

The Karaki dialect of Christians and Muslims in Jordan- Social linguistic study.

Ahmad S. Al janadbah, Zayed University- UAE- Abu Dhabi

E-mail.Ahmadaljanadbah@gmail.com

Submission: 17/05/2019 Acceptance: 22/11/2019 Publication: 31/12/2019

Abstract:

The goal of this paper is to study the dialect among the Christians and Muslims of the city of Karak in Jordan. The study is grounded in the literature and methodology of socio-linguistics and aims to answer two central questions: a- Does religion have an impact on the Karaki dialect? and b- Does the geographical location have an impact on the Karaki dialect? In order to answer these questions, the study employed a sample of 50 participants who grew up and acquired their dialects in a single language environment (Karak Governorate, Southern Amman). The sample was distributed within the city of Karak (The city) and from the three suburbs and villages of Karak. The most important outcome, however, was that the geographical location had a significant effect on the characteristics of the Karaki dialect. While there was a clear difference between the dialect of those who live in the city of Karak and those living in villages and suburbs, the results of the sample did not show an effect of religion (Christianity or Islam) on the dialect of the respondents. However this study aims to explore the influence of religion exemplified Karaki dialect.

Key words: geographical location, Karak ,Religion ,Social linguistics ,Karak dialect.

اللهجة الكركية عند المسيحيين والمسلمين: دراسة لسانية اجتماعية

تهدف هذه الورقة إلى دراسة اللهجة الكركية في الأردن عند مسيحيي ومسلمي محافظة الكرك في الأردن، معتمدة اعتماداً كبيراً على منهج علم اللغة الاجتماعي في الإجابة عن سؤالين محوريين هما: ما مدى تأثير الدين في اللهجة الكركية؟ والسؤال الآخر: ما مدى تأثير الموقع الجغرافي في اللهجة الكركية؟ وقد استعانت الدراسة للإجابة عن هذين السؤالين بعينة مكونة من 50 مشاركاً، جميع أفراد العينة نشؤوا واكتسبوا لهجتهم في بيئة لغوية واحدة (محافظة الكرك- جنوب عمان) وقد توزعت العينة من داخل مدينة الكرك (المدينة) ومن ثلاث ضواحي وقرى في محافظة الكرك، ليتم التحقق من أثر الموقع الجغرافي والدين من عدمهما؛ وخلصت الدراسة إلى نتائج متنوعة كان من أهمها: أن الموقع الجغرافي له أثر بارز في تحديد معالم ومميزات اللهجة الكركية، حيث ظهر فرق واضح بين لهجة من يسكن في مركز مدينة الكرك عنهم ممن يسكن في القرى والضواحي، بصرف النظر عن المرجعية الدينية لدى العينة، بينما لم تظهر نتائج العينة أثراً ذا شأن كبير للدين (المسيحية والإسلام) في اللهجة الكركية لدى أفراد العينة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الدين، الكرك، الموقع الجغرافي، علم اللغة الاجتماعي، اللهجة الكركية.

Introduction

The connection between religion and dialectal variation has gained prominence in the literature on sociolinguistics. Trudgill (1983) identifies religion as one of a number of social variables, along with others such as gender, social class, education, and ethnicity that can influence a dialect. Baker and Bowie (2010) conducted a study focusing on linguistic variations in Utah County among Mormons (members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints) and how vowel pronunciations differ among adherents of a particular religious community.

In the Arab Middle East, a number of linguistic studies have found a correlation between religious group affiliation and dialect (Blanc, 1964; Holes, 1987; Jastrow, 2004; Soliman, 2008). Religious affiliation articulates strongly

with dialect—the result of different ethno-religious communities developing their own in-group speech patterns. While different religious communities may all speak Arabic, the dissimilar forms, especially as displayed by minority religious groups such as Jews and Christians (Versteegh & Versteegh, 1997) underscore a response to dominant social trends and linguistic standards in their society (Miller, 2003). Thus, as both Baker and Bowie (2010) and Trudgill (1983) note, religion serves as a social marker that affects dialect in the region. With this in mind, religiously-based dialect deviations can often mirror larger manifestations of social boundaries, inter-religious relations, and societal assimilation (Versteegh & Versteegh, 1997).

Religion in the countries of the Levant (Palestine, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon) is a complicated issue as it is intricately connected to ethnicity (Izady, 2014). Izady (2014) states:

“Ethnicity refers to group identity, and group identity is a product of history. In the Middle East, ethnicity/group identity can be based on language (Turkomans), religion (Alawites/Alaouites, Levantine Christians, Iraqi or Lebanese Shias, the Armenians), life style (Kurds), common history of suffering and persecution (Jews, Circassians), integrated economy, or a combination of two or more of these or other factors (Arabs) or some other unique criterion (Druze)” (Izady, 2014).

Thus, religion is not merely a way of life or connection to the divine, but indeed a group identification that influences, among other things, language and dialect. While Al-Wer’s (1991) study asserts that religion in Jordan plays no role in dialects, her study 24 years later in and around the city of Al-Salt found that religion “may indeed be an important factor or is emerging as such” in dialectical speech patterns of Jordanians (E. Al-Wer, Horesh, Herin, & Fanis, 2015). The reasons for this are beyond the scope of this paper, but it is possible that socio-political developments and tensions in the region may have contributed to this emergence. The important note here

is that religion is a marker that deserves attention in the study of linguistic and dialectic patterns at difference linguistic variation: Phonetic, morphological syntactic and pragmatic , and that is the focus of this paper.

Context and Communities

The Middle East and North Africa have long been home to a multitude of different cultures, peoples, and religious communities. The rise of Islam and its subsequent expansion meant that communities in the MENA region were largely “Arabized,” both culturally and linguistically, and had to find new ways to construct their respective identities (Versteegh & Versteegh, 1997). Language was one of the most crucial instruments in this process of identity formation.

The modern history of the Levant is marked by the end of Ottoman control over the area in the aftermath of World War I, and the subsequent mandate period, giving the British and French control over the area. The Jordanian state traces its establishment to 1921 as a mandated emirate with the collapse of the Ottoman Empire (Massad, 2001). With the end of World War II, and the end of British and French control over the Levant, five separate states would emerge: Jordan, Palestine, Lebanon, Syria, and Israel, and Jordan gained its independence from the British in 1946. The main urban centers at the time were not found in Jordan, that suffered centuries of neglect by the Ottoman rulers and subsequently the British. The main urban centers in the Levant were Haifa, Yafa (Jaffa), Jerusalem, Beirut, and Damascus (Doughan, 2010). However, the establishment of Amman as the new Kingdom’s capital facilitated the establishment of bureaucratic and governmental institutions of the state while simultaneously creating a migration to the new urban center from towns such as Karak, Irbid, Al-Salt, and Madaba (Doughan, 2010).

The influx of Palestinian refugees during the formation of the state of Israel in 1948 created tensions in the new kingdom. Massad (2001) states that “a

Jordanian nativist self-developed that was opposed to an assortment of non-native others” (p.11), which included Palestinians. The wars of 1948 (and Jordan’s annexation of what is now known as the “West Bank”) and 1967 (in which Jordan lost control of the West Bank) had significant impacts on the demography of the state. This would also have effects on the dialects spoken across the Kingdom.

Jordan’s history in the twentieth century has been heavily impacted by the conflicts in the region. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990 and the current crisis in Syria have brought an influx of Jordanian, Palestinian, Iraqi and Syrian refugees (back) to Jordan. The religious demographics of Jordan indicate approximately a 5-7% population of Christians (E. Al-Wer et al., 2015) with a significant majority of the Jordanian population being Sunni Muslim.

Jordan’s cosmopolitan and national development within the last 80 years provided a unique opportunity for the nation to create both its own domestic and, in turn, linguistic, identity (Massad, 2001). If language does indeed mirror the diversity in a society, the success with which Jordan’s government has been able to integrate a diverse population of ethnic and religious groups within its newly founded nationalist framework should be displayed in that population’s general dialectical conformity.

While Al-Salt was the major metropolitan area in Jordan before its establishment as a modern state, the monarchy, in deciding on a new capital city, placed greater emphasis on Karak, the city situated on the King’s Highway (an historical trade route extending from Egypt to the Euphrates) in southern Jordan, as well as on the city of Amman that housed an established Circassian community.

Karak is one of the oldest known settlements in Jordan with its roots in the Bible as Kir of Moab. Its location about two hours south of Amman in hilly, limestone terrain, in close proximity to the Dead Sea and near multiple

surrounding valleys which waters supply the needs of both agriculture and pastoralism, made Karak a formidable and valuable settlement. Jordanians value Karak because it is the place where many indigenous tribes originated. These were semi-nomadic tribes vied for control of the area's water for their herds and farms. Moreover, the town's position on the King's Highway trade route turned Karak into a contested place. Later, greater sedentarization (The settling of a nomadic population), followed by the establishment of modern Jordan, pacified warring tribes for the sake of national cooperation, leading to an overall melding of tribal cultures and linguistic tradition in Jordan (Palva, 2008).

It is not surprising, then, that Karak is known for its own unique dialect, which has been developing even before the establishment of Amman as a capital. Moreover, Karak is also well-known for its religious harmony. Christians comprise at least 25 percent of the city's population and have had a long, beneficent existence there. Karak's status as a symbol of Jordanian culture and nationalist pride coupled with its well-regarded status as a beacon of religious harmony between Muslims and Christians makes it a worthy place to study dialect.

Significance of the Study

This socio-linguistic study is focuses on investigating whether dialect differences exist between the majority Jordanian- Muslim community and the minority Jordanian- Christian community in and around the city of Karak. The innovative character of this research is that it includes religion as a factor that might affect regional dialects. The relationship between religion and language is a relatively new field of study within the area of sociolinguistics and studying this phenomenon in the Jordanian context is nascent. So far, research has focused on dialect in various cities in Jordan (Abdel-Jawad, 1981, 1986; Al-Ali & Al-Arafa, 2010; E. Al-Wer, 1999; E. Al-Wer, de Jong, & Holes, 2013; Zuraiq & Zhang, 2006) In short, the connection between dialect

formation and religion as well as a study that considers Karak as a city for dialect formation is not present in the literature.

The opportunity to study the interrelation between religion and language is ideal in Jordan. First, the Christian community is sizeable enough in the country to afford an actual understanding of its minority linguistic situation within a dominant Muslim society. Second, relatively little research has investigated the link between language and religion in Karak, providing a unique opportunity for original data collection, new evidence-based inferences, and socio-scientific conclusions.

Of course, whoever, There has been a number of studies on the dialect of Karak (: El -salman (2016), Mrayat(2015) , and El-salman (2003) (Ph.D. dissertation)) these studies has deeply focused to discuss the Christian-Karki dialect that is considered as a marker of religious identity?.this project is by no means conclusive as language as well as linguistic research constantly develops. . In the future, I hope to pursue a more in-depth study that includes greater numbers of conversational participants and geographical locations.

The Dialect and Its Features.

While the majority of those who have settled in Jordan (whether as nomads, migrants, returnees, or refugees) have flocked to its burgeoning capital, this study focuses on the city of Karak. Karak's antiquity and prominence in ethnic Jordanian culture has made Karak's linguistic features very distinguishable. The Karaki dialect easily recognizable by many Jordanians and is linguistically distinct in dialect from Amman and much of the rest of Jordan.

The religious composition of Karak also makes it an interesting context to study. With a Christian population of approximately 25%, the population of Karak represents an ideal mix for which to study dialect. Karak's Christian population is one of the largest in Jordan and has been in Karak for centuries.

As a mirror for Jordanian religious relations, Karak illustrates co-existence and tolerance to the fullest, and as such would likely lead to a singular dialect among all religions.

In addition to Palva (2008), my own position as someone with roots in Karak has provided me the grounding to study and dissect the dialect. I evaluated certain phonetic features of the Karaki dialect, such as: [q], normally pronounced in Karak as [g]; [θ] pronounced as such; and, [d^ʕ], pronounced as such. Additionally, the study evaluated the Karaki use of the dual tense in nouns, [b] to denote the present tense in verbs, and the lack of gender distinction past the second and third person singular. Attributive demonstratives such as hath [hæð] (this), hay (this fem.), hathak [haðæk] (this), and hathik [haðIk] (this fem.) were evaluated. Negation using the ending la, ma, and fish were addressed as well. Finally, I analyzed the usage of Karaki-specific frontal /k/ palatalization and the presence of any foreign words.

Participant Information

I followed the same research criteria using Al-Wer's (2007) study. Participants ranged from 18-25 years old, since this would be the target age of the third generation—children of native-born Jordanians (regardless of actual ethnic background, i.e. with origins in Palestine or not). Participants were all university-educated or currently attending university in order to standardize levels of education. Information acquired for the study included: 1) name; 2) age; 3) religion; 4) place of birth; and 5) profession, vocation, or place of study. I did not note whether our participants were of Palestinian or Jordanian ancestry. Arabic linguistic researchers such as Herin (2013), Al-Wer (2007), Abdel Jawad (1986) and others have already discussed the ethnic influence on Arabic dialects, and especially on Jordanian Arabic dialects. While these ethnic markers do influence the Arabic dialects of present-day Jordanians, the

purpose of this study is to determine specific religious influences on Jordanian Arabic dialect formation. Religion has been noted to correlate with other societal underpinnings, such as the political system, but not necessarily with other social constructs. Moreover, as Bassiouney (2009) suggests, religion in the Middle East is directly linked with ethnicity and, therefore, analyzing religion can be, in its own way, tantamount to analyzing ethnicity, but without the multitude of other experimental variables.

Ethnicity should not be a part of the data if we are to analyze Jordanians first as Jordanians and subsequently with regard to their religious affiliation. Thus, I maintained a constant variable regarding participants' ethnicity, viewing everyone under the lens of Jordanian nationality for the purpose of focusing exclusively on the effects of religion in the study. With this caveat in mind, a similar study in the future could focus on ethnicity and religion separately and the way they intersect with dialect in Jordan.

Methodology

In order to obtain data regarding the dialect of Karak, I prompted conversations with 50 Karaki participants, who included 15 Muslim men, 10 Muslim women, 15 Christian men, and 10 Christian women. All conversations in groups were recorded and the goal was that participants would feel comfortable in these situations with others of a similar background to elicit any dialect that might exist. In-group dialect features are most pronounced in conversations in which each participant shares an identity commonality with the other conversational participants. "Prompted" means here that I would stimulate conversation among the participants using a variety of questions, while participating as minimally as possible. Though conversations create a conundrum in that each one differs from the other and there is no exact standard for a given quantity of phonetic realizations, "in-group" conversations are the most likely to divulge unique dialectical

occurrences. All conversations were held in Jordanian colloquial Arabic and some examples of the questions used to start the conversations included:

What are your opinions on smoking in Jordan?

What are your dreams or aspirations?

What are your daily routines?

What are your favorite foods or desserts?

What is your opinion of sexual harassment in Jordan and the places it occurs?

How is the Muslim/Christian living situation in Jordan in your opinion ??

These questions were meant to stimulate participants to speak comfortably on subjects known to them. Additionally, they were intended to be minimally controversial, as this could overtly shape the participants' responses since, they might be hoping not to offend anyone in the room, including the recorder. All conversations were recorded via EVISTR Mini Digital Voice Recorder device in quite room used to record each participant group separately for 60 minutes to each group, and a thorough review of the recordings was done, with coding of particular dialectic features transcribed.

As previously noted, twelve conversations were recorded with no fewer than three participants in any of the conversations, leading to a total of 50 participants, all from Karak. Conversations ranged from 30 minutes to one hour and twenty minutes, depending on participants' schedules and our agreement. The conversations recorded included: 1) Muslim men; 2) Muslim women; 3) Christian men; 4) Christian women.

Data and Results

Analyzing the data required an implicit quantitative auditory analysis approach with two raters. I listened to the recordings and recorded the occurrence of certain phonetic pronunciations as well as morphological, and otherwise important, linguistic features. In measuring phonetic features, I

took the number of occurrences of a given phonetic pronunciation and divided that by the number of possible occurrences to get a percentage. Essentially, I listened for words with the phoneme in it and noted the actual pronunciation. The analysis focused on phonetic features: [q], [θ], and [d^h]. For [q] I analyzed how many times it was realized as [q], [g], or a glottalized aspiration. [θ] was evaluated with regard to pronunciation as [t] or [s]. Finally, [d^h] was analyzed in terms of its pronunciation as [z] or [d].

In addition to the phonetic data, I noted whether the participants used the phoneme [b] as a prefix to denote present tense verbs. This is a known feature of the Jordanian Arabic dialect and would denote participation in the dialectic community. The use of demonstrative sign words such as heyk (like this), had (This), hay(yes), hada(This.M), and hadol(those.P.) in Amman and hath(This), hay(Like this), hathak(This M.), and hathik(This F.) in Karak was detailed. I noted the presence of the dual conjugation of nouns as well as gender distinction in terms of pronouns and grammar conjugations beyond the second- and third-person singular forms. With regard to negation, I analyzed the use of the “-ish” [Iʃ] ending, which in Amman, may occur at the end of a verb or in words such as mish, meaning “no” or “not,” and fish, meaning “there is not.” In Karak, the most frequently used negations particle are la, ma, and fish. I detailed [k] palatalization at the start of words/k/ → [tʃ] beginning with this phoneme in the Karaki dialect. Finally, I compiled any foreign vocabulary, specifically English vocabulary, which may have arisen during the conversations.

The sample size for this study included undergraduate and graduate students from Karak, all in the age group of 18-25. Fifteen male each from Muslim and Christian communities were included as were 10 female each from Muslim and Christian communities, bringing the total sample size to 50. The results of the analyses of the conversations are as follows:

Table 1. Comparison of Urban and Rural Dialects in Karak

Population Unit of Analysis	City of Karak		Villages around Karak	
	Muslims M&F	Christians M&F	Muslims M&F	Christians M&F
Pronounced as [q]	None	None	None	None
Pronounced as [g]	100%	100%	100%	100%
Pronounced as glottalized aspiration (hamzah) ء	None	None	None	None
Phoneme [t̤]				
Pronounced as [θ]	10%	10%	100%	100%
Pronounced as [t]	80%	80%	None	None
Pronounced as [s]	10%	10%	None	None
Phoneme [d̤ʰ]				
Pronounced as [d̤ʰ]	None	None	None	None

Pronounced as [ð̥]	30%	30%	40%	40%
Pronounced as [d]	50%	50%	None	None
Pronounced as [th]	20%	20%	60%	60%
Dual declension keys Question	Not Existed lawaih, laih,lawa ish,A”dk o.mu hwon)	Not Existed lawaih, laih,lawaish ,A”dko.mu hwon)	Not Existed lawaih, laih,lawai sh,A”dko .mu hwon)	Not Existed lawaih, laih,law aish,A”d ko.mu hwon)
Demonstrative Signs	Existed (had, hadey, hadak, hadeek,h adool,ha doolak)	Existed (had, hadey, hadak, hadeek,had ool,hadoola k)	Existed (hath, hathy, hathak, hathik,hat hool, hathoolak)	Existed (hath, hathy, hathak, hathik, hathool, hathool ak))
Present tense [b]	Existed: “bokl” I eat “Baktub ” I write ...	Existed “bokl” I eat “Baktub” I write	Existed: “bokl” I eat “Baktub” I write	Existed: “bokl” I eat “Baktub ” I write
Foreign Words	Existed:	Existed:	None	None

	“ of course, really, nice and more others	“ of course, really, nice and more others		
[K] Palatalization as: ch	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited

Results 1	Results 2	Total Results
~ -0.03	2014	1.94 %
~ 0.02	2013	1.97 %
~ 0.08	2012	1.95 %

Analysis of Results:

The above table shows the variation in dialect between those from the city of Karak, and those from the surrounding villages. The table depends on the four features of language: phonetic, morphological, grammatical, and semantic. This study focuses on the most important dialectical characteristic within each of the above four features, as they appear in the Karaki dialect specifically. It is important to note that the population sample for this study was drawn from two areas within the Governorate of Karak: the city of Karak (the capital of the governorate) and three villages surrounding the city (Alsmachya, Adir, and Hmood). The sample was chosen from these villages due to their geographic distance from the city, giving these villages a distinct cultural identity, shared among their Christians and Muslims alike. Geography and

culture are the focus of the primary question guiding this research. While, as we will see, gender did not play a defining role on dialect, except insofar as it related to religion or geographic origin, the study of the effect of gender on dialect requires a larger study and is not the focus of this study.

In the table above that analyzes the differences between the urban and rural dialect of those within and outside the city of Karak, the participants unanimously pronounced the phoneme (q) as a (g) – thus, qaryah (village) becomes garyah, qahwah (coffee) becomes gahwah. This pronunciation of the sound (q) distinguishes the Karaki dialect (whether urban or rural), and differentiates it from neighboring dialects in Jordan, as these dialects tend to pronounce the same phoneme as a hamza (ء), thus qalb (heart) is pronounced ‘alb, and qahwah (coffee) pronounced ‘ahweh. It must be noted that some words in the Arabic language with the phoneme(q) are always pronounced (q), for example (Cairo) القاهرة and القرآن(The quran). This difference can possibly be attributed to lifestyle differences marked by urban and rural living that results in linguistic variation.

Unlike the phoneme (q) that was pronounced in the same way among both urban and rural participants, the phoneme (θ) was not. Those from the villages surrounding Karak all pronounced the (t) as it is pronounced in Arabic, i.e. (t) (as in thin), thus pronouncing the words(Tuesday, example, Many) كَثِير، مثلاً، الثلاثاء as they are written in Arabic. Meanwhile, in the city, participants had a mixed pronunciation of the phoneme letter, with some participants pronouncing the (t) as (t), or (t), or (s), or some combination of all three. 10% percent of participants from the city of Karak (regardless of religion) pronounced the (t) as a (t), 80% pronounced the same letter as a(t), while 10% pronounced the (t) as (s). The same participant could pronounce the (t) as follows:(Kater many, Altalata Tuesday- Al talata Tuesday).

The letter (d^ʕ) is considered in Arabic to be one of the most difficult to pronounce, giving Arabic the moniker of (language of the d^ʕaad (لغة الضاد). The letter is difficult to pronounce, both among native speakers and non-native speakers, and is often mispronounced when the letter appears in a word. This difficulty can be attributed to the fact that the letter (d^ʕ) has similar phonetic properties and is formed in similar ways to the letters (ð^ʕ), (ð), and (d). In the same way as the letter (θ), the letter (d^ʕ) was pronounced in different ways by the same participants and from those within the same population. The most notable results from the study are in the pronunciation of (d^ʕ) as either (ð^ʕ), (ð), or (d) 30% percent and 40% percent of urban and rural participants respectively pronounced the sound (d^ʕ) as a (ð^ʕ), thus : d^ʕrory (necessary) as ð^ʕrory, . Among urban Karakis, there was a very high percentage of the sample (50%) who pronounced the sound (d^ʕ) as a (d) thus: d^ʕraba (Hit) as daraba, Meanwhile, the most noticeable difference between urban Karaki and their counterparts from the village was in the pronunciation of the (d^ʕ) as a (ð), 20% percent of rural pronounced the sound (d^ʕ) as a (ð) and 60% percent of urban pronounced it the same way, thus: Md^ʕayiq (worry) as Mðayiq, and d^ʕayyaq (tight) as ðayyaq.

It is not surprising that the Karaki dialect (urban and rural) drops from its usage the standard Arabic use of the dual (ـين and ـان) and instead replaces it with plural pronouns. This is the case with other Jordanian dialect, the majority of which drop the plural pronunciation in speech, especially with verbs. The Karaki dialect replaces the dual pronoun with the demonstrative pronoun *هظول* that is used to indicate the dual and the plural masculine and feminine, thus offering evidence of the lack of a dual pronoun in the Karaki dialect. And perhaps what distinguishes the Karaki dialect is that both the

urban and rural participants in the sample agree on a unified pronunciation of these demonstrative pronouns; they pronounce (This.M ha ðah as hað^ʕa, This .F. haðehi as hð^ʕi, and (Those Hau ʔla as haʔð^ʕol.

The use of the interrogative in the Karaki dialect was also the same across the population sample, and the participants used any number of words to express questions: as Why into: lawaih, Layh,lawaysh and walwaih etc. There was an agreed upon use of these interrogative words depends on its use in the sentence and its agreement in gender and number: thus, Karakis will use for offering something (Adak) for a singular male and (Adki)for a singular female.

The use of the present tense in the Karaki dialect is one of its most distinguishable features and marks those from both urban and rural areas in Karak. At times when a present-tense verb becomes necessary, the participants in the sample all added the sound (B) to the beginning of the word in all cases, such as:(Badros I am studying) (Bokl I am eating)(Baskn I am living) etc for a singular male and female. This characteristic is found in other Jordanian dialects, but not with such uniformity as is found in those from the region of Karak.

Two other phenomena deserve mention that were noticed by the author upon hearing the recordings. The first of these is the interspersing of foreign (mainly English) words into daily speech. This feature was quite widespread among the participants from within the city of Karak, while it did not appear at all among the sample from the villages around Karak. The author attributes this phenomenon to cultural, social and economic factors.

The second phenomenon worth noting is the conversion of the sound (k) to a compound sound, (tch) that does not naturally occur in the Arabic alphabet. The conversion of the K into (tch) appears in limited instances and in limited words among both sample populations (urban and rural). The

conversion was often used as a pronoun to indicate the second person feminine, as in How are you for singular female (Kaif Halik) it also can pronounced as (Kaif Halitch) while the use of the K in this case is used to indicate the second-person masculine The author notes that this is not unique to the Karaki dialect, and that indeed other Jordanian dialects, as in the north (Irbid, Ajloun, Jerash) makes the same conversion. This conversion from K to tch can also be seen across the region, as in the peasants of the West Bank who will say (tchif) instead of (Kaif) while the Iraqis will say (tcham) instead of (kam- how much/ many) This phenomenon is quite widespread in the Arab region and is attributable to the phonetic marker of the sound (k).

Table 2: Conversation of Karaki Muslim and Christian Men & Women Compared

Population Unit of Analysis	Karaki Muslims		Karaki Christians	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Phoneme ق [q]				
Pronounced as [q]	None	None	None	None
Pronounced as [g]	100%	100%	100%	100%
Pronounced as glottalized aspiration	None	None	None	None
Phoneme ث [θ]				

Pronounced as [t̪]	100%	100%	100%	100%
Pronounced as [t]	None	None	None	None
Pronounced as [s]	None	None	None	None
Phoneme ض [d ^ʕ]				
Pronounced as [d ^ʕ]	None	None	None	None
Pronounced as [d]	None	None	None	None
Pronounced as [ð]	100%	100%	100%	100%
Declension Keys question	None Existed (lawyah, laih,lawai sh,A”dko .mu hwon)	None Existed (lawyah, laih,lawai sh,A”dko. mu hwon)	None Existed (lawyah, laih,law aish,A”d ko.mu hwon)	None Existed (lawyah, laih,lawai sh,A”dko. mu hwon)
Demonstrative Signs	Existed (hath, hay, hathak, hathik)	Existed (hath, hay, hathak, hathik)	Existed (hath, hay, hathak, hathik)	Existed (hath, hay, hathak, hathik)
Present tense [b]-	Existed	Existed	Existed	Existed

	Ex: “bokl” I eat “Baktub” I write	Ex: “bokl” I eat “Baktub” I write	Ex: “bokl” I eat “Baktub ” I write	Ex: “bokl” I eat “Baktub” I write
Foreign Words	Existed: “ of course, really, nice and more others	Existed: “ of course, really, nice and more others	Existed: “ of course, really, nice and more others	Existed: “ of course, really, nice and more others
Religion Words	Existed: “ inshallah, mashallah, h, Alhamdol lah h and wallah as I swear.	Existed: “ inshallah, mashallah , Alhamdol lah h and wallah as I swear.	Existed: Same words used by Muslims speakers .	Existed: Same words used by Muslims speakers.
[k] Palatalizatio n tch	Limited	Limited	Limited	Limited

The above table displays the results in the difference in dialect between Christians and Muslims in Karak (without differentiating between geographic location, i.e. urban vs. rural) This is one of the central questions in this

research. By referencing Table 1, we can see that religion has no clear effect on the dialect in Karak. Using the same units of analysis to analyze dialect as in the previous table, we see no difference between Christians and Muslims to which we can point out. The two samples in this analysis (Christians and Muslims) both converted the phoneme (q) to the sound (g) at a rate of 100%, as they both converted the phoneme (θ) to (t) at the same rate. While it is known that the majority of Jordanian dialects (particularly the Ammani dialect) convert the phoneme (q) to a (ʔ) ϵ in many cases, and converted the (θ) to a (t) or (s), We do not see this variation in the Karaki dialect in the sample population of this study, be they Christian or Muslim.

As for the pronunciation of the phoneme (d^{S}), a difference a slight difference between Christians and Muslims is visible. , This cannot be considered as a marker of dialectical difference between those of different religious communities in Karak. Neither community correctly pronounced the (d^{S}), as it should be pronounced (i.e. as it should actually be sounded in standard Arabic). This is not surprising due to its phonetic difficulty and its closeness to the sound (d^{S}), to (d) and (δ). Many Jordanian dialects pronounce the (d^{S}) sound as (δ^{S}) or (d). It seems that the Karaki dialect differentiates itself among Christians and Muslims by pronouncing that sound as a (δ) and this is no doubt a marker differentiating the Karaki dialect from others in Jordan. Based on the author's knowledge of Jordanian dialects (as a native Jordanian and a linguist), there are no other dialects that would pronounce the word (Mitd¹ig-worry) as Mit δ ig, for example.

It is also worth noting that there were no differences in the sample in the use of the dual pronouns in verbs, but instead only used the dual in nouns, e.g. بنتين (bintayn two girls), مدينتين (madynatyn two cities), شابين (shabyn two guys), etc. There was also no difference among Christians and Muslims

in the use of the interrogative, nor the demonstrative pronouns. The two communities agreed on the insertion of the phoneme (B) before present tense verbs as was noted above among the urban sample. It was quite apparent in the sample of that religious communities use foreign words in every day speech, namely words such as “already”, “nice”, “midterm”, and “ok”. There was also a high degree of agreement in certain cases of converting the *هـ* to the compound sound (tch), as in the case of (Kalyb or chalib dog) or (kam hada to cham hada/ how much is this).

There was a particularly interesting finding pertaining to the religious variable in that it shows the religious and social harmony that has existed between Muslims and Christians in Jordan for hundreds of years. Both groups used religious terminology specific to Islam more so than those words related to Christianity. So, words such as (Wallah) *والله* (as avowing, asserting, or showing surprise) (Inshallah, Alhamdollah, Alsalamo, alykom, Saly al nabi). These phrases were uttered by Christians with the same ease as their Muslim counterparts, and the author attributes this to the fact that the Christians are a minority group that live among a majority Muslim population, thus being affected by the majority among whom they live. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the use of religious phraseology does not emphasize religious commitment or faith. Many non-religious Muslims use these same phrases in many cases without any religious connotation. The most noteworthy example of this is the phrase (Inshallah) *إن شاء الله* (God willing) among many Muslims that proves the non-religious use of religious phrases.

Conclusion

This study focused on the effect of religion and geographic location on dialect, attempting to answer the question of the effect of religion on the dialect of Christian and Muslims in Karak and three surrounding villages in the

governorate of Karak. In this study, the correlation between dialects and religion has been investigated for the first time exemplified by the city of Karak. The sample size was a total of fifty participants that were equally divided among Christians and Muslims and equally divided among the urban and rural populations in Karak. The gender of the participants was 30 men and 20 women. The effect of geographic location proved to be a differentiating marker between those within the city of Karak and those who live in the surrounding villages, both Christian and Muslim. There was a general agreement in dialectic pronunciation among those in the city versus those in the villages, and especially among those who are educated. As for the impact of religion, perhaps the most significant finding of this study was that religion had no impact on dialect on the spoken Arabic of Karaki, except in very limited instances, and as social phrases, and not as indicators of faith practices. This study examined the Karaki dialect within the frameworks of religion and geographic location, and showed that there are a number of issues that impact dialect that deserve further study, namely, gender, age, lineage, and national identity. This study can be served as a pilot study that can be served for researchers of the Jordanian and Karaki dialect.

References

- Abdel-Jawad, H. (1981). *LEXICAL AND PHONOLOGICAL VARIATION IN SPOKEN ARABIC IN AMMAN* (PhD). University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. Retrieved from <https://repository.upenn.edu/dissertations/AAI8207924>
- Abdel-Jawad, H. (1986). The emergence of an urban dialect in the Jordanian urban centers. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 61(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1986.61.53>
- Al-Ali, M., & Al-Arafa, A. (2010). An experimental sociolinguistic study of language variation in Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3, 207–230.

Al-Wer, E. (1999). Why do different variables behave differently? Data from Arabic. *Language and Society in the Middle East and North Africa*, 38–57.

Al-Wer, E., de Jong, R. E., & Holes, C. (2013). *Arabic Dialectology: In Honour of Clive Holes on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Brill. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.lb/books?id=HZ93Usv6ni4C>

Al-Wer, E. E. (1991). *Phonological Variation in the Speech of Women from Three Urban Areas in Jordan*. University of Essex. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.lb/books?id=2FHONwAACAAJ>

Al-Wer, E., Horesh, U., Herin, B., & Fanis, M. (2015). How Arabic Regional Features Become Sectarian Features. Jordan as a Case Study. *Zeitschrift Für Arabische Linguistik*, (62), 68–87. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.13173/zeitarabling.62.0068>

Al-Wer, Enam. (2007). The formation of the dialect of Amman. *Arabic in the City: Issues in Dialect Contact and Language Variation*, 5, 55.

Baker, W., & Bowie, D. (2010). Religious Affiliation as a Correlate of Linguistic Behavior. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 15(2). Retrieved from <https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol15/iss2/2>

Bassiouney, R. (2009). *Arabic Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.lb/books?id=nlF99qlS254C>

Blanc, H. (1964). *Communal dialects in Baghdad*. Cambridge, MA: Center for Middle Eastern Studies of Harvard University. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.lb/books?id=lmpBAAAAIAAJ>

Doughan, Y. (2010). *Dilemmas of Identity and Cultural Diversity among Ammani Youth* (Background Paper) (p. 12). Issam Fares Institute at the American University of Beirut. Retrieved from <https://www.giga-hamburg.de/en/publication/dilemmas-of-identity-and-cultural-diversity-among-ammani-youth>

Herin, B. (2013). Do Jordanians really speak like Palestinians. *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies*, 13, 99–114.

Holes, C. (1987). *Language variation and change in a modernising Arab state: The case of Bahrain*. London and New York: Kegan Paul International. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.lb/books?id=KEYOAAAAQAAJ>

- Izady, M. (2014). Question of ethnicity in the Middle East. Retrieved March 20, 2018, from <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/220057-question-of-ethnicity-in-the-middle-east>
- Jastrow, O. (2004). The Arabic dialects of the “Mutallat” (Central Israel). *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, (29), 166–175. Retrieved from <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=2394706>
- Massad, J. A. (2001). *Colonial Effects*. Columbia University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7312/mass12322>
- Miller, C. (2003). The relevance of Arabic-based Pidgins–Creoles for Arabic Linguistics. *Al-Lughā, (Cairo: Arab Development Center)*, 4, 7–46. Retrieved from <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00150427/document>
- Palva, H. (2008). Sedentary and Bedouin Dialects in Contact: Remarks on Karaki and Saḫī (Jordan). *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies*, 8, 53–70. Retrieved from <https://www.journals.uio.no/index.php/JAIS/article/view/4589>
- Soliman, A. (2008, August 7). *The Changing Role of Arabic in Religious Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Study of Egyptian Arabic*. Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA.
- Trudgill, P. (1983). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society*. New York: Penguin. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.lb/books?id=YkdxAAAIAAJ>
- Versteegh, K., & Versteegh, C. H. M. (1997). *The Arabic Language*. Columbia University Press. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.lb/books?id=2tghviSsrF8C>
- Zurairq, W., & Zhang, J. (2006). *Phonological Assimilation in Urban Jordanian Arabic (Working Paper)*. University of Kansas. Linguistics Graduate Student Association. <https://doi.org/10.17161/KWPL.1808.1229>