Chapter 15

Arabic pidgins and creoles

Andrei Avram
University of Bucharest

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 &

Andrei Avram. 2020. Arabic pidgins and creoles. In Christopher Lucas & Stefano Manfredi (eds.), *Arabic and contact-induced change*, 321–347. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.3744529

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–Kebbi 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 /ḫ/, which is generally replaced by [k]: Turku ***k**amsa* ‘five’ < ChA ***ḫ**amsa*; Bongor Arabic ***k**ídma* ‘work’ < ChA ***ḫ**idma*. Many of the substrate languages do not have /f/, which is substituted with [p]

or perhaps [ɸ],[1] e.g. Turku ***pf**il* 'elephant' < ChA *fīl*. In French loanwords, the reflexes of /v/ are either [b] or [w]: Bongor Arabic ***b**oté* 'to vote' < French ***v**oter*, ***w**otír* 'car' < French ***v**oiture*.

The consonants [ɲ] and [ŋ] occur only in loanwords: Bongor Arabic ***ng**ambáy* 'Ngambay' < Ngambay ***ng**àmbáy*; Turku ***ng**ari* 'manioc' < Mbay ***ng**àrì*, *konpa**ny**e* 'company' < French *compa**gn**ie*; [v] and [ʒ] occur only in phonologically non-integrated words of French origin: Turku *si**v**il* 'civilian' < French *ci**v**il*; Bongor Arabic ***ž**urnalíst* 'journalist' < French ***j**ournaliste*.

Variation affects several consonants. For instance, [f] occurs in variation with [b] or [p]: Turku ***f**išan* ~ ***b**išan* 'because'; Bongor Arabic *máf**i*** ~ *má**p**i*** 'NEG' < ChA *mā **f**ī*, *sof**é**r* ~ *so**p**ér*** 'driver' < French *chauf**f**eur*. Most of the substrate languages do not have /š/, which accounts for [ʃ] ~ [s] variation, in words with either etymological /s/ or /ʃ/: Turku *ga**s**i* ~ *ga**š**i*** 'expensive' < ChA *gā**s**ī*, *biri**š*** ~ *biri**s*** 'mat' < ChA *birī**š***; Bongor Arabic *má**š**i* ~ *má**s**i*** 'go'. The usual reflexes of French /ʒ/, absent from the phonological inventories of the substrate languages, are [z], [ʤ] and [s] respectively: Turku ***ǧ**inenal* 'general' < French ***g**énéral*, ***s**uska* 'until < French ***j**usqu'à*; Bongor Arabic *zúska* 'when, during' < French ***j**usqu'à* 'until'.

Finally, vowel length is not distinctive: Turku, Bongor Arabic *kal**a**m* 'speech; speak' < ChA *kal**ā**m* 'speech'.

2.3.2 Morphology

On current evidence (Luffin 2013: 180–181), Bongor Arabic exhibits signs of depidginization 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)
índi gáy árifu úsum-**i**
2SG IMPF know name-POSS.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.'

[1]Transcribed as ⟨pf⟩ by Muraz (1926: 168).

b. anína rikíb-**na** wotír 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 *gáw*; *ngari* 'manioc' < Mbay *ngàrì*. The second most significant important contributor is Sango: *kay* 'paddle' < Sango *kâî*, *tipoy* 'carrying hammock' < *típóí*. A few words can be traced to Fulfulde and Kanuri: *kelkelbanği* 'golden beads' < Fulfulde *kelkel-banja*; *wélik* '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-tənji*, 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 *dûtênë* lit. 'hole stone'.

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.[3]

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: ***h****áfla* 'feast' < SA *ḥafla*; ***á****rabi* 'Arabic' < SA *ʕarabī*. The pharyngealized consonants are replaced by their plain counterparts: ***t****owíl* 'long' < SA *ṭawīl*; ***d****ul* 'shadow' < SA *ḍull*; ***s****úlba* 'hip' < SA *ṣulba*; ***z****úlum* 'to anger' < SA *ẓulum*. The velar fricatives of Arabic are always replaced by velar stops: ***k****ábara* 'piece of news' < SA *ḫabar*; *šó****k****ol* 'work' < SA *šoɣol*, ***g****árib* 'west' < SA *ɣar(i)b*.

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): ***h****aǧa* 'thing' < SA *ḥāǧa*, *aram* 'thief' < SA *ḥarāmi*, *līb* < 'to play' < SA *liʕib*. 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: ***t**owil* 'long' < SA *ṭawīl*; ***d**ulu* 'shadow' < SA *ḍull*, *hi**s**iba* 'measles' < SA *ḥiṣba*; ***z**ulm* 'to anger' < SA *ẓulum*. Like Juba Arabic, Kinubi substitutes velar stops for the Arabic velar fricatives. Consider the following early Ugandan Kinubi forms: ***k**idima* 'work' < SA *ḫidma*; *šo**k**olo* 'work' < SA *šo**ɣ**ol*, *bala**g**o* 'commandment' < SA *balā**ɣ*** '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'**oǧo*. The other consonants which occur only in loanwords from the substrate and/or adstrate languages are [p] [v], [ʧ], [ɲ], and [ŋ]: Kinubi *lí**p**a* 'to pay' < Swahili *-li**p**a*; Kinubi *cam**p*** 'camp' < English *cam**p***; Kinubi ***v**íta* 'war' < Swahili ***v**ita*; Juba Arabic *čam* 'food' < Acholi, Belanda Bor, Jur *čama*, Juba Arabic *čayniz* < English ***Ch**inese*, Kinubi *čay* 'tea' < Swahili ***ch**ai*; Juba Arabic ***ny**ékem*, Kinubi ***ny**ékem* 'chin' < Bari ***ny**ékem*, Kinubi *ny**ány**a* 'tomato' < Swahili ***ny**an**y**a*; Juba Arabic ***ŋ**un* 'divinity' < Bari ***ng**un*. 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* ~ *ge**s*** 'grass'. Further, [z] is in variation with [ʤ] before /o/ and /a/: *zówǧu* ~ ***ǧ**ówǧu* 'to marry', *záman* ~ ***ǧ**áman* 'time; when'. There is also [p] ~ [f] variation in word-initial position, including in loanwords: ***p**oǧúlu* ~ ***f**oǧúlu* 'Pojulu', ***p**rótestan* ~ ***f**rótestan* 'protestant'. Finally, the phoneme /f/ may also be phonetically realized as [p]: *nédi**f**u* ~ *nédi**p**u* '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 /ʤ/. 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/, /ʤ/, /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* ~ ***s**abaka* 'net'). Although it is etymological /š/ which is typically subject to variation, occasionally this also applies to etymological /s/: early Ugandan Kinubi ***s**ikin* ~ *šekin* 'knife' < SA *sikkīn* (Avram 2017a) and modern Kenyan Kinubi *fluš* ~ *flu**s*** '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* ~ ***s**amba* 'field' < Swahili ***sh**amba*. 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 ***ǧ**alan* ~ *zalan* 'angry' < SA *zaʕlān*. However, unlike Juba Arabic, in Kinubi the [z] ~ [ʤ] variation also occurs before the two front vowels /i/ and /e/: ***z**e* ~ ***ǧ**e* 'as', early Ugandan Kinubi *an**ǧ**il* ~ *enzil* '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. *tá**l**e* ~ *tá**r**e* 'go out', *ge**r**í* ~ *ge**l**í* 'near', and in borrowings, e.g. Ugandan Kinubi *čá**l**o* ~ *čá**r**o* 'village' < Luganda *e-kya**l**o*; Kenyan Kinubi *tumbí**l**i* ~ *tumbí**r**i* 'monkey' < Swahili *tumbi**l**i*. 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 *sudá**n**i* 'Sudanese' < SA *sudā**n**ī*, Kinubi *kabír* 'big' < SA *kabī**r***.

3.3.2 Morphology

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

(3) Juba Arabic (Manfredi 2014a: 58)

a. kɔrɔpɔ-ǧín (< Bari *kɔrɔpɔ*)
leaf-PL
'leaves'

b. beng-ǧín (< Dinka *beng*)
chief-PL
'chiefs'

c. b'angiri-ğín (< 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 *-ğín* 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
'European, 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)
kítɜŋ a mɛtà 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** **tatu**
tree hundred three
'three hundred trees'

With cardinal numerals, the order is hundred + unit and thousand + unit respectively:

(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 súkun
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 fí 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 ŋo **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:

(21) a. Juba Arabic (Miller 2001: 469)
úwo kélem **gal** úwo bi-ğa
3SG speak COMP 3SG IRR-come
'He said that he would come.'

b. Ugandan Kinubi (Wellens 2003: 204)
úmon áruf **gal** fí difan-á al gi-ğá
3PL know COMP EXS guest-PL REL PROG-come
'They know that there are are guests who are coming.'

The use of a *verbum dicendi* as a complementizer resembles the situation in Bari,[5] where *adi* 'say' introduces direct speech (Owens 1997: 163; Miller 2001: 469):

(22) Bari (Miller 2001: 469)
mukungu a-kulya **adi** nan d'ad'ar kakitak merya-mukanat
sub-chief PST-say COMP 1SG want worker fifty
'The sub-chief spoke saying: I want fifty workers.'

3.3.4 Lexicon

Since Bari is the main substrate language of Juba Arabic, unsurprisingly it contributes most of its African-derived words: *gúgu* 'granary' < Bari *gugu*; *kení* 'co-wife' < Bari *köyini*; *loŋumég* 'hedgehog' < Bari *lónyumöng*; *tóŋga* 'pinch' < Bari *toŋga*. In several cases, the Juba Arabic form can be traced to a specific dialect: *d'oŋóŋ* 'back of head' < Pojulu *doŋoŋ*; *láŋa* 'wander' < Mundari *laŋa* 'travel'; *nyéte* vs *ŋéte* 'black-eyed pea leaf' < Bari *nyete* vs Kakwa, Pojulu *ŋete*. Moreover, "more Bari lexical items are being borrowed" in Youth Juba Arabic (Nakao 2012: 131): *kapaparát* 'butterfly' < Bari *kapoportat*; *lukulúli* 'bat' < Bari *lukululi*. Several other substrate and adstrate languages have contributed to the lexicon of Juba Arabic (Nakao 2012; 2015): *adúngú* 'harp' < Acholi *aduŋu*; *b'ónğo* 'pumpkin' < Bongo *b'onğo*; *báfura* 'cassava' < Dinka *bafora* 'manioc, (sweet) cassava'; *káwu* 'cowpea' < Ma'di *kau*; *malangí* < bottle' < Bangala/Lingala *molangi*; *kámba* 'belt' < Swahili *kamba*; *imbíró* 'palm tree' < Zande *mbíró*. 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 *luär*

[5]Unsurprisingly, 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:[6] 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*; *serikáli* 'government' < Swahili *serikali*; *tafaúti* 'difference' < Swahili *tafauti*; *úza* 'sell' < Swahili *ku-uza*. 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*; *daŋá* 'bow' < Bari, Jur *daŋ*, Didinga *d'anga*, Dinka *dhaŋ*; *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 *boŋgo*; *godogodo* 'thin from illness' < Acholi, Avokaya, Bari, Baka, Lotuho, Moru, Zande *godogodo* 'thin, sick(ly)'; *mukungu* 'headman' < Acholi *mukuŋu*, Bari *mɔkɔŋgɔ*, 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 *kiŋgili*, Moru *kingile*. In some cases, the occurrence of alternative forms is due to their different SLs: *banǧa* 'debt' < Bari *banja*, Lugbara *banja*, Luganda *e-bbanja* vs. *banya* 'debt' < Acholi *banya*.

[6]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. *gówi* '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. *ída ta fil* 'elephant trunk', cf. Acholi *ciŋ lyec*, Bari *könin lo tome*, Dinka *ciin akɔɔn*, Jur *ciŋ 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 *ŋɔlɔ kop* 'decide, give judgment', Bongo *ad'oci kudo*, Jur *ŋɔl lubo*, Päri *ŋondi lubo*, lit. 'cut word/speech'; Dinka *wèt tèm* 'decide, give the sentence', lit. 'word cut'; *jua bita ter* 'nest', cf. Acholi *ot winyo*, Bari *kadi-na-kwen*, Belanda Bor *kwɔt winy*, Shilluk *wot winyo*, Zande *dumô zirê*, 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]

[7]These are pidgins which "came into being in work situations" (Bakker 1995: 28).

[8]That 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.[9] 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

[9] Bizri (2014: 385) therefore suggests the cover term "Asian Migrant Arabic pidgins".

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 phrayngeals are either replaced or deleted: ***h**abib* 'friend' < IA/EA *ḥabīb*; *mufta* 'key' < IA/EA *muftāḥ*; *saa* 'hour' < IA/EA *sāʕa*. Plain consonants are substituted for pharyngealized ones: *hala**s*** 'ready' < IA/EA *ḥalāṣ*. Both velar fricatives are replaced: ***h**amsa* 'five' < IA/EA *ḫamsa*; *šo**g**ol* 'work (N)' < IA *šu**ɣ**(u)l*. Geminate consonants are degeminated: *si**t**a* 'six' < IA/EA *si**tt**a*. There is no distinction between short and long vowels, either in lexical items of Arabic origin or in those from English: *l**a**zim* 'must' < IA/EA *l**ā**zim*; *sl**i**p* '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/: ***bi**bul* 'people, men' < English ***p**eo**p**le*; *gi**b*** 'give, bring' < English *gi**v**e*.

Consider next several selected features, generally typical of Pidgin Madame, Jordanian Pidgin Arabic, and Gulf Pidgin Arabic. Pharyngeals are either replaced: Pidgin Madame ***h**areb* 'war' < LA ***ḥ**areb*; Jordanian Pidgin Arabic *bisalli**h*** 'repair' < JA *biṣalliḥ* 'repair.IMPF.3SG.M'; Gulf Pidgin Arabic *a**k**san* 'best' < GA *aḥsan*, ***h**ut* 'put' < GA ***ḥ**uṭṭ* 'put.IMP.2SG.M'; or deleted: Pidgin Madame ***ē**ki* 'cry' < LA *əḥki* 'cry.IMP.2SG.F'; Jordanian Pidgin Arabic ***a**rabi* 'Arabic' < JA *ʕarabi*; Gulf Pidgin Arabic *araf* 'know' < GA *ʕaraf*. The pharyngealized consonants are replaced by plain counterparts: Pidgin Madame ***s**arep* 'envelope' < LA *ẓaref*; Jordanian Pidgin Arabic *bandora* 'tomato' < JA *banḍōra*; Gulf Pidgin Arabic *hala**s*** 'finish' < GA *ḥalāṣ*; or they are realized as retroflex: Pidgin Madame ***ʈ**awīle* 'long' < LA ***ʈ**awīle* 'long.F.SG'. The velar fricatives are replaced by velar stops or, less frequently, by /h/: Pidgin Madame *so**k**on* 'warm' < LA *su**ḫ**un* 'warm', *so**g**ol* < LA *šə**ɣ**əl* 'work'; Jordanian Pidgin Arabic ***k**amsa* 'five' < JA ***ḫ**amsa*, *su**k**ul* 'work (N)' < JA *šu**ɣ**l*, *za**g**īr* 'small' < JA *ṣa**ɣ**īr*; Gulf Pidgin Arabic ***k**ubus* 'bread' < GA ***ḫ**ubz*; ***h**alas* 'finish' <

GA ***ḫ**alaṣ*; *yisto**k**ol* ‘work’ < GA *yištu**ɣ**ul* ‘work.IMPF.3SG.M’, *šu**g**l* ‘work’ < GA *šu**ɣ**l*. Geminate consonants generally undergo degemination (Næss 2008: 36; Avram 2014: 15): Jordanian Pidgin Arabic *si**t**in* ‘sixty’ < JA *si**tt**īn*; Gulf Pidgin Arabic *si**t**a* ‘six’ < GA *si**tt**a*.

Moreover, consonants not found in the L1s of the users of Gulf Pidgin Arabic may also be replaced. For instance, Indonesian, Javanese, Sinhalese and Tagalog speakers may substitute [p] for /f/: Pidgin Madame ***p**alē**p**il* ‘falafel’ < LA ***f**alē**f**il*; Jordanian Pidgin Arabic ***p**i* ‘in’ < JA *fī*; Gulf Pidgin Arabic *na**p**ar* ‘person’ < GA *na**f**ar*; Indonesian and Sinhalese speakers may realize /z/ as [s] or [ʤ]: Pidgin Madame *e**s**a* ‘if’ < LA *iza*; Gulf Pidgin Arabic ***s**ēn* ~ ***ʤ**ēn* ‘good’ < GA ***z**ēn* (Bizri 2014: 393; Avram 2017b: 133). Bengali and Sinhalese speakers may replace /š/ with [s]: Pidgin Madame ***s**ū* ‘what’ < LA *š**ū***; Jordanian Pidgin Arabic ***s**u* ‘what’ < JA *š**ū***.

Finally, although phonetically long vowels do occur, vowel length is not distinctive, as shown by the occurrence of variation, e.g. Gulf Pidgin Arabic *b**a**de**n* ~ *b**a**dē**n*** ‘then’ < GA *baʃdē**n***.

4.3.2 Syntax

There is relatively little that can be attributed to SL agentivity in the syntax of the Arabic-lexifier pidgins in the Middle East (Almoaily 2013; Al-Salman 2013; Avram 2014; Bizri 2014; Avram 2017b; Bakir 2017).

Since the substrate of these varieties, with the exception of Romanian Pidgin Arabic, consists of many SOV languages, e.g. Bengali, Hindi/Urdu, Malayalam, Punjabi, Persian, Sinhalese, Tamil, this word order is occasionally attested (Avram 2017b: 133–134; Bizri 2014: 403). For instance, direct objects may occur in pre-verbal position:

(23) a. Pidgin Madame (Bizri 2010: 227)
misʈer kilot sīli
mister underwear take off
‘Mister takes off his underwear.’

b. Gulf Pidgin Arabic (Avram 2017b: 133)
ana čiko sūp
1SG child see
‘I will see my children.’

In attributive possession constructions the order of constituents is possessor–possessee:

(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)
ʈīr 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*:

(28) Pidgin Madame (Bizri 2010: 133)
māmā bīrūt **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): *mašina* 'car' < Romanian *maşină*, *sonda* 'oil rig' < Romanian *sonda*; *spik* 'speak, say, tell' < English *speak*, *tumač* '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 *gīb* '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 gūḍ* '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*, *pēšent* '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', *ğaldi* ~ *ğeldi* < 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/

or Hindi/Urdu (noun/adjective + *karnā* 'make') and/or Persian – noun/adjective + *kardan* 'make'): Jordanian Pidgin Arabic *sawwi zadīd* 'renew', lit. 'make new'; Gulf Pidgin Arabic *sawwi suāl* 'ask', lit. 'make a question', *sawwi zalān* 'upset', lit. 'make angry'.

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

- Miller (1993), Nakao (2012), and Luffin (2014) illustrate in detail substratal and adstratal influence on Juba Arabic and Kinubi.
- 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
ChA	Chadian Arabic
EA	Egyptian Arabic
EXS	existential
FOC	focus
GA	Gulf Arabic
IA	Iraqi Arabic
IMPF	imperfect (prefix conjugation)
JA	Jordanian Arabic
L1	first language
L2	second language
N	noun
NC	noun class
NEG	negative
PASS	passive
PST	past
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PRF	perfect (suffix conjugation)
PROX	proximal
REL	relative
RL	recipient language
SA	Sudanese Arabic
SL	source language
SG	singular

References

Al-Salman, Ibrahim. 2013. *Jordanian Pidgin Arabic*. Irbid: Yarmouk University. (Master's dissertation).

Almoaily, Mohammad. 2013. *Language variation in Gulf Pidgin Arabic*. Newcastle: Newcastle University. (Doctoral dissertation).

Avram, Andrei A. 2010. An outline of Romanian Pidgin Arabic. *Journal of Language Contact* 3. 19–37.

Avram, Andrei A. 2014. Immigrant workers and language formation: Gulf Pidgin Arabic. *Lengua y Migración* 6(2). 7–40.

Avram, Andrei A. 2017a. Evidence of variation in early records of Nubi. Paper presented at the Eleventh Creolistics Workshop "Assessing old assumptions: New insights on the dynamics of languages", Justus-Giebig University, Giessen, March 22–24.

Avram, Andrei A. 2017b. Sources of Gulf Pidgin Arabic features. In Simone Bettega & Fabio Gasparini (eds.), *Linguistic studies in the Arabian Gulf*, 131–151. Turin: Università di Torino.

Avram, Andrei A. 2019. Africanisms in Turku. In Catherine Miller, Alexandrine Barontini, Marie-Aimée Germanos, Jairo Guerrero & Christophe Pereira (eds.), *Studies on Arabic dialectology and sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the 12th conference of AIDA held in Marseille from May 30th to June 2nd 2017*, 15–24. Aix-en-Provence: Institut de recherches et d'études sur le monde arabe et musulman.

Bakir, Murtadha J. 2017. GPA genesis: The extent of substratal influence. Paper presented at the Annual Summer Conference of the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics, University of Tampere, 19–22 June.

Bakker, Peter. 1995. Pidgins. In Jacques Arends, Pieter Muysken & Norval Smith (eds.), *Pidgins and creoles: An introduction*, 130–157. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bakker, Peter. 2008. Pidgins versus creoles and pidgincreoles. In Silvia Kouwenberg & John Victor Singler (eds.), *The handbook of pidgin and creole studies*, 130–157. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bizri, Fida. 2010. *Pidgin Madame: Une grammaire de la servitude*. Paris: Geuthner.

Bizri, Fida. 2014. Unity and diversity across Asian migrant Arabic pidgins in the Middle East. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 29(2). 385–409.

Bureng Vincent, George. 1986. Juba Arabic from a Bari perspective. In Gerrit J. Dimmendaal (ed.), *Current approaches to African linguistics*, vol. 3, 71–78. Dordrecht: Foris.

Cook, Albert R. 1905. *Dinka and Nubi Vocabulary*. Unpublished manuscript.

De Angelis, Pietro. 2002. *Vocabolario zande*. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste.

Jenkins, Edward V. 1909. *English–Arabic vocabulary with grammar and phrases representing the language as spoken by the Uganda Sudanese in the Uganda and British East Africa Protectorate*. Kampala: The Uganda Company.

Lucas, Christopher. 2015. Contact-induced language change. In Claire Bowern & Bethwyn Evans (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of historical linguistics*, 519–536. London: Routledge.

Luffin, Xavier. 2004. *Un créole arabe: Le kinubi de Mombasa. Etude descriptive*. Brussels: Université Libre de Bruxelles. (Doctoral dissertation).

Luffin, Xavier. 2005. *Un créole arabe: Le kinubi de Mombassa, Kenya*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Luffin, Xavier. 2013. Some new information about Bongor Arabic. In Mena Lafkioui (ed.), *African Arabic: Approaches to dialectology*, 161–183. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Luffin, Xavier. 2014. The influence of Swahili on Kinubi. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 29(2). 299–318.

Manfredi, Stefano. 2014a. Qualche osservazione sull'espressione del plurale nominale nel creole arabo di Juba. *RiCognizioni* 2(1). 53–61.

Manfredi, Stefano. 2014b. Strategie di rilessificazione in Juba Arabic. In Alberto Manco & Domenico Silvestri (eds.), *L'etimologia: Atti del XXXV Convegno della Società di Glottologia*, 305–311. Rome: Il Calamo.

Manfredi, Stefano. 2017. *Arabi Juba: Un pidgin-créole du Soudan du Sud*. Leuven: Peeters.

Manfredi, Stefano. 2018. Arabic as a contact language. In Reem Bassiouney & Elabbas Benmamoun (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Arabic linguistics*, 407–20. London: Routledge.

Meldon, J. A. 1913. *English–Arabic dictionary of words and phrases used by the Sudanese in Uganda*. Unpublished manuscript.

Miller, Catherine. 1989. Bari interference in Juba Arabic. In Lionel Bender (ed.), *Proceedings of the 4th Nilo-Saharan Symposium*, 1–10. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

Miller, Catherine. 1993. Restructuration morpho-syntaxique en Juba-Arabic et Ki-Nubi: A propos du débat universaux/substrat et superstrat dans les études créoles. *Matériaux Arabes et Sudarabiques (GELLAS)* 5. 137–174.

Miller, Catherine. 2001. Grammaticalisation du verbe 'dire' et subordination en Juba Arabic. In Robert Nicolaï (ed.), *Leçons d'Afrique: Filiation, rupture et reconstitution des langues. Un hommage à G. Manessy*, 455–482. Leuven: Peeters.

Moi, Daniel R., Mario L. B. Kuduku, Mary M. Michael, Simon H. John, Raphael Z. Mafoi & Nyoul G. Kuduku. 2014. *Bongo grammar book*. Juba: SIL-South Sudan.

Muraz, Gaston. 1926. *Vocabulaire du patois arabe tchadien ou "Tourkou" et des dialectes sara-madjinngaye et sara-m'baye (S.-O. du Tchad)*. Paris: Charles Lavauzelle.

Nakao, Shuichiro. 2012. Revising the substratal/adstratal influence on Arabic creoles. In Osamu Hieda (ed.), *Challenges in Nilotic linguistics: Phonology, morphology, and syntax*, 127–49. Tokyo: ILCAA.

Nakao, Shuichiro. 2015. Another story of Bangala: Language contact with South Sudanese Arabic Creole. Paper presented at the 8th World Congress of African Linguistics, Kyoto University, 20–24 August.

Næss, Unn Gyda. 2008. *"Gulf Pidgin Arabic": Individual strategies or a structured variety? A study of some features of the linguistic behaviour of Asian migrants in the Gulf countries*. Oslo: University of Oslo. (Master's dissertation).

Nebel, Arthur. 1979. *Dinka–English, English–Dinka dictionary*. Bologna: Editrice Missionaria Italiana.

Owen, H. R. & G. J. Keane. 1915. *An abbreviated vocabulary in Hindustani Luganda Lunyoro Swahili Nubi: Designed for the use of the Uganda Medical Service*. Bukalasa: White Father's Printing Press.

Owens, Jonathan. 1985. The origins of East African Nubi. *Anthropological Linguistics* 27(2). 229–271.

Owens, Jonathan. 1997. Arabic-based pidgins and creoles. In Sarah G. Thomason (ed.), *Contact languages: A wider perspective*, 125–172. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pozzati, Aurelio & G. Panza. 1993. *Dizionario Giur*. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste.

Smart, Jack R. 1990. Pidginization in Gulf Arabic: A first report. *Anthropological Linguistics* 32(1–2). 83–119.

Tosco, Mauro & Stefano Manfredi. 2013. Pidgins and creoles. In Jonathan Owens (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Arabic linguistics*, 496–519. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tosco, Mauro & Jonathan Owens. 1993. Turku: A descriptive comparative study. *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 14. 177–267.

Trudgill, Peter. 2011. *Sociolinguistic typology: Social determinants of linguistic complexity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Coetsem, Frans. 1988. *Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language contact*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Van Coetsem, Frans. 1995. Outlining a model of the transmission phenomenon in language contact. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 88. 63–85.

Van Coetsem, Frans. 2000. *A general and unified theory of the transmission process in language contact*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Van Coetsem, Frans. 2003. Topics in contact linguistics. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 92. 27–99.

Wellens, Inneke. 2003. *The Nubi language of Uganda: An Arabic creole in Africa*. Nijmegen: Catholic University of Nijmegen. (Doctoral dissertation).

Winford, Donald. 2005. Contact-induced change: Classification and processes. *Diachronica* 22(2). 373–427.

Winford, Donald. 2008. Processes of creole formation and related contact-induced language change. *Journal of Language Contact* 2(1). 124–145.