does not happen overnight. When a language ceases to change, this is taken as a bad omen of its decreasing vitality which leads in some cases to language death. It is not easy to perceive such a dying language. It is like the person’s death. (Crystal 2000).

“The phrase ‘language death’ sounds as a stark and final as many other in which that word makes its unwelcome appearance. And it has similar implications and resonance. To say that language is dead is like saying that a person is dead. It could no other way—for languages have no existence without people”

Like Classical Latin and Greek, which, though found in the written form, are not spoken today. Language change and development takes decades and sometimes centuries to be manifested in a language, particularly in terms of its structural aspects (i.e. morphological, syntactic, phonetic, phonological, semantic and discourse). These changes testify to the fact that a language is a continuum through history. Linguists who probe through principles of historical linguistics detect, investigate and account for the language change and status normally following the diachronic approach.

As part of evolution every aspect of human life as a matter of course, languages, too succumb to this law of nature. A palpable example of language evolution and change can be seen as a tendency of a language to develop variation. Linguistically, the term ‘language variety’ is taken to refer to a manifestation of a language, in terms of a dialect, or an idiolect. It is a term which encompasses all of these…. [it] is a technical term used for any kind of language production, whether we are viewing it as being determined by region, by gender, by social class, by age or by
our own inimitable individual characteristics” (Bauer 2002: 3). The term ‘variety’ has therefore been taken in this research instead of the term dialect, which is “a kind of language which identifies you as belonging to a particular group of people” (ibid.: 3), because, it appears that the former is a more inclusive term and gives much more space to manoeuvre.

In some cases, language evolution leads to what is known in linguistic academia as ‘diglossia’, which according to Ferguson (1959) refers to “one particular kind of standardization where two varieties of a language exist side by side throughout the community, with each having a definite role to play”. In his discussion of diglossia, Ferguson (ibid.) cites Arabic language as one of the prominent world languages with remarkable diglossic conditions.

The Arabic language belongs to the Semitic family of languages of whose attested history spans over three millennia (Chejne 1969: 25). Historically, this language itself is divided into two varieties, Southern Arabic (used formerly in Yemen, and had its written form well developed even by the sixth century B.C.) and Northern Arabic (used in the rest of the Arabian Peninsula). Little evidence do we have about the development of Standard Arabic (also known as Classical Arabic), which is the variety of Quraish Tribe. During the advent of Islam this variety has seemed to have reached its apex of poetic and linguistic sophistication. Its writing system achieved sophistication in later centuries, though. Even in the pre-Islamic era, Northern Arabic had seven recognised varieties, apart from the non-recognised ones.

The advent of Islam and the revelation of the Holy Quran in Quraish variety elevated this variety to the status of Standard Arabic, known as fiṣḥa, and imparted on it a spiritual value, even at the cost of marginalising other varieties, including the Southern Arabic. But this does not mean that a radical shift had taken and that the
Southern Arabic had been completely forsaken. Of course, the Northern Arabic writing system (xatt ?al-musnad) was given away in favour of the Northern Arabic counterpart. But the spoken form of Southern Arabic seems to have retained some intrinsic aspects of its salient features. This retention of spoken characteristics of a variety seems to apply to almost all the varieties of Arabic, hence the case of diglossia. Therefore, while Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) can be traced back to the variety of Quraish (dominant therein in Makkah, Medinah and other adjacent areas), the non-Quraish varieties of Arabic interacted with the MSA with some reservations, especially at the spoken level.

The Ibb Variety (IV), as one of these varieties of Arabic, is no exception. In the presence a considerable amount of interaction with MSA it retains certain aspects peculiar to it at various levels. Perhaps due to neglect by academia, this variety, like most of the varieties of Arabic, is relegated to a lower status and even considered vulgar and “unliterary”, although vernacular poetry is composed in this variety. But, from a linguistic point of view, a study of this variety can provide us with ample examples of a wide range of concerns pertaining not only to this variety and its relation with MSA but also in terms of language development in general with specific reference to Arabic and its diglossic situation.

1.2. **Aim and Scope:**

The aim and scope of this study is to provide a descriptive synchronic analysis of the morphological structure of Yemeni Arabic as it is spoken by natives of the city of Ibb. Most of the Yemeni vernaculars have not been studied up till now, perhaps due to lack of initiative by academia and the concerned authorities. The study of these vernaculars is of immense value not only for the sake of these varieties and their relations with the MSA but also for linguistic studies in general. Therefore, this study
shall be considered as an attempt to investigate one of these vernaculars in order to document the governing rules and peculiarities of this variety which would otherwise remain in the dark side of academia. The discussion involves approaching this variety from different angles, viz. socially, linguistically and culturally.

Interestingly, Yemen abounds in varieties of Arabic to such an extent that one can recognise the speaker’s region and tribe according to the variety s/he speaks. Within Ibb Governorate one can notice the existence of a myriad of accents which, alongside the accent used in Ibb City, form the variety investigated in this dissertation, i.e. IV. Generally, Ibb city is located in the south of the capital Sana’a, an agricultural society. The population of Ibb Governorate is approximately two and millions, and most of them belong to the rural agricultural community. Ibb Governorate has twenty two Directorates, each of which has its own remarkable accent within Ibb Variety, but one always notices that people from the various Directorates of Ibb Governorate tend to use IV as a “lingua franca” and a common denominator for social interactions – although all accents of IV are mutually intelligible. People regard the accent of Ibb City as a more sophisticated accent and as a way to avoid regionalism.

It has been mentioned above that although speakers of the different varieties of Arabic tend to prefer to keep their vernaculars outside the written form. However, it is probably a popular misconception that only the MSA is elevated to the status of the written language. In other words there exists a phobia that if vernaculars are used in the written form the status and prestige of MSA (the language with the “spiritual value” and a common denominator of all Arabs and Muslims) would diminish. However, these varieties tend also to retain certain phonological and morphological features and generally develop peculiar rules to respond to their speakers’ needs.
alongside the dictates of MSA. This description, therefore discusses the phonology of IV as it interplays with the morphological system. Of course, the native speakers of IV who have participated as subjects in this investigation have been under the influence of the variety standard to a great extent. Most of them are students in Ibb University and the rest include respondents ranging from scholars and teachers in the secondary schools to lay persons or common speakers (uneducated persons).

As most of the Yemeni vernaculars have not been studied from the linguistic point of view by date there is hardly anything that this thesis can draw upon. Hence this study stands as a challenging task and a fresh contribution to linguistics with a specific reference to Yemeni Arabic. The lack of existing studies on IV and other varieties in Yemen is a disadvantage especially as a point of departure from an existing academic opinion, and has necessitated the researcher start from scratch. Of course, materials were available with regard to MSA, but when the case came to IV. The data collected from native speakers alone has served as the backbone of the research reported here.

Modern concepts in linguistics and sociolinguistics have been resorted to in order to explain certain linguistic phenomena related to IV. It is noted that IV morphology operates according to a root-based structure, or ‘architecture’. Virtually all words in IV, with the exception of certain conjunctions, prepositions and articles, operate within this system. Even the loanwords, once adopted into IV, become adjusted into its root-based architecture. The insertion of the vocalic prosodies between the radicals, and the attachment of the affixes, creates and differentiates one morphological category from another. Certain patterns distinguish words into nouns, others into verbs; whereas they may mark a verb for its number, tense, aspect, gender, and model categories besides, and for another verbal categories. As will be
demonstrated and explained in subsequent chapters. Finally this thesis may stand the chance of being model for the description of other varieties of Arabic. It can be used in pedagogy as well. Also, it can be used in machine translation.

1.3. Theoretical Models of Morphology

There are three principal models of morphology (cf. Hockett 1954), each of which tries to deal with the descriptions of various morphological phenomena. Various approaches to morphology have been based on one of these three principal models:

1. Item and Arrangement (IA) conceived as object oriented concatenation in which morphemes are not distinguished with basic and non basic allomorphs (No notion of basic allomorphs). In the following examples, the plural markers /s, z, iz/ are independent and have the same status where in each of these morphemes (viz, s, z, iz attached to book, bag, church respectively) carry tags indicating their address for concatenation. This model of Morphology is also largely unsuitable for describing Arabic which involves non linear order of concatenation.

   book + s → books

   bag +z → bagz

   church +iz → churchiz

2. Item and process (IP) conceived as processing of abstract units of Lexicon. The notion of basic allomorph is at the centre of the concept and the variants are contextually derived. The IP model underlies the Lexeme-based approach to Morphology. In this model, instead of analyzing a word-form as a set of morphemes arranged in sequence, a word is said to be the result of applying rules that alter a given lexeme in order to produce a new word. An inflectional rule takes a lexeme, changes it as is required by the rule, and outputs a word-form. The Item-and-Process approach bypasses the difficulties inherent in the Item-and-Arrangement approach. The plural
suffix formative /iz/ will have three allomorphs viz. [iz], [z] and [s], besides [en] and [ren]. Even the problematic cases like men can start with man and apply the rules of plural formation which automatically massage the form into a well-formed word-form.

\[ \text{Pl} = /iz/ \text{ basic allomorph.} \]

1. \( \text{iz} \rightarrow z/ C_z# \quad \text{iz} \rightarrow s/ C_z# \)

   \[ \text{- cont} \quad \text{- cont} \]

   Alternatively, \( i \rightarrow \varnothing / C_z# \)

2. \( z \rightarrow s/ C_# \)

   \[ \text{-vd} \]

   book+iz \( \rightarrow \) bookz \( \rightarrow \) books

3. Word and Paradigm (WP) The assumption is, a morpho-syntactic Property (P) is associated with the root/stem X. Words (XP) are viewed as exponents of P. This model in its design does not involve concatenation of morphemes in linear instead involves stating fully blown (inflected/ derived) forms as projections of the corresponding morpho-syntactic categories. This model is better suited to be applied to the type of the Arabic language and its varieties. The following examples illustrate the WP in IV.

\( \begin{align*} & \text{katab} \quad \text{write,} \quad \text{p.3.m.s.} \\
& \text{tuktub} \quad \text{write,} \quad \text{p.2.f.s.} \\
& \text{juktubu:} \quad \text{write,} \quad \text{p.3 m.p.} \\
& \text{maktab} \quad \text{office,} \quad \text{m.s.} \\
& \text{maka:tib} \quad \text{office,} \quad \text{m.p.} \\
& \text{maktaba} \quad \text{library,} \quad \text{f.s.} \\
& \text{kita:b} \quad \text{book,} \quad \text{m.s.} \\
& \text{kutub} \quad \text{book,} \quad \text{m.p.} \end{align*} \)
Since the WP model avoids concatenation of morphemes linear order it is in design better sited to describe Arabic Morphology. Particularly, refer the formation of plurals in Arabic. Under this model we may recognise Arabic words constitute word parts k-t-b and a-a where in the first part indicates the basic lexical meaning and the second part the grammatical function meaning

In other frame work of Morphology called Relational Morphology, non concatenation of morphemes are involved rather as in word basic morphology. Word forms are fully formed readibly available in human mental lexicon and various morphological relationship are establishment by correspondence or operation (formal anh semantic similarly) by the forms stated in 1

\[ X_{w_f} \leftrightarrow X'_{w_\beta} \]

Where \( X \) is a word \( (w_f) \) and \( X' \) is another word \( (w_\beta) \). Bothe are related because they have formal similarly, \( x:: x' \), and semantic similarty \( w_f:: w_\beta \), where \( F \) vsus \( \beta \) are distinct morpho-syntactic categories referring to the same lexical content. The morphological relations are appropriately expressed in Arabic using the notation scheme described above.

1.4. Research Methodology and Procurement of Data

Data collection in the field was performed by inviting native speakers of IV to engage in conversation and pronunciation of lexical items in IV. The data used in this dissertation was obtained by the following methods:

1) By discussing with the informants, either by speaking about specific topics, or from general, unguided sessions, and writing down relevant comments.
2) In order to elicit structural forms, the informants would be given lexical items which were frequent in their casual speech and were asked to use these items with affixes. This included the attachment of suffixes in general. The morphology of nouns, verbs and adjectives was also elicited. The formation of broken plural forms of nouns and participles was requested from the informants. The informants were also asked to provide participles from derived verbs and also to conjugate verbs with all subject personal pronouns.

3) Social gatherings with IV informants at the Shab Ibb Club, at my residence or at the campus of Ibb University has given the researcher a greater receptive facility in terms of understanding the grammar of the variety.

The data collected are then refined and tabulated along with their transcription and translation. IPA symbols have been used here for transcription of data. Examples of the processes under investigation are sorted in such a way as to illustrate and substantiate the mechanisms behind these processes.

1.5. **Chapterisation**

This thesis is divided into seven chapters each of which deals with a specific concern of the study.

**Chapter One: This chapter comprises of** Introduction in general and about the Arabic Language in a historical perspective in particular.

This chapter provides a historical background and shows how Arabic language existed in two forms, indicating the postulates of several descriptive models regarding the development of Arabic varieties. Based on Ferguson’s (1959) point of view, this chapter also discusses diglossia in general and moves on to throw light on the situation in context of the Arabic speech communities, tracing it to the pre-Islamic
times. Besides, this chapter discusses the theoretical models of Morphology and the inflection as an overview of grammatical categories in Ibb Variety.

**Chapter Two: The Phonology of IV**

An inventory of vowels and consonants of IV are discussed. This chapter also concerns itself with the description of the phonological processes.

**Chapter Three: The Morphology of IV Verbs**

The Non-Concatenative Theoretic description is used as much as possible to account for morphological processes in IV. Different varieties of IV verbs are explored, showing how IV verbs are inflected and conjugated vis-à-vis MSA.

**Chapter Four: The Morphology of IV Nouns**

IV nouns are classified into various declensional classes in this chapter. In addition, the category of gender with relation to the mechanisms of NP inflection is explored with reference to IV. Besides, this chapter also includes an investigation of pluralisation and other noun forms which occur in IV.

**Chapter Five: The Morphology of IV Adjectives**

This chapter is concerned with the different classifications of IV adjectives, substantiating each type with examples.

**Chapter Six: The Morphology of IV Pronouns**

Special mention is made of the pronouns in both MSA and IV, indicating similarities and differences. This chapter also compares and contrasts IV and MSA in a general way, highlighting the points of convergence and divergence in such a way as to come up with formulas for each type of change.

**Chapter Seven: Conclusion**

This chapter concludes the study by summarising the main points made throughout the research. It also suggests areas where further research is required.
1.6. Inflection: An Overview of Grammatical Categories in Ibb Variety

The term ‘inflection’ generally refers to phonological changes, a word undergoes as it is being used in specific morpho-syntactic context. In English, some common inflectional categories are: number (singular and plural; case in case of pronouns), tense (e.g., past, present), and voice (active and passive). Generally speaking, Arabic as well as IV words are marked for more grammatical categories than are English words. Some of these categories are available in English (ex. aspect) while others, such as inflection for case or gender (in case of nouns) are not. There are eight morpho-syntactic categories in Arabic: aspect, voice, mood, person, gender, number, case and definiteness. Five of these apply to verbs in IV (aspect, person, voice, gender, number), Three apply to nouns and adjectives (gender, number and case), and Four apply to pronouns (person, gender, number and case). Here is a brief summary of these categories and their roles in Arabic with some clarification of the differences of IV variety.

Aspect

Aspect can be seen as of viewing of time. Also, Aspect sees the completeness of an action or state as central: is the action over with and completed, ongoing, or yet to occur. The points of view, aspect focuses on when the action occurs and the other focuses on the action itself – whether it is complete or not. There are two basic morphological aspects in IV: past and present, also called perfective and imperfective, respectively. In dealing with the modern written language, many linguists find it more pragmatic to describe Arabic as well as, varieties in terms of aspect, to past/present (referring to time or and perfect/imperfect/ as well. There is
also a future, indicated by prefixing either *sa-* or *sawfa* to the present form in MSA but in IV by the use of /?al/.

**Person**

Arabic as well as, IV, verbs and personal pronouns inflect for three persons: person, number and gender, first person (I, we), second person (you), and third person (she, he, they). There are differences with English, however, in the gender and number of these persons. For the IV first person (*?ana, ?ihni?*) there is no gender distinction. For the second person, there are two forms of 'you': masculine singular (*?inta*), feminine singular (*?inti*), we can find that the dual pronouns are not lost but associated with plural pronouns /?intu/ which means 2nd masculine, feminine plural and 3rd masculine feminine plural. This is difference in MSA, which has five forms of the 2nd person. For the third person, there are five verbal distinctions in IV and five pronoun distinctions: he (*hu*), she (*hi*), they-two masculine (*hum*), they-two feminine (*han*), they more than two masculine (*hum*) and they feminine (*han*).

**Voice**

The category of voice refers to whether an IV verb or participle is active or passive. Generally speaking, the passive is used in IV only if the agent or doer of the action is unknown or not to be mentioned for some reason.

**Mood**

‘Mood’ or ‘mode’ refers to verbal categories such as indicative, subjunctive, imperative, or (in Arabic) jussive. These categories reflect contextual modalities that condition the action of the verb. For example, whereas the indicative mood tends to be characteristic of straightforward statements or questions, the subjunctive indicates an attitude toward the action such as doubt, desire, wish, or necessity, and the imperative mood indicates an attitude of command or need for action on the part of the speaker.
The issue of mood marking is a central one in Arabic grammar (along with case marking). Moods fall under the topic of morphology because they are reflected in word structure; they are usually indicated by suffixes or modifications of suffixes attached to the present aspect verb stem, and the phonological nature of the verb stem determines what form the suffix will take. The mood markers are often short vowel suffixes, for example, /-ul/ for indicative and /-al/ for subjunctive. In Arabic, mood marking is done only on the imperfective or present tense stem; there are no mode variants for the past tense. The Arabic moods are therefore non-finite; that is, they do not refer to specific points in time and are not differentiated by tense. Mood marking is determined either by particular particles which govern or require certain moods (e.g., the negative particle lam requires the jussive mood on the following verb) or by the narrative context in general, including attitude of the speaker and intended meaning. It is worth mentioning here that mood is not subject in most of Arabic varieties, Hofiz (1995) indicates that verbs of Dubai Dialect are not inflected for mood, as well as, IV the mood is lost (not inflected).

**Gender**

IV exhibits two genders: masculine and feminine. For the most part, gender is overtly marked, but there are words whose gender is covert and shows up only in agreement sequences. The gender category into which a noun falls is semantically arbitrary, except where nouns refer to human beings or other living creatures. Gender is marked on adjectives, pronouns, and verbs, as well, but is not inherent, as it is in nouns.

**Number**

IV has three number categories: singular, dual, and plural. Whereas singular and plural are familiar categories to most Western learners, the dual is less. A very
few nouns are both masculine and feminine, for example: ‘salt’ /milh/ and ‘spirit’ /ruːh/. The dual in IV is used whenever the category of “two” applies, whether it be in nouns, adjectives, pronouns, or verbs. The concept of plural therefore applies to three or more entities. This category interacts in specific ways with the category of gender and also with a morphological category which is peculiar to Arabic and IV as well: humanness. Both gender and humanness affect the way in which a noun, participle, or adjective is pluralized. Numerals themselves, their structural features and the grammatical rules for counting and sequential ordering, constitute one of the most complex topics in Arabic. They are discussed in Chapter Four.

Case

Arabic nouns and adjectives normally inflect for three cases: nominative, genitive, and accusative. Cases fall under the topic of morphology because they are part of word structure; they are usually suffixes attached to the word stem, and the nature of the word stem determines what form the suffix will take. In general, the case markers are short vowel suffixes: /-u/ for nominative, /-i/ for genitive and /-a/ for accusative, but there are substantial exceptions to this. A case-marking paradigm is usually referred to as a declension. Cases also fall under the topic of syntax because they are determined by the syntactic role of a noun or adjective within a sentence or clause. The nominative case typically marks the subject role (most often the agent or doer of an action); the accusative marks the direct object of a transitive verb or it may mark an adverbial function; and the genitive is used mainly in two roles: marking the object of a preposition and marking the possessor in a possessive structure.

The crucial difference between the MSA and IV is the total lack of any morphological inflection of case on nouns (as in the other colloquial variants). When
case endings were indicated by short vowels MSA, the corresponding forms are simply not available in IV.

**Definiteness: Determiners**

Arabic as well as, most of Arabic varieties has both definite and indefinite markers. The definite marker is a word (ةَل-) which is not independent but is prefixed to nouns and adjectives; the indefiniteness marker is an affix (-ْن), normally in Arabic suffixed (only but not with the varieties) to the case-marked vowel on nouns and adjectives; thus، ١٠ُ-١٠-١٠ (‘the house’ – nominative, definite), but ١٠-١٠-١٠ (‘a house’ – nominative, indefinite). The suffixed ١-١ sound is not written with the letter ١١ (١١) but is indicated by modifying the short vowel case-marker. Whereas the definite article is visible in Arabic script, the indefinite marker normally is not.

1.7. **Distribution of inflectional categories: paradigms**

In terms of the distribution of the above eight categories of inflection, IV verbs inflect for the first five: aspect, voice, person, gender, number, but not for mood. Nouns and adjectives inflect for the last two: gender, number, but not for case and definiteness. Pronouns inflect for gender, number, and person respectively. Any verb, for example, can be analyzed as being marked for five categories; any noun can be analyzed for four categories and any pronoun for three. This means that word structure in IV is complex, and that verbs have the most complex structure of all².

**Nouns and Adjectives**

In the colloquial spoken varieties of Arabic, much of the inflectional and derivational grammar of Classical Arabic nouns and adjectives is unchanged. The colloquial varieties have all been affected by a change that deleted most final short vowels (also final short vowels followed by a nunation suffix -ْن), and shortened final long vowels.
Loss of Dual

The dual number is lost except on nouns, and even then its use is no longer functionally obligatory (i.e. the plural may also be used when referring to two objects, if the "two-ness" of the objects is not being emphasized). In addition, many varieties have two morphologically separate endings inherited from the Classical dual, one used with dual semantics and the other used for certain objects that normally come in pairs (e.g. eyes, ears) but with plural semantics (which IV follows).

Changes to Elative Adjectives

Elative adjectives (those adjectives having a comparative and superlative meaning) are no longer inflected; instead, the masculine singular serves for all genders and numbers. Note that the most common way of saying e.g. "the largest boy" is ‘?akbar walad’, with the adjective in the construct state (rather than expected ‘?al-walad ?al-akbar’, with the adjective in its normal position after the noun and agreeing with it in state).

Preservation of Remainder of System

Other than the above changes, the system is largely stable. The same system of two genders, sound and broken plurals, to complete the declension of some nouns and adjectives still exists, and is little changed in its particulars. The singular of feminine nouns is normally marked in /–al/ or /–ih/. The masculine plural marked in /i:n or em/ whereas the feminine plural marked in /a:t/.

1.8. The Arabic Language: A Historical Background

Since at least what is traditionally known as the pre-Islamic period (i.e. up to the sixth century in the Christian Calendar), the Arabic Language has existed in two forms, Literary Arabic, hereafter abbreviated LA, and regional or colloquial varieties. As is discussed later, LA is also known as ‘Classical Arabic’ and the ‘Modern
Standard Arabic’ is the language of contemporary writing. LA is called ‘?al-lu?a ?al-?arabija ?al-fu?ha’.

In most Arab countries there are several varieties; one is the high-prestige urban variety used by the elite, another is the variety used by the common people. Still there may exist an additional variety, i.e. the variety of Bedouins, or nomadic Arabs, in some Arab countries. Accordingly, these varieties can be described by the following variables or a combination of them: i. Region or Location, ii. Family and Tribal Affiliation, iii. Mode of Living, whether nomadic or sedentary. These variables are factors which may contribute either to the formation or continuation of a variety, or to its demise.

Generally, these varieties vary widely from each other and from LA. However, LA as it is used in one Arab country does not significantly differ from LA as it is used in another Arab country in terms of phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicon. As was referred to above, the LA of the pre-modern period is sometimes called ‘Classical Arabic’, whereas contemporary LA is also known as Modern Standard Arabic (MSA).

LA first began to make its impact as the language of pre-Islamic Arabic poetry. With the revelation of Quran, and the expansion of the Islamic State, LA made its full impact. Also written in LA (Classical Arabic) are the Holy Quran, the prophetic hadith (traditions of the Prophet), and the literature of the early Islamic period, (beginning with hijra, the journey of the prophet from Mecca to Almadina, A.D. 622, until around the middle part of the Abbasid period). Over time, some of the vocabulary of older LA (i.e. Classical Arabic) has become anachronistic, whereas the recent Modern LA has acquired current shape with the advancement of scientific knowledge and technology.
Although, it is not empirically proven that LA and the Arabic varieties stem from the same early Arabic form, most scholars are opinion of that both LA and Arabic varieties have diverged from a common progenitor. This is paralleled by the general agreement among scholars that Arabic and the other Semitic languages, including Akkadian, Amharic, Aramaic, Hebrew, Maltese, Phoenician, South Arabic, Tigre, Tigrinya, etc., descended from the same proto-Semitic language.

However, whether or not the colloquial varieties of Arabic developed directly from old LA has not yet been settled. In terms of chronology, there is variance of opinion about the Arabic varieties which existed in the pre-Islamic era and the extent of their variation. Related to this is the phenomenon of the penetration of Arabic into the Fertile Crescent, which apparently had begun long before the hijra. How this issue relates to the spread and development of the varieties with the rise and expansion of Islam outside of Arabia proper must have played a significant role in the development of the precursors of today’s modern Arabic varieties, including IV (Ibb variety). Well-known examples of Medieval Arabic literature, including The Thousand and One Nights, grammatical treatises, and other written sources testify that a number of Arabic varieties were extent by the mid-Abbasid period.

Several descriptive models for the development of the Arabic varieties have been postulated. Many differing conjectures have emerged about the linguistic situation at the time of the Prophet and the inception of Islam. Each explanation attempts to describe the linguistic situation in the Arabian Peninsula just prior to the Islamic expansion.

The Arabic Koine, a theoretic model, was proposed by Johan Fueck and Charles Ferguson (1959). They postulate that a common colloquial form of Arabic arose with the spread of Islam outside the confines of Arabia proper. The Koine
model purports to explain why most sedentary Arabic varieties share certain linguistic features. It claims that while the Koine spread and developed along with the Arab-Islamic state, LA remained fundamentally unchanged over time and space.\(^9\)

Teymour (1932: 635) proposes another theory, prevalent among Arabs, resembling the Koine model in some respects. It states that the modern varieties of Arabic diverged from each other owing to foreign occupation and colonization. It is generally agreed upon that this process started with the decline of the Abbasid Caliphate in the CA 11 C, followed by Mongol invasion in the mid-12 C. The challenge to authority posed by Turkish troops within the still predominantly Arabic-speaking and Arab-ruled Islamic state was an important factor in this development. Outside the realm of Abbasid politico-military power, the colloquializing process in spoken Arabic began to take place. Perhaps, lack of education and the non-use of Arabic as the official language during the Turkish rule, along with the subsequent occupation of Arab land by imperialist powers (British, French, Italian), all aggravated the situation even more first by excluding Arabs from the world and from each other, and then by imposing their own languages and systems of education on the Arabs.

Versteegh (1984) argues that the Old Spoken Arabic and the Poetic Koine, which existed at the time of the Prophet and shortly thereafter, was a single language which he calls Old Arabic. Any variation which existed was not beyond the range of the normal linguistic variation found in any living language. His basic position is that the descriptions and conclusions of the early Arab grammarians about the Arabic language are reliable and should be used as real evidence for determining the state of early Classical Arabic. His strongest argument for the unity of Old Arabic is the evidence of the early grammarians. In his first chapter he does not state how quickly
the changes take place, but he does characterize these changes as radical and far-reaching. Versteegh asserts that the changes between Old Arabic and New Arabic (his terminology) are so deep that New Arabic constitutes a new language type.\textsuperscript{10}

Blau (1965/1981 and 1966), as well, argues that Old Spoken Arabic and the Poetic Koine were in essence the same language. His evidence is the lack of pseudo-corrections in the Quran. He also argues that the poets would not have been able to correctly compose the \textit{Jahiliyya} (i.e. a common term used to describe the pre-Islamic period) poetry if they were not comfortable using the features of the Poetic Koine.

Ziadeh (1986) uses the evidence of the multiple forms of broken plurals to argue that extensive cross-dialect borrowing occurred in \textit{Jahiliyya} poetry. He also argues that sometimes the poet would just invent forms in order to get the correct rhyme and meter.\textsuperscript{11} He seems to support Zwettler’s argument that the Poetic Koine was a language that became increasingly artificial during the pre-Islamic period. Zwettler and Ziadeh both seem to be aiming their arguments at Blau, in an effort to show that the use of “correct” Poetic Koine does not mean that the Poetic Koine was the poets’ native vernacular.

Combining the explanation of Versteegh with Ferguson explanation, it appears that the radical changes which occurred to Arabic took the form first of abrupt pidginization and creolization which was followed by a long period of gradual decreolization. The spoken language to which this process of pidginization, creolization and then gradual decreolization occurred was Ferguson’s Koine II (a postulated common spoken language of unknown origin used by the conquering Arab armies during the Islamic expansion). I think this accounts for the features that are common to all dialects but differ from Old Arabic, which is what Ferguson was aiming at. It also accounts for those features where each dialect is different from Old
Arabic and is different from the other dialects as well, which is what Versteegh was aiming at. In fact Versteegh uses this anomaly to try to discredit Ferguson’s theory. I differ with Versteegh’s analysis where he wants to say that the dialects developed out of Old Arabic, and that this Old Arabic was the same language as the Quran.

Ferguson (1989) is more convincing when he points out that the only category for which duals exist in modern Arabic dialects is the noun, and that it invariably takes plural agreement. This is very different from Old Arabic and MSA which have dual categories in the verb, pronoun and adjective. In MSA and Old Arabic a dual noun takes dual agreement with the verb, pronoun and adjective which makes it a separate category from singular and plural. In MSA there is a complex set of rules for verbal agreement, and adjectival agreement with the noun. If the verb precedes the noun it takes gender but not number agreement. Non-human plurals take feminine agreement with adjectives. Dual nouns apparently break this rule by invariably taking dual agreement with adjectives regardless of their human/non-human status, but verbs which precede dual nouns only take gender agreement. In the New Spoken Arabic dialects adjectival agreement with non-human plurals can be plural or feminine. It is generally safe in the dialects to give feminine adjectival agreement to non-human plural nouns because even if this is not correct for that dialect it can be taken as a “classicism”. However, in the modern dialects dual nouns mostly take plural agreement. It is hard to imagine that this exact feature could have developed independently in so many different places. Ferguson’s argument is very persuasive that the New Spoken Arabic dialects have a common source and that this source is different from the Poetic Koine.

The above are mainly the most commonly held views regarding the emergence of Classical Arabic and the possibility of the existence of varieties in pre-Islamic
Arabia. Generally, with the advent of Islam and the fact that the Quran is written in the Arabic Koine, it is not until the 7th century that a crucial attempt at systematisation started to take place, particularly at the hands of Abu al-Aswad al-Du’ali (c.603 - 688), who is known in the Arab world as the first to put dots to mark different letters, and Sibawayh (c. 760-796), who is acclaimed as the first Arab distinguished grammarian. Their attempts pioneered the way of progress towards systematisation and standardisation.

1.9. Diglossia in Arabic

In western scholarly literature, a great deal of discussion has revolved around the pervasiveness of diglossia in Arabic. Beginning with Karl Krumbacher (in Zughloul 1980) in Germany around 1902, the discussion continued through the period of William Marçais (in Abboud-Haggar 2005) in France during the 1940’s followed by Charles Ferguson in the U.S.A in the late 1950’s (Ferguson 1959).12

According to The Encyclopaedia of Language (Crystal 1995/97), diglossia is a language situation in which two markedly divergent varieties each with its own sets of social functions co-exist as standards throughout the community. One of these varieties is used (in many localized variant forms) in ordinary conversations, the other variety is used for special purposes primarily in formal speech and writing. It has become conventional in linguistics to refer to the former variety as “Low” (L) and the later as “High” (H).

The term ‘diglossia’ was introduced into the English language literature on sociolinguistics by Ferguson (1959) in order to describe the Language High-Low Arabic, known as ?al-fusha (classical) and ?al-ammi?jah (colloquial), Greek Katharevousa Dhimotiki, Swiss German Hochdeutch (High German) and Schwyzertütsch (Swiss-German) – i.e. situations found in places like Greece, the Arab
world and the island of Haiti – a list which can easily be extended (Hudson 2002). In all these societies there are two distinct varieties, sufficiently distinct for lay people to call them separate languages, of which one is used only on formal and public occasions while the other is used by everybody under normal, everyday circumstances. The two varieties are normally called “high” and “low” or “standard” and “vernacular”. By way of definition, Ferguson (1959) states that ‘Diglossia’ is a relatively language situation in which in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety. Diglossia was later extended by Fishman (1972) to include the use of more than one language.

To some extent, Diglossia should be mentioned in any discussion of Arabic or at least a cursory discussion of Diglossia. Ferguson is credited with first using the term Diglossia in an article which he wrote in 1959 called *Diglossia*. He identified four languages, Arabic, Greek, Haitian Creole and Swiss German as being prime examples of languages which fit into his definition of Diglossia. Very simply stated, he said that diglossic speech communities have an ‘H’ variety that is very prestigious and an ‘L’ variety with no official status, which are in complementary distribution with each other, for instance, the ‘H’ variety might be used for literary discourse and the ‘L’ variety for ordinary conversation. His original definition of Diglossia was that the two varieties which are in a diglossic relationship with each other are closely related, and therefore Diglossia is not bilingualism. In his defining examples, he points out that the ‘H’ variety is always an acquired form, and that some educated native speakers might even deny that they ever use the ‘L’ variety.
There are many societies where the schooling language is usually an official language of the state and is significantly different from the home language often called a ‘variety’. In fact, Arabic situation has been studied as an enriched and valuable example of Diglossia. Ferguson, (1959) refers to this superposed variety as the high variety or ‘H’, and to the ‘primary dialects’ as the low variety or ‘L’. He applied the term, which he coined, to situations where the vernacular, which he called ‘low’ or ‘L’ and the formal language called ‘high’ or ‘H’, could be regarded as, in some sense, variants of the same language; the examples he gave were those of colloquial and classical Arabic, viz, his area of expertise, demotic and Katharevousa Greek, Creole and French in Haiti, and Schwyzertütsch (Swiss-German) and German in Switzerland. In the 1960s, however, research by Joan Rubin in Paraguay showed that the relation between the linguistically unrelated Guaraní and Spanish in that country was, socially, of the same nature, and so the use of term was expanded.

One point that Ferguson has insisted on was a distinction between Diglossia as he defined it and the more common “dialect-standard” dichotomy, the difference being that while in the latter situation, there are people who actually speak “standard” under Diglossia no one speaks ‘H’ colloquially. I firmly believe that no one really speaks “standard” as taught in school, especially as far as Arabic is concerned, with all the grammatical and syntactic rules that one is expected to follow in expository writing. People who think that they speak standard “incorrectly,” they often believe, actually speak a dialect that is a colloquial, regionally coloured variant thereof.

Ferguson’s hypothesis is that Diglossia generally occurs in situations where 1) there is large body of literature to which the community is much attached because it is culturally defining, 2) literacy rates are low and 3) the literature has been around for a number of centuries. He also posits that Diglossia tends to be relatively stable. He
wrote another article called *The Arabic Koine*. In this article, he argues that Diglossia was developed well at the time of the Islamic conquests but that the conquests caused a linguistic levelling or new Koine (Koine II). Koine II was used by the military for inter-tribal communication and/or for communicating with non-Arabs in the military camps in the newly conquered territories shortly after the Islamic conquests.

### 1.10. Linguistic Situation in Pre-Islamic Middle East

The origin of Arabic Diglossia lies in the fact that the situation for Arabic as it spread out from the Arabian Peninsula at the time of the Islamic conquests was quite complex. In addition, the linguistic situation of the conquered territories was if anything even more complex, especially in the core area of the Middle East, which is Egypt, the Levant and Mesopotamia. In Egypt, the common language was some form of Coptic, which was a direct descendant of the Egyptian language used by the Pharaohs. Corriente (1976) states that Coptic was also used as a liturgical language by the Egyptian Christian Orthodox Church. Egypt was also part of the Eastern Roman Empire or the Byzantine Empire as it is variously called. The Hellenistic culture in Egypt date back 900 years to the time Alexander the Great conquered Egypt (Corriente, 1976). What this means is that not only was Greek used as the language of administration, but there was also a Greek speaking population which lived in Egypt at the time of the Islamic conquest.

The situation in the Levant was even more complex. Ferguson (1959) has pointed out that the Jewish people spoke Aramaic as their native tongue, but used Hebrew as their liturgical language. In addition, some of the Christians had developed Syriac, a special form of Aramaic which served as both their literary and liturgical language, but spoke some dialect or other of common Aramaic and Greek was the language of the administration. In the areas which bordered on the desert in what is
now the Sinai Desert of Egypt, the Negev Desert and most of Jordan and the Golan region of Syria, the Ghassanids spoke Arabic. In Mesopotamia Pahlavi was spoken by the population and was also the official language of administration. Pahlavi is the ancestor of modern Persian. Hebrew was the liturgical language of the Jews, and Aramaic was spoken by some elements of the population. Syriac was used as a liturgical language by the Christians and Arabic was spoken by the Lakhmids (Dem, 1976). I think that it is very interesting that in both the Byzantine and the Sassanid empires in Iraq/Persia, there were Arabs gradually filtering in from the Arabian Peninsula.

1.11. Review of Literature

The material written on Arabic phonology and morphology falls into the following category: i) descriptive analysis of the only first study of a Yemeni variety, ii) descriptive analysis of Gulf Arabic, and iii) descriptive and prescriptive investigations of other dialects related to Gulf Arabic.

1.11.1. Yemeni Variety

The first study of a Yemeni variety is done in India on 2010, Hyderabad, EFLU by Tawfiq Alshar’bi “Prosody and Morphology as Mutually Interacting System: The Case of Yemeni Arabic”. This thesis is studied the interaction between prosody and morphology in Shar’bi variety of Arabic. On the prosody front, this thesis examines and accounts for the stress phenomenon in the variety and compared it with Yemeni and Cairene. On the morphology front, this thesis studies subject agreement and templatic morphology in Shar’bi variety and compares it with MSA. The subject agreement and the templatic morphology of Shar’bi variety exhibited a systematic process of restructuring and reduction compared to MSA. In this thesis, the researcher has used the term ‘dialect’ instead of ‘variety’. According to Ferguson
diglossic speech communities have an ‘H’ variety that is very prestigious and an ‘L’ variety with no official status, which are in complementary distribution with each other. But for this dissertation the term “variety” is used instead of “dialect”.

Another study about Yemeni varieties is done by Najat Ahmed Busabaa (October to December 2011) about “The Impact of Y Replacement on the Phonological Structure of the Verb Form in the Hadhrami Dialect. This paper dealt with /y/ replacement /ʤ/, which results in a change in the phonological and morphological structure of the verb forms: past non past and imperative in Hadhrami variety. Moreover, /y/ replacing /ʤ/ results into establishing a syllable type unacceptable in MSA.

1.11.2. Gulf Arabic

Because this research focuses on IV as it is spoken in the city of Ibb, Republic of Yemen, it seems quite relevant to compare it with some other varieties spoken in Arabian Peninsula. Some work has been done with regard to Gulf Arabic and taking a look at this work can provide insights of a great benefit to this research.

Qafisheh has written on Gulf Arabic in some detail, e.g. Basic Gulf Arabic (1970) is based on the variety of Abu Dhabi. Loanwords from other varieties of Arabic (Palestinian, Egypt, Iraqi, etc.), are included in this text. The book was designed to enable speakers of English to communicate with the natives of Abu Dhabi on a mostly ‘work-related’ basis. One of the most significant attributes of this written work is that it analyzes Gulf Arabic in a linguistically systematic manner. Before the publication of this book in 1970, the variety of Arabic spoken in the Gulf region had not been treated with this degree of academic rigour. This is also a ‘pedagogically-sound text’; it contains substantial drills for grammar reinforcement, and dialogue and translations as comprehension activities. A Short Reference Grammar of Gulf Arabic
(1977), another book, is focused on the variety of Abu dʰabi as it is modified by the varieties of Bahrain and Qatar. Arabic dialectologists use it as a source of information about Gulf Arabic. It systematically presents the linguistic sources of Gulf Arabic. It is invaluable not only for learning to speak the variety but also for the linguist specializing in Arabic Varieties. Other relevant books by Qafisheh include Basic Course in Gulf Arabic and Gulf Arabic: Intermediate Level (1976 & 1979) and Advanced Gulf Arabic & Glossary (1993), which also deal with the variety of Abu dʰabi. In his study of affricates /c/ and /j/ in the variety of Abu dʰabi in comparison with some other varieties of Gulf Arabic, Qafisheh (1975a) observes that the transformation of the voiceless velar stop /k/, into a fricative is shared by Latin and French, implying that this process seems to be the result of ‘a linguistic tendency’ because it has taken place into two unrelated languages.

Another book relevant to my dissertation is ?al-xaṣaːʔiṣu ?aṣuwaṭiijja fi laḥadžatī ?alimaːratijjī ?aṭarabjia ( Abdur-Rahmaːn, 1986), [The Phonological Features of Emirates Arabic Variety]. For the purposes of learning more about the phonology of U.A.E. variety, the author uses a huge number of secondary school and college students from all the emirates in the U.A.E., both males and females. To treat the data, the author uses what he calls a “comparative, historical (and) descriptive methodology” (ibid.: 16).

Other attempts include A Handbook for the Spoken Arabic of Bahrain, (no date or place) published by the Bahrain Petroleum Company, i.e. this is a workplace-oriented publication. Spoken Arabic of Qatar, (Dajani 1956) is somewhat similar to the above book. Three related books were published by Aramco some time ago. They are Spoken Arabic (1957), Conversational Arabic, and English-Arabic Word-List, (1958). Because these books are in and about the pan-Arabic Koine, none of them can
truly be said to be about Gulf Arabic. Johnstone’s *Eastern Arabian Dialects* (1967) is also relatively old. A number of shortcomings appear in this text, among which are the inclusions of the variety of Kuwait into the category of Gulf Arabic, failure to represent any variety of Gulf Arabic accurately and lack of coherent organization. Holes ‘*Language Variation and Change in Modernising Arab State*** (1987) compares the phonological systems of two major social groups in Bahrain i.e. that of high-prestige Sunni Muslims, to the speech of Shi’i neighbours. Concerning sociolinguistics, the author discusses code-switching on the part of the latter and how it relates to sociolinguistic strategies of Bahrainis of various backgrounds.

Another dissertation which is relevant to this dissertation is the work done by Hoffiz (1995) with regard to Dubai dialect. As a linguist for a sub-language that descends from the mother, it should have been called variety, not dialect. Through this dissertation the writer did not follow the International Phonetics Association (IPA) for the transcription words. In Chapter II he calls such sounds (ʈ,ɖ,ɖʰ and ʂ) as emphatic whereas they are in fact velarized. In Chapter III, he shows that a triliteral verb in Dubai Dialect has ten derived forms. Further, he mentions in Chapter IV that the plural is classified into three types (i.e. masculine, feminine and broken), which is not systematic according to Arabic grammar nor logical since broken plural can be either masculine or feminine. Moreover, he shows that broken plural in Dubai dialect has twenty six types. Generally, the work, valuable as it is, has been written by a non-native who, like many others, sometimes fell in the trap of trying to ‘bend’ sounds to fit his rules and formulas. It does not follow any modern morphological theory either.

1.11.3. Related literature on other Arabic Varieties

Holes has also written *The Colloquial Arabic of the Gulf and Saudi Arabia* (1984) and *Gulf Arabic* (1990). Although these books seem to presume the existence
of one variety of Arabic in Saudi Arabia, the fact is that these books actually treat more than one variety because of the extensive geographical area they cover, from southern Iraq to Oman. Additionally, the form of Arabic used in them is that of educated speakers whose speech exhibits a considerable amount of literary Arabic (LA) and pan-Arabic characteristics in terms of phonology, syntax and vocabulary.

The effect of the influx of foreigners upon the Arabic of Alhasa, west of Dhahran in eastern Saudi Arabia, is another area of interest to this dissertation. Smeaton (1973) points out the influence of Hindi, Urdu, Persian, Turkish, French and English upon the variety of Alhasa and shows the impact of this influence in terms of phonology, morphology and semantics. The author has divided the loanwords used by Arabs in the Arabic variety of Alhasa into three categories: a) words still intact from the language that loaned them, b) those words that have been partly modified in the direction of “an acceptable Arabic pattern” (ibid.: 61), and c) fully Arabized loanwords, from the standpoint of both phonology and morphology.

The relationship between “Arabic authenticity” (alaṣa:la ?aľarabia) and the varieties of the Arabian Gulf is the subject dealt with in ?alaṣa:la ?aľarabia fi Allahlgi ?alxali:gi by Matar (1985). It is apparent that the author wishes to demonstrate that, with the spread of education and mass media, the Arabic varieties are likely converge towards LA. In a different vein, the author claims that studying the Arabic varieties serves to benefit one’s command or understanding of Classical Arabic. Although this claim is not proved conclusively or empirically by the author, the point may be taken to imply that two neighbouring varieties differ in the features which they share with LA. Likewise, these same varieties may have different features that diverge from LA. In this book, the author also treats phonological features in two main Bahraini varieties, i.e. the variety of Muharraq, which is of a high prestige
because it is spoken by Sunni population (ibid.: 117). Another characteristic of this variety is that it uses the glide /j/ in the place of /dʒ/ of LA. In contrast, speakers of the Shitra variety, which is spoken by the Shiite minority, normally use the /j/ of LA in spontaneous conversation amongst each other. But, in speaking with speakers of Muharraq variety, a speaker of Shitra variety might pronounce the word /dʒamiːl/ ‘beautiful’, ‘nice’, 'attractive’, as /jamiːl/, for example, which sounds as the verb /jamiːl/ ‘to incline (towards)’, hence creating a homonymous effect.

Al-Wer and De Jong (2009) edited Arabic Dialectology: In Honour of Clive Holes on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday. Here, Essa (2009) refers to Jeddah City as a melting pot of some Arabic Saudi varieties and outlines the consequences of the dialect contact between two varieties of Arabic: the Najdi variety and the urban Hijazi variety. Her analysis adopts methods of quantitative sociolinguistics to analyze the variation in the speech of Najdi speakers who live in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, in relation to the affrication of /k/ and /g/. Affrication in Najdi Arabic is manifested in two domains; in the stem where the velar stops /k/ and /g/ are realised as [ts] and [dz], respectively, in the environment of the front vowels most of the time and in the domain of the 2nd plural feminine suffix

With regards to ‘Issues in Arabic Morphology and Phonology’, by Khabir (1997), which an attempt to address some problems in Arabic morphology and phonology, which have serious consequences for morphological and phonological theories. It consists of four chapters. Chapter one that Arabic (and Semitic) morphology is not root based as it has traditionally been assumed in Western grammars of Arabic and Structurlist and post-Structurlist morphological studies of this language. Chapter two deals with the phonological and morphological behaviour of MA nominal plurals. With regards to chapter three, several arguments have been
adduced to show that rules are problematic devices because of their arbitrariness and because of the difficulties involved in constraining their excessive power. Finally, chapter four has provided further support on the basis of phonological behaviour of nominal and verbal triliteral morphology.

Owaish (1982) in his dissertation ‘Verbal Nouns in Language and Grammar’ talked about the opinions that grammarians and linguists mentioned verbal nouns in their books. It divided into three chapters. Chapter one dealt with three points, which were the basis of nominative and verbal sentences in violation or disagreement. Then he showed the specifications and patterns in disagreement. Finally the writer tackled the changes in Arabic varieties. Second chapter clarified the types of disagreement. Syntax dealt with in chapter three.
Endnote

1 This is supported by McCarthy (1981).
2 In traditional Western grammars, there are two major divisions of paradigms: verbs and nominals (nouns, adjectives and pronouns). A verb paradigm is called a conjugation; a nominal paradigm is called a declension. Verbs are said to “conjugate” or inflect for verbal categories of aspect, person, number, gender, and voice. Nominals are said to “decline,” to inflect for number, gender.
3 Although some linguists may refer to these varieties as dialects, which is a literal translation of the Arabic word *lahadʒat* (pl. of *lahdʒah*, i.e. dialect), it is preferred in this thesis to use the term ‘variety’ instead.
4 See Diglossia in this chapter.
5 The use of such variety dwindles once people shift from a village to a city as they start to adapt with the new certain variety used in city.
6 In *A Thousand and One Nights*, among other colloquialisms, the verb /raːh/ ‘to go’ is often used instead of the LA /ðahaba/. This is highly unusual in a formal, written Arabic document or literary work from the era.
8 Some grammarians use KoinÎŻ instead of Koine. For matters of systematicity, the latter is used throughout this thesis, except for the bibliography where the title of the source is written as the author intended it to be.
10 I do not agree with him here, though.
11 It seems that Ziadeh, too, has derived his sources from “cheap” poetry. If only he had noticed the *mua'llaqat* and the great poetry of that period, he would have reconsidered his statement. These *mua'llaqat*, and the likes, are highly appreciated in Arabic because their poets managed to master both rhyme schemes and ideas. Even when they use seemingly nonsensical words, they seem to be driven by stylistic nuances.