CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

This research has basically emanated to respond to the fact that in spite of the much talk of diglossia in Arabic, and also the fact that there is diglossia in Arabic, little has been done to seriously investigate the reasons or the outcome of this situation. Arabic speakers’ tenacity of their ‘pure’ and ‘holy’ language is perhaps the main cause for the marginalisation of varieties, which exist nonetheless, perhaps to the majority as a looming danger and a source of variation to the dearly held Arabic ‘pure’ form. A wise move would be to study the varieties of Arabic, account for linguistic development, which is an inevitable fact of every living language, and only then can scholars come up with authentic data as to how such varieties developed and how to account for the diglossic situation.

This dissertation is an attempt in this line, opening up a new horizon for the study of varieties of Arabic in Yemen, particularly Ibb Variety (IV), Yemen, which is used by two million speakers approximately. Its utmost significance lies in the fact that no study so far has addressed the features of IV at all and, therefore, it is the first to tread an untrodden path, hoping that more studies will follow in the near future.

The study has depended mainly on pointing out and accounting the differences between Ibb Variety (IV) and Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), which is considered unanimously as the only ‘legitimate’ representative of Classical or Literary Arabic (CA or LA). Features existing in MSA and lacking in IV have been marked out and discussed with the premise that differences and variations are not to be considered as a defect (as some hard-line Arabic grammarians would) but as a natural outcome of linguistic evolution and social, cultural, etc. interaction.
It cannot be claimed that this dissertation has presented everything pertinent to IV, but it is the first to give IV its due status of a variety worth investigating. It focuses only on the morphological side of the variety. But this does not mean the isolation of morphology from other branches of language study, nor belittling their importance. Basically, all branches of language study are interrelated and complementary to one another. Secondly, while the focus of this study has been formed on the morphology of IV, the researcher has had to resort to other branches of language study to explain some data whenever required, especially in Chapter Two. The researcher’s interest in studying the morphology of IV rather than other branches is the result of the belief that through morphological investigation, one can come up with rules and formulae that can account for the formal matrices of the variety which can function as the basis for further understanding of the other features.

For purposes of investigation, the dissertation has been divided into seven chapters in addition to the Introduction, which shows the layout and the major objectives and scope of the research. Chapter One, entitled “The Arabic Language: A Historical Background”, provides necessary data and details related to the research. It can be seen to contain three major parts, i.e. a historical account of Arabic and its varieties, diglossia in Arabic, and review of the literature related to this dissertation. It begins with a historical background of Arabic language, pointing out the most important views regarding the emergence of Arabic in its Classical form and the evidence of the existence of varieties in the pre-Islamic period in Arabia. The concept of the Koine, a theoretical model proposed by Fueck and Ferguson (1959), is discussed in some detail, following which some views pertinent to the emergence and status of Arabic (and its varieties) in the pre-Islamic period are elicited. Among these
views, Teymour (1932) states that the modern varieties of Arabic emerged from one common language and diverged from each other owing to foreign occupation and colonization, a process which started with the decline of the Abbasid Caliphate in the 1100’s, followed by Mongol invasion in the mid-1200’s, the Turkish occupation which lasted up to the beginning of the 20th century in some areas, and finally the occupation by western colonialist powers. The predominant illiteracy and the lack of official status for Arabic throughout that period aggravated the situation and escalated the colloquializing process in spoken Arabic. Versteegh (1984) argues that the Old Spoken Arabic and the Poetic Koine, which existed at the time of the Prophet and shortly thereafter, both refer to a single language which he calls Old Arabic. Blau (1965/1981 and 1966) argues that Old Spoken Arabic and the Poetic Koine were in essence the same language. Ziadeh (1986) uses the evidence of the multiple forms of broken plurals to argue that alongside poets’ innovativeness in deriving forms to suit the strict meter of Arabic poetry, extensive cross-dialect borrowing occurred in Jahiliyya poetry.

By juxtaposing 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. 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’s (1989) argument appears more plausible when he indicates 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 requires dual agreement with the verb, pronoun and adjective, which makes it a separate category from singular and plural. Generally, it is not until the 7th century that a crucial attempt at systematisation of Arabic started to take place.

Having briefly dealt with Arabic from a historical perspective, the chapter then deals with diglossia in Arabic as proposed by Ferguson (1959) in order to describe the Language High-Low Arabic, known as ?al-fuṣḥa (classical) and Al-ammijjah (colloquial). By tracing the linguistic situation from pre-Islamic Middle East up to present, the discussion attempts to shed light on the concept of code-mixing and code-switching in Arabic on basis on the frequency model (Holes 1987). Finally, the chapter offers a brief review of literature, summing up most of the work carried out on a number of Arabic varieties so far. Finally, this chapter presents the theoretical models of morphology as well as, the inflection categories of IV.

Chapter Two is entitled ‘The Phonology of Ibb Variety’. Although the primary aim of this study is to investigate the main morphological components of IV, certain phonological features were presented and accounted for herein. This was to achieve a comprehensive analysis of IV morphology across the interface between these two related linguistic aspects. Having pointed out the real start-point of Arabic linguistics,
represented by Sibawayh, whose pioneering work initiated the study of Arabic grammar in the eighth century, the chapter sheds light on the role of consonantal systems in Semitic languages, including Arabic, pointing out that Semitic languages are marked by a limited vocalic system and a rich consonantal system. It has been indicated that Arabic has 28 consonants, 2 semi-vowels, and 3 vowel sounds represented phonologically by dint of the Arabic diacritic system. These sounds have been presented in the phonetic chart of MSA consonants incorporated in this chapter.

The discussion then swerves towards IV sound system and the distribution of consonants in IV, indicating that, like MSA, IV has 28 consonant sounds (19 of which have equivalents in English while the rest of them do not). Each consonant sound in IV is then described briefly.

The final part of the chapter is concerned with the study of IV vowel sounds, including vowels and diphthongs. One final remark in this regard is the observation that IV is subject to phonological processes, such as anaptyxis, assimilation, deletion. In terms of phonological development, it seems that Arabic vowel system in particular shows the most clear proof of linguistic change. Certain features retained by MSA have disappeared or changed in IV, as is the case with many other contemporary varieties of Arabic. For example, it has been indicated that IV has dropped the word-ending vocalic movements that represent grammatical cases in MSA. That is to say, while in MSA the subject, object, and genitive for example are typically marked by ُammah, fathah and kasrah (a.u and e) respectively, this feature holds no more in IV as all word-end sounds tend to use suku:n ‘motionlessness’. Besides, the nunation (i.e. adding an /n/ sound after the word-end movement vowel) does not exist in IV any more. Again, the rule of the tied ‘t’ (taː? marbuːṭah, a /l/ that at the end of a noun,
mostly feminine, that is pronounced as /t/ if followed by another sound and as a /h/ if no sound follows it) is hardly effective in IV, as IV speakers tend to use /h/ sound more frequently. In addition, certain phonological rules of MSA are also violated. While MSA does not allow the co-occurrence of two ‘suku:n-ed’ consonants (i.e. ?ıltiqat:sakinain), IV seems to entertain this feature. IV consonant clusters are rich in the second syllable and less in final syllable, whereas it shares only few sounds with the first syllable such as /t, ɵ, s, ʃ, dʰ, and n/. Further, most of the velarized clusters can be occurred with such sound together, which is illustrated and discussed with examples and table of consonant clusters of each sound.

Chapter Three, entitled ‘The Morphology of Verbs in Ibb Variety’, has dealt with the morphological rules pertinent to verbs in IV. The theoretical ground on which the whole study is based derives from the theory of non-concatenative morphology, with a particular reference to its notable proponent, McCarthy (1979, 1981, and 2005). Using the non-concatenative templatic morphology, which is common and in and is held by many as the most effect way to deal with Semitic languages, the different types of IV verbs have been classified in terms of their the number of radicals (usually consonants in the case of sound verbs, or including a semi-vowel in the case of non-sound verbs) into triliteral and quadriliteral. Generally, IV verbs inflected for gender, number, person and aspects, like MSA but with significant variations. It has been indicated that in IV, just as the case in Semitic languages and their varieties in general, it is not always easy to predict the formation of a verb. Verbal derivations of IV are classified into two types: derived and non-derived. The derived ones are of two types, triliteral and quadriliteral, whereas the non derived ones are of two types, sound and weak. While the triliteral group has nine
forms of verbs, unlike MSA (which has fifteen), the quadriliteral group has only two types, derived and non-derived.

Having provided the theoretical framework for discussion, represented by the theory of non-concatenative morphology and the module of verb derivation patterns used in Arabic linguistics (i.e. /fa*ala/), this chapter investigates IV verbs with reference to inflection, derivation, the perfective versus imperfective aspect, the imperative mood and verb negation. Regarding inflection, it has been pointed out that IV verbs inflect for aspect, gender, person and number, but unlike MSA, the dual category is treated as plural. The derivation of IV verbs depends mainly on two major considerations, i.e. the pattern of the verb, and the fact whether the verb is sound or non-sound. Broadly speaking, IV verbs are considered to belong to either one of nine verb forms derived from triliteral roots. Each of the nine forms, the formation of which involves either a change/addition of a vowel or a morpheme to the stem, has been discussed, highlighting the process of its derivation and providing illustrative examples to substantiate the argument. While sound verbs have been shown to reveal a considerable number of consistency and predictability with regard to derivation, non-sound verbs (subdivided into hollow and defective) have been observed to pose a derivational challenge. The main reason behind this difficulty is the existence of a glide as one of the radicals of the verb whereby, any further derivation (or inflection) necessitates special treatment of this radical. The case is more difficult if the radical is /a:/, as further derivation entails a change of this radical into one of the glides /w/ or /j/.

As for aspect, it has been indicated that in IV, as well as MSA, there are two aspects of the verb, perfective and imperfective. The perfective aspect indicate the use
of the verb to refer to an action etc., that took place in the past, while the imperfective refers to present, future, and sometimes the past-form-for-present-action/state. The discussion of these two aspects has involved elaboration of various verb forms with examples drawn from IV. The argument then is focussed on the imperative mood in IV, illustrating the morphological processes that take place in various verb forms in IV during the formation of the imperative mood. Finally, prior to the summary of the chapter, the last part presented the major features of negation in IV, indicating the modifications taking place while negating a verb in the present, past, future, perfective, imperfective, and imperative.

The next chapter, entitled “The Morphology of Nouns in Ibb Variety”, concentrates on the morphological processes involved in the formation of nouns in this variety. This chapter has outlined the formation of nouns in IV. It has indicated that, in harmony with MSA system, most nouns in IV are derived from verbs which are mainly based on triliteral roots. But there are also nouns derived from adjectives and from other nouns as well. Further, the discussion has shown that nouns are inflected for gender and number. Based on the premise that nouns in Arabic are either gender-based, inflection of nouns for gender therefore involves the masculine-feminine dichotomy. While the sound feminine nouns in MSA are marked by ta:ʔ marbuṭah ‘tied /t/’ at the end of the noun, IV sound feminine nouns end in either /a/ or /ih/. However, this is not always the case with feminine or masculine nouns, as some feminine nouns can end in any sound when they are as a matter of fact feminine, whereas some masculine nouns may end in ta:ʔ marbuṭah ‘tied /t/’ but are not feminine.
It has also been pointed out that the feminine plural inflection can serve two functions, i.e. authentic feminine sound plural and grammatical feminine sound plural. The latter category refers to nouns considered masculine and have a masculine form in the singular, i.e. ending in sounds other than $ta:?$ marbu:$a$ah ‘tied /t/’, but take the feminine marker /a:t/ when they are inflected for plural. In the same vein, number in MSA as well as IV subsumes countable and uncountable nouns. The focus has been placed on countable nouns, the derivation and inflection of which involve three categories, i.e. number (singular, dual and plural) and gender (feminine and masculine).

Generally, singular nouns have been discussed with regard to their derivation. Regarding dual form, it has been indicated that IV, partly like MSA, uses the nominal dual suffixes /-i:n/ for dual masculine and /-ti:n/ for dual feminine. But unlike MSA, IV uses both the suffixes in all grammatical cases while MSA uses /-a:n/ (m.) and /-ta:n/ (f.) in the nominative and /-en/ (m.) and /-tem/ (f.) in the accusative and genitive. Moreover, it has been noticed that IV shows a tendency to use a dual quantifier, /?iɵneɪn/ (m.) and /ɵinteɪn/ (f.), before a plural noun to indicate duality more than the affixation system deployed for dual noun formation in MSA. Besides, when it comes to noun-verb agreement, IV considers dual nouns along with plural nouns. That is, dual nouns take verbs inflected for plural, unlike MSA which has special suffixes for verbs to indicate dual noun subjects. Finally, the discussion of plural nouns has revealed that pluralisation in IV is based on whether the noun can take a sound (regular) plural form or a broken (irregular) plural form. It has been observed that while MSA has 44 patterns of broken plurals, IV uses only 24. These 24
patterns have been discussed and illustrated with relevant examples with an emphasis on predictability.

The discussion then focuses on the derivation of some other noun forms. In this connection, verbal nouns have been investigated and illustrated with examples under three categories, i.e. Form One Verbal Nouns (11 patterns), Triliteral Verbal Nouns (8 patterns), and Quadriliteral Verbal Nouns. Finally, the chapter has briefly touched upon some other noun forms, namely Nouns of Instance, Unit Nouns and Collective Nouns, Occupational Nouns and Nouns of Habituality, Participial Nouns (and Adjectives), Nouns of Instrument, Nouns of Location, and Diminutive Nouns. Regarding Participial Nouns (and Adjectives), it has been pointed out that in Arabic linguistics, both nouns and adjectives derived on the basis of participial grounds are considered as nouns, a point investigated in Chapter Four. As for Diminutive nouns, a brief comparative study between IV and MSA in this regard has been presented, revealing that IV does not retain much of the diminutive formation seen in MSA but instead use lexical words and sometimes forms not used in MSA.

Chapter Five is entitled “The Morphology of Adjectives and Noun Modifiers in Ibb Variety”. It deals with adjectives and noun modifiers as used in Ibb variety. This chapter has examined the morphological classification of IV adjectives. IV adjectives have been classified into positive adjectives, participial adjectives, nisba (relative or attributive) adjectives, ?id’a:fa (annexation) constructions, the possessive marker haqq ‘belonging to’, elative adjectives, quantifiers and adjectives of colour (and physical defects). The chapter has indicated the various aspects of each type with examples. It has been noted that the same productive morphological system of triliteral roots used in verbs and nouns is also operative for most adjectives. While
adjectives in both MSA and IV inflect for number and gender, it has been pointed out that IV does not reflect the dual category in the inflection of adjectives. Coming back to the first type of IV adjectives, which is Positive Adjectives, it has been noted that these adjectives can be classified into three types: a) Deverbal Adjectives, b) Denominal Adjectives and c) Adjective derived from adjective. Regarding participle adjectives, there are active and passive participles each of which is investigated in terms of two properties which are meaning and derivation. The property of meaning for both has two dimensions, grammatical and aspectual. The adjective of \( ?idʰa:fa \) may take the definite article if it modifies a definite noun, which is known in Arabic as \( /?idʰa:fa/ \) [i.e. annexation]. \( ?idʰa:fa \) Adjective is a syntactic form binding at least two nouns or NP’s. The first term of an \( ?idʰa:fa \) construct is a noun that must appear indefinite in form, whereas the second term of the construct can be definite or a single noun or noun phrase.

Like English Adjectives, Elative Adjective has comparative and superlative forms. Elative adjective is used for evaluation or comparison. The pattern \( /?af\al/ \) is the paradigm of most elative adjectives followed by the preposition \( /\text{min}/ \) ‘than’ and formed from positive adjectives with triliteral roots. Like comparative adjectives, superlative adjectives are formed in the same way, but immediately followed the word they modify.

Quantifiers (numerical modifiers or adjectives) have been divided into two types, cardinal and ordinal. The cardinals modify a noun that possesses the attribute of singularity, duality, or plurality. The First Type Cardinal (one) follows the noun it modifies and agrees with the noun in number and gender, as well as definiteness. IV differs from MSA in this respect since this case applies to cardinals in MSA from 3
to 10, but in IV cardinals it begins from 2 to 10. In IV, if the cardinals (from 2 to 10) precede the noun they modify, the noun must be overtly plural. On the other hand, if a cardinal higher than ten directly precedes a noun then the noun modified by it will stay morphologically singular. Contrastively, ordinal quantifiers are derived according to the pattern /faːːl/ (ih) except for the irregular form /ʔawwal/ ‘first m.’ and /ʔawwala/ ‘first f.’ and /oaːnä/ ‘second m’, respectively. It is worth mentioning here that anaptyxis occurs here with ordinals (f.), particularly as the sound /-i/ in the word-final disappears with the additional feminine suffix /-ih/. Thus, pertinent to the paradigms shown above, it is noticed that the prosodic theory of non-concatenative morphology is active both inside and outside the boundary.

Finally, Adjectives of Colour and Physical Defects have been included together since their morphological processes are identical. They have two categories: adjective of colours or physical defect with the pattern /ʔal/ and its variant /faːl/, and Nisba adjectives of colour. The latter adjectives are formed by the addition of word-final /-i/ in the masculine singular to noun, whereas feminine singular by adding the word-final /-jih/ to masculine singular.

The focus of Chapter Six, entitled “The Morphology of Pronouns in Ibb Variety”, is on the pronominal system of IV. For purposes of discussion, IV pronouns have been categorised into Personal Pronouns, Demonstrative Pronouns, Interrogative Participles and Relative Pronouns. In harmony with Arabic linguistics, Personal Pronouns are classified into (a) Independent (known in Arabic and in IV as ɖamaːʔir munfaʂilah i.e. unaffixed pronouns) and (b) Pronominal Suffixes (known as ɖamaːʔir muttaʂilah i.e. affixed pronouns). Unlike MSA, IV has only ten categories of personal pronouns. Like MSA, IV dependent pronouns can be attached to verbs (as a direct
object) and to nouns (to indicate possession). Pronouns can also be attached to active participles, as either direct object or a possessive adjective suffix. It has been argued that the possessive pronouns and suffixed pronouns are homophonous except in the 1st person singular. There are morphological and phonological changes in each change and some movement sounds according to these features. The number of pronouns in IV varies from that in MSA. The MSA dual pronouns are not found in IV. Instead, IV uses plural pronouns to refer to dual entities. It has been found in IV that the sound /h/ of the 3rd person independent pronoun is not realized when it is cliticized to particles, such as qa: ‘already’ + hum ‘they (m.)’ becoming qa:wm. Unlike MSA, where independent pronouns are not attached to other words, IV pronouns allow this feature, as in the previous example and in the construction haqq- ‘possession of’ + independent personal pronoun to indicate possession or emphatic possession.

Regarding reflexive expressions in IV, it has been observed that these pronouns follow the same system of MSA with some phonological modulations. In order to form a reflexive pronoun, IV suffixes the dependent pronoun to the term nafs ‘self’, which is originally a noun and is used as one of three reflexive terms in MSA. But IV can also use the reflexive pronominal form as an object of a transitive verb, depending on the context. In addition, the reflexive pronoun in IV does not always have to follow the noun it refers to immediately, but can come at the end of the clause. In this case, if the reflexive pronoun is separated from its referent by an intransitive verb, the preposition /bi/ is prefixed to it, sometimes inducing a potential ambiguity.

Demonstrative pronouns have been divided into near/close and distant demonstrative. It has been observed that the number of IV demonstratives is much
less than that of MSA. Besides, while MSA demonstrative pronouns systems show variations not only in terms of number and gender, but also for stylistic purposes, IV tends to adopt a more simplified system of demonstratives.

Interrogative pronouns in IV show many differences from those in MSA. Some IV interrogative pronouns inflect for gender and number, and some accommodate the attachment of certain dependent pronouns, unlike MSA in which interrogative pronouns are not marked for number and gender and do not accept pronominal affixation. Finally, the relative pronominal system of IV varies greatly from that of MSA. While MSA has various relative pronouns each of which reflects the number and gender of the referent, IV uses only one relative pronoun, /?illi/, to refer to one and all. Generally speaking, the pronominal system of IV reveal the most conspicuous deviation of IV from MSA.

Despite its limitations, it is hoped that this research can be considered as a foundation stone for the study of Ibb Variety in particular and all varieties of Arabic in general. A comprehensive study of Ibb Variety would not be possible within the confines of this dissertation, but it has been the main concern here to tackle at least one side of this variety, the morphological side, no matter how introductory in nature this research is. Other word classes, such as prepositions and adverbs, have been left out not because they are less important but because these two word classes reveal less morphological activities and deviations from MSA. Ultimately, every aspect of Ibb Variety (and other varieties of Arabic) requires attention and further investigation.

Below are some recommendations that the researcher deems important which covers IV and other topics related to diglossia and other varieties of Arabic.
1. It is recommended that IV receive more attention from the linguistic academia in order to investigate all the linguistic (morphological, syntactic, phonological and semantic) and sociolinguistic aspects of this variety. More work entails more understanding not only of the variety but also of the diglossic situation of IV speakers.

2. Although some attempts have been made to study some Yemeni Arabic varieties, such as the syntax of Sana’ani Variety (Watson 1993) and the prosody and morphology of Shar’abi Variety in Taiz, Yemen (Shar’abi 2010), too much is still in store, given the linguistic richness of Yemen in terms of varieties. More studies of more Yemeni Arabic varieties would lead to a better understanding of the linguistic features of the situation of MSA in Yemen and how these varieties interact with and derive from one another and also MSA.

3. Certain areas of IV have not been covered here. Therefore, it is recommended that further research be done to make up for what has been missed out.

4. It is recommended that synchronic and diachronic studies of IV be carried out in the future. Such studies would make it possible to trace linguistic evolution and development as well as interaction with other varieties.

5. It is recommended that comparative linguistic studies be made between IV and other varieties of Arabic spoken in or outside Yemen.

6. It is recommended that the pronominal system of IV be studied from a genealogical perspective individually or in comparison with other varieties.
7. More academic attention should be made to account for the reasons behind the dwindling significance of diacritics and word-ending vowels.

8. Finally, it is recommended that diglossia in Arabic receive much more attention and practical investigation than what has happened so far. Pathetically little has been done in this regard, and most of the studies in this field have been carried out by non-native Arabic scholars.