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ABSTRACT

This paper studies the mutual dialectal exchanges between the urban dialect of Tlemcen and the rural dialect of Ain el Hout, aiming at determining the degree of influence of both dialects on each other. It also reviews some particular characteristics of both of them. Based on a sociolinguistic analysis, on the linguistic history of each variety, and relying on the Structuralist Approach of Pierre Bourdieu, with all its terminological concepts, the results obtained are interpreted. The current study reveals that Ain el Hout speakers tend to imitate the way Tlemcenians speak for historical, ethnic and socio-economic reasons.
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INTRODUCTION

This study tries to investigate the sociolinguistic impact of Tlemcen Arabic (hereafter TA) on the community of Ain el Hout; an area located in the North of Tlemcen. That is, it is fundamentally concerned with “the mutual influence between urban and rural dialects as a comparative sociolinguistic study between TA dialect and its counterpart of Ain el Hout. It also sheds some light on the attitudes of Ain el Hout individuals towards some of their local dialect features and their speech in general. Both qualitative and quantitative approaches are opted for to investigate the concrete aspects of the dialectal exchange between both speech communities focusing on a set of phonological and morphological variables.

In fact, there has always been a tight relationship between the village of Ain el Hout and Tlemcen town; a relationship which appears at different levels and in distinct domains, but the most primordial connection, and which represents the central core of this study is a dialectal one. This paper, hence, attempts to unveil the nature of that relationship which links both urban TA and the rural Arabic dialect of Ain el Hout.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The current research paper endeavours to inquire about the complexities of the dialectal interplay between both varieties which they share particular characteristics on one hand, and show other different specificities on the other. Therefore, the following research questions can be raised:
1. What is the origin of the constituent dialectal elements of TA and Ain el Hout Dialect?
2. What are the underlying phonological and morphological characteristics that distinguish each one from the other?
3. Since the two settings are often related to each other, how is this fact manifested in their dialectal interaction or exchange? And what is the type of dialectal exchange that arises from their contact?
For studying both dialects, it is necessary for the researcher to consider methodological, social and geo-historical matters which have tight relationships with those varieties under study, and which contribute to interpret and clarify numerous facets related to the dialects. In fact, the primordial matter is represented in collecting data about the areas under investigation since a dialect is considered to be the offspring of social interaction and various historical accumulations associated with the community where it is spoken. Therefore, it is of paramount importance to go through the history of Tlemcen city and Ain el Hout area referring primarily to their social history which is thought to be helpful in understanding both dialects and interpreting the nature of their relationships with one another. In addition, a general geographical and historical background about the two regions is offered.

**Tlemcen: A Geo-historical Background**

Tlemcen, the name of a town located in the North-west of Algeria, is an arabicized Berber name which means the sources, labeled in ancient times Agadir which finds its roots in the Phoenician language, but its denomination means a rock or a plain, revealing a topographic reality about this city, as it occupies a large surface under the plain of Lella Setti; 800m of height. This plain is characterized by a particular geological structure that contributes in conserving large amounts of water in the form of giant underground basins which render the mountains of Tlemcen a distributor reservoir of water, making of its suburbs fertile lands. Water abundance and its moderate climate made of Tlemcen an attracting place for human stability from pre-historic times till now.

Tlemcen is one of the oldest towns in North Africa. It was established by the Berber Zenati “Banu Yafran”, and has been invaded by many civilizations; each of which has left its historical, social and economic traces. It was ruled by Romans until they have been defeated by the Vandals. As all North African towns, Tlemcen, under the Vandal reign, witnessed a big regression. However, by the coming of the Byzantines, it has just known a slight progress till the arrival of the Arab fatihins, during the 7th century, with whom it knew significant events in its history. In the era of Almoravids, Tlemcen was governed by Yussuf bnu Abi Tachfin. After them, it was ruled by Almohads / El Mowahhidin who made great developments in building high defending walls and tremendous buildings and palaces, especially after the appearance of the rebel El Mayourki Yahia bnu Ghânnia who invaded the Middle Maghreb starting from Bedjaia, threatened Tlemcen many times, and caused many devastations with the help of the Arabs of Banu Hilal.

In the era of Bani Abdi el Ouad, it became a very powerful principality. Its frontiers stretched till the town of Azaffoun in the East and that was under the rule of Abi Ḥammou Bnu Othman, who was in a constant dispute with its neighbours, Eddawla el Ḥafsiya in the East, and Eddawla elMariniya in the west, about the lands of North Africa and as Tlemcen was located between the two, it no more endured their clash, and was defeated by El Marinid.

Later, this principality was re-established under the rule of Abi Ḥammou Ethâni who named it Eddawla Ezzianiya, which witnessed under his rule and his following Caliphat (Kholafāa in Arabic) a very high style of sedentary and civilized life. Yet, by the coming of the 16th century, its conditions of life decreased and knew a great depression due to the appearance of

---

1 An idea mentioned in Dāiret el maārif el islāmiya, (no date:452).

some disputes between the ruling family members about the crown. Instead of working on
governing their citizens and contributing in the management of their political affairs, its rulers
were engaged in making intrigues, setting traps and conspiracies, a fact that created a wide
gap between the central government and the distant regions. Consequently, many semi-
independent principalities were raised in mountains and in plains. The Spanish seized this
opportunity, after getting rid of the existence of Islam in Andalousia, to occupy the coastal
towns of North Africa.

When the Omarãa of Beni Zianes felt themselves not able to face the Spanish, they adopted a
policy of being obedient to their rule, and that led the town dwellers, after suffering from the
unfair Spanish authority, to ask for the interference of the Turkish brothers KheirEddine and
Baba Arroudj to defend them as an attempt to protect their religion, possessions, and
honours. As a result, the Turkish have defeated Banu Zianes after many events.

When the Turkish came to Tlemcen, they brought with them a number of displaced
Andalousians, and later some Mourisquians or Moors who were descendants of Fatih elAndalus, coming from the different Arabic tribes, such as the Adnan; Hashemites and
Amayyauds, and other Yamenis such as the tribe of Kahlân and El Azd, in addition to those
who joined them in El fat; Egyptians, Shami, and Iraki, and a great number of Berbers who
integrated all with some Tlemcen dwellers who were Goths and Spanish. Then, the existence
of the Ottomans in Tlemcen lasted around five centuries before the coming of the French in
1845 when it fell under their colonization until independence in 1962.

The historical succession of these races and their civilizations has been reflected in the Arabic
dialect of Tlemcen, embodied in many phonetic sounds, morphological structures, and mainly
in its lexical repertoire which still perpetuates some linguistic features of particular
languages. This fact leads us to deduce that Tlemcen speech is a mixture of different
linguistic varieties.

**Ain el Hout: A Geo-historical Description**

The small village of Ain el Hout, located in the North of Tlemcen, at some 8 kilometers far
from it, is composed of two human agglomerations; the first one is situated in the eastern part
of the village surrounding the tombs of saint persons, the second is rather located a little bit
in the western part and it is called “Tralimet”; an agricultural area that is not currently
inhabited by Ain el Hout dwellers. (See the map on the left)

---

3 Mouley Belhamissi (1975: 31)
4 Ahmed Amine (no date : 1)
The style of life of Ain el Hout inhabitants is pastoral. They mainly practise market gardener, planting fruit trees, cereal agriculture, and livestock as well.\(^5\) It must be pointed out that Emile Janier has observed that, in all what concerns food and clothes, Ain el Hout inhabitants have adopted the traditions of sedentary life.\(^6\)

**Map 1/ Ain el Hout vis-à-vis Tlemcen**

Ain el Hout is an agricultural village \(\text{/hawz}\)\(^7\) which is located not far from Tlemcen city. It was first inhabited by Berbers and their existence is obviously proved through some toponyms, which are still used by its dwellers. It was also inhabited by the Romans who exploited its agricultural lands in planting different fruit trees, mainly olives which Ain el Hout individuals still name it “\(\text{ghars erroumi}\)”: “Roman plantations” in English. Later, Ain el Hout has witnessed the coming of the Muslim Fatihins, then, it knew many other successive invasions until it fell under the rule of Mohamedbnu Khazr at a time when Idriss bnu AbdiAllah entered Morocco who succeeded in attracting the attention of bnu Khazr, and eventually, it became under his authority. However, when this latter moved to morocco, he handed his brother Solaymane the rule of Tlemcen and its surroundings. This latter established Ain el Hout as a cradle for his own \(\text{emārah}\)\(^8\) and his descendants are still living in Ain el Hout till present time. After the Idrissi rule, the region witnessed many settlements, such as the Almoravids, the Almohad dynasty, the Zianids, and the Turkish Ottomans.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

The present section is devoted to the definitions of the basic study key-concepts and operational terms, which are used in interpreting the data collected and the linguistic realities in both communities.

---

\(^5\) An idea mentioned by Emile Janier (1956:67) in « Bulletin de la société des amis du vieux Tlemcen».

\(^6\) An idea mentioned by Emile Janier (ibid:68)

\(^7\) Chafika Maarouf (1984: 363-366) defined \(\text{El hawz}\) as a word that is derived from the Arabic word \(\text{/hazza/}\) which implies the surrounding areas of big cities such as villages, that are mostly rural, and this characteristic is widely spread in North Africa. Each town has its \(\text{hawz}\) as Tlemcen city. The notion of \(\text{hawz}\) is originally the result of a political conception which goes back in time to the middle ages.

\(^8\)Abderrahim Benmansour(2011:10).
KEY CONCEPTS

1. The Mutual Influence
It is considered to be a collection of linguistic features which result from the interaction that occurs between two dialects or more in a specific geographical area. These dialectal characteristics are themselves the offspring of various social changes\(^9\) that lead to the appearance of some new dialectal phenomena (at different linguistic levels) and other language attitudes towards them.

2. Dialect
Generally, the concept of dialect has been defined as a set of linguistic characteristics that are shared between the residents of a particular regional area. In fact, the environment where a given dialect is spoken constitutes a parcel of a broad environment involving a number of distinct dialects which have particular characteristics, but they all share a group of linguistic phenomena which contribute in creating mutual intelligibility between their speakers, or a degree of understanding that depends on the relationship that is interwoven between these dialects\(^10\) (dialect continuum). Accordingly, these dialects are classified into urban, rural and bedouin dialects. It can be also divided in another way depending on several dimensions and distinct considerations. There are two types of dialects relating with this study and which are:

2.1 Urban Dialect: The urban dialect refers to the set of linguistic features which generally characterize the dialects spoken in cities, whether on the phonological, morphological or semantic level, and that are subject to the norms of the context where it is utilized. In this research, Tlemcen dialect really represents a concrete model of this type of dialects.

2.2 Rural Dialect: It encompasses a group of features which facilitates the interaction between the individuals of rural areas, and it has idiosyncratic phonological, morphological and semantic items that different from those of urban dialects. AH, as a rural area, is located not far from Tlemcen city; a fact that leads to a constant language contact between two urban/rural varieties. This interplay, indeed, represents the central core of a comparison that will be made in this investigation.

Operational Concepts

For a sociolinguistic interpretation of our field collected data, it is of paramount importance to make recourse to some relevant Structuralist notions that are thought of as primordial operational concepts, primarily those of Pierre Bourdieu which will be represented as follows:

1. Dominant - Dominated Dichotomy: This dichotomy sheds light on the fact that there is a kind of attraction and competition between dialects which lead to some attitudes of language users towards each other. Thus, this fact gives birth to a classification of dialects within speech communities by which speakers identify themselves, and in such a way, they are arranged in the Dominant-Dominated dichotomy.

2. Dialectal Habitus
Bourdieu (1994:9) understands the Habitus as follows:

\(^9\)Henri Boyer (2001:19)

\(^{10}\)Dr. Ibrahim Anis (no date:11)
A philosophy of sciences that we can say it is relational, as it gives priority to relationships” (or structures), as well as “a philosophy of action sometimes referred to as dispositional that notes the potentialities traced on the body of agents and in the situations where they act or, more exactly, in their relationship.  

The Habitus (es), according to Bourdieu, are “structured structures” / «structures structurées» in French, because they come from the incorporation of a social structure which is itself constituted of a set of Habitus (es) that function, in turn, as “structuring structures” / «structures structurantes».

3. Symbolic Capital
The Symbolic Capital can be considered as a set of linguistic elements or accumulations that a dialect has known, as well as the processes followed with the objective of maintaining its Capital through the application of multiple strategies, such as imitating and emulating the other seeking assimilation. In this case, this Capital, in one way or another, is a context of dispute.

METHODOLOGY
For the sake of undertaking this study, a scientific current should be adopted to well understand the linguistic interplay between the dialects under investigation, and to draw a clear picture about the social factors which led to it and influenced these dialects’ developmental trajectory. Hence, the adoption of the Structuralist Current, focusing on the views of Pierre Bourdieu and those of Fernand Braudel, is relied on in analyzing and interpreting the data of the present research work.

Both qualitative and quantitative approaches are adopted in this research. The main linguistic characteristics, be they phonological, or morphological of both dialects have been represented in the form of linguistic variables and the different realizations of a single feature in the form of variants following the Labovian paradigm in representing the main items in the structure of the speech of New York City (1960).

1. Field Research Instruments
In sociolinguistic inquiries, scholars and researchers should adopt appropriate research tools which help in collecting valid, representative, and reliable data that allow them to arrive at accurate and concrete results, from which we cite recorded interviews with both Tlemcen and Ain el Hout informants. First, the informants in both agglomerations were interviewed and recorded simultaneously and the raised questions were asked in a dialectal form. Another research tool was the questionnaire which was opted for, at a final step in research, to analyze the data quantitatively, to check whether the recorded data are similar or different, and for a more profound understanding for the nature of the dialectal exchange between both dialects. Moreover, the recorded interviews are thought to be helpful in capturing the exact linguistic characteristics even with their suprasegmental features, and to better transcribe them to reach

11This is the original definition of Pierre Bourdieu as it was mentioned by Jean-Michel (2000:2) : «Une philosophie des sciences que l’on peut dire relationnelle, en ce qu’elle accorde le primat aux relations » (ou structures), ainsi qu’une « philosophie de l’action désignée parfois comme dispositionnelle qui prend acte des potentialités inscrites dans le corps des agents et dans la structure des situations où ils agissent ou, plus exactement, dans leur relation».

12The plural form of habitus is written as habitus (es) following the French word les habitus (es) as utilized by Pierre Bourdieu.
a high degree of validity and objectivity in analysis. But, the interviews which were conducted with Tlemcenians were sometimes in the form of different questions and various discussions unlike the pre-determined questions which were asked with the sample population of Ain el Hout. In the light of the aforementioned Structuralist Approach, the type of language contact and exchange between these two dialects will be clearly identified.

2. The Statistical Description of the Sample Population
The sample population of Tlemcen community has been selected depending on the original names of Tlemcenian families; however, the sample population of Ain el Hout is a random one. Concerning the total number of informants, we have 62 informants from Ain el Hout, and 61 were Tlemcenians. The age in both samples has been divided into four age groups: [0-20], [20-40], [40-60], and [60-90] for both genders. Both samples have been divided in relationship with gender into 28 men from 62, with a percentage of 45.16 per cent, and 34 women, that is, 54.84 per cent in Ain el Hout, then, 28 males from 61, i.e., 45.90% and 33 females, that is 54.10% in Tlemcen.

3. Approaches of the Study
Three approaches are to be adopted to analyze and interpret the data collected in both communities: Ibn Khaldoun’s thought, Pierre Bourdieu’s structural approach and Fernand Braudel’s model of dialect development.

3.1 The Khaldounian Thought
Once returning back to the history of both regions, it is obviously recognized that Tlemcen city has remarkably occupied a tremendous position as one of the great civilizations in the Middle Maghreb. The region of AH, however, has not occupied such a position. But, it has always been conceived as “Hawz”, a term implying dependency/subordination in all domains; political, economic, religious, and so forth. In this line of thought, one may think of it as more influenced rather than influencing due to the fact that Ibn Khaldoun claims that emulation is the result of the admiration of the dominant not because of his force or power but rather for his conceptions and habits. Therefore, one may notice that the dominated is constantly imitating the dominant in all his matters, in his clothes, his weapons….etc. If a nation, he adds, is a neighbour of another dominant one, the assimilation and emulation occurs with a great degree.\footnote{Ibn Khaldoun’s view has been paraphrased in his original quotation in Ibn Khaldoun (2004:161).}
Thus, the whole laws of sociology which were already cited by Ibn Khaldoun in his *Introduction / Mukaddimah* certainly fit in analyzing linguistic phenomena. Furthermore, the application of (the influencing- influenced) rule, with all its psychological mechanisms, i.e. the imitation and emulation, in addition to the relational or social mechanisms, is thought to be fruitful in the present field of study as it serves to well compare both linguistic behaviours as displayed by *Tlemcen* speakers to those of AHspeech community. In fact, a more profound and thoughtfully explanation of the linguistic interplay between the two communities is required.

The collected data are to be deeply analyzed on the light of the Critical Structuralist Approach as theorized by Pierre Bourdieu, relying on the terminological concepts which he has adopted in interpreting various social phenomena.

### 3.2 The Terminological Concepts of Pierre Bourdieu

According to his distinct field studies and his analytical insights, be it epistemological or methodological, Pierre Bourdieu has developed many key-concepts aiming at a better understanding of the social world in general, and the partial social worlds in particular. Through this conceptual framework, he sought to deal with this world as a set of contiguous worlds which are characterized by independence in the forms of what are called “fields”, or “champs” in French, in which each *individual* or *agent* is equipped with the *Habitus* that controls his perceptions and his behaviours at the same time. In this way, one may explicitly observe the Critical Structuralism of Pierre Bourdieu which is highly characterized by dualism. To well understand both terms of Bourdieu, they can be compared to two wheels which are inter-related with each other and they turn under the pressure of social facts. In this respect, the field, thus, represents society, human gatherings, classes… etc, and the *Habitus* represents the individual and the personality in conflict between freedom and determinism. In fact, these individuals and their social groups are neither toys for these structures nor a master on them. They are rather inter-related where both elements (i.e. *field* and *Habitus*) are structuring tools and structured entities simultaneously, and they continuously produce society which, in turn, impacts on them and draws their features as well.

The turning of the aforementioned imaginary wheels leads to what Bourdieu labeled “reproduction”; a process that gives birth to a “symbolic capital” which is conceived as the result of the frequency and accumulation of facts. This symbolic capital will eventually become an area of competition, and, therefore, it is the fuel which guarantees the continuous turning of those wheels and assures the ever continuance of reproduction too.

To sum up, this is a simplified picture for the conceptual and theoretical framework of Pierre Bourdieu, and the question that can be raised here is how could it be projected on the phenomenon of this study? According to what has already been elucidated, both the urban Tlemcenian society and its rural counterpart of AHrepresent two fields, and the individuals who belong to both of them are considered as reduced *habitus* (es). The whole set of *habitus* (es) makes the habitus (es) of both societies, and the inter-relation between each society’s *field* with its particular *habitus* (es) produces a *Symbolic Capital*. This latter constitutes many forms. The dialectal Symbolic Capital is seen as one form of paramount importance of the whole *Symbolic Capital*, and its *reproduction* is guaranteed as a heritage and as a Symbolic Capital by its individuals.

---

15. Thierry Watine, (ibid:139).
In fact, the spontaneous interaction between the field and the habitus in both societies creates a “linguistic market”. Indeed, whenever the symbolic capital, on which a linguistic market depends on, is huge, this market almost dominates the other existing linguistic markets. In this respect, according to Pierre Bourdieu (1982:59-95):

the linguistic exchanges in a community is related to a specific economy, an economy that gives rise to a dominant “market” whose prices are fixed (tacitly) well heard by those who possess the cultural and linguistic “capital” required for imposing its domination and to obtain “profits”. The linguistic market as official is, therefore, a place for power relations, where those who possess the legitimate competence are recognized, lay down the law. This does not exclude the existence of other linguistic markets inside the same community, in the margin of the official market, at its outskirts, where the “values”, the rules of game are others (and sometimes even reversed).  

As the village of Ain el Hout is not far from Tlemcen, the constant contact exists between both regions in different domains, and consequently, they cannot escape the inevitable dialectal contact. Hence, on the light of Bourdieu’s perceptions, how can this dialectal contact and interaction between their interlocutors be described?

3.3 Fernand Braudel and the Dimension of Time
For a more profound understanding for the nature of the interaction between the two dialects, the perspective of the French sociologist Fernand Braudel will be adopted. In social and historical disciplines, Braudel proposes a very significant illustration for socio-historical events / facts which focuses on the dimension of time. In his conception, for the analysis of these phenomena, time is conceived to be divided into three main periods: the short period in which the progress of a given phenomenon can be followed in a span that takes from one year to twenty years or more, the middle period lasts from fifty years to one century, and finally, the long period begins from one century and lasts till one thousand years.  

At this level of analysis, one may wonder what results that can be obtained of the application of Braudel’s approach in the present dialectal phenomenon.

RESULTS
The collected data show that TA and its neighbouring dialect of AH are characterized with a set of dialectal features which are summarized in what follows:

Some Characteristics of Tlemcen Dialect
TA is characterized by a set of linguistic features that cannot be detailed in this research paper. For this reason, only some of which seem to be of great importance, whether at the phonological or the morphological level, and which are relevant to this sociolinguistic study will be mentioned.

At the Phonological Level: Most of its striking and distinctive phonological features are represented in:

16 The original quotation is mentioned by Henri Boyer (2001:34) : « les échanges linguistiques en communauté relèvent d’une économie spécifique, économie qui donne lieu à un « marché » dominant dont les « prix » sont fixés (tacitement bien entendu) par ceux qui possèdent le « capital » culturel et linguistique requis pour imposer leur domination et en obtenir des « profits ». Le marché linguistique que officiel est donc le lieu d’un rapport de forces où ceux qui détiennent la compétence légitime, donnent la loi. Ce qui n’exclut pas l’existence au sein de la même communauté d’autres marchés linguistiques, en marge du marché officiel, à sa périphérie, où les « valeurs », les règles du jeu sont autres (et parfois même inversées) ».

El qalqala: el 2al2ala is a salient phonetic feature which Tlemcenians or ‘el hadar’ call it El aâla; a phonetic characteristic in which the /q/ sound is mainly substituted by [ʔ]. In this respect, William Marçais (1902:17) wrote: “At last, it must be noted that a number of Tlemcenians seem to have an impossibility of pronouncing the q, in their mouths, it sounds as that of Cairo and Damascus, as a loud hamza…”.

The following examples illustrate more this point:

/qalb(un)/ as [ʔalb]: “a heart”, /qabr (un)/ as [ʔbo:r]: “a tomb”
/qɪrmaːʃ(un)/ as [ʔmaʃ]: “cloth”, /qɪt(t)(un)/ as [ʔaːt(t)]: “a cat”

However, the /q/ sound is not always pronounced [ʔ], it is also substituted by a [g] variant as in the following examples:

[jaːgʊd]: “he sits down”, [jaːgʊ[OF]: “he crosses the street”, [ŋɡiː]: “the noon”, [bɑːɡrɑː]: “a cow”, [sːluːɡiː]: “a dog for hunting”, [næɡɡɑː]: “a feeling of hatred between two persons”, [æl ɡɑːmɾɑː]: “the moon”, [ɡɑːɾnuːʃ]: “artichoke” [jɡaʃmɜː]: “he crouches down”.

Semi-absence of Dental Emphatic Sounds /d/ and /ḍ/:
In TA, both emphatic /d/ and /ḍ/ are substituted by [t] in some words such as: /ɑːḍdɑːhrʊ/ is pronounced as [tʃɪhr]: “the back”, /ɑːl ædɑːfɜːrʊ/ as [tʃɪfɜː]: “nails”, /mɑːdɛː(un)/ as [mɑːtʊʃ]: “place”, /ɑːḍdɑːʊʔʊː[ʃ] as [ʃɔː]: “light”. These instances and others have been obtained from the interviews conducted with some Tlemcen informants.

Replacement of /d/ and /ḍ/ by [t]:
Tlemcenian dialect is characterized by the articulation of /d/ and /ḍ/ as [t] as in the examples /hɑːfɪː(un)/ pronounced as [hʃεː]: meaning “grandson” and /fɑːχɪð(un)/ as [fʃɑː]: which means “thigh”. Indeed, W. Marçais (1902:14-15) has referred to this characteristic through the aforementioned examples, and it has also been witnessed in the recorded conversations being conducted with the sample population of Tlemcen city.

The Maintenance of /dʒ/ Sound:
The data collected show that Tlemcenians keep the sound /dʒ/ as in Classical Arabic (hereafter CA). Additionally, W. Marçais (1902:15) also noticed this feature and wrote: “the pronunciation of z in Tlemcenian speech is j (English j); it is not a pure fricative, but an affricate comprising an initial dental element, and both make the dj pronounced as one letter”.

Here are examples where the /dʒ/ sound is kept in TA:

/ɑːl hɑːdʒʊː / [hɑːdʒʊː]: “an old man”, /ɑːl dʒɑːzzʊ / [ldʒɑːzzʊ]: “nuts”
/ɑːl dʒɑːmɪʔʊː / [ldʒɑːmɪʔʊː]: “mosque”, /ɑːl dʒɪː:raːnu / [ldʒɪː:raːnu]: “neighbours”.

18 The above English quotation is our translation. The original one is: «… Enfin il faut noter que nombre de Tlemceniens semblent atteints de l’impossibilité de prononcer le ɛq; dans leur bouche, il se traduit comme dans celle des Cairotes et des Damasquins, par un fort hamza…».

19 Note that this quotation is not a word by word translation. We have attempted to translate the meaning as much as it was possible. The original one is: “La prononciation courante du ɛn tlemcenien est j (j anglais) ; ce n’est pas une sifflante pure, mais une lettre double comportant un element dental initial, et équivalente au groupe dj prononcé en une seule emission de voix”.
However, the pronunciation of the variant [dʒ] is not the same as in CA, but rather a mid consonant between /dʒ/ and /tʃ/ with a stress on the syllable in which the sound [dʒ] is part of.

Since this study is interested in showing TA and AHD phonological and morphological features, some morphological characteristics will also be reviewed.

**At the Morphological Level**

TA is characterized by some morphological characteristics that are summarized in this section as follows:

**Verbs**

In TA, the inflectional system is characterized with a considerable set of characteristics observed when conjugating verbs. Some of them are:

- The feminine mark {-i}, (حركة ياء التأنيث), of third person singular is omitted in verbs when addressing to a female speaker, and no gender distinction is made between masculine and feminine addressees. The addresser may say: [kliːt]: “did you eat?”, [ʃriːt]: “did you buy…?”, [sallaft]: “did you borrow …?” for both genders.

- The absence of the feminine mark {-i:} with imperative verbs: the imperative verb /kul/ meaning “eat!” of Standard Arabic (SA) is replaced with the dialectal form [kuːl] in Tlemcen when addressing to both males and females in opposition with the other Algerian Arabic varieties, mainly of a rural type, where their speakers utilize [kuːl] for a man and [kuːl:i] for a woman.

- When conjugating verbs in Tlemcen dialect, no distinction in masculine and feminine plurals is made. For instance, Tlemcen speakers tend to talk about some children who are playing by saying: [raːhom # jallaːbuː]: “they are playing” referring to both boys and girls without making any distinction in gender.

- In SA, verbs which are constructed in /ʃNftaːN/ pattern are used to make requests. However, in Tlemcen dialect, requests are usually made in /ʃaːNal/pattern. This characteristic is more clarified through these examples:

  - /ʃNstalNf / ———————————>[sallaft]: “borrow!”
  - /ʃNqtarNB / ———————————>[ʃarrab]: “come closer!”

**Nouns**

Duality in TA is made by the addition of the final morpheme {-æjan} to the singular as in: [ʃumæjan]: “two days”, [ʃahræjan]: “two months”, [ʃamæjan]: “two years”, [martæjan]: “twice”, and [liːteæjan]: “two nights”.

In TA, dual forms are also made by adding the numeral “zaːdʒ” which means “two” to the plural nouns as in the following dual nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Dual Forms</th>
<th>TA Dual Forms</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/bintæ:nal/</td>
<td>[zaːdʒ # bnaːt]</td>
<td>“two girls”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʃadʒaːraːnal/</td>
<td>[zaːdʒ # sədʒraːt]</td>
<td>“two trees”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/daradʒaːnal/</td>
<td>[zaːdʒ # dardʒaːt]</td>
<td>“two stairs”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1/ Dual Forms in TA**

**Pronouns**

The dual pronoun [huːman], meaning “they”, is used to refer to both dual and plural forms, i.e., it refers to both masculine and feminine dual forms and to masculine and feminine plural
forms as well. That is, [hu:man], in TA, may represent the CA/huma:/ of both masculine and feminine dual pronouns, and /hum/, the masculine plural pronoun, and /hunna/, the feminine plural pronoun. The same characteristic is noticed with the pronoun /antuma: / “you” which is realized as [ntu:man] with both dual and plural forms with both genders.

In what concerns the singular pronoun, its final morpheme {-hu} is changed by {-u} as it is illustrated in the following examples:

/qa:la # lahu / [ʔa:llu]: “he told him”.
/bɪŋtuhu / [baʃtu]: “I sold it”.

The final pronouns which represent the inflectional morphemes {-hu}, {-ha:}, and {-hum} sometimes disappear in Tlemcen dialect when conjugated with the verb /ʔara:/ meaning “I see him, I see her, I see them” pronounced as [ra:], [ri:] or [ri:ha], [rom] or [rohom] respectively, instead of [ra:h], [ra:ha] , [ra:hum] which are widespread in rural communities.

Adverbs

Adverbs are compound words which are morphologically composed of two or more constituents. They are also characterized with a type of elision known in Arabic grammar as “hadf et taqrir”. These examples clarify more this point:

- [ki:fa:] is composed of /keɪfa/ and /seɪf/ meaning “how” and “the thing” respectively. The initial and final syllables of the word /seɪf/, (/ə/ eshamiya) and (/ʔ/), are dropped and the geminated /ʃ/ is slightly diluted, then, added to the first part /keɪfa/, which, in turn, becomes [ki:f] after the substitution of the diphthong /eɪ/ by the long vowel [i:] to form at last the adverb [ki:fa:] which means in TA “how?”. The process of elision which occurred in the word /seɪf/ letting only few phonetic traces from the original sounds which signify the word /seɪf/ to be understood as “a thing” is called: Ḥadif Taqrir (حذف تقرير). The same interpretation could be done with the adverbs /waʔtd:ʃ/ , /læj:tʃ/ and /fuʔa:ʃ/ which they mean “at what time?”, “why?” and “on what place?”, or simply “where?” respectively.

- [ki:rako:] is composed of two words /keɪfa/ and /ʔara:ka/ where the syllables /fa/, /ʔa/, and the final vowel /a/ representing el fatḥa are elided and the /eɪ/ has been altered by [i:], and consequently, the remaining elements of both words are combined together to form the adverb [ki:rako:] which means “how are you?”. This combination is used when addressing to males whereas females are addressed to by the use of the adverb [kɪːriːk].

- [makaːnʃ]: is composed of /maː#kaːna#ʃeɪʔ/. Its meaning is “there is nothing”, and the omitted sounds are interpreted in the same way as the aforementioned adverbs have been dealt with.

Through the interviews which were recorded with a sample population in the area under investigation, a set of characteristics which are related to the dialect spoken in the village of Ain el Hout are deduced.

Ain el Hout Dialectal Features

Ain el Hout dialect (AHD) has a considerable set of characteristics that will be shown as follows:

Phonological Characteristics

The most phonological features which characterize AHD are:
The Distinct Variants of /q/: the phoneme /q/ has two different variants in addition to its maintenance as in CA.

The first variant is the alternation of the plosive sound /q/ by the glottal stop [ʔ] which is a feature that appears in the speech of both men and women, and it is commonly altered by women who have a tendency to its use. Examples of this phenomenon are: [nʔullek] instead of [nqullek]: “I tell you”, [ʔsu:q] instead of [ssu:q]: “market”, [ʔdi:m] in place of [qdi:m]: “old”...etc. This phenomenon is attributed to that fact that Ain El Hout speakers have inherited it from the speech of their ancestors who are known are “Dar el ârsa” which is a toponym for an area in Ain el Hout. Yet, the new comers who reside in Ain el Hout, especially women speakers, tend to pronounce the /q/ as [ʔ] to talk in a soft voice in speech which reflects their feminity and seeking more prestige and to imitate the Hadars in their way of speaking.


The maintenance of /q/ in many words and expressions as they are pronounced in CA and it is seen as one feature of masculine speech in Ain elHout like in: [ri:q]: “street”, [taqa:fa]: “culture”, and [lqahwa]: “coffee”...etc.

The dual use of [g] and [ʔ] is highly observable as one particularity of feminine speech. One example of this use is: / … gult # luχt # k1 # 3a:t # 1:la # mahad # lfar # ḥaṭta # waḥad # majšrɔlla #: nqaddah # ra # kajɔn # lamsaka #: an #: man #: nadj #: tta #: nafq # meaning: “I told my sister when she came if no one uses this bedding I will give it to poors? I can’t even tidy (my house)”.

The use of [q], [ʔ], and [g] is considered as one particularity of masculine speech. Yet, it is used with different extents as in: /gallu #: madabi:k # taʔtɛna #: haṭik #: lwarʔa (…) ʔtahalu #: w # raʔuo #: ṯriːq / which means “he told him: it is preferable to give us that paper (…) he gave it to him and they repaired the street”.

The Substitution of Dental Emphatics /d/ and / ḥ/ by [ṯ] In AHD, the dental emphatics /ɗ/ and / ḥ/ are altered by [ṯ] as in [ṯroːs] instead of [djroːs]: “molars”, [ṯom] instead of [dam]: “a bone”, [ṯawri] instead of [dawri]: “my back” ...etc, and are also replaced by [q̱] as in: [q̱jaːf] instead of [q̱jaːf]: “guests”, [q̱rab] instead of [q̱rab]: “he hit”.

The Alternation of / d/ by [ṯ] It is a rare feature in dialects, and only two examples were found in AHD where its speakers pronounce [ḥfidi] as [hfeːṯ]: “grandson”, and [fχad] as [fχaṯ]: “moiety”, which is generally pronounced in Algerian dialects with (ⱃdaːl junmaːla) [d] instead of (ⱃdaːl junmuʔdzama) [ɓ] of CA.
The Dual Use of /dʒ/ 
It is often pronounced as [ʒ] as a sound which resembles /ʃ/, and in other words, it is pronounced as [dʒ] as the way Tlemcen speakers pronounce it. Some examples of the first sound are: [ʒbə:l]: “mountain”, [ʒαɾ]: “stone”, [ʒaɾ]: “a drawer”, and the following are instances of its articulation as [dʒ]: [ldʒanaːt]: “fields”, [ɾadʒi]: “my leg”, [lədʒaɾ]: “stone”, and [nədʒən]: “I knead (bread)”, and both of them can be heard in the same conversation by the same speaker.

Morphological Characteristics
The rural dialect of Ain el Hout is characterized by a set of morphological features which will be reviewed briefly in the following section.

Verbs
At the level of verbs, Ain el Hout speakers make a distinction in gender, between both masculine and feminine, through the maintenance of the CA feminine mark { -i} at the end of verbs, but the ħaraka of باء التأنيث, or this short vowel { -i} is slightly weakened when talking to feminine addressees. A male is addressed to by [kliːt], for instance, in the past meaning “did you(masc.sing.) eat?”. A woman, however, is addressed to by [kliːti], and in the present tense, we may hear [tʰ:aːkul]: “do you eat (masc. sing.)?” and [tʰ:aːkli] for a female. In the imperative, they say [kʊːl] and [kʊːli] for singular masculine and feminine respectively. Some verbs which indicate requests that are originally constructed in /N̩ftaN̩l/ pattern, they take the pattern /fBal/ as in: /N̩qtarN̩b/ of CA is articulated in Ain el Hout [ʁ-raːb] or [ɾaːb] meaning “come closer, please!”

Nouns
When dealing with the morphological structures which characterize the nouns of Ain el Hout dialectal system, the most striking feature is the ways its speakers refer to a pair of things or two persons or two things. In SA, dual forms are formed through the addition of the dual mark{-aːni} in ħalat erraf, or {-eːN̩n̩i} in ħalat nasb or eljar, but in Algerian Arabic dialectal forms in general, and in Ain el Hout in particular, this rule is changed by other constructions such as:

- The Use of the Numeral /zaudʒ/ + the Plural Form of a Noun:
  The following examples illustrate more this point:
  /zaudʒ # ˌlbasatː/: “two dresses”
  /zaudʒ # təˌjaːʃarː/: “two planes”
  /zaudʒ #fraˌaːtː/: “two butterflies”

- The Addition of {-aːjən} to Singular Nouns
  Another way of forming dual form is the addition of the morpheme {-aːjən} to a singular noun as in these examples:
  SA
  /lajlate1n̩i/ \→ [liːtəːjən]: “two nights”
  /marratejni/ \→ [marrtaːjən]: “twice”.

Pronouns
The most significant feature in AHD is that its pronouns have some characteristics such as:

Gender Distinction in the Use of Pronouns
Unlike the urban speakers who utilize the pronoun /ntna/ to refer to both masculine and feminine addressees, AHD involves the pronouns /nta/ and /ntaːja/ to address to a male, and /nti/ or /ntja/ to address to a female. Concerning the dual and plural pronouns, the pronoun /ntuːma/ is used to refer to both and with both genders.
The Use of the Pronoun {-hu}
The pronoun {-hu}, which is a bound morpheme added at the end of verbs and nouns, is generally kept as in CA but in the form {-ah} in AHD in opposition with the urban Tlemcen speakers who pronounce it as {-u}. Therefore, in the region of Ain el Hout, one may hear these verbs: [ʔætah]: “I gave him (something)”, [hsabtah]: “I thought it…”, [fritah]: “I bought it”, and in nouns [ʔasmah]: “his name”, [mraːtah]: “his wife”, and [sɡaːwlah]: “his trousers”.

Adverbs
In AHD, adverbs are characterized by diluting el hamza or eliding it in the adverb /ʔajna/ meaning “where?”, then it is preceded by / f / and pronounced as [fajːәr] or [farraːh]: “where is he?” in which /ʔajna/ is omitted and both [f] and [rah], which is taken from the verb /ʔaraːhu/: “I see him”, are kept. Both expressions are used for asking about the place of someone. To ask about time, the word [faːwaʔ] is frequently used among women. The expression [fajwaʔ], however, is rarely heard and both of them are derived from the standard form / fiːhajja waqt / meaning: “at what time?”, in which the two /j/ sounds are dropped in /fiːhajja/ and in /ʔajja/ with diluting the hamza of this latter, in addition to the omission of /h/ in the word /waqt/ and substituting its sound /q/ by [ʔ]. Similarly, the expression [fajwaʔ] knew all the aforementioned changes but the /j/ sound is preserved in /ʔajja/. But, men frequently use [fajwak] and sometimes [fawak] with a lesser degree.

The second adverb is represented in [darwak] which is taken from the SA expression / fiːkariːf el saːr / meaning: “at this time” which knew the omission of /kәɾf el saɾ / and the /kәɾf/ of /kәɾf el saɾa:/ which became [dәɾ] by the substitution of the dental fricative /ɾ/ by the alveolar [d]. In the word /әɾ waqt/, the /әɾ/ and the /q/ are altered by [r] and [k] respectively with the elision of the final /ɾ/. This adverb is commonly pronounced with /k/ by men. Women, however, pronounce it as [darwaʔ].

In Ain el Hout, the expression [kәɾfak] (with a male addressee) and [kәɾfak] is used with a woman to ask someone about how is he doing, and both of them are derived from the SA expression / keɾfa #ʔaraka / which undergo the already mentioned changes. Also, /kәɾfak / and /kәɾfak/ are used by exceptionally when asking about the health of someone ill, and it is also composed of many elements.

Generally, the old inhabitants of Ain el Hout have a remarkable tendency to imitate the urban Tlemcenians in their way of speaking. This imitation is mainly witnessed with varying degrees with both males and females, yet it is highly remarkable in feminine speech. This phenomenon will be deeply interpreted through the adoption of Pierre Bourdieu’s view of interpreting all types of social phenomena including linguistic matters as well.

From what precedes, one may explicitly notice that both dialects under investigation share many phonological and morphological characteristics, but each of them involve some features peculiar to it, and that are different of those of its counterpart. These distinctive features can only be attributed to the impact of the social environment and its norms on the structure of each regional dialect.
In fact, the environment where these varieties are spoken, with all their norms, economic institutions, psychological and behaviourist models, influence the structure of each dialect, and this leads us to deduce that the study of the two dialects requires a more profound investigation at other levels of analysis to arrive at a more satisfactory and total understanding of these dialects, and that a dialect is such an intricate phenomenon which cannot only be studied in a descriptive way.

Data Quantification of Field Research

Basing on the data collected in the two communities under investigation which have been obtained through the use of various research tools, these data have been treated by the use of the excel software for the sake of representing them in the form of effectives that are highlighted in tables and illustrated in graphs and charts. In fact, the results of this descriptive and statistical study have brought considerable information about the dialectal characteristics of TA on one hand, and those of Ain el Hout on the other. Indeed, it provides a clear picture about the divergence between the two dialects.

The scores below reflect this fact and shed light on the use of some linguistic variables, both phonological and morphological, which are thought to be helpful in drawing a comparison between the dialects of both agglomerations.

The Studied Variables

In both sample populations, much importance has been given to the study of the use of the phonological variable /q/ which has the [ʔ] and [g] as two variants in correspondence with the morphological {-u} and {-ah} just to check the tendency of imitating the use of the variant [ʔ], and the use of the feminine mark {-i} vs {∅} to know the number of informants who make a distinction in gender when addressing to women.

a. Scores of the Use of Distinctive Characteristics in TA

The scores of the use of particular features are to be focused on for the sake of drawing a comparison between the two dialects.

The Use of [ʔ] vs. [g] in Relation with the Variable {-u} or {-ah} in Correlation with Gender

As it is known that the Tlemcenian community uses the glottal [ʔ], but for checking its use by the first few informants who were recorded, the following question was asked to 61 informants (both genders):

Can you pronounce /qa:la # lahu/ (meaning “he told him”) in your dialect?

All answers have been grouped in tables 2 and 3 in correspondence with gender in the following section:

Scores of the Use of [ʔ] vs. [g] and {-u} vs. {-ah} by Men

Table 2 describes the use of [ʔ] vs. [g] combined to the variable {-u} or {-ah} by some Tlemcenian men:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Use of</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>0-20</th>
<th>20-40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>60-90</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ʔ]+{-u}</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʔ]+{-ah}</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]+{-u}</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]+{-ah}</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2/Scores of the Use of [ʔ] vs. [g] and {-u} vs. {-ah} by Men
All men of the *Tlemcenian* sample population pronounce the /q/ as [ʔ], and they rarely combine it with the suffix {-ah}; only 2 from 28 combine them in saying [ʔallah]: “he told him”.

**Scores of the Use of [ʔ] vs. [g] and {-u} vs. {-ah} by Women**

Table 3 describes the use of [ʔ] vs. [g] combined with the variable {-u} or {-ah} by some Tlemcenian women:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>[0-20]</th>
<th>[20-40]</th>
<th>[40-60]</th>
<th>[60-90]</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ʔ]+{-u}</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʔ]+{-ah}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]+{-u}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]+{-ah}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3/ Scores of the Use of [ʔ] vs. [g] and {-u} vs. {-ah} by Women*

All Tlemcenian women, as it is clearly shown in table 3, articulate the plosive /q/ as a glottal [ʔ], and they all say [ʔallu] with the final morpheme {-u} and only one informant has articulated the word [ʔallah] meaning “he told him”, a fact that can be attributed to her contact with rural speakers.

➤ **The Use of {-i:} in Correlation with Gender**

To examine the use or the non-use of the feminine mark {-i:} which distinguishes a female from a male in TA, informants were asked to choose the widely used verb (with or without {-i}) when addressing to a woman.

**The Use of {-i:} among Male Informants**

The following table summarizes the use of {-i:} vs. {-φ} by some Tlemcenian men:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>[0-20]</th>
<th>[20-40]</th>
<th>[40-60]</th>
<th>[60-90]</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{-i}</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{-φ}</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4/ Scores of the Use of the Feminine Mark {-i:} among Men*

Table 4 shows that 33.33% of teenagers aged less than 20 years old use the feminine mark {-i}, 4 men (aged [20-40] from a total of 9 utilize it with a percentage of 44.45%, as well as other 2 men (aged [40-60] from 8, i.e., 25% in addition to 80% of the old category aged more than 60 do not use it.

**The Use of {-i:} among Female Informants**

Table 5 summarizes the use of {-i:} vs. {-V} by some Tlemcenian women:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>[0-20]</th>
<th>[20-40]</th>
<th>[40-60]</th>
<th>[60-90]</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{-i}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{-φ}</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5/ Scores of the Use of the Feminine Mark {-i:} among Women*
Almost all women of Tlemcen informants do not articulate this morphological variable at the end of verbs. Only one young woman aged 26 does use it. She explained this use and attributed it to her interaction with her family-in-law in Beni Saf.

b. Scores of the Use of Some Characteristics in AHD

In this section, the same steps will be followed in dealing with the sample of AHD as it has been done in the preceding statistical study of TA.

➢ The Use of [ʔ] or [g] with the Variables {-u} and {-ah} in Correlation with Gender

For checking the use of the glottal [ʔ] in AHD, the same question raised for Tlemcen informants was asked to 62 individuals (both genders): Can you pronounce /qa:la # lahu/ in your dialect?

All answers have been grouped into tables (6) and (7) in correspondence with gender in the next section:

Percentages of the Use of [ʔ] vs. [g] and {-u} vs. {-ah} by Men

The following table regroups the data which concerns the use of the variants [ʔ] vs. [g] in relation with the use of the morphemes {-u} vs. {-ah}:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>[0-20]</th>
<th>[20-40]</th>
<th>[40-60]</th>
<th>[60-90]</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ʔ]+{-u}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʔ]+{-ah}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]+{-u}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]+{-ah}</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6/ Scores of the Use of [ʔ] vs. [g] and {-u} vs. {-ah} by Men*

Once reading the results of table 6, one may notice that:

- The only four informants who pronounce the /q/ as [ʔ], all their mums are Tlemcenians.
- Among the 71.43% of children who use the [g] but none of them use the morpheme {-u}.
- Among the 77.78% of young individuals, aged between 20 and less than 40 years, who pronounce the [g], only one person does followed by an {-u}.
- All men who are more than 40 years old use the [g] but only 4 informants (with a percentage of 33.33%) pronounce it with {-u}, and the other 66.66% of this age group use the [g] with the morphological variant {-ah}. 
It is noticed in Chart 1 that men in Ain el Hout, without taking into consideration their ages, rarely use the ʕ sound. Their speech is mostly characterized by the pronunciation of /q/ as [g] with the variant {-ah}. They consider that their use of ʕ contradict with their masculinity and their rural environment.

**Percentages of the Use of ʕ vs. [g] and {-u} vs. {-ah} by Women**

Table 7 summarizes the data which concern the use of ʕ vs. [g] in parallel with the use of {-u} vs. {-ah} among the women in Ain El Hout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>The Use of ʕ</th>
<th>[0-20]</th>
<th>[20-40]</th>
<th>[40-60]</th>
<th>[60-90]</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʕ+{-u}</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʕ+{-ah}</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]+{-u}</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]+{-ah}</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A look at table 7 reveals that:

- Among the 44.12% of women, whatever age they have, who use the [g], none of them pronounce it accompanied by the morpheme {-u}.
- Among the other 55.88% of females of different ages, who utilize the sound ʕ, 68.42% of them use it with the variant {-ah} in opposition with 31.58% who pronounce it with the {-u} variant.
The majority of women prefer the use of the [ʔ] sound in /qa:la # lahu/meaning: “he told him” like Tlemcenians. This fact indicates that the use of [ʔ] is just an imitation since 63.16% of women combine the variant {-ah} with the [ʔ] in [ʔallah]: “he told him”, a feature that never occurs in Tlemcen female speech.

**The Use of the Variable {-i} vs. {Ø} in Correlation with Gender**

To check whether Ain el Hout speakers make a distinction in gender in their local speech, all informants were also asked to choose the widely used verb (with or without {-i}) when addressing to a woman:

/ kuli:/ “eat!” (imperative): [ku:l] [ku:li]
/ ʔakalti:/ “you ate” (past): [kli:t] [kli:ti]
/ taʔkuli:na:/ “you eat” (present): [taʔkul] [taʔkli]

**Gender Distinction among Males**

Table 8 gathers the scores of the use of the feminine mark {-i} by men in Ain el Hout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>[0-20]</th>
<th>[20-40]</th>
<th>[40-60]</th>
<th>[60-90]</th>
<th>∑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{-i}</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Ø}</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8/ Scores of the Use of the Feminine Mark by Men**

In this table, 23 male informants from 28 with a percentage of 82.14% use the {-i}.
Pie-chart 1/ Gender Distinction in AHD among Males

What is observable in table 8 is the fact that men in Ain el Hout distinguish between males and females when using the imperative and the interrogative forms.

**Gender Distinction among Females**

Table 9 shows the scores of the use of the feminine mark {-i} by women in Ain el Hout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Variant</th>
<th>[0-20]</th>
<th>[20-40]</th>
<th>[40-60]</th>
<th>[60-90]</th>
<th>∑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{-i}</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Ø}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9/ Scores of the Use of the Feminine Mark {-i} among Women*

In glance vision of this table, one may remark that:
- All young females less than 40 years use the feminine mark {-i}.
- 75% of females aged between [40-60] use the {-i}.
- Three women among seven aged 60 or more than 60 (with a percentage of 42.86%) do not use this feminine mark.

Pie-chart 2/ Gender Distinction in AHD among Females

The data collected show that 29 female informants from 34, (namely 85.29 %) use the feminine mark {-i}.
Like men, women in *Ain El Hout* distinguish between a male and a female when using the imperative and interrogative forms.

This part has confirmed the validity of the data collected through interviews, recordings and questionnaires. However, these statistical results necessitate some analyses and interpretations, and as the topic treated requires a sociolinguistic analysis, the two analytical frameworks of Pierre Bourdieu and Fernand Braudel are adopted.

**DISCUSSION**

Since urbanization has always been considered as the final point in the development of societies, the dialect was permanently used as a channel to achieve it. For this, the dichotomy of (dominant vs. dominated) which was adopted by Pierre Bourdieu in the interpretation of the development and the social changes that societies may undergo in their historical trajectories apparently proved to fit our context of investigation, as the inhabitants of *Ain el Hout* who are rural in their mode of life tend to imitate the urban Tlemcenian inhabitants in all what concern their habits especially their dialectal habits. This tendency of imitation is clearly witnessed in the use of similar linguistic features at both levels of analysis.

This phenomenon is only attributed to the fact that TA possesses a bigger symbolic capital in opposition with that of AHD, and as speakers of this latter went through the stages of human development to arrive at the final point of urbanization, they displayed positive attitudes towards TA and, consequently, got accustomed to the habit of imitating Tlemcenians in their way of speaking seeking to some extent their degree of urbanization. Indeed, this phenomenon has been clearly noticed during the data collection phase. For example, a female informant, who has been met in the bus, asserted in this respect: / ana # nħabb # nahdar # kīma # tlemsenijīn # ta(ang)ebni # hadrathum # nʔi:ja # māhafri:n # laḥwa:ta # jahhadru # balʔala # xīr # laʃra:jat # ʔellı # dʒau # menna # w # menna # ʒabu # ʔelga # wː # jahhadru # bəlga / which means in English: “I like to talk like Tlemcenians, I like their speech, it is pure, they are urbanized, the Houtis talk with el āala and only their daughters-in-law brought the [g], they pronounce the [g]”. In this respect, another female informant also says: / ji:ħ # ḥna # kə # tlemsen # ʔein # āl huːt # wː # tlemsen # ʔi:l # kːf # kːf # hadrathum # ta(ang)ebna # bazzef # wː # nħabbuhum # wː # jḥabbuːna # nħobb # nahdar # kːfhum / meaning “yes, we are like Tlemcen, Ain el Hout and Tlemcen are alike, we like their speech too much, we love them and they love us, I like to speak like them”. When we have asked another girl about her point of view towards TA, she answered: / ta(ang)ebni # hadrathum # tlemsenijīn # ja(ang)ebuːni # f # kul # ʃ1 # madabija # kīmma # nʔulu # manhadroːʃ # bəlga /, i. e., “I like their speech, I like Tlemcenians, I like everything they have or they do, I prefer that we would not pronounce the /g/”. These attitudes indicate the tendency of imitation and emulation which is the result of *Ain el Hout* speakers’ admiration for TA. The interpretation of these attitudes falls in the speciality of Social Psychology of Language more than in the field of Sociolinguistics, but when considering the current of Bourdieu, this fact is attributed to the existence of two symbolic capitals and one of them is older than the other. Hence, one may deduce that TA is deeply influencing its counterpart of *Ain el Hout*. This impact is easily practised through many channels. One of these could be the matrimonial exchanges because
kinship relationships of original Tlemcenian families with the Arabs living in the surroundings or ahwaz of Tlemcen are really rare in comparison with the other ahwaz who are Berber in origin, and that are themselves few in comparison with their kinship relationships with Nedroma and Ain el Hout which they remain as two regions for the external exchanges of Hadars”.

Through the analysis of the characteristics of both TA and AHD in the preceding sections, one may notice the existence of some similarities and other remarkable differences. Among the dialectal affinities, we may notice that Ain el Hout dwellers, both males and females, realize the /q/ as [ʔ] in some words. Yet, the difference between these dialects lies in the prevalence of the variant [ʔ] in TA, and the use of the three variants [q], [ʔ] and [ʔ] for the variable /q/ by the same individual in the same conversation in Ain el Hout. In fact, their imitation for el Hadars had led them to commit many mistakes of pronunciation in some words which are originally pronounced with [q]. Ain el Houtspeakers utter it with [ʔ] because they think that the general rule in TA is the substitution of /q/ by [ʔ] in all environments.

Furthermore, many similar phonological substitutions are equally used in both dialects, as in the alternations of /]%/ and /d/ by [t], /d/ and /b/ by [t] as it has been referred to previously. At the phonological level, the differences between both varieties are represented, on one hand, in the articulation of the affricate /dʃ/ in all its occurrences, except in some few environments. Ain el Houtspeakers tend to pronounce it as the fricative [s] and the affricate urban [dʃ] in a single word as one may hear the word /hodʃar/: “stone” as both [h3ar] and [h3ar]. On the other hand, the differences between their morphological features are rather striking due to the distinct rules that are followed in constructing their verbs, with all types of pronouns, and nouns which can be attributed to the distinction made in terms of gender. In fact, it has been proved that the inhabitants of Ain el Hout mainly the ancient families tend to imitate the urban Tlemcenian speech and this tendency is remarked with different degrees with all individuals, but it is highly witnessed with women. This fact can be attributed to various reasons which have been interpreted through the adoption of Pierre Bourdieu’s view. Yet, it is illogical that AHD is solely influenced by TA. In any objective theorizing, it is said that in any linguistic exchange, both varieties are influencing each other, but the degree of influence can differ from one another. Therefore, Tlemcen speech is also influenced, but with a lesser extent, by its counterpart dialect of Ain el Hout, especially at the phonological and lexical levels for Tlemcen speakers pronounce some words with a [g] sound in addition to whole words, which are rural in origin, mainly those related to agriculture, and that are themselves borrowed from the Bedouin dialects spoken in bedouin environments. Thus, these linguistic facts support Bourdieu’s current which insists on the phenomenon of deglutition which means that the older symbolic capital is constantly erasing some of the constituents of the other symbolic capitals which are not so old. It does so just to keep and perpetuate the continuance of the Dominant-Dominated Dichotomy. However, this fact is not always witnessed because some individuals do not exhibit the trait of imitation for the dialect of ḫadars. Those speakers consider this trait as a threatening behaviour for their own identities. As an example, we found that one informant asserts, when she was asked whether she likes imitating TA or not: /ana # nahdar # haddarti # k1mma # mddari # taːʔ # bba # wa # mma # wa # ʃduːdi /, meaning “I speak on my way, as I used to, the speech of my father, my mother and my grandparents”. Then, another informant who was asked about how she

---

20 Dali Ahmed Ch. (2012: 63)
considers the speech of Tlemcen, replied: / tɔɪna # mliːnHar /, then asked whether individuals in Ain el Hout like to speak as Tlemcenians do, she said: / naζɛ # hadrar # laḥwaːta # tlemsenirja /, and when she has been asked / madabiːkum # tʔaldduhum /, i.e., do you prefer imitating them?, she objected by saying: / lla # ma # nʔaldduhum # ma # walu # ʃnna # nshadro # hadratna # ʃnna # nʃfaḥmuːhum # w # huma # jʃfaḥmuna / meaning “No, we do not imitate them. We speak the way we used to do. We understand them, and they understand us”. In addition, another example about the same attitude was of a girl whom we asked the following question:

/lḥadrə # ntaθ # tlemsenirja # tʃɔʃɔbek /, i.e., do you like Tlemcen dialect?

She answered: / lla /, “no”.

We told her: / tʃebbi # tḥahdrə # ḫaddartak /, i.e., do you like your way of speaking?

She said: / iːθ /, “yes”.

Then, she was asked: / ʃ1ːlaːf # matʃɔʃaʃbaʃkʃ /, i.e., “why don’t you like it?”

But, she did not reply.

This last attitude which exhibits an objection to imitating Tlemcen speech is interpreted on the light of Bourdieu’s Approach when he referred to “linguistic hypercorrection” where he considers that the attempt of getting rid of the conceptions which classify an individual in the category of being dominated leads to the adoption of other different attitudes and habits from those of the dominant individuals. This domination is of a cultural kind. It prompts the individuals of both groups, the dominant and the dominated, to control all what has a relationship with their identities, and as speech is one constituent of the identity of individuals, it undergoes both personal and social control for the sake of avoiding imitation or assimilation to the speech of the other group.

This sociological interpretation for the linguistic phenomenon dealt with in the present research and which some of its aspects have been treated is still in need of more profound analysis because its accurate scientific treatment requires too much time and deeper analysis. Yet, this modest analysis draws a clear picture about the relationship between both dialects where TA is somehow dominating the linguistic behaviours of the members of Ain el Hout community. This domination is attributed to some historical, ethnic and cultural justifications which are in need of more details, but it has undeniably been influenced by its counterpart dialect. Furthermore, the reasons behind this impact constitute another topic of research which requires the investigation of the successive ethnicities which Tlemcen has known through too many long centuries. Anyway, no profound understanding for both dialects could be reached without studying their general and linguistic histories accurately, because all “nations are the result of a long past, and not of one hour, and it is the offspring of the influence of environments of distinct impacts. Therefore, its present is interpreted through restoring its past”.

A question to be raised, at this level of analysis, is: what are the results that can be obtained of Braudel’s approach if it will be applied in the present dialectal phenomenon?

Earlier in this research work, it has been proved that both TA and AHD share many origins and various characteristics particularly those of a Bedouin origin. On the light of Braudel’s

21 This is a meaning translation of the quotation of Gustave Le Bon (no date: 23):

(الآمر نتيجة ماض طويل، وليست ساعة واحدة، لذا يفسر ضعفها بواضعها)
view, the Bedouin dialect develops through time into a rural dialect which, in turn, becomes after long times relatively into an urban dialect. Indeed, this fact provides researchers with appropriate tools to understand its developmental trajectory and vice versa, that is, the urban dialect is the climax that the Bedouin dialects reach in their course of development, whereas the rural dialects occupy a transitional stage between both urban and Bedouin dialects. Furthermore, many urban dialects, through long eras, become rural (the middle period), or even Bedouin (the long period), and the following diagram illustrates more clearly the development of dialects in the course of time:

![Diagram 1/ The Process of Dialect Development](Image)

It is demonstrated that the two analytical and sociological approaches of Pierre Bourdieu and Fernand Braudel have proved the existence of many similar origins between the characteristics of the urban TA and its rural counterpart of Ain el Hout. Furthermore, the data analysis, on the light of both approaches, attributes the occurring differences to the nature of the environments, which they were constantly evolving through time; i.e., the difference in the two environments have led to various distinct dialectal features.

**CONCLUSIONS**

In this paper, it has been attempted, through the problematics which have been raised, to understand the nature of the dialectal exchanges between two dialects of different types, the first is of an urban kind, and the second is rural. To a arrive at a profound understanding for this sociolinguistic phenomenon, many phonological variants and various morphological constructions of both dialects were reviewed, a fact that was helpful to prove that these two varieties are ‘mixed’ dialects which share the same origins, but they had undergone through history some developments so that each had a different trajectory that is different from the other’s.
Starting from this conception, the central core of this study has been to first determine the type of relationship between the two dialects, and sought to analyze it through a scientific and sociolinguistic approach via the adoption of Bourdieu’s Structurational approach, and utilizing his conceptual framework: symbolic capital, dialectal habitus, dominant-dominated dichotomy…etc which unveiled the tight relationships that characterize their mutual dialectal exchange and proved that AHD is heavily influenced by that of Tlemcen city, and more deeply in women’s speech more than in masculine speech, and among the old generation more than among the young one. However, this influence is also exercised on urban TA by that of Ain el Hout, even if it is noticed at a lesser degree in comparison with the influence on the other dialect. This reciprocal impact is due to many historical, political, economic factors, and heavily practised through the matrimonial exchanges between the two regions.
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