The chapter is an overview of eight Arabic-lexifier pidgins and creoles: Turku, Bongor Arabic, Juba Arabic, Kinubi, Pidgin Madame, Jordanian Pidgin Arabic, Romanian Pidgin Arabic, and Gulf Pidgin Arabic. The examples illustrate a number of selected features of these varieties. The focus is on two types of transfer, imposition and borrowing, within the framework outlined by Van Coetsem (1988; 2000; 2003) and Winford (2005; 2008).

1 Introduction

This chapter aims to illustrate the emergence of Arabic-lexifier pidgins and creoles for which the contact situation – i.e. socio-historical context, the agents of change, and the languages involved – is at least relatively well known.

The varieties considered can be classified into two groups, in geographical, historical and developmental terms: the Sudanic pidgins and creoles, and the immigrant pidgins in various Arab countries. Geographically, the Sudanic varieties developed in Africa – in present-day South Sudan, Chad, Uganda, and Kenya. Historically, the varieties derive from a putative common ancestor, a pidgin that emerged in southern Sudan, in the first half of the nineteenth century. Various Turkish–Egyptian military expeditions between 1820 and 1840 opened southern Sudan for the slave trade. Permanent camps were set up soon after by slave traders in the White Nile Basin, Bahr el-Ghazal and Equatoria Province, inhabited by an Arabic-speaking minority and a huge majority of slaves from various ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. After 1850, the slave traders’ settlements were turned into military camps in which a military pidgin emerged, which is traditionally referred to as “Common Sudanic Pidgin Creole Arabic” (Tosco &
Manfredi 2013: 253). Two subgroups of Sudanic varieties are recognized: the western branch, consisting of Turku and Bongor Arabic (in Chad), and the eastern one, made up of Juba Arabic (in Sudan) and Kinubi (spoken in Uganda and Kenya).

Immigrant pidgins emerged in the eastern part of the Arab World, in Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and the countries of the Arab Gulf. Historically, these do not go back more than 50 years. All these varieties are incipient pidgins.

The contact situations illustrated presuppose: (i) a source language (SL) and a recipient language (RL); (ii) agents of contact-induced change, who may be either SL or RL speakers; (iii) a psycholinguistically dominant language, which is not necessarily a socially dominant language (Van Coetsem 1988; 1995; 2000; 2003; Winford 2005; 2008). A distinction is made between two types of transfer: imposition and borrowing (Van Coetsem 1988; 2000; 2003). Imposition involves SL-dominant speakers as agents (SL agentivity), is typical of second-language (L2) acquisition, and induces changes mostly in phonology and syntax, although it may also include transfer of lexical items from the dominant SL into the non-dominant RL (Van Coetsem 1995: 18; Winford 2005: 376). Borrowing normally involves RL-dominant speakers as agents (RL agentivity), typically targets lexical items, but may also include transfer of morphological material from a non-dominant SL into the dominant RL.

In light of their sociolinguistic history, the varieties considered all emerged under conditions of untutored, short-term L2 acquisition by adults dominant in their socially subordinate SLs. L2 acquisition, a fortiori with adults, triggers processes such as imposition via SL agentivity (i.e. substrate influence), simplification (Trudgill 2011: 40, 101) – also known as restructuring (Lucas 2015: 529) – as well as language-internal (i.e. non-contact-induced) developments such as grammatical reanalysis (Winford 2005: 415).

As in Manfredi (2018), the focus of this chapter is on imposition and borrowing. It does not illustrate restructuring which does not involve any kind of transfer, but often involves a reduction in complexity (Lucas 2015: 529). In the case of Arabic pidgins and creoles, restructuring is manifest in the domain of morphology, in, for example, the loss of the Arabic verbal affixes and of the nominal and verbal derivation strategies (Miller 1993).

The examples are illustrative only of selected contact-induced features of Arabic pidgins and creoles and their number has been kept to a reasonable minimum. The examples from Arabic and the pidgins and creoles considered appear in a uniform system of transliteration.

The chapter is organized as follows. §2 and §3 are concerned with Sudanic pidgins and creoles. §4, on the other hand, deals with Arabic immigrant varieties. §5 summarizes the findings and introduces issues for further research.
2 Turku and Bongor Arabic

2.1 Current state and historical development

Turku is an extinct pidgin, formerly spoken in the Chari–Bagirmi region in western Chad (Muraz 1926). After the abolition of slavery by the Turkish–Egyptian government in 1879, the Nile Nubian trader Rabeh withdrew with his slave soldiers into Chad. From a sociolinguistic point of view, Turku was initially a military pidgin. However, it later became one of three trade languages in what was then French Equatorial Africa, along with Sango and Bangala (Tosco & Owens 1993: 183). Turku was a stable pidgin which does not appear to have creolized (Tosco & Owens 1993).

Bongor Arabic is spoken in southwestern Chad, in and around the town of Bongor, the capital of the Mayo–Kebe Est region, at the border with Cameroon (Luffin 2013). Given the many structural features it shares with Turku, it is plausible to assume that Bongor Arabic developed from the former. Sociolinguistically, Bongor Arabic is a trade pidgin, used by the local Masa and Tupuri populations with Arabic-speaking traders. It is currently a stable pidgin, but it exhibits features indicative of depidginization under the influence of Chadian Arabic (ChA). No information about the number of speakers is available.

2.2 Contact languages

The lexifier language of Turku and Bongor Arabic is Western Sudanic Arabic. The substratal input was provided by languages of various genetic affiliations: Nilo-Saharan – e.g. Bagirmi, Mbay, Ngambay, Sar, Sara (Central Sudanic), Kanuri (Western Saharan); Afro-Asiatic – Hausa (West Chadic); Niger-Congo – Fulfulde. In the case of Turku, an additional contributor was the creole language Sango. Both in Turku and in Bongor Arabic there is also adstratal input from French. The adstrate of Bongor Arabic additionally includes two languages: Masa (Nilo-Saharan, Western Chadic) and Tupuri (Niger-Congo).

2.3 Contact-induced changes

2.3.1 Phonology

The substrate languages do not have /ŋ/, which is generally replaced by [k]: Turku *kamsa* ‘five’ < ChA *ḥamsa*; Bongor Arabic *kidma* ‘work’ < ChA *ḥidma*. Many of the substrate languages do not have /f/, which is substituted with [p]
or perhaps [ɸ], e.g. Turku pf'il ‘elephant’ < ChA fil. In French loanwords, the reflexes of /v/ are either [b] or [w]: Bongor Arabic boté ‘to vote’ < French voter, wotîr ‘car’ < French voiture.

The consonants [ɲ] and [ŋ] occur only in loanwords: Bongor Arabic ngambây ‘Ngambay’ < Ngambay ngâmbây; Turku ngari ‘manioc’ < Mbay ngârì, konpanye ‘company’ < French compagnie; [v] and [z] occur only in phonologically non-integrated words of French origin: Turku sivil ‘civilian’ < French civil; Bongor Arabic žurnalîst ‘journalist’ < French journaliste.

Variation affects several consonants. For instance, [f] occurs in variation with [b] or [p]: Turku fišan ~ bišan ‘because’; Bongor Arabic mâfi ~ mápi ‘NEG’ < ChA mâfi, sofér ~ sopér ‘driver’ < French chauffeur. Most of the substrate languages do not have /ʃ/, which accounts for [ʃ] ~ [s] variation, in words with either etymological /s/ or /ʃ/: Turku gasi ~ gâsi ‘expensive’ < ChA gâsi, biriš ~ biris ‘mat’ < ChA birîš; Bongor Arabic mási ~ màsi ‘go’. The usual reflexes of French /ʒ/, absent from the phonological inventories of the substrate languages, are [z], [ʒ] and [s] respectively: Turku ğinenal ‘general’ < French général, suska ‘until < French jusqu’à; Bongor Arabic zûska ‘when, during’ < French jusqu’à ‘until’.

Finally, vowel length is not distinctive: Turku, Bongor Arabic kalam ‘speech; speak’ < ChA kalâm ‘speech’.

2.3.2 Morphology

On current evidence (Luffin 2013: 180–181), Bongor Arabic exhibits signs of de-pidginization under the influence of Chadian Arabic. The most striking instance of this is the use of pronominal suffixes, unique among Arabic-lexifier pidgins and creoles:

(1) Bongor Arabic (Luffin 2013: 180)
indî gây árifu úsum-i
2SG IMPF know name-POS.1SG
‘You know my name.’

Also, verbal affixes are sporadically used:

(2) Bongor Arabic (Luffin 2013: 181)
a. ána ma n-árfa
1SG NEG 1SG-know
‘I don’t know.’

1Transcribed as 〈pf〉 by Muraz (1926: 168).
b. anína rikíb-na wotir da sáwa
   1PL ride.PRF-1PL car PROX together
   'We took the car together.'

These cases might be analyzed as borrowing under *sui generis* RL agentivity, whereby morphological material from a non-dominant SL is imported into a non-dominant (second) RL.

### 2.3.3 Lexicon

A part of the non-Arabic vocabulary of Turku can be traced back to its substrate languages (Avram 2019). Most of the loanwords are from Sara-Bagirmi languages: *adinbang* ‘eunuch’ < Bagirmi *ádim mbàŋ* ‘servant of the sultan’; *gao* ‘hunter’ < Sar *gàw*; *ngari* ‘manioc’ < Mbay *ngàri*. The second most significant important contributor is Sango: *kay* ‘paddle’ < Sango *kâi*, *tipoy* ‘carrying hammock’ < *típói*. A few words can be traced to Fulfulde and Kanuri: *kelkelbanği* ‘golden beads’ < Fulfulde *kelkel-banja*; *wèlik* ‘lightning’ < Kanuri *wulak* ‘flash of lightning’. In a number of cases, the exact SL cannot be established: *koporo* ‘0.10 Francs’ < Fulfulde, Sango, Sara *koporo* ‘coin’; *gurumba* ‘hat’ < Hausa *gurúmba*, Kanuri *gurumbá*. As for Bongor Arabic, its African adstrate languages have contributed only a few loanwords, such as *bursdíya* ‘Monday’. There are also loanwords from French. In Turku most of these relate to the military (Tosco & Owens 1993: 262–263), e.g. Turku *itenan* ‘lieutenant’ < French *lieutenant*, *permišon* ‘permission’ < French *permission*. In addition to nouns, French loanwords include some verbs, such as Bongor Arabic *komandé* ‘order’ < French *commander*, and at least one function word, Turku *suska*, Bongor Arabic *zúska* ‘when, during’ < French *jusqu’à* ‘until’.

The substratal influence on Turku can also be seen in a number of compound calques (Avram 2019; Manfredi, this volume). Some of these are modelled on Sara-Bagirmi languages: *bahr gum* ‘rising water’, cf. Ngambay *màn-kàw*, lit. ‘river goes’; *nugra ana asal* ‘beehive’, cf. Ngambay *bòlè-tanji*, lit. ‘hole (of) honey’. Other calques have equivalents in several SLs, such as *nugra haǧer* ‘cave’, lit. ‘hole mountain/stone’, cf. Kanuri *kûl kau-be* lit. ‘cavity mountain-of’, Ngambay *bòlò-mbàl* lit. ‘hole mountain’, Sango *dûtênê* lit. ‘hole stone’.
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3 Juba Arabic and Kinubi

3.1 Current state and historical development

Juba Arabic is mainly spoken in South Sudan; there are also diaspora communities, mostly in Sudan and Egypt. Two main reasons make it difficult to estimate its number of speakers. Firstly, while Juba Arabic is spoken as a primary language by 47% of the population of Juba, the capital city of South Sudan, it is also used as a second or third language by the majority of the population of the country (Manfredi 2017: 7). Secondly, the long coexistence of Juba Arabic with Sudanese Arabic, its main lexifier language, has led to the emergence of a continuum ranging from basilectal, through mesolectal, to acrolectal varieties; delimiting acrolectal Juba Arabic from Arabic is no easy task, particularly in the case of the large diaspora communities in Khartoum and Cairo.

Juba Arabic emerged as a military pidgin. Sociolinguistically, it is today an inclusive identity marker for the ethnically and linguistically diverse population of South Sudan (Tosco & Manfredi 2013: 507). Developmentally, Juba Arabic is a pidgincreole.²

The Mahdist revolt, which started in 1881, eventually brought about the end of Turkish–Egyptian control over Equatoria, in southern Sudan. Following an invasion by Mahdist rebels, the governor fled to Uganda, accompanied by slave soldiers loyal to the central government. These soldiers subsequently became the backbone of the British King’s African Rifles. While some of the troops remained in Uganda, others were moved to Kenya and Tanzania. This led to the dialectal division between Ugandan and Kenyan Kinubi. Like Juba Arabic, therefore, Kinubi started out as a military pidgin, then underwent stabilization and expansion. Today, however, Kinubi is the only Arabic-lexifier fully creolized variety, that is, a native language for its entire speech community.

Kinubi is spoken in Uganda and in Kenya. The number of speakers of Kinubi is a matter of debate. Ugandan Kinubi was spoken by some 15,000 people, according to the 1991 census, and Kenyan Kinubi by an estimated 10,000 in 2005. However, other estimates put the combined number of speakers at about 50,000. The largest communities of Kinubi speakers are in Bombo (Uganda), Nairobi (the Kibera neighbourhood) and Mombasa (Kenya).

² A pidgincreole is “a former pidgin that has become the main language of a speech community and/or a mother tongue for some of its speakers” (Bakker 2008: 131).
3.2 Contact languages

The main lexifier language of Juba Arabic is Sudanese Arabic (SA), with some input from Egyptian Arabic (EA) and Western Sudanic dialects as well. The substrate is represented by a relatively large number of languages, belonging to super-phylums, Nilo-Saharan and Niger-Congo. The former includes Eastern Sudanic languages, such as Bari, Lotuho (Eastern Nilotic), Acholi, Belanda Bor, Dinka, Jur, Nuer, Päri, Shilluk (Western Nilotic), Didinga (Surmic), and Central Sudanic languages, such as Avokaya, Baka, Bongo, Ma’di, Moru; the Niger-Congo super-phylum is represented by, for example, Zande and Mundu. The main substrate language is considered to be Bari, including its dialects Kakwa, Kuku, Pojulu, and Mundari.  

Given its sociolinguistic history, Kinubi shares much of its substrate with Juba Arabic. However, the substrate of Ugandan Kinubi additionally includes Eastern Sudanic languages, such as Alur, Luo (Western Nilotic), and Central Sudanic languages such as Mamvu, Lendu and Lugbara (Owens 1997: 161; Wellens 2003: 207), spoken in Uganda. Unlike Juba Arabic, Kinubi also exhibits the effects of the adstratal influence exerted by two Bantu languages, Luganda – particularly in Ugandan Kinubi – and Swahili – particularly in Kenyan Kinubi. One other language that should be mentioned is English, official both in Uganda and in Kenya.

3.3 Contact-induced changes

3.3.1 Phonology

A number of consonants found in Arabic, but absent from the phonological inventories of the substrate languages, are either deleted or substituted. Consider the reflexes of pharyngeals: ḥáfla ‘feast’ < SA ḥafla; ārabi ‘Arabic’ < SA ʕarabi. The pharyngealized consonants are replaced by their plain counterparts: towil ‘long’ < SA ṭawil; dul ‘shadow’ < SA ḏull; sūlba ‘hip’ < SA ʃulba; zūlum ‘to anger’ < SA ẓulum. The velar fricatives of Arabic are always replaced by velar stops: kābara ‘piece of news’ < SA ʕabar; šokol ‘work’ < SA šoyol, gārib ‘west’ < SA yar(i)ib.

As in Juba Arabic, the pharyngeals of Arabic are either replaced or lost in Kinubi (Owens 1985: 10; Wellens 2003: 209–212). The earliest records of Ugandan Kinubi\(^4\) are replete with illustrative examples (Avram 2017a): ḥāga ‘thing’ < SA ḥāga, aram ‘thief’ < SA ḥarāmi, liḥ < ‘to play’ < SA liTib. The pharyngealized

\(^{3}\)Sometimes considered to be separate languages (Wellens 2003: 207).

\(^{4}\)The main ones are: Cook (1905), Jenkins (1909), Meldon (1913), and Owen & Keane (1915).
consonants are replaced by their plain counterparts, as in these examples from early Ugandan Kinubi: *towil* ‘long’ < SA *ṭawīl*; *dulu* ‘shadow’ < SA *ḍull*, *hisiba* ‘measles’ < SA *ḥisba*; *zulm* ‘to anger’ < SA *ẓulum*. Like Juba Arabic, Kinubi substitutes velar stops for the Arabic velar fricatives. Consider the following early Ugandan Kinubi forms: *kidima* ‘work’ < SA *ḥidma*; *šokolo* ‘work’ < SA *šoyol*, *balago* ‘commandment’ < SA *balāy* ‘message’. Substratal influence also accounts for consonant degemination, given that the substrate languages “lack these in all but a few morphonologically determined contexts” (Owens 1997: 162).

Substratal influence can also be seen in the occurrence of certain consonants. Consider first /ɓ/ and /ɗ/: Juba Arabic *d’éngele* ‘liver’ < Bari *denggele*; Juba Arabic *b’ónǧo* ‘pumpkin’ < Bongo *b’ônǧo*. The other consonants which occur only in loanwords from the substrate and/or adstrate languages are [p] [v], [ʧ], [ɲ], and [ŋ]: Kinubi *lîpa* ‘to pay’ < Swahili *lipa*; Kinubi *camp* ‘camp’ < English *camp*; Kinubi *vîta* ‘war’ < Swahili *vîta*; Juba Arabic *câm* ‘food’ < Acholi, Belanda Bor, Jur *ćama*, Juba Arabic *ćaynîz* < English *Chinese*, Kinubi *ćay* ‘tea’ < Swahili *chai*; Juba Arabic *ńyêkem*, Kinubi *ńyêkem* ‘chin’ < Bari *ńyêkem*, Kinubi *ńyânya* ‘tomato’ < Swahili *ńyanya*; Juba Arabic *ńun* ‘divinity’ < Bari *ńgun*. The integration of these phonemes is thus a result of borrowing (under RL agentivity) rather than of imposition.

The following instances of consonant variation are more common in Juba Arabic (Manfredi 2017: 25–27). The most frequent is [ʃ] ~ [s]: *geš* ~ *ges* ‘grass’. Further, [z] is in variation with [ʒ] before /o/ and /a/: *zówgu* ~ *gówgu* ‘to marry’, *záman* ~ *ğáman* ‘time; when’. There is also [p] ~ [f] variation in word-initial position, including in loanwords: *poğulu* ~ *foğulu* ‘Pojulu’, *prótestan* ~ *frótestan* ‘protestant’. Finally, the phoneme /f/ may also be phonetically realized as [p]: *nédi fu* ~ *nédi pú* ‘to clean’. Of these cases of variation, the latter has been specifically attributed to substratal influence from Bari (Miller 1989; Manfredi 2017). It might be argued, however, that all these instances of consonant variation reflect the influence of the substrate languages, regardless of their genetic affiliations. The following do not have /ʃ/: Acholi, Avokaya, Baka, Bari, Belanda Bor, Bongo, Dinka, Jur, Lotuho, Ma’di, Moru, Mundu, Nuer, Päri, Shilluk, Zande. Of these, Acholi, Belanda Bor, Bongo, Dinka, Jur, Nuer, Päri and Shilluk do not have /s/ either. A number of substrate languages do not have /z/: Acholi, Bongo, Belanda Bor, Dinka, Jur, Lotuho, Nuer, Päri, and Shilluk. All of these, however, have /ð/. Finally, /f/ is not part of the phonological inventory of Acholi, Bongo, Dinka, Jur, Nuer, Päri, and Shilluk, which do, however, have /p/. Given the intricacies of the distribution of /ʃ/, /s/, /z/, /ð/, /f/, and /p/ across the substrate languages, the types of variation illustrated are not surprising.
As in Juba Arabic, [ʃ] is in variation with [s] in Kinubi (Owens 1985: 237; Owens 1997: 161; Wellens 2003: 38; Luffin 2005: 62; Avram 2017a): early Ugandan Kinubi šabaka ~ sabaka ‘net’). Although it is etymological /š/ which is typically subject to variation, occasionally this also applies to etymological /s/: early Ugandan Kinubi sikin ~ šekin ‘knife’ < SA sikkīn (Avram 2017a) and modern Kenyan Kinubi fluš ~ flus ‘money’ < SA fulūs (Luffin 2005: 63). Note that [š] ~ [s] variation also extends to loanwords from Swahili (Wellens 2003: 80; Luffin 2005: 63; Avram 2017a): early Ugandan Kinubi šamba ~ samba ‘field’ < Swahili shamba. Like Juba Arabic, Kinubi exhibits [z] ~ [ʤ] variation (Owens 1985: 235; Owens 1997: 161; Wellens 2003: 215; Luffin 2005: 63; Avram 2017a): early Ugandan Kinubi ġalan ~ zalan ‘angry’ < SA zaflān. However, unlike Juba Arabic, in Kinubi the [z] ~ [ʤ] variation also occurs before the two front vowels /i/ and /e/: ze ~ ġe ‘as’, early Ugandan Kinubi anġīl ~ enzīl ‘descend’. According to Owens (1997: 161), this “is due perhaps to Bari substratal influence, since Bari has only j, not z.” In fact, as in the case of Juba Arabic, the same is true of several other substrate languages. Lastly, there are instances of [l] ~ [r] variation (Wellens 2003: 214; Luffin 2005: 65), affecting both etymological /l/ and etymological /r/ in Arabic-derived words, e.g. tāle ~ tāre ‘go out’, gerī ~ gelī ‘near’, and in borrowings, e.g. Ugandan Kinubi čālo ~ čāro ‘village’ < Luganda e-kyało; Kenyan Kinubi tumbīlī ~ tumbirī ‘monkey’ < Swahili tumbili. This variation seems to reflect the influence of Luganda and Swahili. In the former, [l] and [r] are in complementary distribution, with [r] occurring after the front vowels /i/ and /e/, and [l] elsewhere (Wellens 2003: 214), while in the latter [l] and [r] are in free variation (Luffin 2014: 79).

As in the substrate languages, there is no distinction between short and long vowels: Juba Arabic sudānī ‘Sudanese’ < SA sudānī, Kinubi kabīr ‘big’ < SA kabīr.

3.3.2 Morphology

Apart from the Arabic-derived plural suffixes -at and -in, Juba Arabic uses the plural marker of Bari origin -ġīn (Nakao 2012: 131; Manfredi 2014a: 58), which is attached only to loanwords from local languages:

(3) Juba Arabic (Manfredi 2014a: 58)
   a. kɔrɔpɔ-ġīn (< Bari kɔrɔpɔ)
       leaf-PL
       ‘leaves’
   b. beng-ġīn (< Dinka beng)
       chief-PL
       ‘chiefs’
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c. b’angiri-ǧín (< Zande b’angiri)
    cheek-pl
    ‘cheeks’

Another phenomenon worth mentioning is the occurrence in the speech of young urban speakers of hybrid forms, which consist of the Bari relativizer lo- and a noun either from Arabic or from one of the substrate/adstrate languages (Nakao 2012: 131). Note, however, that there is a functional overlap between Bari lo- and Sudanese Arabic abu.

(4) Juba Arabic (Manfredi 2017: 46)
   a. lo-beléde (< Bari lo- + SA beled)
      rel-country
      ‘peasant’
   b. lo-pómbe (< Bari lo- + Swahili pombe)
      rel-alcohol
      ‘drunkard’

Given that a relatively large number of Bari-derived words contain lo- (Miller 1989; Manfredi 2017: 46), the examples in (4) confirm the fact that morphological innovations are typically introduced through lexical borrowings via RL agentivity, and subsequently become productive in the RL.

Note, finally, that most of the speakers who use the plural marker -ǧín and the relativizer lo- are dominant in Juba Arabic. These cases therefore confirm the fact that RL monolinguals can be agents of borrowing (Van Coetsem 1988: 10).

A small number of Kinubi nouns borrowed from Swahili exhibit the Bantu nominal classifiers:

(5) Kinubi (Wellens 2003: 57)
   a. mu-zé wa-zé
      NC1-old.man NC2-old.man
      ‘old man, old men’
   b. mu-zukú wa-zukú
      NC1-grandchild NC2-grandchild
      ‘grandchild, grandchildren’
   c. m-zúngu wa-zúngu
      NC1-European NC2-European
      ‘Europeans, Europeans’
3.3.3 Syntax

Bureng Vincent (1986: 77) first noted the similarity between the prototypical passive construction in Juba Arabic and its Bari counterpart:

(6) Juba Arabic (Bureng Vincent 1986: 77)
   a. bágara áyinu ma Wáni
cow see.pst with Wani
   ‘The cow has been seen by Wani.’
   b. Bari (Bureng Vincent 1986: 77)
kítəŋ a mɛ̀ta kɔ̀ Wànì
cow pst see with Wani
   ‘The cow has been seen by Wani.’

As can be seen, in both Juba Arabic and Bari the agent is introduced by the comitative preposition ‘with’. This is a case of lexico-syntactic imposition via identification of SL and RL lexemes (Manfredi 2018: 415): the Juba Arabic lexical entry ma is derived from Sudanese Arabic maʕ, but its semantics reflects the influence of Bari kɔ̀. The same is true of Kenyan Kinubi:

(7) Kinubi (Luffin 2005: 230)
yal-á al akulú ma nas tomsá
child-pl rel eat.pst.pass with pl crocodile
‘the children who were eaten by a crocodile’

Consider next the syntax of numerals in Kinubi (Wellens 2003: 90; Luffin 2014: 309). Their post-nominal placement is calqued on Swahili:

(8) Kinubi (Luffin 2014: 309)
wéle kámsa ma baná árba
boy five with girl.pl four
‘five boys and four girls’

(9) Swahili (Luffin 2014: 309)
miti mia tatú
tree hundred three
‘three hundred trees’

With cardinal numerals, the order is hundred + unit and thousand + unit respectively:
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(10) Kinubi (Luffin 2014: 309)
elf  wáy
thousand one
‘one thousand’

Kinubi thus follows the Swahili model:

(11) Swahili (Luffin 2014: 309)
elfu  moja
thousand one
‘one thousand’

Consider also a case of syntactic change induced by lexical calquing. Juba Arabic (fu)wata ‘ground’ functions as an impersonal subject in weather expressions:

(12) Juba Arabic (Nakao 2012: 141)
(fu)watá  sûkun
ground  hot
‘It is hot.’

Nakao (2012: 141) shows that this is also the case in Acholi and Ma’di:

(13) Acholi (Nakao 2012: 141)
piiny  lyeet
ground warm
‘It is warm.’

(14) Ma’di (Nakao 2012: 141)
vu  aci
ground hot
‘It is hot.’

In fact, these types of sentences are widespread in Western Nilotic substrate languages, such as Dinka, Jur, Päri, and Shilluk:

(15) Dinka (Nebel 1979: 202)
piny  a-tuc
ground 3sg-warm
‘It is warm.’

In both Juba Arabic and Kinubi ras ‘head’ also occurs in the complex preposition fi ras ‘on’:
(16)  

a. Juba Arabic (Nakao 2012: 141)

merísa  fi  fi  ras  terebéza
beer  exs  on  head  table
‘The beer is on the table.’

b. Kinubi (Wellens 2003: 159)

fi  rás  séder
on  head  tree
‘on  top  of  the  tree’

Nakao (2012: 141) attributes this function of ras to substratal influence from Acholi and Ma’di:

(17)  

Acholi (Nakao 2012: 141)

cib  wi-meja
put  head-table
‘Put  it  on  the  table.’

However, other possible sources include Western Nilotic languages such as Belanda Bor, Jur, Päri and Shilluk:

(18)  

Jur (Pozzati & Panza 1993: 342)

kedh  njo  wi  tarabesa
put  3sg  head  table
‘Put  it  on  the  table.’

Moreover, a preposition ‘on’ derived from the noun ‘head’ is also attested in Bongo (Central Sudanic) and Zande (Niger-Congo):

(19)  

Bongo (Moi et al. 2014: 39)

ba  do  mbaa
3sg  on  car
‘He  is  on  a  car.’

(20)  

Zande (De Angelis 2002: 288)

mo  mai  he  ri  ngua
2sg  put  3sg  on  wood
‘Put  it  on  the  wood.’

The  verb  gal/gale/gali  ‘say’  is  used  in  Juba  Arabic  and  Ugandan  Nubi  as  a complementizer,  with  verba  dicendi  and  verbs  of  cognition:
3.3.4 Lexicon

Since Bari is the main substrate language of Juba Arabic, unsurprisingly it contributes most of its African-derived words: gūgu ‘granary’ < Bari gugu; keni ‘co-wife’ < Bari köyini; lopumég ‘hedgehog’ < Bari lonyumöng; tónga ‘pinch’ < Bari tona. In several cases, the Juba Arabic form can be traced to a specific dialect: d’onjó ‘back of head’ < Pojulu donjor; láña ‘wander’ < Mundari lana ‘travel’; nyête vs ñête ‘black-eyed pea leaf’ < Bari nyete vs Kakwa, Pojulu ñete. Moreover, “more Bari lexical items are being borrowed” in Youth Juba Arabic (Nakao 2012: 131): kapaparat ‘butterfly’ < Bari kapoportat; lukululi ‘bat’ < Bari lukululi. Several other substrate and adstrate languages have contributed to the lexicon of Juba Arabic (Nakao 2012; 2015): adüngú ‘harp’ < Acholi adųju; b’óŋgo ‘pumpkin’ < Bongo b’ongó; básura ‘cassava’ < Dinka bafora ‘manioc, (sweet) cassava’; káwú ‘cowpea’ < Ma’di kau; malangí < bottle’ < Bangala/Lingala molangi; kámba ‘belt’ < Swahili kamba; ímbiró ‘palm tree’ < Zande mbiró. Some sixty lexical items found in the earliest records of Ugandan Kinubi can be traced back to various substrate languages (Avram 2017a): lawoti ‘neighbours’ < Acholi lawoti ‘fellow, friend’; korufu ‘leaf’ < Bari korofo ~ kɔrɔpɔ ‘leaves’; lwar ‘abscess’ < Dinka luár

5Unsurprisingly, in Juba Arabic “the use of adi as in Bari [is] the most frequent […] in particular among speakers of Bari origin” (Miller 2001: 470; author’s translation).
'pain of a swelling'; seri ‘fence’ < Lugbara seri ‘plant used for fencing’; mukuta ‘key’ < Päri mukuta.

The influence of Luganda and Swahili as adstrate languages is already documented in early Ugandan Kinubi (Avram 2017a): Ugandan Kinubi kibra ~ kibera ‘forest’ < Luganda e-kibira, nyinveza ‘fix’ < Luganda nyweza ‘make firm, hold firmly’; dirisa ‘window’ < Swahili dirisha; kibanda ‘shed’ < Swahili kibanda ‘small shed’. The lexicon of modern Ugandan Kinubi is characterized by a large number of loanwords from Luganda and Swahili (Wellens 2003; Nakao 2012: 133–134), such as: mé(é)mvu ‘banana’ < Luganda amaemvu ‘bananas’; ntulége ‘zebra’ < Luganda e-ntulege; karibísha ‘welcome’ < Swahili karibisha ‘welcome’; sangá ~ šangá ‘be surprised’ < Swahili shangaa. In some cases, these loanwords have replaced previously attested compounds consisting of Arabic-derived elements: early Ugandan Kinubi mária bitá murhúm ‘widow’, lit. ‘wife of the deceased’ vs. modern Ugandan Kinubi mamwándu ‘widow’ < Luganda nnamuwandu. As for the lexicon of modern Kenyan Kinubi, it is strongly influenced by Swahili. Luffin (2004) lists some 170 loanwords from Swahili (out of approximately 1,400 words recorded), from a wide range of domains, for example: barabára ‘highway’ < Swahili barabara; serikálí ‘government’ < Swahili serikali; tafaútí ‘difference’ < Swahili tafauti; úza ‘sell’ < Swahili ku-úza. Swahili has also contributed several function words: badáye ‘after’ < Swahili baadaye ‘afterwards’; íle ‘these’ < Swahili ile; na ‘and, with’ < Swahili na. Kenyan Kinubi lexical items have occasionally undergone semantic shift or semantic extension under the influence of the meanings of their Swahili counterparts (Luffin 2014: 315): destúr ‘tradition’, cf. Swahili desturi ‘tradition’; fáham ‘to understand, to remember’, cf. Swahili -fahamu ‘to understand, to remember’.

In some cases, the exact origin of loanwords found in Juba Arabic cannot be established: búra ‘cat’ < Acholi, Bongo, Dinka, Päri bura; Didinga buura; daná ‘bow’ < Bari, Jur danj, Didinga d’anga, Dinka dhany; pondú ‘cassava leaf’ < Bangala, Kakwa, Lingala pondu, Pojulu pöndu. The same holds for a number of loanwords attested in early Ugandan Kinubi (Avram 2017a): bongo ‘cloth’ < Acholi, Lendu, Lugbara, Zande bongo, Bari bongo; godogodo ‘thin from illness’ < Acholi, Avokaya, Bari, Baka, Lotuho, Moru, Zande godogodo ‘thin, sick(ly)’; mukungu ‘headman’ < Acholi mukuŋu, Bari mkọŋgọ, Luganda o-mukungu, Lugbara mukungu ‘(sub-) chief’. This is also true of several Kinubi words attested in more recent sources (Wellens 2003; Nakao 2012: 133–134): júju ‘shrew’ < Bari juju, Ma’di juju; kingílo ‘rhinoceros’ < Avokaya kingili, Moru kingile. In some cases, the occurrence of alternative forms is due to their different SLs: banğa ‘debt’ < Bari banja, Lugbara banja, Luganda e-bbanja vs. banya ‘debt’ < Acholi banya.

---

See also Tosco & Manfredi (2013: 509).
Under the influence of the substrate and adstrate languages, some Arabic-derived lexical items have undergone semantic extension, thereby becoming polysemous in Juba Arabic (Nakao 2012: 136), e.g. gowi ‘hard; difficult’, cf. Acholi tek, Bari logo', Lotuho gol, Ma’di okpo, Swahili kali.

Juba Arabic “compensates its lexical gaps through the lexification of Arabic morphosyntactic sequences” (Tosco & Manfredi 2013: 509). A case in point are Juba Arabic compounds, formed via juxtaposition or with their two members linked by the possessive particle ta (Manfredi 2014b: 308–309). These include calques after several substrate languages (Nakao 2012: 136), e.g. ida ta fil ‘elephant trunk’, cf. Acholi cin lyec, Bari könin lo tome, Dinka ciin akon, Jur cin lyec, Lotuho naam tome, Shilluk bate lyec, lit. ‘arm (of) elephant’. Kinubi also exhibits a number of calques (Nakao 2012; Avram 2017a; Manfredi, this volume). Some of these compounds and phrases can be traced to several SLs, as in the following early Ugandan Kinubi examples (Avram 2017a): gata kalam ‘decide, judge’, cf. Acholi ṇol kop ‘decide, give judgment’, Bongo ad’oci kudo, Jur ṇol lubo, Pāri ṃndi lubo, lit. ‘cut word/speech’; Dinka wet tém ‘decide, give the sentence’, lit. ‘word cut’; jua bita ter ‘nest’, cf. Acholi ot winyo, Bari kadi-na-kwen, Belanda Bor kwot winy, Shilluk wot winyo, Zande dumó zirè, lit. ‘house (of) bird’. Other calques, presumably more recent ones, reflect the growing influence of Swahili on Kenyan Kinubi (Luffin 2014: 315): bakán wáy ‘together’, cf. Swahili pamoja ‘together’, lit. ‘place one’, mára wáy wáy ‘seldom’, cf. Swahili mara moja moja ‘seldom’, lit. ‘time one one’.

To conclude, SL agentivity accounts for the small number of loanwords and calques recorded in the earliest stage (i.e. pidginization) of Juba Arabic and Kinubi. At a later stage (i.e. after nativization), the larger number of loanwords and calques is a result of borrowing under RL agentivity.

4 Arabic-lexifier pidgins in the Middle East

4.1 Current state and historical development

Several Arabic-lexifier pidgins have emerged in the Middle East. These include Romanian Pidgin Arabic, Pidgin Madame, Jordanian Pidgin Arabic, and Gulf Pidgin Arabic. The first three can be classified as work force pidgins.7 Gulf Pidgin Arabic also started out as work force pidgin (Smart 1990: 83), but it is now an interethnic contact language (Avram 2014: 13).8

7These are pidgins which “came into being in work situations” (Bakker 1995: 28).
8That is, one which is “used not just for trade, but also in a wide variety of other domains” (Bakker 1995: 28).
Romanian Pidgin Arabic (Avram 2010) was a short-lived pidgin, formerly used on Romanian well sites in Iraq, in locations in the vicinity of Ammara, Basra, Kut, Nassiriya, Rashdiya and Rumaila. Romanian Pidgin Arabic emerged after 1974, when Romanian well sites started operating in Iraq. Romanians typically made up two thirds of the oil crews, with Arabs making up the final third. The first Gulf War and the subsequent withdrawal of the Romanian oil rigs put an end to the use of Romanian Pidgin Arabic.

Immigration of Sri Lankan women to Arabic-speaking countries is reported to have started in 1976 (Bizri 2010: 16), but the large influx into Lebanon came later, in the early 1990s. Pidgin Madame is spoken in Lebanon by Sri Lankan female domestic workers and their Arab employers, mostly in the urban centres of the country.

Jordanian Pidgin Arabic (Al-Salman 2013) is used in the city of Irbid, in the Ar-Ramtha district in the north of Jordan, in interactions between Jordanians and Southeast Asian migrant workers of various linguistic backgrounds. However, only Jordanian Pidgin Arabic as spoken by Bengalis is documented.

Gulf Pidgin Arabic is a blanket term designating the varieties of pidginized Arabic used in Saudi Arabia and the countries on the western coast of the Arab Gulf, i.e. Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Bahrain, and Qatar.

4.2 Contact languages

The main languages involved in the emergence of Romanian Pidgin Arabic are Romanian, Egyptian Arabic (spoken by immigrant workers), and Iraqi Arabic (IA). A small minority of the participants in the language-contact situation had some knowledge of English.

The other pidginized varieties of Arabic in the Middle East share the characteristic of having various Asian languages as their substrate. For Pidgin Madame, the main contact languages are Lebanese Arabic, as the lexifier language, and Sinhalese. Another language, with a much smaller contribution, is English. In the case of Jordanian Pidgin Arabic, the contact languages are mainly Jordanian Arabic (JA) and Bengali. The contribution of English is very limited. As for Gulf Pidgin Arabic, it emerged in a contact situation of striking complexity. On the one hand, Arabic, the lexifier language, is represented by several dialects, which are not all subsumed under what is known as Gulf Arabic (GA), in spite of what the name of the pidgin suggests. On the other hand, the number of languages spoken by the immigrant workers is staggering: for instance, in the United Arab

---

Bizri (2014: 385) therefore suggests the cover term “Asian Migrant Arabic pidgins”.

---
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Emirates the 200 nationalities and 150 ethnic groups speak some 150 languages. Adding to the complexity of the language-contact situation is the fact that these languages are typologically diverse. Last but not least, English also plays a role in interethnic communication, particularly in the service sector.

4.3 Contact-induced changes

4.3.1 Phonology

The phonology of all the pidginized varieties of Arabic in the Middle East exhibits the outcomes of SL agentivity, which also accounts for the occurrence of considerable intra- and inter-speaker variation (Avram 2010: 21–22; Bizri 2014: 393; Avram 2017b: 133).

Consider first Romanian Pidgin Arabic. The following are features characteristic of speakers with Romanian as their first language (L1). The pharyngeals are either replaced or deleted: *habib* ‘friend’ < IA/EA ḥabīb; *mufta* ‘key’ < IA/EA muftāḥ; *saa* ‘hour’ < IA/EA sāfa. Plain consonants are substituted for pharyngealized ones: *halas* ‘ready’ < IA/EA ḥalāṣ. Both velar fricatives are replaced: *hamsa* ‘five’ < IA/EA ḥamsa; *ṣogol* ‘work (n)’ < IA ṣuy(u).l. Geminate consonants are degeminated: *sita* ‘six’ < IA/EA sitta. There is no distinction between short and long vowels, either in lexical items of Arabic origin or in those from English: *lazim* ‘must’ < IA/EA lāzim; *sleep* ‘sleep’ < English sleep. A feature typical of speakers with Iraqi or Egyptian Arabic as L1 is the substitution of /b/ for Romanian or English /p/ and /v/: *bibul* ‘people, men’ < English people; *gib* ‘give, bring’ < English give.

Consider next several selected features, generally typical of Pidgin Madame, Jordanian Pidgin Arabic, and Gulf Pidgin Arabic. Pharyngeals are either replaced: Pidgin Madame *hareb* ‘war’ < LA ḥareb; Jordanian Pidgin Arabic *bisallih* ‘repair’ < JA biṣallīḥ ‘repair.impf.3sg.m.’; Gulf Pidgin Arabic *aksan* ‘best’ < GA aḥsan, *hut* ‘put’ < GA hutt ‘put.impf.2sg.m.’; or deleted: Pidgin Madame *ēki* ‘cry’ < LA aḥki ‘cry.impf.2sg.f.’; Jordanian Pidgin Arabic *arabi* ‘Arabic’ < JA ʿarabī; Gulf Pidgin Arabic *araf* ‘know’ < GA ʿaraf. The pharyngealized consonants are replaced by plain counterparts: Pidgin Madame *sarep* ‘envelope’ < LA ʿaref; Jordanian Pidgin Arabic *bandora* ‘tomato’ < JA bandōra; Gulf Pidgin Arabic *halas* ‘finish’ < GA ḥalāṣ; or they are realized as retroflex: Pidgin Madame *tawile* ‘long’ < LA tawīl ‘long.f.sg.’. The velar fricatives are replaced by velar stops or, less frequently, by /h/: Pidgin Madame *sinkon* ‘warm’ < LA suḥun ‘warm’, *ṣogol* < LA ʿayr ‘work’; Jordanian Pidgin Arabic *kamsa* ‘five’ < JA ḥamsa, *sukul* ‘work (n)’ < JA ṣuyl, *zagir* ‘small’ < JA ʿayr; Gulf Pidgin Arabic *kubus* ‘bread’ < GA ḥubz; *halas* ‘finish’ <
GA خيصل ٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌٌ_
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(24)  a.  Pidgin Madame (Bizri 2010: 198)
    kullu māmā benet
    all mother girl
    ‘All mother’s girls.’
  b.  Gulf Pidgin Arabic (Næss 2008: 87)
    ana jawd bādēn ysīr Jakarta stokol
    1sg husband then go Jakarta work
    ‘Then my husband went to work in Jakarta.’

Adjectives generally precedes the nouns they modify:

(25)  Pidgin Madame (Bizri 2010: 119)
    bīr bēt
    big house
    ‘A big house.’

Similarly, adverbs precede the adjectives they modify:

(26)  a.  Pidgin Madame (Bizri 2010: 119)
    tīr gūḍ
    very good
    ‘very good’
  b.  Gulf Pidgin Arabic (Avram 2014: 25)
    sem-sem kalām
    same speak
    ‘They speak in the same way.’

Occasional instances of postpositions are attested:

(27)  a.  Pidgin Madame (Bizri 2010: 132)
    mister mayik masārē
    mister with money
    ‘Mister has the money.’
  b.  Gulf Pidgin Arabic (Avram 2014: 25)
    zamal fok
    camel above
    ‘Above the camel.’

Interestingly, Pidgin Madame has a focalized negative copula, derived etymologically from English no:
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(28) Pidgin Madame (Bizri 2010: 133)
māmā birūt no
mother Beirut NEG.FOC
‘It’s not in Beirut that my mother is.’

This resembles the Sinhalese negator nemiyi, which “is used only in focalized phrases” (Bizri 2010: 69):

(29) Pidgin Madame (Bizri 2010: 69)
bat kāve mama nemeyi
rice ate 1SG NEG.FOC
‘It is not I who ate the rice.’

4.3.3 Lexicon

Imposition under SL agentivity accounts for the fact that there are few instances of transfer of lexical items from the various SLs into the non-dominant RL (i.e. the pidgin).

The lexicon of Romanian Pidgin Arabic includes words of Romanian and English origin (Avram 2010: 32): maşina ‘car’ < Romanian maşină, sonda ‘oil rig’ < Romanian sonda; spik ‘speak, say, tell’ < English speak, tumaţ ‘much, many’ < English too much. Occasionally, non-Arabic words undergo semantic extension under the influence of phonetically similar Arabic words (Avram 2010: 32): gib ‘give; bring’ < English give, cf. EA gib ‘bring,IMP.2SG.M’.

The lexicon of all the other pidginized varieties of Arabic spoken in the Middle East includes loanwords from English: Pidgin Madame ambasi ‘embassy’ < English embassy; go ‘go’ < English go, kam ‘come’ < English come, no gūɖ ‘bad’ < English no good, oké ‘OK’ < English OK; Jordanian Pidgin Arabic bēbi ‘child’ < English baby, finiš ‘finish’ < English finish, fisa ‘visa’ < English visa; Gulf Pidgin Arabic hazband ‘husband’ < English husband, pēşent ‘patient’ < English patient. However, as noted by Smart (1990: 113) concerning Gulf Pidgin Arabic, “it is difficult to say [...] whether they are a true part of the pidgin” or rather nonce borrowings.

Given the extreme diversity of the substrate, it is not surprising that only a few words from the SLs have made it into the lexicon of Gulf Pidgin Arabic (Avram 2017b: 134–135): ača ‘fine’ < Urdu achā ‘good, very well’, ġaldi ~ ġeldi < Hindi/Urdu jaldī ‘quick’.

Jordanian Pidgin Arabic and Gulf Pidgin Arabic exhibit light-verb constructions which may well be calques on Bengali (noun/adjective + kara ‘make’) and/

5 Conclusion

This chapter has shown that Arabic-lexifier contact languages emerged primarily through imposition under SL agentivity, in line with the typology of contact languages (Winford 2005: 396; 2008: 128).

The effects of imposition are most obvious in the phonology, syntax and the syntax-semantics interface, and to a lesser extent in the morphology and the lexicon. In the phonology, SL agentivity induces the loss or replacement of certain phonemes not found in the SLs. However, there are also instances of imposition in the sense of transfer from the SLs. As seen, for example, in Turku and Bongor Arabic, some consonants occur only in loanwords from the substrate languages. The occurrence of such loanwords confirms the fact that imposition under SL agentivity may include transfer of lexical items into the RL. Borrowing under RL agentivity has generally played a far less significant role in the development of Arabic pidgins and creoles. As expected, it mostly involves transfer of lexical items; these may lead to the borrowing of certain consonant phonemes, as seen in, for example, Juba Arabic and Kinubi. Finally, borrowing has been shown to include transfer of morphological material as well.

A notable difference between Juba Arabic and Kinubi on the one hand, and the Arabic-lexifier pidgins in the Middle East on the other hand, resides in the relative weight of imposition under SL agentivity and borrowing under RL agentivity. As we have seen, Juba Arabic and Kinubi exhibit the effects of both imposition in their earliest stage (i.e. pidginization), and of borrowing in their latest stage (i.e. nativization). In contrast, imposition is pervasive in the Arabic-lexifier pidgins in the Middle East, given that these varieties have not undergone nativization.

There are still a number of issues awaiting resolution. For instance, the identification of the SLs is rendered difficult by their number and typological diversity. This difficulty is further compounded by the fact that some substrate languages are still under-researched. This is particularly the case of the substrate languages of Juba Arabic and Kinubi. Also, the distinction between substrate and adstrate languages is blurred (Nakao 2012: 132), particularly when varieties emerge and develop in situ, as, for example, with Juba Arabic. Further research also needs
to consider the effects of the existence of a creole continuum in Juba Arabic as well as of bilingual and monolingual speakers of the language on the relative importance of restructuring, imposition and borrowing. The extent of restructuring and imposition, for instance, is presumably much greater in basilectal and L2 varieties, as opposed to acrolectal and monolingual varieties of the language. The same holds for Bongor Arabic, which, as shown, appears to be undergoing depidginization. Last but not least, further investigations are necessary to establish whether Gulf Pidgin Arabic is evolving towards stabilization, possibly becoming closer to its lexifier via borrowing of morphological material, or is rather undergoing constant repidginization, essentially via imposition.

Further reading

- Avram (2019) analyzes the substratal input in the lexicon of Turku.
- Avram (2017b) and Bakir (2017) discuss the various sources of Gulf Pidgin Arabic.

Abbreviations

| 1, 2, 3 | 1st, 2nd, 3rd person          | NEG   | negative  |
| ChA    | Chadian Arabic                | PASS  | passive   |
| EA     | Egyptian Arabic              | PST   | past      |
| EXS    | existential                   | PL    | plural    |
| FOC    | focus                         | POSS  | possessive|
| GA     | Gulf Arabic                   | PRF   | perfect (suffix conjugation) |
| IA     | Iraqi Arabic                  | PROX  | proximal  |
| IMPF   | imperfect (prefix conjugation) | REL   | relative  |
| JA     | Jordanian Arabic              | RL    | recipient language |
| L1     | first language                | SA    | Sudanese Arabic |
| L2     | second language               | SL    | source language |
| N      | noun                          | SG    | singular   |
| NC     | noun class                    |
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