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INTRODUCTION

Overview

The sociolinguistics of Arabic varieties is much more complex than the conventional nomenclature of Arabic dialects may lead the non-specialist to believe. One hears or reads of linguistic entities such as “Egyptian Arabic,” “Syrian Arabic,” “Moroccan Arabic,” which imply that each of these is a singular, cohesive unit, which one can describe, study, and become proficient in. Furthermore, these nation-state-based labels create the illusion that today’s political borders, many of which are artificial colonial or post-colonial creations of the early-to-mid 20th century, are able not only to each contain a single dialect of Arabic, but also delimit the beginnings and endings of dialect areas, as if political events are the sole factors in the formation of isoglosses.

Compare Arabic to another well-studied language, e.g., English, and it becomes clear. While in some instances it may be useful to distinguish “British English” from “American English” from “Canadian English” and so forth, the multitude of sociolinguistic studies now at our disposal from each of these countries demonstrates just how limited these taxonomies are. Add to that regional, social, interpersonal and intrapersonal variation, and – most importantly to the case we shall be presenting henceforth: migration, isolation, and dialect contact – and it will become clear that in Arabic, as in other languages, a fine-tuning of our understanding and definition of dialect boundaries is in order.

The current study concerns a Palestinian speech community. This community can, actually, be viewed as two communities which have split from one another as a result of ethnic cleansing and displacement and subsequent immersion in a third community. More specifically, the city of Jaffa, on the Mediterranean coast of central Palestine, which had been a thriving
cultural, intellectual and economic urban center of the Arab Palestinian community (Levine 2005), was brutally emptied of over 90% of its inhabitants in 1948 during the ‘Catastrophe’ (Nakba in Arabic), the Zionist-propagated ethnic cleansing of Palestine, which led to the establishment of the Jewish-majority State of Israel. The 90+% of Jaffa residents who were driven out of the city became refugees, many of whom fled to Gaza, some 69 km south of Jaffa, on the same Mediterranean coast (Levine 2005; Morris 2008; Pappé 2006).

Being a refugee in Gaza carries some degree of social markedness, as well as the refugee status that most speakers are afforded by the United Nations. Part of this social markedness has to do with dialect differences. The traditional dialect of Jaffa differs from that of Gaza in a number of interesting ways. This is one prime example of two dialects, both urban, both Palestinian, both coastal-Mediterranean – three features which are known in Arabic dialectology to indicate convergence of dialectal features – which have nonetheless diverging features, as we will demonstrate below.

Our analysis provides an examination of the linguistic outcomes of politically induced and maintained dialect contact in one of the world’s most volatile areas. At the same time, we suggest that a sociolinguistic variable of high social salience in the Arabic speaking world is being re-contextualized as an identity marker in Gaza City through processes of adequation, the pursuit of ‘socially recognized sameness’ (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 383). What may once have been considered a variable split along fairly straightforward sociolinguistic lines has taken on new meaning in Gaza City to create and maintain identity within a community of Jaffan refugees.

As Bucholtz and Hall (2004: 371) have argued, the systemic organization of difference, which is in our specific case, linguistic difference, is an output of identity work. At the same time
identity, particularly ethnic, often emerges in cases of contact and allows communities and individuals to avoid the ‘de-ethnicizing process of citizenship in the nation-state’ (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 371; also see Fishman 1999). While it is true that Palestine does not today constitute a full-fledged nation-state, it is impossible to deny that some wider conceptualization of Palestinian identity does exist. However, this larger sense of identity is intertwined with hyper-localized identity frames tied to specific geographic locations, many of which have been physically erased as a result of forced migration.

By examining the outcomes of dialect contact we show how the enduring relationship between sense of self and specific, localized, community affiliations within the Palestinian community can be viewed linguistically. We argue that by viewing the linguistic practices of Jaffan refugees in Gaza City through a framework of adequation it is possible to highlight the wider social implications of dialect change as a result of contact in coastal Palestine. Following a discussion of the corpus that constitutes the data of the study, we describe and analyze the three sociolinguistic variables under investigation. Based on the results to be detailed below, our analysis then focuses its attention more directly on the final variable whose variants, we argue, index different aspects of community identity in Gaza and Palestine more generally.

The corpus

During a window of relative political and military calm, Author Y was able to obtain the necessary authorization to enter Gaza through Egypt for a period of four weeks and conduct fieldwork. In May 2013 Author Y interviewed 39 speakers in Gaza. Of this sample, 32 speakers
are from families that trace their history back to Gaza City, while the remaining seven speakers are refugees from Jaffa. Within this “refugee” group we include both persons who were born in Jaffa before 1948 and expelled during its ethnic cleansing (two out of the seven) and their offspring who were born in Gaza (the remaining five). Author X conducted fieldwork in Jaffa in 1999, 2004 and 2005, having interviewed 24 native speakers of the Jaffa dialect (23 of them in Jaffa proper, one in the village of Jaljulya, where one of the speakers had been internally displaced). Twelve additional speakers were interviewed by Author X in the West Bank cities of Ramallah and Jerusalem for comparison. In all cases, the data are derived from sociolinguistic interviews conducted by the authors with local speakers in or near their places of dwelling or employment. All interviews were recorded digitally, saved and backed up in several locations.

The current study is based on subsets of the samples from Author X’s Jaffa study and Author Y’s Gaza Study, constructed in a manner that allows for a preliminary understanding of the evolution of the Jaffa dialect over time and space. For this purpose, we extracted the seven speakers from the Gaza sample who were either born in Jaffa or were of Jaffa ancestry and identified as refugees from Jaffa (henceforth “Gaza speakers”). We supplemented the corpus with data from seven speakers from the Jaffa sample (henceforth “Jaffa speakers”). The speakers chosen from the Jaffa sample were each as close as possible in year of birth and of the same gender as one of the Gaza speakers, thus creating a relatively balanced sub-corpus.

(Table 1 here)
The speakers seen in Table 1 can be classified in the following manner:

1. Six speakers born in Jaffa who have remained Jaffa residents.

2. One speaker who was born in Jaffa and left in 1946 to marry, then displaced in 1948 and eventually resettled in a village near the border between modern-day Israel and the West Bank (on the Israeli side).

3. Two speakers who were born in Jaffa and were expelled to Gaza in 1948.

4. Five descendants of Jaffa-born Palestinians who were born in Gaza: two children of Jaffa natives and three grandchildren.

It may be argued that the speakers in (4) above should not be included in a study such as this. After all, they have spent their entire lives in Gaza, and report never having visited their ancestral town of Jaffa. Yet the social structure in Gaza is such that these speakers are still marked, both linguistically and socially, as refugees, and they very much identify with their Jaffa heritage. Among other things, this identification with Jaffa is a reminder to themselves and to their interlocutors that they are victims of the violence that had erupted in 1948. This situation is analogous to some extent with the situation described by Mesthrie (2007:148) regarding Indians living in South Africa under Apartheid. In the 1960s, Mesthrie reports: ‘Young speakers losing touch with their ancestral languages did not think of themselves as any less “Indian.”’ Similarly, in Gaza, Jaffan Palestinians who have lived their entire lives as refugees still maintain a direct link to their heritage not only through social and cultural ties that transcend geopolitical boundaries, but also, as we argue below, in their linguistic practices.

The analysis that follows aims to investigate three features which appear to have emerged as sociolinguistic variables in urban Palestinian Arabic. These variables are provided in Table 2 alongside the variants that are typical of the dialects of Jaffa and Gaza respectively, as well as
examples of the variation that is present in the data. Following our analysis of these variables in light of dialect contact we move on in the discussion to look at the broader social and identity-based implications of this type of linguistic contact.

(Table 2 here)

A note on demographics

Palestinians living in Jaffa, formerly an autonomous municipal entity and today part of the city of Tel Aviv–Jaffa, are in many ways full participants in the urban experience, culturally and financially. Despite their integrated status into the fabric of the larger metropolitan area, there appears to be some controversy surrounding the number of Palestinians currently living in Jaffa. Based on the most recent report by the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics, ‘Arabs’ (i.e., Palestinians) constitute 20.69% of Israel’s population of 8,114,000.

According to the demographic section of the 2012 statistical bulletin for the City of Tel Aviv–Jaffa, out of 404,800 people living in the city as a whole (Tel Aviv and Jaffa combined), at the end of 2011, 388,100 (95.87%) were ‘Jewish and other non-Arabs’ and the remaining 16,700 (4.13%) were ‘Arabs’ (i.e., Palestinians). The numbers reported by the League of the Arabs of Jaffa, a local group that describes its goal as ‘to preserve the Arab presence in Jaffa and to protect the rights of the Palestinians in Jaffa as an Arab Palestinian Minority [sic],’ are slightly higher, estimated to be around 23,000 individuals.

(Figure 1 here)
Palestinians in Gaza City experience a much different reality than that of their Jaffa counterparts. Based on reports from the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, the current population of the Gaza Strip is estimated at 1,819,982 of whom at least 70% (1,258,559) are refugees from other areas in historic Palestine. Gaza City itself has a population of over 566,000, with an additional 43,000 Palestinian refugees living in Beach Camp, a United Nations refugee camp on the shores of the Mediterranean in the heart of Gaza City. In addition to many indigenous Gaza Palestinians, a significant number of Palestinian refugees also call Gaza City home, living not only in the city’s official refugee camp, but throughout the many neighborhoods that comprise the city itself. As the results of our analysis of the three sociolinguistic variables presented below reflects, this demographic complexity in coastal Palestine has had clear linguistic consequences.

LENITION OF THE VOICED PHARYNGEAL FRICATIVE ($\emptyset$)

History of the variable

A purely phonological variable, the traditional voiced pharyngeal fricative /$\emptyset$/ is simultaneously a quintessential characteristic of virtually all varieties of Arabic (the main exception is Maltese) and one of the most vulnerable phonemes in the language. This is perhaps because of its rareness amongst the languages of the world, its articulatorily expensive production and its near-vocalic acoustic nature. In Author X (2014) robust quantitative evidence shows that in the contemporary Jaffa speech community, there is a tendency to lenite this phoneme in casual speech to [ʔ], $\emptyset$ or one of several vocalic realizations, and that this tendency is correlated with speakers’ contact with Modern Hebrew.

Hebrew, which, like Arabic, is a Semitic language, underwent a massive reduction of its phonemic inventory beginning in the late 19th century, when Jewish immigrants to Palestine
“revived” the language using a phonemic system that is very similar to those of the European languages that they spoke natively (the most notable of these being Yiddish; see Wexler 1990; Zuckermann 2003). These European languages lack many of the historic Semitic phonemes: pharyngeal consonants, emphatic consonants, uvular stops. This has resulted in a merger with more cross-linguistically available phonemes present in the inventories of these European languages. This reduction in the Hebrew phonemic inventory has had a contact effect on the Arabic spoken by Palestinian citizens of Israel (such as those who remained in Jaffa). The lenition of /ʕ/ is one consequence of this contact.

Author X (2014) also sampled a number of speakers from the West Bank (Ramallah and Jerusalem) and compared their realization of (ʕ) to that of the Jaffa speakers. The results showed that speakers from these West Bank communities do as an aggregate lenite the pharyngeal fricative less often than their Jaffa counterparts. This is consistent with the finding within Jaffa that speakers with more contact with Hebrew lenite more frequently, as contact between Arabic and Hebrew in the West Bank is minimal at best. Their speech, however, is not completely free of lenition.

In terms of contact with Hebrew, the Gaza speech community is even more isolated than those communities examined in the West Bank. Contact with Hebrew is virtually non-existent for the vast majority of Gaza residents and lenition of (ʕ) as a result of contact plays a dramatically more limited role than it does in the Jaffa case. Even the older Gaza speakers in our sample, who were born in Jaffa, are not expected to have had significant contact with Hebrew or its speakers, as they were all displaced from Jaffa prior to the city becoming bilingual and prior to the introduction of Hebrew instruction in its schools.
Results

Author X (2014) established that at least five variants of the (ʕ) variable are in play:

1. Voiced pharyngeal fricative [ʕ]
2. Glottal stop [ʔ]
3. Syllabic vocalization, i.e., two vowels, whether identical or not, separated by a syllable boundary – V.V
4. Compensatory lengthening of an adjacent vowel – V: 
5. Deletion – Ø

The resultant variability in this phoneme can be seen in the examples below from the data:

1'. arbaʕa ~ arbaʕa ‘four’
2'. seʕa ~ seʔa ‘hour’
3'. maw.dʕuʕ ~ maw.dʕuʕ ‘subject’
4'. maʕruʕ ~ ma:ruʕ ‘known’
5'. mʕallmi:n ~ malmi:n ‘teachers’

Upon running both linear and logical regressions using Rbrul (Johnson 2009) with various combinations of the Jaffa and Jaffa+West Bank data, it became evident that the phonetic distinctions among variants 2-5 above do not contribute much to the analysis. For our current study, therefore, we only considered a binary model of variable rule analysis, whereby any value greater than 1 would be considered an application of the variable rule lenition, and 1 would be considered non-application.
In the initial run of the combined data coded for Jaffa and Gaza speakers, we considered Speaker as a ‘random effects’ factor group. While the regression found this factor group to be significant, there was little, if any, other advantage to continue including Speaker in any further analysis, as no specific speaker proved to have any meaningful influence on the results as a whole, and in fact caused other, “real” social factors, to be thrown out. In other words, while the factor group was found to be significant against other factor groups, no individual speaker stood out, and no particular patterning of speakers could be discerned within this factor group.

(Table 3)

(Table 4)

The results for the Community factor group are fairly straightforward and further confirm the hypothesis that contact with Hebrew contributes to the favoring of lenition of the voiced pharyngeal fricative. The speakers who remained in Jaffa and now live alongside Hebrew speakers, have been exposed to a complex system of education, government, commerce and administration in Hebrew. They are, in fact, for the most part, fully bilingual, with many current-day Jaffans attesting that they feel more comfortable speaking, reading, writing and doing business in Hebrew than in Arabic. And it is this group of speakers within Jaffa that shows the higher tendency to pronounce a lenited (ʕ).

Looking at Year of Birth as a significant factor, a more nuanced explanation may be in order. One may be surprised to find that the youngest group of speakers is the least advanced in what appears to be a change in progress in the Jaffa dialect. However, two things must be taken into account. First, Author X (2014) has found that even in Jaffa alone the youngest group of
speakers was the one least prone to lenition of (ʕ). This stems from the inclusion in this group of both very young (high school-aged) speakers and older speakers, in a manner in which the high-schooilers did not dominate the group. Indeed, when the youngest speakers, high school students, were singled out for investigation, they were found to be favoring lenition.

Secondly, the youngest group of speakers in the Gaza subset of our sample are probably best characterized for the sake of this study not merely as young – and therefore expected to be innovative linguistically – but as the most removed from life in Jaffa, among speakers of the Jaffa dialect. This permits us to formulate two, perhaps complementary, propositions:

1. Lenition of the voiced pharyngeal fricative, as a variable rule, is inherent to the Jaffa dialect, regardless of contact with Hebrew, more than it is for the Gaza dialect.

2. Since we know that contact with Hebrew is a salient factor in Palestinian Arabic (Author X 2014; Hawker 2013; Henkin-Roitfarb 2011), extreme lack of contact amongst half of this younger combined group is yet another contributing factor to the results presented above.

In this respect, lenition of (ʕ) appears to be happening to a much greater extent within the speech of those speakers who have remained in Jaffa, with Gaza speakers leniting much less frequently. The result for Gaza speakers reflects a situation in which their speech has diverged from what is today the norm in the Jaffa dialect. In a similar fashion for the remaining two variables, we see additional instances of Gaza speakers diverging from the norms of the Jaffa dialect, while converging towards local Gazan linguistic norms.

THE FEMININE GENDER MARKER (AH)§

History of the variable
This variable, which pertains to a specific Arabic morpheme, is phonologically conditioned.

Through an examination of earlier descriptive work, it is possible to posit a foundational description of the conditioning environments for vowel raising of the feminine marker (Grotzfeld 1980; Levin 1994; Versteegh 2001). With respect to general processes of vowel raising (imaːla in Arabic) in Levantine dialects (e.g., Palestinian, Syrian, Lebanese), the following rules have been posited (see Grotzfeld 1980:181; Levin 1994:44-45; Al-Wer 2007:68):

1. The default vowel of the feminine ending is -e – the “raised” variant.9

2. The vowel of this ending is -a in the following cases:
   a. after ‘back’ consonants (i.e., pharyngeal, glottal, ‘emphatic’/pharyngealized, post-velar) – ḥ, ᵛ, ᵉ, ᵐ, ᵐˤ, ᵐˤˤ, ᵇ, ᵇˤ, x, y, q.
   b. after r, but only if preceding the r there is no high front vowel. This is true both for words with a synchronic i(ː) vowel before r or, in some cases, if there is a historic i vowel before the r which had been deleted due to a process in many of these dialects whereby short vowels in unstressed syllables tend to delete. In the latter case, there is usually variation between -a and -e as the feminine ending vowel (e.g., n-nasˤra ~ n-nasˤre [< n-nasˤira], ‘Nazareth’).

The resultant variability in the different environments of /r/ is illustrated in the examples below10:

1. *fazara11 ‘tree’ [fazara] (no raising)
2. *fatra ‘period’ [fatra] (no raising)
4. *sʔayː-ra ‘small’ [zɣiː-re] (/i/ in preceding syllable)

Raising of the feminine marker has been attested in most of the major urban centers throughout the Levant and is a dialect feature often associated with the dialects of the major Levantine capitals. This type of raising has been described linguistically for the cases of Jerusalem (Levin 1994; Rosenhouse 2007), Amman (Al-Wer 2007), Damascus (Lentin 2007), and Beirut (Naím 2007), among others. This distinguishes Levantine urban dialects from other areas, notably Cairo (Woidich 2007), which do not raise the feminine marker, leaving its realization in the neighborhood of [a].

In the case of Gaza City, the present home of the Jaffa refugees included in this study, treatment of the feminine marker is limited to the two primary sources available on the dialect, Bergsträßer (1915) and Salonen (1979, 1980). Bergsträßer’s early dialect atlas details no raising of the feminine marker in Gaza City (Bergsträßer 1915: map 6). In contrast to Bergsträßer’s account, Salonen’s (1979, 1980) texts do suggest some degree of raising for this feature. This raising manifests with the vowel in question being raised from [a] to [e], and also as high as [i] in certain examples (Salonen 1979: 40). However, most of Salonen’s informants were not actually from Gaza City itself, but from the surrounding rural area (de Jong 2000: ch. 5; see comment 8).

In addition to these two earlier dialectological works, a series of texts from Gaza collected by Barnea (1973) is available. Examples provided in Barnea (1975: 4) show variable raising of the feminine marker, but a closer examination of Barnea’s data reflects that on the whole the texts present limited instances of raising.

(Figure 2 here)
In contrast to the Gaza case, when examining the linguistic information available on the dialect of Jaffa, (e.g., Al-Wer 2007: 68-71), [e] emerges as the default variant of (AH) with [a] appearing in specific phonological environments, as described earlier. At the regional level, Al-Wer notes, ‘in general, the non-raising dialects are generally peripheral, localized, non-urban dialects, whereas all of the socially dominant dialects are raising dialects, such as the dialects of Beirut, Damascus, and Jerusalem’ (Al-Wer 2002: 71). The dialect of Gaza City, therefore, can be viewed as a more peripheral dialect. Despite this, in reality, the dialect situation of Gaza City is more complex, as it utilizes a collection of both urban and Bedouin linguistic features. In light of Al-Wer’s discussion on the phonological conditions which favor raising in urban Palestinian Arabic we would expect a scenario in which speakers of a Jaffa dialect background would raise this vowel in line with the phonology of the dialect. A closer examination of the results reveals that for Jaffa refugees living in Gaza, this is not entirely the case.

(AH) Results

Based on the conditioning environments mentioned above for this variable, as a first step in the analysis all tokens of the feminine marker were coded for their preceding phonological environment. Our examination of this feature confirms the findings in earlier research with respect to phonological environments that condition raising, with the raising of the feminine marker blocked when following emphatic, pharyngeal, and glottal consonants. Following /r/, raising was also blocked unless there was an /i/ or /iː/ in the preceding syllable (Al-Wer 2007: 68; Levin 1994:44-45).

Because of this, those tokens of the feminine marker that occurred in situations where the preceding phonological environment blocked raising were excluded from the analysis, since no variation is attested in this environment. After excluding tokens that do not meet the conditions
for potential raising the sample contains 825 tokens of the feminine marker that occur in a phonological environment conducive to raising. Examples of the variability present in the data include:

5. [yazza] vs [yazze] - ‘Gaza’


7. [maglu:ba] vs [maglu:be] - ‘Maqlu:ba’ (a traditional food dish)

8. [hilwa] vs [hilwe] - ‘beautiful’ (fem.)

When conducting the statistical analysis of the data individual Speaker was again treated as a ‘random effects’ group, in an effort to determine if it played a statistically significant role in influencing the quantitative results. However, as was the case with (ʕ) above, although Speaker as a group was statistically significant, no specific individual within that group was found to have a significant effect on influencing the variation in the data. As a result Speaker was dropped from the model. After ruling out Speaker as a potential correlate of variation, our statistical analysis suggests that in the sample both Community and Year of Birth emerge as factors significant in determining variation in the data. These results are provided in Table 5 and Table 6.

(Table 5 here)

(Table 6 here)

Within the speech of Jaffa speakers, the data exhibit no true variation. These Jaffa speakers raise the feminine marker in line with the phonology of their dialect, as would be
expected. This finding confirms that for these speakers (AH) is not a true variable. Yet, some potential exceptions from the data collected in Jaffa should be highlighted. We argue that these apparent exceptions reflect ongoing processes of nativization into the phonology of the Jaffa dialect, which result in examples like those presented below.

9. *n-na:šra* ‘Nazareth’ (no raising, despite a historical /i/ in a preceding syllable)

10. *šansurija* ‘racism’ (no raising, a word adapted from Standard Arabic)

11. *huriija ~ hurije* ‘liberty’ (variable production between [a] and [e])

12. *hukumijja ~ hukumije* (variable production between [a] and [e])

‘governmental’

Gaza speakers, regardless of other factors, show a strong tendency towards non-raising of this morpheme in their speech. When viewing this tendency in concert with a history of forced migration that has been a major contributing factor in the present demographic and linguistic makeup of the Gaza Strip, it is clear that contact between dialects of Palestinian Arabic is rampant in Gaza City. As Author Y (2013) has documented, the indigenous dialect of the city does not raise this vowel, reflecting a situation wherein for speakers who are not of a refugee background (AH) is not a linguistic variable at all, being categorically realized as [a]. As a result, the tendency evidenced in the data, whereby Jaffa refugees are seen to be converging towards local Gaza norms is in line with what one may expect.

The oldest generation of Gaza speakers shows the greatest tendency towards using a raised variant of the feminine marker, but for them this is not true vowel raising. Rather, they maintain a feature native to their traditional Jaffa dialect (Al-Wer 2007; Shahin 2007). Within
the middle generation of the sample there is now a tendency towards the lowering of the Jaffan [e] realization in the direction of what we call the unraised Gazan [a] variant (Author Y 2013). The only exception to this comes from a single speaker, Sabeer (born in 1960), who does exhibit some use of the raised variant [e] in his speech. However, Sabeer self-reports as being bi-dialectal, and notes at the end of the interview that his traditional Jaffa dialect is one that is primarily reserved for interactions with other family members, stating that he speaks differently fi ʃa:rif ‘in the street.’

Sabeer’s linguistic production and his bi-dialectalism reflect a linguistic state, which of course is not unique to Arabic or the Middle East. Mesthrie (2007: 152) discusses the conundrum faced by (mostly monolingual) Indian South Africans when contemplating travel to (multilingual) India. While Mesthrie was referring to cases of language shift, we argue that an analogy may be drawn with dialect shift. The Palestinian case differs from the Indian-South African one also in its much more confined geographical span. However, the isolation in which the Gaza community has found itself, especially since 1967 and even more so in the last decade, intensifies this connection despite the short distance between the Jaffa dialect’s place of origin and the Gaza Strip.13 We will return to the Palestine—South Africa analogy later in this analysis.

Sabeer’s attests that his native Jaffa dialect is one which he associates with notions of “home” or “family,” contrasting it with a variety whose domain is located outside the home and in the wider community of Gaza City. In sociolinguistic terminology, we can interpret this association with the idea of indexicality (Eckert 2008; Silverstein 2003), where his native Jaffa dialect points to more intimate associations. Although Sabeer does not elaborate on the particulars of this other variety, it is presumed to be one more in line with the traditional dialect of Gaza City as it is today (Author Y 2013).
The youngest Gaza speakers show a reversal of the trends witnessed in the earlier generations of speakers in the sample, now strongly favoring the unraised [a] realization of the feminine marker. This tendency towards the loss of the raised [e] realization appears to be a direct result of contact with speakers of other Arabic dialects. For the case of the final variable we examine in this study, we again see Gaza speakers diverging from the traditional Jaffa dialect. However, we argue that the high social salience of the variable discussed below has forced a recontextualization of this feature, tying it to wider issues of identity.

THE UVULAR STOP (Q)

History of the variable

We now turn to the variable (Q), which is perhaps the most widely examined linguistic feature in sociolinguistic studies of Arabic (e.g., Abd El-Jawad 1981, 1987; Al-Wer 2007; Al-Wer and Herin 2011; Hachimi 2007, 2012; Haeri 1997; Holes 1983). Versteegh describes the diachrony of this phoneme as having once been /g/, the voiced counterpart of the voiceless /k/. This voiced realization is still a prominent feature of Bedouin dialects of Arabic and is in line with the early Arabic grammarian Sibawayhi’s classification of /q/ as madghu:ra, the Arabic equivalent of ‘voiced’ (Versteegh 2001: 21, 89). Al-Jallad (2015) argues that there is actually no evidence of a voiced velar representing /q/ in pre-Islamic material or in the transcriptions of Arabic from the first Islamic century, often represented in Greek orthography. Rather, it is likely that as in other Semitic languages, the /q/ had evolved from an ejective (glottalized) velar, unmarked for voicing. He also notes (p.c.) that madghu:ra in this context may imply some sort of voiced uvular consonant [ɢ], but not a velar [g]. We maintain that Al-Jallad’s reconstruction is more consistent
both with the recent findings reported in his 2015 paper and with recent scholarship in comparative Semitic linguistics.

In urban dialects of the Levant /q/ is typically realized as a glottal stop [ʔ], with rural and Bedouin dialects often realizing this phoneme as [k] and [g], respectively. Al-Jallad notes (p.c.) that it is in fact plausible to assume that this contemporary glottal realization is a relic of the old glottalized velar, i.e., ”k’ > ʔ. As was noted above for the case of the feminine marker, however, these types of classifications provided by Cadora (1992) are not set in stone. The dialect of Amman represents a case in point, with (Q) being realized variably between [g] and [ʔ] (Al-Wer 2007; Versteegh 2001: 153). The expansion of the major regional capitals has aided in creating a situation wherein the dialects of the countryside are being replaced by those of the major cities, which in turn helps to form regional linguistic standards that run counter to the notion of ‘standard’ proposed in earlier works on diglossia in the Arab world (Ferguson 1959; Haeri 1997, 2000; Versteegh 2001: 153). These works have treated the variety known as Modern Standard Arabic (or in its older manifestation, Classical Arabic) as the standard to which educated Arabic speakers aspire in their naturally occurring speech. However, as Haeri (2000) points out, based on Ibrahim (1986), “Standard Arabic” is not naturally spoken or acquired by anyone in the Arabic speaking world, including the educated upper class. In every Arab speech community there is a local standard, often an urban one, which is based on some vernacular. This has created a situation in which different standards exist across different communities.

In dialects of Palestinian Arabic, the following four primary variants of the uvular stop /q/ have been attested (Shahin 2007: 527):

13. [k] - voiceless velar stop
14. [ʔ] - glottal stop
15. [g] - voiced velar stop

16. [q] – voiceless uvular stop

In addition to the four realizations above, a fifth is present in some rural Palestinian dialects, where ‘pharyngealized’ q is realized between a velar and uvular (transcribed as k [k‘]) (Shahin 2007: 527). The uvular stop [q] was once a prominent feature in the dialect of Nablus in the northern West Bank, but has since given way to the [ʔ] variant (Abd El-Jawad 1987: 361). The voiceless velar stop [k] is attested in rural dialects of the West Bank and village dialects across historic Palestine. The glottal stop [ʔ] is the prominent dialectal realization for /q/ in many of Palestine’s urban centers including: Jerusalem, present day Nablus, Jaffa, and Ramallah (which traditionally had [k]) (Abd El-Jawad 1987; Author X 2000; Rosenhouse 2007; Shahin 2007). The voiced velar stop, [g], is a dialect feature that is most prominent in the Bedouin dialects of Palestine, particularly in the Nagab Desert region and the village dialects of the southern West Bank (Cleveland 1967; Palva 1984; Shahin 2007; Shawarbah 2012). Finally, the conservative voiceless uvular variant [q] is known to be preserved primarily by members of rural Druze communities in the Galilee and Mt. Carmel regions of northern Palestine (Blanc 1953: 68-69).

Al-Wer and Herin (2011) have made the important point that in a number of studies of Arabic sociolinguistics (Q) has been misidentified as a variable in situations where no true variation takes place. Damascus is cited as a primary example in this respect, a dialect which features [ʔ] as its standard dialectal realization of /q/. While the true voiceless uvular [q] does occur in Damascus, as Al-Wer and Herin note, it is confined to lexical items from Standard Arabic or instances of extremely formal speech. The lack of true variation between [ʔ] and [q] in
Damascus creates a situation in which /q/ is not variable in the dialect, despite being labeled as such in previous studies. They offer Beirut and Jerusalem as further examples of this point, wherein /q/ has been misidentified as a variable in situations where no real variation occurs (Al-Wer and Herin 2011: 60-61).

From a variationist sociolinguistic perspective, the fact that discrete dialects show variation for a feature across speech communities is not sufficient for a determination that the feature in question is variable. What makes a variable a variable is the existence of intra-speaker and/or inter-speaker variation within the same speech community. Consider the following statement from Weinreich, Labov and Herzog (1968: 101): ‘The key to a rational conception of language change—indeed, of language itself—is the possibility of describing orderly differentiation in a language serving a community.’ For (Q) this is rare, although as we will demonstrate below, in a place with a tumultuous history of population changes such as Gaza, the emergence of (Q) as a true sociolinguistic variable is unsurprising.

(Q) Results

Within the subset of data collected from Gaza speakers, (Q) has emerged as a sociolinguistic variable, showing a statistically significant correlation with gender, with respect to variation between the [g] and [ʔ] realizations of this phoneme. There is some indication that age might be a contributing factor as well, although our model did not find age to be statistically significant. Contrastively, in the speech of Jaffa speakers /q/ is not a true variable, being categorically realized as [ʔ], in line with the traditional urban dialect of Jaffa (Author X 2000; Shahin 2007). The only exceptions to this categorical realization can be found in certain lexical items, which may show variability based on their incomplete nativization into the lexicon of the dialect. These
types of words are all either borrowings from formal registers such as Standard Arabic or place names. Some examples of these exceptions can be seen in:

17.  kʕawmiyya – ‘nationalism’
18. ʕariːqa – ‘deep-rooted’
19.  kʕalansawe – (toponym)

In contrast to the invariability of this phoneme in the dialect of Jaffa, the position of /q/ in the dialect of Gaza City, which bears directly on those speakers of Jaffa descent who are refugees in Gaza, is less clear-cut. The earliest sources on the dialect noted the glottal [ʔ] variant as the prominent realization of /q/ in the dialect (Bergsträßer 1915). The later texts collected by Salonen (1979, 1980) present a dialect situation in which the voiced velar [ɡ] has become the predominant realization for /q/, presumably as a result of dialect contact with neighboring Bedouin tribes, all of which feature the [ɡ] realization of /q/ in their dialects (de Jong 2000). This is further confirmed by an examination of Barnea’s (1973) texts, as well as Al-Shareef’s (2002) work on the neighboring dialect of the Jabalia refugee camp north of Gaza City, which show widespread use of the [ɡ] realization of /q/.

When examining the data from Gaza speakers it is possible to see a clear intrusion of the traditional Gaza [ɡ] (Author Y 2013, 2016; Barnea 1973; Salonen 1979, 1980). However, this has not resulted in the complete displacement of the traditional Jaffan [ʔ]. Instead, for Gaza speakers, (Q) appears to be shifting, with the realization of this phoneme splitting along gender lines. Female speakers of Jaffan heritage show the highest likelihood to realize (Q) as the traditional Jaffan [ʔ], while male Jaffan speakers in the sample have overwhelmingly adopted the voiced velar [ɡ]. Additionally, as Author Y (2016) points out, (Q) is also a variable in the speech
of indigenous Gazans, however female speakers in this community have adopted the glottal realization of (Q) to a much smaller degree. We argue that the high degree of maintenance of the Jaffan [ʔ] across generations in the speakers examined in the present study further supports the notion that (Q) is doing identity related work in Gaza City, given that the speech of male speakers has changed so dramatically.

In the statistical results presented in Table 7 and Table 8 Speaker was again treated as a ‘random effects’ group to determine its potential influence on the variability present in the data. As was the case with the previous variables, however, it was removed from the final model as no single speaker was determined to have a statistically significant effect on the variation present in the data (both tables below reproduced from Author Y 2016; they represent data from the entire original Gaza corpus, which includes both Jaffa refugees and indigenous Gazans).

(Table 7 here)

(Table 8 here)

The tendency for female speakers to spearhead the realization of (Q) as [ʔ] has been noted in numerous other studies of Arabic sociolinguistics. It has been documented in the Arabic of Nablus in Palestine (Abd El-Jawad 1987), Amman in Jordan (Abd El-Jawad 1981; Al-Wer 2007), and the Egyptian capital of Cairo (Haeri 1997),15 as well as others. In the Levant [ʔ] represents a supralocal variant of (Q) (Al-Wer 1997) and prior work on this variable has shown that female speakers tend to opt for these supralocal variants in their speech, while male speakers opt for more localized variants (see Milroy et al. 1994 for a parallel case in northeast England). The data collected from Jaffa refugees in Gaza are no exception to this. Despite being relative
newcomers (in sociolinguistic terms) to Gaza City, male Jaffa refugees show extremely high rates of usage of this variant (Author Y 2016). Based on the results presented above, the situation of (Q) appears to resemble a straightforward case of dialect contact and change. However, as we argue below, the high social salience of this linguistic feature may be carrying a heavier workload in Gaza City which has recontextualized its variants as identity markers for Jaffan refugees.

DISCUSSION

We have noted previously that the [ʔ] variant of (Q) represents a supralocal variant and that female speakers show a clear tendency to opt for these variants across the Levant (Al-Wer 1997, 2007). In another analogy to the South African sociolinguistic situation – this time from the post-Apartheid era – Mesthrie (2010:28) refers to the linguistic ‘acculturation to the White norm’ for the English vowel in GOOSE. He concludes that Black females form the social group that is the most prone to this acculturation. This appears to be not merely another case of females leading a phonological change. These speakers stood out among females and males of various South African ethnic groups, and their linguistic innovation has as its target a sort of supralocal standard – similar to the supralocal glottal stop variant of (Q) which we report about here. This tendency could also be seen to reify the indexicality of this variant with notions of “femininity” or “urbanness,” a point raised by speakers themselves during fieldwork in the Gaza Strip, and the oft-reported stigmatic interpretation of the glottal variant when used by male speakers or in non-urban communities (Al-Wer 2014; Eckert 2008; Hachimi 2012; Silverstein 2003).

Having analyzed the three variables presented in this study, it has become clear that while all of them deserve close scrutiny and further investigation, (Q) is the variable that bears the
broadest general implications. (ʕ) and (AH) both appear to be heading in directions typical of
changes in progress, which is interesting for the study of Arabic dialects given what is still a
general lack of research in Arabic sociolinguistics. Yet (Q) is emerging as a much more salient
variable that may illustrate processes related to identity that are relevant cross-linguistically.

As we have mentioned above, in most other dialects it is not worthy of the label
‘variable’ at all. Furthermore, it is a variable that has a very clear supralocal variant, which can
have implications for other, much more widespread dialects, as well as to sociolinguistic theory.
Finally, it is the one variable in this study that attracts the most social awareness from speakers.
(ʕ) and (AH) appear to still be flying under the radar for most (if not all) speakers. But members
of the community time and time again express their sometimes quite emotional reactions to
people using this or that variant of (Q).

Perhaps the gender distinction, which is quite robust for this variable, is the key to
explaining why this is so. People are aware of all sorts of gender-conforming and gender non-
conforming behaviors, and linguistic behaviors that fall along gender lines are not an exception.
We see this in many other speech communities in which female speakers are innovators of
linguistic change. In the Gaza/Jaffa case, as in the South African case reported by Mesthrie,
additional political and societal factors enter into the mix as well. In our final remarks, therefore,
we will pay closer attention to the (Q) variable than to the other two.

We argue when examining the place of (Q) in the speech of Gaza speakers that it is
possible to see an example of adequation, the long-term ‘pursuit of socially recognized
sameness’ (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 383), but one that has been realized sociolinguistically along
gender lines. As we have alluded to, conceptualizations of meaning as they relate to (Q) are not
inherently uniform. (Q) may do different kinds of identity-related work and take on different
social meanings at various levels within a given community. As we detailed at the beginning of our study, the result is a situation in which identity operates at different levels and in varied ‘markets’ for Jaffan refugees in Gaza City, located not only at an event/interaction based level, but also at more meta-pragmatic or meta-cultural levels (Agha 2007; Eckert 2000; Wortham 2006).

The linguistic practices of male Jaffa refugees in converging towards localized Gaza norms for (Q) (Author Y 2016) works to locate them as part of a wider Gaza community, one which is made up of Palestinians from varied geographic backgrounds. These practices, along with the reality that many refugees in Gaza are of dialect backgrounds that have [g] as their traditional realization of (Q), also works to mitigate the potential associations between specific variants of (Q) and “refugee speech” given the high social salience of this linguistic feature. Adequation in this sense further reifies the reality of the social, economic, and political situation of the Gaza Strip, a reality that is drastically different than that of many other Palestinian communities throughout the Middle East.

Simultaneously, the linguistic practices of female Gaza speakers represent perhaps another form of adequation, one which makes it possible to maintain a historically grounded notion of community located outside of Gaza City. In this sense, the use of the [ʔ] variant of (Q) does work to locate female speakers as ja:fa:wijje ‘Jaffan’ within a diverse linguistic environment. This aids in maintaining Jaffan identity over a period of time when the language of male speakers in this community seems to be more readily changing (see Hoffman 2008 for a related case in Morocco). Although the glottal realization of (Q) is supralocal in the region, the fact that it has not been more readily adopted among female speakers of an indigenous Gaza background (see Author Y 2013, 2016) serves to further validate the idea that the type of
adequation which we describe is also doing identity work in this specific context. At a more macro level, the practices of female speakers with respect to (Q) simultaneously situates them as part of the wider Palestinian community, given the prominent status of this variant throughout the Levant and in Palestine’s urban centers, regardless of the actual physical or geographic location of the speakers themselves.

The connection between linguistic production and different forms of identity work that we have proposed in relation to these Gaza speakers finds grounding in the work of other communities, notably the Indian South African community (Mesthrie 2007). As Mesthrie notes regarding the South African situation, ‘The gains of becoming bilingual in English were thus “outward” in terms of economic mobility and social integration within the broader South African society; while the subsequent impulse towards shift was more “inward” in terms of new identity formation as a close-knit Indian South African minority’ (Mesthrie 2007: 151). The Gaza case reflects a similar situation, but one which is intimately tied to processes of dialect contact that comes as a result of political conflict as opposed to bilingualism. The production we see in the Gaza speakers of our sample provides an example of how both inter-speaker and intra-speaker production can do identity work that looks both outward towards a wider more macro-oriented community while simultaneously looking inward as well.

CONCLUSION

Bucholtz and Hall have argued that processes of adequation can work to preserve community identity in situations of intense social or cultural change, while also allowing individuals to locate themselves within multiple identity frames at a given moment (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 383). The Palestinian community represents a clear case of intense social and cultural change that continues to evolve as the result of seven decades of protracted political conflict. This has
dispersed a once geographically localized community across the entirety of the Middle East and has fractured, in every sense of the word, many aspects of Palestinian life and community identity. What was once simply Palestinian can now be divided and compartmentalized into refugee, Gazan, West Banker, tama:nija w-?arbaši:n (lit., “’48,” refers to Palestinian citizens of Israel, who as a group have shifted to this status in 1948), etc. Naturally, language exists as part of this social and cultural milieu and, as the results of this study show, continues to evolve alongside and as a result of the changes taking place at various levels within the Palestinian community. As our analysis suggests, dialect contact in this sense has laid the foundation for the refashioning of one of Arabic’s most socially salient linguistic features into a marker of identity that locates speakers as members of communities both locally and across geographic, political, and social borders.

NOTES

2 1,678,400 people. This is based on the Central Bureau of Statistics’ Monthly Bulletin of Statistics - December 2013, published 7 January 2014:


5 http://www.unrwa.org/where-we-work
For a number of social and political reasons, some Palestinian refugees do not formally register with the United Nations, so in reality the percentage of the Gaza population that is of a refugee background is higher than the numbers reported by UNRWA.


7 Also note the degeminated [l]. Variable loss of germination is believed to be another consequence of Arabic-Hebrew contact.

8 Note that “(AH)” is a mnemonic based on the history of Arabic and the glyph used in Standard Arabic to denote the feminine ending. It does not imply the synchronic presence of a /h/ sound in the varieties of Arabic discussed here.

9 The reason this variant is considered “raised” is that in Standard Arabic the feminine ending is invariantly -a.

10 Forms on the left represent these lexical items as they would be in Modern Standard Arabic, which we take as a ‘default’, although it is not a language spoken natively by anyone in the Arabic speaking world.

11 * Indicates the underlying and/or historic form.

12 See particularly Ch. 5 in de Jong (2000) for a more in-depth description of these features. In particular de Jong offers a comparison between the dialect of Gaza City and the neighboring sedentary dialect of Al-Arish in Egypt’s Sinai Peninsula.

13 A host of studies in North America have been conducted in isolated communities, especially islands off the shores of the Carolinas and Maryland. Schilling-Estes (2002) goes into great detail explaining the intricacies of isolation and its effect on speech patterns across generations in the Lumbee Native American community in Robeson County, North Carolina and on Smith Island, Maryland. Neither of these cases seem as extreme in their isolation as the Gaza Strip, but
the principles are similar. Whereas much of her data demonstrates decreasing isolation and retention of dialect variability, one may postulate that the converse is true, as in the Gaza case: increased isolation causes loss of dialect differences and further assimilation with the host dialect.

14 Bearing de Jong’s (2000) cautions in mind about the reliability of Salonen’s informants, Author Y (2013, 2015) showed quite clearly that in the dialect of Gaza City today the voiced velar [g] is the primary realization of (Q), but that this variable is potentially shifting along sociolinguistic lines.

15 The Cairene case described by Haeri is more complex. Cairene Arabic has undergone the shift *q>*ʔ. However, [q] is re-emerging as a possible variant (the other being a glottal stop) in certain innovative lexical items, which entered the dialect long after this shift occurred (Haeri 1997, ch. 4).
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### Table 1. Speaker demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Umm Khalil</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Jaffa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Jaffa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layla</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryam</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Jaffa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabihah</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Jaffa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabeer</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazid</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Jaffa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamil</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Jaffa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamim</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wajdi</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tariq</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Jaffa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Realization of the variables (Q), (AH), and (ʕ) in the speech of residents of Jaffa and refugees of Jaffa heritage in the Gaza Strip

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variants in the Gaza dialect</th>
<th>Variants in the Jaffa dialect</th>
<th>Examples of alternations in Gaza City</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q)</td>
<td>[g] ~ [ʔ]</td>
<td>[ʔ]</td>
<td>gahwa ~ ?ahwa</td>
<td>‘coffee’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AH)</td>
<td>[a] ~ [e]</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>hilwa ~ hilwe</td>
<td>‘pretty’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ʕ)</td>
<td>[ʕ] ~ [ʔ] ~ [V:]</td>
<td>[ʕ] ~ [ʔ] ~ [V:]</td>
<td>ba?de:n ~ baʔde:n</td>
<td>‘afterwards’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[V.V] ~ Ø</td>
<td>[V.V] ~ Ø</td>
<td>ba:de:n ~ ba.a.de:n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bade:n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Lenition of (ʕ) correlated with Year of Birth ($R^2=0.051 \ p=0.0273$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>Logodds</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948-1973</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1948</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974 &amp; after</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Lenition of (ʕ) correlated with Community ($R^2=0.051 \ p=7.35e-07$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Logodds</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaffa</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>-0.381</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. (AH) correlated with Year of Birth ($R^2 = 0.559 \ p=1.8e-09$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of birth</th>
<th>Logodds</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974 and after</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-1973</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1948</td>
<td>-0.816</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. (AH) correlated with Community ($R^2 = 0.559 \ p=1.85e-89$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Logodds</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaffa</td>
<td>-1.951</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Rbrul results for (Q) by Gender ($R^2 = .473 \ p=2.54e-29$) (from Author Y 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Tokens</th>
<th>%?</th>
<th>Log-Odds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>46% (N=123)</td>
<td>1.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>13% (N=40)</td>
<td>-1.437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Cross tabulation of (Q) in the speech of Jaffa refugees in Gaza City by Gender (from Author Y 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>[ʔ]</th>
<th>[g]</th>
<th>Total tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Gaza Strip Digital Elevation Map, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elevation in Meters</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref.: ARU, Geo-Informatics Department, 2008